
Subject: New Order of Beings

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 08:14:15 GMT

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

Sage,

Gary was talking about the Temple & relating it to the Body of Christ, so I wanted to show that we have a different purpose than Israel. I said -

Quote: `However the Body of Christ is of a different order, KingPriests, where there is no `male or female, `differences. To be given a body like Christ`s, & where there is no marriage (in heaven) shows that it is a new body for a new order of beings.`

And you enquired â€“

Quote: `I don`t really understand what you are trying to say.....What do you mean by a new order of beings. I can`t say I have ever heard that expression from a Christian point of view. Thank you.`

A very interesting question, Sage, & one I would loved to expound upon.

`The Body of Christ is of a different order, Kingpriests.`

`Jesus...having become a high priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek.` (Heb. 6: 20)

`The Lord (God) has sworn & will not change His mind, Thou (Christ) art a priest forever, according to the order of Melchizedek.` (Ps. 110: 4)

`Yes, it is He who will build the temple of the Lord, & He who will bear the honour, & sit & rule on His throne. Thus He will be a priest on His throne, & the counsel of peace will be between the two offices.` (Zech. 6: 13)

The order of Melchizedek is a King Priest â€“ a royal Priest. Previously in Israel there were kings & there were priests but they were separate offices. However Father God is saying that with Christ He is a King & a Priest, (as the type Melchizedek was). It is a different order than the Aaronic Priesthood that was only temporary & added because of transgressions. But Christ`s order of Priesthood (KingPriest) is before the Aaronic Priesthood & not temporary â€“

`the former priests, on the other hand, existed in greater numbers, because they were prevented

by death from continuing, but He, on the other hand, because He abides forever, holds His priesthood permanently. Hence, also, He is able to save forever those who draw near to God through Him, since He always lives to make intercession for them.` (Heb. 23 â€“ 25)

Now Christ being a High Priest shows that there are other priests, (High Priest over other priests) & these would be of the same order â€“ King Priest. And you would know we have been told that â€“

`He has made us to be kings & Priests to His God & Father...` (Rev. 1: 6)

A new order of beings, King Priests with a body like Christ`s that can go through time & space.

`He must rise from the dead...` (John 20: 9)

`when the doors were shutJesus came & stood in their midst.` (John 20: 19)

`He also predestined to become conformed to the image of His Son.` (Rom. 8: 29)

`When He appears, we shall be like Him,...` (1 John 3: 2)

`For this perishable must put on the imperishable, & this mortal must put on immortality.` (1 Cor. 15: 53)

That is part of your questions Sage. I`ll give time for others to comment if they wish.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 14:21:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Marylin,

Quote:

Now Christ being a High Priest shows that there are other priests, (High Priest over other priests) & these would be of the same order " King Priest

"these would be of the same order" <- This premise is not substantiated.

To think that redeemed people will be/are of the order of Melchizedek (king-priest) in God's eyes is a potentially dangerous idea. The "order of Melchizedek" was something unique to Jesus.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 339 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Posted by [Gary](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 17:11:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: Gary was talking about the Temple & relating it to the Body of Christ, so I wanted to show that we have a different purpose than Israel. I said -

Marilyn,

Your quoting me out of context. This is not what I was referring to here.

I was stating you can not find women in any way shape or form working in the temple in some type of ministry.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 20:58:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jman,

Thank you for your thoughts.

Just a general comment first. Some people think, why do we study Eschatology or the eternal Purposes, as that is for the future, but they do not realise that these important topics actually effect our everyday life, right to the core, as our discussion today will show.

The foundations "Because we haven't known each other very long it can seem like you are on one continent & I'm on another & we are both shouting to be heard. But as we travel more together & discuss various topics a greater understanding of each other "attitude & beliefs" foundations develop. Gary & I have been on Andrew Strom's site for a while so we have developed an understanding of the other person & trust has built. (foundations) I know that as we all share more on OO that the joy of "comprehending with all the saints...." & "as each joint supplies..." we'll "grow up into Christ who is our Head." What an awesome journey.

Error â€“ I am very thankful to William who pointed out to me my error re: Rev. 4: 2 on the word, `One.` I am pleased to be shown my error & the truth, as who wants to live in the dark, but rather desire to come more into His light, His truth, because that is what changes us by His Holy Spirit, as we all know. And I`m sure I`ll need more corrections as we discuss more topics.

KingPriests â€“ Because of our carnal nature we all have to address the error of believing kingship means, `lording it over, superior, & other subservient, etc.` Our selfishness desires to be kingpin. Have our own way, be first, be entitled etc, etc & this shows up in everyday life especially to those closest to us. Everyday we have the choice to be first or be the servant.

Today`s reading by the Holy Spirit through Gary is all about being that servant & that is the heart of what Christ means when He says that we will rule with Him. It is as a servant, (servant king). We find that hard to get our head around as these concepts seem totally opposite, but as we by the Holy Spirit learn to `rule our own spirit,` & humble ourselves under His mighty hand, die to self daily then we are being prepared to â€“

- (Servant) rule on His throne. (Rev. 3: 20)
- If we endure, we shall also (servant) reign with Him. (2 Tim. 2: 12)
- We shall (servant) judge the world system. (1 Cor. 6: 2)
- We shall (servant) judge (fallen) angels. (1 Cor. 6: 3)
- The Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve...` (Matt. 20: 28)

So Kingpriest might sound grandiose but it is not what our carnal minds imagine, but a totally new order of servant hearts â€“ for our Kingpriest is a servant king.

Hope that explains my thoughts a bit better.

Marilyn

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 21:01:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

Sorry Gary, I don't mean to quote you out of context but your comment re the temple & women in the Body of Christ, to me, shows that you are connecting the two. I was trying to point out that they are two different purposes of God.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 21:36:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Marilyn,

In a previous post you said:

"However the Body of Christ is of a different order, KingPriests, where there is no `male or female,` differences. To be given a body like Christ's, & where there is no marriage (in heaven) shows that it is a new body for a new order of beings."

Then I asked:

Is it because in heaven there is no marriage therefore it is okay for women to be called to the 5-fold ministry of teacher or pastor or evangelist or apostle?

I am just wondering if you believe they can function in these offices.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 21:55:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn,

I'm starting to understand what everyone is saying here. I don't think we can come up with all new types of Wording that does not exist in the Word of God.

For instance: New Order of Beings. No where is this term used by Paul or any of the Apostles. Unless you can establish what you are saying in the mouth of two or three witnesses in scripture it all becomes bogus.

In college when you are told to write a paper on a certain Biblical subject you must prove all your statements with scripture. Everything must be proven with scripture, and that means not pulling

one out of context to prove a point, and adding your own interpretation.

Since what your saying is not found in scripture it then sounds like new age information. Your completely adding new terms here that are not Bible based.

Whenever you start saying things that are not found directly in scripture then it makes everything you say suspect. I thought it was just cultural terms here that was the issue but now I see your adding things to the Bible that have no basis in scripture.

Do you have a web page with a doctrinal creed that your church propagates? The information your stating sounds like it comes from a different Book then the Bible.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 22:25:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

I hear what you are saying. So does this sound correct, from 2 Cor. 5: 17 -

`Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.`

`Therefore, if any one is in union with Christ, he is a new being..` (TCNT - The Twentieth century New testament.)

(from 26 translations of the Holy Bible)

New creations under Christ`s Royal Priesthood in the order of Melchizedek.

And so how would you say what we are?

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 22:48:03 GMT

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

Sage,

Thankyou for bringing my attention to the other part of your good questions. I said -

Quote:"However the Body of Christ is of a different order, KingPriests, where there is no `male or female,` differences. To be given a body like Christ`s, & where there is no marriage (in heaven) shows that it is a new body for a new order of beings."

Body of Christ - Kingpriests. `He has made us to be kingpriests to His God & Father...` (Rev. 1: 6)
`But ye are....a royal priesthood...` (1 Peter 2: 9)

No male or female - `For all of you who were baptised into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.` (Gal. 3: 28)

No marriage in heaven - `Is this not the reason you are mistaken, that you do not understand the Scriptures, or 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)

People in the Body of Christ are a new creature, a new creation, a new being. (2 Cor. 5: 17)

`Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.`

`Therefore, if any one is in union with Christ, he is a new being.` (TCNT - The Twentieth century New testament.)

Order - `Now if perfection was through the Levitical priesthood (for on the basis of it the people received the Law), what further need was there for another priest to arise according to the order of Melchizedek, & not be designated according to the order of Aaron?` (Heb. 7: 11)

`New creations under Christ`s Royal Priesthood in the order of Melchizedek.`

This is what I have written to Gary so I hope that is in language that we can understand & agree on.

Hope that explains it better. Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [james](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 23:39:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn,

William hasn't 'transferred the power"lol of moderating on these newest Sections so rather than just 'fix' peoples mistakes I will just have to point them out<kindly>. Your quoting of II Corinthians 6:17 in a couple of posts isn't correct, I believe you meant II Corinthians 5:17.

Also, I believe your answer to Sue about whether you believe women can/should hold the offices or positions of the 5-fold isn't clear. (I think I already have a clear understanding that you do believe that, but feel free to correct me if I'm wrong.)

And while this certainly isn't a 'rule' amongst us, generally we use the KJV; so it's possible(and even very likely) that you're drawing conclusions from scripture different than we are using various translations.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 23:47:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

James,

Thank you for the correction & help re KJ. Also will answer Sage soon on that point. I thought I would change the heading to help everyone but I noticed that everyone`s individual headings were still the other one, so I changed it back.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 2013 23:57:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Are king/priests the same as queen/priestess? <grin>

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 00:06:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Definitively not!!!! William,

Though you would think so with a lot of the songs out now.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 00:17:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sage,

Sorry to have made such a confusion on my posts. Now your question is -

Quote:`Is it because in heaven there is no marriage therefore it is okay for women to be called to

the 5-fold ministry of teacher or pastor or evangelist or apostle?’

No that is not what I meant as I was trying to explain the difference between the old order of priests & Christ’s ‘new’ order.(which actually was before the Aaronic order of priests)

But you did ask about women & the 5-fold ministries. I was brought up to believe they were just men. And these ministries should always function together & not be isolated from each other.

Personally I don’t like women running Christian organisations as the sole leader. To me there should always be multiple leadership responsibility. And in today’s Christian organisations we see more of the CEO type of leadership & not necessarily the 5-fold ministries.

Finally I believe God gifts women as Shepherds, teachers, evangelists but I have not seen the 5-fold Prophetic or Apostleship by a woman as yet - but that is only my observation. Christ is the Head & through out many countries there could be these operating as such.

So its only my belief, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 00:36:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Marylin,

Quote:

‘New creations under Christ’s Royal Priesthood in the order of Melchizedek.’

This is what I have written to Gary so I hope that is in language that we can understand & agree on.

No Marylin, no agreement. We human beings (we "New creations") are not in the order of Melchizedek.

Please state clearly how the "order of Melchizedek" concept relates to this new doctrine.

Quote:

Body of Christ - Kingpriests. `He has made us to be kingpriests to His God & Father...` (Rev. 1: 6)

It does not say "kingpriests." There are two different words in Greek - kings and priests.

Marylin, misquoting your new terminology into a Bible verse just ain't right.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 339 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 00:53:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Thu, 05 December 2013 16:25Gary,

I hear what you are saying. So does this sound correct, from 2 Cor. 5: 17 -

`Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.`

`Therefore, if any one is in union with Christ, he is a new being..` (TCNT - The Twentieth century New testament.)

(from 26 translations of the Holy Bible)

New creations under Christ's Royal Priesthood in the order of Melchizedek.

And so how would you say what we are?

Marilyn.

Duhhhh! You should of shared this sooner. I did not realize this other translation. Most of the

scriptures I have memorized are from the KJV, but presently I read the NKJV.

Thanks for clarifying this you may want to switch versions when trying to explain this stuff. It sounded like a foreign language for a minute. There was another word I seen you use, it was terrestrial but I understood what you were saying there.

I would say we are new "creations".

A few word changes does make a difference.

Gary

P.S. That was very humorous on Williams part that he shared.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 02:23:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Great Gary,

Sorry to cause such confusion. But we can all have a laugh. Yes I will certainly try & stick to James` name sake. (King James - has a nice ring about it doesn`t it James!!!!!!!)

Now you said the New King James. Is that the New Order of Book for the New Order Of beings!!!!

I think I may have to have `joke lessons,` from you & James, or rather leave it to you both as a duo with William`s voice coming from on high sometimes.

Yes, good humour by William.

Blessings, we live toenjoy another day. Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 03:09:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jman,

Sorry I missed you post amid the rush & just saw it in my mail box. That is a good question & I hope we can look into the word to see whether it is true or not.

While I am doing my part can you look into what you believe about us being kings & priests?

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 03:52:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Marylin,

Please state clearly how the "order of Melchizedek" concept relates to this new doctrine.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 339 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 05:44:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jman,

I am not bringing out any new doctrine. However I hope that together we all can read God`s word to clarify what He is saying to us.

I see scripture tells us that we are in Christ & of His priesthood, which is of the order of Melchizedek, (King Priest).

In the tabernacle when Aaron was High Priest over other priests, they were his sons but they were not Royal, & their offices were not perpetual & their sacrifices were not spiritual, etc. With Christ who is our High Priest, He is Royal, & His office is eternal & his sacrifice & offerings are forever effectual. (Heb.Ch.7&8)

And as our High Priest â€œ

`it was fitting for Him, for whom are all things & by whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory...` (Heb. 2: 10)

Now sons of God brings with it responsibility & we are told that we will be kings & priests. Kingship â€œ activity, Priesthood â€œ worship.

Christ is a priest & as a High Priest He is over other priests (sons).

Christ is a king & as King of kings He is over other kings. (sons)

Thus we will be kings & priests of Christ`s eternal Priesthood & not of the Aaronic order of priests which were not royal & only tempory.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Posted by [william](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 08:19:45 GMT

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

Hi Marilyn,

You said:

Quote:KingPriests - Because of our carnal nature we all have to address the error of believing kingship means, "lording it over, superior, and other subservient, etc." Our selfishness desires to be kingpin. Have our own way, be first, be entitled etc, etc and this shows up in everyday life especially to those closest to us. Everyday we have the choice to be first or be the servant. Today's reading by the Holy Spirit through Gary is all about being that servant and that is the heart of what Christ means when He says that we will rule with Him. It is as a servant, (servant king). We find that hard to get our head around as these concepts seem totally opposite, but as we by the Holy Spirit learn to "rule our own spirit," and humble ourselves under His mighty hand, die to self daily then we are being prepared to -

Most of us know this, if not in practice (yet) at least in theory. We have no desire to "lord over" anyone. You can't walk in the Spirit very long and not be overwhelmed with the stench of authoritarianism that is prevalent all around us. Jesus has given us a taste of freedom and we

eschew the idea of losing it and we certainly don't want to put anyone else under that kind of bondage.

Quote: "He has made us to be kings & Priests to His God & Father..." Rev. 1:6

Here is where I'm a little unclear... are you taking this verse to be future? Some of the things you have said indicate that you are. The verse isn't speaking of some future event even if it sounds like it is in the translation that you quote.

The KJV translates it: "And hath made us kings and priests unto God..."

The grk verb translated "hath made" is an "aorist active indicative" which means that we who are in Christ, are already kings and priests. This isn't some future event that takes place when our bodies are changed.

With that information in mind we ought to be able to look at the lives of Paul, Peter, John and others in the NT and find examples that show us exactly how the phrase "kings and priests" applies to our lives. I think it was Gary that mentioned it, but what you need to do is show us a real biblical example of someone who walked in this king/priest office and then show us how the "new order" you describe is something different than what we are now.

The same is true concerning the "new creation in Christ". We already are new creations in Christ: Therefore if any man [be] in Christ, [he is] a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. [2Cr 5:17 KJV]

This is already a "done-deal" as we say here in the west.

Are things going to be different when we receive our new bodies? Certainly... but we ought not use these particular passages to tout some future new order because they aren't applicable in that sense. Both passages should be presently active in our lives right now.

Before this you seem to indicate that the kings/priests order is a present reality and then move on to speak of the way it is in heaven (which is the reason I said I'm unclear about your meaning) --you said: (and Sage asked you about it)

Quote:"However the Body of Christ is of a different order, KingPriests, where there is no "male or female, "differences. To be given a body like Christ's, & where there is no marriage (in heaven) shows that it is a new body for a new order of beings."

Obviously the first part --the body of Christ, is a present reality while the second part --in heaven, is yet future. I guess my question is: why are you using the "new order" language (about the angels in heaven) to prove your contention about the present order of things in the body of Christ

(where marriages exist and where we are not like the angels in heaven)? You can't mix up the dispensations, otherwise the body of Christ should quit procreating (and all of the other stuff that goes along with that) and be like the angels! <grin>

Lastly, I was only half joking about the kings/priests (always male in the OT) and the queens/priestess comment. My point was that if you are going to use a new word like kingpriest, you might as well coin one that would be more relevant to your point about female leadership, and a good one to use would be queenpriestess. I wasn't aware of any song or group that used those words so any humor based on that was way over my head!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 10:31:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

After reading Williams comment the title of this topic would read: New Order of New Creations.

Something doesn't sound right in either title.

We are new creations/beings now, in heaven what takes place we only have a small idea because we look through the mirror dimly and do not have full understanding.

12 For now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part, but then I shall know just as I also am known.

Marilyn why do you use this version of the Bible, Do you think its closer to the Greek/Hebrew or what?

The New King James Version that I use does away with old archaic words that we do not use today, like thee, thou, etc. I do find though some words are not from literal greek but I think this is because of copyright laws, but it is closer to the original text for the most part.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 11:56:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Most of us know this, if not in practice (yet) at least in theory. We have no desire to "lord over" anyone. You can't walk in the Spirit very long and not be overwhelmed with the stench of authoritarianism that is prevalent all around us. Jesus has given us a taste of freedom and we eschew the idea of losing it and we certainly don't want to put anyone else under that kind of bondage.

Don't want to change the thread here of any investigation or interrogation of Marilyn's doctrines.
LOLOLOL

But my wife and I was talking about this subject the other day, that William mentioned above. Give some one a little authority or some title in life and immediately they wave it around like they hit the lottery. I think it has to deal with "self" importance or "self" esteem.

Someone at her place of employment had a new position of authority and power and it changed they way they thought and acted.

Anyway there is a lot of truth in what your sharing here and sadly it carries over into the body of Christ.

For some reason certain titles carry an air of importance to some and it elevates them over their fellow man. Even titles with in the five fold bring a level of importance to peoples minds.

Its easy to talk about dying to self, actual living it is a whole different ballgame.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Fri, 06 Dec 2013 15:39:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But you did ask about women & the 5-fold ministries. I was brought up to believe they were just men. And these ministries should always function together & not be isolated from each other.

Personally I don't like women running Christian organisations as the sole leader. To me there should always be multiple leadership responsibility. And in today's Christian organisations we see more of the CEO type of leadership & not necessarily the 5-fold ministries.

Finally I believe God gifts women as Shepherds, teachers, evangelists but I have not seen the 5-fold Prophetic or Apostleship by a woman as yet - but that is only my observation. Christ is the Head & through out many countries there could be these operating as such.

I'm assuming you mean by Christian organizations the local church. I agree that women should not be the leader of a church, and for that matter I don't even care for them to be CEOs or Supervisors in the work place. In all my years of working I have only had one female boss that was any good. She had the respect of all who worked under her, both male and female. The other female bosses all seemed to have something to prove, or a pride issue, or domineering/authoritative attitudes.

From the beginning of time God has set male leadership in all aspects of our lives, the Temple, the home, the local assembly, and the government. I can't think of anyplace in the New Testament where God put women in a position of leadership in the church. There were men elders, men pastors, men apostles, men evangelist, men teachers all functioning in the 5-fold ministry in the church. The only 5-fold position that could possibly be a female was prophetess. I don't see that as having changed.

The women in God's eyes are not less than the man, but has a different function in the home and the local assembly. Because God calls the man to be the head of the home and the local assembly does not make the women inferior in God's eye. Maybe because we see so little male leadership in all aspects of our society there are major issues with the children, including things like ADD, ADHD, Autism, Sexual Orientation problems, Asthma, and God only knows what else. Not making a doctrine here, just a thought.

For the man to be the leader of a home is an awesome responsibility, and needs a wife who will be a Godly helpmeet for him. She isn't a doormat, or subservient to him, but rather has a different function in the family. There has to be a leader in the home and church, therefore God has chosen the man to function in this capacity. Where God calls, He will enable. The human body has various functions, so I believe that is why the Lord called the local assembly the body of

Christ, each having their specific function. When we are all doing as God has called, it is a beautiful thing, but when people are functioning where they are not called it can cause confusion and deception. I asked a male pastor what he thought of women pastors, and his response was quite insightful to me. "When you have more and more women in positions of pastors and leadership positions, it will gradually make the men quit coming to church, and it will be mostly women going to church, the men will stay home." I couldn't agree more.

I don't even like to see women leading worship, or being deacons, let alone elders as so many denominations have now. It is the frog in the water. A church or denomination compromises just a little with God's divine order, and it opens the door to deception. And just because someone is a male, does not automatically place him in the 5-fold ministry, but only if he meets the scriptural requirements and is called by God to function in such position. Just because a woman is not in the 5-fold ministry does not mean she can't share with others what God has taught her.

But in saying all that, it doesn't mean men are infallible. We all, male and female, need to know doctrine and the truths of God's word, so we can each, individually discern what is of God and what isn't. It will be each of us individually standing before God one day, with no one to blame if we allow ourselves to follow any deception. Blaming others goes all the way back to the garden, we need to take personal responsibility for our own actions and beliefs.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 01:13:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

William,

Thank you for being interested in what I believe & I do appreciate your comments & study. We all know these wonderful truths & it's good to meditate on them for it brings forth thanksgiving, awe & praises to our wonderful Lord & Saviour, Jesus Christ. I hope I can explain myself to you.

`Christ....has made us kings & priests to His God & Father...' (Rev. 1: 6 NKJ)

William explained to us that this means `already kings & priests.` (my husband Trevor said, `have you got your crown yet William?` lol)

Now I believe what you say in relation to the now & then aspect. God tells us we are His sons

but we have not yet come into our full inheritance. This new life, as God`s sons, is the resurrection life of Christ that is being formed in us, as we all know, however to be given full responsibility & authority as kings & priests comes with maturity, (in heaven) Here are some scriptures so we can get God`s thoughts.

`The first man Adam became a living being. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit.`(1 Cor. 15: 45) (Christ`s resurrection life.)

`But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God....` (John 1: 12) (sons of God)

`And because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying out, `Abba, Father!` Therefore you are no longer a slave but a son, & if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.` (Gal. 4: 6 & 7) (sons & heirs)

`The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God, & if children, then heirs â€“ heirs of God & joint heirs with Christ, if indeed we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together.` (Rom. 8: 16 & 17) (& even joint heirs with Christ)

God has given us an example of this resurrection life within someone, showing how this Christ life overcomes the flesh, the world (system of man) & the devil. It is the life of Christ firstly & then the Apostle Paul`s life is displayed to us & the suffering he went through - ` if indeed we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together.` (Rom. 8: 17)

`For whatever is born of God overcomes the world;` (1 John 5: 4)

`Therefore most gladly I will rather boast in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in needs, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ`s sake. For when I am weak, then I am strong.` (2 Cor. 12: 9 & 10)

`But what things were gain to me these I have counted loss for Christ. ...& be found in Him,that I may know Him & the power of His resurrection, & the fellowship of His sufferings...if I ...may attain to the resurrection of the dead. Not that I have already attainedbut reaching forward ... I press towards the goal of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus.....For our citizenship is in heaven,....` (Phil. 3: 7 â€“ 20)

`God.. has begotten us to a living hopeto an inheritance incorruptible & undefiled ... reserved in heaven for you.` (1 Peter 1: 3 & 4)

With Christ`s resurrection life within we are sons of God. And as sons we come into an inheritance

with Christ. What is that inheritance? - to be like Him & to have responsibility & authority (under Christ) as a king & a priest.

`to those who are called according to His purpose.....he also predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son.....first born among many brethren.` (Rom. 8: 28 & 29)

`To him who overcomes I will grant to sit with Me on My throne....` (Rev. 3: 21)

`He shall sit & rule on His throne; So He shall be a priest on His throne,....` (Zech. 6: 13)

`Therefore, if perfection were through the Levitical priesthood...what further need was there that another priest should rise according to the order of Melchizedek, & not be called according to the order of Aaron.` (Heb. 7: 11)

`...Jesus, having become high priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek.` (Heb. 6: 20)

Summing up â€œ

We are new creations (beings) in Christ, sons of God & joint heirs with Christ as Kings & Priests of His order. This order is the order of Melchizedek (King & a Priest) which is Royal, eternal & includes women. The `old` order, the `Aaronic` priesthood was not Royal, only temporary & only for men.

New Order of Priests, (new creations, beings)
New Order ofbeings.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 03:13:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sage,

Thankyou for sharing your beliefs on that topic, I appreciate that for it helps us to get to know each other better.

Blessings, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 03:18:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marylin,

I think you really "crossed a line" when you altered Rev 1:6 above.
(your post #10523 which I already quoted in my post #10530)

<<< possible cultural difference : "Crossed a line" in USA means did something so bad that it cannot be ignored >>>

You inserted "kingpriest" in place of God's actual words - so then your new version reads as if the newly invented term "kingpriest" is rightly applied to believers. An error which would falsely support/prove your Melchizedeck ideas.

I am really having trouble accepting this "altering God's Word" tactic.

It is really bugging me.

Since you have knowledge of and access to the Greek there can be no excuse.

=====

Please lay out this "Eternal Purpose/Melchizedeck" doctrine in a complete outline-type overview so I can see what I am getting into if I invest more time into this thread.

I do not trust you as to where you want to lead us doctrinally.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 340 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 04:11:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jman,

As I have said before -

`But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood...' (1 Peter 2: 9)

Royal - Gk. `basileia,` kingly.

Royal Priest, King Priest, which Hebrews Ch. 7 & 8 tells us.

Do you have trouble when I put the words close together?

KingPriest. Well I can easily write King Priest if that helps & not offends you.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Posted by [wishing34](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 04:53:45 GMT

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

Marilyn,

Please lay out this "Eternal Purpose/Melchizedeck" doctrine in a complete outline-type overview.

Jman

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Posted by [GWB](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 04:59:21 GMT

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

This has been very interesting and informative.

I think it would be helpful if all views would be put into an outline form. This way, we could compare all aspects.

I would like to begin with your outline, wishing34.

It would be helpful as to why this does not agree with your theology.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 12:44:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi GWB,

Not my thread.

I do not know what topics are yet to come.
So I do not know what doctrines will be involved.
So I cannot make a point by point outline.

I am about ready to sit back and just wait until Maryliin fully develops her teaching.

I'll count on you GWB to speak up if she has anything that is un-Scriptural.

Tip: It appears this Melchizadeck aspect is going to be important to watch.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 341 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

GWB,

I have pretty much decided that my spoon is not big enough to bail out Marylin's ocean everyday so I thought I might give you more info as to what to watch out for.

=====
Example of Truth: Believers are "in Christ'

this results in:

- have authority in spiritual realm
- have imputed righteousness
- called to imitate Christ in daily life
- have eternal life
- can approach the Father as Abba Father ("child of God" or "son" of God - small "s")
- generally are in fellowship with God

=====

=====
Example of Silliness: Say someone convinced you that you are "in the order of James Bond" the movie spy

this results in:

- you have a license to kill - Un-Scriptural you say? But "the James Bond order" trumps the other Scriptures
- you can imitate Bond with a worldly lifestyle
- more???

If you accept the premise that you are in the order of James Bond then you are open to many possible re-writes of Scriptural doctrines. The key is to sell you on the original premise.

=====

No one could sell you on the James Bond idea, but say someone convinced you that you are "in the order of Melchizedek"

(Note: Jesus is of the order of Melchizedek, but human beings are not.)

Now that person can define what the order of Melchizedek includes. Their definition is wide open because this Melchizedek doctrine is not in the Bible. If you have bought into their Melchizedek doctrine then they can have you dismiss other Scriptures because, after all, you are of the order of Melchizedek.

=====
Example of Dangerous: You are "in the order of Melchizedek"

this results in:

???
??
?

Notice the results are not known/given - not until first you are sold on the Melchizedek doctrine.

=====
GWB, these are some ideas to store in your back pocket as you watch this thread. My hunch is it will be relevant.

I am pretty much done with Marylin after the Rev 1:6 thing, so I'll leave her in your capable hands.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 341 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 18:01:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GWB wrote on Fri, 06 December 2013 22:59 This has been very interesting and informative.

I think it would be helpful if all views would be put into an outline form. This way, we could compare all aspects.

I would like to begin with your outline, wishing34.

It would be helpful as to why this does not agree with your theology.

The concept of an outline, for me at least, is to present a complete overview of the material. It's like a ladder. I'd like to see where the ladder is going to take me before I start climbing.

Now I'm not so naive as to think that there's only one way to teach, but I can tell you the method being employed right now isn't working for me. Let me say again, I'm not AGAINST anyone presenting material to the best of their abilities... no one has been perfected in that department, but what I am saying is that the method being used is not working at all for me.

Marilyn's method may be working for others but to me this is what I'm getting:

1. Someone says something... (it may just be a random comment).
2. This provokes a grand dump of material supposedly relevant to the comment.
3. This of course causes others to make comments on bits and pieces of the grand dump of material that was supposed to answer the first comment.
4. More grand dumps of material (complete with their own section) follow, again, supposedly to answer the questions raised by others.
5. William's mind -- Blown fuse.

Now maybe my mind is predisposed to being blown and others are grasping what is being said/taught and it makes perfect sense to them.

Or maybe this is a fundamental male/female gap that will never be bridged.

An outline does what a map would do for a person traveling. It presents an overview of where we are going and the route we are going to take to get there. I've got to have that map, or I'm not going to even start the journey. The random, piecemeal, presentation of the material may be giving some the impression that something great is being built but it is just a pile of stones to me... I need the blueprint to be able to grasp where we are going.

Now I know that this is going to sound like I'm just biased against a woman teaching (I'm not, and I have given ample evidence of that in previous posts) but I can clearly see the reasons for passages in the Bible that give the nod to the male when it comes to establishing doctrine. Both the bible and *my* experience backs this up.

Obviously you aren't having the problems that I've been having, Gillyann. I can only guess that it is because you are a woman and your mind is more capable of understanding another woman, but I'm not experiencing the same sort of satisfaction, maybe because I'm from Mars. (I'm going to get that book, Gary!)

So far, all of the questions I've raised have been answered with a massive dump of scripture passages. Perhaps one might even say that this is the proper way to do it, it even sounds good after all, who could argue with scripture?

A person could spend all day posting scripture and my response would always be AMEN, it's all true, but the thing that is missing are those connecting dots that make the scripture relevant to the questions being asked.

I haven't gone back over the whole thread to see if this next statement is absolutely true but it seems that all of the questions raised by Jman, Gary, James and myself (all men!!) at least have implications that have a bearing on specific Biblical passages.

We have given concrete reasons as to why certain passages do or do not apply and the only response is a re-iteration of the passages, plus a bunch more, yoked with a vague concept about the order of Melchisedec.

Now one shouldn't be too put off about the difficulties of explaining Melchisedec, Paul himself faced the same challenge.

But, and this is the crucial part, if someone is going to delve into such an esoteric doctrine, it needs to be presented in a clear and unambiguous manner. An outline is the least of our expectations. Even if it were a man presenting the doctrine he would face an almost insurmountable hurdle, but someone from Venus trying to teach someone from Mars? That is a challenge that borders on the impossible.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 18:57:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I appreciate everyone's ideas on how to present this topic that is being discussed.

I still think an outline from Jman is needed first for comparison. It would be a baseline for all of us to look at so we could stay on track. It would also offer valuable information on the topic. Not everybody reading or participating has your vast knowledge and gift of interpreting scripture, Jman. Maybe you could be so kind as to share one.

If you ask someone to present something like this, you should be willing to do the same.

Marilyn is new to OO. Be it male or female, I am sure we all want to show Marilyn our love and kindness that we learned at FA when people are talking about the Word.

I am sure that nobody here, who claim to be Overcomers, wants to be guilty of sarcasm, tongue in cheek, condescending to others, or maybe even having an unloving attitude.

For now, I don't think this has anything to do with the original topic. I think it is now about how we treat people in disagreements.

God has given many on OO talents for teaching, sharing, dividing scripture, and knowledge of faith.

"Faith works by love." If love is not involved in any conversation, how genius it may be, people are clanging cymbals in God's eyes.

Maybe you are right, William. Because this involves a woman's opinion, it might be impossible to come to a conclusion. However, it is not impossible to show a right attitude and love towards the brethren when talking about the Bible in any situation we find ourselves.

Many people have been discouraged and have left OO due to this very reason. I hope this will not be the case with this topic.

I hold no ill feelings towards anyone. This is just what I see. I hope my opinion will be considered.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 20:18:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here is a brief history of this doctrine:

Quote: Christians believe that Jesus is the Messiah spoken of as "a priest forever in the order of Melchizedek" (Ps. 110:4), and so Jesus plays the role of the king-priest once and for all. According to the writer of Hebrews (7:13-17) Jesus is considered a priest in the order of Melchizedek because, like Melchizedek, Jesus was not a descendant of Aaron, and thus would not qualify for the Jewish priesthood under Law of Moses.

Melchizedek is referred to again in Hebrews 5:6-10; Hebrews 6:20; Hebrews 7:1-21: "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek"; and Hebrews 8:1.

And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham: But he whose descent is not counted from them received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises" (Hebrews 7:5-6).

If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law" (Hebrews 7:11-12).

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the New Testament discussed this subject considerably, listing the following reasons for why the priesthood of Melchizedek is superior to the Aaronic priesthood:

1. Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek; later, the Levites would receive tithes from their countrymen. Since Aaron was in Abraham's loins then, it was as if the Aaronic priesthood were paying tithes to Melchizedek. (Heb. 7:4-10)
2. The one who blesses is always greater than the one being blessed. Thus, Melchizedek was greater than Abraham. As Levi was yet in the loins of Abraham, it follows that Melchizedek is greater than Levi. (Heb. 7:7-10)
3. If the priesthood of Aaron were effective, God would not have called a new priest in a different order in Psalm 110. (Heb. 7:11)
4. The basis of the Aaronic priesthood was ancestry; the basis of the priesthood of Melchizedek is everlasting life. That is, there is no interruption due to a priest's death. (Heb. 7:8,15-16,23-25)
5. Christ, being sinless, does not need a sacrifice for his own sins. (Heb. 7:26-27)
6. The priesthood of Melchizedek is more effective because it required a single sacrifice once and for all (Jesus), while the Levitical priesthood made endless sacrifices. (Heb. 7:27)
7. The Aaronic priests serve (or, rather, served) in an earthly copy and shadow of the heavenly Temple, which Jesus serves in. (Heb. 8:5)

The epistle goes on to say that the covenant of Jesus is superior to the covenant the Levitical priesthood is under. Some Christians hold that Melchizedek was a type of Christ, and some other Christians hold that Melchizedek indeed was Christ. Reasons provided include that Melchizedek's name means "king of righteousness" according to the author of Hebrews, and that being king of Salem makes Melchizedek the "king of peace." Heb. 7:3 states, "Without father or mother, without genealogy, without beginning of days or end of life, like the Son of God he (Melchizedek) remains a priest forever." Melchizedek gave Abraham bread and wine, which some Christians consider symbols of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, the sacrifice to confirm a covenant.

Here is further information concerning the Protestant view:

Quote: Protestantism

Some Christian evangelicals and Messianic Jews hold that Christ will return as the true Messiah in the name. According to this view, which is taken from a literalist interpretation of Revelation 20, he will serve as both King and High Priest (e.g. the Melchizedek priesthood) in a coming millennium of the Messiah.

A more common Protestant theological understanding simply holds that the mysterious Melchizedek priesthood refers to Jesus as the eternal priest. His once-made sacrifice fulfilled the need for atonement of sins and he currently rules within the Church. In this via traditions of the Book of Hebrews, Jesus has ever been, is, and will ever be the only totally perfect priest (Hebrews 9â€“7). Amillennialists believe that the messiah has already come, and his earthly role has been fulfilled. This is contrary to millenarianism which expects a pre-millennial return of Christ as Messiah.

Some Christians believe Jesus Christ the Son came to Earth at various times before the New Testament, including once as Melchizedek himself. These appearances are called Christophanies. Others still maintain that Melchizedek is actually Archangel Michael: Michael is designated in the apocryphal Book of Enoch and the canonical Book of Daniel as "the prince of Israel". He is the angel of forbearance and mercy (Enoch, xl:3) who taught Enoch the mysteries of clemency and justice (lxxi:2). In the book of Jubilees (i:27 and ii:1), the angel who is said to have instructed Moses on Mount Sinai and to have delivered to him the tables of the Law is most probably Michael. Still others believe that Michael is Jesus.

Don't know if this helps the conversation but it has been presented as a valid doctrine or teaching in Christianity. I remember that HEF dealt with this but I do not remember what was said on this teaching.

At this point I don't know what Marilyn is implying by the way she is sharing it. Because she is not making it plain for everyone to understand.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 20:21:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi GWB,

Quote:

I still think an outline from Jman is needed first for comparison . . .

Say someone asks you for an outline of a sermon as you sit in church listening to the sermon. But the sermon is only 2 minutes old. You know the start point, but you could not make an outline of the rest of it. We are only at the 2 minute mark in Marylin's sermon.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 341 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 20:32:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here is a book that deals with this subject but I do not know what it is about or anything about the author:

http://www.amazon.com/Order-Melchizedek-Rediscovering-Eterna-I-Priesthood/dp/1616233206/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&am;qid=1386448546&sr=1-1&keywords=order+of+melchizede+k

There appears to be a number of books on this subject. This man appears to be one of the promoters of this doctrine:

<http://francismyles.com/about/>

Everyone will have to decide for yourselves. It seems to be something fairly new sweeping through the body. I don't know how valid all of this information is.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 20:33:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

Thanks so much for taking the time to present all of that info. I appreciate your willingness to do so. I will review it and use it for study.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 20:38:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow, Gary,

That man is so way off, so not what the Bible says but in the Dominionists camp of taking over the world for Christ.

I thought I had answered your questions as you said with scriptures to show what I was saying but I think there has been so many questions on the way that we have all gotten off on to many tangents. And it seems like I have given William another head ache & maybe raised his blood pressure.

I will do an out line because that is what I also like when people are talking to me, the bottom line as we say.

Just noticed your other comments back further on Melchizedek & didn't realise there was so much variation. Would be good if you could find out what you had been taught on Christ's priesthood because that is the essence of our topic.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 20:43:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

To all,

Can you please clear this up for me. The priesthood of believers - what is that, now & in glory? I'm not sure what you mean.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Posted by [Gary](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 20:57:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sat, 07 December 2013 15:43 To all,

Can you please clear this up for me. The priesthood of believers - what is that, now & in glory? I'm not sure what you mean.

Marilyn.

"You also, as living stones, are being built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ â€¦ But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, His own special people, that you may proclaim the praises of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvelous light" (1 Peter 2:5-9).

In the Old Testament tabernacle and temple, there were places where only the priests could go. Into the Holy of Holies, behind a thick veil, only the High Priest could go, and that only once a year on the Day of Atonement when he made a sin offering on behalf of all of the people.

Because of Jesus' death upon the cross of Calvary, all believers now have direct access to the throne of God as royal priests through Jesus Christ our great High Priest (Hebrews 4:14-16).

We can access the throne of God because of the shed Blood of Jesus, He paid the price and made this possible.

I guess we don't think of ourselves as being priests in this capacity.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 21:02:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thank you Gary,

Yes I totally agree -

Quote:`I guess we don't think of ourselves as being priests in this capacity.

But in what capacity do you see us as priests? You said -

Quote:`Because of Jesus' death upon the cross of Calvary, all believers now have direct access to the throne of God as royal priests through Jesus Christ our great High Priest (Hebrews 4:14-16).

What does `royal priests,` mean to you?

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 21:08:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sat, 07 December 2013 14:43To all,

Can you please clear this up for me. The priesthood of believers - what is that, now & in glory? I'm not sure what you mean.

Marilyn.

I just went back over the thread and you are the only one who has mentioned "priesthood" so when you say "... I'm not sure what you mean"... quote someone who has mentioned "priesthood" (besides yourself) and perhaps they can clear it up!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 21:21:02 GMT

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

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sat, 07 December 2013 16:02 Thank you Gary,

Yes I totally agree -

Quote: `I guess we don't think of ourselves as being priests in this capacity.

But in what capacity do you see us as priests? You said -

Quote: `Because of Jesus' death upon the cross of Calvary, all believers now have direct access to the throne of God as royal priests through Jesus Christ our great High Priest (Hebrews 4:14-16).

What does `royal priests,` mean to you?

Marilyn.

Because I was quoting the scripture in Peter. We have direct access to the throne of God "as" priests.

The priests in the old testament had direct access to God on the day of atonement in behalf of the nation. We can go to God now in prayer or fellowship "as" priests. I don't know of anyone who things of themselves as priests part of a priesthood.

I think its like an example showing us we have access to the throne. We cannot read into scriptures and assume anything.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 21:41:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The OT priests had three basic functions: 1- To serve God, 2- To serve the people, 3- to offer sacrifices on behalf of the people (and themselves).

The third function was rendered unnecessary by Jesus Christ. In fact the whole idea of a physical priesthood was removed at the cross.

With that in mind, a royal priesthood, in the NT sense would be metaphorical and not literal. I think the same thing could be said concerning believers being kings but you didn't ask about that. This doesn't mean that the term is an irrelevant distinction. All believers are called to serve God and serve others as spiritual priests.

The verse Gary quoted essentially says just that --"that you may proclaim the praises of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvelous light" (1 Peter 2:5-9)

We are a chosen nation, holy people, a royal priesthood to do what? --to "proclaim the praises of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvelous light". Jesus gives believers the awesome responsibility to mediate (function as a priest) his gospel to others. We represent (minister) God to others and at the same time minister to God with our worship.

There is no formal "order" here. We're not like the Catholics who relish the setting up of specific "orders" (like the monastic order) which implies some sort of physical structure/office that we as believers function in.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 22:07:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

William,

Yes I mentioned Priesthood because that was what Gary was implying (Testimony of Discipling 10474).

Quote: `When the Lord gave them the design of the temple, it was men who the Lord used to work in the temple, woman had an outer court. Why did not woman come into the temple to serve is some capacity? Because it was never the Lord's Will.

It is no different today God has called men who are created in His image to run churches and have authority over them.`

And I thought that concept was very Catholic also. But I wanted more information. Thus our discussion developed & went off into many areas.

A word concerning your comments to me about `my method.` I realise now that men tend to like the `bottom line,` approach & women like the details. Had you thought that if I came on OO & started laying out long posts of teachings, well you`d say, Who does she think she is!!!`

And because I have the privilege of reading much of what you have been taught I know that we have lots in common with a few details yet to be discussed.

Thus my approach is to bring up topics but also to follow the conversation so you can all understand where I am coming from. That is the foundation of good discussions but we are having to work through the `errors.` And Gary found the big one -Dominionism. And this great deceptive error is through out Christianity & twists all the doctrines of the Bible.

Now you know I don`t believe in that false teaching, more understanding is developing between us. You need to give me & others time to work through many topics in the Bible to understand where we are coming from.

Of course I would expect you all to discern very carefully what I or anyone else says, but give time & grace for conversations to develop for the men & for the women. And note I do see long posts by men expounding on their thoughts too.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 22:19:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: 10474: Marilyn,

To be truthful I think the discussion has stagnated. Let me share one thing here. God who is the same yesterday, today, and forever, has from the beginning made man to be created in His image and to rule over the earth.

We know the whole story of what took place. When the Lord gave them the design of the temple, it was men who the Lord used to work in the temple, woman had an outer court. Why did not woman come into the temple to serve in some capacity? Because it was never the Lord's Will.

It is no different today God has called men who are created in His image to run churches and have authority over them.

This is just the way God wanted it to be, its not in our power to change God's order we just have to believe and accept it.

We must never add to or take away from what God has said in His Word. Women were created for men not to teach them nor to rule over them. It's God's design and we as His creation just have to accept it.

Gary

Quote: Marilyn Wrote; William,

Yes I mentioned Priesthood because that was what Gary was implying (Testimony of Discipling 10474).

Marilyn,

Here is 10474 I do not see anything about priesthood that your saying I am quoting. Seems like your putting words in my mouth here, that don't exist.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 22:22:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: Marilyn wrote: Now you know I don` t believe in that false teaching, more understanding is developing between us. You need to give me & others time to work through many topics in the Bible to understand where we are coming from.

Of course I would expect you all to discern very carefully what I or anyone else says, but give time & grace for conversations to develop for the men & for the women. And note I do see long

posts by men expounding on their thoughts too.

Marilyn.

This sounds like a snow job here.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 07 Dec 2013 22:27:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thank you William & Gary,

I can now appreciate where you are coming from & what you believe. William you said -

Quote: `Jesus gives believers the awesome responsibility to mediate (function as a priest) his gospel to others. We represent (minister) God to others and at the same time minister to God with our worship.`

What a wonderful ministry that is. And I agree with your thoughts here -

Quote: `The OT priests had three basic functions: 1- To serve God, 2- To serve the people, 3- to offer sacrifices on behalf of the people (and themselves).

The third function was rendered unnecessary by Jesus Christ.`

However I don't fully agree with what you say here -

Quote: `In fact the whole idea of a physical priesthood was removed at the cross. (True) With that in mind, a royal priesthood, in the NT sense would be metaphorical and not literal.`

If our priesthood is `metaphorical,` not literal, then wouldn't God have written, `You are AS a royal Priesthood?` Yet we do minister to people & worship God as you said, so wouldn't it be true to

say we are a spiritual priesthood.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 02:45:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Marilyn,

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sat, 07 December 2013 16:27

If our priesthood is 'metaphorical,' not literal, then wouldn't God have written, 'You are AS a royal Priesthood?'

Not necessarily... one might walk into a wild meeting where some were barking and some were making chicken noises and make the statement -- "this place is a zoo!". No one would think that it was necessary to correct the obvious implication and meaning by saying --"no brother, don't you mean that this place is LIKE a zoo!"

The literal priesthood of Israel with all of its trappings had come to an end with the renting of the veil of the temple. All believers had the same access to God as the literal priests in the OT. There was no temple. There was no more sacrifice. There was no more need for a mediator between God and man. Likewise, when Peter says you are an holy nation, there would be no need for him to explain that he didn't mean a "nation" in the political sense, just as there would be no reason for him to stop and explain his meaning was not to be taken as a literal nation.

Quote:

Marilyn said: Yet we do minister to people & worship God as you said, so wouldn't it be true to say we are a spiritual priesthood.

Wasn't that what I said? William said: All believers are called to serve God and serve others as spiritual priests.

I could have just as easily said, and I think that most would automatically assume that I meant --"...that metaphorically speaking we are spiritual priests." We are not priests in the literal sense of the word.

The word "priesthood" used in the passage (1Pet 2:9) is obviously (at least to me) meant to be a description of something using an implied comparison, not a literal comparison, which makes it by definition metaphorical.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 04:37:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

William,

You said

Quote: `All believers are called to serve God and serve others as spiritual priests.`

I agree. And I believe God`s word puts the emphasis on the actual & reveals the shadow as such, a `copy & shadow.`

`...For if He (Christ) were on earth, He would not be a priest, since there are priests who offer the gifts according to the law; who serve the COPY & SHADOW of the heavenly things,` (Heb. 8: 4 & 5)

You again said -

Quote: "...that metaphorically speaking we are spiritual priests." We are not priests in the literal sense of the word.

This puts the wrong emphasis onto the copy & the shadow & not on the reality, which is Christ, the priest from whom all priests have their pattern.

`See that you make all things according to the pattern shown you on the mountain.`

`Now this is the main point of the things we are saying: We have such a high priest, who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary & of the true tabernacle which the Lord erected, & not man.` (Heb. 8: 1 & 2)

Christ`s priesthood is the reality not man`s copy & shadow. This was given by God for us to understand Christ`s ministries. And the statement of us `a royal priesthood,` indicates that it is not of the copy & shadow, but of the reality, Christ`s Priesthood which is royal. His is a Royal Priesthood, while this kingly aspect was not of the copy & shadow priests. Christ`s Kingship, as we know was presented to us in a separate office of Kingship by King David. (& others)

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 05:43:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

You said -

Quote:`Here is 10474 I do not see anything about priesthood that your saying I am quoting. Seems like your putting words in my mouth here, that don't exist.

Quote:`When the Lord gave them the design of the temple, it was men who the Lord used to work

in the temple..`

Isn't that referring to the priests?

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 06:40:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

THE ETERNAL PURPOSES OUTLINE. (of what I believe)

God`s Eternal Purpose â€œ

Is `that in the dispensation of the fullness of the times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven & which are on earth â€œ in Him,..` (Eph. 1: 10)

This is brought about by â€œ

Christ reigning `till He has put all enemies under His feet.` `...then the Son Himself will also be subject to...` God, `that God may be all in all.` (1 Cor. 15: 25, 28)

Summary

GOD (Father, Son & Holy Spirit) is `all in all.` (1 Cor. 15: 28)
THE LORD JESUS CHRIST â€œ The pre-eminent Ruler. (under the Father) (Col. 1: 18) He rules as a Priest upon His throne appointed by God. (Zech.6: 13 Ps. 110: 4 Heb. 6: 20)

He rules in Time â€œ All rule, authority & power to become subject to Christ . (1 Cor. 15: 24 â€œ 28)

He rules in Eternity â€œ Christ rules over thrones, dominions, Principalities & Powers, visible & invisible realms. (Col. 1: 16 Eph. 1 : 21)

Christ delegates authority in different realms.

The Body of Christ â€œ ruling with Christ in the heavenly realms. (Rev. 1: 6 3: 21 1 Peter 1: 4

Phil. 3: 20 Eph. 2: 6 Col. 1: 5)

Israel â€“ ruling with Christ over the nations of the world. (Gen. 22: 17 & 18 2 Sam. 7: 13 Is. 66: 22)

NOTE:

Christ`s Priesthood â€“ In Him we offer spiritual offerings, now & always. (1 Peter 2: 5 Rev. 4: 10)

Christ`s Kingship â€“ In Him we are His servants ready to serve now & always. (1 Thess. 1: 9 1 Cor. 6: 2 & 3)

We cannot perform these functions `worshipping & serving,` without Christ`s divine nature being formed in us. (2 Peter 1: 4 &8)

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 06:41:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn,

You have very interesting perspectives and questions.

I am looking forward as to how others respond regarding their knowledge of this subject and *everything* we were taught at FA.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Posted by [william](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 06:53:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Okay, now you have switched from speaking about believers and suddenly you are speaking about Jesus who actually is the culmination of the priestly office. I have nothing to offer in rebuttal to that.

So when you say:

Quote:Christ`s priesthood is the reality not man`s copy & shadow given by God for us to understand Christ`s ministries.

I say amen.

Man's copy, as you phrased it, had specific functions and requirements, all of which have been done away with now that Jesus has completed His work.

They wore special clothes, had specific duties, ministered at the temple, sacrificed, received the tithes from the people, carried the actual Ark of the covenant in the wilderness, participated in the hierarchy of the priesthood, were distinct from the other tribes of God's chosen, derived their livelihood from the rest of God's chosen, burned incense, etc.. None of which applies to the metaphorical priesthood, namely us.

Gal 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."

This passage, if it teaches us anything, teaches us that there is no difference between believers with respect to hierarchy. As they say, "the ground is level at the foot of the cross." The OT priesthood is nothing without hierarchy. (I think the word is even derived from the Greek word for priest!)

I don't see any type/anti-type between the Levitical priesthood and believers, not in any sense that we see the type/anti-type between the high priest and Jesus.

That isn't to say that there aren't some similarities that would enable us to speak in metaphorical language to describe ourselves as ambassadors of Jesus Christ ON BEHALF OF THE LOST WORLD.

We've looked at Peter's usage of the term "priesthood" and we can allow for the concept that in some measure we have the responsibility to serve/minister the gospel to those who have yet to experience the good news. Going further we can even say with Paul that any evangelical offering (sacrifice) of the fruits of our ministry can be loosely equated with the offerings of the priests of the OT (see Romans 15:15-16.) But this cannot be compared in any typical/anti-typical way to the

role of the priests in the OT and the role of the believer in the NT.

To equate this with some special "order" of believers is not warranted. The "type" doesn't fit the "anti-type."

My understanding is that the whole idea of the priesthood was not a precursor to some "new order" of priests but it was designed to teach mankind that fellowship with God required the shedding of innocent blood which they were not capable of securing on any permanent basis without the intervention of God Himself. When that aspect was secured by the Blood of His own Son, then the whole concept of the Levitical priesthood became a moot point with no other purpose (for the believer.)

Of course I've read the passages where believers are called "priests" (cf Rev 1:6, Rev 5:10, Rev 20:6) but those passages should be understood in the light of the "once for all" sacrifice of Jesus Christ and with the understanding that the normal priestly functions were completely rendered unnecessary beyond the loose connection of our ministry to the world and our ministry to God Himself.

Christian priesthood, if you must use the term, is not the fulfillment of typology.

I could say the same thing about us being referred to as "kings"... we reign and rule with Christ because of our relationship to him, not because we are fulfilling some type that we see presented in the OT. King David was a type of whom King Jesus was the anti-type, but Solomon and the rest of the kids don't represent a type of Christian believers who are supposed to be the anti-type. A loose metaphor, maybe, but not a new anti-typical order of littlekings.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 07:30:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

William,

You said -

Quote:`Okay, now you have switched from speaking about believers and suddenly you are speaking about Jesus who actually is the culmination of the priestly office.`

We cannot talk about a royal priesthood of believers other than looking at the Royal Priest Himself.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 07:53:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn,

You furnished us with nothing that speaks to the central reason an outline was asked for:

Jman specifically asked:

Quote:Please lay out this "Eternal Purpose/Melchizedeck" doctrine in a complete outline-type overview so I can see what I am getting into if I invest more time into this thread.

An outline of the eternal purposes of God could be something like this:

- I. God decided to create man.
- II. God decided to reveal Himself to His creation.
- III. God allowed man to fall in order to reveal Himself in a more complete way to His creation.
- IV. God reveals that sin offends His nature and must be punished.
- V. God reveals that He is merciful (a new concept to Adam who had no way of understanding the awesome Love of God until he sinned)
- VI. God reveals that only He can provide a method for mankind to be restored to fellowship, How? --the innocent must die for the guilty.
- VII. God drives home this point via the sacrificial system.
- VIII. Man begins to understand that he cannot do anything to permanently restore fellowship without completely trusting God to do it. Man fails repeatedly.
- IIX. God, after helping mankind see the futility of all of their efforts, takes the initiative, and provides for man's inability Himself. He provides His own Lamb --Jesus! ...for the restoration of mankind.
- IX. Mankind begins to grasp the wonderful Being that is GOD!
- X. Those who grasp the revelation of God, are restored to fellowship, they are filled with an understanding of His nature, and they praise and love Him forever!

That is the eternal purpose of God in a nutshell but it tells us nothing about the subject you introduced that is causing all of the stir.

I'm sure you agree with the ten point outline I've presented, just like I agree with your attempt at an outline (unless there is a veiled reference to the ultimate reconciliation doctrine that denies "eternal" punishment --and by eternal I mean eternal, not just a long time!) but it does nothing to address the specific point that needs to be addressed.

We could spend the rest of our time on earth fleshing out the outline but unless we get to the "Eternal Purpose" as it relates to the "Melchizedek doctrine", nothing is going to be gained here.

Surely you understand that?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 08:18:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

William,

Christ is the Royal High Priest after the order of Melchizedek.
I wrote that in my outline, Christ's Priesthood & Kingship. The typology of that is as God's word tells us, Melchizedek, a King Priest rather than just a priest, or just a king.

It is what we all know from scripture. The point of difference I see is that I believe we function as priests & kings, worshipping & serving, in the heavenly realms in eternity.

I never called my beliefs a Melchizedek doctrine. Jman did that. (10545)

Quote: `Please lay out this "Eternal Purpose/Melchizedek" doctrine in a complete outline-type overview so I can see what I am getting into if I invest more time into this thread.`

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sun, 08 December 2013 00:43Gary,

You said -

Quote: `Here is 10474 I do not see anything about priesthood that your saying I am quoting. Seems like your putting words in my mouth here, that don't exist.

Quote: `When the Lord gave them the design of the temple, it was men who the Lord used to work in the temple..`

Isn't that referring to the priests?

Marilyn.

Marilyn,

Hi, I'm saying all of this in a nice, kind tone, so read it in that narrative.

It's an emphatic "No" I was not referring to the priests or even trying to imply it was priests. Your making it Priests.

The point I was making is that God always used men in the temple for ministry. God used men in every realm to lead the people.

But I think I know now why you keep insisting on this word priest, as the Spirit has shown me.

Your trying to tie the two in together. The priests in the old testament and now these royal priests who are mentioned in the New Testament, that you see as literal ministry rather than a type. William laid it out very clearly what these scriptures are teaching.

In using your method your trying to prove that now women are called to be ministers of the Word since they are priests and kings before the throne. Since there are no direct scriptures telling us women are to teach or rule over men then these scriptures are being woven together to mean something they are not saying. If what your saying is true then you can feel justified in teaching men.

Marilyn we on earth don't make the rules God is the one who created man in His image woman came from man that is just the facts.

2 Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things and keep the traditions just as I delivered them to you. 3 But I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, the head of woman is man, and the head of Christ is God.

In 2 Timothy 2:2

And the things that you have heard from me among many witnesses, commit these to faithful men who will be able to teach others also.

Paul does not say commit these things for the men and women to teach.

Marilyn just by the fact your taking a small portion of a scripture and trying to prove a point, or portions of peoples comments and implying things that do not exist. This is shown by your statement made by Jman.

Look at this statement made by you:

Quote: I never called my beliefs a Melchizedek doctrine. Jman did that. (10545)

`Please lay out this "Eternal Purpose/Melchizedeck" doctrine in a complete outline-type overview so I can see what I am getting into if I invest more time into this thread.`

He is only calling it a doctrine to clarify a point and that is by you sharing your version it then becomes a teaching or doctrine.

Back to the subject on royal priests: As I said; William made it quite clear what the Bible is teaching on this. I would take the time and pray that God will show you, or help you to understand what William is sharing. Read over his post several times and see it though while praying. Were not trying to be mean towards you in sharing all this we want your best in Christ. God has more for you if you will listen to what is being said.

That's all I'm asking; pray, listen to the Spirit as you read them, try not to look at them through some past teaching that your holding to and may the God of heaven open your eyes to see it.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 14:28:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Marilyn,

When you say this:

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sun, 08 December 2013 02:18William,

Christ is the Royal High Priest after the order of Melchizedek.
I wrote that in my outline, Christ's Priesthood & Kingship. The typology of that is as God's word tells us, Melchizedek, a King Priest rather than just a priest, or just a king.

I can't find that in your outline. Maybe you implied it.

Quote:

It is what we all know from scripture. The point of difference I see is that I believe we function as priests & kings, worshipping & serving, in the heavenly realms in eternity.

I never called my beliefs a Melchizedek doctrine. Jman did that. (10545)

If that is ALL you are saying, why didn't you just say so?

Now I've learned a great lesson here...

Venus woman speaks: "The point of difference I see is that I believe we function as priests & kings, worshipping & serving, in the heavenly realms in eternity."

Mars man's translation: "The point of difference I see is that I believe we function as [in a similar manner as] priests and kings, worshipping & serving, in the heavenly realms in eternity."

Or better still-Mars man's Amplified Translation: "The point of difference I see is that I believe in the heavenly realms of eternity, we will be worshipping and serving, like kings and priests in the OT."

Now that is something I can wrap my head around.

What say we let her go, Jman? Gary? James?...

She seems harmless enough...

...especially since she now knows the difference between doctrine and personal interpretation and seems to be picking up on some of our language... <grin>

Okay mate, you're free to go... sorry about the rope burns... those night shift guys can be brutal!
<grin>

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 16:11:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

William Wrote:

Quote: What say we let her go, Jman? Gary? James?...

She seems harmless enough...

...especially since she now knows the difference between doctrine and personal interpretation and seems to be picking up on some of our language... <grin>

Okay mate, you're free to go... sorry about the rope burns... those night shift guys can be brutal!
<grin>

Blessings,
William

Ay Mate we just wanted to argue the toss, I don't think any of the mates have had a toey here. Its just the las had a bit of a perk on this scripture. Its just that its been a extra grouse with the Aussies here. I'm still trying to make a quid and stop in occasionally.

HooRoo

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 16:15:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary wrote on Sun, 08 December 2013 10:11William Wrote:

Quote: What say we let her go, Jman? Gary? James?...

She seems harmless enough...

...especially since she now knows the difference between doctrine and personal interpretation and seems to be picking up on some of our language... <grin>

Okay mate, you're free to go... sorry about the rope burns... those night shift guys can be brutal!
<grin>

Blessings,
William

Ay Mate we just wanted to argue the toss, I don't think any of the mates have had a toey here. Its just the las had a bit of a perk on this scripture. Its just that its been a extra grouse with the Aussies here. I'm still trying to make a quid and stop in occasionally.

HooRoo

Oh, NO!

We've been taken over by these... these... creatures!<grin>

Blessings,

William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Sun, 08 Dec 2013 18:11:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Missing from the outline is the idea that believers (human beings) are of the order of Melchizedek. This idea was present at the beginning of this thread.

All agree that :
Melchizedek was of order of Melchizidek in the Old Testament.
Jesus was/is of the order of Melchizedek.

Marylin, in past, present, or future - is anyone else of the order of Melchizedek?

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 342 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our chil

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 06:06:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

Thank you for the friendly tone of the last comment I appreciated that. Now I just want to state my views on that link in Post 10556.

Quote:Marilyn wrote: Now you know I don't believe in that false teaching...`

In Andrew Strom`s recent board (The Lack of Hunger)I posted these comments -

Dear,

I hear your heart for our precious Lord but I am concerned with some of your words, as they are beginning to sound like `Dominionism.` Remember I spoke about that in the last thread. Andrew S. said that people on this site do not agree with NAR (New Apostolic Reformation) however it is infiltrating all areas of Christianity, through songs, books, teachings etc, like the frog who slowly gets boiled, this teaching is everywhere.

Here are it`s main false teaching.

1. `We can change the world. `They seek people of good will whether Christian or non-Christian to lead society in 7 areas â€“ religion, family, government, arts & entertainment, media, business & education. They call them the 7 moulders of culture.

They partner with the world system, which belongs to Satan.

2. They say -There will be a special army, transformed so they cannot die who will physically fight the enemies on earth. They call them `Joel`s army,` from Joel 2 but they misinterpret this for God says this army is the Northern army, (Joel 2: 20)

3. They believe that they will take dominion of the earth & give it to Christ when He comes. They have an earthly focus.

Hope that helps Gary, to see that I am not into Dominionism but speak out about its errors. That link you had is a good example of this false teaching.

Blessings Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 06:24:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jman,

You said,

Quote: `All agree that :
Melchizedek was of order of Melchizidek in the Old Testament.
Jesus was/is of the order of Melchizedek.`

Then you asked -

Quote: `Marylin, in past, present, or future - is anyone else of the order of Melchizedek?`

God says of Christ,

`You are a priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek,..... though He was a Son, yet He learned obedience by the things which he suffered & having been perfected, He became the author of eternal salvation to all who obey Him, called by God as High Priest according to the order of Melchizedek, of whom we have much to say, & things hard to explain, since you have become dull of hearing.....

This hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure & steadfast, & which enters the inner part behind the veil. where the forerunner has entered for us, even Jesus, having become high priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek.` (Heb. 5: 5, 9 - 11, 19 & 20)

Summing up Jman, We are IN Christ & whatever He desires of us we will do. Ask Him for the labels.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 06:30:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

Thank you for your kind and compassionate heart when presenting the Word. You are a treasure when presenting your views.

It is the difference between Law and Grace. I feel it is the difference between being able to deliver a groaning creation or being a part of a system that we supposedly abhorred.

Are we clanging cymbals and browbeating or are we showing the love and compassion of Jesus when others don't grasp doctrine or the Word?

The answer lies in the fruit of what everyone has shared. What is the fruit of this topic that we have discussed?

Have we ministered life or death and condemnation?

I have my answers. I hope other will wisely consider their conclusions.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 06:34:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Great William,

As Joan, an elderly Godly woman from Andrew`s site said one evening as she was about to sign off, `Now put on your mittens & play nicely.` I think a few mittens are in order (!!!!) needed, in stead of mitts, !!!!!

I`ve learned a good lesson here also - becareful when using my own phrasing of truths as it can be confusing & misunderstood by others.

We live toanother day. Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 06:36:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That is a Holy Spirit word, Gillyann,

And I take sober note of it from Him.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 10:24:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Mon, 09 December 2013 01:06Gary,

Thank you for the friendly tone of the last comment I appreciated that. Now I just want to state my views on that link in Post 10556.

Quote:Marilyn wrote: Now you know I don`t believe in that false teaching...`

In Andrew Strom`s recent board (The Lack of Hunger)I posted these comments -

Dear,

I hear your heart for our precious Lord but I am concerned with some of your words, as they are

beginning to sound like `Dominionism.` Remember I spoke about that in the last thread. Andrew S. said that people on this site do not agree with NAR (New Apostolic Reformation) however it is infiltrating all areas of Christianity, through songs, books, teachings etc, like the frog who slowly gets boiled, this teaching is everywhere.

Here are it`s main false teaching.

1. `We can change the world. `They seek people of good will whether Christian or non-Christian to lead society in 7 areas â€“ religion, family, government, arts & entertainment, media, business & education. They call them the 7 moulders of culture.

They partner with the world system, which belongs to Satan.

2. They say -There will be a special army, transformed so they cannot die who will physically fight the enemies on earth. They call them `Joel`s army,` from Joel 2 but they misinterpret this for God says this army is the Northern army, (Joel 2: 20)

3. They believe that they will take dominion of the earth & give it to Christ when He comes. They have an earthly focus.

Hope that helps Gary, to see that I am not into Dominionism but speak out about its errors. That link you had is a good example of this false teaching.

Blessings Marilyn.

Marilyn,

To be honest, I just ran across the site and thought it dealt with this Melchizedec teaching.

I did not think you were teaching Dominionism (which I only have a faint idea of what it is at the time). I remember you telling others it was a false doctrine. I should of asked more questions about the site before posting and I may remove it since it promotes false teaching. Don't want the wrong person reading it.

Anyway thanks for sharing here, I hope you liked the Australian slang. I thought later I hope those words were good slang words as the web page had a kangaroo drinking a beer on it.

Thanks Gillyan for the kind words I hope and pray I can live up to them. LOL

Lord Bless,
Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 10:30:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

I think it is important what you have posted as it will help people to discern what is true & what is false. We need to have discernment. So might be a good discussion point.

Was that Aussie? Well I better go & have another `bo-peep..... `Well, you are now fair dinkum, & really true blue.`

Blessings, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 12:19:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I asked:

Quote:

`Marylin, in past, present, or future - is anyone else of the order of Melchizedek?`

You gave a very slippery, crafty non- answer, Marylin.

William, if you were actually requesting comment, I am at a point to sit back and watch Marylin work and watch others discern.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 343 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 16:56:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wishing34 wrote on Mon, 09 December 2013 06:19
William, if you were actually requesting comment, I am at a point to sit back and watch Marylin work and watch others discern.

Yep. Me too.

I think that Marilyn is taking a personal opinion, based on scant evidence, and building a whole new order (doctrine). This is dangerous for the reasons that you mentioned in an earlier note to Gillyann in this thread:

wishing34 wrote on Sat, 07 December 2013 09:29GWB,

I have pretty much decided that my spoon is not big enough to bail out Marylin's ocean everyday so I thought I might give you more info as to what to watch out for.

=====
Example of Truth: Believers are "in Christ'

this results in:

- have authority in spiritual realm
- have imputed righteousness
- called to imitate Christ in daily life
- have eternal life
- can approach the Father as Abba Father ("child of God" or "son" of God - small "s")
- generally are in fellowship with God

=====

=====
Example of Silliness: Say someone convinced you that you are "in the order of James Bond" the movie spy

this results in:

- you have a license to kill - Un-Scriptural you say? But "the James Bond order" trumps the other Scriptures
- you can imitate Bond with a worldly lifestyle
- more???

If you accept the premise that you are in the order of James Bond then you are open to many possible re-writes of Scriptural doctrines. The key is to sell you on the original premise.

=====

No one could sell you on the James Bond idea, but say someone convinced you that you are "in the order of Melchizedek"
(Note: Jesus is of the order of Melchizedek, but human beings are not.)

Now that person can define what the order of Melchizedek includes. Their definition is wide open because this Melchizedek doctrine is not in the Bible. If you have bought into their Melchizedek doctrine then they can have you dismiss other Scriptures because, after all, you are of the order of Melchizedek.

=====

Example of Dangerous: You are "in the order of Melchizedek"

this results in:

???
??
?

Notice the results are not known/given - not until first you are sold on the Melchizedek doctrine.

Marilyn, (I assume you are reading this) this is a real danger... not the part about your own personal beliefs, that's your own business, but you are, in reality, presenting these things as Christian doctrine and if you consider yourself a teacher then you also should consider yourself subject to serious scrutiny.

Serious scrutiny is never done with kid-gloves ("mittens," as you call them) --it is a serious task because "truth" is at stake.

In my last note I tried to mitigate the situation somewhat with a little humor, leaving you with a respectable exit on this particular matter but you didn't seem to want that and went on to indicate

that you have "lived to fight another day."

Well, just so you know, we consider contending for truth, the ultimate expression of love, and if we do it in a manner that is offensive to those more accustomed to a lovey-dovey-let's-all-just-hug-and-be-nice kind of way, then accept this as fair warning to the contrary.

If, in the face of all we have said, there isn't enough to prompt you to re-examine things or at least acknowledge that what you are defending has precious little Biblical support, then it might be wise for you to re-consider your call as a promoter of SOUND doctrine.

Jman has given a pretty clear road-map that should help anyone to see the destination that results from building on shaky ground.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 17:08:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"You gave a very slippery, crafty non- answer, Marilyn."

Just for the record, Jman, I don't believe Marilyn is trying to be slippery (slimy), crafty (suggests manipulation which is witchcraft), or non-answers.

These are strong and flat out of order accusations towards Marilyn's character.

I think it is a good idea for you to sit out until you can figure out how to mix the character of Jesus with your vast head knowledge of the Bible.

Marilyn is new. Love and compassion is more important than being right about anything. You owe Marilyn a humble and compassionate apology.

I am not telling you to sit out, you volunteered. Correct doctrine is important. But, it can be presented and corrected with a right attitude.

Contending for the faith is admirable. But love is our highest calling. That does not mean we have to compromise anything we have been taught.

According to your sign off statement, yes, something is missing.

Faith works by love. Obviously, it is easier said than done and it is key to having signs following.

I do not mean to start anything. I just think some attitudes need to be seriously adjusted among all of us, myself included.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 17:34:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GWB,

Obviously we disagree a lot.

This post is to extend you to courtesy of acknowledging that I read your post.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 343 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 17:41:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thank you for the courtesy.

I have also been given your response and consideration towards being harsh towards brethren.

Some can sit around and wonder for 35 more years as to why "something is wrong."

I shared my heart as to what I felt we could do to to be better when sharing what we were taught.

You go ahead and be right and stubborn. Someone is hurting but the doctrine is now corrected.

Jesus did not and does not minister in this manner.

Yes.....Something is very, very wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 19:38:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GWB wrote on Mon, 09 December 2013 12:41 Thank you for the courtesy.

I have also been given your response and consideration towards being harsh towards brethren.

Some can sit around and wonder for 35 more years as to why "something is wrong."

I shared my heart as to what I felt we could do to to be better when sharing what we were taught.

You go ahead and be right and stubborn. Someone is hurting but the doctrine is now corrected.

Jesus did not and does not minister in this manner.

Yes.....Something is very, very wrong.

GWB,

I don't know who would be hurting. Everyone has just been asking questions that never get answered. How can we learn if what Marilyn is saying is true unless she gives us the straight facts.

If someone is teaching on a subject they should be able to share what they believe, where it is found in scripture, and they should be able to back it up with several scriptures as confirmation.

If someone asks a question there should be no need to get offended, just explain what the Bible teaches on it.

Please go back and look at all the posts here from the beginning.

If anyone is presenting a doctrine or teaching then they should be able to make it plain and answer the questions. If what is being said is true then there is no need to be alarmed because the Holy Spirit who leads and guides us into all truths will reveal the matter. We all have to be teachable but we have to know what we are being taught to make a decision. That's the nature of the beast, if you cannot prove what your saying and it is not clear in the Bible then its not a valid teaching or doctrine. Then it could be error or worse yet heresay.

Think about it, Paul came preaching about the messiah to the Bereans, they took his teaching and searched the scriptures to see if the things Paul was saying was true. I am sure there was questions they would ask Paul. What happened? They saw it in the scriptures and believed what Paul was teaching them and they believed Jesus was the Messiah.

This is why I believe men were called by God to lead and be teachers or any other five fold ministry. Our brains are not controlled by emotions, we analyze what is being taught, and we are not affected by flattery.

After rereading all the posts I see where Marilyn is not able to answer the questions, she tells people I'm glad you shared what you believe, and she is running off on tangents that are not dealing with the subject. Unless she can show clearly where she gets this teaching and what she believes we can only assume that it does not exist in the Bible.

That is only fair to anyone. If you're going to teach on a subject then prove it.

Honestly GWB you know good and well what God showed us, and we can prove it from scripture. I am talking about "sound" doctrine that leads to life.

1 Timothy 1:10and if there is any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine,

2 Timothy 4:3

For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine,

Titus 1:9

holding fast the faithful word as he has been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convict those who contradict.

Titus 2:1

But as for you, speak the things which are proper for sound doctrine:

We have to have clear sound doctrine as we move closer to the end. If anyone contradicts the Bible we are called to exhort and convict those who contradict.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 20:28:04 GMT

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

Gary, William, Jman,

Let's have a good look at where this discussion started -

Gary said - (in the discipling thread)

Quote: `When the Lord gave them the design of the temple, it was men who the Lord used to work in the temple, woman had an outer court. Why did not woman come into the temple to serve is some capacity? Because it was never the Lord's Will.`

I replied -

Quote: `Just a quick note of what I believe re the Temple. it was a structure given by God to show forth the Lord & His ministry. It was given to the nation of Israel who are ordered as you said. However the Body of Christ is of a different order, KingPriests, where there is no `male or female,` differences. To be given a body like Christ`s, & where there is no marriage (in heaven) shows that it is a new body for a new order of beings.`

I thought that when Gary said it was `men who the Lord used to work in the temple,` that he was referring to the priests. I didn`t know that other men worked in the temple. Thus I was trying to point out that the priests who worked in the temple were of the Levitical order, temporal & not royal, whereas the Body of Christ are a royal priesthood.

We are not like the priests of Baal. (demonic)

We are not like the Pharisees. (of your Father the devil, said the Lord)

We are not like those who `lord it over` others. (like the Gentile rulers)

We are not like the Levitical priesthood which is temporal & not royal.

But we are like Christ, in Him, a royal priesthood because he is the Eternal Royal Priest, & the abilities & functions flow from Him as He wills to use us now & eternally -

- worshipping & serving now, reaching out to others in the ministry of reconciliation,
- worshipping & serving in eternity, - (no eye has seen, no ear has heard.....)

I don`t see that as any new doctrine that you are saying I`m trying to teach.

Hope that explains it more. Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 20:41:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: Gary, William, Jman,

Let`s have a good look at where this discussion started -

Gary said - (in the discipling thread)

Marilyn,

I don't think that is what everyone is talking about here. Whenever someone asks you a question on this order of melchizedek, you answer: Did you see that bird fly by, Look at that cat over there.

It's about that bad.

I think its about this new order of beings, the order of melchizedek is where all the questions are directed.

Please forget about that statement in the discipling thread.

Are you being serious here?

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 20:43:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I understand how important it is to keep sound doctrine. Yes, you should be able to support your beliefs by scripture. It is very important to defend sound doctrine. It is very important to not entertain heresy. It is very important to correct people if they are wrong.

"I don't know who would be hurting."

Well, I do. Marilyn is. I have communicated with her in PM's. I feel her character has been attacked, as well. If some don't agree, fine. I have known some to be the way she was described, and worse, but did not say anything.

"If someone asks a question there should be no need to get offended."

I agree, Gary. But everybody's personality is different. Some people can just let things roll off of their back. Others are more sensitive. Personally, I feel that people with these types of personalities should be considered and handled appropriately. Most on here pretty much take it to the dirt, at times. That is OK. We walk away and it does not bother most of us. It bothers some.

Most of us on OO are very blunt. I believe it is to a fault, at times, after having watched people interact on the board. That is JMO. If others disagree, that is their right to do so.

Everyone here has been guilty of sarcasm, tongue in cheek, condescending to others, etc. It is human nature and it needs to be kept in check. I am guilty as well. I feel that, sometimes, new

people do not know the sense of humor or personalities of the regulars on OO. Things can be taken wrong or misinterpreted.

"...and we are not affected by flattery."

OK. I did not know my expressing to you that I appreciate your heart when sharing would affect the thread to such a degree. I will not express things like this in the future if it clouds anything or a thread in general. I truly had no ulterior motives.

I have gone back and reviewed the thread. I appreciate everyone's willingness to try and solve this issue (whoops, flattery? I don't know anymore.)

"We have to have clear sound doctrine as we move closer to the end. If anyone contradicts the Bible we are called to exhort and convict those who contradict."

Agree. But, do we have to degrade people in order to do so? We should not. If some feel this has not happened, fine. We can just pray for each other and let it be. That is where I am at right now. I am letting it go. SMH....but I am letting it go.

So, here we are, again. The doctrine has absolutely been defended, cleared up, people exhorted, people convicted, and people set straight. Great. The doctrine issue is fine. The doctrine is safe. There will be no heresy here, I am sure of that. Even where Marilyn does not understand, etc., the doctrine will live on just fine.

There is a problem. Someone got their feelings hurt. Does it matter? Should it matter?

I have come to the conclusion that people have different answers than I do. However a person answers those questions is between them and Jesus. I am leaving it there.

If being kind, patient, and gracious to someone is being ooey-goey, hugs, kisses, etc., I am not above that. Jesus was not either. I highly disagree that defending a doctrine harshly is the highest form of love. You have to meet people where they are at. If being lovey dovey is what it will take to help someone make it into heaven and to understand God's Word, I will do it. If other's don't want to, fine. Again, that is between them and Jesus.

I hope I have answered all of the points that you presented.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 21:06:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

Let's go on to Jman's comment at the beginning also -

My comment,

Quote: `Now Christ being a High Priest shows that there are other priests, (High Priest over other priests) & these would be of the same order` " King Priest.`

Jman said -

Quote: "these would be of the same order" <- This premise is not substantiated.

To think that redeemed people will be/are of the order of Melchizedek (king-priest) in God's eyes is a potentially dangerous idea. The "order of Melchizedek" was something unique to Jesus.`

There was a man in the Old testament raised up to represent Christ in some small measure as a priest & a king. He was called (as we all know) Priest of the Most High God & King of Salem. But it is just an earthly representation & the writer to the Hebrews enlarges on this to tell us that Christ is the eternal Royal Priest ministering from the heavenly sanctuary, the wonderful riches of His grace & mercy.

So take the focus off the representative of Christ's ministry & put our attention on Christ the Eternal Royal Priest.

`looking unto Jesus, the author & finisher of our Faith who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, & has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.` (Heb. 12: 2) Priest & King

If we are a royal priesthood as peter says, then please tell me what type of priest are we -

Baal, Levitical, Pharisee, lording it over, or a royal priest?

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 22:24:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gillyann,

You are confusing a couple of issues here <<HUG>> (I know that can be taken as sarcasm and it is, but I do have a point by using the device and the point is <<PLEASE DON'T GET OFFENDED>>)

Look at all of the notes. Marilyn has been welcomed with open arms and anyone else who has popped in over the last few years has been similarly treated. Yes, we all have a history of being known as a 'suspicious' bunch but I'd say that a lot of that stuff no longer applies.

Secondly, and this is important, Marilyn, unlike you, unlike Sue, and I've forgotten if there are any other females, but unlike anyone else, -- has come to teach. I don't mean teach by example, or teach by being gracious, or anything like that, I mean that she has come here to TEACH Doctrine.

She has made the passage in Gal 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.) to be her rally cry for females being accorded the same privilege as men to be able to teach.

Now you of all people should know that this issue alone, even if she had brought up no other topic, was going to raise the eyebrows of all who have been in our circles. Heck, it would cause problems on 80% of Christian forums! Nonetheless, we have given her a platform.

But laying aside the female/teacher issue, you know for a fact that if a man had come in and was saying the EXACT SAME THING, the reactions would be EXACTLY the same. No one would pull any punches and reactions would no doubt mirror the reactions toward Marilyn. You have reacted the EXACT SAME WAY toward others when you have perceived doctrinal error, (antisemitism,

etc.,) even directing some of it to Marilyn, early on, if I'm remembering it right.

I'm not pointing this out to criticize you, I'm only saying that your perspective toward Jman and the others, (me included) should take all of this into consideration before jumping to the conclusion that something unfair is taking place.

A teacher is going to be, and should be, held to a higher standard when doctrine is concerned. If someone comes in here as a fashion model, or as a movie star, or whatever, they are going to be treated with as much courtesy as we can muster. I believe that is true. I hope that we would treat them as well as we would treat someone we met at the grocery store...

But this isn't the case here. There is a double standard. Most of the time "double standards" imply hypocrisy but not here... the Bible gives us this double standard regarding teachers.

One needs to look no further than Paul's reaction to Peter in Gal 2:11 to see the tremendous responsibility required when doctrine is concerned. (cf. James 3:1)

My point is this: Marilyn is being treated in the same way we would treat anyone who was trying to teach something that we didn't understand. If she is truly a teacher then she should expect this kind of scrutiny, it comes with the territory. (Marilyn, I disagree with your comment about "playing" nicely with mittens... we aren't "playing" here, doctrine is serious business with us.)

Thirdly, she hasn't done a very good job at answering questions that have been raised but continues to move at break-neck speed to other doctrinal issues. Surely you understand how this can be frustrating, especially for us dull minded men!

If Marilyn is "hurting" then I have to ask why? I don't know of any personal issue she has, I'm not privy to any private PM's you may have that describes this condition, and I'm sorry to say I'm not a mind-reader. If she lets us know, you'll see some serious compassion and prayers on her behalf but if she is "hurting" because of being challenged concerning her teaching, well, that is a problem without a remedy and I'm just going to have to cruelly say, suck it up, Jeremiah, it's going to get worse!! Jer 12:5

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Mon, 09 Dec 2013 23:10:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Heck, it would cause problems on 80% of Christian forums! Nonetheless, we have given her a platform.

You are not suppose to shoot cuss! lol Just trying to keep it light.

I admit, this whole thing has gotten me very upset. I hate to see division. We all have personality differences and quirks, but this is waaayyyy over the top for me. Somehow, this has gotten way out of hand and this is rare for OO for things to get this far.

Yes, I did go overboard on the Anti-Semitism issue. The issue is beginning to raise it's head more than ever in the world and I was adamant about it. I attacked like a junk yard dog. I felt like it was Ok since it was about "the apple of His eye," but, looking back, my attitude was way off.

I don't believe a woman should teach. I believe the Word is very clear about that. Also, the judgment is very harsh for teachers. I don't need any more trouble, so I would run from that office.

It gets complicated when PM's go back and forth and then we write on the board. I knew her feelings were hurt before I even approached her to see if she was OK. She was not OK.

Marilyn, I feel like I am acting like you are not in the room! I don't mean to do that. I am just trying to explain why I reacted the way I did and I want you to be OK, too.

Whether you feel like woman should teach or not is between you, Jesus, and the people on this board if the conversation continues. I don't know if that is a good idea at this point. We all know where everyone stands and maybe we should just let it be. Believe me, it can get a whole lot worse!!! A whooooooollleee lot worse! If everyone else is up for it, fine. I am not. I officially bow out.

Marilyn, you know I will always be there for you. All of this is between you all now, though.

Thank you, William for taking the time to explain. I hope you don't see that as a compliment because Gary does not like it.

Soooo.....that is how I feel.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 10 Dec 2013 00:59:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

William,

I think we are all weary of this, but I would like to finish by pointing out what I see has happened. Have you heard of people asking questions that whatever way you answer you would be in the wrong?

Eg. `Do you still beat your wife?`

If you said yes, then you do still beat her. However if you say no, then it implies that you did used to beat your wife. So what about the person who never beat his wife. He couldn't answer yes or no. He'd have to say `I never did beat my wife.`

This is what has happened. Jman accused me of presenting a `new doctrine.` I tell him I am not. But he keeps at it saying I have `crossed a line` because I ran two words together Kingpriest. I said I would separate them. And then again he says `please lay out this doctrine..` Others get involved -William you say I'm presenting an `esoteric doctrine,` & then Gary finds sites on the internet which seems to back up this so-called doctrine. I say it is false teaching & accused of a `snow job.` Further still William you keep asking me for `this doctrine,` (which I said I don't have.)

But you see whatever I say will not match up with the first accusation `new doctrine` I am supposed to be bringing/teaching. The more I try to explain the more people think I am evading the issue. However William you said `If that is all you are saying, why didn't you say so.` Great some clarity. But what we were saying got lost in the hunt for this so-called `new doctrine.`

Then just when everyone`s had enough & tried to understand each other, lessons learnt, then along comes the fire stirrer (Jman) & accuses again calling me `slippery, crafty...` & William you fall into line & say I'm `building a whole new doctrine.`

Gillyann insightfully points out Jman`s rude accusations when he said, `How slippery (slimy), &

crafty (suggests manipulation which is witchcraft) my comment was. She said `These are strong & flat out of order accusations towards Marilyn`s character.`

I again say I am not presenting a new doctrine. I came on OO to be able to discuss the word with others on a variety of topics & to share what I had been taught concerning `end times.`

Blessings in Christ, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Tue, 10 Dec 2013 23:40:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Worthy is the Lamb

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RgmCfr-eDH8>

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 00:18:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Truly amazing Gary,

Thank you for the link. Lifting up Jesus.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 00:24:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Tue, 10 December 2013 19:18 Truly amazing Gary,

Thank you for the link. Lifting up Jesus.

Marilyn.

Hi Marilyn,

I thought you'd left us I was going to write a note that I'd see you at Andrews. Glad to see your still hanging in there.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 03:32:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GWB,

I got an e-mail from someone unknown to me saying I had done wrong by 2 women and that I am not Biblical for having a name like Wishing34.

Just thought you would enjoy the encouragement that others also think I am wrong as relating to 2 women (must be you and Marylin that he/she is thinking of).

To the emailer please do join this site (if not already), and I do not intend that to imitate your challenging tone. I seriously think you would enjoy it. It can be challenging to organize/communicate your thoughts, and that is actually a good thing - and kinda fun. Really, please consider

participating. I promise I will encourage and help if I can.

I already like you because of your passion. Lots of people around here oscillate between liking what I say and not. You will not be alone. You will probably find excellent comradery here.

And - regarding "wishing34" - In a melancholy moment and being reminded (by discovering OO) of the old FA days while signing up I typed that name because I was wishing it all had worked.

Regarding that I do not take PM messages. (or use backchannel emails) I do not take PM messages because of baggage that is maybe unique to me (and I am not criticle of PM's) . Decades ago I long endured much character assasination by secret, behind the scenes gossip and criticism.

So now I only communicate in the open.

Again, I believe you will have a good experience if you participate. With the passion to send that email you should be posting with us.

(Posted in this thread to be sure the emailer finds it)

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 344 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 04:06:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

I haven't left. I just said `finish` in relation to the last topic. We all get in a muddle & misinterpret each other sometimes. Thanks for caring - re seeing me on Andrew's site.

Peace on OO & goodwill towards each other. Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 04:08:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

To Jman or "wishing" 34:

I appreciate the transparency.

I sent the email.

I love being transparent.

What is your full name?

Did you attend the Glory Barn?

If so, where did you sit?

When did you attend FA?

Did you marry someone from FA?

If so, what is her maiden name?

Where did she live.

Who did she fellowship with?

When did she attend FA?

Where did you live?

Where did you sit at the building?

Who were you close to and who did you fellowship with?

In short.....WHO ARE YOU??

What was your experience at FA? What has happened since then?

Are you OK with your experience? If not, why.

I can't wait to get to know you better.

"Decades ago I long endured much character assassination by secret, behind the scenes gossip and criticism."

Well.....so did I. I was shunned and was the topic of a sermon. I endured a lot of heartache as well.

What??.....What happened??

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 06:28:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Also, *wishing* 34.....

What are you "wishing" about and to whom are you "wishing" ?

Please tell me the exact number and series of teaching where *wishing* is correct for a follower of Jesus.

I have members of my family who are delivered from the occult, by faith, in Jesus Name. They will have a glorious testimony.

They did not have the great opportunity, like you did, to attend FA and have access to the teachings of HEF.

You have not confirmed your exact presence to me when attending FA, so I will let you know if I think you were really a member of FA or not.

My family *wishes* to their pagan Gods of Wicca and to the gods of Lucifer.

I walk into their houses and see their alters to the gods they *wish* to.

I have to tear those "wishing" alters down every morning and night in prayer, by faith.

Just answer the simple questions I have presented to you. I will answer all of them for myself!!!
NO problem!

You know that Satanists/Luciferians hate his (Hobart E. Freeman) guts for a reason...right???

Tell me why.

You are so full of the knowledge of the tapes and teachings and why FA existed. Tell me why.

Tell me why, when HEF was attending The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,(and June and His three daughters were living in Charlestown, Indiana,) the Satanists, in Louisville, Kentucky, (the 2nd largest Satanic church in American) hated his guts.

You know where this is referenced in his books and on the tapes, right?

List them.....list them.

I can.

So, don't come on OO and act like you have the right to have "attitude."

Don't come on OO and act like you are above women/a woman who has/have suffered and fought to stay alive, by faith....alone....without any help....crying out to God every night.

When you can roll over, every single night in bed, and don't know if you will be murdered and wake up in heaven or not, maybe I will listen to you.

If you have been a faithful follower of OO, you will know what I am talking about.

In the meantime....just answer the simple little questions I have presented.

Thank you for any consideration. Jesus did the same. So I will too.

In the meantime, I would start preparing for the type of persecution that I have mentioned above. It is not coming, it is here.

I trust you have listened to the teachings of the Blood, faith, and dying with your physical body. Not just dying about attitude, but dying and you are in heaven or hell.

Again, thank you for any consideration.

Hi GWB,

Interesting. I had no idea you sent the email.

Quote:

Jman : "Decades ago I long endured much character assassination by secret, behind the scenes gossip and criticism."

GWB: Well.....so did I. I was shunned and was the topic of a sermon. I endured a lot of heartache as well.

Looks like we have this in common. I was juicy pulpit red meat for sermons after I left the assembly (satellite church) .

I know how it feels. And you loose all your fellowship/friends also, at least for a while. I'm so sorry that happened to you.

As far as your list of questions, I have chosen anonymity for this very reason we share in common

-

I have baggage about it from the past.

Christians have a knack for character assasination. I fully expected to get the same gossip, criticism, and character assasination when I signed up here. So I came in anonymous and want to stay so.

Quote:

In short.....WHO ARE YOU??

I think it is clear that I am someone who was part of the FA churches.

I am someone carrying baggage as I think I have said before.

I have a knack for decribing theology - but I claim no gift.
I'm pretty much a recluse, a cantankerous (recent word <grin>) - old fart.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church
without apostles for 41 years and 345 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out
why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 06:50:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jman,

You said,

Quote: `I am someone carrying baggage as I think I have said before..`

There is no need to `carry baggage,` as William has said before that the place we all meet is at the foot of the cross. That is where our burdens are lifted, otherwise they just become excuses for our bad behaviour.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 07:04:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GWB,

To me "wishing" has a meaning little different than "wanting."

But I do not have the experiences with occult family members that you have, so the word does not key associations with the occult to me.

Quote:

. . . so I will let you know if I think you were really a member of FA or not.

I definitely was not a member of FA.

For much of what you said there is no response for me to have.
I actually do not know the Satanists/Luciferians references on HEF's tapes/books.

More tomorrow if you want. This is way, way past an old man's bedtime.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 345 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 07:05:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jman,

I don't buy your answers.

I don't buy your vague answers. It is either black or white.

Be honest and answers my questions.

OO is not a joke and a place to play games.

We are in this for life and death.

Please review my previous posts.

We don't have the luxury of having "baggage."

I did not have the luxury of having "baggage" when I was believing to stay alive in a house surrounded by Satanists. I really don't care if you believe that or not. Pretty soon, you will know that it is true.

Either you live or die by Jesus.

Live and speak Truth. Die to yourself and to your physical body and live for eternity.

Time is short. We don't have time for games.

I said I would take it to the dirt. I have and I will continue to do so.

We came from dirt and we will go back to it if He tarries.

To die is gain.....DEATH. Period.

Again, answer the questions I have listed. Your name, the Body you were involved in, what city, who came and ministered to you from FA?

Answer these simple questions, Jman, or you do not belong on OO.

You have PRETENDED to be a part of us if you can't. If you are not from FA fine, but, please, just admit it.

It is SO simple. Let's take it to the dirt.

Who are you?

No. You are not clear. You have appeared on here for years. But, I don't know who you are. You don't have the luxury of claiming anonymity either. Not with FA!!!! Not with the message HEF delivered!

You denounce everything you have ever said on OO or fess up to who you are.

You have thrown yourself around on here for long enough. This is about more than who you are. This about people who will die for their faith. You can't even tell us your name!!!

Name? Location? Body? 5-Fold Minister who came to you minister to your Body?

Don't come on here and think you can question anyone's character in Jesus and we don't even know if "You were a part of us."

I want answers. Yes, I want solid answers.

You have pretended to be something and someone that you are not unless you can answer my questions.

"You can only communicate in the open."

OK, Jman. Do so.

Not dropping this.....

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 10:19:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: Jman wrote: Regarding that I do not take PM messages. (or use backchannel emails)
I do not take PM messages because of baggage that is maybe unique
to me (and I am not criticle of PM's) . Decades ago I long endured much
character assasination by secret, behind the scenes gossip and criticism.

So now I only communicate in the open.

Jman,

You should be commended for this because there is a lot of backbiting going on in PM's.

Character assassinations by the gossips and critics is what Jesus went through as well so don't feel alone there brother, all of us has had to endure this somewhat.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 10:48:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:GWB Wrote: OO is not a joke and a place to play games.

We are in this for life and death.

This is just the unreal world of cyberspace. We may never meet in this life, its just peoples thoughts and experiences floating on the internet.

If we were all in a room setting around a table talking we would have a whole different attitude. When your with people its a whole different ballgame.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 10:51:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nothing has been shared in PM's on my part towards Jman that has not been shared in the open.

This matter has nothing to do with personal PM's.

It have everything to do with what he has not shared concerning who he is and why he thinks he has authority to act like he is a part of FA.

It is all out in the open on everyone else's part.

It is Jman's turn to be open and reveal who he really is.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 12:51:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GWB wrote on Wed, 11 December 2013 05:51 Nothing has been shared in PM's on my part towards Jman that has not been shared in the open.

This matter has nothing to do with personal PM's.

It have everything to do with what he has not shared concerning who he is and why he thinks he has authority to act like he is a part of FA.

It is all out in the open on everyone else's part.

It is Jman's turn to be open and reveal who he really is.

Oh Yeah! Next your going to want to know where Clark Kent keeps running off too. Where does it stop?

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 14:46:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

It stops here. Not that it matters, but I am surprised you have Jman's back on this. I don't have anything else to say to you.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 14:49:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

QWB,

Responding to what you said regarding no anonymity allowed.

What does it matter in a Biblical discussion about specific verses, on an internet forum, who says a particular idea? Is the idea any less true or false depending upon who said it?

The message HEF delivered stands or falls based on the verses not who it is that is quoting the verses.

And a "verse quoter" need not even have been a part of FA - as long as they are accurately quoting the verses.

If you want to say I was not part of FA (I have said I was in a satelite church) then just assume I am a stranger who knows all about what happened and all about the various doctrines. It will all still come down to the verses we discuss, not who we are or were decades ago.

=====

GWB. I am not going to stop being anonymous. If you want to get rid of me you could lobby William to change the anonymity policy.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 345 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 14:50:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jman,

I knew you would not answer one of the questions, let alone all of them.

I asked the questions because you do not represent what FA was at all. I simply can't believe you heard what I heard and are so disrespectful about the message and to people.

I will simply call you out when I see your arrogance and disrespect again.

Many people read OO and not just former members. I will let them know that your behavior is unacceptable of a man, let alone an "Overcomer."

And you wonder why the signs are not following.

Shock. I am done and have nothing else to say. Watch your back.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 17:56:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

You said,

Quote: `This is just the unreal world of cyberspace. We may never meet in this life, its just peoples thoughts and experiences floating on the internet.

If we were all in a room setting around a table talking we would have a whole different attitude. When your with people its a whole different ballgame.`

Not wanting to misinterpret you here, but wouldn`t our motivation be the same whether we are talking to a person face to face or over the internet, on the phone, in a letter, etc.

Looking at William`s temporary heading & what James has given as the word for the day, I think clarity is needed here so we can hear your heart, brother.

Blessings, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 18:24:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Wed, 11 December 2013 12:56 Gary,

Not wanting to misinterpret you here, but wouldn't our motivation be the same whether we are talking to a person face to face or over the internet, on the phone, in a letter, etc.

Looking at William's temporary heading & what James has given as the word for the day, I think clarity is needed here so we can hear your heart, brother.

Blessings, Marilyn.

Now think about it. If we could see each other and was having a conversation. We would be able to see our facial expressions, the attitude in how something was being said. It would be just a casual, friendly discussion.

On the internet we can only see words written and they can affect us how ever we see them as we cannot see a persons actions if they were speaking.

For me I'm sure William has written this title with tongue in cheek. I thought it was funny when I saw it and got a good laugh. But there was a measure of truth there. But I attribute it all the fact we cannot see each other as we speak, so we read words and assume attitudes are being manifested, or were being attacked.

Plus I think the devil uses fiery darts to affect peoples minds in how they read something on a forum board.

The other day James made a statement, I commented, I thought he was throwing the baby out the window with the bathwater. William wrote later, I don't think he was saying what your implying from your comment. I went back and reread it in a different light and sure enough I had took it the wrong way. It happens all the time on these internet boards.

So in answering your question, no I don't think it is the same because of reasons given.

We were taught that "Doctrine is Divisive" and we see this within the whole body of Christ world wide. I was trying to think Lord why does it have to be this way? But I think its too complicated to ever solve.

The Word is a light unto our paths and a lamp unto our feet and its what is going to preserve us in these last days. When we hear God's word we got to pay attention to what it is saying, at least for me this is true.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 20:44:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z0LV_p3HQQI

I will praise Him in this Storm, Amen. Thank You Jesus.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 22:03:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

I hear what you are saying re; facial expressions, tone of voice, & clearing up differences, etc & I agree. However I was referring to the `heart motivation,` compassion, care, love, etc. Thus we were talking about different parts of the subject.

Have a good day, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [william](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 22:19:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gillyann,

I think that Gary is right when he says that our conversations might be interpreted differently if we were all in the same room. Marilyn also has a point when she says that we should not be one way online and one way face to face.

What is missing here though, is the assumption, that we are all Christians.

Christians don't throw around curses at each other. You took Jman's comment, the one about Marilyn offering a slippery and crafty non-answer, to be something it was not.

In fact, I thought the same thing about Marilyn's comment.

But I didn't think that it was "crafty" in the same sense that you did.

I often marvel at a good reply, especially if it encapsulates the heart of the matter in a brief clever statement (something I "wish" to aspire toward!)

If he had said "slimy and deceptive", well that might have been a cause for raised eyebrows because that would imply that the person you were talking to was trying to perpetuate a deception, which, if true, would take away the presumption that you were speaking to a fellow believer in Christ.

On the other hand, and I'm looking for a way to give you the full benefit of the doubt here, your comment to "Watch your back" sounds like a threat.

Before anyone takes it that way, please clarify. You should remember that the last time you used those words, it resulted in two people taking it as a threat and it caused a nuclear chain reaction that almost destroyed the forum. I took your side on that occasion... please let me know if I was mistaken.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 23:12:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Brother, William, What in the world could I do to harm anybody in cyber space?

"Watch your back."

Watch what you say. Don't demean people. Don't be condescending. Don't be arrogant.

It got to the point where anything can be said and it is OK. Nobody is doing anything to stop it. So, I inform them to stop doing it because it is wrong. I would continue to let them know when something is not appropriate.

So, I try to keep someone from treating others in this fashion and now I am the bad guy.

For the sake OO, I will not describe keeping someone accountable using those words.

If some feel nothing was not appropriate, all I can say is, "You have got to be kidding me!!!"

If this is the case, I see it as double standards.

Someone was genuinely hurt and it is now being swept under the rug.

This has gone too far. I said so earlier. All of this is getting exaggerated and over the top. I stayed away today because of this.

Does that make sense to you?

Did that clear things up?

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 23:17:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It won't happen again, but neither should the other.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 23:19:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

William,

I appreciate your view of crafty, but Jman was not meaning `artful, `but `cunning,` as can be seen by his next comment -

Quote: `William, if you were actually requesting comment, I am at a point to sit back and watch Marylin work and watch others discern.`

The actual `cunning` though was performed by Jman himself when he introduced the statement -

Quote: `Please state clearly how the order of Melchizedek concept relates to this new doctrine.`

He was the one to ACCUSE of a new doctrine & got others witch hunting for it. I repeatedly said there was no new doctrine but the bon-fire was lit & you danced around it.

Jman kept adding fuel to the fire -

Quote: `Marylin, misquoting your new terminology into a Bible verse just ain`t right.`

William also ran the two words together but it doesn`t change their meaning. And it is stating the obvious that Jman has trouble spelling my name & `ain`t,` is not good English. The point being that this is what he calls `potentially dangerous.`

Now these are the words Jman uses to describe me - Cantankerous, potentially dangerous, very slippery & crafty, & I am pretty much done with Marylin.....` So you can see he is not thinking of crafty as a compliment.

What needs to take place when we discuss is NOT ACCUSATIONS but an asking for more information. Then we are able to hear what the other is really saying.

Hope we can have better communication in the future. Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2013 23:38:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

For the sake of OO, Jman, I am sorry.

Now, Jman, where is your apology for Marilyn?

If you think one is not due, I felt the same way.

I did it anyway.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 00:03:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BTW, William,

I did not curse to anybody. Not one curse word was said.

What is that about? When did I curse?

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 00:18:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn,

I did not realize regarding the name thing. I apologize for misspelling your name.

But am likely to butcher the English language at any time.

You would not know it from the last weeks, but I am the "Rip Van Winkle" of OO.

I go to sleep and disappear sometimes until something/someone interests me.
And I am feeling a snooze coming on.

=====

William,

I did perceive some of GWB's previous wording as too much but not the "Watch your back" part. I took that to mean she would watch closely and react to what I say - no problem. If I snooze for a while it is not a reaction to QWB. I do not know what happened years ago, but she has not affected my relationship with OO.

=====

QWB,

I do perceive you as a similar/fellow pilgrim. You can be my conscience anytime - just stay fair and square.

Jman

---sig-----

At the time of this post . . .

FA, the satellites, the spinoffs, and the FA diaspora have been having church without apostles for 41 years and 345 days.
Initial start date 1/1/72

Recommended: No faith stands that strongly impact our (our children's) lives until we figure out why the signs and wonders are missing. Something is wrong.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 00:22:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As far as I am concerned, that sounds good to me.

Have a nice slumber.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 00:32:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jman,

When you wake from your slumber & want to get your teeth into something look up this site that Gary posted & see if you can find the error. This is a Melchizedek doctrine, & it is Dominionism, false teaching. It is not easy to spot the errors as they seem to believe the Bible but it is a good exercise because this false teaching is insidiously coming through all parts of Christendom & we need to know how to discern it.

<http://francismyles.com/about/>

Have a good day, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 01:11:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Jman,

Before and if you decide to take a break I wanted you to know I have appreciated your questions and comments. I also appreciate the brothers on this site that have discernment and a deeper understanding of God's word. I do believe you brothers are a type of watchman on the wall who have been able to expound and explain scriptures and discern error and deceptions. And I am not just referring to anything current, but over the years. This is all glory to the Lord. Not trying to

puff anyone up, although Proverbs does say Let another man praise you, but just want to thank the Lord for all of you.

And as far as the baggage, I think a lot of people are working through things. Just acknowledging this lets you know what areas in your life that Jesus will help you with.

I've experienced similar things, but most of those people who thought I was wrong are now some of my best friends. I hope someday you can let us know where you went to church as I have been able to meet and visit a lot of the different places and would wonder if we would know some of the same people.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 01:50:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sage,

Thank you very, very much for your kind encouragement w/r baggage.

As far as watchmen, others are truly watchmen.

I am more of a "theology wonk."

(If you recall they used to call pres. Clinton a govt. policy "wonk" because he could grind out the details)

My baggage, of course, goes much deeper than mere past criticisms.

I am a humpty dumpty, and it will take our King to come and fix me.

Beyond that I never explain lest I draw others into my "slough of despond."

Wow, I do have a knack for writing a "have a happy day" post , do I not ?

Again, thank you.

Jman

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 03:06:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, Jman, we are all a work in progress that is why we need each other to speak the truth in love. (with the right attitude.)

Now I am held accountable to what I say & my attitude here on this board now & in the future, & it should be so for all of us. Thus I need to say you have not apologised for -

1. Your Accusations that I was presenting a new doctrine.
2. Your bad attitude to me - `Cantankerous, potentially dangerous, very slippery & crafty, & I am pretty much done with Marylin.`

How can we have good discussions unless we are held accountable to `speak the truth in love.`

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 10:37:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: William Wrote: You should remember that the last time you used those words, it resulted in two people taking it as a threat and it caused a nuclear chain reaction that almost destroyed the forum. I took your side on that occasion... please let me know if I was mistaken.

William,

You may not have had knowledge of this or you may of forgotten. There was more then just two people who thought it was a threat. Its just that a lot of things were being written in emails and private messages.

There was maybe 7 or 8 who left the board and went to another board, a month or two later 3 or 4 returned here to this board and set up shop. Several on the other site were not big posters anyway.

Things were brewing long before the threat and many voiced concern in the private message section over certain emails everyone was getting and told not to say anything to each other.

Which everyone compared notes anyway.

Secondly, I took it like Jman was just chiding Marilyn over the term cantankerous. It was done jokingly and not meant as something bad. Americans all the time use terms when were face to face and kidd each other is the way I took it and I told Marilyn this as well.

Marilyn if we hear something that is different from what we were taught then to "us" it is a new doctrine. There are several things you have shared that we have never heard before and this is why were thinking this stuff is new doctrines or teachings because we have never heard it so its new to us. This whole discussion on the 10 Arab nations is a new doctrine to us for example.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 16:37:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn said:

"Now I am held accountable to what I say & my attitude here on this board now & in the future, & it should be so for all of us. Thus I need to say you have not apologised for -

1. Your Accusations that I was presenting a new doctrine.
2. Your bad attitude to me - `Cantankerous, potentially dangerous, very slippery & crafty, & I am pretty much done with Marylin."

Marilyn I donâ€™t see in scripture where we go to someone and tell them to apologize, but I do see in scripture where you forgive them if they have offended you. As James has so eloquently said:

â€œWe need to die to self.â€• Certainly not always an easy thing to do, but something that is required of us as Christians. And besides, a forced apology is not really worth anything anyways.

All Jman did was ask you:

`Marylin, in past, present, or future - is anyone else of the order of Melchizedek?`

To me this is a "Yes or No" answer, and if you would so desire you could expound on your answer. Since you choose not to answer with a yes or no Jman said:

You gave a very slippery, crafty non- answer, Marylin.

He did not call you slippery or crafty. If someone tells a lie you could say "you lied to me." This does not make them a habitual liar. As far as I read, same with Jman, he does not say you are a slippery, crafty person, but your answer was such. A simple yes or no would have sufficed.

When anyone brings an apparent new teaching to this site we have some discerning, Christlike brothers who will "prove all things, and hold fast to that which is good." Back in the Dicippling section

you said: "plus I was taught by Apostles, Prophets, Teachers etc great revelation that was before it came across the Body. and I know there is still more to come that I have been taught." Of course you

would be excited to share such revelations, but we have to prove all things, and hold fast to that which is good. And Rev. 2:2 tells us to try them who say they are apostles. Just because someone says they are an apostle, prophet, teacher, evangelist, or pastor does not mean we buy into everything they say. We, here in the USA, have a lot of people going around calling themselves apostles, and prophets. Some of our churches got involved with false prophets, which ultimately caused a lot of people to follow deception and error. Others just left the faith criticizing what they once believed.

IF what you say is true the Lord will show us, but it cannot be forced. IF what the Lord has shown others the same applies, the Lord will show you. We need to be teachable, but not gullible. Prove all things, hold fast to that which is good.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 17:48:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gary,

When you first came back to this board, I talked to you about what had taken place. You stated, "You did not do anything wrong."

Have you changed your mind? What exactly are you accusing me of?

Jman and I have hashed it and we are fine.

I answered all of William's inquiries and have apologized for any misinterpretation.

Any "behind the scenes PM's were sent, it was to inquire if relationships were OK.

You are adding a lot of gas to the fire, now Gary.

Again, what exactly are you saying here and what are you accusing me of to where you are not happy as this matter stands?

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Gary](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 19:19:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GWB wrote on Thu, 12 December 2013 12:48Gary,

When you first came back to this board, I talked to you about what had taken place. You stated, "You did not do anything wrong."

Have you changed your mind? What exactly are you accusing me of?

Jman and I have hashed it and we are fine.

I answered all of William's inquiries and have apologized for any misinterpretation.

Any "behind the scenes PM's were sent, it was to inquire if relationships were OK.

You are adding a lot of gas to the fire, now Gary.

Again, what exactly are you saying here and what are you accusing me of to where you are not happy as this matter stands?

GWB,
Just lost my whole lousy post.

Calm down girl I was only stating to William it was not "two", but "eight" and a lot of it happened though emails and private messages.

My lands, you've been on an emotional roller coaster for a while here. It started when you was accusing Marilyn of anti-semantic language which never existed.

Quote: Then it was Jman, William Wrote: Christians don't throw around curses at each other. You took Jman's comment, the one about Marilyn offering a slippery and crafty non-answer, to be something it was not.

Now I'm being falsely accused here and putting words in my mouth.

It sounds like something is going on and your bringing your frustrations here on the board or your just wanting to pick a fight for no reason at all.

Don't read into the posts more then what they say.

If you need prayer were all here and will pray with you. Something is on your mind and I don't think its what is being written on this board, you don't seem your normal self.

Gary

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [GWB](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 19:36:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Seriously, Gary?

Yes, a lot has happened.

I am fine. I don't need prayer.

However, I do need a break from Romper Room.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 21:07:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sage,

You said,

Quote: `I donâ€™t see in scripture where we go to someone and tell them to apologize...`

You may not realise it but that is part of reconciliation -

`He has committed to us the word of reconciliation..` (2 Cor. 5: 19)

`when we are slandered, we try to conciliate;..` (1 Cor.4 13 NAV)

` first be reconciled to your brother..` (Matt. 5: 24)

As regards the `Yes or No,` answer. You said -

Quote: `To me this is a â€œYes or Noâ€• answer..`

How would you answer `Yes or No,` to `Do you still kick your cat?` it`s a trick question just like Jman`s about this so called new doctrine that I was supposed to unveil. But because there was no new doctrine how could I say `Yes or No.` Jman needed to ask me to explain what I was meaning, but he just jumped in & assumed wrong things & led a charge that has caused great difficulty for all.

Why I have specifically asked Jman for an apology is because that is the place that William said (& we all know it) is where we all meet, at the foot of the cross. It is the place of healing for all. where we get rid of our baggage.

Unless I am wrong in this then have you a new doctrine that I should know about?

I think the Holy Spirit again through James has said to all of us to seek our own forgiveness before God.

Together in Him, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 22:26:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Brothers & sisters in Christ,

I have sought the Lord & I believe I need to say that I am sorry that my words `New Order of Beings,` (meaning new creations / beings in Christ) have caused offense, which caused Jman to jump to conclusions thinking it was a new doctrine.

`Lord, I feel for my brothers & sisters who are hurting & thus reacting, may you come with your healing & restore your people to each other, in Jesus` name.`

Prayfully, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Thu, 12 Dec 2013 22:54:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You may not realise it but that is part of reconciliation -

`He has committed to us the word of reconciliation..` (2 Cor. 5: 19)

`when we are slandered, we try to conciliate;..` (1 Cor.4 13 NAV)

The verse before says: â€œbeing reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it.

Matthew 5:44 â€œBut I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;â€•

Luke 6:27-29 "But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, Bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloak forbid not to take thy coat also."

Luke 23:34 "Then said Jesus, Father forgive them; for they know not what they do."

Romans 12:14 "Bless them which persecute you; bless and curse not."

Colossians 3:12-13 "Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels(heart) of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; Forbearing one another, if any man have a quarrel(complaint) against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do you."

"first be reconciled to your brother.." (Matt. 5: 24) To me this means you go to your brother and say I am sorry, is there something I did to offend you. Not to demand an apology.

The message of Jesus is forgiveness, not demanding our rights. With the verses I quoted there is: we bless, we suffer the wrong, we love, we do good, we pray, we go the extra mile, we show mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering, and forbearance.

When Stephen was being stoned he didn't demand his rights or for judgment to be called down, but rather said Father forgive them.

Same with Jesus. Now don't you think that same mind should be in us? If you feel you have been wronged then forgive and let God deal with the offending party. I don't see reconciliation as demanding an apology from someone. Now in saying that, if I am wrong the Lord will show me.

As regards the "Yes or No," answer. You said -

Quote:

"To me this is a "Yes or No" answer.."

How would you answer "Yes or No," to "Do you still kick your cat?" it's a trick question just like Jman's about this so called new doctrine that I was supposed to unveil. But because there was no new doctrine how could I say "Yes or No." Jman needed to ask me to explain what I was meaning, but he just jumped in & assumed wrong things & led a charge that has caused great difficulty for all.

I don't see that, but if that is how you perceive it then that is how it will stand.

Why I have specifically asked Jman for an apology is because that is the place that William said (& we all know it) is where we all meet, at the foot of the cross. It is the place of healing for all. where we get rid of our baggage.

That is correct, you get rid of your baggage and you let God take care of the other person. Because if you have forgiven them for the wrong or perceived wrong, then it won't bother you, but rather you will count it all joy for the Lord taking your baggage.

Unless I am wrong in this then have you a new doctrine that I should know about?

Not a new doctrine, but a new concept to some. Death to self, therefore not taking offense when someone says something. Or demanding what we consider our rights.

Subject: Re: New Order of Beings
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 13 Dec 2013 06:08:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sage,

I appreciate your concerns for me, as regards praying for those we think are persecuting us. This my husband & I have done regularly in what has been happening here.

You said -

Quote: `first be reconciled to your brother..` (Matt. 5: 24) To me this means you go to your brother and say I am sorry, is there something I did to offend you..`

Here are some examples of how I have tried to do this over this whole conversation.

Quote: `Your quoting me out of context (Gary)
Sorry Gary, I don't mean to quote you out of context (me)

I am very thankful to William who pointed out to me my error (me)

Thank you for the correction & help re KJ (me)

Sorry to have made such a confusion on my posts (me)

Sorry to cause such confusion (me)

Its easy to talk about dying to self, actual living it is a whole different ballgame. (Gary)

Do you have trouble when I put the words close together?

KingPriest. Well I can easily write King Priest if that helps & not offends you. (me)

Sometimes apologies get lost in the general conversations. Hope that is helpful Sage to show my heart motivation more.

God bless, Marilyn.