

Apostolic Agreement

This paper is dedicated to all those who are truly seeking to allow Abba YHVH to mold them into the image of His dear Son Yeshua/Jesus Ha'Mashiach. Let's boldly prepare as quickly as the Spirit will carry us, so we FINALLY can be with Him as his Church-Bride.

Our Copyright is the right to Copy. Please feel free to use anything we post from Harvest of Hope International to further your own study. We would be honored if it helps anyone go farther than we have.

Harvest of Hope International 2017

This article is intended to serve as an example of respectful dialogue on a matter of Biblical Doctrine. These discussions often end up debated with much emotional and disrespectful exchange. As you will see below, this exchange was the opposite of that norm.

This discussion was based on an article I (Tim) wrote by the title of "[The Two Faced Church](#)" (< link). The purpose of the article was to show how polarized the institutional church has become from the spiritual church. For the purposes of understanding this concept a bit, let's define the institutional church as any church or group of churches which have been established since the First Century and had been standardized according to their own exclusive set of beliefs and governing by-laws. We will define the spiritual church as the many-membered Body of Messiah (Yeshua/Jesus) who have been born into faith in Yeshua as Messiah by accepting Him as Lord and Savior. While all members of the spiritual church are probably members of the institutional church in some way, the reverse is not true.

I would highly recommend reading the article before reading this discussion. In it you will see that the point is not to insult the modern church at all, but rather to point out how polarized it has become. To examine the First Century church and determine if it may be possible that the modern church really isn't operating at God designed. Obviously, the fact that we have many denominations, and within each denomination are factions who believe one set of things while another faction may believe the opposite. This has resulted in many denominational splits. Further, within each body of belief there are churches who become a microcosm of the larger denominational division by splitting into two or more congregations because of some division.

I do know that there are divisive people who cause problems and seek to gain a following in order to start a church by splitting one. I also know there are people who have leadership of a church split thrust upon them because the original church had a tyrannic (or possibly an inept) leader and so people simply left and asked the most trusted elder to become their new leadership. I don't condone the splitting of an assembly for anything short of heresy from leaders, however, like many things there are shades of ambiguity where this is concerned. Those are the topic for another discussion though. In this, again, I want us to see that a church split doesn't have to be the inevitability of conflict or differing opinion.

Let me introduce Tom Steele. Tom is the founder of [Truth Ignited](#) (<link). We met while attending World Harvest Bible College (now Valor University) in 2002 and worked together at World Harvest Church for a couple of years. We've maintained occasional contact and as you'll see in the thread below have come to some similar conclusions regarding this subject matter. We each came from different backgrounds and took different roads through a differing timetable to come to these similar conclusions. But, this is why I believe this to be such a perfect example of modern reasoning together in an apostolic spirit guided by Ruach Ha'Kodesh (Holy Spirit). God used a series of event for each of us, to put us on a path which led us back to

the First Century church as our one and only acceptable example of God's design for the Church-Bride of Yeshua/Jesus! I may be more firmly against the modern structure than Tom, and he may be more firmly committed to Kosher ideals than I. But, we can still reason together and find the commonalities and build from there. This doesn't need to become a point of separation, but rather one of maturation. We can both be matured by Ruach Ha'Kodesh as we sharpen one another in friendly discourse, and pray for Abba to reveal His truth to each other. All too often, in my observation, people try to be Holy Spirit to other believers. Instead of trusting Ruach Ha'Kodesh to lead and guide others into all truth (which is one of His primary functions to the body and on behalf of the Trinity); we try to convict others with our own revelation of truth. It is far more beneficial to present, without selfish or ego based motive, and let Him do the work of renewing the mind of the other(s) and let it go there. It is the intense disagreements which lead to church splits and relationships being destroyed over ego!! Ruach Ha'Kodesh has not ego to invest, He is all powerful and all knowing already. When He says something is a fact, well it's just a fact and no amount of mental gymnastics of philosophic maneuvering with change it.

I deeply respect Tom and his research. I believe his apostolic approach to scripture and his Berean tenacity to search our truth in the claims of others who say they are sent by God is beyond commendable.

Matthew 24:4-5

And Jesus answered and said unto them, "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many".

I've heard about as many theories on this one as I can possibly stand frankly. LOL. Everything from "this is about the antichrist" to "this is about false/self proclaimed prophets". Ok....while both may be true and there is reference to this quote later in the same chapter which would indicate they are; the Law of Deductive Reasoning would dictate the simplest answer is in the question. That question being 'who shall deceive many?'. Simple deduction says "Those who say 'I am Christ'". But, if one is to complete a thorough investigation, we cannot stop there. We must dig deeper than just a single method of inspection of the evidence. You see, Christ is not a Hebrew word and never has been. "Christ" is from the Greek word *Christos* or the Latin word *Cristos* (for those of Catholic background). It means anointed one. Well then, that leaves one asking themselves "doesn't the word "Christ refer to Yeshua/Jesus"? It absolutely does and I am not debating that. This is where Matthew 24: 23-24 comes in handy. It refers to "false Christs", false prophets doing signs and wonders. Hmmm. Wait a second.... doesn't Mark 16:17-18 say that signs and wonders would follow all believers? Doesn't Shaul (Apostle Paul) refer to the anointing in all believers? So then what is Matthew 24:4-5 really saying?

In my very humbled opinion (as God has shown me many humbling things in His Word the last 10 years), Yeshua/Jesus is saying there will be many who come, are called to a ministry office, anointed, and appointed into very distinguished positions.

In fact, so distinguished, that people will go many miles to hear them speak. These are anointed people who pervert the anointing by employ incorrectly. Those who seek to control or build a kingdom of their own. A pastor who must approve every ministry which people in the congregation engage in, even if it doesn't take place in the church building. An evangelist who seeks to build a following of people who travel from town to town to hear them speak. Pastors who will only allow other Pastors to minister in their church. The Pastor who teaches they are the Prophet of the House, so their congregation won't seek prophetic ministry elsewhere for their lives. The Prophet who exaggerates what God is doing in their ministry, or uses divination to "see" into the spirit realm through soulish means. The Apostle who lords their authority over the churches they have planted and in doing so replace the Holy Spirit as the guide for the church. Or even the board of Elders who allow a Pastor to take control of the finances. This is a time and season when the man-made structural church will be slowly (but increasingly quickly) dismantled. I use that word (dismantled) purposeful to describe two things,

1. the careful deconstruction of the structural church (for those who will accept the reconstruction of a First Century model)
2. the eventually possible and likely removal of mantles of anointing for those who will not

One last thought, It is so very important for us to search scripture for everything, including church structure, doctrine, standards for living and health, etc. As you read this discussion, I think you will see there really is a positive way to discuss controversial information from scripture. Essentially Tom and I agree the whole time and that helps, but we have had many discussions where we don't see eye to eye quite so much and yet they would look just like this one. It is so incredibly vital that as the church-bride begins to mature into a Warrior Princess, which is the kind of Church-Bride He is coming back for, like we see in Esther. She took upon herself the responsibility of using the situation she found herself in to save the entire nation of Israel!! We cannot let the world down. We MUST become the Church-Bride/Esther who does everything we can to prepare ourselves in order to be chosen. Remember,, scripture says many are called but few are chosen. All who believe shall be saved. But world changers are chosen. They dare to swim against the current and confront error in love. We stand on the edge of a doctrinal precipice and we need to be ready to fly when it comes time to jump, and that time WILL come. Only those who have walked away from man-made constructs will even know the time has come. Only those who have prepared will fly.....

May God guide the Body Of Messiah, and may the Body be prepared to grow beyond it's current understanding into all the truth He is revealing for the restoration of all things.

This will take some stretching, and stretching hurts. Abba will help the willing to grow.

Truth Ignited I think the biggest problem is that the Modern Church has absolutely no concept of the importance of Torah. Even those who have some understanding generally associate Torah as a general reference to the five books of Moses, and while that is an acceptable interpretation, it is not necessarily the most accurate. Torah simply means "instruction" and for the purpose of Scripture it means the Instructions given directly by YHWH Himself.

Something I have been researching, and I have by no means made an absolute conclusion on, is a unique difference I noticed while looking at the Stone Tablets given to Moses (Exodus 24). If you look at the text and the description between the initial giving of the tablets in Exodus 24 and the second set in Exodus 34, as well as all other related text within the account, you may notice some interesting things that are completely missed by most, because we have had it ingrained into our thinking that the tablets contained the Ten Commandments... and that's all they contained.

However, what I noticed (a good source of understanding is using the TLV Bible, it's on BibleGateway in the list of translations they have) is that in chapter 24 it says that the tablets contained the Torah and the mitzvot. In Exodus 32:15 it is revealed that the tablets were written on both sides. Then in Exodus 34:28 Moses is told to write the Ten Words on the tablets himself.

Now, we don't really know how big the tablets actually were, but we could get a clue of the maximum size because they had to fit inside the Ark of the Covenant. But, it seems very likely that, especially as a language void of vowels, the Ten Commandments would not need to take up both sides of two tablets.

I have done some digging and am strongly leaning toward the notion that the tablets contained ALL of the Torah and mitzvot given by YHWH to Moses, which would be the 613 instructions commonly associated with Torah. This would mean that all instructions found in what is referenced as the Torah today, the five books of Moses, were inscribed by the finger of YHWH onto the stone tablets.

This would change a lot of things, but most importantly it means that the Torah is written by YHWH Himself, not "divinely inspired" writing like the rest of Scripture. As such, Torah becomes the absolute foundation of all other Scripture, and all other Scripture becomes commentary on Torah. While still divinely inspired, it always goes back to Torah. Thus, all interpretation of Scripture must be based on what Torah says. Taking this approach would completely eliminate wide and varying interpretations of Scripture, because laws given in Torah are absolute, they are not vague, they do not offer multiple interpretations. When it says do not murder, it needs no interpretation. When it says a man shall not lay with a man as with a woman, that needs no interpretation. When it says to remember the Sabbath Day and keep it holy, that needs no interpretation. When it says do not eat the pig or other things specified, that needs no interpretation.

So then the Torah becomes the foundation of all interpretation of Scripture because the Torah is the only thing in Scripture that is said to be written by YHWH Himself. Even Yeshua, who is the Torah made flesh, always went back to Torah when teaching. He

always agreed with Torah. He said that until heaven and earth pass away the Torah would not pass away.

What this means is that the Church has got this all wrong, and really much of Judaism probably does to. It is not wonder, however, that the Jewish people have preserved Torah above all other Scripture, and that one of the major points of focus is Torah with the weekly Torah Portions that are put together for people to make sure that no matter what, they are reading and studying Torah every week.

[Unlike](#) · [Reply](#) · [Message](#) · 1 · February 16 at 3:28am

Harvest of Hope International Hi Tom, I have held to this view for over 10 years now. It has cost me a lot of flack and people who've even lost respect for me over it. This blog is about the restoration of lost understanding of the freedom gained from a right understanding of YHVH's plan for the Church-Bride. So, your insights are right in line with the blog indeed. The issue is that the Septuagint was used all too often in the interpretation of B'rit Hadasha. I've said many times since I began my research into Messianic Teachings and Hebraic Roots in 2004/2005 (honestly I began dabbling in 1994 while pastoring in Colorado Springs), that threads of Mitzvot are throughout all of Tanakh. Those words got me ostracized by most of the people I called friends and colleagues. The connection of this to my blog is that Yeshua came to destroy the Takanot of the Religious Hierarchy, but He upheld every bit of Torah and become what would Tanakh, as did Paul when he taught the things I bring up in this blog. I did have to learn to balance my research so I did not become so intellectually puffed up that I became Pharisaic in my pursuit of truth. Even now, it can seem to many that I am splitting hairs. But I try to help them see, that like the Pharisees of Yeshua's time, the church uses the right phraseology to teach and explain their doctrines of works. They are so good at it that one would be hard pressed to use scripture to prove them wrong because they are perhaps only one degree off center when they teach. PLUS many use an expository method of teaching, scripture by scripture. By the time they get to the common threads from one book to another, they can be one degree off and no one sees it. When they teach topically, they use Greek or Hebrew to prove or back a point but never seek to transliterate and cross interpret from BOTH so contextual interpretation gets narrowed beyond the revealing of falsities. This blog is the first in a series of cross-examining B'rit Hadashah principles with the Tanakh doctrine so as to expose the current Takanot (mitzvot created by religious leaders and which changes the interpretation of scripture). Thank for your thoughts, while a little deeper than I was ready to go so early in this series, they are right on.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Commented on by Tim Hillis](#) · February 19 at 8:12pm · Edited

Tom Steele Quite excellent! This is exactly what I was telling someone the other day... Pastor Parsley often says that a partial truth is a whole lie. Well, then if Christian doctrines are 99% correct, then it's that 1% that would ultimately making the majority of Christianity a whole lie. It only takes Satan a sliver of false teaching to deceive a person to the point where they could enter hell through the doors of a Church.

Ironically, I think in a way your time frame is in line with mine. I really got started seriously with this in '04 as well, after we heard Ted Broer speak at WHC, but as I am sure you notice from my blogs and focus in my posts I went toward more studying a lot of the science behind things like the dietary laws, agricultural laws, hygiene laws, etc. Although my eyes were opened to the Hebrew Roots (without even knowing the term Hebrew Roots was a thing) while we were in Bible College. I can't remember if you were in the class that did the Seder Service with the Jordans, I know you had a weird schedule I think at times because you were doing overnights at the Church.

One thing I have fond is that all Scripture after Torah seems to point right back to Torah. Whenever there is something that appears to change or contradict what Torah says, studying it out seems to reveal that such contradictions or changes are nonexistent. I was just pointing this out the other day in a post explaining the verse in Nehemiah that says to "eat the fat". The word "fat" is different from the word in Torah that says not to eat any animal fat. In Torah it refers to actual fat from an animal. In Nehemiah it actually means "fat one" and would be similar in nature to the story of the prodigal son where the father ordered the fatted calf to be prepared... they ate the fat one, and drank the sweet. So, a verse that many would use to say, "See, right there, God changed Torah and we can eat animal fat now" doesn't say that at all. It seems every time I have to address something like this with people, it always ends up agreeing with Torah. Even the teachings of Yeshua, which I always have to point out to some people that He is the Torah made flesh, so obviously He could not contradict Himself.

Anyway, always good to know we are on the same page. I am noticing a good number of people from our era of WHBC going this way, and even getting involved with Messianic ministries. In one FB Group a while back someone even asked the question, something like, "Why are so many Bible College grads teaching what appears to be Messianic Judaism?" I replied to them that it was probably because that is what Pastor Parsley himself has been teaching. Unfortunately, as always, I sense there is resistance (not open, but it seems to be there in spirit) to the teachings, and it may even be all the way up to leadership. Of course, Pastor has also been saying for a long time that what gets in the head eventually gets in the body. Just seems like it's taking a long time to get to the body... must be some pretty thick oil (metaphor) that is slow to move down from the head to the body.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Message](#) · February 19 at 9:54pm

Harvest of Hope International That head to body thing is a whole other can of worms. We're following a corporate church model that isn't Biblical or found anywhere in scripture. I'll save that for another time though. LOL

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · Commented on by Tim Hillis · February 20 at 6:13am

Tom Steele I know that... but at the same time, in the case of corporate houses of worship like World Harvest, you would think that the people would at least take seriously the word being brought forth. On that note, what do you do with the Churches listed in Revelation and the "angel of the Church" in each case. Obviously

the mainstream Christian Church model considers this to be the Pastor, perhaps there is some acceptability in that, perhaps not.

While I do agree that there is much wrong with the current state of Christianity and the modern Church model, I have come to certain conclusions from both observations from that model and observations from the direction a lot of people are going within the growing "Hebrew Roots" phenomenon. What I have noticed in the latter is a lot of people "breaking away" from Christianity altogether. I have even seen some that are doing a "virtual Church" model, which I suppose can be good in some regards, and I have been inclined to look more into that myself.

Some of the major problems I see with these things, even formal gatherings within the movement, is that these people all seem to have an "escape" mentality. They have "broken free" from the Christian Church in their mind, and as such they lack the foundations and, as I am sure you notice, they start diving into wild beliefs. There is even an attraction to a belief that the Earth is really flat and that NASA and every government in the world is involved in a major conspiracy to deceive us all into "thinking the world is a globe". The irony is that I have taken a serious look at this because I know someone here locally who has embraced this head on and the theory does present a lot of interesting points, including Scripture, and in reality from where I stand on the Earth, short of an opportunity to go into space and see for myself, it is hard to argue the theory either way. But, that too is a whole other subject.

In response to someone on my page I explained it in Naval terms, which you know I am rather familiar with. While watching a Hanukkah service done by Pastor Larry Huch, who I quite enjoy listening to, although also still within that mainstream corporate Church model that I agree may not be exactly Scriptural, he was saying that his mission is to convert the Church, but that doing so is like trying to turn an aircraft carrier. Well, as I thought about that, I realized there are two major types of support craft for large ships: lifeboats and tugboats. What most of the people awakening to this stuff with Torah and the Hebrew Roots of Christianity are doing is jumping onto lifeboats while the ship continues to veer off course or even worse continues sinking. Tugboats are small craft that come alongside the ship and guide it to its destination. What we need is to create small groups that act as tugboats to help guide the "ship" to its destination. We need to stay connected to the local Churches, as far as I see it, and help lead groups within them. These will in turn influence others within the Church to follow the truth. The Church model may never go away, but we can still use it and correct its course.

Currently I am facing a potential opportunity to do this very thing at World Harvest. From there, hopefully we can provide a model for other Churches connected to WHC through the Alliance and other branches. At the same time, I am hoping that through connections I am slowly making within the movement to be able to convert them from being lifeboats leading people away from the main ship to being tugboats to come along and guide the ship to port. That is really what I am seeing, and why I chose the slogan "Uniting The Torah And The Gospel" for the ministry I am building, because it speaks about bringing the Church back together with the Hebrew Roots, whether that be the Jewish people themselves or these fringe groups that have left mainstream Christianity.

Harvest of Hope International Part 1 - Good points Tom. Yeah, I have seen many of the same break-aways and also a great number of people moving into such fringe topics/doctrine/rituals/etc that it even goes beyond my ability to accept that much latitude. You know me, I like to dig out and research the fringe stuff as a hobby. LOL But as for the church model, it seems to me that we need to look at first century church models. The house church was established by an Apostle (almost with any variable) each house church was turned over to an elder or local apostolically gifted believer who may or may not have been called to be an actual apostle but could maintain the apostolic breaker anointing. Many of those were later matured into apostolic callings from the evidence; i.e. Priscilla and Aquila. The modern church offices of apostle and prophet often seem to see marriages containing one apostle and prophet. While this is surely not a part of the “plan” nor is it necessary, it seems to be quite common. I bring this up only to point out that Priscilla and Aquila were probably that since Paul called Priscilla an esteemed colleague ahead of Aquila her husband. It was common, as you know, to address those of one's own “social stature” ahead of those of the same gender. In fact, it was probably the ONLY time it could be absolutely justified. Secondly, I bring this up to show something noteworthy – many of the best-researched papers on the author of Hebrews seem to indicate it was indeed Priscilla. Her writing a book which would stand the test of scrutiny over time and remain in the canon would attest to her apostolic calling, not to mention she was Apollos' teacher. Now, they eventually became a church planting team and their churches also showed strong grounding in the Word. To me, this indicates more than one 4/5 Fold Office within their two-person team. While an Apostle can fill the role of Prophet and actually function in that office (or any of the offices), it is not intended that it be long term and the example set in the next model proves it.

The Antioch Model – overseen by elders and prophets, we see no sign of a pastor as the head of this body. While many argue that the word for elders used there is obviously a synonym for pastor, I completely disagree. Paul did not use any of his usual methods of creating a poetic point (i.e. the interchange/A-B-A-B, or particualrization/chiasm) or even driving home the dis-proving of a ludicrous idea by way of his sometimes subtle sarcasm (like modern hyperbole). That said, the model resembles a multi- cornered room with a prophet or elder occupying each corner. Near but not keeping them hedged in are the spiritually senior members of the body. Inside all of them and hedged in for protection, guidance and actual contact/interaction are the believers, with the newest the furthest to the center. I do not believe this a “perfect model” however, it is far removed from the “pastor is the head of the local church” model which is best represented by the corporate tree which one must climb to have any access to the supposed leader. We cannot find this model in the New Testament Church. The church is not the new Israel, or else this might work using Moses as a model. But frankly, I believe Moses as much an Apostle as a Prophet. He showed us how to administrate and was the first to show the Trinity concept of equal and shared authority in leadership. The “pastor led model” does not reflect share authority and if Yeshua sealed the deal on a second half of the covenant, which I believe He did and it is not two separate ones, but a lack of literary exactness to say old covenant and new,

the the Brit Hadashah model should be one of equally shared authority in the 4/5-Fold Offices. I'll briefly explain why I keep calling it a 4/5-Fold for anyone who read but may not be familiar with anything other than Ephesians 4:11 being called the 5-Fold. In the Greek there is no punctuation. There is however a usage of a writing style which clearly shows a differentiation between each of the first 3. In the English this is commonly shown something like this "and He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers. Do you notice there is no comma between Pastors and Teachers. It is the opinion of the most respected authorities (not just my opinion but that of many others) that this would have been more accurately translated with something like "Pastors as Teachers". With one small exception, I still believe this is true. The exception is this, one need not pastor to be a teacher, but as Paul told Timothy "A pastor must be apt (able) to teach".

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · Commented on by Tim Hillis · February 21 at 8:26pm · Edited

Harvest of Hope International Part 2 - So then, we have the house church, the Antioch model and I know of at least one more for sure without really thinking this over. The Messianic Model – or, those followers of Judaism who accepted Yeshua HaMashiach. These seemed to mostly stay in the synagogue for teaching but were part of house churches for worship. Perhaps that blending is what lead the writer of Hebrews (again whom I think probably was Priscilla) to pen the book to begin with.....? Just a thought.

Of these, the only which could be successful, which would allow the operation of every office, and which shows all 5 in operation though 3 are unseen, is the Antioch model. We don't see the evangelist or apostle for a very good reason. Apostles were "sent ones". Churches fasted, prayed, ordained and sent apostles to break the spiritual atmosphere of new territories. Among other responsibilities better suited for another discussion. Evangelists were out gathering converts into the body to be brought into the family of Messiah. Now, why don't we see pastor? Because pastors were not pastors in title. They were mentors/shepherds. Shepherds are in the crowd, with the people, mingling with the sheep and building relationships for mentoring. But this does not mean some mass teaching couldn't also be done by a pastor. Only that it should be used to improve the effectiveness of the mentoring relationship. This is another reason I believe the oneness of the pastor-teacher from Ephesians 4:11. This also personifies the positive scriptures in Jeremiah's example of pastors. The negative scriptures seem to prophetically point to the CEO-Pastor we see most commonly today. We cannot use the requisites for Bishops or Elders (since they are VERY different words and not synonyms) from the epistles to see the requisites of the pastor-teacher. We know elders preached. Paul says so clearly a few times. But, Paul, while mentoring a young "pastor" in 2 Timothy 2:24-25 shows the heart of a pastor. In fact, beyond verse 25 he describes a mentoring relationship. This is the mentor as teacher part. I believe a true pastor has the shepherding heart which leads to natural mentoring relationships which open the door to instruct by earning genuine trust. But I reject the unbiblical concept of a pastor led church model and also the "pastor is the prophet of the house" mindset. It leads to a CEO-Pastor who is untouchable by the people (thus the reason the corporate tree diagram is the best visual to represent it). Ephesians 4 also shows us that Yeshua divided Himself in giving the gifts of the offices to the Body

of Messiah. We can see Him as shepherd-teacher when He mingled with and even touched/ministered/served every person in a crowd of thousands before He would leave them. The pastor led model leads to a “leadership only” ministry function and precludes any chance of every believer being used by the Holy Spirit as the Spirit guides. The opposite of "perfecting the saints for the work of the ministry to minister to the whole body of Christ, until we come into maturity in faith in the fullness of Christ" Ephesians 4:11-13. Also Christ is to be the ONLY head in the church (any and all churches) Ephesians 4:15. The CEO-Pastor model forces a “church membership” roster system which is similar to the sacred rights of pagan organizations. It has no choice if it is to be consistent and keep continuity with the corporate tree. Further and lastly for now, it fosters an already orphan mentality of sheep who don't need to have human interaction by way of ministry from other believers because one person (almost always the same person) does all of the teaching/preaching. I've already established that a pastor's primary responsibility was to shepherd and teach by mentoring so I won't belabor the whole issue with mass ministry of preaching from an office not called to it. But, I don't believe a pastor can never preach. But that requires delineation between preaching and teaching which I don't want to get into now because it will distract from my real points. I know you know the difference, but others may not. It has been lost by the pastor self-help, ministry of many churches today. Sorry, cheap shot. I digress.....

To close this, let me say the following..... Holy Spirit has total reign and latitude. So, all these are guidelines and are designed to set the tone for the “norm”. This is where God's concept of “decent and in order” must over ride man's. The man-made concepts of that are so far out of what God views (based on scripture) I don't have time or desire to address them all. However, I will say that any crossing over the Holy Spirit wishes between gifts/offices and callings/ is not and would never be un-biblical. For instance, can a shepherd-teacher preach? Sure, but that is a very minor and occasional function of that office. Pastors, have no business in church business beyond what the elders allow though. Nor should they ever even FEEL (much less act on) the brazenness of overruling the elders in a financial/business matter because the pastor is not the Biblical head of the local Body of Messiah. I sometimes wish it were so, perhaps then they would not feel so threatened by apostles and prophets who God sends to a specific region. This mess we are in is largely because the Catholic model of hierarchy carried over into the reformation and took root in likely power-hungry leaders with little revelation of scripture on the topic, and it has remained mostly unchallenged until the last decade. God is moving on this and we will soon see some serious changes on the face of Christendom. A polar divide is happening and as it does so will a shifting of influence in communities and nations. Slowly at first and snowballing beyond any person's control, no matter how big and influential they may have been or are once the snowballing begins. I pray for lots of ministries with very anointed men and women of God at the helm who need to step aside and adopt a First Century Church model. Whether Antioch or a variation which follows the natural order God is bringing to light in every nation

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · Commented on by Tim Hillis · February 20 at 7:52pm · Edited

Tom Steele This is all good information Tim. I've got a slightly busy day today and when I get home I have some posts to make through my own ministry page (perhaps "my own" is not the best phrase, but you know what I mean). Hopefully after that or sometime tomorrow I can read through your comments more thoroughly and provide a longer reply.

I am glad you brought up the Synagogue model though, I kept thinking of that as I was reading through, and it is clear in Scripture that it was the custom of both Yeshua and the Apostles to attend weekly Sabbath worship at the Synagogues. In fact, if you count up the number of times the Apostles are recorded in Acts as attending the Synagogue on the Sabbath it totals over 80 times (which includes counting every week in lengthy periods like that year and a half Paul was documented as such). The Synagogue does offer a model of corporate gathering for worship and teaching, although I also see it as very different than the modern Protestant Christian Church model.

I do see the potential trend to get away from the standard Church model and even the possibility of the end of the "megachurch" age. Perhaps it will be, especially with the use of technology and the Internet, that leaders will be called to Apostolically oversee small groups by use of the web and other forms of media and technology, helping keep these groups in check, because as it is now there are a lot of people scattered around with little or no guidance from people who are grounded. That's why I and I am sure many others are feeling caught in the middle and being tossed around, but I will still stay strong on the path I see YHWH leading His people and do my best to guide the Church toward the truth and bring those who have deviated to the fringes back toward the truth as well. Never an easy position, but if that's what He wants me to do, I'm good with that.

[Unlike](#) · [Reply](#) · [Message](#) · 1 · February 20 at 10:27pm