

119

MINISTRIES

“The following is a direct script of a teaching that is intended to be presented via video, incorporating relevant text, slides, media, and graphics to assist in illustration, thus facilitating the presentation of the material. In some places, this may cause the written material to not flow or sound rather awkward in some places. In addition, there may be grammatical errors that are often not acceptable in literary work. We encourage the viewing of the video teachings to complement the written teaching you see below.”

The Church: His Model – FAQ

With any teaching presentation, there are often questions. This teaching will address frequently asked questions about our teaching [The Church: His Model](#). This is a complicated and controversial topic, and our goal in this teaching is to provide additional clarity on the subject.

The teaching [The Church: His Model](#) details how YHWH intends for his people to organize and structure themselves. In that teaching we conclude that a church should have one head, which is Yeshua our Messiah. Then, we are to have an equal plurality of elders that teach and ensure that others in the faith are following the Word of God.

The original teaching was never intended to address every point of scripture related to this subject, but simply offer a Biblical framework and perspective that would enable a student of the Word to really explore how YHWH wants his people to organize themselves.

Thus, the following **FAQ's** will address two things. We will address the questions that we have received, as well as some of the questions that we feel should have been asked.

We hope that this question and answer format serves well. Before you proceed with the rest of this teaching, we ask that you watch the teaching titled, [“The Church: His Model”](#) first.

Let's begin.

Q - Where did the term or phrase “Moses Model” of leadership originate?

It is difficult to say. The term ‘Moses Model’ as a form of church structure is not a recent invention. A simple search on [Google](#) will evidence how common the model is in both Jewish and Christian circles. Searching for ‘Moses Model’ in quotations yields nearly 24,000 results, so clearly, we are not dealing with an uncommon style of church leadership.

Q - Are you suggesting that the Moses Model is a faulty and unbiblical model for organizing the church?

Not at all, and let's say that again, not at all. We teach that the 'Moses Model' is the one true model outlined in the Bible. In the way that we understand it, for whatever that is worth, the 'Moses Model' was and is the ONLY Biblical model. The reality, however, is that few are actually employing the Moses Model as scripturally designed. It is all about who fills the role of "Moses" over the congregation. Should it be a head pastor, or Yeshua our Messiah?

Those are our two choices and that is going to be the key difference between what we understand to be the correct application and a faulty application of the Moses Model. We teach that Yeshua is the head of the church, and the High Priest over the church, thus filling those two roles perfectly, with no mediator interrupting the direct line between the Body and the Messiah. In the way that most implement the Moses Model today, the head pastor fills the role of Moses, instead of our true head, Yeshua the Messiah.

1 Timothy 2:5

For there is one God, and there is **one** mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus [Messiah Yeshua],

We cannot force another head to fit between God and man. Nor should we replace Yeshua. The true 'Moses Model' is having Yeshua as the head of the congregation.

Q - Does the Moses model work?

Most certainly, it worked as the system in the time of Moses, and in the first century. What doesn't work is when we, as man, try to be Moses when that role is reserved for Yeshua alone.

Q - Are you saying that there are no authorities?

Absolutely not. Actually, quite the opposite. We are saying that there is only one authority, which is the Word of God, which is the same as saying Yeshua our Messiah is our authority, since he only taught and practiced the Word of God.

Revelation 19:13

He is clothed in a robe dipped in blood, and the name by which he is called is The Word of God.

The only authority in our lives is the living breathing Word of God that we are to submit every ounce of our being and life to. To claim any other authority over us is to misplace our submission in the Word of God.

There are also human authorities, but human authorities must derive their authority from the Word of God. If they conflict with the Word of God, then they are not authorities at all.

Q - Is there really no other authority than Yeshua?

That is correct. Yeshua is the Word of God, and only speaks the Word of God. Yeshua said that He did not speak His own Words, but ONLY the Words of our Father.

John 14:10

Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me? The words that I say to you I do not speak on my own authority, but the Father who dwells in me does his works.

What this means is, Yeshua's authority comes straight from the Father. His words are the Father's words, and that is why they carry authority. If another man comes speaking his own words and claiming that he has authority, that man is wrong. Only the Word of God has authority.

To place some other man over us with their own words is clearly not to be part of how YHWH intends for his people to organize themselves.

Q - Do you believe there is anyone over the head of the husband?

Yes. We believe Yeshua is the only head.

1 Corinthians 11:3

But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God.

When a husband and wife are joined together in marriage, they become one. This is the same word picture that teaches us about our future relationship with our Messiah. Our Messiah is the bridegroom and we are the bride. Just like it is unacceptable for another man to come between an earthly husband and wife, it is unacceptable for another man to come between us and our heavenly bridegroom. To place another individual between the husband and wife creates a dynamic that is not only unbiblical, but creates disharmony, friction, and drama. The same happens in a church setting as well. The more that a head pastor attempts to usurp Yeshua's headship, the more friction, drama, and disharmony there will be in the church.

Q - What about Paul appointing elders? Does this mean that Paul had more authority?

Let's see:

Acts 14:23

And when they [Paul and Barnabus] had appointed elders for them in every church, with prayer and fasting they committed them to the Lord in whom they had believed.

Also see Titus chapter one

Titus 1:5

This is why I left you in Crete, so that you might put what remained into order, and appoint elders in every town as I directed you.

Some might point to these verses and consider that Paul, Barnabus, or even Titus may have had some special authority granted to them. That might make sense, until we realize what is actually taking place. Notice how the word church (*ekklesia* in the Greek) is singular, and elders (*presbuteros* in the Greek) is plural.

Let's read it again:

Acts 14:23

And when they [Paul and Barnabus] had appointed elders [PLURAL] for them in every church [SINGULAR], with prayer and fasting they committed them to the Lord in whom they had believed.

There is no mention of an appointing of a head pastor but only a plurality of elders over a singular congregation. This, of course, is completely consistent with the church structure we teach as the Biblical model. There is to be no head pastor, other than Yeshua, but instead only a body that consists of a plurality of equal elders, only to distinguish between those who are mature in the faith and capable of teaching the Word and those who are not.

Yet, some might suggest that because others, such as Paul or Barnabus, appointed these elders, that they have a special authority over the elders that they appointed. Yet, this is an assumption and not a fact. We have to examine the context.

The reality is this, which becomes rather simple to understand once it is considered. An elder is someone who has been trained up in the Word of God, so that they, through correcting and teaching, can create more elders in the Body. Now if the apostles, which literally means “to go forth”, are charged with creating churches, a certain dynamic presents itself that requires a certain protocol of logic and process.

Paul would establish churches and because he is only one man, he can only teach so many the Word of God as he knows and understands it, to so many at any given time. Paul would stay months or even years at one location to accomplish the teaching required to form a local church.

Now, when Paul was done teaching and ready to form a church somewhere else, how do you suppose that Paul appointed elders? What would it make sense for Paul to do? He simply cannot leave and expect all to be well.

The clear obvious choice is that Paul appointed the plurality of elders that successfully learned the Word of God well enough to teach it to others as well. Only Paul would have been a good enough judge to determine whether someone knew the Word of God well enough to teach it. Thus, Paul was exercising a Biblical authority behind this process, consistent with the Word of God. Paul could not just appoint anyone he wanted at a whim.

If you are going to create a church, first you must teach a group the Word of God, so that they can be accountable to teaching and correcting others in the same capacity. Those who get trained up in the Word of God by design are now equipped to correct and teach using the Word of God. And because Paul knows the Word of God and can determine himself who learned the Word of God well enough, he can then determine those that should be elders as he goes forth to create more churches. Again, the only authority that exists is the same Word of God that is being taught and is used as the way to live.

Q - Is the assumption that anyone that has authority over someone is lording over them?

The Pharisees often ‘larded over’ by adding to the Word of God. They would teach, correct and instruct using words that were not from the Father but from themselves. Thus, the Pharisees became the “lord” over other people’s lives versus the only authority of the Word of God. Mark 7 and Matthew 23 would be excellent chapters to read on this matter.

When instructions are given that are not of the Word of God, it is generating a new authority that comes from man. That approach of course, is not Biblical by any stretch because we are to only follow God.

Acts 5:29

But Peter and the apostles answered, “We must obey God rather than men.”

We are to obey the Word of God ONLY. Consider this in the form of a question. If we start obeying men, then who has become our God?

Some might say, when there is a dispute in the church about how to interpret the word of God, doesn't some man or group of men have to exercise authority and determine which way it will be interpreted?

Absolutely. Any declaration or command coming from a man or plurality of elders must be able to point to the Word of God, to prove that it is not his words being spoken but only the Word of God. Therefore, what we do not want to do is place any false head covering between us and our Messiah by adding another head, whether that be a head pastor, or head anything.

Q - Does this mean that those in the faith can just “go do their own thing”?

No one can just “do their own thing.” Why? Because we are to follow the Word of God. However, when differences arise in how to do just that, sometimes leadership will accuse people of just “doing their own thing.”

If the elders tell you to apply the word of God in a particular way, should they be obeyed or not? If the elders tell the whole congregation of apply the word that way, what should the congregation do?

There is a balance that needs to be applied here. We should not blindly obey elders on a matter without regard to what we believe the Word of God to instruct, however, we should not also blindly disregard the knowledge and reasoning that elders can provide to us.

What we should all be doing is walking out the Word of God and teaching it to others the best that we can.

That involves testing our understanding, and even the elders’ understanding, to the Word of God, and also recognizing that this often takes time and patience with all involved.

In the end, we are responsible how we decided to walk out the Word of God, and that needs to be taken seriously. On the flip side, the Torah prescribes elders to sincerely care for us and support us in our walk in the faith, and that should always be respected, considered, and acknowledged.

Q - What about Romans 13 as it relates to authority? Are governments an authority in our lives outside of the Word of God?

Romans 13:1-7

Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore whoever resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of the one who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, for he is God's servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain. For he is the servant of God, an avenger who carries out God's wrath on the wrongdoer. Therefore one must be in subjection, not only to avoid God's wrath but also for the sake of conscience. For because of this you also pay taxes, for the authorities are ministers of God, attending to this very thing. Pay to all what is owed to them: taxes to whom taxes are owed, revenue to whom

revenue is owed, respect to whom respect is owed, honor to whom honor is owed.

There are two types of governmental structures, those that are governed by YHWH's instructions, his Torah, and those that are of the nations and govern their own way. Clearly Romans 13 is referring to God's governmental system, not of the nations. How do we know this? Take verse 3 for instance, in which it states that leaders *are not a terror to good conduct?*

Romans 13:3

For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad.

How many of us would say that Hitler was not a terror to good conduct? How many would have said that Hitler should have been an authority over you? How many would have called Hitler a servant of God? How many would have said that Hitler had the Word of God? See, it is all about context.

Romans 13 is teaching on a governmental system that is actually built on the Word of God, not adding to it, nor taking away from it. Most of us know that the "sword" is metaphorically the Word of God. For example:

Ephesians 6:17

and take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God,

Would we say that the leaders of the nations today bear the sword; that is, that they bear the Word of God?

Some might argue that there may be some debatable leaders, but in large, most would agree that there are not really many, if any nations following the Whole Word of God and only the Word of God in their governmental legislation. Romans 13 is speaking of a leader who is of the Word of God, one who is God's servant and one who bears the sword, the Word of God.

Consider:

Romans 13:4

for he is God's servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain. For he is the servant of God, an avenger who carries out God's wrath on the wrongdoer.

So, does that mean that there is another authority besides the Word of God, or just another witness that the ONLY authority is the Word of God?

Clearly, only the Word of God has authority over us. The Torah teaches us that we are not to offend others. Thus, as we live in the nations, we live by those nations' rules, as long as it does not violate or replace the Word of God as the only authority.

Q - What about Hebrews 13:7?

Hebrews 13:7

Remember your leaders, those who spoke to you the word of God. Consider the outcome of their way of life, and imitate their faith.

The Bible very clearly teaches that we have leaders. A leader is simply one that leads. One that leads simply

knows the path. The path is the Word of God and we are to watch those who know and teach the Word of God as our examples.

This does not mean we do not test their actions and doctrine but that we afford some trust in the fact that they may know what they are doing and what they are talking about. Yet, even with that extra measure of faith in our leaders, we are still required to “Test Everything” and only hold on to what is good.

Q - What about Hebrews 13:17?

Hebrews 13:17

Obey your leaders and submit to them, for they are keeping watch over your souls, as those who will have to give an account. Let them do this with joy and not with groaning, for that would be of no advantage to you.

This is in the same context as verse 7, which we just reviewed. In verse 7, our leaders are defined as those who “spoke the Word of God” Thus, a leader is one who teaches or speaks God’s Word. Anyone who speaks anything that cannot be found in the Word of God just rendered themselves no longer a leader.

And who would argue that we are not to obey the Word of God? It would be the plurality of elders, who know and teach the Word of God, that we are to obey, not obey them per say, but obey the Word they are supposed to be living and teaching. Just like Yeshua Himself did not speak his own Words but only the Words already given by the Father. Thus, when we obey Yeshua, we are really obeying the Father, not Yeshua, since the Father was and is the source of the Word.

Note how this verse says *obey your leaders*, not your leader of the church. Again, this verse supports the fact that we are to have a plurality of elders leading us, not a head pastor. The word “leaders” happens to be plural. The word “head pastor” happens to be singular. The two are not compatible.

Q - Matthew 21:23 Are chief priests the same as chief elders?

Matthew 21:23

And when he entered the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came up to him as he was teaching, and said, “By what authority are you doing these things, and who gave you this authority?”

Notice how the term chief priests are used but not chief elders. The phrase “chief priests” is used in conjunction with “elders” no less than 19 times in the New Testament. Do you want to guess how many times “chief elders” as in “head pastors” is mentioned? The answer is not once.

The Word of God does detail out high priests for very important roles. However, the Earthly priesthood is not functioning today as articulated in the Torah. Guess who is our High Priest today? Our Messiah alone is our High Priest. And once again, this takes us back to the fact that there is to be a plurality of elders, and not a head elder or head pastor, that role is reserved for our chief shepherd and chief priest, Yeshua our Messiah.

Q - How did Moses set up his elders?

The elders, with the knowledge of the Word of God, are simply there to teach the Word and hold others accountable to it. Thus the authority that the elders have is simply the Word of God. However, just the same, we

are all also responsible to teach and correct based on what we know.

According to the Moses model, the elders are to perform this very role:

Exodus 18:20

And you shall warn them about the statutes and the laws, and make them know the way in which they must walk and what they must do.

Meaning this, the elders are only to teach the Word of God, and hold others accountable to the Word of God. The elders are to do no more and no less. Thus, the elders are not to become in between us and Yeshua, but represent Yeshua, as the Word of God.

The elders do not have the right to speak their own mind as an authority, just like Yeshua did not have the right to speak his own mind, only the mind of the Father.

Moses taught the Word of God to the elders, just like Yeshua teaches the Word of God as our perfect example. Thus, the plurality of elders represent the Word of God that is over the congregation. Some are able to watch over more than others, based on their own abilities. Moses assigned those who were “able” over those who were still learning.

Exodus 18:25

Moses chose able men out of all Israel and made them heads over the people, chiefs of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens.

To be qualified as “able” the elders must know the Word of God and be consistent with certain Biblical standards. Also notice for the one congregation of Israel that there is no head elder, or in today’s lingo, a head pastor. On the contrary, there was a plurality of elders under Moses. Likewise, today, there is to be a plurality of elders for one congregation, under Yeshua, teaching and correcting the Body, not using their own words, but the only Word, the Word of our Father.

Q - What about the term “nasi?” Isn’t the first century usage of “nasi” evidence that a head pastor or rabbi role is the intended Biblical structure of the Church?

The Biblical usage of “Nasi” is usually a political position in Judea. The Scriptures do not apply the term “nasi” to a spiritual leadership structure. It was a position created out of necessity when the Jews were in a Hellenistic state. Out of tradition, the Pharisees retained this practice.

The Jewish schools were divided in the time of Yeshua. The Sadducees and Boethusians argued, that the High Priest was head over the Sanhedrin and was referred to as the “Nasi.” The Pharisees maintained their tradition of both a “Nasi” (High Priest) and “Ab Bet Din” during the second temple (<http://jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/11330-nasi>)

These traditions are clearly not rooted in the Bible. Such leadership structure is the result of Hellenization and secularization of the Jews, primarily the Pharisees. Given the number of times Yeshua was against the Pharisees for their traditions that were against the Word of God (for example Mark 7; Matthew 23) we should not be so quick to adopt their traditions without serious testing.

We should not be so eager to interrupt the Biblical leadership structure by creating a false role of a “Nasi” or “Ab Bet Din.”

Most instances of a singular “Nasi” being used in the Bible are merely for political roles, not spiritual.

A plurality of “*nasi*” is present in the Scriptures related to a role in the congregation:

Exodus 16:22

On the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers each. And when all the leaders (*nasi* as plural) of the congregation came and told Moses,

The fact that first century Jews employed a particular leadership structure does not make that structure Biblical or right. It may resemble the Moses Model in some ways, but they replaced Moses with their tradition, and that makes it invalid. If traditions are to become our practice, then we might as well go back to celebrating Christmas and Easter and submitting to the Pope. Clearly, it is the Word of God that is our authority, and source of truth and wisdom on this matter.

Extrabiblical practices and tradition are not what sets us apart from the world. Thus, solely Biblically speaking, a “*nasi*” in the singular can simply relate to a political position or Biblically and spiritually speaking, a “*nasi*” in the singular is referring to the High Priest. Today, that would be referring to Yeshua, not a head pastor as a head *nasi*.

A plurality of the word *nasi* is clearly indicating that a “plurality of elders” is the Biblical model for a congregation. This dichotomy is present in the New Testament accounts. The Greek word equivalent to the Hebrew word “*nasi*” is “*archon*.” When speaking of congregations, the word is used in the plural, thus once again referencing a “plurality of elders.”

However, Paul did once use “*archon*” (Hebrew word “*nasi*”) in the singular in an instance of referring to the Torah and the High Priest.

Acts 23:5

And Paul said, "I did not know, brothers, that he was the high priest, for it is written, 'You shall not speak evil of a ruler [*archon*] of your people.'"

Thus, once again, the correct application of the singular usage of “Nasi” is for the “High Priest.” This should make sense to us if we have watched the teaching “[The Church: His Model](#).” As Yeshua, our Head, is ALSO our High Priest. Thus, and this is important, anyone claiming to be the “Head *Nasi*” in a congregation instead of a part of an equal plurality of *nasi* (elders) is consequently claiming to be in the exact same role that Yeshua is stated to be in. That of course, should be interpreted as a problem.

Q - Didn't Paul make what is called “halachic rulings” and doesn't God have to acknowledge Paul's decision? For example, we see Paul ruling on a decision for women to not teach in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 and 1 Timothy 2:12.

If a woman can be a disciple like Junia or Tabitha/Dorcas; a deacon like Phoebe; evangelists like Euodia and Syntyche; or a judge over all Israel like Deborah (Judges 4:4, 5), why can't she be a “*teacher of men*?” The concern in 1 Timothy seems not so much about women speaking, but to not speak out of turn while the current

teacher is teaching. Surely, such action is disrespectful universally; neither is it normal for men to be given such liberty.

Thus, Paul really is making a commonsense judgment based on societal norms and also attaching it to the Biblical fact that the women's role is defined as the more submissive but equal role, which could be understood as a halachic ruling. Paul appears to be giving an opinion on a particular circumstance that apparently got out of hand in a particular situation.

In the letter to the Corinthians, Paul acknowledges several times that he is simply giving his opinion in certain matters and that it is not from God. Meaning this, it is up to others to decide if they want to take his opinion and advice to heart. There is no such thing as a man making "halachic ruling" and God having to concede to it. Such a belief is not only *not* Biblical, it is *against* the law of God. We are not permitted to add or take away from the Law of God (Deuteronomy 12:32; 4:2)

If men were permitted to make "halachic rulings" and then God had to acknowledge them, then the whole concept of the Jewish Talmud or oral law would be valid. However, we know that this is not the case.

Mark 7:5-13

And the Pharisees and the scribes asked him, "Why do your disciples not walk according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with defiled hands?" And he said to them, "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written,

"This people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me in vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men. You leave the commandment of God and hold to the tradition of men."

And he said to them, "You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God in order to establish your tradition! For Moses said, 'Honor your father and your mother'; and, 'Whoever reviles father or mother must surely die.' But you say, 'If a man tells his father or his mother, "Whatever you would have gained from me is Corban" (that is, given to God) then you no longer permit him to do anything for his father or mother, thus making void the word of God by your tradition that you have handed down. And many such things you do.

Thus, we are not granted any special authority to make decisions and hold others to them, unless such is already founded in the Word of God.

Q - Are not those who are against a head pastor likened unto Korah who came against Moses?

Everything in Scripture happens for a reason. There is nothing new under the sun and nearly everything that happens is a prophetic shadow of what is to come. As we stated earlier, Yeshua was the prophet likened unto Moses. Thus, the company of Korah served as a prophetic foreshadow of the first century Jewish leadership who came against Yeshua during his ministry on the earth. Secondly, Moses represents the word of God. Likewise, Yeshua also represents the word of God. The spirit of Korah is a spirit of the Anti-Christ.

It is noteworthy to point out that Korah was swallowed up by the earth. Likewise, Revelation tells us that the army that follows the Antichrist, gets swallowed up by the Earth. Since Moses represents Yeshua and is not an additional head pastor, it is presumptuous to claim that Korah is one who is in disagreement with the Moses

model being applied to a local congregation. We cannot make this comparison. It is evident that Korah is a type and shadow of antichrist whose heart is set against the word of God.

Q - If we are not to have any authority between the husband and Yeshua, wouldn't that be a contradiction with the usage of a plurality of elders?

Not at all. As noted in the teaching "[The Church: His Model](#)" the elders are understood to know the Word of God well enough to teach, rebuke, and correct. Any obedience projected toward the elders should ONLY be the result of the elders speaking consistent with the Word of God, nothing more and nothing less.

Meaning this, if the elders are speaking something not contained in the Word of God, then we are NOT required to obey them. For instance, elders cannot say that you cannot leave a local church body and go elsewhere without permission or blessing. *Such language is a symptom of a cult, not Biblical authority.* Thus, we are not obeying the elders in the first place, but instead obeying the Word of God.

Elders are simply a vessel in the Body of the Messiah that assists in keeping the Body within the confinements of the Torah (the law of God). *Thus the elder is not one's spiritual authority but instead the Word of God that the elder is speaking is our spiritual authority.*

Q - What is the Hebraic difference in the usage of elder, shepherd, or pastor?

Ephesians 4:11

[And he gave the apostles, the prophets, the evangelists, the shepherds* and teachers,*](#)

The answer is offered indirectly in the teaching, intended to equip the audience to do their own study, as these words appear numerous times in the NT, too often to take the time to address them all.

"Elder," "teacher," and "shepherd" are all referring to the same thing, but each term is emphasizing a different aspect of that thing. The term "elder" refers to the person's maturity, "teacher" refers to his role, and "shepherd" or "pastor" refers to his function.

Thus, you might only see shepherd and teacher noted in verse 11 (most commentaries combine those two words together), not pastor. That is because a pastor is to shepherd (keep in the fence), teach (meaning to feed), and be an elder (mature in the Word).

Thus, nothing has changed, there is only to be a plurality of elders for Israel under the one head Yeshua. In our teaching we do not go into as much detail as to what apostles are, because yes, their purpose and function is slightly different.

The word for apostles means to literally "go forth." It does not command a higher authority, but a distinct dedicated purpose of the body to share the good news of the whole Word of God.

Based on how apostles are used in Scripture, they are apologetic in nature, and the goal appears to start, equip, and organize congregations...teach the Word, and assign those who know the Word as elders so that they can keep feeding/teaching and creating more elders...That is why they are the "foundation" of the New Jerusalem in Revelation...they are from which all else builds...

Q - Can Pastors or Leaders use Numbers 27:15-17 to justify their head position over a congregation?

Numbers 27:15-17

Moses spoke to the LORD [YHWH], saying, "Let the LORD [YHWH], the God of the spirits of all flesh, appoint a man over the congregation who shall go out before them and come in before them, who shall lead them out and bring them in, that the congregation of the LORD [YHWH] may not be as sheep that have no shepherd."

Recall how there "is to be a prophet like unto Moses?" ...well, the one that followed Moses was "Joshua" with the SAME NAME (in Hebrew) as our Messiah...Yeshua...Coincidence? ...not at all. This was all completely prophetic.

Joshua carried forward in the Moses Model, but certainly Joshua was not like unto Moses, BUT it showed us what the name of our Messiah would be. The "one man" that is over the "one congregation" is none other than Yeshua today.

1 Timothy 2:5

For there is **one** God and **one** Mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ [Messiah Yeshua]

Thus Moses employed the Moses model and so did Joshua. This of course leads us prophetically, to Yeshua, who is currently our head in the Moses model who was to be the prophet like unto Moses (Deuteronomy 18:15) and we learn through Joshua as a prophetic type.

Q - Could this teaching on the Moses Model be considered divisive?

Many groups have organized themselves with a plurality of elders, like this teaching describes, and they have experienced its benefits, including unity and fellowship, as a result of that structure. Our intent is not to divide people, but to get them into groups whose structures foster spiritual growth and proper relationships with God and others. The goal is for people to be in alignment with God's Word, not to cause division. Some people may refuse to be under a plurality of elders, and for them, perhaps this teaching could be considered divisive, but the goal is to unite God's people in obedience to his Word.

Q - Ezekiel 34:1 shows that there were shepherds of Israel, how does that fit within your teaching?

It would fit perfectly. Shepherds is interchangeable with elders in Scripture, which here is plural. Israel is the congregation, which is singular. There is to be a plurality of elders in the singular congregation.

Q - Why did Yeshua say to submit to the Pharisees in Matthew 23?

Yeshua instructed us to submit to what the Pharisees said when they read from the Seat of Moses. This of course is referring to when they read the Torah.

This makes sense because only the Word of God is our authority. Thus, when the Pharisees were reading, they Torah they were speaking the words of the Father. However, when they left the Seat of Moses, they began to do and teach their own doctrines. This of course, is not what we are to follow, which are things of man.

Matthew 23:1-4

Then Jesus [Yeshua] said to the crowds and to his disciples, “The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat, so do and observe whatever they tell you, but not the works they do. For they preach, but do not practice. They tie up heavy burdens, hard to bear, and lay them on people's shoulders, but they themselves are not willing to move them with their finger.

Q - Did you say that we cannot have any blessings if you are in a church model that is not compatible with Scripture?

No, we stated that one might be missing out on blessings. That is not to say all blessings. God is capable of making good out of all things. However, would it not make more sense that we are blessed more if we do things his way instead of our own way?

Acts 5:29

But Peter and the apostles answered, “We must obey God rather than men.”

Q - The title of the teaching uses the word “Church,” don’t you know that it is better translated as assembly?

Yes, we actually are aware of that and we teach that in several of our teachings (such as one titled [Ekklesia](#)). The reason we chose the word “Church” is because of how that term is used today and what it means in people’s minds in terms of structure. When people hear “church” they often immediately think of a head pastor and a congregation under that pastor. That is exactly the issue we are trying to address in our teaching, thus our word choice for the title was intentional and serves the purpose intended.

Q - My Pastor says that he has the authority to bind and loosen and that means I must follow him. Is this Biblical?

No. Binding and loosening is a Hebrew language idiom for exercising authority (to prohibit and permit). But the debate over its interpretation is about the nature of this authority and the exercising of this authority. The Catholic Church sees this authority as their right to change Law, to overturn Law and to create new Law. So we must ask ourselves: "is it possible to alter our Creator’s Law or overturn it?"

There are a myriad of places in the Law and the Prophets which expressly prohibit changing or abrogation of God's Law. The Lord himself instructed through Moses:

Deuteronomy 4:1-2

And now, O Israel, listen to the statutes and the rules that I am teaching you, and do them, that you may live, and go in and take possession of the land that the LORD [YHWH], the God of your fathers, is giving you. You shall not add to the word that I command you, nor take from it, that you may keep the commandments of the LORD [YHWH] your God that I command you.

And,

Deuteronomy 12:32

Everything that I command you, you shall be careful to do. You shall not add to it or take from it.

The phrase to bind and loosen is often picked up in Matthew 16.

Matthew 16:19

I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

What then, is this authority that has been given to Peter? And what are the keys of the reign of heaven, which Peter was to receive?

The prophet Isaiah speaks about the key which is connected to the authority to bind and loose:

Isaiah 22:20-22

"At that time I will summon my servant Eliakim, son of Hilkiah. I will put your robe on him, tie your belt around him, and transfer your authority to him. He will become a protector of the residents of Jerusalem and of the people of Judah. I will place the key to the house of David on his shoulder. When he opens the door, no one can close it; when he closes the door, no one can open it.

Here, the "key" that Eliakim was to receive was authority over the house of David to open and close (or bind and loose). The promise to the church of Philadelphia in the Book of Revelation also associates this key of David with the authority to bind and loose:

Revelation 3:7

To the angel of the congregation in Philadelphia write the following: "This is the solemn pronouncement of the Holy One, the True One, who holds the key of David, who opens doors no one can shut, and shuts doors no one can open"

This "key" appears to be the right to rule and reign over the house of Israel. What is the standard by which the house of Israel was to be managed? The Law of Moses was that standard.

Deuteronomy 4:1

And now, O Israel, listen to the statutes and the rules that I am teaching you, and do them, that you may live, and go in and take possession of the land that the LORD [YHWH], the God of your fathers, is giving you.

Deuteronomy 6:1-2

Now this is the commandment—the statutes and the rules—that the LORD [YHWH] your God commanded me to teach you, that you may do them in the land to which you are going over, to possess it, that you may fear the LORD [YHWH] your God, you and your son and your son's son, by keeping all his statutes and his commandments, which I command you, all the days of your life, and that your days may be long.

The nation of Israel was to be operated according to the laws and the right-rulings of God's law. All disputes were to be settled by the application of the laws and right-rulings. In fact, the Law or in Hebrew, Torah, was Israel's inheritance:

Deuteronomy 33:4

when Moses commanded us a law, as a possession for the assembly of Jacob.

The Instruction, which is what the Torah literally means, is made up of two parts:

Deuteronomy 6:1

Now this is the commandment—the statutes and the rules—that the LORD [YHWH] your God commanded me to teach you, that you may do them in the land to which you are going over, to possess it...

The "rules" (Hebrew, *chukot*) were basic laws or precepts. These precepts are basic guidelines for behavior. The breaking of these commandments usually resulted in a severe penalty. The "right-rulings" were the "judgments" or correct disciplinary measures in the event of a minor misdeed. Included among these, for example, is the commandment to require the restitution of property plus a fifth of its value to the one wronged. The *mishpatim* were the "judgments" which Israel was to administer when someone was found guilty of wronging another.

Now let's consider the instruction in

Matthew 16:19:

I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

The grammatical construction in the Greek manuscripts is very important to the understanding of the meaning of this instruction.

"Shall be having been bound" and "shall be having been loosened" is very awkward English. But it accurately renders the periphrastic future perfect tense. It is constructed by attaching the future tense of the "to be" verb to the perfect participle of the action verbs. It essentially means, "when this judgment is 'bound,' it shall already have been bound in heaven" and "when the judgment is 'to loose' (release), it shall have already been released in heaven." The action, when declared by the disciples, will at that point in time already have been done in heaven.

What Messiah was actually saying was, "the judgment which you render shall have already been rendered." Why? **Because the Law of Messiah's reign is the Law of Moses.** Any decisions that have to be made in the assembly of Messiah must be done in accordance to the judgments (*mishpatim*). When all disputes and disagreements among Messiah's people are handled and settled according to the judgments of the Law, then it is easy to see how that the decision was already made in heaven.

Any loosing or binding must be done in accordance with what has already been decided by God and written in the Law. Thus, when the elders decide to "bind" in accordance to the dictates of the judgments of the Torah, then heaven has indeed already decided the case and has been "bound."

And when the elders decide to "loose" according to the dictates of the judgments of the Law, then the heavens has already "loosened" because the decision has already been made by God and it has been written into the Law as a judgment.

There is no new authority that Peter has been given. There is no new authority that anyone has been given. Neither is there any new authority that the assembly (the "Church") has been given. The authority that the Messiah has given to his disciples and their descendants is that authority which has been encapsulated into simply the Torah, the Word of God.

These are the righteous judgments which the Almighty has issued for the building up of and administration of Messiah's assembly. They are already written. The keys of the reign of Messiah are rightfully placed in the hands of Messiah's disciples, because theirs is the Law, and their inheritance is the Law. Yeshua's declaration to Peter is merely an affirmation of what has already been established.

The prophets declare that Messiah will teach the Law to the nations:

Isaiah 2:2-4

It shall come to pass in the latter days
that the mountain of the house of the LORD [YHWH]
shall be established as the highest of the mountains,
and shall be lifted up above the hills;
and all the nations shall flow to it,
and many peoples shall come, and say:
“Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD [YHWH],
to the house of the God of Jacob,
that he may teach us his ways
and that we may walk in his paths.”
For out of Zion shall go forth the law,
and the word of the LORD [YHWH] from Jerusalem.
He shall judge between the nations,
and shall decide disputes for many peoples;
and they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
and their spears into pruning hooks;
nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war anymore.

The judging disputes and settling of cases during the Messianic age will be done in conjunction with the instructions of the Law/Torah. The judgments are those laws which are the judgments between disputers. The prophet Micah says the same thing:

Micah 4:2-3

...and many nations shall come, and say:
“Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD [YHWH],
to the house of the God of Jacob,
that he may teach us his ways
and that we may walk in his paths.”
For out of Zion shall go forth the law,
and the word of the LORD [YHWH] from Jerusalem.

He shall judge between many peoples,
and shall decide disputes for strong nations far away;
and they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
and their spears into pruning hooks;
nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war anymore;

Messiah will rule and reign on earth during the Messianic age and enforce the Law, the Torah, which simply means YHWH's instructions. This is why he is the Head and no one else.

Q - So, what does all of this look like? How is it all put into practice?

It is absurdly simple. If you are part of a local assembly, all in the assembly need to identify those in your congregation that are equipped and able to teach the Word of God, that they have proven in their walk and doctrine that they know the Word of God. This should be more than one person. These are your elders. These people are responsible to make sure others also learn, know, and walk the Word of God.

The goal is for everyone to be elders and know the Word of God. There is no head elder that has an office with their name on it, no main teacher or head pastor, or other such structure. You will be amazed by how your local assembly will be blessed when you are organized the way the Bible teaches.

We hope that these Frequently Asked Questions have blessed you, and remember, continue to test everything.

Shalom

For more on this and other teachings, please visit us at www.testeverything.net

We hope that you have enjoyed this teaching. As always, remember to continue to test everything.

Shalom, and may Yahweh bless you in walking in the whole Word of God.

EMAIL: Info@119ministries.com

FACEBOOK: www.facebook.com/119Ministries

WEBSITE: www.TestEverything.net

TWITTER: www.twitter.com/119Ministries#