

# Who has the Authority to Baptize according to Scripture

 [sightedmoon.com/who-has-the-right-to-baptise-new-believers/](http://sightedmoon.com/who-has-the-right-to-baptise-new-believers/)

By Joseph F. Dumond

August 26, 2011

## News Letter 5847-024

26th day of the 5th month 5847 years after the creation of Adam  
The 5th Month in the Second year of the third Sabbatical Cycle  
The Third Sabbatical Cycle of the 119th Jubilee Cycle  
The Sabbatical Cycle of Earthquakes Famines, and Pestilences

August 27, 2011

Shabbat Shalom Brethren,

A reader wrote to say;

Joseph,

I wanted to ask, after reading your article on baptism, and laying on of hands, do you have a prayer language such as Paul, who said, "I pray in tongues more than all of you," and that as the disciples received in Acts 2. Many brethren are blind to these things and assume they have passed away with the first apostles! Yet we know that this outpouring of the Holy Spirit is for "all flesh." Many avoid this issue—and even go so far as to preach that it is demonic. How crazy to twist the scriptures this way. Reading the accounts of the Holy Spirit falling on the gathering at Cornelius' house, and other places in Acts 10 and 19 for example, where the believers prayed in tongues, and of course 1 Corinthians 12-14, the body of Christ is to display the power of the kingdom to every generation—the kingdom so emphasized by Yeshua. The spiritual gifts of 1 Corinthians 12 are often experienced after one has received the Holy Spirit, as evidenced by speaking in tongues. Duet. 10 shows us that God is not partial. He would not give this power to the early church and then withhold it to subsequent generations!

Laying on of hands is also for healing, just as the disciples demonstrated when they prayed for the sick and demonstrated the power of the kingdom (see Luke 5 and 6). Part of the commands of Yeshua, as we read in God's covenant through Him, is to lay hands on the sick and they will recover (see Mark 16). James also tells us to call for the elders, .... and the sick one will recover.

Some have faith to receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and speak in tongues on their own, others through the laying on of hands. "If you being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask." The promise of the Father, "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, who is the guarantee of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, to the praise of His glory."

Please don't disregard my comments. They are sent with "love from a pure heart, a clear conscience, and a sincere faith."

USA

I have included this readers letter as many of you also think in a similar fashion. I do not agree with this thinking. It does not make us enemies. I do not agree with this thinking and I responded to this reader with the following response.

Shabbat Shalom

We all bring with us the baggage of the former churches and teachers we associated with. I do it and so does everyone else.

I do not believe as you seem to concerning the tongues issue.

Here is what the word tongue means is 2 Cor12:10

G1100

???????

glo'ssa gloce'-

sah

Of uncertain affinity; the tongue; by implication a language (specifically one naturally unacquired): – tongue.

What many churches call "speaking in tongues" today is nothing like what the Bible records in the books of Acts and Corinthians. The miracle that occurred on the Day of Pentecost in A.D. 31 (Acts:2:4-8[4]And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.[5]And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.[6]Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language.[7]And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans?[8]And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?) was one of communication—apparently both in the speaking and the hearing. The Greek word translated "tongues" is glossa and means "languages." The miracle of speaking in tongues meant that every member of the audience could hear in his or her native tongue (language, see verses 9-11).

Also, some in the early Church, particularly in Corinth, had the ability to speak in different languages. In that case, it seems that people were showing off their abilities, speaking every language they could, regardless of whether the people who heard them could understand. They were caught up in their vanity, having lost sight of the fact that one should always use spiritual gifts to serve others. Paul wrote chapter 14 of 1 Corinthians specifically to deal with this problem. He pointed out that the proper use of the gift of languages would be to speak the language or languages that the congregation could understand. It would be like speaking Spanish to a Spanish-speaking audience or French to a French-speaking audience.

Paul reminded the Christians in Corinth that speaking different languages was of no real value if an audience could not understand the words. He admonished them to concentrate more on understandable communication than on their linguistic abilities.

All biblical examples of speaking in tongues stand in stark contrast to the type of “speaking in tongues” done in some churches today, where the speaker utters a “language” that sounds like gibberish, not an actual human language.

In other letters, Paul and John warn Christians not to be taken in by spiritual-appearing phenomena, indicating that demon spirits sometimes imitate spiritual gifts in an attempt to confuse people (1 Timothy:4:1 Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;; 1 John:4:1 Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.).

I myself can speak French and Spanish with some difficulty. Hope this helps.

But the best one I received was from a brother in Nova Scotia who wrote me the following.

Greetings Joseph,

You wrote:

How clear, then, that when baptism is properly supervised, by a true servant of YEHOVAH God, with the authority to oversee baptisms and preach, the laying on of hands is not required or necessary.

That is not scriptural.

Ac 9:17 So Ananias departed and entered the house. And laying his hands on him he said, “Brother Saul, the Master Yahshua who appeared to you on the road by which you came, has sent me that you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit.”

Ananias wasn’t even a deacon like Phillip but simply a disciple and he laid his hands on Paul that he might receive the Holy Spirit.

Also, it wasn’t that Phillip wasn’t authorized to lay hands on people but Samaria first had to be unlocked by the individual with the keys and so Peter was sent for. Just as Peter unlocked the kingdom for the Jews on the day of Pentecost (see Act 2:14) and the Gentiles with Cornelius.

Ac 10:5 (Cornelius) “send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter.”

There is no special authority required to administer baptism or laying on of hands but the power of Yahweh’s spirit in a person. To say otherwise is to fall in the trap set up by organized religion, whether it be Christian or Jewish.

Nova Scotia

I have wrestled with this for some time; Struggling with former church teachings that I have carried with me all this time. My baggage I had not yet dropped. Some have told I me I could not baptize because I was not ordained by any set group or some church organization. And I believed them. I did not agree with them but I could not prove them wrong in this teaching until now. That was the baggage of my former church associations. Now I can throw them away with this understanding I am about to share with you.

I love it when I am corrected and done so in the way that David Smith has done. He wrote an article about 10 years ago on this subject and I submit to you now for your edification.

## **THE AUTHORITY TO BAPTIZE IN SCRIPTURE BY DAVID R. SMITH**

**[HTTP://WWW.SEEKWHATISTRUTH.COM/](http://www.seekwhatistruth.com/)**

The mini-study, “The Authority to Baptize,” published by Yahweh’s New Covenant Assembly, states only ordained ministers are sanctioned to perform baptisms. Let’s see what the Holy Word tells us regarding this important step for each new believer.

We see in Acts chapter 8, Philip, only a deacon and not an ordained minister, baptized the Samaritans. On page 3 of “The Authority to Baptize,” YNCA states:

”We are not told the reason Philip was pressed to immerse these Samaritans. It may have been necessary for this deacon to act on behalf of the Samaritans, for not being Jews, the Elders\* perhaps did not consider them worthy of baptism and ignored them. They likely were not aware that Yahweh was calling both Jew and Gentile as well as Samaritans into the ‘Ekklesia\*\*.’”

\*See end of study regarding this term.

\*\* 1577 ~ekklhsia~ from 1537 and a derivative of 2564; a gathering of citizens called out from their homes into some public place, an assembly; or the whole body of Christians scattered throughout the earth.

We are not told the reason because Philip was not “pressed.” Ac. 8:12 “But when they believed ... they were baptized, both men and women.” Was that not the purpose of preaching, to have them believe, in order that they could accept Yahshua’s gift of grace and be baptized and take on His name.

“Because the Samaritans we’re Jews the Apostles didn’t consider them worthy and ignored them!” Let’s give the Apostles a little credit here. These were men who had seen and heard Yahshua dealing mercifully with these people for two days, Jn. 4:41 “And many more (Samaritans) believed because of his (Yahshua’s) own word.” In vs. 35-38 Yahshua pointed out that these very Samaritans were the harvest and that He was sending them (the apostles) out to reap that harvest. Did He not say the Holy Spirit would bring this to their remembrance (Jn. 14:26)? Did He not specifically tell them to witness in Samaria (Ac. 1:8)? Indeed He did.

Did not the Holy Spirit confirm Philip's actions, with "signs and great miracles" (vs. 6,7&13 RSV)? When Peter and John arrived there was no reprimand or even a hint that things were not properly done. Did Yahweh disapprove? Certainly not! Before Philip could take a break he was sent on another mission which again, with the obvious approval of the Holy Spirit, led him to baptize another new believer. Now either he was blatantly disobedient, the apostles neglected to tell him he was unauthorized to baptize or the Holy Spirit overlooked his mistake, only to send him off to repeat it all over again. One other possibility exists, he was authorized to baptize and no one questioned it then and so we must accept it now.

"They likely were not aware that Yahweh was calling both Jew and Gentile as well as Samaritans." The apostles knew Yahweh was calling the Jew, that's evident, we now can see they also were not surprised that He was choosing the Samaritans, but the real shock came two chapters later, in Acts chapter 10, when the Gentiles are brought in the body of Messiah.

Peter was given the keys (Mt. 16:19) to open each new door, first to the Jews at Pentecost, then here to the Samaritans and then to Cornelius and the (Ac. 15:7b) Gentiles. The Holy Spirit could not be given without Peter there to open the door to the Samaritans. It wasn't the laying on of hands, as usually is the case, but the foreordained plan of the Father that brought His Holy Spirit to rest within the believers at Samaria. There was nothing Philip could have done to change this, just as Peter was helpless to control it at Caesarea.

On page 4 of "The Authority to Baptize" we find this statement that is not supported by Scripture: "Baptism by a deacon (Philip) is the exception and not the rule. Baptisms were done by the ordained ministers." The reason we are looking into this subject is the very fact that the New Testament does not state who can and who cannot baptize. It certainly doesn't say anywhere in the Bible that baptisms should be carried out by ministers not deacons.

Again we read on page 6, "There is no example of just anyone taking upon himself this authority of laying on hands, but it was carried out by the Elders." To answer this let's turn to Ac. 9:17, "And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Master Yahshua, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. 18 And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." Ananias was not a minister or Elder, he wasn't even a deacon, he was just a believer, like anyone of us. It says in Ac. 9:10, "And there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias." He was just a disciple, (#3101 maqthj, a learner, pupil, disciple) a follower of the Messiah. Paul doesn't even call him a disciple in Ac. 22:12, "And one

Ananias, a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there." We are all disciples if we follow in the path of Yahshua. A disciple can also be a woman, as we see in Ac. 9:36, "Now there was at Joppa a certain disciple named Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas: this woman was full of good works and alms deeds which she did." Ananias, an ordinary believer, was chosen by Yahweh to bring into the assembly one of His most effective and dedicated servants.

If Yahweh chose to use a mere disciple to baptize Paul and only a deacon to initiate the work in Samaria and baptize all the believers there, why should we forbid the same people in our day from carrying out the exact same responsibility?

We now can take a look at 1 Co. 1:12-13, it is quoted on page 6 by YNCA to point out how baptizing was only done by ministers or Elders; 12 “Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Messiah. 13 Is Messiah divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?” At first glance it would appear that Paul is telling us only three men ever baptized any of the Corinthians, Paul, Apollos and Peter. However, once we learn what the subject matter is, it’s clear he’s only speaking of certain ones baptized, who later bragged about the importance of the person who did the baptizing and not the importance of Yahshua.

If we read a little further Paul makes an astonishing statement, 14 “I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; 15 Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. 16 And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.” So it appears Paul did very little baptizing and the reason for that he makes immediately clear: 17 “For the Messiah sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.” Paul obviously felt baptizing could be handled by others while he concentrated on preaching. This would indicate that other apostles as well would spend their time preaching to as many as could be reached while leaving the baptizing to others.

This is what Adam Clarke says regarding verse 17, “It appears sufficiently evident that baptizing was considered to be an inferior office; and though every minister of Christ might administer it, yet apostles had more important work.”<sup>1</sup> A. T. Robertson adds, “This is Paul’s idea of his mission from Christ, as Christ’s apostle, to be a gospelizer. This led, of course, to baptism, as a result, but Paul usually had it done by others as Peter at Caesarea ordered the baptism to be done, apparently by the six brethren with him (Acts 10:48).”<sup>2</sup>

Let’s take a look at Ac. 10:48 from the KJV, “And he commanded (4367) them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.” 4367 ~prostassw~ 1) to assign or ascribe to, join to 2) to enjoin, order, prescribe, command 2a) to appoint, to define NIV reads, “So he ordered that they be baptized in the name of Yahshua Messiah.”

On this verse A. T. Robertson says, “Commanded (prosetaxen). First aorist active indicative. Peter himself abstained from baptizing on this occasion (cf. Paul in 1 Cor. 1:14). Evidently it was done by the six Jewish brethren.”<sup>3</sup> With a full study of these passages we glean a conclusion which is completely opposite from what we read in YNCA’s ministudy. An added note here is worth mentioning, in Jn. 4:2 the Apostle John mentioned something that also indicates baptizing was not always done by the leaders, “Though Yahshua himself baptized not, but his disciples.”

In conclusion I believe every true and faithful follower of Yahshua can be used by Yahweh to accomplish any work that Peter or Paul was called on to do. Each assembly does need leadership and must be organized and disciplined, this is all laid out in scripture. What is not

laid out, and never should be, is regulations that stifle the work of enthusiastic brothers and sisters, whose aim is only to further the cause of the gospel. This is of course conditional on the grounds that the Word of Yahweh is always strictly adhered to.

#### New Testament baptizers

If we base our study on the scriptures, we can easily discover no authority was ever given authorizing who can baptize, as was just confirmed by Elder xxxxx (name removed) own words. However, this is a two edged sword, since no rules were laid down in the entire Bible for who can baptize, it is just as clear there are no rules for who cannot baptize, regardless of the by-laws YNCA have drafted.

Here's a list of those who baptized in the New Testament:

John the Baptist

Yahshua's disciples (before the resurrection)

Philip (deacon)

Ananias (disciple)

Paul (apostle)

We can only deal with the last three, Philip, Ananias and Paul, since they're the only ones found in the New Testament to have baptized after the beginning of the assembly. According to YNCA's standards, only Paul on this list would be authorized to baptize, Philip, and certainly Ananias, would not be. We're left with Paul, who, in his own words, disqualifies himself as a baptizer, "For Messiah sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1Co. 1:17).

No one wants to hear unsubstantiated excuses to explain away the scriptures like, "Philip was pressed" or "Ananias was more than a mere disciple." Numerous portions of scripture have been twisted in this way over the centuries, leading to many false doctrines (2Pe. 3:16). This is a slippery slope to travel and wise men will return to the firm foundation of the Word in haste.

Elder xxxxx goes to great length to emphasize Philip and Ananias' "Specially chosen status," which is supposed to cover up the fact they were not Elders. Was Philip pressed into going to Samaria, was he specially instructed to baptize there? Again I insist on turning to the Bible which simply and plainly says, "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Messiah unto them" (Ac 8:5). This is what every believer should do, tell the great news of Yahshua's sacrifice!

Elder xxxxx makes, what I feel is an unscriptural statement, when he writes, "They did not take this responsibility (baptizing) upon themselves. Nowhere do we find an individual takes it upon himself to baptize others." In the next paragraph he states, "There is no record of anyone going about baptizing on his own." Contrary to these statements we turn to Ac 8:12 and find, "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Yahshua Messiah, they were baptized, both men and women." Also Ac 8:38 "And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." Why did Philip do what we were told was never done, why did he take it upon himself to baptize the Samaritans and the eunuch? We could then ask why

then bother preaching at all in case someone believes and repents which would then require baptizing? Is this not what preaching the gospel is all about? Is not our goal to have new converts ask to be baptized?

Suitable for baptism?

This leads us to what we must require from new converts before allowing them to be baptized. In Acts 2:37 they asked Peter "What shall we do?" Peter's simple answer was "Repent!" He didn't require them to take counseling, he didn't quiz them on their knowledge of the scriptures or see that they all kept the law correctly. In Acts 8:36 the eunuch asked Philip "what doth hinder me to be baptized?" 37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." The Bible tells us there are two requirements for being baptized, 1.) Believe on Yahshua Messiah 2.) Repent. Ac 2:41 Then they that gladly received his (Peter's) word were baptized: and the same day there were added [unto them] about three thousand souls. Other scriptures that confirm this are Acts 10:47, 16:33, 18:8 and 19:4-5. The New Testament speaks of new converts as "babes," unknowledgeable about most things and just starting to learn. Unable to digest the meat, or deeper doctrines of the word, requiring milk to help them develop.

Heb 5:13 For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe.

1Pe 2:2 As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby:

1Co 3:2 I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able [to bear it], neither yet now are ye able.

Baptism kills the "old self"

How is it possibly for a new believer to shed his old life of sin and start to learn how to "walk in newness of life" if his old self is not "crucified with him (Yahshua), that the body of sin might be destroyed?"

Ro. 6:3 Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Yahshua Messiah were baptized into his death? 4 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Messiah was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. 5 For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: 6 Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

Many times new believers are compelled to demonstrate they have buried the old sinful man in their past before being given the opportunity to be "crucified with him."

Two Dangers

We should not impose requirements on new believers over and above what the apostles did. I realize the fear YNCA has of baptism being taken too lightly, I share that concern, and so stress should be placed on the two requirements I mentioned above to avoid this extreme. The danger that exists with the other extreme is believers being refused baptism because assemblies require more proof from the new convert than just their word. Nowhere in scripture



do we see anyone being screened for appropriate lifestyle or suitable commitment. We must guard against being too zealous in this way and if someone asks for baptism, sincerely repents and declare a belief in Yahshua as their Saviour, we must not refuse them baptism.

What this study boils down to is YNCA versus the scriptures. YNCA maintains, without scriptural support, deacons and disciples are not authorized to baptize. The Bible clearly shows they were and did, with no reprimand. This has forced YNCA to qualify Philip and Ananias as special cases in order to legitimize their doctrine on baptism. YNCA ignores Paul's statement that apostles were sent to preach and not baptize and overlooks the fact Peter ordered others to baptize. Since nowhere in the New Testament is there a fixed set of regulations for baptizing, YNCA, in order to confine this authority to a few, has followed the custom observe for centuries by the Roman church on down and made up their own rules.

Some baptized will be lost

The parable of the sower (Mt. 13, Lu. 4 & Mk. 3) clearly demonstrates that not all who believe and are baptized will enter into the kingdom. This is not the preacher's fault or the one who baptized, but Yahshua puts the blame squarely on the hearer. Mt 22:14 For many are called, but few are chosen. Many are called, baptized and, for a time, walk the narrow way only to slip back into the world for a number of reasons, none of which we have any power to change. Man likes to believe he is in charge of his own destiny but the scriptures tell us otherwise Joh 6:44 No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. Joh 6:65 And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.

We sometimes take this a step further and feel it's within our control to convert sinners with our teaching.

Ro 9:16 So then [it is] not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. We must always remember Yahweh does it all for "hath he mercy on whom he will [have mercy], and whom he will he hardeneth" (Ro. 9:18). Our job is to preach the word and baptize those who receive it, never are we told to judge whether they are worthy of baptism.

Samaritans?

The first question Elder xxxx tackles is a notion he has that I think the Samaritans were Jews, he writes, "Brother Smith says the Samaritans were Jews." I would ask Elder xxxxx to point out in my study where he found such a statement. It is a known fact the Samaritans were not from the tribe of Judah or even from the house of Judah but from the house of Israel which consisted of the ten northern tribes. They became an assimilation of the Assyrians, sent to the northern kingdom after the conquest of 721 BCE (2Ki. 17:26 -28), and what remained of the ten tribes left behind (2Ch. 30:25, Ez. 6:17). The ten tribes were not lost as you see from Ac. 26:7 and Ja. 1:1. They also were not Gentiles, and the Jews didn't look on them as such. They were circumcised Israelites and worshipped Yahweh in their own temple (Jo. 4:21). Both the booklet "Authority to Baptize" and Elder xxxx state the apostles "ignored the Samaritans." If they did, they also ignored what Yahshua commanded they to do in Jo. 4:35 and Ac. 1:8. This

makes me inclined to think YNCA looks at the Samaritans as a classification of Gentile rather than an outcast group of Israelites. Also Elder xxxxx writes that at the Jerusalem Conference Peter and Paul both mention the Samaritans when describing their work involving the Gentiles, yet they are never mentioned in the entire 15th chapter of Acts.

The new assembly was strictly confined to Jerusalem until the persecution which began in Ac. 8:1, "And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles." There is no reason to say the apostles ignore the Samaritans because they concentrated the work in Jerusalem, for only a short time had elapsed since the assembly was formed. It was with this persecution that Yahweh began to spread the word abroad, "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts 8:4).

Again, I must reiterate that I also share your fear of baptism becoming trivialized without a defined program of teaching that would layout guidelines to avoid an incident similar to Elder xxx's experience with the young man in his early 20's. It would be wise to instruct a group or assembly that only mature, seasoned members should be called upon to baptize and then only after consultation with other members. This should be one who is grounded in the Word with a stable background and dedicated to this way of life. It is imperative to point out that this would be considered sound council from the Elders of the assembly and not imply that it is a commandment from the scriptures.

Nobody wants to be baptized by someone with a questionable lifestyle or who might soon be off following the latest religious trend. Nevertheless, even if this should arise it is very critical to remember it's not who baptizes you that's important but who you're baptized into that matters. However, even this fear cannot excuse YNCA for their doctrine which has been established that not only ignores the truth underlying the experiences given us from the 1st century assembly, but goes as far as to embellish on those experiences to advance their position, not being mindful of Deut. 4:2 and Rev. 22:18 -19.

Please forgive me if you feel I wrote certain things that sound objectionable or offensive, but to be honest, I am dismayed by YNCA's disregard of scripture pertaining to this doctrine. I have come to see YNCA as one of a very few assemblies that are faithful and dedicated to uphold the Word of Yahweh above all else. In regard to this subject, and my other dissent on your book "Deciphering the Biblical Gift of Tongues," I have to say the scriptures are not being observe. I felt compelled to be blunt and to the point trusting you would know I only aim to enrich us all with this exchange of views.

I realize much of what I've written conflicts with your By-laws and the customary way you've been conducting your assembly, nevertheless if any changes were made that more truthfully conformed to scripture, I am convinced Yahweh would reward this faithfulness despite the upheaval it might cause. This is something for you to consider.

With Yahweh's love and blessing,  
David Smith