

Those to Serve

(B) Kevin Grant
(FV) Keith Stifflemire
(O) Jack Wall
(A) Kyle Stifflemire
1st prayer Judd Wall
2nd prayer Doug Pruett
Announcements: Calvin Burks
Singing: Mike Mallett



Avery Vann Feb. 11th

Mac Vann Feb. 14th

Koh Stapp March 12th

Dates to Remember

February 12th

Abraham Lincoln's Birthday

February 14th

Valentine's Day

February 18th

Presidents Day

March 3rd

Mission Sunday

March 10

Day light Saving

Prayer List:

Mike Lovell
Letha Sheldon
Ruby Jones
Loyd Crownover
Pray for our Nation
Our Troops
Law Enforcement
Rescue Personnel



Vernon & Linda Houts

Feb. 14th

“Acappella”

The word “acappella” is defined by the dictionary as: “music without instrumental accompaniment.” It comes from a Latin word which literally means “as in the church.” Interestingly, the etymology (origin) of this word, proves that at the beginning of the church (and for many centuries thereafter), the music in worship was singing only, without instrumental accompaniment. - by Greg Gwin

Edifier

Evant church of Christ

310 W Brooks Drive

Evant, TX 76525

254-471-5705

February 10, 2019



Attending church services regularly is like making a path through the forest: the more often you use it, the less obstruction you find in the way.”

Sunday Worship:

Will Vann, Preacher

9:30 am Bible Study

863-899-0987

10:20 am Worship

Email: wvann@yahoo.com

12:30 pm Afternoon

www.evantchurchofchrist.org

Wednesday Night

6:00 pm

God's Money

In last week's bulletin we discussed whether or not the church building was sacred, in this week's we will be taking a look at the church's bank account. We have already seen the consequences of supporting non-institutional doctrine, namely worldly things such as the church building becomes sacred. Thayer defines sacred as, "consecrated to deity." This would include things like the tabernacle and altar, also people such as Aaron and the priests (**Ex. 29:43,44**). What some brethren hold as sacred does not stop at the building, but most worldly things that pertain to the church including its bank account. To be honest, the vast majority of non-institutional beliefs stem from the use of the church treasury. If we can see the truth of this, the proper use of the contribution taken up on the first day of the week, a big part of what separates us will simply vanish.

The problem stated. One non-institutional preacher wrote, "In **Acts 5**, Ananias and Sapphira died because they did not make a distinction between God's money and their money. What Ananias did was sell some land and give part of it to the church. But he told Peter that they were giving the full price of the land. He wanted more credit for sacrificing than what he should have gotten. If there is no real significance in the treasury of the church, then all Ananias did was brought money and lied to the people there. Peter, however, specifically said that Ananias did not lie to the people but lied to God. The only way that Peter's statement can be true is if the money, once given, no longer belongs to the people who gave it but immediately transfers to God. If giving to the church was a man-to-man transaction, then the lie would have still been to men. However, Peter is saying once the money is given to the church, it is not a pooled resource of the members, but it is resource belonging to God. Once we realize that the money now belongs to God, the church has an obligation to spend it only on those things that conform to how God wants His treasury spent. The church no longer owns the money -- the church is just the steward of the money." There are a few problems with what this brother said. We will first address them, then conclude with a few observations.

First, he makes a distinction between lying to people and lying to God. Consider what David said while reflecting on his sin with Bathsheba, "Against You, You only, have I sinned, And done this evil in Your sight" (**Ps. 51:4**). We understand that David is speaking figuratively here. It is obvious that he sinned against men, particularly Uriah, as well as God, but he recognizes that the primary party who is violated when one sins (violates the law **1 Jn. 3:4**), is the law giver (God). However, this brother wants to take the same kind of language that is used in both passages (**Ps. 51:4; Acts 5:4**), and apply it literally. We can see that like David, Ananias not only sinned against God, but against Peter and the church as a whole. The sin that Ananias committed against God manifest itself in lying to Peter and the church (**c.f. 1 Jn. 3:10-15**). Ultimately, what Ananias thought of as only a little white lie to bolster his prestige among the brethren was actually full blown sin against God.

(Continued on next page)

God's Money

This is the point that Peter was trying make, and not that there was a difference between lying to people as apposed to lying to God. Again we see scripture being misinterpreted for the purpose of supporting a false doctrine. It has to be this way though for there to be a distinction between Ananias' money while it was still in his hand, and "God's money" once it was laid at the apostles' feet, there has to be a distinction between lying to God and merely lying to people. No where in the Bible does it teach anything like this.

The point of this brother's argument is to show that the church's treasury, "is resource belonging to God," that, "the church is just the steward of the money," and therefore, "the church has an obligation to spend it only on those things that conform to how God wants His treasury spent." The problem with these statements are not what he says, I agree with what he is saying. The problem is with what he is not saying. When reading through this brother's statement we clearly see that there is "our money" and there is "God's money." To summarize, we can spend our money on whatever we wish, but God's money can only be spent according to His will.

Can we truly spend our money on whatever we wish though? Consider these passages of scripture: "But if anyone does not provide for his own, and especially for those of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever" (**1 Tim 5:8**); "Therefore, as we have opportunity, let us do good to all, especially to those who are of the household of faith" (**Gal. 6:10**); "Pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father is this: to visit orphans and widows in their trouble, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world" (**Jas. 1:27**). We can rightly infer from these verses and others that God has expectations of how "our money" is used as well as "His money." Often, I hear in the prayer given before the taking up of the collection on Sunday thanks to God for the opportunity we have to provide for ourselves. Not only that, but we are also told, "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and comes down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no variation or shadow of turning" (**Jas. 1:17**). Knowing this, we can understand that not only are we, as the Lord's church, stewards of "His money," but of "our money" as well.

Concluding, we can clearly see that the distinction that some place between "God's money" and "our money" is not one that is found in Scripture. This doesn't mean that we can or should use the things that God has blessed us with and made us stewards over however we might feel. It would be hard for me to claim to be a good steward of the church's treasury if I was using it for my own personal expenses while having an income of my own. On the same token, how could I be a good steward of my own finances if I were spending it on my pleasures while letting my children starve? When looking for authority in all that we do (**Col.3:17**), always remember to look at commands, examples and those things that we can rightly infer from the two. Most importantly, we must let biblical doctrine determine our beliefs and not let our beliefs determine doctrine.

BY WILL VANN