

# AGENDA

## Synod Christian Reformed Church

*To convene June 8, 1938  
at Grand Rapids, Mich.*

### [ **PART I:** **REPORTS** ]

Office of the Stated Clerk  
737 Madison Avenue, S.E.  
Grand Rapids, Mich., U.S.A.

# AGENDA

## Synod Christian Reformed Church

*To convene June 8, 1938  
at Grand Rapids, Mich.*

### **[ PART I: REPORTS ]**

Office of the Stated Clerk  
737 Madison Avenue, S.E.  
Grand Rapids, Mich , U.S.A.



## PREFACE

**T**HE Synod of 1926, p. 174 of its "Acta," and reiterated by the Synod of 1937, p. 111, decided that hereafter its Agenda should be published in two parts, the first, to contain the Reports, to appear as soon as possible after January 1st of the synodical year; the second part to contain the Overtures to be laid before Synod, to be published on or before May 1st of that same year. The present volume is PART I. The second part is to appear on or before May 1, 1938. Classical stated clerks, please send us the overtures, the names of all the delegates, and the ADDRESSES of the elders by the first day of April.

## VOORWOORD

**D**IT boek is het eerste stuk der Agenda, voor de e. k. Synode. Het bevat de rapporten die volgens opdracht der vorige synodale vergadering werden samengesteld. Het tweede stuk, met voorstellen voor de Synode, verschijnt D. V. op of vóór 1 Mei, 1938, zie "Acta" der Synode van 1926, bl. 174, en verder p. 111 der Acta Synodi 1937. De classicale stated clerks worden bij dezen vriendelijk uitgenoodigd om ons die voorstellen, alsmede de namen der gekozen deputaten, en de ADDRESSEN der ouderlingen tegen één April te doen toekomen.

*Henry Beets*

737 Madison Ave., S. E.,  
Grand Rapids, Mich., U. S. A.

# AGENDA

## PART I

## REPORTS

---

### REPORT I.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF ARTICLE XXXVI.

---

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

**T**HE undersigned, appointed by the Synod of 1936 as a Committee on the Revision of Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession, have the pleasure and honor to report as follows:

#### I. THE MANDATE

The immediate occasion for the appointment of your Committee and for the charge it received from the 1936 Synod was found in a communication addressed to that Synod anent Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession by the Seminary Faculty.

In that communication (see *Agenda 1936, Part II, Report XXVII*, pp. 335-340) the Seminary Faculty called the attention of Synod to an inconsistency or conflict in the creedal formulation of the position which our churches hold respecting the proper relation between Church and State. It pointed out that that conflict obtains between the present reading of Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession and the footnote which the Synod of 1910 ordered to be appended to this Article. Quoting both the Article and the footnote, it briefly reviewed the historical background of this action of the 1910 Synod as found especially in the action of the 1896 and 1905 Synods of "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland" in the matter, and then proceeded to give four reasons why it was deemed highly advisable and even necessary that the inconsistency between Art. XXXVI of our Confession and the footnote appended to it in 1910 be removed. The communication then concluded as fol-

lows: "For these reasons we petition Synod to take these matters into serious consideration and, if our representations are found to be correct, to take effective measures looking toward the removal of the present conflict between Article XXXVI of our Confession of Faith and the footnote appended to it in 1910. As to the mode of removal, whether by a deletion as made in the Netherlands, or by a more extensive deletion, or by an overhauling of the whole Article, or in some other way, we do not venture to express any preference, but pray that the Lord may guide the Church to a proper solution of the problem."

The 1936 Synod received this communication after it was read to that body by President Berkhof and decided "to request the Seminary Faculty to give further study to this matter, to get into contact with sister denominations in so far as they deem this advisable, and to present a definite formulation to the following Synod." (Art. 33, p. 14, *Acts of 1936*.) From this charge it is clear that Synod was agreed with the tenor of the Faculty communication and asked it to carry the matter of the elimination of the existing conflict between Art. XXXVI and its footnote forward by further study and the presentation of a definite formulation of the proposed reading of this Article to the 1938 Synod.

## II. CLARIFICATION OF THE ISSUE

Your Committee might now at once proceed to submit and discuss "a definite formulation" of the proposed removal of the acknowledged conflict. Before doing so, however, there is need for a further clarification of the issue, so that both the significance of and the need for such proposed action on the part of Synod may be clear to all concerned.

### A. *Historical Elucidation.*

To keep the historical background clearly in mind, it will be helpful to repeat here what the Faculty stated briefly on that subject in its communication to the 1936 Synod. This brief historical resumé reads as follows:

The movement which culminated in the addition to Article XXXVI of the Confession of this note, which officially contradicts part of the contents of the Article, was occasioned by a similar movement in the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands. A proposal to revise this Article was entertained by the Middelburg Synod of those Churches in 1896, and after nine years of deliberation a revision was actually adopted by the Utrecht Synod in 1905. By this revision the words,

"and thus may remove and prevent all idolatry and false worship, that the kingdom of antichrist may thus be destroyed" (in Dutch: "om te weren en uit te roeien alle afgoderij en valschen godsdienst, en het rijk des antichrists ten gronde te werpen"), were deleted from the Article.

In view of our close connection with the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands and in view of the American conception of Church and State, it was to be expected that this revision should find a strong echo in our own churches. In 1906 no less than four overtures were presented to our Synod, everyone of which bore on the question of a revision of Article XXXVI. One asked for a revision; another requested Synod's opinion on the action taken by the General Synod of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands in this matter; a third petitioned Synod to consider the desirability and necessity of such a revision as adopted by those Churches; the fourth transmitted to Synod a gravamen against Article XXXVI (*Acts of Synod, 1906*, p. 53.)

In response to these overtures our Synod then declared a revision of Article XXXVI desirable and necessary, since according to the Word of God the government may not exercise authority over men's convictions of faith and, therefore, eradication of heresy by the sword of the government is out of the question. In order to obtain the desired revision in the proper way, Synod furthermore decided,

- a) prior to the next meeting of Synod to present the revision to the consistories for consideration, since the fact that the question concerns the revision of a part of the Confession calls for the recognition of all churches in the matter; and,
- b) although the Netherlands Churches had already altered this Article for their own circle, nevertheless to try to procure the judgment of our sister-Churches, in order thus to reach a definite decision regarding revision, since the bond between the Reformed sister-Churches demands that such a revision should not materialize without foreknowledge of the sister-Churches (*Acts of Synod, 1906*, pp. 53, 54).

However, the Committee appointed to carry out these resolutions of Synod did not find them definite enough, and the Synod of 1908 continued the Committee with the definite direction, that in a note a further explanation of the criticized clause in Article XXXVI be given (*Acts of Synod, 1908*, p. 49). Two years later the Committee presented such a note to Synod (*Acts of Synod, 1910*, pp. 104, 105), and Synod adopted it and ordered its addition to the Article (*ibid.*, p. 9). (See *Agenda, 1936, Part II*, pp. 337-338.)

These then are the salient historical facts in the case:

(1) That "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland," which is not only a sister-church, but may properly be called our mother-church, and which, beyond dispute, is the Church with which our own Church has the strongest ties of spiritual affinity—the Church which by common consent is the purest continuation of the historic Reformed Church in the Netherlands, had for some time prior to 1905 been considering making an alteration in Art. XXXVI, so as to remove the element in that article

which teaches the duty of the State by force to maintain the true religion.

(2) That this Church, after most careful consideration of the issue and the study of an extensive report, decided as far back as 1905 to remove those phrases from Art. XXXVI which apparently imply the sanction of the use of force on the part of the government in maintaining and defending the true religion. (For full statement of the reports—the one before, the other during Synod—the recommendations, and the decision of “de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland” in the matter, see: *Acta der Generale Synode van de Geref. Kerken in Nederland, 1905*. For Reports, see pp. 273-319; for decision, see pp. 81-82. For a good summary of the position, see pp. 310-311.)

(3) That our own Church, being at the time in very close touch with ecclesiastical and theological thought in the Dutch Churches, had this matter on the table of everyone of its Synods (except one) from 1898 to 1910 (see *Acta 1898*, Art. 78, p. 61; *Acta 1900*, Art. 102, p. 65; *Acta 1902*, Art. 104 (14), p. 55; *Acta 1906*, Art. 93, pp. 53-54; *Acta 1908*, Art. 70, p. 49; *Acta 1910*, Art. 10, p. 9, Cf. Bijlage X, pp. 104-105), and finally disposed of the matter by adding a footnote to the article in question.

(4) That this footnote, which was undoubtedly intended either to neutralize or to interpret the incriminated phrases in the Article, is in irreconcilable conflict with these phrases (which were allowed to stand) and that consequently ever since 1910 we are as a Church in the anomolous position that on this issue the article in question states one view and the footnote quite another.

In the light of these historical facts there emerges an element which should not be overlooked. Although in general the problem before us (both in 1910 and today) is the same as that which the Dutch Synod faced and disposed of in 1905, in its specific form we are facing the matter quite differently. The general problem for them (at the time) and for us was and is: How can the discrepancy be removed between certain phrases in Art. XXXVI which clearly teach the duty of the government to use force in order to maintain what it considers the true religion, and the conviction as to the freedom of religion and the separation of Church and State which is almost universally accepted in all non-state Reformed



bodies today. That was the issue which de Gereformeerde Kerken faced and solved in 1905. That was also the issue which our Church faced and which the Synod of 1910 disposed of by appending a footnote to the Article in question. And that is, *in the main*, still the issue which we face today, because in 1910 the incriminated phrases were not excised (or the article otherwise revised) but left standing alongside of a footnote which, in the main, states the correct Reformed position in the matter today.

Just on this account the *specific* problem which we face today is different. That specific problem is the removal of a contradiction, a discrepancy, between the (un-revised) article and the footnote of 1910. As to spirit, we presume it must be said that our Church has virtually already adopted the revised position. Not only did the 1906 Synod take the preliminary step of declaring the incriminated clause in Art. XXXVI unbiblical (*Acts of 1906*, pp. 53-54), but no doubt the 1910 Synod intended the footnote adopted to offer the true interpretation of the stand which our Church would take in the matter. No other interpretation of the intent of the 1910 Synod is conceivable. But, whatever its intent, the actual position of our creed on this most serious issue has ever since the 1910 decision been an anomalous one. The article and the footnote flatly contradict one another. To hold that an "explanatory" footnote (later adopted) supersedes the article of the creed to which it is appended, while meanwhile the original article *which flatly contradicts that footnote* is left intact, is an impossible position which, both in the interest of a wholesome creedal sense and in the interest of the truth as bearing upon the issue involved, cannot be allowed to stand.

The specific form in which the matter is hence before us today is not that of the presentation of a gravamen against the Creed. That was the case in "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland" in 1896 and 1905. That was virtually also the case in our Church before 1906 and 1910. But once our Church in 1906 (Cf. *Acts 1906*, pp. 53-54) took favorable action on the overtures of 1898 to 1906 (some of which were in the very form of "gravamina"), and once it adopted the footnote in question in 1910 in response to these overtures, the matter entered upon a new stage. What the Synod of 1910 apparently took to be a final solution of the difficulty, ap-

pears upon later reflection to be unsatisfactory until the discrepancy then introduced between Article and footnote is removed. Hence also the Seminary Faculty in 1936 did not present a creedal gravamen to the Synod, but it sent a communication pointing out the existing contradiction and begging Synod to take appropriate action for the removal of the contradiction. In a sense the action now proposed (see below) is a reversal of the decision of the Synod of 1910, but in a deeper sense it is simply carrying forward the real intent of that decision by removing the contradiction then introduced between the Article and the footnote.

**B. *Grounds for Removing the Conflict Between Article XXXVI and Its Footnote.***

After this historical elucidation it is now in order to state the grounds upon which the proposed action for the removal of the contradiction between article and footnote is based.

Perhaps someone at this point asks whether the 1936 Synod, by giving your Committee the charge it did, has not already declared itself favorably on the need for such proposed action and on the grounds advanced at that time in the original Faculty communication. In reply it must be said that, although one could argue that by implication the Synod did make such a declaration, there is nevertheless *no explicit resolution, with the necessary grounds*, passed by the 1936 Synod declaring that there exists a conflict between Art. XXXVI and its footnote and that such conflict should be removed. Seeing this is only stated by implication, and seeing any action on this score by the 1938 Synod must be taken in the light of the real grounds for the proposed change, it will not be deemed superfluous to state these grounds at this time. We feel no need of enlarging upon these grounds as stated in our communication of 1936 and hence repeat them here in that form as relevant and pertinent at this time.

The main proposition with its four grounds ran as follows:

We deem it highly advisable and even necessary, that the inconsistency between Article XXXVI of our onfession and the footnote appended to it be removed, and take the liberty to present the following facts to the attention of Synod:

a) For the addition of an explanatory note to an Article of the Creed there would seem to be room only in case the Article is open to more than one interpretation, and it becomes necessary to deter-

mine officially which of the various interpretations represents the conviction of the Church. But the character of the note appended to Article XXXVI is in no sense explanatory of the Article, but frankly critical, and in fact contradictory. In the words of the note, the Article upholds the principle of the Established Church, while the note advocates the principle of a certain separation of Church and State.

b) In support of its advocacy of the principle of the separation of Church and State the note appeals not merely to the verdict of history and the consensus of practically all the Reformed Churches, but also to the nature of the New Dispensation and the teachings and demands of the New Testament; specifically the lordship and kingship of Christ over His Church. If this is really the conviction of the Church, it should find expression in the body of the Creed itself, since this is the formal and official declaration of the faith of the Church.

c) Certain phenomena in the world round about us make the subject-matter of this Article and its footnote highly actual and the removal of the contradiction between the two exceptionally urgent. While the legal regulation of the relation between the Church and the State which obtains in our own country harmonizes with the principle advocated in the footnote and not with that enunciated in the Article to which the footnote is appended, recent developments in more than one foreign country indicate that the drift of our time is definitely toward the totalitarian State, which subordinates the Church to its own ends and subjects her to its own will. Surely, this situation makes it incumbent upon the Church, to take a clear-cut and unequivocal position regarding the proper relation which ought to exist, according to the Word of God, between the State and the Church.

d) As teachers of theology, appointed by the whole Church, we find our official work to be not merely intimately concerned in this matter, but also to be positively hampered by the inconsistency of footnote and Article. We are, as a group, charged with the duty of teaching theology on the basis of our Confession, but find it simply impossible to teach concerning the relation of Church and State in harmony with both, Article XXXVI of our Confession, and its official footnote. (*Agenda, 1936, Part II, pp. 338-339.*)

We feel no need at this time of adding anything to these grounds, except to remark that what is here stated of the Seminary Faculty members as teachers of theology holds from the nature of the case of every minister, elder, and teacher in the Church.

### III. POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION.

We now proceed to a consideration of the way in which this contradiction between Article XXXVI in its present form and its footnote may be eliminated.

In the abstract there are various possibilities. Some of these have been stated in passing in the original Faculty communication. (Cf. *Agenda 1936, Part II, p. 340*). Also

the report submitted to the Dutch Synod of 1905 and the report of the advisory committee of that Synod discuss various possibilities. (See *Acta Gen. Synode Geref. Kerkén in Ned. 1905*, p. 311ff., 316ff.)

After all that has been advanced above, it would seem beyond dispute that any attempt to keep the original text of Article XXXVI intact is out of the question. And yet, such proposals have sometimes been made, though perhaps not in our own Church at present. Some have pleaded for leaving the Creed intact, and then making an official statement either at the beginning or at the close to the effect that the Church does not (or, no longer) accept(s) such an interpretation of any part of the Confession which would imply the recognition of the duty (or, right) of the State to use compulsion in maintaining the true religion. But such a procedure is highly objectionable. It would encourage the pernicious idea that a creed can be accepted provisionally and with certain definite restrictions upon its apparent meaning. This would open the door for possible grave abuses in the future. Moreover, it would not overcome the same objections that have been urged against the present anomolous formulation of the Church's belief on the point in question, viz., that of saying one thing in the Article and quite another, in fact opposite, thing in the footnote. As the distinguished authors of the report to the Dutch Synod of 1905 have also recognized, this procedure, though on the surface it seems to commend itself because of its leaving the original text intact, is in reality dangerous as well as unsatisfactory. Moreover, it would also conflict with the spirit of the decision of our own Synod of 1906. (*Acts 1906*, pp. 53-54).

Another possibility would seem to have more in its favor. This is the proposal for a complete revision of Article XXXVI. By such complete revision is meant the re-writing of the entire article, so that the present-day Reformed view of the proper relation of Church and State may come to adequate expression. In favor of this it might be urged that such a proposed revision would enable the Church to do justice in its Creed to the present-day view of the Reformed Churches on this great issue; that certain phrases which the Dutch Churches have not eliminated are after all part of a bit of discourse that seems to assume a good deal of the background and spirit

of the old, repudiated view; and that the article, so re-written, would possess more consistency and unity, i.e., would be cut out of one cloth.

However, over against these seeming advantages a number of counter-considerations must be weighed. They are the following:

(a) As long as the Church does not decide to proceed to a more or less extensive expansion (and/or, revision) of the Creed, it is not desirable to depart from the original form of the Creed more than is absolutely necessary.

(b) It would not be an easy matter to compress into one article of the Confession an adequate statement of the present position of the Church anent the highly complex and, at present, burning issue of the proper relation between Church and State. The danger is far from imaginary that, if such re-writing of Art. XXXVI were undertaken, the article would, either in size or in construction, or in both, turn out to be quite out of keeping with the present architecture of the Confession.

(c) It should not be forgotten that there is a real difference between revising the Creed upon the occasion of the presentation of a gravamen (as was the case originally in reference to Art. XXXVI) and revising and/or expanding the Creed by reason of new needs that have arisen in our day. In the latter case one does not approach the Creed as a document that the subscriber no longer believes. In the former case that is precisely the situation. In reference to Art. XXXVI it must be said that we no longer believe, and therefore cannot sincerely subscribe to, the incriminated phrases of that article. This has also been explicitly stated by our Synod of 1906 (see especially ground "a" on page 54 of *Acts of 1906*). It would appear that a revision appropriate to that state of the case is a revision that limits itself strictly to that which is absolutely necessary to alter in order that the anomaly may be removed.

For these reasons your Committee does not deem the procedure of adopting a complete revision of Art. XXXVI advisable.

It seems to us that the most advisable procedure is to follow the example of "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland" in excising the objectionable phrases and,

for the rest, leave the article intact. These objectionable phrases are: "and thus may remove and prevent all idolatry and false worship, that the kingdom of antichrist may be thus destroyed."

In favor of this procedure the following may be urged:

(a) This involves changing only that in the article which is absolutely necessary, and such an irreducible minimum of change is both in keeping with the nature of a gravamen-revision and with respect for the original form of the Creed.

(b) This proposed deletion corresponds exactly to the change adopted by "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland."

(c) This proposed change in no way prejudices the form which this and other articles might assume if a more complete revision and/or expansion of the Creed should some day be undertaken and effected.

As to the footnote to Article XXXVI—if such proposed revision of the article is adopted, it is apparent that this footnote has become superfluous. It no longer serves any purpose. It was originally added to offset the real implication of the objectionable phrases. When these phrases have been removed, there is neither need of, nor excuse for, the retention of the present footnote. However, when the objectionable phrases are removed from the article, it would seem advisable to displace the present footnote with another footnote, one of an historical kind, in which mention is made of the words which formed part of the Confession in the original form and explanation is made that these were excised by the Synod of 1938. Such an explanatory footnote is also found in the newer editions of the Belgic Confession in its Dutch translation as ordered by the Synod of "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland" in 1905.

#### IV. THE ATTITUDE OF OTHER REFORMED BODIES

Before presenting our advice, we would say a few words on the present stand of other Reformed (and Presbyterian) bodies on this matter, at least of those with which we stand in some historical or practical, if not officially ecclesiastical, relationship. This information may be helpful in connection with the statement in our charge: "to get into contact with sister denominations

in so far as they deem this advisable." (*Acts of 1936*, p. 14, Art. 33).

The Presbyterian bodies in our country do not, of course, have the Belgic Confession with its Article XXXVI among their doctrinal standards. Nevertheless, originally they had the same problem on their hands as did the Netherland Churches, for the original Westminster Confession (Chap. XXIII, Paragraph III) taught substantially the same doctrine of the union of Church and State, and the duty of the State to maintain the true religion by the forcible suppression of heresy. However, the Presbyterian Church in our country adopted a complete revision on this score as far back as 1788. Hence such bodies as, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., and also the Presbyterian Church in America no longer have the old, antiquated doctrine of the relation of Church and State and of the state's duty to suppress heresy in their creed. This is not the case with the Reformed Presbyterian Church. (See Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. I, pp. 796-813; Vol. III, pp. 653-654).

As to the Reformed bodies of Dutch antecedents, it may be said that all have the Belgic Confession, but that on the matter under discussion three different groups are found among them.

(1) "De Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland," as sufficiently explained above, has accomplished the revision of Article XXXVI.

(2) The second group has as yet made no alteration or explanatory addition of any kind. Here belong the Reformed Church in America, the Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerk of the Netherlands, and (to the best of our present knowledge) die Gereformeerde Kerk of South Africa. It may be said, however, that in each of these three groups definite agitation in favor of revision is found. The Reformed Church in America at its recent General Synod of 1937, acting upon two overtures asking that the well-known incriminated clauses be placed in a footnote, decided as follows: "that these words be placed in a footnote and not deleted from the Confession, and that this recommendation be sent to the various classes for action." It is probable that this revision will be finally completed in 1938, at about the time our Synod meets. (It must be added that the Reformed Church in America has slightly increased the proposed deletion by adding also the clause:

“and the Kingdom of Christ promoted”). The “Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerk” of the Netherlands has among its clergy some strong advocates of the same change as that adopted by “de Gereformeerde Kerken,” but how bright prospects are for action in that direction in the near future we do not venture to judge. As to die Gereformeerde Kerk of South Africa, we cannot at this time say precisely what progress has been made, but we do know that in an enumeration of points which the Synod of that Church mentioned as requiring revision in its letter to our Church anent co-operation for creedal revision, also Article XXXVI was mentioned.

(3) The third position is that of the church groups that have left our denomination since the adoption of the footnote in 1910. These are in the same position as we, in that they have as yet taken no steps to eliminate the contradiction between Article XXXVI and its footnote adopted by our Synod in 1910. Here belongs the Protestant Reformed Church and, probably also, the Berean Church.

## V. ADVICE

In the light of the information and arguments offered above, your Committee proposes the following to Synod for adoption.

A. In view of the fact that the Synod of 1906, in response to certain overtures in the nature of a gravamen against certain clauses in Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession, acknowledged these “gravamina” as well-founded; and

In view of the fact that the Synod of 1910 disposed of the matter by leaving the incriminated clauses intact and adding an explanatory footnote, in which the present-day Reformed view on religious freedom and on the relation of Church and State is set forth; and

In view of the fact that ever since that time there has existed a conflict between the teaching of the Article and that of its footnote on the subject of religious freedom and the relation of Church and State;

### SYNOD DECIDES:

To remove this conflict by dropping the present footnote and by excising the following clauses from Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession: “and thus may



remove and prevent all idolatry and false worship, that the kingdom of antichrist may be thus destroyed."

*Note:* In order that the remaining clauses may form a well constructed sentence, it is necessary to make one or two slight grammatical changes. The sentence will then read as follows: "Their office is not only to have regard unto and watch for the welfare of the civil state, but also to protect the sacred ministry, that the Kingdom of Christ may thus be promoted."

B. Synod adopts the following official reading for Article XXXVI, as also the historical footnote herewith appended.

1. *English Text.*

ARTICLE XXXVI

*The Magistracy (Civil Government)*

We believe that our gracious God, because of the depravity of mankind, has appointed kings, princes, and magistrates; willing that the world should be governed by certain laws and policies; to the end that the dissoluteness of men might be restrained, and all things carried on among them with good order and decency. For this purpose He has invested the magistracy with *the sword for the punishment of evil-doers and for the protection of them that do well.*

Their office is not only to have regard unto and watch for the welfare of the civil state, but also to protect the sacred ministry, (\*) that the Kingdom of Christ may thus be promoted. They must therefore countenance the preaching of the Word of the gospel everywhere, that God may be honored and worshipped by every one, as He commands in His Word.

(\*) In the original text this sentence read as follows: "Their office is not only to have regard unto and watch for the welfare of the civil state, but also that they protect the sacred ministry, and thus may remove and prevent all idolatry and false worship, that the kingdom of antichrist may be thus destroyed and the kingdom of Christ promoted." The Synod of 1910, recognizing the unbiblical teaching concerning freedom of religion and concerning the duty of the State to suppress false religion contained in this sentence, saw fit to add an explanatory footnote. The Synod of 1938, agreeing with the 1910 Synod as to the unbiblical character of the teaching referred to, but recognizing a conflict between the objectionable clauses in the Article and its footnote, decided to eliminate the footnote and to make the change in the text of the Article which appears above, corresponding to the change adopted in 1905 by the General Synod of de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland. (See *Acts of Synod, 1910*, pp. 9, 104-105. Also *Acts of Synod, 1938*, pp. ....)

Moreover, it is the bounden duty of every one, of whatever state, quality, or condition he may be, to subject himself to the magistrates; to pay tribute, to show due honor and respect to them, and to obey them in all things which are not repugnant to the Word of God; to supplicate for them in their prayers that God may rule and guide them in all their ways, and *that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity.*

Wherefore we detest the Anabaptists and other seditious people, and in general all those who reject the higher powers and magistrates and would subvert justice, introduce community of goods, and confound that decency and good order which God has established among men.

## 2. Dutch Text.

### XXXVI. (Van het Ambt der Overheid.)

Wij gelooven, dat onze goede God, uit oorzaak der verdorvenheid des menschelijken geslachts, Koningen, Prinzen en Overheden verordend heeft; willende dat de wereld geregeerd worde door wetten en politien, opdat de ongebondenheid der menschen bedwongen worde en het alles met goede ordinantie onder de menschen toega. Tot dat einde heeft Hij de Overheid het zwaard in handen gegeven tot straffe der boozen en bescherming der vromen. En hun ambt is, niet alleen acht te nemen en te waken over de Politie, maar ook de hand te houden aan den Heiligen Kerkedienst (\*); en het Koninkrijk van Jezus Christus te

(\*) In den oorspronkelijken tekst luidt deze zin als volgt: "En hun ambt is, niet alleen acht te nemen en te waken over de Politie, maar ook de hand te houden aan den heiligen Kerkedienst; om te weren en uit te roeien alle afgoderij en valschen godsdienst, om het rijk des Antichrists te gronde te werpen, en het Koninkrijk van Jezus Christus te doen vorderen;" enz. De Synode van 1910, erkennende dat de leering aangaande vrijheid van godsdienst en aangaande den plicht der overheid om den valschen godsdienst uit te roeien zooals vervat in dezen zin, niet in overeenstemming geacht kon worden te zijn met de Heilige Schrift, voegde aan dit Artikel een verklarende noot toe. De Synode van 1938, zich aansluitend aan het oordeel van de Synode van 1910 inzake het onbijbelsche van de leering vervat in dezen zin, sprak uit dat er een conflict bestond tusschen de bewuste clausules in dezen zin en de in 1910 aan dit Artikel toegevoegde noot, en besloot om, met schrapping van de noot zoodanige wijzigingen in het Artikel zelve aan te brengen als in de hiergeboden lezing te vinden zijn. Deze gewijzigde lezing stemt overeen met die welke de Generale Synode van de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland heeft aangenomen in 1905. (Acta der Synode, 1910, pp. 9, 104-105. Tevens Acts of Synod, 1938, pp. ....)

doen vorderen, het woord des Evangelies overal te doen prediken, opdat God van een iegelijk geëerd en gediend worde, gelijk Hij in zijn Woord gebiedt. Voorts, een ieder, van wat qualiteit, conditie of staat hij zij, is schuldig, zich den overheden te onderwerpen, schattingen te betalen, hun eere en eerbied toe te dragen, en hun gehoorzaam te zijn in alle dingen, die niet strijden tegen Gods Woord; voor hen biddende in hunne gebeden, opdat hen de Heere stieren wille in alle hunne wegen, en *dat wij een gerust en stil leven leiden in alle Godzaligheid en eerbaarheid*. En hierin verwerpen wij de Wederdoopers en andere oproerige menschen, en in het gemeen alle degenen, die de Overheden en Magistraten verwerpen en de Justitie omstoöten willen, invoerende de gemeenschap der goederen, en verwarren de eerbaarheid, die God onder de menschen gesteld heeft.

### 3. German Text.

#### ARTICLE XXXVI

Wir glauben, dass unser guetige Gott, von wegen der Verderbtheit des menschlichen Geschlechtes, Koenige, Fuersten und Obrigkeiten angeordnet hat; denn Er will, dass die Welt durch Gesetze und oeffentliche Gewalten regiert werde, damit die Zuegellosigkeit der Menschen bezwungen werde, und alles in guter Ordnung unter den Menschen hergehe. In dieser Absicht hat Er der Obrigkeit *das Schwert in die Haende gegeben zur Strafe der Boesen und zum Schutze der Frommen*. Und ihres Amtes ist es, nicht allein die Polizei zu handhaben, sondern auch den heiligen Kirchendienst unter ihren Schutz zu nehmen, (\*) und zu

(\*) Urspruenglich lautete dieser Satz folgendermassen: "Und ihres Amtes ist es, nicht allein die Polizei zu handhaben, sondern auch den heiligen Kirchendienst unter ihren Schutz zu nehmen; abzuwehren und auszurotten alle Abgoetterei und falschen Gottesdienst, zu zerstören das Reich des Antichristen und zu foerdern das Koenigreich Jesu Christi," usw. Die Synode des Jahres 1910 erkannte den unbiblichen Charakter der in diesem Satze enthaltenen Lehre betreffs Religionszwanges und Verpfichtung des Staates zur Unterdrueckung falschen Gottesdienstes, und fuegte diesem Artikel eine erklærende Randbemerkung bei. Die Synode des Jahres 1938 stimmte mit der Synode von 1910 ueberein betreffs des unbiblichen Charakters der bezueglichen Lehre, nahm aber auch Kenntniss von einem Widerspruch zwischen den beanstandeten Ausdruecken in diesem Artikel und der ihm beigefuegten Randbemerkung, und beschloss zur Wegnahme der Randbemerkung und zu der oben angegebenen Lesung des Artikels, welche Veraenderung uebereinkommt mit der im Jahre 1905 von der Generalen Synode der Reformierten Kirchen in den Niederlanden angenommenen Revision dieses Artikels. (Vgl. *Syn. Akta*, 1910, Seite 9, 104-105, und *Akta der Synode*, 1938, Seite .....)

foerdern das Koenigreich Jesu Christi, zu sorgen, dass al-  
lenthalben das Wort des Evangeliums gepredigt werde,  
damit Gott von jedermann geehrt und gedient werde, wie  
Er in seinem Worte gebietet. Ueberdies ist ein jeglicher,  
wes Ranges oder Standes er auch sei, schuldig, sich den  
Obrigkeiten zu unterwerfen, Abgaben zu entrichten, ihnen  
Achtung und Ehrerbietung zu bezeigen und gehorsam zu  
sein in allen Dingen, welche nicht streiten wider Gottes  
Wort; fuer sie zu bitten in den Gebeten, auf dass der Herr  
sie leite in allen ihren Wegen, *damit wir ein stilles und  
geruhiges Leben fuehren moegen in aller Gottseligkeit  
und Ehrbarkeit.* . . . Und hierbei verwerfen wir die Wie-  
dertaeufer und andere aufruehrerische Menschen, und ue-  
berhaupt alle, die Obrigkeiten und Regierungen verwerfen  
und die Handhabung des Rechts umstossen wollen: die den  
kommunismus einfuehren wollen, und Treu und Glauben,  
den Gott unter den Menschen bestellt hat, verwirren.

C. Synod decides to instruct its Publication Commit-  
tee to make the required change in future editions of the  
Liturgy in the Church's Psalter-Hymnal; to direct the re-  
sponsible ecclesiastical bodies to make whatever change  
may be necessary in the text of the Creed to which the  
Formula of Subscription for office-bearers is appended;  
and to urge upon consistories and members who still  
make use of the Dutch language to avail themselves of  
that edition of the Dutch "Psalmboek met Liturgie"  
which has incorporated the change adopted by the Dutch  
Synod of 1905, viz., the Rutgers-Bavinck-Kuyper Edition.

D. Synod decides to notify all those churches which  
are mentioned under IV above and which have the Belgic  
Confession among their doctrinal standards, of the de-  
cision herewith adopted; and, moreover, in the case of  
those churches which have not as yet made this or a  
similar change in their text of Article XXXVI, to urge  
such action upon them.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Seminary Faculty,

L. BERKHOF  
SAMUEL VOLBEDA  
CLARENCE BOUMA  
M. J. WYNGAARDEN  
H. SCHULTZE  
D. H. KROMMINGA

## REPORT II.

### REPORT ON ADVISABILITY OF CREEDAL REVISION AND/OR CREEDAL EXPANSION

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHERN:

**Y**OUR Committee appointed by the Synod of 1936 on the matter of the advisability of creedal revision and/or expansion has the honor to report as follows:

Our appointment was occasioned by an overture of Classis Grand Rapids East, which read as follows (*Acts of 1936*, Art. 62, p. 28):

Classis Grand Rapids East overtures Synod to declare that there is need of enlarging or/and revising of our Creed. *Grounds:*

- a. The Church is called the pillar and ground of truth. This means that it should confess the truth also in its creed according to the light which it has today. Our creeds at present fail to reflect the new light, which has been gained on a number of important points.
- b. The purpose of the Creed is not only to formulate the truth, but also to combat and prevent heresy; but many heresies have arisen which did not exist when our creeds were formulated — as for example the denial of the Reformed doctrine of Inspiration, and the doctrine of Evolution.

The Classis requests Synod to appoint an able Committee to recommend to the Synod of 1938 on what subjects our Creed should be enlarged or improved, and what would be the best manner to bring this about.

The charge given your Committee in response to this overture is formulated in the same article of the minutes of Synod as follows: "Synod decides to appoint a committee to study the desirability of the revision and enlargement of our Creed." It will be noted that this charge is not the same as that which the overture requested. We are charged to report on the desirability of creedal revision and expansion.

We would discuss this subject from two angles. First, from the angle of the desirability as such, or viewed ideally; and, second, from the angle of the desirability with a view to past and present circumstances.

## I. AS TO THE DESIRABILITY OF CREEDAL REVISION AND/OR EXPANSION, VIEWED IDEALLY

It is intended under this head to consider the desirability of creedal revision and/or expansion with a view to the ideal of what a creed ought to be, as well as with a view to the needs of our day and age as bearing upon the duty of the Church to profess its faith.

Now a statement of the desirability of such creedal revision and/or expansion has been made to our churches before. This was done by a committee appointed for practically that very purpose by the Synod of 1928. This statement is contained in the report of that committee submitted to the Synod of 1930. It is true that that Synod did not adopt the proposals made by that committee, but this in no way alters the force of the arguments and grounds there presented. The more so since in the decision of the 1930 Synod in this matter not one ground is adduced against the advice of the committee.

Your present Committee finds itself in substantial agreement with the advice there presented and hence believes it can do no better than restate and re-emphasize the positions there enunciated.

The position of that report which is of value and importance for us in this connection, and to which your Committee wholeheartedly subscribes, is stated in the form of a reply to two queries. The first of these queries had been addressed to our Synod by the Committee on Creedal Expansion (*Belijdenisuitbouw*) of "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland." The second was contained in a letter from a similar committee appointed by the Synod of "die Gereformeerde Kerk van Suid Afrika."

The pertinent question from the Dutch communication may be translated as follows: "Do you deem a further formulation of the Reformed doctrine concerning Scripture necessary or, at least, desirable?"

This question was given a tentative answer for Synod by the Committee in the affirmative, and for this proposed reply it offered the following grounds (see *Agenda 1930, Part I*, pp. 71-72):

1. Onderscheiden dwalingen van onzen tijd tasten het stuk der Heilige Schrift, hetzij door aanval of door negatie, in zijn hartader aan. Dit is een feit van zulk een algemeene bekendheid, dat het aanvoeren van bewijs of voorbeelden in dezen overbodig mag worden geacht.

2. Gedeeltelijk door den invloed van deze dwalingen, maar ook vooral in aansluiting aan het theologisch denken van den nieuweren tijd, heeft de verdere ontwikkeling van de Gereformeerde Theologie in Gods voorzienigheid langzamerhand meerder licht doen vallen op elementen, die wel in dit aloude leerstuk lagen opgesloten, doch die niet in de Belijdenis uitgewerkt zijn, daar deze zich uit den aard der zaak aansluit aan de dwalingen van den tijd van haar ontstaan. Dit betreft onder meer zulke punten, als het organisch karakter der inspiratie, de verhouding van den menschelijken en den goddelijken factor bij het teboekstellen der Heilige Schrift, en de relatie van de goddelijke autoriteit der Heilige Schrift tot haar inhoud. (In verband met dit laatste punt zou het overweging verdienen, dat belijdenis-uitspraken vastgesteld werden, als de volgende, n. l., dat de heilsfeiten tot het wezen der openbaring behooren, en dat de goddelijke autoriteit niet alleen betrekking heeft op de ethisch-religieuze elementen der Heilige Schrift, maar op de gansche Schrift.)

3. Alhoewel dankbaar erkend mag worden, dat de Belgische Confessie, door zes Artikelen aan de behandeling van het stuk der Heilige Schrift te wijden, de fundamenteele betekenis van dit leerstuk op den voorgrond stelt, toch heeft geen van deze drie Formulieren van Eenigheid op het stuk der Heilige Schrift punten zooals onder (2) genoemd uitgewerkt. Gelijk de vaderen het leerstuk aangaande de Heilige Schrift gehandhaafd en ontwikkeld hebben tegenover de dwalingen van hun tijd, zoo zien wij ons de taak aangewezen, om met het meerder licht tegenover de nieuwere dwalingen dit leerstuk verder toe te passen en breeder uit te werken.

The desirability of a more comprehensive expansion of the Creed was dealt with in a proposed reply to the query contained in the South African letter. This matter was also linked up with a further query as to whether our Synod was willing to appoint a committee for possible creedal expansion to co-operate with a similar committee of the South African "Gereformeerde Kerk" and, possibly, the Dutch "Gereformeerde Kerken."

The Committee reporting to our Synod in 1930 advised Synod to appoint such a committee, whose task was to be, not only to correspond with sister denominations anent questions they might raise in the future about matters pertaining to a possible creedal expansion, but also to make an independent study of the entire matter of a possible expansion of the Creed and to render a report in the matter to the following Synod. It is clear that this advice implied a definite expression of sentiment in the affirmative as to the matter of the desirability of creedal expansion and/or revision, and the grounds that were advanced for this advice were hence virtual grounds for the desirability of such creedal revision and/or expansion.

The four (of the five) grounds which are as pertinent today as they were then read as follows (*Agenda, 1930, Part I, pp. 73-75*):

1. Met het oog op de nieuwere stroomingen en de daarmee gepaard gaande dwalingen van onzen tijd is hieraan wel behoefte. De Commissie denkt hier met name aan een viertal verschijnselen.

Ten eerste is te noemen het Modernisme, dat binnen de historische Protestantse kerkengroepen in ons land nog steeds veld wint, en dat de historische Christelijke belijdenis ondermijnt niet alleen met zijn Schrifteritiek, maar ook met zijn evolutionistische en humanistische reconstructie van zulke fundamentele leerstukken, als die van God en mensch, zonde en verzoening, heiligmaking en Koninkrijk Gods.

Ten andere behoort gewezen te worden op de veelvuldige sekten, die, hoewel ze zich veelszins op de Heilige Schrift beroepen, nochtans vele fundamentele stukken van het Christendom loslaten, zooals b. v. het Russellisme, het Mormonisme, en Christian Science.

Ten derde dient hier nota genomen te worden van onderscheidene godsdienstige groepen of stroomingen van onzen tijd, die een min of meer syncretistisch karakter dragen en in sommige gevallen sporen vertoonen van den invloed van Oostersche godsdiensten, en die tevens de valsche religieuze eenheidsbeweging van onzen tijd voeden; hiertoe behooren o. a. de Theosophie, de Vrijmetselarij, en de Society for Ethical Culture.

Ten vierde zijn er ook onderscheiden dwalingen, die niet zoozeer beperkt zijn tot de één of andere kerkengroep of sekte, maar die in mindere of meerdere mate in onderscheiden kerkengroepen of sekten gangbaar zijn. Hier kunnen het Baptisme met zijne verwerping van de Gereformeerde verbondsbeschouwing, het Sabbatisme, het radikale Premillennialisme, en de Geloofsgenezing als voorbeelden dienen.

2. Hoewel het hedendaagsch verschijnsel van de vermenigvuldiging der sekten geenszins beperkt is tot Amerika, staat ons land toch niet ten onrechte bekend als bij uitnemendheid het land der sekten. Het feit, dat wij ons door Gods voorzienig bestel geplaatst zien in zulk een omgeving, doet voor ons de vraag naar de wenschelijkheid of noodzakelijkheid van den uitbouw onzer belijdenis bijzonder klemmen.

3. Gelijk de vaders de Waarheid gehandhaafd en ontwikkeld hebben tegenover de dwalingen van hun tijd, zoo rust op ons als hun geestelijke nazaten de taak en roeping, om de Waarheid tegenover de nieuwere dwalingen verder toe te passen en breder uit te werken.

4. Zulk een studie, als in het advies der Commissie bedoeld, zoo wel als de actie, waartoe zulk een studie eventueel zal kunnen leiden, zal ongetwijfeld het confessioneel besef onder ons ten goede komen. Aan versterking van dat besef bestaat behoefte. Het gevaar is verre van denkbeeldig, dat wij onze belijdenis op den duur wel behouden, maar min of meer als een eerwaardige antiquiteit, waarvan geen wezenlijke kracht meer uitgaat. "De Bijbel en niet de belijdenis!" is de onwaarschijnlijke en bedenkelijke leuze van vele sekten rondom ons. Daartegenover heeft het confessioneel besef onder ons versterking noodig.

To these grounds your Committee subscribes wholeheartedly. Taking the question as to the desirability of a proposed revision and/or expansion of the Creed in the



light of what a creed ought to be, of what our Creed is today, and of what the conditions in the religious life of our day are, your Committee believes such desirability to be apparent.

## II. AS TO THE DESIRABILITY OF CREEDAL REVISION AND/OR EXPANSION VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF CERTAIN RECENT CIRCUMSTANCES

Your Committee feels that the desirability of creedal revision and/or expansion should not only be viewed ideally, i.e., with a view to the ideal demands for a Reformed creed in the light of the needs of our day, but that it ought also to be considered with a view to certain pertinent circumstances obtaining at present. It might be quite conceivable that, though desirable in the abstract, creedal expansion and/or revision becomes undesirable today by reason of certain circumstances. Before our affirmative answer will have force, we ought to consider the question whether certain pertinent circumstances possibly neutralize this desirability, at least for the present.

As such possibly pertinent circumstances the following might be mentioned.

1. The fact that in 1930 our Synod decided for the time being to take no action looking toward creedal expansion.
2. The fact that "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland" took a similar stand in the same year.
3. The probably unfavorable prospect as to obtaining the co-operation in this matter of "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland" at present.

A word on each one of these three circumstances.

1. At the Synod of 1930, despite strong sentiment favoring the advice of the advisory committee expressed both before and during the synodical sessions, it was decided:

- 1) Dat de Synode, met het oog op de kerkelijke toestanden in ons land, voornamelijk geen uitbouw onzer belijdenis in breederen zin, noch een nadere formulering van het leerstuk der Heilige Schrift in engeren zin, noodzakelijk of wenschelijk acht;
- 2) Dat dit echter niet wegneemt, dat de Synode met belangstelling kennis hoopt te nemen van den arbeid, dien onze zusterkerken in dezen mogen verrichten, om in de toekomst, indien noodig, daarmede hare winste te doen. (*Acta 1930*, pp. 199-200.)

2. A few months later matters took almost the identical turn at the Synod of Arnhem of "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland." Despite the fact that many outstanding leaders had championed the cause of favorable action on taking steps in the direction of creedal expansion (*belijdenisuitbouw*) both before and during the synodical sessions, after an extensive discussion, in which numerous motions were introduced, Synod finally decided as follows:

- 1) den deputaten dank te zeggen voor hun belangrijken arbeid;
- 2) uit te spreken, dat uit het ingediende rapport en de daaraan toegevoegde proeve de noodzakelijkheid van uitbreiding der belijdenisschriften niet voldoende is gebleken om daartoe thans over te gaan, en
- 3) geen nieuwe deputaten voor deze zaak te benoemen. (*Acta der Gen. Synode v. d. Geref. Kerken in Nederland gehouden . . . 1930, p. 141.*)

3. The third circumstance bearing upon this matter is what your Committee has called the probably unfavorable prospect of obtaining the co-operation for creedal expansion and/or revision of "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland" at present.

Possibly we misjudge the situation in our Dutch sister churches, and we surely desire to speak with caution and reserve. But we cannot escape the feeling that the present state of theological discussion in these Churches is not such as to enable us to look with great hope to prompt action looking toward creedal expansion. We do not overlook the fact that outstanding leaders in these Churches have been and are still strong champions of the cause. Professor Grosheide did so in a comparatively recent number of *Noord-Hollandsch Kerkblad* (see issue of July 9, 1937). And Professor Hepp recently wrote this sentence in his new religious weekly: "Indien onze Gereformeerde belijdenis wordt uitgebreid, wat wel kan worden uitgesteld, maar niet tegengehouden, zal blijken wat Kuyper daarvoor heeft gedaan." (*Credo*, Oct. 29, 1937, p. 26). Nevertheless, we fear that the present controversy about Calvinistic philosophy, together with its theological implications, is not creating an atmosphere in which creedal expansion will find a welcome reception, at least not for the time being.

On the other hand, we are no less convinced on the grounds above adduced—none of which grounds either synodical decision so much as seeks to refute—that the

taking of steps looking toward eventual creedal expansion and/or revision is desirable.

In view of these facts and considerations it would seem advisable that our Church take action at this Synod to get the ball arolling and at the same time that the procedure be marked with caution, careful deliberation, and the avoidance of all undue haste. The matter of creedal expansion and/or revision is a serious and an urgent matter. Therefore it does not deserve to be put into the waste basket. It is likewise a matter with large implications, imposing a task of no mean proportions. Therefore it ought to be undertaken with caution, careful reciprocal deliberation, and with a strong determination to overcome all obstacles. It should, moreover, be understood that it is highly inadvisable that any real creedal expansion and/or revision be undertaken in which other Reformed bodies having the same creed, and especially "de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland," are not co-operating.

In view of all this your Committee proposes the following for adoption.

*Advice.*

SYNOD, in view of the urgent need for creedal expansion and/or revision on the grounds advanced in the report herewith submitted; and

in view of the fact that such creedal expansion and/or revision ought not to be undertaken without consultation and deliberation with other Reformed bodies having the same doctrinal standards; and

in view of the fact that there may exist at present certain discouraging circumstances with a view to the realization of this ideal;

DECIDES to appoint a Committee whose task it shall be to contact those Reformed bodies which have the same doctrinal standards as we have, in order:

1. To ascertain what the present status of the matter of proposed creedal expansion and/or revision in each of these bodies is;

2. To urge upon the highest judicatory of these bodies to take up this matter and, if at all possible, to take steps that may lead to some joint action on the part of all Reformed bodies holding the same creed;

3. To report to the next Synod as to the possible progress that it may have made and, if at all possible, to make further definite recommendations as to how this matter may be carried forward.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Seminary Faculty,

L. BERKHOF  
SAMUEL VOLBEDA  
CLARENCE BOUMA  
M. J. WYNGAARDEN  
H. SCHULTZE  
D. H. KROMMINGA

## REPORT III.

### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON OUR ATTITUDE TO WAR

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE Seminary Faculty, to which the matter designated as "Our Attitude to War" was assigned for study and the formulation of recommendations by the 1937 Synod, has the honor to report to your body as follows.

#### I. HISTORY OF THE MATTER

This matter had its inception at the Synod of 1936. At that Synod there was present an overture from the Second Englewood Church of Chicago proposing synodical adoption of the following: "The Synod disapproves of much of our present-day pacifism which condemns all war and loses sight of the state's duty to maintain justice if needs be with the sword (Romans 13). At the same time the Synod would also enunciate the principle that all wars of aggression are contrary to the Word of God and that the members of the Church of Christ are justified, in an actual war of aggression, to feel free before God not to bear arms." Two grounds were appended, which were "grounds for bringing this overture before Synod." (See *Acts of Synod, 1936*, p. 29).

In connection with this overture the same Synod also took cognizance of a communication of two brethren (the Messrs. Kroon and Denkema) occasioned by the previous publication of this overture, in which they requested "that the Synod refuse to adopt that portion of an overture from the Consistory of the Second Christian Reformed Church of Englewood, Chicago, which reads as follows: 'That Synod enunciate that all wars of aggression are contrary to the Word of God' and 'that members of the Church of Christ are justified in an actual war of aggression to feel free before God not to bear arms.'" To this request five grounds were subjoined. (See *Acts of 1936*, pp. 29-30).

Synod appointed a special committee, which at a later session made the following recommendation:

Your Committee advises Synod to appoint a Committee of study to report at the next Synod:

- a. Whether matters of this kind properly belong to the province of Synod.
- b. To inform Synod of the principles involved.
- c. To inform Synod of the practical implications of these principles.

*Grounds:*

- 1) There is apparently no unanimity of opinion among us.
- 2) This is an ethical problem of great practical significance.
- 3) The problem is of such a nature that it is impossible for your advisory committee to enter upon the matter as such during the sessions of this Synod. (*Acts of Synod, 1936, p. 96.*)

In harmony with this advice, which was adopted, Synod appointed a committee (consisting of the brethren J. M. VandeKieft, P. Holwerda, and J. T. Hoogstra) which submitted a report to the 1937 Synod. (See *Agenda 1937*, pp. 18-27).

After interpreting the original overture of Englewood Second as requesting Synod to make three declarations bearing upon war and pacifism, the report continued to discuss the legality and the expediency of Synod making such declarations. The position advanced on the matter of the legality is succinctly stated in the following summarizing sentence: "When *doctrinal and ethical issues* pertaining to the Christian's relation to the government or to society are of sufficient magnitude in the judgment of any synod to *demand* formulation, defense, or restatement, a synod shall deem it its duty and privilege to state the truth as found in God's Word, and to warn against all departures from God's holy will, and, if necessary, even to advise discipline." (p. 23) In the matter of the expediency of such synodical deliverances the committee took the stand that various circumstances in our day render Synod's making a declaration in the matter advisable.

The Committee then saw its recommendations together with their subjoined grounds adopted by Synod. These decisions, together with their grounds, read as follows:

A. Synod declares that political, social, and economic questions are ecclesiastical matters only when doctrinal and ethical issues of sufficient moment and magnitude are involved according to the Word of God and our standards. *Grounds:*

1. Reformed confessions have not hesitated to formulate positive doctrinal statements denouncing the heresies and the ethical teachings of the Anabaptists.

2. Our Synods have done the same in regard to socialism and birth control.
3. Our sister church in the Netherlands felt constrained to warn against a political party whose platform contained anti-Christian doctrine and ethics.
4. If we as a church keep before us this fundamental principle enunciated above, we shall not follow in the wake of some of the American churches, nor invade the rights of the state, nor erase the boundary between our duty as a church institute and the duty as Christian citizens.

B. Synod deems it expedient that a new study be made of the problem presented to the Synod of 1936 by the overture of the Second Englewood Christian Reformed Church of Chicago, and the communication of the brethren A. Kroon and H. Denkema (see *Acts of Synod 1936*, Art. 67, p. 29), also including the recommendations of this committee. *Grounds:*

1. Reformed confessions are silent on the right of the individual in cases of unrighteous wars.
2. The right to make aggressive wars an exception has become a question of sufficient importance, *particularly if we do not narrow the term too much*. No matter what our attitude may be, the ethics involved is far-reaching.
3. The church is in duty bound, as the Reformed churches did when Anabaptism was prevalent, to assert its own position over against the anti-Christian philosophy basic to much of the present-day pacifism. Of necessity a different foundation supports our superstructure.
4. This question can be profitably discussed when war hysteria does not rob us of a balanced and calm mind.

C. Your committee recommends that Synod place this matter in the hands of the Committee of Revision of Art. XXXVI of the Belgic Confession (Seminary Faculty). *Grounds:*

1. The nature and the importance of the questions involved are, in our opinion, too weighty to be entrusted to a committee of three.
2. The Seminary Faculty, including professors in ethics, dogmatics, exegesis, church history, and church polity would seem to be the logical body to advise Synod on this question.
3. The Seminary Faculty has in hand the related question of the revision of Art. XXXVI of the Belgic Confession.
4. A revision, if necessary, of one article by one committee would insure a more uniform style.

## II. THE CHARGE GIVEN TO YOUR COMMITTEE

The charge given to your Committee is, no doubt, expressed in the second resolution, which states that Synod deems it expedient "that a new study be made of the problem presented to the Synod of 1936 by the overture of the Second Englewood Christian Reformed Church of Chicago, and the communication of the brethren A. Kroon and H. Denkema (Cf. *Acts of Synod of 1936*, Art. 67, p. 29), also including the recommendations of this Committee."

But this mandate is rather general. Synod does not as a rule appoint committees merely to make a study of issues, however important and urgent. Nor was this, we assume, intended. However, as soon as we endeavor to discover just what the more specific purpose of this general charge to make a study of the problem is, there appears to be some degree of vagueness and ambiguity. In a number of places, both in the report leading up to the recommendations, and in the grounds appended to these recommendations (which became the resolutions of Synod), it seems to be hinted that it is expected of your Committee to suggest such a revision of Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession as to include the results of its study of the subject of war in definite declarations that are to form an integral part of that article. In other parts of the series of grounds appended to these resolutions it is clearly hinted that possibly some declaration might be made by Synod comparable to the Testimony on Birth Control adopted by the Synod of 1936. This makes it difficult for your Committee to properly discharge its task until after Synod has given it a more specific mandate.

If in reply to this it be suggested that the Synod of 1937 clearly left this matter open, so that your Committee could make such recommendations as it saw fit after careful study and due deliberation, your Committee feels constrained to remark two things:

First, your Committee does not believe that in a matter of this kind the mandate ought to be left in so vague a form.

Secondly, the desirability, if not necessity, of awaiting an expression in the matter of the forthcoming Synod arises from the further circumstance that this matter is, from the nature of the case, inter-related with and dependent upon the Synod's stand on two other matters upon which your Committee has been called to give advice to your honorable body. Prior decision on these matters will greatly aid in the clarification of the direction in which the present issue is to be brought to a possible solution.

We refer to the matter of the Revision of Article XXXVI and to the matter of the Desirability of Expansion and/or Revision of our Creed. On both of these matters your Committee has already submitted definite proposals to



your honorable body, and their possible adoption or rejection will have a very real bearing upon the treatment of the matter under discussion at this time.

The possibility of revising Article XXXVI in such a way that the position of our Church on the problem under discussion in this report (i.e., pacifism, evil of aggressive wars, right of conscientious objectors to military service) may be incorporated in such a proposed revised form of this Article is suggested more than once in the report and in the grounds of the resolutions which called for our appointment and specified our charge. But in the report bearing upon revision of Article XXXVI we recommend a course of action which would not allow for such a procedure. Is it not desirable that Synod express itself first as either in favor or opposed to the advice offered anent the revision of Article XXXVI? After such a decision has been reached, Synod will undoubtedly be in a position to be more specific as to the mandate anent our attitude to war. And, even if Synod should not deem it necessary or desirable to express itself more definitely on this mandate anent our attitude toward war, your *Committee* would, after Synod's decision on Article XXXVI had been reached, at least have some indication either one way or the other as to the possibility of offering advice involving a revision or expansion of Article XXXVI.

Moreover, also Synod's decision on the matter of Creedal Expansion and/or Revision may also have a very real bearing upon the matter under discussion. Your Committee, which has submitted a report also on that matter, has advised a course of action which, if adopted by Synod, will make a revision of Article XXXVI with a view to prompt incorporation of a present-day stand on the issue of conscientious scruples against military service in certain wars quite unlikely, if not impossible. Also from this point of view it is highly desirable that Synod first express itself as to its stand and possible policy anent Creedal Revision and/or Expansion before a definite advice is drafted on the issue of war.

In the light of these circumstances it would appear inadvisable for your Committee to offer definite and final advice to Synod in 1938 on the matter of our attitude toward war.

### III. SUGGESTED COURSE OF ACTION

This does not mean that your Committee simply proposes postponement of the consideration of this matter, so that no progress can be made at the 1938 Synod. We believe such progress can and should be made.

1. The first way in which this matter can be carried forward has already been suggested. The stand which Synod will take on the other two related matters alluded to (Art. XXXVI and Creedal Expansion) will, almost automatically, imply some determination as to the course of action that may, or should be, pursued in the matter under discussion in this report. After what has been said above on this point there is no need for further explanation.

2. A second way in which the matter can be carried forward would be for Synod to say as specifically as possible, after a stand in the other two related matters has been adopted, just what Synod expects its Committee to draft. This, of course, does not apply to the *content* of the proposed report as such, but rather to its proposed objective. What is that objective to be? To draft a revised form of Article XXXVI? To draft a reply to the overture of Englewood Second? And, if the latter, is this to be viewed as an interpretation of our Creed on the matter of War, Pacifism, etc.? Or is a statement to be drafted setting forth the stand of the Church on the subject under discussion, a statement which might ultimately be incorporated in a possible later revision of our Creed? Or, finally, is it the desire of Synod that a statement be drawn up in the nature of a declaration or testimony, somewhat like the Testimony on Birth Control adopted by the Synod of 1936?

Your Committee believes that Synod ought to express itself on this matter. In order to aid Synod in coming to such a decision, your Committee offers it as its opinion that the last-named course would possibly be the most advisable, *viz.*, that the study to be devoted to this subject shall be brought to crystallization in a declaration or testimony somewhat comparable to the Testimony on

Birth Control adopted by the Synod of 1936. (See *Acts of 1936*, pp. 136-138). We are led to suggesting this advice by the following considerations.

(a) The matter should not be linked with a revision of the incriminated phrases in the present reading of Article XXXVI, (whose elimination is proposed in another report of this Committee) because that revision is in the nature of a creedal gravamen. The war issue apparently is not a matter of a creedal gravamen; at least, it has not been so presented to Synod, and if it is intended to be that, it should be so presented and treated as a distinct gravamen, also distinct from the one which the revision of Article XXXVI seeks to meet.

(b) The war issue is too pressing and too urgent an issue for our church membership today to make it advisable to postpone action on the matter until an adequate expansion and/or revision of our Creed shall be effected. Even if the question as to the probability of such a general creedal expansion ever taking place could be answered definitely in the affirmative, the task involved is of such proportions and would involve so much planning and conferring with other Reformed bodies, that prompt action on the issue under discussion is out of the question.

(c) Definite advantages in charging the Committee to draft a declaration or testimony for approval to Synod—somewhat like that adopted in the matter of Birth Control—are:

(1) This will insure prompt action on a matter of great practical urgency and moment.

(2) It will constitute a reply to the overture of Englewood Second and will be in the nature of interpreting the Creed on the points raised in that overture.

(3) It will in no wise close the door to the possibility of incorporating the gist of the position expressed in such a testimony at some future time in the official Creed of the Church, in case creedal expansion should be officially undertaken.

(4) It will offer Synod a fine opportunity to warn the membership of our Church earnestly against certain

evils, such as, a consistent pacifism (i.e., a refusal to bear arms under all circumstances) on the one hand, and a glorification of war as such on the other, both of which are in conflict with Scripture and our Creed.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Seminary Faculty,

L. BERKHOF  
SAMUEL VOLBEDA  
CLARENCE BOUMA  
M. J. WYNGAARDEN  
H. SCHULTZE  
D. H. KROMMINGA

## REPORT IV.

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE Committee appointed in 1936 to study the matter of members whose beliefs deviate from our doctrinal position has completed its work and hereby submits its report.

### I. THE TASK OF THE COMMITTEE

This is set forth in the Acts of Synod, 1936, pp. 121, 122.

XIV. *Overture Englewood I, Overture 35, Agenda II, p. 480.*

The Consistory of Englewood I asks Synod "how to proceed with discipline in the case of members of the Christian Reformed Church who have deviated from our doctrinal position to the extent that they cannot be admitted to the Lord's Supper, but whose manner of life is otherwise blameless." The Consistory petitions Synod "to consider this problem and enlighten our churches."

Your Committee recommends:

Since there is an urgent and widespread need of enlightenment in our churches as to the way in which Consistories should proceed with members who conscientiously object to certain doctrines of the Church, a need illustrated by the petition of Englewood I which concerns a member who denies the validity of water baptism and who in the opinion of the Consistory and Classis Illinois should be placed under discipline (cf. Acts 1888, Art. 57 b);

Since the problem presented by Englewood I as to how a member who denies the validity of water baptism can be removed from the church without being declared to be "excluded from the fellowship of Christ" and accounted "a Gentile and a publican," is a real problem, the more so since it seems to be a foregone conclusion that continued suspension from the Lord's Supper does not offer a solution; and

Since the problem is very involved and the time is lacking to present to this Synod a satisfactory solution,

Synod, realizing that the Acts of 1888, Article 57.b, state that members who conscientiously object to certain doctrines shall finally be disciplined, decides that a Committee be appointed to study the problem thoroughly and to report to the next Synod. (See Art. 188.)

*Adopted.*

## II. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

### A. The Specific Case Involved.

The Consistory of the First Church of Englewood, Chicago, Ill., is laboring with an aged brother, a former elder of the church. After his retirement from office this brother acquired beliefs differing from those expressed in our standards. In the main he is a premillenarian; but the really objectionable element in his beliefs is his denial of the validity of water baptism. He holds that the only true baptism is that of the Holy Spirit.

The brother readily acknowledges that he is out of harmony with our standards. Although he has been urged to join some church which holds his beliefs he has refused to do so because there is no other church in which he feels at home than the Christian Reformed. He seems to be at one with our doctrine in most matters. No evidence has been submitted that he has propagated his views among other members of the church.

### B. Action by the Consistory.

The Consistory has forbidden the brother to partake of the Lord's Supper, but no official discipline has been administered. From this point on the Consistory does not know how to proceed because it is not fully convinced that the brother's deviation is sufficient to justify excommunication. At the same time the brother remains anxious to partake of the Lord's Supper. Consequently the Consistory has appealed to Classis for advice.

### C. Action by the Classis of Illinois.

The Classis of Illinois referred the matter to a committee. Although the committee was divided in its opinions, Classis adopted that on which all the committee members agreed, namely, "that the Consistory continue to labor with this erring brother for some time to come. If the brother makes propaganda for his views and causes a disturbance in the congregation, then the consistory can deal with him on these grounds."

Classis refrained from comment on either the majority or the minority opinion of the committee. The majority opinion was as follows: "That the church in such cases proceed cautiously and that it exercise much loving forbearance and patience. If after continued admonition and instruction the member remains, either willfully ignorant, or if it appears that he is unable to be convinced of the Reformed persuasion on such a definite point of doctrine, that then, with the approbation of Classis, such a member simply be dropped, and it be publicly declared to the congregation that this person is no longer a member of the Christian Reformed Church."

The minority opinion was: "Our advice is to proceed according to our Church Order even to the point of excommunication, although it is advisable in the given case to proceed very slowly from step to step. In this particular case there is perhaps no particular need of undue haste."

#### D. The Appeal to Synod.

Since Classis virtually only approved what the Consistory had done and did not remove the difficulty under which the Consistory labored, this body very naturally appealed to Synod. The Consistory in its overture to Synod does not complain of this lack of decisiveness on the part of Classis but simply casts the matter at Synod's feet.

Probably Classis expected that the Consistory would after a certain time report either the failure or the success of its labor with the brother, and that then Classis would have given a definite decision. Instead of waiting for anything that Classis might do, the consistory went directly to Synod. Undoubtedly the Consistory realized that if the advisory committee of Classis was divided in its opinions Classis certainly would be, and eventually the matter would come to Synod. Hence to save time the matter was at once submitted to Synod.

However, the consistory in its appeal to Synod asks not only advice in the specific case involved, but assumes that there is an abstract problem as well and petitions Synod to act on that abstract problem also.

#### E. Action by the Synod of 1936.

Synod completely ignored the appeal of the consistory for immediate advice on the specific case involved. For

various reasons the matter was regarded as an abstract problem about which a committee should make a thorough study and report in 1938.

In the meanwhile the aged brother continues in a state of virtual excommunication and may well have departed from this life before his case has been settled, a victim of ecclesiastical procrastination.

### III. THE AIM OF THE COMMITTEE

Although the committee was not instructed to advise concerning the specific case, the committee feels that justice both to the Consistory and to the brother concerned demands the settlement of this concrete case. Moreover, by advising on this particular matter, the committee will have contributed most toward an answer of the abstract problem which both the Consistory and Synod raise. If Synod sees fit to adopt our recommendations a precedent will be established that will be a guide to consistories that must meet situations similar to that confronting the Consistory of First, Englewood.

To have done literally as Synod instructed would have led the committee to the consideration of the almost numberless shades and degrees of deviation that can take place from our doctrinal position. Even if that consideration could be completed by June, 1938, the committee sees clearly that no general rule could be devised that would cover all the possible deviations. The rule would be so general as to lose all practical value.

Synods can very conveniently sidestep a very difficult practical problem by simply resolving it into an abstraction and by referring it to a committee that shall recommend a general ruling two years hence. Problems that concern the church are not solved by that method. Satisfactory results are obtained and progress is made only by facing definite cases squarely and settling them individually in the light of Scripture and the Church Order.

The committee aims to consider the particular case confronting First, Englewood, in the light of Scripture and the Church Order.

### IV. CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUES

A. Was the Consistory justified in suspending the brother's rights as a communicant as long as the Consistory was not perfectly sure that his fault merited ex-



communication as interpreted in our form of excommunication?

To this question the committee must answer that the consistory erred by thus suspending his rights.

Ground—The Consistory failed to heed Article 76 of the Church Order. There the reasons justifying suspension are plainly stated as follows: "Such as absolutely reject the admonition of the Consistory and likewise those who have committed a public or otherwise gross sin shall be suspended from the Lord's Supper."

This rule is not only a guide for the Consistory but a protection of the member. No consistory may because some irregularity has entered into the conduct or belief of a member simply at once suspend his rights as a communicant. Only when the conditions predicated by Article 76 obtain may the Consistory proceed to suspension.

Because the Consistory of First, Englewood, did not abide by Article 76, it failed to lay the proper groundwork for its procedure with the brother, and was at a loss how to proceed after it had suspended him. Had the Consistory followed Article 76 the Consistory would have known whether the brother's fault required merely admonition and instruction or suspension and subsequent excommunication. If the latter measures were required, the Consistory could have followed the further course outlined in Articles 76 and 77 without the delay which has now occurred.

The Consistory may argue that suspension is only a preliminary measure taken before the formal steps of censure are followed. Granted, but this preliminary measure is taken for a twofold purpose, namely, to permit the consistory to remove all doubt as to the member's guilt of the offense with which he is charged and to afford the member an opportunity to repent before any formal or public steps of censure are followed. However, while this preliminary measure is taken the consistory may at no time doubt that the offense itself is sufficient ground for excommunication. The Consistory must be sure that the conditions specified in Article 76 are met. If the Consistory doubts, the member must receive the benefit of the doubt.

B. Is the denial of the validity of water baptism a censurable sin in the sense that it merits excommunication?

The committee answers that according to the letter of the Church Order this denial must be regarded in that serious light.

Grounds—

1. Article 72 specifies error in doctrine as one of the sins worthy of censure.

2. Denial of water baptism is an error of doctrine because it contradicts the commandment of Christ (Matthew 28:19 and Mark 16:16) and the example of the apostles (Acts 2:38, 41; 8:38; 9:18; 10:48).

The committee realizes that the application of Article 72 involves difficulties in the method of application. These arise from the fact that certain errors of doctrine touch the heart of Christianity while others concern only the less essential parts of the truth. Naturally the method of application of Article 72 depends on the kind of doctrinal error. When vital Christian doctrines are denied, proof is given of an unregenerate heart, and the course that must be pursued is very easily discernible. A dead member must be excluded from the Church of Christ. When, however, as in the present case, the doctrinal error is serious but does not concern anything essential to salvation, positive proof is lacking of an unregenerate heart. The most that can be said is that the member entertaining the error is spiritually sick and he must be dealt with accordingly. He must be patiently carried and every means for his recovery must be used. When after patient ministration the ailment of the member becomes infectious so that it spreads to other members or involves other doctrines, censure must be applied even to the point of excommunication.

The same course of action must be pursued when the member will not submit to the admonition of the Consistory. We arrive at this conclusion when we view the matter in the light of the Formula of Subscription required by Article 53 of the Church Order. According to that formula professors, ministers, elders and deacons who find sentiments arising in their minds differing from those expressed in the Standards are not suspended when they reveal such sentiments to their fellow officebearers,

but only when they refuse to submit to the judgment of Consistory, Classis, or Synod.

Certainly the members of the Church must be dealt with according to the same rule. The present particular case proves that the member of the Church is just as liable as the officebearer to change his mind on certain doctrines after he has promised loyalty to the standards of the Church. When this occurs the member must feel free to express his change of views to the Consistory without fear of immediately becoming the object of censure. If the Consistory has conscientiously sought to turn him from his heretical views and he will not submit to the Consistory he must be disciplined even to the extent of excommunication for his insubordination in addition to his heresy.

The question will arise as to what should be construed as submission to the Consistory. Naturally, the most desirable submission is that which acknowledges error and expresses wholehearted agreement with our standards. However, the Consistory should be satisfied when objections have been silenced and the member quietly fulfills his duty as a member of the Church.

C. Is the recommendation contained in the majority report of the advisory committee of the Classis of Illinois correct when the following advice is given: "That the Church in such cases proceed cautiously and that it exercise much loving forbearance and patience. If after continued admonition and instruction the member remains, either willfully ignorant, or if it appears that he is unable to be convinced of the Reformed persuasion on such a definite point of doctrine, that then, with the approbation of Classis, such a member simply be dropped, and it be publicly declared to the congregation that this person is no longer a member of the Christian Reformed Church?"

The Committee answers that neither in Scripture nor in the Church Order is authority accorded to the Consistory to do as above recommended. Scripture and Church Order allow for only three ways whereby a member ceases to belong to the institution of the Church, namely, by death, by voluntary withdrawal, and by excommunication. When either of the first two takes place the Consistory simply recognizes an accomplished fact when it erases the name of the person concerned from the record of the Church. In the third case there is a

definite judicial act of the Consistory taken for definitely specified reasons and following a clearly prescribed method. It is manifestly an injustice to a member when he is excluded from the Church against his own will by any other process than the orderly procedure of discipline.

When a situation arises such as the present one, namely, when a member who is irregular in doctrine does not voluntarily withdraw and the Consistory is not free to excommunicate and the member seeks the fellowship of the Church, the Consistory can do nothing else than carry that person as an ailing member of the Church and deal with him as described above.

V. Recommendation to Synod.

On the basis of the above consideration of the issues involved, the committee recommends that Synod answer the Consistory of the First Church of Englewood, Chicago, Ill., as follows:

1. The Consistory erred by suspending the member's communicant rights before the Consistory was sure that the conditions predicated by Article 76 of the Church Order existed.
2. Denial of the validity of water baptism is a censurable sin as defined by Article 72 of the Church Order.
3. The method to be followed by the Consistory is:
  - a. Patient ministration to the member as one who is spiritually ill.
  - b. Censure to the point of excommunication when the spiritual ailment becomes infectious or when the member refuses to submit to the Consistory.

Respectfully submitted,

D. HOLLEBEEK  
W. GROEN  
J. M. BYLEVELD

## REPORT V.

### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONTACT BETWEEN THE SYNOD AND THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF REFORMED YOUNG MEN SOCIETIES

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

FOR many years it has been the ideal of the A. F. R. Y. M. S. to have in the field a man who could devote all his time and energies in the service of the young people of our denomination. The federation in outlining the qualifications for this youth leader indicated that it realized the importance of this position and believed that a man of very high caliber should be chosen for this task. His qualifications as outlined by the Board of the Federation can be found in *The Young Calvinist*—the April issue of 1937 where we read “the following characteristics are considered essential:

- 1—Must understand young people.
- 2—Must understand and love the Reformed principles.
- 3—Must understand youths' problems.
- 4—Must be a good speaker.
- 5—Must have the confidence of young people.
- 6—Must have the confidence of the church.
- 7—Must be tactful.

Everything else being equal, it would seem that an ordained man would be preferable.”

In this same issue of *The Young Calvinist* the Board also outlined the tasks in which this man should be engaged . . . Cf. I—The work of the Youth Secretary—below . . .

After a preliminary campaign among the Federation Societies, who pledged over \$500 toward the cause, a church-wide campaign was launched in the spring of 1937 for funds to carry on this work. Synod was asked to endorse this project and to recommend the cause to our churches. This Synod did. Its decisions are found on pp. 99 and 100 of the 1937 Acts of Synod—Article 122, 19th session. Synod not only endorsed the Federation

and the youth leader plan but also appointed a committee to make regulations for permanent contact.

*A. Our Mandate.*

This is contained in point 3 of the above-mentioned article. It reads, "In view of the importance of the position of the Youth Secretary for the future welfare of the church and our young people, Synod appoint a committee to consult with the Board of the Federation for the purpose of drawing up a plan regulating the official's work and his relation to the church, and for establishing permanent contact with the Federation."

At the first combined meeting of the Synodical Committee and the Board on Sept. 24, 1937, this mandate was interpreted as follows. We are to

- I. Draw up plans regulating the Youth Secretary's work.
- II. Clarify his position in relation to the church.
- III. Make regulations for permanent contact between Synod and the Federation.

*B. Our Conclusions.*

I. THE WORK OF THE YOUTH SECRETARY

In considering the work of the youth secretary, it must be remembered that it seeks to fill a *present* pressing need, and that no such position has before existed in our circles. Hence it is impossible to describe this work in detail. The Youth Secretary will be a pioneer in this field. Varieties of conditions and situations will demand individual treatment. His experience and initiative will to some extent determine his activities.

Nevertheless the DIRECTION of his work can be pointed out. As agreed by the joint body his task will be to

- 1—Organize societies.
- 2—Strengthen existing societies.
- 3—Organize leagues.
- 4—Strengthen and guide the Federation.
- 5—Serve in an advisory capacity on the Board.
- 6—Make propaganda for the Federation.
- 7—Address societies and leagues.
- 8—Address church gatherings.
- 9—Plead for youth organizations at classical and synodical gatherings.

- 10—Plead for youth organizations in our church papers.
- 11—Edit a department in the *Young Calvinist*.
- 12—Study and contact other youth movements.
- 13—Study the psychology and problems of youth.
- 14—Serve as consulting specialist on youth problems.

The Youth Secretary, it is understood, would be engaged by the Federation Board and be directly responsible to it. The Board will supervise his activities. Here again, due to the fact that he will be a pioneer in this field it is impossible and undesirable to regulate his work in detail and bind him by a set of rules. His tact and discretion will determine and guide his actions.

In approaching his field of labor, however, the joint body agrees that contact should be established in any one of these three ways:

- 1—By invitation from one or more local consistories, pastors, or societies.
- 2—In churches where there is no society by request from the youth secretary to the consistory for the privilege to speak or work in the local church in behalf of the youth movement.
- 3—In churches where there is a society by request to the society.

## II. THE RELATION OF THE YOUTH SECRETARY TO THE CHURCH

It becomes necessary for us to clarify the Youth Secretary's relation to the church only if he be a minister. The Board has previously expressed itself to the effect that "Everything else being equal, it would seem that an ordained man would be preferable for this work." Cf. *Young Calvinist*, April, 1937.

Due to the fact that the Youth Secretary will be expected to address church gatherings, classes and synods as well as promote reformed convictions among our young people, the joint body agrees that it is highly desirable that an ordained man should be given the preference for this work, and should a minister accept this position, he should retain his ministerial status.

To obviate the necessity of designating a church to call him, the simplest way would be for the church which he is serving to loan him for this work.

### III. PERMANENT CONTACT BETWEEN THE SYNOD AND THE FEDERATION

The decision of Synod presupposes that contact between Synod and the Federation is desirable. The nature of this contact will depend upon the relation of an organization such as the Federation is, to Synod.

A matter similar to this has engaged the attention of prominent men in the Netherlands. They did much to clarify this relation between the consistory and the Young Men Society. The position of Dr. H. H. Kuyper finally prevailed. His view is expressed in the following quotation from Prof. L. Berkhof's book entitled "*Why Reformed Young Men Societies*" p. 24, and published by the American Federation of Reformed Young Men Societies as their own publication.

"Young Men Societies are voluntary clubs . . . clubs which the young men themselves organize for the purpose of their own, and which they control with a definite aim in mind. In that respect our Young Men Societies differ radically from the great majority of Young Peoples Societies in the church round about us. These are practically church organizations existing for church ends, for which the church provides leaders. In that respect our societies are much more in harmony, not only with the democratic spirit of our age, but also with the growing feeling of independence in the adolescent youth and the corresponding desire for self-government. Our young men should not infer from this, however, that it would not be wise for them to seek the advice and the guidance of older men in their society life. They ought especially to recognize the right of their parents to insist on it that the GUIDANCE which they receive in their societies be in harmony with the teachings of God's Word. And in addition to that they should honor the supervision of the church. In the Netherlands this question has long been debated, whether the right of the church to supervise the work of the societies depends on the voluntary consent of the societies or is an inherent right of the church. The conclusion reached was that, in so far as the societies make it their task to study and interest the Word of God and the Confessional Standards of the church, the latter has the right of supervision *suo jure* and does not receive it by a grant from the society. *The society does not place itself under the supervision of the church but is under its*



*supervision.* Dr. H. H. Kuyper says: 'Naar eisch der Gereformeerde beginselen heeft de Jongelingsvereeniging de Kerk van Christus te erkennen . . . Het toezicht der Kerk geldt niet het geheele vereenigingsleven, dat als zoodanig buiten haar sfeer ligt, maar alleen voor zoover de zaken der religie aangaat, met name de uitlegging van God's Woord en de handhaving der belydenis.'

The Federation, like the Y. M. S., is a voluntary, independent organization. According to its Constitution (Art. I) it is, "based upon the Bible as the infallible Word of God, according to the conception of the same as expressed in the Three Forms of Unity." Hence, it likewise considers itself amenable to the church in these matters.

The joint committee agrees that the best way to promote good understanding between Synod and the Federation without affecting the independence of the Federation and to co-operate in such a way that our contact may be congenial and beneficial to the youth of our denomination, is through the appointment of an advisory member on the Federation Board by Synod, and through annual reports by the Youth Secretary to Synod.

*C. Our Recommendations to Synod.*

Your committee recommends that:

- I. Synod approve the plan outlined above, regulating the Youth Secretary's work, as agreed upon by the Federation Board and the committee.
- II. Synod decide that a minister accepting the position of Youth Secretary retain his ministerial status by having the church he is serving, when appointed, loan him for this work.
- III. Synod, at the request of the Federation Board, appoint a member to the Federation Board to serve in an advisory capacity and report to Synod at its regular session.

Respectfully submitted,

The Committee,

JOHN WEIDENAAR, *Chairman.*

M. ARNOYS, *Reporter.*

WM. KOK.

## REPORT VI.

### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON "REVISION OF THE COMPENDIUM"

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE mandate given to this Committee is found in the Acts of Synod 1936, Art. 43, page 17. According to the charge given, the specific task entrusted to the Committee is contained in these words: That the Synod appoint a Committee "for the purpose of drafting a revision of our present Compendium of the Heidelberg Catechism, charging said Committee to alter the construction and language of the present Compendium wherever advisable, avoiding, however, all unnecessary changes, but not neglecting to incorporate in the proposed revision a brief exposition of the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer; charging said Committee in the second place to add supplementary questions and answers on the doctrinal tenets vital today, not stressed or explicitly mentioned in the Catechism and its Compendium." Regarding the incidental requirement as expressed on page 119 of the Acts of Synod 1936, point 4, that "the highly desirable goal of greater unification in the educational work of the Church be kept in mind, Synod instruct the Committee for the editing of a Sunday School paper of our own to consider in conjunction with the Committee for the editing of a Revised Compendium the proper correlation of our Sunday School work with the work of our catechism classes," this Committee is of the opinion and proceeded in the prosecution of its charge accordingly, that the initiative for this end should be taken by the Committee appointed for the editing of a Sunday School paper of our own.

The motivation which prompted the Synod to the appointment of this Committee and giving to it this specific charge, viz., that our Churches might have for our young people a Compendium Text on Reformed Doctrine, having Synodical approval, which would realize the objectives of safety, uniformity and efficiency, will without

argument be accepted to be highly commendable and genuinely desirable. While we would in no wise minimize the value of the Compendium as originally written in 1608, it cannot be denied that there are glaring weaknesses in it which it has long been felt ought to be corrected. Witness the score or more of catechism books that have appeared within the last twenty-five years which may serve as the unanswerable argument to prove this conscious dissatisfaction. Those instructing our Covenant youth in the fundamentals of our faith as these truths have received expression in our standards, were very conscious of the limitations of the Compendium and fully recognized the need of amplifying and augmenting that material. This was done either orally or by preparing written material for the catechumens. By this method some of the weaknesses of the Compendium were in a measure overcome. The lamentable feature about this method, however, is obvious, namely that it led to much division and lack of uniform emphasis. If the proposed Revision of the Compendium as presented by this Committee or by any other could meet with Synodical approval, such a contribution would be a distinct advantage and would be fruitful of much good for the youth of our church.

A perusal of the Revision as herewith presented will evidence at a glance that your Committee did not take a slavishly literal interpretation of its mandate. This was done in the interest of the Revised Compendium. The one concern of your Committee was that it might succeed in giving a Revised Compendium which would *in very fact* be a summary statement of the salient truths comprehended in the Heidelberg Catechism. Where and when we deviated from the Compendium or added material not included in the Present Compendium, we did so either in order that we might adhere more closely and strictly to the Heidelberg Catechism, or for the purpose of adding "supplementary questions and answers on the doctrinal tenets vital today, not stressed or explicitly mentioned in the Catechism and its Compendium." It will be conceded that this sort of integration is exceedingly desirable and valuable, since it will prepare the catechumen for a better appreciation and evaluation of sermons that are preached every Sunday from our pulpits on the Heidelberg Catechism. In this revision we took cognizance of a very

sad fact among our young people generally, namely the lack of definite scriptural knowledge. Wherever possible the question has been shaped in such a form that some definite scripture passage will serve as the correct and convincing answer. Realizing the difficulty and the aversion that young people have in memorizing lengthy, involved sentences, we have aimed to make the answers short, concise, lucid and in language fitted to the mind of the catechumen. Rather than the abrupt beginning of the Compendium, we have included two lessons of introductory material, which action we believe will commend itself.

Concerning the bulk of the proposed revision we have adhered to the Compendium and more strictly still to the Heidelberg Catechism, adding lessons on the Law and the Lord's Prayer as was required.

May this proposed Revision of the Compendium find favor with your honorable body, to the end that our Covenant youth may secure a better comprehension and appreciation of our precious Reformed heritage. May our God give you guidance and wisdom in your manifold labors, to the end that His Zion may be benefited and His Name magnified.

P. S. Should this Revised Compendium find favor with your honorable body and receive Synodical approval, this Committee then suggests that the Synod appoint a Committee to edit this Revised Compendium adding supplementary explanatory notes to each lesson.

Humbly submitted,

H. KUIPER, *President*

A. S. DEJONG

P. A. HOEKSTRA

W. H. RUTGERS, *Secretary.*

### LESSON I.

- Q. 1. What is the only true religion?  
A. The Christian religion built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief cornerstone. Eph. 2:20.
- Q. 2. What is the first condition of true religion?  
A. Knowledge of God.
- Q. 3. What makes knowledge of God possible?  
A. God has made Himself known to us.
- Q. 4. How has God made Himself known to us?  
A. God has given a general revelation in nature and a special revelation in Scripture.
- Q. 5. What does the general revelation teach us concerning God?  
A. His everlasting power and divinity. Rom. 1:20.
- Q. 6. Does the general revelation teach God's wisdom?  
A. Yes. Prov. 3:19, "Jehovah by wisdom founded the earth; by understanding He established the heavens."
- Q. 7. Does the general revelation also speak of God's goodness?  
A. It surely does. Acts 14:17, "He did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness."
- Q. 8. Is God's general revelation sufficient to make us wise unto salvation?  
A. No; it does not make known the way of salvation in Jesus Christ.
- Q. 9. What effect does the general revelation have on those who are strangers to the gospel?  
A. It causes them to be without excuse. Rom. 1:20.

### LESSON II.

- Q. 1. What do we call God's special revelation?  
A. The Word of God, Holy Scripture, or The Bible.
- Q. 2. Is God's Word in the Bible or is the Bible God's Word?  
A. The Bible is God's Word because the whole Bible is inspired.
- Q. 3. What do we mean when we say that the Bible is inspired?  
A. That the writers of the Bible were so guided and controlled by the Holy Spirit that they wrote the infallible Word of God.
- Q. 4. Can you prove that the Bible is divinely inspired?  
A. 2 Tim. 3:16, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."
- Q. 5. Can you give any more proof?  
A. 2 Peter 1:21, "For no prophecy ever came by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." See also John 16:13.
- Q. 6. How is the Bible divided?  
A. Into two parts: the Old and the New Testaments.
- Q. 7. What is the main message of the Old Testament?  
A. The Old Testament tells us what God did in preparation for the coming of Christ.
- Q. 8. What is the main message of the New Testament?  
A. The New Testament tells us what God has done and still does through Christ for the salvation of sinners.
- Q. 9. What authority has the Bible?  
A. The Bible comes to us with divine authority so that we must regard it as the absolute rule for faith and conduct.

Q. 10. Why is it a great privilege to have the Bible?

A. 2 Tim. 3:15, "And that from a babe thou hast known the sacred writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

### LESSON III.

Q. 1. What is the great message of the Bible?

A. The Bible teaches us how to obtain true comfort.

Q. 2. What is man's only real comfort in life and death?

A. The assurance that he belongs to the faithful Savior Jesus Christ.

Q. 3. How many things must you know that you may enjoy this comfort?

A. Three: first, how great my sins and miseries are; second, how I shall be delivered from all my sins and miseries; third, how I shall express my gratitude to God for such deliverance.

Q. 4. Why is knowledge of sin and misery necessary?

A. Without this knowledge no one will seek deliverance.

Q. 5. How thorough must our knowledge of misery be?

A. So thorough that we despair of saving ourselves and seek refuge with Christ. Luke 18:13.

Q. 6. Why is knowledge of deliverance necessary?

A. Assurance of salvation is the very heart of real comfort. Rom. 8:37, 38.

Q. 7. Why is knowledge of gratitude necessary?

A. Without knowledge of gratitude we cannot make our calling and election sure. I Peter 1:5-10.

Q. 8. Is a purely theoretical knowledge of misery, deliverance, and gratitude sufficient?

A. No, we must have experiential knowledge.

Q. 9. On whom are we dependent for such knowledge?

A. On the Holy Spirit for whose grace we must pray. Luke 11:13.

Q. 10. Can we do anything to obtain this knowledge?

A. Yes, we must search the Scriptures prayerfully. John 5:39.

### LESSON IV.

Q. 1. What is sin?

A. Sin is disobedience to God.

Q. 2. Whence do you know your sin and misery?

A. Out of the law of God. Rom. 3:20, "For through the law cometh the knowledge of sin."

Q. 3. What has God commanded you in His law?

A. That is contained in the Ten Commandments recorded in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5.

Q. 4. How are the Ten Commandments divided?

A. Into two tables.

Q. 5. What is the one thing demanded by all the Ten Commandments?

A. Love. Rom. 13:10, "Love therefore is the fulfillment of the law."

Q. 6. What does God require in the four commandments of the first table?

A. Matt. 22:37, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind."

Q. 7. What does God require in the six commandments of the second table?

A. Matt. 22:39, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Q. 8. Can we keep this law perfectly?

A. No, we are inclined by nature to hate God and our neighbor, and to transgress the commandments of God in thought, word, and deed.

Q. 9. Can you prove that we are naturally inclined to disobey the law?

A. Yes. Rom. 8:7, "Because the mind of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be." See also Titus 3:3.

Q. 10. Why did God give the law if we cannot keep it?

A. The law is meant to be our tutor to bring us unto Christ. Gal. 3:24.

#### LESSON V.

Q. 1. Is God responsible for our sinfulness?

A. By no means. Job 34:10, "Far be it from God, that He should do wickedness; and from the Almighty, that He should commit iniquity."

Q. 2. How has God created man?

A. God created man good and in His own image. Gen. 1:27.

Q. 3. What does the image of God involve?

A. True knowledge of God, righteousness, and holiness.

Q. 4. Prove that the image of God involves true knowledge of God.

A. Col. 3:10, "And have put on the new man, that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of Him that created him."

Q. 5. Prove that the image of God involves righteousness and holiness.

A. Eph. 4:24, "And put on the new man, that after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth."

Q. 6. How did man become sinful and disobedient?

A. Through the fall and disobedience of Adam and Eve in Paradise.

Q. 7. What is this disobedience?

A. They ate of the fruit of the tree which God had forbidden them.

Q. 8. How did they come to do this?

A. They listened to the lie of Satan.

Q. 9. Who is Satan?

A. A fallen angel, whom Scripture calls the father of lies and a murderer from the beginning. John 8:44.

#### LESSON VI.

Q. 1. Does the disobedience of Adam concern us?

A. Certainly, for he is the father of us all.

Q. 2. For what other reason?

A. Adam represented all mankind as the head of the covenant of works.

Q. 3. What are the results of Adam's sin for us?

A. The guilt of Adam's first transgression is charged to our account and besides we have all inherited a corrupt nature.

Q. 4. Can you prove that the guilt of Adam's first transgression is charged against all men?

A. Rom. 5:18, "Through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation."

Q. 5. Can you prove that all men have inherited a corrupt nature?

A. Job 14:4, "Who can bring a clean thing out of unclean? not one."

Q. 6. Does Scripture teach the total depravity of the natural man?

A. Yes, he is dead in trespasses and sins. Eph. 2:1.

Q. 7. What does this involve?

A. This involves that he is incapable of doing any spiritual good and inclined to all manner of wickedness.

Q. 8. Will God allow this disobedience and corruption to go unpunished?

A. By no means, but in His just judgment He will punish them with temporal and eternal punishment. Gal. 3:10.

Q. 9. What are some of the temporal punishments of sin?

A. Remorse of conscience, the sense of God's displeasure, all sorts of suffering, and death.

Q. 10. Does Scripture teach the certainty of eternal punishment?

A. It surely does. Matt. 25:45, "And these shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life."

## LESSON VII.

Q. 1. Can we in any way save ourselves?

A. No, for we daily increase our guilt by our sins.

Q. 2. How then can we escape punishment and again be received into favor?

A. Through a mediator who in one person is very God and a real, righteous man.

Q. 3. What must the mediator do to reconcile us with God?

A. He must bear the punishment which we deserved and show the obedience which we failed to render.

Q. 4. Why must our Mediator be very God?

A. Otherwise He could not deliver us from the wrath of God and endow us with eternal life.

Q. 5. Why must our Mediator be a real man?

A. Otherwise He could not take upon Himself our guilt and suffer and die in our stead.

Q. 6. Why must our Mediator be a righteous man?

A. A man who is a sinner cannot render satisfaction for others any more than he can redeem himself.

Q. 7. Who is the one Mediator between God and man?

A. I Cor. 1:30, "Christ Jesus, who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption."

Q. 8. Prove that Jesus Christ is very God.

A. I John 5:20, "This is the true God and eternal life."

Q. 9. Prove that Jesus Christ is a real man.

A. I Tim. 2:5, "For there is one God, one Mediator also between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus."

Q. 10. Prove that Jesus Christ is a righteous man.

A. II Cor. 5:21, "Him who knew no sin, He made to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him."



### LESSON VIII.

Q. 1. Shall all men be saved by the Mediator, Jesus Christ, as they are all condemned in Adam?

A. No; but those only who receive Him by a true faith.

Q. 2. Prove this from Scripture.

A. John 3:36, "He that believeth on the Son, hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

Q. 3. What is true faith?

A. It is a sure knowledge of God and His promises revealed to us in the gospel, and a hearty confidence that all my sins are forgiven me for Christ's sake.

Q. 4. Does Scripture speak of faith that does not save?

A. Yes; Scripture speaks of historical, miraculous, and temporary faith.

Q. 5. What is historical faith?

A. Historical faith is mere assent to the truth of God's Word which leaves the heart cold and the life unsanctified.

Q. 6. What is miraculous faith?

A. Miraculous faith believes that a miracle will be performed by us or on us.

Q. 7. What is temporary faith?

A. Temporary faith is faith that receives the Word straightway with joy, but does not acknowledge Christ as Lord.

Q. 8. What are the characteristics by which true faith is distinguished from faith that does not save?

A. True faith involves godly sorrow for sin and complete self-surrender to Christ.

Q. 9. Can true saving faith be lost?

A. No. John 10:28, "And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of My hand."

### LESSON IX.

Q. 1. What must a Christian believe?

A. All that which God has revealed in His Word

Q. 2. What is the summary of that which God has promised in the gospel and commanded us to believe?

A. That which is comprehended in the twelve articles of the Catholic Christian Faith known as the Apostles' Creed.

Q. 3. What are these articles?

A. I. I believe in God the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

II. And in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Lord;

III. Who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the virgin Mary;

IV. Suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead and buried; He descended into hell.

V. The third day He arose again from the dead;

VI. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty;

VII. From thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead.

VIII. I believe in the Holy Spirit.

IX. I believe a holy catholic Church, the communion of saints;

X. The forgiveness of sins;

XI. The resurrection of the body;

XII. And the life everlasting.

Q. 4. What fundamental doctrine is professed by this creed as a whole?

A. The doctrine of the Trinity — that God, who is one in essence, exists in three persons.

Q. 5. When you profess to believe in God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, do you mean that there are three Gods?

A. In no wise; for there is only one true God?

Q. 6. Why do you then name three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit?

A. Because God has so revealed Himself in His Word, that these three distinct persons are the only one and true God.

Q. 7. Cite a text which definitely affirms that there is only one God.

A. Deut. 6:4, "Hear, O Israel: Jehovah our God is one Jehovah."

Q. 8. Cite a text which definitely affirms that God exists in three persons.

A. Matt. 28:19, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

Q. 9. Do we need a Triune God for our salvation?

A. Yes; we need the Father to love us with an everlasting love and to provide a sacrifice for our sins; we need the Son to redeem us; and we need the Holy Spirit to re-create and sanctify us.

#### LESSON X.

Q. 1. What truth is expressed in the first article of the Apostles' Creed?

A. The Fatherhood of God.

Q. 2. In what threefold sense is God called Father?

A. God is the Eternal Father of His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ; the Father of all creatures by virtue of creation and providence; and the Father of believers in a spiritual and saving sense.

Q. 3. What is it to create?

A. To bring into existence by an act of almighty will things that were not.

Q. 4. What is the very opposite of the doctrine of creation?

A. The doctrine of evolution which teaches that this present world is the product of blind forces inherent in nature.

Q. 5. Is the doctrine of evolution dangerous?

A. Yes, it strikes at the very foundation of all true religion and morality.

Q. 6. What do you understand by the providence of God?

A. That God upholds the world by His Almighty power and so governs it that His eternal program is realized.

Q. 7. Does God's providence extend even to the smallest details?

A. Yes. Matt. 10:30, "But the very hairs of your head are all numbered."

Q. 8. Does God in His providential rule always confine Himself to the use of ordinary means?

A. No. God sometimes works miracles which are events wrought by the extraordinary operation of God's power.

Q. 9. Does the universal Fatherhood of God provide any worthwhile comfort?

A. No; unless we are children of God through faith in Christ the wrath of God abides on us.

Q. 10. How must the Christian look upon the Almighty Creator and Ruler of the universe?

A. As his loving Father who will make all things work together for his good.

#### LESSON XI.

Q. 1. What do you believe when you say, "And in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Lord"?

A. That Jesus Christ is the eternal and only Son of the Father, one in being with God the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Q. 2. Prove the Deity of Christ.

A. John 1:1, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

Q. 3. Do you not believe that He also became man?

A. Yes; for He was conceived by the Holy Spirit, and born of the Virgin Mary. John 1:14, "And the Word became flesh."

Q. 4. Is His Godhead then changed into humanity?

A. No; for the Godhead is unchangeable. Mal. 3:6, "For I, Jehovah, change not."

Q. 5. How did He become man?

A. By assuming human nature into a personal union with His Deity.

Q. 6. Did He bring His human nature from heaven?

A. No; but He took it on Him of the Virgin Mary, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and is thus become like unto us, His brethren, in all things sin excepted.

Q. 7. What does it mean then that the Word became flesh?

A. The Son of God who always was and remained God also became man at the time of His incarnation.

Q. 8. Is it important to hold to the essential Deity of Jesus Christ?

A. It surely is; unless He is very God He cannot be our Savior.

Q. 9. Is it also important to hold that Jesus Christ was truly human?

A. Most certainly; He could not have been our sin-bearing substitute if He had not shared our flesh and blood.

Q. 10. What is one of the most common and most dangerous heresies of the present day?

A. The denial of the absolute Deity of Jesus Christ.

#### LESSON XII.

Q. 1. What does the name Jesus mean?

A. The name Jesus means "Jehovah saves," and it marks our Mediator as the Divine Savior.

Q. 2. Why was the name Jesus given to our Mediator?

A. Matt. 1:21, "And thou shalt call His name Jesus: for it is He that shall save His people from their sins."

Q. 3. What does it mean to save?

A. To deliver from the greatest evil, from sin and all its consequences, and to impart the highest good, which is fellowship with God.

Q. 4. Is there no other Savior?

A. No; Acts 4:12, "And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved."

Q. 5. What does the name Christ mean?

A. Anointed, that is, He was ordained by God the Father from eternity and qualified by the Holy Spirit, especially at His baptism, to be our Redeemer.

Q. 6. For what threefold office was our Redeemer anointed?

A. To be our Chief Prophet, our only High Priest, and our Eternal King.

Q. 7. What is the work of Christ as our Chief Prophet?

A. To teach us the way of salvation.

Q. 8. What is the work of Christ as our only High Priest?

A. To secure salvation for us by His self-sacrifice and intercession.

Q. 9. What is the work of Christ as our Eternal King?

A. To give us actual possession of the salvation which He earned for us.

Q. 10. Why are believers called Christians?

A. Because they as members of Christ have been made partakers of His anointing in order that they may be prophets, priests, and kings themselves.

### LESSON XIII.

Q. 1. What is the essence of Jesus' saving work?

A. As our substitute He suffered for us, was crucified and died, was buried and descended into hell.

Q. 2. What is meant by "descended into hell"?

A. That Christ suffered the torments of hell. Matt. 27:46, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

Q. 3. In what state did Christ suffer?

A. In the state of humiliation, that is, when He stood before God as guilty because of our sins?

Q. 4. In which nature did Christ suffer?

A. Only in His human nature, that is, in soul and body.

Q. 5. Did His divine nature have nothing to do with His suffering?

A. His divine nature strengthened His human nature so that He could bear the burden of God's wrath against sin and deliver us from it.

Q. 6. Prove from Scripture that Christ's suffering was substitutionary.

A. Isa. 53:5, "But He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities.

Q. 7. Why was Christ's suffering necessary with reference to God?

A. To satisfy the justice of God.

Q. 8. For whom did Christ suffer?

A. For those who were given Him by the Father.

Q. 9. Was it not the purpose of Christ to save all men?

A. No; John 10:11, "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd layeth down His life for the sheep."

Q. 10. If Christ died in our stead, why must we die?

A. Our death is not a satisfaction for our sins, but only an abolishing of sin and a passage into eternal life.

Q. 11. How must we respond to the gospel of the suffering Christ?

A. We must place all hope of salvation on the perfect sacrifice of Christ.

LESSON XIV.

Q. 1. Did Christ remain under the power of death?

A. No; He arose from the dead the third day with the same body that had been crucified.

Q. 2. Why was the resurrection of Christ inevitable?

A. It was a matter of divine necessity that Christ, having satisfied the justice of God, should enter the state of exaltation.

Q. 3. Do we have good grounds for believing the great miracle of the bodily resurrection of Christ?

A. Most assuredly. The empty tomb, the testimony of the angels, the witness of those to whom the Risen Christ appeared, and the establishment and preservation of the Christian Church — all give eloquent testimony to this fact.

Q. 4. What benefits do we derive from the resurrection of Christ?

A. The resurrection of Christ guarantees our justification; it is the fountain of our new life; and it is a sure pledge of our blessed resurrection.

Q. 5. Where is Christ now?

A. He ascended into heaven to be our Intercessor with the Father.

Q. 6. What does Scripture mean when it tells us that Christ sits at the right hand of God?

A. That God, having exalted Christ to the highest glory, put all things in subjection under His feet and gave Him to be head over all things to the Church. Eph. 1:22.

Q. 7. Is He not with us then even unto the end of the world, as He has promised us in Matt. 28:20?

A. With respect to His godhead, majesty, grace, and Spirit, He is never absent from us, but with respect to His human nature He remains in heaven till the end of the world.

Q. 8. What will happen when Christ returns?

A. All that are in the tombs shall hear His voice and shall come forth. John 5:28, 29.

Q. 9. What else will happen?

A. Christ will judge the living and the dead.

Q. 10. Will Christ not return before the end of the world?

A. No; the return of Christ will usher in new heavens and a new earth. II Peter 3:13.

LESSON XV.

Q. 1. What do you believe concerning the Holy Spirit?

A. That together with the Father and the Son He is the true and eternal God.

Q. 2. Prove from Scripture that the Holy Spirit is a divine person.

A. Acts 5:3, 4, "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Spirit? . . . thou hast lied not unto men, but unto God."

Q. 3. What does the Holy Spirit do for the world at large?

A. He is the author of all life, the source of all knowledge, and the giver of all talents.

Q. 4. What does the Holy Spirit do for God's people in particular?

A. He makes them partakers of Christ and His great salvation.

Q. 5. How does the Holy Spirit make men partakers of salvation?

A. By working in them regeneration, faith, conversion, sanctification, and glorification.

Q. 6. What is regeneration?

A. That making alive of dead sinners which Scripture calls being born anew. John 3:3.

Q. 7. How does the Holy Spirit work faith?

A. By accompanying the Word with such power that men cannot fail to believe.

Q. 8. What is conversion?

A. Conversion is a turning from sin to God.

Q. 9. What is sanctification?

A. Sanctification is the gradual transforming of believers into the likeness of Christ.

Q. 10. What is glorification?

A. The perfect cleansing of the soul in the moment of death.

Q. 11. Does the Holy Spirit ever forsake God's children?

A. No; John 14:17, "He abideth with you and shall be in you."

Q. 12. How may we know whether we have received the Holy Spirit and His saving grace?

A. By asking ourselves whether we show the fruits of the Spirit.

#### LESSON XVI.

Q. 1. What do you believe concerning the Holy Catholic Church?

A. That it is the gathering of all true believers, which is the body of Christ.

Q. 2. How does Christ gather the church?

A. By His Word and Spirit.

Q. 3. Whom does Christ gather into the church?

A. Those who are chosen to eternal life.

Q. 4. Prove that God has elected certain men to eternal life.

A. Eph. 1:4, "Even as He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blemish before Him in love."

Q. 5. Why is the church called holy?

A. Because it is separated from the world and consecrated to God.

Q. 6. Why is the church called catholic?

A. Because it includes the believers of every tribe and tongue and people and nation. Rev. 5:9.

Q. 7. What distinctions are commonly made with regard to the Church?

A. The church militant and the church triumphant; the visible and the invisible church.

Q. 8. How can we determine what is the best church?

A. By inquiring what church shows most clearly the marks of the true church.

Q. 9. What are the marks of the true church?

A. The pure preaching of God's Word, the proper administration of the sacraments, and the faithful exercise of Christian discipline.

Q. 10. What benefits does Christ bestow on His church?

A. The communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.

Q. 11. May we be satisfied with membership in the visible church?

A. No; we may not be satisfied except we know that we are living members of Christ.

### LESSON XVII.

Q. 1. What is one of the most blessed fruits of saving faith?

A. Justification.

Q. 2. What is justification?

A. Justification is that gracious act of God as Judge whereby He acquits sinners of all guilt and punishment, adopts them as His children, and makes them heirs of life eternal.

Q. 3. On what ground does God justify sinners?

A. Solely on the ground of the perfect satisfaction and righteousness of Christ.

Q. 4. Prove this from Scripture.

A. Phil. 3:9, "And be found in Him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith."

Q. 5. How is it to be understood that we are justified by faith?

A. Faith is the hand by which we receive Christ and His righteousness offered us in the gospel.

Q. 6. Show from Scripture that being justified by faith means the same thing as being justified by grace.

A. Rom. 3:28, "We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law."

Q. 7. Why cannot our good works be our righteousness before God or some part thereof?

A. Because even our best works in this life are imperfect and polluted with sin.

Q. 8. Do our good works then merit nothing which yet God will reward in this and in a future life?

A. This reward is not given out of merit but of grace.

Q. 9. What is the reward of grace?

A. A free gift which has not been earned.

Q. 10. Can believers have assurance of their justification?

A. Yes. Rom. 8:16, "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God."

### LESSON XVIII.

Q. 1. Who is the author of that faith which gives men a share in Christ and His salvation?

A. The Holy Spirit. II Cor. 12:3, "No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit."

Q. 2. By what means does the Holy Spirit work faith?

A. By the preaching of the Word.

Q. 3. Prove this from Scripture.

A. Rom. 10:17, "So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the Word of Christ."

Q. 4. Is the Gospel invitation general?

A. Yes, God commands all men everywhere to believe.

Q. 5. Is the preaching of the Gospel sufficient to work faith?

A. No, the Holy Spirit must apply the Gospel to our hearts.

Q. 6. Where does Scripture teach this?

A. In Acts 16:14, "Whose heart the Lord opened to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul."

Q. 7. How does the Holy Spirit strengthen faith?

A. By the preaching of the Word and the use of the Holy Sacraments.

Q. 8. What are the sacraments?

A. Holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace.

Q. 9. What is the covenant of grace?

A. It is the gracious arrangement whereby God promises His people complete salvation in the way of faith.

Q. 10. What do the sacraments signify and seal?

A. That God graciously grants us remission of sins and life eternal for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ finished on the cross.

Q. 11. How many sacraments has Christ instituted in the New Testament?

A. Two: Holy Baptism and the Holy Supper.

#### LESSON XIX.

Q. 1. What is the outward sign in Holy Baptism?

A. The water with which we are baptized.

Q. 2. Of what is this water a sign?

A. Of the washing away of our sins by the blood and Spirit of Jesus Christ.

Q. 3. Is baptism by sprinkling Scriptural?

A. Yes; Scripture speaks of sprinkling as a symbol of spiritual cleansing. Ezekiel 36:25, "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean."

Q. 4. What does Holy Baptism seal?

A. The trustworthiness of God's covenant-promise.

Q. 5. What is this covenant-promise?

A. That God will be the God of believers and of their children.

Q. 6. Who are entitled to baptism?

A. Believers and their children.

Q. 7. Why should the children of believers be baptized?

A. They, as well as their parents, are included in the covenant of God and in His church.

Q. 8. Prove this from Scripture.

A. According to Genesis 17 God commanded that infants of Abraham's household should receive circumcision as a seal of the covenant.

Q. 9. Can you give more proof?

A. In Acts 2:39 Peter tells us that children of covenant-members share the covenant-promise, and in I Cor. 7:14 Paul calls them holy.

Q. 10. To what do parents bind themselves when they present their children for baptism?

A. To instruct their children in the doctrine of salvation and to rear them in the fear of the Lord.

Q. 11. What does your baptism mean to you?

A. It means that I may confidently ask God for the fulfilment of all my needs, but it also means that I am under solemn obligation to trust, love, and serve God.

#### LESSON XX.

Q. 1. What is the outward sign of the Lord's Supper?

A. The broken bread which we eat and the poured-out wine which we drink.

Q. 2. What do these tokens signify?

A. That Christ with His crucified body and shed blood feeds and nourishes our souls to everlasting life.



Q. 3. How does this sacrament seal God's covenant-promise?

A. This sacrament assures God's people that their sins are forgiven them as certainly as they eat the bread and drink the cup.

Q. 4. Is the bread changed into the body of Christ and the wine into His blood?

A. No, no more than the water in baptism is changed into the blood of Christ.

Q. 5. Is Christ nevertheless present in the Lord's Supper?

A. Yes; though He is not present after the body, yet Christ communicates Himself in a spiritual way to all who hunger and thirst after His righteousness.

6. Is celebration of the Holy Supper a duty as well as a privilege?

A. Most certainly. Covenant-members who have arrived at years of discretion may not neglect Jesus' command: "This do in remembrance of Me," Luke 22:19.

Q. 7. Is it possible, however, to sin seriously in celebrating the Holy Supper?

A. Yes, when we partake of this sacrament in an unworthy manner. I Cor. 11:27.

Q. 8. How must we prepare ourselves for the proper celebration of the Lord's Supper?

A. By self-examination.

Q. 9. How must we examine ourselves before we come to the Lord's Supper?

A. We must ask ourselves whether we are truly sorry for our sins, whether we trust in Christ as our Savior, and whether it is our sincere purpose to lead a Christian life.

Q. 10. Does Scripture teach that public confession of faith is necessary?

A. Yes. Rom. 10:10, "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

## LESSON XXI.

Q. 1. What are the keys of the Kingdom?

A. The preaching of the Word and church discipline.

Q. 2. How does the preaching of the Word open the Kingdom of heaven?

A. By proclaiming that all those who believe in Christ and repent of their sins are heirs of heaven.

Q. 3. How does the preaching of the Word shut the Kingdom of heaven?

A. By proclaiming that the wrath of God abides on the unbelieving and impenitent.

Q. 4. Does such opening and shutting of the Kingdom of heaven have divine sanction?

A. Most assuredly; God will judge in full harmony with His Word.

Q. 5. How is the Kingdom of heaven shut by church discipline?

A. By forbidding the use of the sacraments to those who maintain unchristian doctrines or practices and by excluding such persons from the church in case they prove impenitent.

Q. 6. How is the Kingdom of heaven opened by church discipline?

A. By restoring to all the privileges of church-membership those who turn from the error of their way.

Q. 7. Prove from Scripture that church discipline must be applied to those who teach unchristian doctrines.

A. Gal. 1:9, "If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema."

Q. 8. Prove from Scripture that church discipline must be applied to those who indulge in unchristian practices.

A. II Thess. 3:6, "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly."

Q. 9. Why is church discipline necessary?

A. For the sake of the honor of Christ, the purity of the church, and for the spiritual welfare of the members.

Q. 10. Does excommunication really exclude from the Kingdom of Christ?

A. Yes it does, if applied according to the Word of God. Matt. 18:18, "What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven."

## LESSON XXII.

Q. 1. How must we manifest our gratitude for deliverance?

A. By good works.

Q. 2. Why, if we are saved by grace, must we do good works?

A. Not to merit heaven thereby but because God requires them.

Q. 3. Can we go to heaven if we do not do good works?

A. No; Scripture tells us that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. I Cor. 6:9.

Q. 4. Why is it impossible for us to go to heaven except we do good works?

A. Because good works always accompany saving faith as the fruit thereof.

Q. 5. What are good works?

A. Works that proceed from a true faith, are done according to the law of God, and aim at His glory.

Q. 6. What purpose do our good works serve?

A. They glorify God; they assure us of the sincerity of our faith; and they commend Christianity.

Q. 7. Prove from Scripture that God is glorified by the good works of believers.

A. John 15:8, "Herein is My Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit."

Q. 8. Prove from Scripture that good works can assure us of the sincerity of our faith.

A. Matt. 7:20, "Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

Q. 9. Prove from Scripture that good works commend Christianity.

A. Matt. 5:16, "Even so let your light shine before men; that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven."

Q. 10. Does Scripture even teach that the good works of believers can help win others for Christ?

A. Yes. In I Peter 3:1 we are told that the Christian conduct of believing wives may win their unbelieving husbands for Christ.

### LESSON XXIII.

- Q. 1. What is the Christian's rule of life?  
A. The law of God known as the Ten Commandments.
- Q. 2. What is the preface to the Ten Commandments?  
A. I am Jehovah, thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.
- Q. 3. What does this preface teach us?  
A. That we are bound to keep His commandments, because God is our Covenant God and Redeemer.
- Q. 4. Can Christians keep the law perfectly?  
A. No; even the most holy men, while in this life, have only a small beginning of obedience. James 3:2, "For in many things we all stumble."
- Q. 5. May Christians be satisfied with their imperfection?  
A. No; they must strive every day anew after sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord. Heb. 12:14.
- Q. 6. What is sanctification?  
A. Sanctification is the daily renewal of our hearts and lives, also called daily conversion.
- Q. 7. What does this include?  
A. A continual dying unto sin and growth in holiness.
- Q. 8. What is an indispensable requirement for sanctification?  
A. Fellowship with Christ. John 15:4, "Abide in Me and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in Me."
- Q. 9. What means must we employ to promote our sanctification?  
A. We must study God's Word earnestly, make a faithful use of the sacraments, and abound in prayer.
- Q. 10. Can we be sure that sanctification will issue in glorification?  
A. Yes. Phil. 1:6, "Being confident of this very thing, that He who began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ."

### LESSON XIV.

- Q. 1. What great truth is the basis of the first commandment?  
A. That Jehovah is the one and only God.
- Q. 2. What does the first commandment require?  
A. It requires that we know, trust, love, and serve the only true God.
- Q. 3. What does the first commandment forbid?  
A. It condemns all atheism and idolatry and forbids placing in any creature the trust that we must place in God.
- Q. 4. Upon what great truth is the second commandment based?  
A. That God is a Spirit.
- Q. 5. What does the second commandment forbid?  
A. It forbids worshipping God by images or in any other way than He has commanded in His Word.
- Q. 6. What does the second commandment require?  
A. It requires that we worship God in spirit and truth.
- Q. 7. What great truth does the third commandment teach?  
A. That God is a God of infinite holiness.
- Q. 8. What does the third commandment forbid?  
A. It forbids all profanity and irreverent use of God's name or Word.

Q. 9. What does the third commandment require?

A. It requires reverence for God and for His name and Word and work.

Q. 10. What is the great truth underlying the fourth commandment?

A. That our souls can find rest and joy only in God.

Q. 11. What does the fourth commandment require?

A. That we set apart the day that God appointed to worship Him in His house and in our homes.

Q. 12. What does the fourth commandment forbid?

A. All unnecessary labor and all other activities on the Sabbath day that hinder us in the worship of God.

### LESSON XXV.

Q. 1. What fundamental truth is taught in the fifth commandment?

A. That God has set some men in authority over others.

Q. 2. What does God require of us in the fifth commandment?

A. That we show all honor, love, and loyalty to our parents and to all in authority over us, also in church and state.

Q. 3. What does God condemn in the fifth commandment?

A. God condemns all disobedience and disrespect toward all those in authority.

Q. 4. What is the fundamental principle underlying the sixth commandment?

A. The sacredness of human life.

Q. 5. What does God forbid in the sixth commandment?

A. God forbids all envy, hatred, desire for revenge, and murder.

Q. 6. What does God require in the sixth commandment?

A. God requires that we promote the well-being of our neighbors as much as in us lies.

Q. 7. What is the underlying principle of the seventh commandment?

A. Purity.

Q. 8. What does God forbid in the seventh commandment?

A. God forbids all unchaste thoughts and deeds whether in wedlock or in single life.

Q. 9. What does God require in the seventh commandment?

A. That I live chastely and temperately, since both my body and soul are temples of the Holy Spirit.

### LESSON XXVI.

Q. 1. What is the underlying thought of the eighth commandment?

A. The right of private property.

Q. 2. What does God forbid in the eighth commandment?

A. God forbids theft, robbery, gambling, and every wicked device by which we unlawfully gain our neighbor's goods.

Q. 3. What does God require in the eighth commandment?

A. Honest labor and fair dealings with our neighbor.

Q. 4. What is the underlying principle of the ninth commandment?

A. The sacredness of truth.

Q. 5. What does God forbid in the ninth commandment?

A. All falsehood, slander, back-biting, and gossip, and whatever injures my neighbor's good name.

- Q. 6. What does God require in the ninth commandment?  
A. That I protect the good name of my neighbor and promote all truth.
- Q. 7. What is the underlying thought of the tenth commandment?  
A. Jehovah looketh on the heart.
- Q. 8. What doth God forbid in the tenth commandment?  
A. All desire for the forbidden and every evil inclination of the heart.
- Q. 9. What does God require in the tenth commandment?  
A. That I love the law of God with all my heart.

### LESSON XXVII.

- Q. 1. To what should the study of the Ten Commandments lead us?  
A. To a prayerful endeavor by the grace of God to become more and more conformed to His image.
- Q. 2. What is prayer?  
A. Prayer is speaking with God.
- Q. 3. What does prayer involve?  
A. Adoration, confession, petition, and thanksgiving.
- Q. 4. To whom must we pray?  
A. Not to any creature, but to God alone.
- Q. 5. In whose name must we pray?  
A. In the name of Christ, His Son, who has merited all things for us.
- Q. 6. Why must we pray?  
A. Because prayer is the highest expression of faith, and it is the way in which God wills to supply our needs.
- Q. 7. Who must teach us to pray?  
A. The Holy Spirit.
- Q. 8. How should we pray?  
A. We must pray with sincerity, in true humbleness, and in child-like trust.
- Q. 9. Does God answer prayer?  
A. Yes; Jesus says, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." Matt. 7:7.
- Q. 10. What are we to pray for?  
A. For all things which Christ, our Lord, has comprised in the prayer that He Himself has taught us.
- Q. 11. What are the words of that prayer?  
A. Our Father who art in heaven,  
Hallowed be Thy name;  
Thy kingdom come;  
Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.  
Give us this day our daily bread;  
And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors;  
And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.  
For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

LESSON XXVIII

- Q. 1. Why do we address God as "Our Father"?
- A. Because He is our Father in Christ, to whom we come with childlike reverence and confidence.
- Q. 2. Why is it added "who art in heaven"?
- A. That we may realize the heavenly majesty and almighty power of our Father.
- Q. 3. What do we pray for in the first petition?
- A. That God may be known and honored and praised in all His works.
- Q. 4. What do we pray for in the second petition?
- A. That the kingdom of grace may be advanced, the works of the devil destroyed, and the kingdom of glory hastened.
- Q. 5. What do we pray for in the third petition?
- A. That we may renounce our will and obey God's will as faithfully as the angels do.
- Q. 6. What do we pray for in the fourth petition?
- A. That God may provide us with all things necessary for the body, and that we may trust in Him only for these needs.
- Q. 7. What do we pray for in the fifth petition?
- A. That God for Christ's sake may pardon all our sins, a thing which we are encouraged to ask because we by His grace forgive others.
- Q. 8. What do we pray for in the sixth petition?
- A. That God may either keep us from being tempted to sin, or give us grace to overcome temptation.
- Q. 9. What does the conclusion of the perfect prayer mean?
- A. That God is able and willing to hear us and that we ascribe all glory to Him.
- Q. 10. What does the final word "Amen" mean?
- A. That we believe God will assuredly hear our prayer.

A P P E N D I X

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS according to EXODUS 20:1-17

And God spake all these words, saying,

I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

- I. Thou shalt have no other gods before Me.
- II. Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them; for I Jehovah thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate Me, and showing lovingkindness unto thousands of them that love Me and keep My commandments.
- III. Thou shalt not take the name of Jehovah thy God in vain; for Jehovah will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain.
- IV. Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath unto Jehovah thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore Jehovah blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.
- V. Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee.
- VI. Thou shalt not kill.
- VII. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
- VIII. Thou shalt not steal.
- IX. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.
- X. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's.

## REPORT VII.

### REPORT CONCERNING THE INTRODUCTION OF A COURSE OF STUDY FOR PROSPECTIVE EVAN- GELISTIC MINISTERS

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

OUR mandate is found in the following resolutions of the Synod of 1936, which are printed on page 40 of its Acts:

"1. (That) since there are at present training schools in some places for lay workers, Synod now declare that the Committee is to interpret its mandate as pertaining to prospective evangelistic ministers only, that is to say, such as wish to specialize, as future ministers, in mission work.

Adopted.

2. Synod discharge the present Committee (Reporting in Agenda I, p. 17) and request the Seminary Faculty to report to the next Synod concerning the feasibility of such a course, and, if considered feasible, to suggest a way in which this might be carried out.

Reason: This work seems to belong properly to the domain of the Seminary Faculty.

Adopted."

The problem of providing evangelistic training has been discussed by our Synods ever since 1932, but little headway was made due to the unclarity as to whether the course of study was to be for prospective ministers only or also for laymen who wished to engage in evangelistic work. This uncertainty has now been removed by the first of the synodical resolutions reproduced above. And our task is limited to advising Synod,

1. as to the feasibility of such a course for such prospective ministers as wish to specialize in evangelistic work; and,
2. as to the way in which such a course might be introduced.



The question of the feasibility of a course of study for prospective evangelistic ministers embraces among others the question whether the Faculty in its present strength will be able to carry the additional load. On this point, we think we can assure Synod, that no serious difficulty stands in the way.

Another question is, whether within the three years of seminary work, which are at present required of every one who seeks the ministry in the Christian Reformed Church, room can be found for the additional studies which it will become necessary to introduce. For, on the one hand, the present seminary curriculum offers no subjects of study which can easily be eliminated as being more or less of a luxury for anyone who desires the ministry of the Gospel in our times. And, on the other hand, the new subjects of study, in order to furnish effective preparation for evangelistic work, can not be kept down to a few additional hours for which possibly place might be found within the three years and next to the studies required at present of all our regular seminary students. The only solution, which we see, is the addition of a fourth year of study for such students as wish to prepare themselves for evangelistic work and to specialize in that type of work in their ministry.

As to the subjects of study which ought to find a place in a course calculated to meet the needs of the prospective evangelistic minister, we offer the following suggestions, subject to revision on the basis of later actual experience. In the first place, evangelistic work is a type of missionary labor, and the minister engaging in it should have a rather thorough knowledge of both, the general field of missions, and the special department of evangelization. In the second place, the people to whom he is to minister and the proper way of ministering to those people are much more foreign and strange to the prospective evangelistic minister than are the Christians among whom he has grown up and the spiritual ministrations of which he has been the recipient to the minister who serves or is to serve a Christian church. The evangelistic minister-to-be will therefore have to acquire a knowledge of the milieu in which and the conditions under which the recipients of his ministrations are living, and as much practical training as possible under the best expert guidance that can be had.

These considerations lead us to suggest, that for the contemplated extra year of specialized evangelistic training the following curriculum might well be considered:

	Semester Hours
History of Missions.....	3
Theory of Missions.....	3
Rise and Growth of Evangelism.....	3
Evangelistic Technique.....	3
Evangelistic Sociology.....	6
Practical Training.....	6

---

Total number of semester hours.....24

Under the suggested regulation for ministerial training, the choice of a special course in evangelistic training and the devotion of an extra year to it would be entirely optional with the students. When this idea was first broached, in 1932, the interest then apparent in the matter emboldened Synod to declare, "that the rampant neopaganism of our day and land" . . . "also require that, if possible, in addition to the regular pastor, the church or churches engage an ordained minister especially for this evangelistic work" (Syn. Acts, p. 20, A). However, the interest has since then, presumably largely due to the continued economic depression, died down appreciably, and Synod's declaration has hitherto stimulated no church or churches to meet the requirement by calling a second pastor for evangelistic work. Under these conditions the necessary incentive is lacking to induce students for the Christian Reformed ministry to volunteer for evangelistic work and to sacrifice a year in special preparation for such work. The problem will be to seek to remove this lack of inducements.

We are glad to be able to state, that the removal of this lack of incentives is not beyond the scope of possibility. Certainly the urgency of evangelism has not decreased, and it is to be hoped, that returning prosperity will enable the Church's realization of its duty in this respect to increase and to find effective expression. On the academic side, the introduction of a postgraduate course in our Seminary has since 1930 met with a gratifying response from our own more recent graduates as well as others, so that it is evident, that there is among them an interest in a longer theological course. In ministerial conferences and otherwise the idea of requiring an internship of our

prospective ministers and providing the same for them has been broached, as also the possibility and desirability of adding courses in the field of Practical Theology, neither of which ideals seem capable of proper realization without the lengthening of the required seminary course beyond the present three years. And if an additional year of preparation should be required of our prospective ministers, the possibility of providing for some optional diversification of course and aim of study would be opened and the chances greatly heightened, that some of the students would choose a course that aims to prepare specifically for evangelism.

It is evident at first glance, that all these various ideas that have for some time been afloat among us are connected and that they find their common center in what may be designated as the problem of the future development of our Seminary. For that reason we would not advise the introduction of a course in evangelistic training without previous thorough study of its connection with and bearing on the solution of the larger problem of the future development and enlargement of our Seminary. Certainly the expansion and development of our Seminary beyond the scope of the introduction merely of an optional course in evangelistic training without an increase in the Seminary's teaching personnel must, to put it mildly, be deemed highly problematical.

May the Lord clear the way for an energetic and wise advance in the important field of kingdom work represented by evangelism and may He lead our Church into it.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Faculty of Calvin Seminary.

## REPORT VIII.

### REPORT CONCERNING THE PENSIONING OF RETIRING SEMINARY PROFESSORS

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE Faculty's mandate in this matter is found on page 45 of the Acts of the Synod of 1936, in the following passage:

"B. In regard to the proposal of the Board that the same pension plan shall apply to the professors of both the College and the Seminary,

Your Committee recommends that Synod requests the Seminary Faculty to advise the next Synod,

1. Whether and why they deem it desirable that the custom now in vogue in regard to the pensioning of retired Seminary professors shall continue;
2. Or, whether and why they wish either of the following two rules to apply:
  - a. The one proposed by the Board of Trustees;
  - b. Or, Article 13 of our Church Order.

Adopted."

It is evident that this request of Synod was occasioned by the overture of the Board of Trustees of Calvin College and Seminary, which is recorded in its report to Synod under (4) on page 170 of the synodical Acts of 1936. In order to have a complete picture of the background of the present request of Synod to the Seminary Faculty, it should be known, that the Faculty was approached during the school year 1935-1936 by the Board of Finance of Calvin College and Seminary with the request to appoint one of its members to co-operate with the Board in drawing up a pension plan for the professors. However, in view of the fact, that hitherto the pensioning of retiring Seminary professors had always been taken care of by special resolution of Synod as each new case came up, and that to the knowledge of the Faculty Synod had nowhere expressed a desire that this custom should cease, the Faculty judged it to be beyond its competency to accept such an invitation and therefore wrote to the Board of Finance, as follows:

“The Faculty does not feel free to appoint any of its members for this task, since it is not aware of the fact that Synod (by which the pensions of theological professors have always been fixed) has instructed any body of men to prepare such a plan as bearing on the Seminary professors.”

If perhaps from this action of the Faculty the thought has been gathered, that it entertained objections to the pension plan worked out by the Board and that it preferred to express its own ideas and wishes in the matter to Synod, such is to be regretted. For nothing was farther from the intent and meaning of the Faculty. To the contrary: we wish to avoid the indelicacy, involved in expressing ourselves as public servants of the entire Church, whose action will go on record, accessible to the whole Church, on a financial question which so directly concerns our own interests as this question does.

These same considerations prompt us also now, to beg to be excused from complying with this request of Synod. We fully appreciate the good will, manifest in the opening of this opportunity for the Faculty to voice its opinion on this subject, which naturally interests every one of its members. But we prefer, without the expression of any preference whatsoever, to leave the regulation of the pensioning of retiring Seminary professors to the fairness of the Church and the wisdom of Synod.

From what has been said, we trust it is clear, that our immediate difficulty arises from the predominantly subjective character of the advice which Synod requested of us. It is true, that the request can be read so as to call for, or at least to admit of, advice also concerning such objective factors involved in the matter of the care for retiring Seminary professors as, for instance, the principle on which such care is or should be based. Nevertheless, the fact is unmistakable, that the questions put to the Faculty throw the emphasis on our subjective attitude, since they speak of desirability and ask outright what our wishes in the matter are.

However, our difficulty is not solely with the broad scope and subjective emphasis of these questions, but fully as much with their implications as to the principle involved in this matter. Article 13 of our Church Order voices it as the conviction of our Church, that the ministers' duty of lifelong service and the Church's duty of lifelong sup-

port are reciprocal duties. The questions addressed to the Faculty, as they stand, imply, that these reciprocal duties and obligations do not hold with respect to the relation of the Church and its Seminary professors—at least, that hitherto our Church has not cared for its retired Seminary professors on that basis, and that it will not do so when the rule proposed by the Board of Trustees is applied, and that the possible application of Article 13 is, in the case of retiring Seminary professors, a matter, not of duty, but of the wishes and agreement of contracting parties. We are not at present concerned with the question of the correctness of these plain implications, nor with the further question, in case they are correct, what must follow either for the ministerial standing of the Church's Seminary professors, or for Article 13 of our Church Order. But we are concerned with the antecedent question, whether or not the Synod intended these implications and whether or not the Church means them.

We believe, whatever may possibly become true in the future, at the present time this question must be answered in the negative. We believe, that those implications of the questions addressed to the Seminary Faculty, as far as the intent and meaning of the Synod and the Church are concerned, have slipped into their formulation unawares. We have no knowledge of the presence, in whatever scant public attention this matter of the pensioning of retiring Seminary professors has received, of any evidence to the contrary. In fact, we are not aware of any desire, entertained on the part of the Church and expressed through its regular governing bodies, of a change in the custom now in vogue with respect to the care for retiring Seminary professors. In case such a desire does exist and should emerge, we hope the Church through Synod will not act upon it without previous consideration of the bearing which Article 13 of our Church Order may have upon the matter of the financial care for retired Seminary professors.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Faculty of Calvin Seminary.

## REPORT IX.

### REPORT OF THE EMERITUS FUND COMMITTEE

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

**T**HE Synod of 1932 decided that "The Support of the Emeriti Ministers, their widows and orphans, founded upon the Word of God and prescribed in Art. 13 C. O., is not a matter of charity, but is the right of the parties named and the duty of the churches as a whole." (Acts of Synod 1932, p. 49) The Synod of 1934 decided that "the clergy shall be asked to contribute to the Emeritus Fund according to a fixed scale." (Acts of Synod 1934, p. 166) Your Committee was appointed by the Synod of 1936 to present a plan which shall include both elements (Acts of Synod 1936, p. 66). We hereby submit this plan to you.

#### **Rules for the Pension and Relief Funds of the Christian Reformed Church of America.**

##### ARTICLE 1

For the execution of Article 13 of the Church Order, the Christian Reformed Church of America shall maintain a Pension Fund and a Relief Fund from which emeritated ministers and widows and orphans of ministers shall receive aid as hereinafter stipulated.

##### ARTICLE 2

The administration of these funds shall be in charge of a committee of five persons appointed by the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church of America. This committee shall be composed of two ministers and three other office-bearers or former office-bearers. It shall be incorporated as the Board of the Emeritus Fund of the Christian Reformed Church of America. Synod shall appoint, in every even-numbered year, alternately, three and two members. Members who are functioning may be re-elected. An alternate shall be appointed for each member.

##### ARTICLE 3

The duties of the Emeritus Board shall be as follows:

- a. It shall elect its own officers.
- b. It shall receive and administrate all moneys contributed for the Pension Fund and Relief Fund, and shall disburse them in accordance with these rules and further decisions of Synod.

- c. It shall give a full report of its activities to Synod.
- d. It shall submit to Synod a budget for the ensuing year.
- e. It shall bond its treasurer for the sum of \$10,000 and shall have his books audited by a competent accountant.
- f. It shall have authority to gather all the necessary data from the churches and from the ministers for the administration of these funds.

#### ARTICLE 4

The Pension Fund shall be maintained by contributions from the churches and from the ministers as follows:

- a. Synod shall determine from time to time what each church shall contribute proportionate to the number of its families.
- b. These contributions from the churches shall be sent to the treasurer of the Board in quarterly payments.
- c. All ministers desiring for themselves and for their widows and orphans the benefits of this fund shall contribute annually 3% of their salary. The consistory will deduct this amount from the salary of the minister and send it quarterly to the treasurer of the Board.
- d. As all ministers do not receive a separate auto allowance, the ministers who do receive such, shall add it to their salary in order to compute the amount to be paid. Those who receive more than \$200.00 allowance due to the special needs of their work, such as missionaries and others, shall not be called upon to add more than \$200.00 of the allowance to the salary.

#### ARTICLE 5

The Pension Fund shall be disbursed as follows:

- a. All ministers who have served the Christian Reformed Church of America ten years or more, shall, upon emeritation, receive as an annual pension, two-fifths of the average annual salary of the ministers in the Christian Reformed Church.
- b. When an emeritated minister is officially declared eligible to entertain a call from the churches, his pension shall cease not later than one year from that date.
- c. All widows of ministers who have served the Christian Reformed Church of America ten years or more and who themselves have served in the manse, shall receive as an annual pension one-third of the average salary of ministers of the Christian Reformed Church. Upon re-marriage their pension shall cease.
- d. Orphans of ministers who have served the Christian Reformed Church of America ten years or more, shall receive an annual pension of \$75.00 until their eighteenth birthday, unless physically or mentally incapacitated, in which case their pension shall be continued. However, orphans of one family shall never receive together more pension than that to which their mother would have been entitled.

#### ARTICLE 6

A Relief Fund for those emeritated ministers, widows, and orphans who, because of special circumstances, need more than the allotted pensions, shall be maintained and administered as follows:



- a. This fund shall be maintained by free-will offerings of the churches. The Board shall keep the churches informed as to the needs of this fund.
- b. Any recipient of the above pensions, if special circumstances warrant it, may apply for aid to this fund. This application, to be made on a blank provided by the Board, shall state reason for and extent of need, and shall have the approval of the consistory of the applicant. Upon receipt of such application duly filled in and approved, the Board shall grant such aid, subject to the approval of Synod, as it deems necessary. Application for aid from this fund must be renewed at the beginning of every fiscal year with the approval of the applicant's consistory.
- c. The total pension and relief granted shall never exceed two-thirds of the average salary of the ministers of the Christian Reformed Church of America.
- d. Lack of personal means shall be the primary basis upon which application for aid from this fund can be granted.
- e. The payments from this fund shall be reported to the advisory committee of Synod and, if Synod desires, to the Synod itself in executive session. These payments shall receive no further publicity.

#### ARTICLE 7

All income from legacies, unless otherwise specified, shall be divided as follows: one-third to be put in the Relief Fund, and the Pension Fund to receive the remaining two-thirds; and shall be kept as Capital Funds, only the interest of these to be used for the benefit of the Pension and the Relief Funds.

#### ARTICLE 8

The Synod of the Christian Reformed Church of America reserves the right to alter and amend these rules as may be required and justified by experience and the available resources for the general advantage of the Church.

The Committee advises Synod to divide the present Capital Fund in the same manner as future legacies viz. one third for the Relief Fund and two thirds for the Pension Fund.

If the above plan is adopted your committee presents the following revision of Art. 13 of our Church Order. The article to read as follows:

*Ministers who, by reason of age, sickness, or otherwise, are rendered incapable of performing the duties of their office, shall nevertheless retain the honor and title of a minister, and the Church which they have served shall provide honorably for them (likewise for the orphans and widows of ministers) out of the common funds of the churches, according to the general ecclesiastical ordinances in this matter.*

We also recommend that Synod decide, that those ministers who have served the churches 35 years or have reached the age of 65 and who desire to retire upon proper emeritation, are eligible to the benefit of these funds. *Ground:*

It may be that those who have served the Church so many years or have reached that age would like to retire. This privilege should be given to them in view of the many years of service.

Your Committee has found upon investigation that the average salary of the ministers is about \$1,600.00. It has learned that the amount needed to put the above plan in operation is about \$41,000.00 for the coming year. 3% of the ministers' salaries would bring about \$12,480.00. An assessment of \$1.40 per family would bring about \$34,440.00. A total of \$46,920.00. Your committee is of the opinion that an assessment of \$1.40 per family per year is necessary in order that if at all possible a small surplus be created.

Respectfully submitted,

Your Committee,

Y. P. DEJONG

WM. KOK

GEO. J. BROODMAN

TONY NOORDEWIER

RALPH J. BOS

## **REPORT X.**

### **REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON REVISED MISSION ORDER TO SYNOD OF THE CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH**

*To the Synod of 1938.*

ESTEEMED BRETHREN :

**T**HE mandate of your committee is found on page 58 Acts of Synod 1936 and reads as follows: We (Advisory Committee) therefore advise

1. That Synod declare itself in favor of an arrangement whereby our mission work shall be under the control of Synod. Adopted.

2. That our Mission Order be so revised that Synodical control for the sake of unity and co-operation be established. Adopted.

3. That a Committee be appointed to prepare this revision, and submit this to the following Synod. Adopted. (Cf. Art. 188 for appointment of committee.)

In obedience to this mandate your Committee humbly submits the following to your honorable body:

#### **Proposed Mission Order for the Indian and China Missions of the Christian Reformed Church**

##### **PREAMBLE**

It is the sacred duty, as well as blessed privilege, of all individual Christians and Churches to take part in the fulfillment of Christ's Great Commission to evangelize the world. However, for the sake of order and unity in the work at home and on the field, certain rules and regulations should be observed. These rules and regulations governing the work of the Indian and China Missions of The Christian Reformed Church are found in the following paragraphs:

##### **ARTICLE I.**

###### **SYNOD**

Proceeding from the principle that Synod, in its annual assembly, shall conduct and supervise all the work, in as far as possible;  
**SYNOD —**

**SECTION 1.** Determines and designates the fields in which work is to be carried on, as also the particular places or posts on the field that shall be occupied.

SECTION 2. Appoints the individual churches to officially extend missionary calls in its behalf to the men whom she has chosen to serve on the field. The CALL-LETTER shall be drawn up by Synod and signed by its President and Clerk.

SECTION 3. Shall consider and decide all matters pertaining to the work and of all matters in connection therewith, as the financial support of her missionaries and their helpers, salaries, children or educational and auto allowances, pensions, housing, etc.

SECTION 4. Shall consider and determine the Annual Budget for the work, designating the quota per family to balance it.

SECTION 5. Appoints the Members of the Board as proposed by the several Classes and elects from a nomination the three delegates-at-large.

SECTION 6. Elects the Secretary of Missions.

SECTION 7. Shall have final decision as to expansion or retrenchment of the work and the dismissing or recalling of Missionaries.

## ARTICLE II.

### THE CHRISTIAN REFORMED BOARD OF MISSIONS

Proceeding from the assumption that the Synod will need an agency to carry out its decisions, adopted while assembled, and to act for it in matters and emergencies that may arise and call for action before it meets again, there shall be an approved Synodical Board of Missions, WHICH SHALL:

SECTION 1. Be incorporated and known as the Christian Reformed Board of Missions, consisting of one member from each Classis and three members-at-large elected by the Synod. Each Classis shall propose its representative to be appointed on this Board. The term of membership shall be for two years.

SECTION 2. Have the following officers: (1) President; (2) Vice-President; (3) Secretary; (4) Treasurer. Each of these shall be responsible for the duties generally appertaining to these offices.

SECTION 3. Meet annually; to approve its report to Synod, to prepare a proposed Budget to be submitted to Synod, to make recommendations to Synod as to fields, personnel, and work.

SECTION 4. Be represented during the course of the year by an Executive Committee consisting of the members of the Michigan and Illinois Classes and the three Synodical members. All actions taken by this committee shall be incorporated in its minutes, copies of which shall be sent to each member of the Board. Where it is possible, any new matter shall first be submitted by the Secretary to all members of the Board before definite action is taken. A report pertaining to matters of general interest shall be sent after each meeting to all consistories.

The Executive Committee meets bi-monthly or as often as the work may require.

SECTION 5. Through its Executive Committee appoint all undordained workers and missionary helpers. All such appointments shall be for one year, unless the Synod in assembly should decide to make an exception in certain cases.

SECTION 6. Through its Executive Committee carry out all the decisions of Synod. Only in such other matters and emergencies, which cannot wait until the next meeting of Synod, may the Board take definite action.

### ARTICLE III.

(*Director of Missions*)

Adopted by Synod 1920. See Acts 1920, pp. 84-86.

SECTION 1. The Secretary of Missions shall labor under the supervision of the Christian Reformed Board of Missions, of which he shall be a member *ex-officio*.

SECTION 2. *His Duties Regarding the Board.* To act as its Secretary in keeping full and complete record of the transactions of the Board and its Executive Committee, conducting and having charge of the correspondence of the Board, and keeping files of all the letters and papers concerning the work of the Christian Reformed Board of Missions, (for which purpose he shall be provided with the necessary office equipment); to arrange and bring up all such business as requires the attention of the Board and its Executive Committee; to submit such documents as may be necessary for their information; to prepare and submit to the Board the reports to the Synod; and to attend the meetings of Synod for advisory services concerning mission matters.

SECTION 3. *His Duties Regarding the Missionaries.* To visit them and their fields from time to time, as directed by the Christian Reformed Board of Missions, for the purpose of counseling with them concerning their work and assisting them in case of difficulties which may have arisen or are likely to arise, adjusting personal relations between the various workers, if necessary, and bringing about such understanding and harmonious coöperation between the workers of the various posts as shall promote the harmony and well-being of the work.

SECTION 4. *His Duties Regarding Other Missionary Organizations.* To attend the meetings of the Home Mission Council and the Foreign Missions Conference and of such of their respective committees as his work in the interests of our own mission requires, and to place himself in such personal contact with our own Jewish and Home Mission organizations as will enable him to advocate properly their interests as set forth in Section 5.

SECTION 5. *His Duties Regarding the Denomination.* To visit as many classical meetings and congregations as his other duties allow; to enlighten and enthuse people on the subject of missions in all its branches; to stimulate prayer for missions and the study of mission literature; to have Christian young men and women consecrate themselves to the cause of missions at home and abroad; to organize, wherever deemed necessary, missionary societies and mission festivals and conferences and to present the cause of missions to these meetings. He shall also write or edit and advance the publication of such missionary literature as covers entire field of our missionary activities at home and abroad. And since the Church has no general budget for missions, he is charged with studying the financial problems of our heathen mission work and to promote such giving, by individuals and congregations, as will, with God's blessing, provide the means needed for our missionary undertakings.

SECTION 6. The Secretary of Missions shall provide the Christian Reformed Board of Missions with bi-monthly reports of his work.

SECTION 7. He shall be allowed one month vacation each year, to be taken at such times as shall least interfere with his work, the vacations to be arranged in consultation with the Board of Missions.

SECTION 8. The above named Sections may be changed or amended only by Synod, although the Mission Board, in case of necessity, may provisionally alter them in minor respects.

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE CALLING CHURCHES

SECTION 1. These are appointed by Synod to call and to send out officially in the name of Synod the missionaries chosen by Synod.

SECTION 2. They shall, if possible, contribute toward the salaries of these missionaries. When this contribution amounts to two-thirds or more of the salary of this missionary or amounts to double the quota they are obliged to pay the Church, they upon request shall be excused from the quota for the work in which this missionary is engaged.

SECTION 3. They shall keep in personal contact with these missionaries in conjunction with the Church and Classis in the midst of which the Missionary labors, and have oversight as to their doctrine and conduct.

SECTION 4. They shall receive a report from their missionary at least quarterly.

#### ARTICLE V.

##### THE MISSIONARIES

SECTION 1. *Qualifications.* (1) Age. Preferably between 24 and 32. (2) Health: Robust health, verified by physician's examination. If married this also holds for his family. (3) Special love for and adaptability to mission work, verified by past experience and activity in this line. This also to be taken into account as to his wife. (4) Approved ability to work in coöperation with, and if necessary, under supervision of other missionaries and the Board, appointed by Synod to have oversight of the work. (5) Tact and discretion to associate with outsiders, as Government officials and employees with whom he may and would come in contact on the field. (6) Academic and practical requirements: *a.* Studious character; *b.* Special linguistic ability (to be verified by his record while at school); *c.* Apt teaching and acceptable speaking qualifications. (7) Administrative ability: *a.* Able and willing to take the initiative in affairs pertaining to his work; *b.* Good leadership. (8) All other things being equal, preference to be given to men who have already served in the ministry and have practical experience in ministerial and pastoral work.

SECTION 2. *Duties.* He shall do all he can in every way, preaching, teaching, visiting, etc., to promote and to further the cause for which he has been sent out.

SECTION 3. *Vacation and Furlough.* Missionaries on the Indian field shall be entitled to one calendar month vacation annually. Missionaries on the China field shall receive a furlough of approximately one year at the conclusion of each seven years of service abroad.

SECTION 4. Shall report regularly each quarter to the Board of Missions and to the Calling Churches.

## APPENDIX

### THE PRESENT SITUATION, ETC.

Synod and the Board, as Synod's agency, shall arrange to bring the situation obtaining at present into harmony with the provisions of this Mission Order whenever this is called for; however, no present contracts and agreements in force or existing relationships shall be abrogated or disturbed by the adoption of this Mission Order. Changes shall only be made after consultation with all parties concerned [the Synod (or Board), the Calling Churches, and the Missionaries], and upon mutual agreement.

HENRY BAKER  
GEORGE HYLKEMA  
JOHN DOLFIN

## I N D E X

REPORT	PAGE
I. REVISION OF ARTICLE XXXVI.....	4
II. ADVISABILITY OF CREEDAL REVISION.....	20
III. OUR ATTITUDE TO WAR.....	28
IV. DISCIPLINE .....	36
V. CONTACT BETWEEN SYNOD AND A. F. R. Y. M. S.....	44
VI. REVISION OF THE COMPENDIUM.....	49
VII. PROSPECTIVE EVANGELISTIC MINISTERS.....	71
VIII. PENSIONING OF RETIRING SEMINARY PROFESSORS....	75
IX. EMERITUS FUND COMMITTEE.....	78
X. REVISED MISSION ORDER.....	82



## CHINA

