

AGENDA

Synod Christian Reformed Church

*To convene June 9, 1943
at Grand Rapids, Mich.*

PART II: **RELATED** **REPORTS &** **OVERTURES**

Office of the Stated Clerk
1137 Turner Avenue, N.W.
Grand Rapids, Mich., U.S.A.

AGENDA

Synod Christian Reformed Church

*To convene June 9, 1943
at Grand Rapids, Mich.*

PART II: **BELATED** **REPORTS &** **OVERTURES**

Office of the Stated Clerk
1137 Turner Avenue, N.W.
Grand Rapids, Mich., U.S.A.

P R E F A C E

This Agenda, Part II, for the Synod of 1943, contains belated Reports, a list of the synodical delegates, overtures, a list of appeals, etc.

Tuesday evening, June 8, 1943, at 8:00 o'clock, D. V., PRAYER MEETING FOR SYNOD in the Seymour Christian Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Mich., led by the Rev. Herman Bel, president of the Synod of 1942.

Wednesday, June 9, at 10:00 a. m., in the Calvin College Library building, the president of the previous Synod formally opens the synodical meeting with an appropriate address, prayer, and roll call.

According to established custom, our congregations are requested to prayerfully remember, on the preceding Sabbath, the forthcoming meeting of our Synod.

1137 Turner Ave., NW.

J. DE HAAN, JR., S. C.
Grand Rapids, Mich., U. S. A.

AGENDA

PART II

BELATED REPORTS

REPORT IV.

MISSION SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON PLANNING COMMITTEE

To the Synod of 1943:

THE undersigned committee was charged by the Synod of 1942 with drawing up a lesson plan for a proposed Mission Sunday School paper. (Cf. Acts 1942, pp 60,61) In its deliberations your committee enjoyed the counsel of a number of mission workers outside its own number, for whose valued suggestions we are grateful.

Your committee arrived at its results on the basis of the following convictions, which are presented herewith by way of preliminary explanation:

1. The typical Mission Sunday School has constant pupil "turn-over". A complete schedule of lessons, therefore, should cover the Bible in *no more* than three years.
 - b. Each year, in turn, should have an alteration of Old and New Testament material. A second reason for this alternation is the psychological principle of variety for the sake of sustained student interest.
2. The Sunday Schools have just completed a half year of Old Test. lessons. Hence the choice of Gospel material to begin the initial year, lest immediate duplication ensue.
3. Since the writers of the lesson explanation determine the central message of each lesson, it is their task, rather than that of the lesson planners, to select memory verses which appropriately epitomize each lesson. We take the liberty, however, of sending along occasional texts which urged themselves upon

us, during our deliberations, as being possibilities for memory verses. (These were sent to the Publication Committee of Chr. Ref'd Church, to relay to the lesson writers.)

4. In the present experimental stage it would be unwise to lay out, in detail, a lesson schedule for more than the initial year.

Respectfully submitted,

DR. G. GORIS
REV. ROLF VEENSTRA, *Sec'y*
REV. P. JONKER, JR.
MR. THOMAS AFMAN
MR. G. DYKMAN

LESSON PLAN FOR THE YEAR 1943

January	3	The Boy Jesus; Luke 2:40-52
	10	The Baptism of Jesus; John 1:19-34, Matt. 3:13-17, Mk. 1:9-11
	17	The Temptation of Jesus; Matt. 4:1-11
	24	Jesus' First Disciples; John 1:37-51
	31	Jesus' First Miracle; John 2:1-11
February	7	Jesus and Nicodemus; John 3:1-21
	14	Jesus and the Samaritan Woman; John 4:1-42
	21	Jesus at the Pool of Bethesda; John 5:1-18
	28	The Parable of the Sower; Matt. 13:3-8, 18-23
March	7	(Prayer Day Sunday) Jesus Teaches His Disciples to Pray; Matt. 6:5-13
	14	The Parable of the Tares and the Wheat; Matt. 13:24-30, 36-42
	21	The Parable of the Prodigal Son; Luke 15:11-24
	28	The Parable of the Rich Fool; Luke 12:16-21
April	4	Jesus in Gethsemane; Matt 26:30-46
	11	The Trial of Jesus; John 19:17-30
	18	Jesus' Crucifixion and Death; Luke 23:33-56
	25	Jesus Rises From the Dead; Matt. 28:1-15
May	2	The Risen Christ and The Two Discouraged Travelers; Luke 24:13-35
	9	Jesus Appears to His Disciples in the Upper Room; John 20:19-29
	16	Jesus Appears to His Disciples at the Lake; John 21:1-17
	23	The Risen Lord, the World's Savior; Matt. 28:16-20
	30	Jesus Ascends into Heaven; Luke 24:50-53, Acts 1:1-11
June	6	The Home to Which Jesus Went; John 14:1-4, Rev. 22:1-5
	13	Jesus Sends the Comforter; Acts 1:6-9, 2:1-40
	20	The Creation of the World; Gen. 1:1-25, 31
	27	The Creation of Man; Gen. 2:7, Ps. 8

July	4	The Beginning of the History of Man; Gen. 2:4-25
	11	The Beginning of Sin; Gen. 3:1-24
	18	Home Life Wrecked by Sin; Gen. 4:1-26
	25	The World-wide Result of Sin; Gen. 6
August	1	God's Judgment Upon Sin; Gen. 7 and 8
	8	The Renewed Outbreak of Sin; Gen. 9:18-27; 11:1-9
	15	Abraham Called to Leave Home; Gen. 12:1-9
	22	Lot's Choice and Its Results; Gen. 13 and 19
September	29	The Marriage of Isaac; Gen. 24
	5	Jacob and Esau; Gen. 25:27-34, 27:1-41
	12	Jacob and Uncle Laban; Gen. 29:1-30
	19	Joseph Sold Into Egypt; Gen. 37
October	26	Joseph In Prison; Gen. 40 and 41
	3	Joseph's Brethren Come to Egypt; Gen. 40: 53-57, chaps. 43, 44
	10	Joseph Reveals Himself to His Brethren; Gen. 45
	17	The Deaths of Jacob and Joseph; Gen. 49 and 50
November	24	The Life of Job; Job 1 and 42
	31	The Birth of Moses; Exodus 1:7-22, 2:1-10
	7	The Call of Moses; Exodus 3
	14	God Dealing with Stubborn Pharaoh; Exodus 7-11
December	21	The One Thankful Leper (Thanksgiving Sunday); Luke 17:11-19
	28	The Passover; Exodus 12:1-36
	5	The Birth of Jesus Foretold; Gen. 3:15, 49:10, Isa. 7:14, Isa. 9:2, 6, 7, Micah 5:2, Mal. 3:1-3
	12	The Birth of Jesus' Forerunner; Luke 1:5-23, 57-80 John 1:6, 19-29
	19	The Birth of Jesus; Luke 2:1-20
	26	Jesus' Reception By the Faithful; Luke 2:22-39

REPORT V.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE RE BETTER PROTECTION OF ARCHIVES

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

YOUR committee was appointed by the Synod of 1942 —“to arrange for more adequate protection for Synod's Archives”. Art. 127-11, Page 130, Acts of Synod of 1942.

Your committee has been looking over the opportunities at Calvin but we find no suitable room or place for the safety of the Archives of Synod. The vaults in both the College Building and the Seminary Building are now used to capacity. Neither do we find available any other room that might be used for this purpose. Our recommendation therefore is;

1. That the Archives of Synod be placed in a room at our Christian Reformed Publishing House, 47 Jefferson Avenue, where some of the records of synod are now kept. This room is in the fire-proof basement of this building and is 8 feet by 8 feet in size. There is no door to this room. A wooden door lined with tin may be fitted here at a small cost. A new fire-proof door is not available at the present on account of war priorities.
2. To instruct the Board of Trustees of Calvin College and Seminary to arrange for the building of a fire-proof vault wherein the records of Synod may be safely kept, in one of the new building additions proposed to be constructed on the Campus of Calvin when conditions warrant.

Respectfully submitted,

The Committee

J. J. BUITEN, *Chairman*

HENRY DENKEMA

HENRY J. VOSS, *Sec'y*

REPORT VI.

FAITH, PRAYER AND TRACT LEAGUE

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

ALTHOUGH many activities have been curtailed or retarded because everything is being put into the war effort, we are happy to be able to report that our League has been enabled to carry on without curtailment during the past year. More than that, this present conflict has opened up avenues of service, of which many are availing themselves. To be sure, we should supply every available comfort to those in the armed forces. So we can appreciate that "Camels" are sent out by the thousands every week. But how much better is the comfort and teaching of the Word of God, and of tracts that are built upon that Word. These latter it is our privilege to supply to all who wish to send them out.

During the past year 382,340 tracts were sold and 20,430 sent out gratis, making a total of 402,770 tracts sent out. With another half million tracts printed we have now reached a total of almost six million tracts.

The financial report, as of August 9, 1942, is as follows:

RECEIPTS

Balance on hand, Aug. 10, 1941.....	\$ 712.02
Membership Fees	33.00
Donations	1,717.76
Sale of Tracts.....	1,417.96

\$3,880.75

DISBURSEMENTS

Printing	\$1,262.80
Advertising	606.28
Postage	171.41
Supplies	54.64
Miscellaneous	27.37
Salary	350.00

\$2,472.50

Balance on hand, August 9, 1942.....

\$1,408.24

Trusting that our cause may again be commended to our people and churches, and wishing Synod God's blessing upon its labors, we are,

Yours in His service,

Faith, Prayer and Tract League,
Muskegon Heights, Mich.
S. G. BRONDSEMA, *Mgr.*

REPORT VII.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE REFORMED BIBLE INSTITUTE

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE Synod of 1941 charged your Committee with the following mandate:

- a. To make a thorough study of the history of Bible Schools in America;
- b. To determine, thereafter, whether there is room for a central national R. B. I. (day school), in our *Reformed system*;
- c. If the Committee should decide that there is room for such an institution as the R. B. I. (Day School) in our Reformed educational system, to suggest proper safeguards, in order that in the future we may whole-heartedly support this institution both morally and financially;
- d. To report at the next Synod. (See Acts of Synod of 1941, p. 104).

In its report to the Synod of 1942, your Committee advised Synod that it had not been able to complete its work; whereupon Synod continued the Committee for another year, appointing the Rev. G. Stob to serve in the place of professor-elect Rev. W. Hendricksen. The mandate of the Committee remained unchanged, and reads as quoted above.

Your Committee now has the following to report:

A. It has not been feasible to "make a thorough study of the history of Bible Schools in America."

1. Though several inquiries have been made, we have not been able to learn of any "history of Bible Schools in America" ever having been published or written.
2. In view of the lack of available source materials, a "thorough study of the history of Bible Schools in America" would require seeking access to and inquiring into the archives of a number of represent-

ative Bible Schools. Since this would involve a considerable expenditure of time and money, your committee did not feel free to enter upon this effort.

3. However, a partial study has been made by means of inquiries addressed to a number of Bible Institutes. From their replies it appears that these Bible Institutes were originally organized for the religious training of lay workers, but in view of the liberalization of denominational colleges and seminaries these Institutes were increasingly sought by aspirants for the ministry and missionary work and appealed to by Churches which desired a Bible-believing ministry, with a resulting enlargement of their facilities and curricula, and in many cases of their aims. A representative statement of this development is set forth in an address delivered by Dr. James M. Gray before a Baptist Ministers' meeting in New York City on May 6, 1935, and published in the Moody Bible Institute Monthly of October, 1935. From it we quote the following:

"The purpose of Mr. Moody was not to establish a school for ministers or pastors. He thought only of lay workers. He had in mind men and women of more advanced years who had been denied scholastic opportunities in their youth but who with a knowledge of the English Bible, gospel music, and practical methods of Christian work, especially personal work for souls, might be equipped for better service in their churches, and in the slums and destitute places of our great cities.

To use his own words: 'One great purpose we have in view is to raise up men and women who will be willing to lay their lives alongside of the laboring class and the poor and bring the gospel to bear upon their lives.'

In other words, the influx of pastors and ministerial aspirants that soon began to swell the student roll of the Institute and which has continued to do so, was a profound surprise to Mr. Moody and his collaborators.

And this brings me to the point of saying that the theological seminaries themselves are largely to be charged or credited, as you may choose to put it, with the increase of that class of students in the Moody Bible Institute in these latter years. The Institute has not changed its spirit, its atmosphere, its methods, its doctrine, or its main objective, but it has been obliged to change its personnel, its curriculum, its administrative scheme, and to a certain extent, its relations to the educational and ecclesiastical world. These changes have in a sense been imposed upon it from without, and have not arisen from any ambition or purpose of its own

In closing let me say that it would give us unfeigned satisfaction if the denominational seminaries should win our students from us by the same attractions which have held them to us all these years. Our loss would in the end be our gain." (pp. 4, 5, 8, pamphlet mentioned above).

B. Your Committee has not presumed to fulfill the second part of its mandate, i.e., "to determine . . . whether there is room for a central national R. B. I. (day school), in our *Reformed system*."

This question has in effect already been answered affirmatively by the decision of the Synod of 1942 to grant the R. B. I. "recognition and moral and financial support" (See Acts of 1942, Art. 52, p. 38). It is not reasonable to suppose that the Synod of 1942 would desire that a Committee should immediately re-examine and re-evaluate a position which it has just taken, which your Committee would in effect be doing if it should carry out this part of its mandate.

C. Since by the decision of the Synod of 1942 granting "recognition and moral and financial support" to the R. B. I., room has been found "for such an institution as the R. B. I. (day school) in our Reformed educational systems", your Committee feels itself charged, as requested in the third part of its mandate, "to suggest proper safeguards, in order that in the future we may wholeheartedly support this institution both morally and financially."

1. Your Committee judges that Synod may properly and should be interested in establishing such safeguards, for the following reasons:
 - a. The continuance of "recognition and moral and financial support" for the R. B. I. as a unit in the Reformed educational system, depends upon the manner and measure in which that institution, in its organization, purposes, curriculum, and influence keeps its place within the Reformed educational system, without either encroaching upon or reflecting upon the established Church Schools.
 - b. Since it may be expected that the R. B. I. will give training to men and women who are to serve as religious lay workers in the Sunday Schools and missions of our own churches, Synod is concerned with the type of training that institution offers and the kind of influence it exerts.
2. Your Committee advises that Synod appoint an R. B. I. Advisory Committee of three members, to serve as a medium of contact between Synod and the R. B. I. The function of this Committee shall be:

- a. To acquaint itself with the character and influence of the R. B. I., by taking note of its organization, faculty, curriculum, teaching, and the placement of R. B. I. graduates; and by having within its possession and examining all official statements which reflect the character and purposes and aims of the R. B. I.
- b. To serve the Board and Faculty of the R. B. I. with such advice as will enable the R. B. I. most effectively to fulfill its particular function in our Reformed educational system.
- c. To render a report concerning the R. B. I. to Synod each year.

RECOMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

1. That Synod adopt the advice contained in (C-2-a. b. c.) of the above report.
2. That Synod declare the work of the present R. B. I. Committee to have been completed.

Respectfully submitted,

LOUIS BERKHOF, *President*

JOHN WEIDENAAR

GEORGE STOB, *Sec'y*

REPORT VIII.

REPORT OF THE DELEGATE TO THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

YOUR representative has the privilege of rendering another brief report to the forthcoming meeting of Synod. The past year has witnessed the largest issue of Scriptures ever made from the Bible House in New York. In the "Bible Society Record" of February, 1943 we read the following interesting statements:

"In the twelve months ended November first, 1942, issues from the Bible House in New York totaled 8,202,398 volumes. These are larger than the issues of any twelve months in the Society's history.

As compared with the whole of the year 1941, Bibles showed an increase of over 50 percent; portions of over 135 percent; New Testaments, of over 400 percent; the total being up 250 percent.

These issues would have been considerably larger, had it been possible for the Society to keep an adequate stock of books on hand. Since the war began, the Society has not been able, because of printing problems to get army and navy New Testaments fast enough to meet the mounting demands."

In particular the distribution of the Scriptures to the men in the armed forces of our country, to the prisoners of war here and abroad in addition to the orders for the regular channels of trade and the translation of parts of the Bible in new tongues—this is the stupendous task of the American Bible Society. The war has brought with it challenging situations and intricate problems. The Board of Managers and the Secretaries do their best to cope with them. Take, for example, the war emergency work. The goal set is the great sum of \$306,200.00 and this is to be raised by the end of June, 1943. We sincerely hope it may be realized.

Your delegate attended the regular meeting of the Advisory Council held on December 2nd, 1942 in New York. The Rev. Dr. Luther J. Holcomb, pastor of the Temple Baptist Church in Washington, D.C. was elected the chairman for the session. Forty denominations of the American Protestant Churches were represented at this meeting. Delegates from several other communions were

unable to attend. Many illuminating reports were rendered by the secretaries. It gave us new inspiration for the work to be present at the Council meeting.

On Universal Bible Sunday, December 13th, 1942, it was our privilege to give a fifteen minute address over station WPAT, Paterson, N. J., on the "Significance of the Bible" and we strongly urged the radio audience to help support the great work of the American Bible Society.

Am pleased to report that our church has again responded splendidly to the appeal for funds to send forth the Word of God without note or comment into the whole world. Never before have our churches contributed so generously for this cause. For the regular work, \$3,807.37 was received and for war emergency work, the sum of \$94.84. Hearty thanks to all the churches, Societies, Sunday Schools and individuals for the liberal donations given during the year 1942.

Again we recommend the American Bible Society to our churches for moral and financial support and the request that the Synod of 1943 place it on the list of accredited causes.

Humbly submitted,

JOHN BEEBE

Delegate to the American Bible Society.

REPORT IX

REPORT OF GENERAL TREASURER — GENERAL FUND JEWISH MISSIONS

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

ONCE again it gives us joy that we are able to report that the General Fund of the Christian Reformed Jewish Mission is in very good condition. The balance at the close of business January 17, 1942, was \$6,110.70; the balance this year, January 15, 1943, was \$6,925.58; our balance has thus increased during the past year by \$814.88. This, however, does not tell the entire story, for besides this increase we invested during the year \$2,000.00 out of the last year's balance in U. S. Government bonds, so that the net gain in the balance over the year has been \$2,814.88. We hereby openly testify of our deep gratitude to God for His good provisions for us and to our people—the churches, societies, individuals—for their loyal support of this Gospel work. May all our donors experience the truth of His Word when He says: "God loveth a cheerful giver."

Acknowledgements were sent to all classical treasurers in each case, letters of appreciation with requests for continued prayerful interest were sent to societies and individual donors. Receipts were, of course, booked as they came in. Monthly disbursements were sent to the Chicago Jewish and to the Paterson Hebrew Missions. For the support of our patiently persevering missionaries let us continue our gifts for this work by bringing the Gospel to the Jew; and let us pray that the Lord of the harvest will sustain our workers giving them a measure of joy in their efforts, and further that He will cause the seed sown to bear fruit to the glory of His Name and the salvation of many sinners from the Jews.

Of the nineteen classes thirteen contributed more than the quota set by the previous Synod; their combined total above this quota was \$1,382.10. The other six classes contributed less than the quota; their total below-the-quota contribution amounted to \$461.45. Subtracting the

under-the-quota contribution by the six classes from the over-the-quota contribution by the other thirteen classes we observe that we end up with an income from the classical treasurers of \$920.65 above the full quota for all classes. However, due to problems in currency exchange between U.S. and Canada there is a special treasurer for the Canadian Churches; and outside of and beyond the above we also received \$178.23 from the Canadian Churches. Adding this amount to the above \$920.65 we notice that we have received a total of \$1098.88 above the full quota of all classes. Surely herein we have abundant reasons for gratitude; and let us not fail to show it not merely in our words but by seeking even more the grace of giving for His work. In these days of enlarging incomes we should remember with special emphasis that unless we make our offerings according to our income God may make our income according to our offerings.

The offerings from societies, individuals and sources other than the classical treasures amounted to \$1,785.15 this year. Of this \$500.00 was a special bequest with the request that the name be withheld. Last year the total in this column was just one dollar less or \$1784.15, but then there was \$1250.00 in special bequests. These gifts have totaled especially high the past two years. It may be that, in view of the greater persecutions for which the Jews as a people have been singled out again in recent years, our people have been led to give greater consideration to mission endeavors for their salvation. At any rate let us be thankful that it has pleased our God to use them to reveal Himself unto us and the world and through them to send us our Saviour.

It is our plan again presently to invest about \$2000.00 of our large balance in U.S. Government bonds, so that that balance will not be lying idle in the bank.

In view of the fact that the Canadian Churches did not send in their quotas through their classical treasurers but through the special treasurer for Canadian Churches, those classes (Pacific, Grand Rapids East, and Minnesota) which have churches in Canada should be given an increased credit in their gifts to this fund in proportion to the number of families that they have in Canada. Especially Classis Pacific should receive more credit for she has 272 families in Canada; Grand Rapids East has 113; and Minnesota has 27.

Once more—thank you, very heartily for your gifts and prayers of the past; we beg of you to continue this stewardship; and kindly remember that the quota for this year, 1943, is \$0.57 per family.

SUMMARY OF THE FIGURES OF OUR REPORT

Classis	No. of Families	Full Quota	Amt. Rec'd	More or Less than Quota	Rec'd per family
California	864	\$ 492.48	\$ 676.47	\$ 183.99 more	\$0.784
Chicago North	1645	937.65	900.15	37.50 less	0.547
Chicago South	1811	1,032.27	931.87	100.40 less	0.516
Grand Rapids East	2359	1,344.63	1,552.85	208.22 more	0.66
Grand Rapids South	2579	1,470.03	1,333.93	136.10 less	0.517
Grand Rapids West	1531	872.67	983.30	110.63 more	0.642
Hackensack	868	494.76	588.82	94.06 more	0.678
Holland	2124	1,210.68	1,452.08	241.40 more	0.683
Hudson	1462	833.34	847.92	14.58 more	0.579
Kalamazoo	1042	593.94	594.93	0.99 more	0.57
Minnesota	1171	667.47	565.83	101.64 less	0.488
Muskegon	2208	1,258.56	1 486.55	227.99 more	0.673
Orange City	943	537.51	622.84	85.33 more	0.66
Ostfriesland	607	345.99	384.67	38.68 more	0.634
Pacific	1183	674.31	691.74	17.43 more	0.585
Pella	1360	775.20	763.41	11.79 less	0.561
Sioux Center	1333	759.81	685.79	74.02 less	0.516
Wisconsin	784	446.88	468.63	21.75 more	0.597
Zeeland	1712	975.84	1,112.89	137.05 more	0.65
Candadian Churches			178.23		
Totals.....	27,586	\$15,724.02	\$16,822.90	\$1382.10 more 461.45 less	

On the overall average the classes contributed \$920.65 more than the quota without counting the Canadian churches; including the Canadian churches it was \$1098.88 above the quota. The quota was \$0.57; the average quota received was \$0.61—.

Total receipts from classes.....	\$16,822.90
From societies, churches, individuals.....	1,677.65
From Interest	107.50
Balance on hand January 17, 1942.....	6,110.70

Total of all receipts plus balance.....	\$24,718.75
---	-------------

Disbursements:

To Chicago Jewish Mission.....	\$ 9,600.00
To Paterson Hebrew Mission.....	6,000.00
For two U.S. Treasury bonds.....	2,078.47
Gratuity	100.00
Bond, box, stamps, etc.....	14.70
Balance in bank January 15, 1943.....	6,925.58

Total disbursements plus balance	\$24,718.75
--	-------------

In Reserve:

Michael Vanden Berg bonds.....	\$ 1,000.00
Johanna Woltman legacy	500.00
(Certificates—5 shares paid up stock)	
Two U.S. Government bonds.....	2,000.00

Total reserve	\$ 3,500.00
---------------------	-------------

The quota for 1943 is \$0.57 per family.

Respectfully submitted,

OREN HOLTROP, *Treasurer*

March 20, 1943. Audited and found correct as of close of business January 15, 1943, showing a balance of \$6925.58—period from January 18, 1942 to January 15, 1943.

Was Signed: LOUIS M. BOLT, Manager,
Union Trust Company, Rochester, N. Y.

REPORT IX-a

REPORT OF THE PATERSON HEBREW MISSION BOARD

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE work at the Mission is faithfully carried on by the personnel consisting of the Superintendent the Rev. J. Rozendal and Miss Martha Rozendaal and Miss Agnes Vellenga. The work is done under the supervision of the Board.

As we reported last year the work at the Mission is carried on in the usual manner. Except for the summer months the Board meetings are held Monthly. At these meetings the Board in consultation with the Missionary transacts the business and regulates the policy of the Mission.

From reports of the Superintendent we learn that the meetings are well attended, that many calls are made in the homes, shops, stores, and Hospitals. The work is not free from opposition. Recently a Rabbi was successful in getting the addresses of some of those Jewish boys who attend and forbade their attendance at the Mission. Likewise the personnel who are hindered in the personal work.

In regard to the fruit on the labors of the Missionaries we would say the task of spreading the Gospel is not in vain in the Lord. One young man faithfully attends the services in the Third Christian Reformed Church of this city. He has confessed his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Another wrote a letter to the Superintendent expressing appreciation for the interest shown to her father. And at the meetings held at the Mission often testimonies are heard from the Jews of their appreciation of the work of our staff. And frequently Jews come to service in the regular churches with the Missionaries.

The dispensary also affords an excellent opportunity for the mission work. Before the opening of the Clinic the Missionary conducts a brief Gospel meeting. At the present time there are fewer patients at the Clinic than a year ago. This is probably due to better working conditions that prevail here.

Every month one of the neighboring Churches is represented at the Mission. The Pastor loci and a group of interested people - singers - musicians render interesting programs. This is followed by a social hour, as in the regular Congregational life. These meetings are well attended.

At Christmas time programs appropriate to the seasons are prepared by the personnel. It is surprising how eagerly the Jewish children take part. It is a real pleasure to hear them recite and sing the songs relating to the birth of the Saviour.

Another year has elapsed — opportunities there have been abundant for the spread of the Gospel among the Jews. May God's choicest blessing rest upon these labors of love expended in behalf of the Jew.

May many experience what Jesus said to Nicodemus in John 3, you must be born again.

We commend this work to you for your moral and financial support.

Humbly submitted,

HENRY VAN OSTENBRIDGE, Sec'y

The Board consists of the following members: Rev. J. Beebe, Pres.; Rev. Peter Van Dyke, Vice-pres.; Rev. Henry Evenhouse, Rev. Hessel Bouma, Mr. H. Van Ostenbridge, Sec'y; Mr. A. Veenstra, Treas.; Mr. Wm. De Vries, Mr. E. Attema.

THE NUMBER OF MEETINGS AND ATTENDANCE

		Attendance
Gospel meetings	48	807
Clinic meetings	89	651
Special meetings	8	196
Ladies' meetings	41	271
English meetings	54	91
Children's classes	20	39
Tuesday Evening Ladies' Classes	4	8
Calls to homes and stores	1,409	
Bibles given out	7	
Gospels given out	1,474	
New Testaments given out	96	
Circulars given out	262	
Offerings received	\$107.01	

HAMILTON AVE. BRANCH

		Attendance
English classes	66	405
Ladies' classes	28	56
Girls' classes	92	463
Boys' classes	88	484
Special ladies' meetings	1	14

The above attendance includes only Jews who attended the Mission

H. VAN OSTENBRIDGE, Sec'y

TREASURER'S REPORT OF THE PATERSON HEBREW MISSION FOR 1942

RECEIPTS

Balance on hand January 1, 1942.....		\$1,826.93
From General Fund	\$6,000.00	
Rent, 2nd floor	420.00	
Free will Offerings	107.57	
Special gifts	25.00	
Refund telephone toll	19.80	
Interest, bank deposit	10.37	
Refund, Public Service	6.50	
Refund, Mission Board	60.00	
Refund, Strombeck Mfg. Co.	6.53	
Total Receipts		6,655.77

\$8,482.70

DISBURSEMENTS

Salaries	\$4,711.70	
Hamilton Ave. Cleaning	79.74	
Fuel, electric, water	363.24	
Telephone	46.04	
Gospels, tracts, etc.	25.99	
Medical Supplies	139.51	
Class and Society Exp.	192.24	
Rent, Hamilton Ave.	315.00	
Garage Rent	31.50	
Insurance	12.60	
Repairs	206.36	
New Equipment	15.40	
Advanced Missionary Trip	60.00	
Total Disbursements		\$6,199.32

Balance on hand December 31, 1942 \$2,283.38

Respectfully submitted,

ABRAM VEENSTRA, Treasurer

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE PATERSON HEBREW MISSION FOR 1943

Salaries:

Rev. J. R. Rozendal, Missionary.....	\$2,000.00	
Miss M. Rozendaal, Missionary Nurse	1,200.00	
Miss A. Velenga, Missionary Worker	1,080.00	
Dr. W. L. Dunning.....	500.00	
Janitor's service	104.00	
Rent for Missionary's Home.....	480.00	
Rent Hamilton Ave.	360.00	
Garage rent	36.00	
		\$4,884.00
		876.00

Fuel, Electric, Gas, Water	425.00
Supplies, Medical Dept.	152.00
Supplies, Societies and Classes	200.00
Literature, Printing, Miscellaneous	75.00
Insurance	25.00
Building Repairs and Replacements.....	200.00
Paterson City Tax	350.00
	<hr/>
	1,425.00
Total	<hr/>
	\$7,185.00

STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

Three Story Mission Building	\$10,000.00
Furniture and Equipment	800.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,800.00

REPORT X.

REPORT OF TRANSPORTATION SECRETARY

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

YOUR Transportation Secretary has the honor of submitting the following report for the calendar year 1942:

Severe transportation conditons, brought about by the war, have caused railroads to increase their efforts toward elimination of free transportation. However, we were very kindly favored with six annual and ten trip passes.

Attached is a statement showing by Classes the transportation expenses of delegates to the 1942 Synod; also a comparison of the 1942 totals with those of 1941.

May we again ask the cooperation of Synodical delegates, and others traveling on Church business, toward making any reasonable savings in their transportation expenses, in order that the money thus saved may be used for more directly spiritual causes?

For your information, we quote the following extracts from the letters received from the Office of Defense Transportation:

"There must be a voluntary curtailment of travel if we are to avoid a system of compulsory controls."

"Every convention or meeting cancelled, even if it would have involved travel by only a comparatively small number of persons, will mean a decidedly worthwhile saving of transportation facilities and will itself constitute a contribution to the war effort."

"The Office of Defense Transportation obviously cannot undertake to assess the essentiality of each of the many thousands of meetings and conventions normally held in the United States every year. It is a responsibility of the officers or members of individual associations to make their decisions, bearing in mind the burdens now imposed on the nation's transportation systems in the conduct of transportation's share of the war program."

"Individuals upon whom we rely to curtail their travel voluntarily and thus achieve the objective of elimination of unnecessary travel, become easily conscious of convention travel because of the publicity and the conspicuous nature of the group meeting. Without understanding the reasons for the meeting, individuals may become critical and justify any lack of response to our requests on their part by pointing out convention activities in their own cities.. As

you probably have observed, the public is extremely intolerant of anything that savors of discrimination."

"We are hopeful that leadership by organized groups—those that have already manifested their leadership by the very existence of an association over a period of years — will, by canceling their meetings, help us in our attempt to secure voluntary curtailment of unnecessary travel and thereby help the carriers to do their important war transportation work."

"I must emphasize once more that no easing of the burden on transportation lines is now in sight. On the contrary, the load is constantly growing heavier. War production will be gaining its full stride in 1943, requiring the carriers not only to haul more freight but to transport more passengers on essential war business."

It is our privilege and pleasure to be of service to the Church.

Respectfully submitted,

BERT POUSMA

Classes	Railroad Pullman Meals	Bus	Private Auto	Other Meals Lodging	Totals 1942	Totals 1941	Increase	Decrease
California	\$ 333.17	\$	\$	\$	\$ 333.17	\$ 312.80	\$ 20.37	\$
Chicago North	18.00	1.00	19.00)	20.95
Chicago South	14.46	6.14	20.60)	18.65
Grand Rapids East	11.00	11.00	11.00
Grand Rapids South	3.75	3.75	3.75
Grand Rapids West	3.60	3.60	3.60
Hackensack	148.30	28.40	176.70	141.50	35.20
Holland	8.40	8.40
Hudson	158.11	1.30	3.00	162.41	180.00	17.59
Kalamazoo	12.00	12.00	8.10	3.90
Minnesota	57.10	75.00	4.75	136.85	119.90	16.95
Muskegon	6.72	7.80	1.20	15.72	16.80	1.08
Orange City	79.40	20.00	7.00	106.40	113.00	6.60
Ostfriesland	25.10	1.35	34.00	22.00	82.45	118.07	35.62
Pacific	386.38	386.38	389.73	3.35
Pella	80.03	2.00	25.00	8.00	115.03	179.12	64.09
Sioux Center	73.20	29.60	18.00	120.80	130.50	9.70
Wisconsin	4.42	1.60	20.70	3.00	29.72	39.20	9.48
Zeeland
Totals 1942	\$1,377.30	\$ 40.79	\$ 249.45	\$ 67.95	\$1,735.58	\$	\$ 115.72	\$ 155.91
Totals 1941	560.97	18.00	991.70	205.10	1,775.77
Increase	\$ 816.42	\$ 22.79	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Decrease	742.25	137.15	40.19	40.19

REPORT XI

MAJORITY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF ARTICLE 36 OF THE CREED

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THIS Committee on revision of Article 36 of the Creed was appointed by the Synod of 1940 in response to two documents which it received and which were critical of this article of the Belgic Confession that was adopted in 1938. Those documents are a "Communication Concerning Article XXXVI From Consistory of Lafayette, Ind.", which is printed as Supplement XIV-a in the Acts of the Synod of 1940 on pages 316-322, and a supporting Overture which Classis Illinois presented to the Synod of 1940 and which appears on pages 323-329 of the Acts of the same Synod as Supplement XIV-b. While the former document merely laid the complaints of the Consistory of Lafayette before Classis Illinois with the request to forward them to Synod—if possible, with the support of Classis—the Overture of Classis Illinois formulated a specific request for reconsideration of the synodical decisions of 1938 and 1939 in re Article XXXVI and the Footnote of 1910. It further suggested to Synod, "that it consider the advisability of appointing a committee to study this matter and report to the following Synod".

The Advisory Committee of the Synod of 1940 summarized the contents of these documents, as follows:

"B. These communications draw the attention of Synod, in the main, to the following matters:

1. A discrepancy between the official German and Dutch, and the English version of Article 36. The German and Dutch have "und" and "en" respectively, while the English has "that".
2. The advisability of readopting the footnote of Article 36, which was omitted by the revision of 1938.
3. The need of an unambiguous formulation of the relationship between Church and State in these days of totalitarianism."

Furthermore, it

“advises Synod, to accede to the request of Classis Illinois and appoint a Committee which shall study the matter of the relationship of Church and State, with a view to the reformulation of Art. 36, in its entirety.” Syn. Acts, p. 82, 83.

When the Committee asked the Synod of 1941 for an interpretation of its mandate, it received the following answer, which we found of less help than we at first hoped:

“It is the opinion of the Synod of 1941, that your Committee was instructed to study the matter of the relationship of Church and State. If at the conclusion of such a study you decide that another version of Art. 36 is necessary, you are expected to present such a revision to the Synod of 1942.” Syn. Acts, p. 31.

I.

It is with respect to this *broad mandate*, that the Committee is now ready to render its report to your reverend body. It really comprises two mandates, one categorical, and the other conditional. It should be noted, that in the process of the evolution of this broad mandate various matters of detail which the complaining documents mentioned and some of which the Advisory Committee of the Synod of 1940 specified have disappeared, swallowed up, as it were, in the broader task assigned this Committee. As to the conditional mandate of presenting a revision of Article XXXVI, it will appear, that this Committee found no revision necessary and therefore presents none. Synod will without doubt expect some account of the way by which or the grounds on which we arrived at such a conclusion. What this report offers in what follows is, however, not simply a demonstration to the effect, that no further revision of Article XXXVI is now *necessary*, but rather a review of facts which we have encountered in our efforts to carry out the mandate received from Synod and which raise the question of the *propriety* of considering a further revision of Article XXXVI in view of the material presented by the two documents voicing complaints against the revision of 1938. The facts are the following:

1. The mandate which the Synod of 1940 gave this Committee and which the Synod of 1941 interpreted we have found to be altogether too vague and inclusive to

admit of being carried out within a reasonably limited period, if at all. Through some of its members this Committee has made an attempt to wrestle with its assignment by way of exegetical and historical inquiry. While in the historical field there are not merely definite theories as to what the relationship between Church and State ought to be but also a vast amount of information as to what the changing relationships between Churches and States have actually been, there is naturally nothing authoritative about all this material. And the exegetical inquiry has been equally disappointing. There seems to be no scriptural material that is clearly and directly normative for the relationship between Church and State, so that inferences would have to be drawn from general scriptural principles which might be held to have a bearing on this particular question. Our search would therefore have to be mainly for such general principles, and whatever inferences we might make from them would be the more exposed to attack because of their inferential nature. We believe it was a mistake, when in 1940 complainants buried the specific objectives they had in mind under a blanket request for a Committee "to study this matter", and when the Synod of 1940, in following this lead, broadened the mandate it gave us so as to call for a study of "the matter of the relationship of Church and State, with a view to the reformulation of Art. 36, in its entirety" (Syn. Acts, p. 83).

2. In virtue of its broadness the mandate which we received is essentially though not formally a reversal of a decision passed by the Synod of 1938. For that Synod had the question of a complete revision of Article XXXVI as an alternative to a partial alteration formally under consideration and decided against it by adopting the other alternative. The reasons which its Committee on the revision of Article XXXVI then urged against a complete overhauling of this Article of the Belgic Confession were as follows:

- (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 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 It would appear that a revision appropriate to this 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." Agenda I, p. 12.

So far nothing has been brought forward to invalidate the considerations on which the Synod of 1938 was advised and decided to walk the path of a partial instead of a complete revision of the Article. It can only lead to confusion, if subsequent Synods reverse decisions of earlier Synods without giving serious heed to the grounds on which those earlier decisions were passed. Our mandate confuses the two types of creedal revision, running together, as it does, a question of expansion and one of doctrinal soundness.

3. The relationship of Church and State, which our mandate requires us to study in its entirety, is not the subject of the Article in our Creed, the need of a re-formulation of which we are to bear in mind, Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession. It is true, that in the discussion leading to the revision of this Article the relationship of Church and State has been mentioned; but this was in the main due to the fact that the footnote which in 1910 had been appended to the Article erroneously ascribed to this Article and combated in this Arti-

cle the position that the State is in duty bound to set up a church establishment by law. The Article itself, however, is quite clear as to its subject-matter. According to Dr. A. Kuyper's *De Drie Formulieren van Eenigheid*, it has the caption: "Van het Ambt der Overheid"; and with this caption its entire contents agree. Its structure is such, that it covers successively the duty of the government with respect to public morals and order, its duty with respect to the Christian religion, and the duty of the subjects to their government. It is only in what the Article has to say on the second subtopic, the duty of the government with respect to the Christian religion, that the Article can be said to touch upon the subject of the relationships of Church and State; and even here this subject is not brought up in any direct way but only by implication. We can not see, why the real question, the question of the scripturalness of the revision which the Article has undergone at the hands of the Synod of 1938, should necessitate a study of the relationship of Church and State in its entirety. An incorporation of an explicit declaration on the subject of this relationship would so fundamentally alter the nature of the Article, that its present caption could no longer be retained.

4. While the general thrust of the documents which occasioned the creation of this Committee by Synod is plainly and strongly condemnatory of the present reading of Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession among us, those documents do not at all present a clear picture as to what reading they would want to see substituted. On the one hand there is a desire for the reinstatement of the footnote which the Synod of 1910 had appended to the Article and which was deleted in the revision of 1938, or at least for the rescue of the valuable element which that footnote is said to have contained in its declaration of the independence of the Church from the State (Communication-Lafayette, III; Overture-Illinois, III (b)), while on the other hand there appears a predilection for the American political principle of the separation of Church and State (Communication-Lafayette, last paragraph before II, Syn. Acts, 1940, page 321; Overture-Illinois, I, C; II, C, 2, last paragraph; II, C, 3, third paragraph; II, D, third paragraph.

What complicates matters still further, is the lack of a uniform understanding of the principle of the separation of Church and State in these documents. The Com-

munication-Lafayette declares the American position to be also the Reformed position and to be "the position of the absolute separation of church and state, and the freedom of religion" (B, 2, last paragraph), and it also declares, that "the American position—and we believe this is also the truly Calvinistic position—is that it is the right of every human being to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, and the government may not legislate in favor of any religious group to the disadvantage of another" (II, B). The Overture-Illinois says, that "the American position and we believe the truly Calvinistic position on this question is precisely this, that the government must not in the slightest degree interfere in the matters of religious conviction, giving full and equal protection to all to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience" (I, C). But the same document also declares, that the purpose of the deleted footnote was "a clear statement of the American and truly Calvinistic position of a free church not leaning for support on the government, and a neutral state giving equal protection to all its citizens in the exercise of their religious life and worship" (II, C, 2, last paragraph).

These varying claims of the documents can not be harmonized. The principle of the absolute separation of Church and State is not identical with the position of the footnote which positively declares, that the State has duties with respect to the first table of the law and has duties toward the Church just as the Church has toward the State. Nor is a *neutral* State giving full protection to all its citizens in the exercise of their religious life and worship quite the same as a State which gives full and equal protection to all who worship *God* according to the dictates of their conscience. Certainly, before a plea for further revision of Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession can expect and receive serious consideration, it should make clear just which one of these varying and conflicting positions it wishes to see embodied in the Article.

5. The theory of the separation of Church and State is, comparatively speaking, a recent and untried innovation. As even the documents addressed to the Synod of 1940 illustrate, there is no unanimity as to just what the theory means. No Church has yet incorporated this theory as a principle in its creed. Some are frankly

critical of this principle and prefer cooperation between Church and State, as does the footnote;—for instance, Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, I, pp. 390-396, and Bannerman, *The Church of Christ*, I, pp. 124-143. In view of all this the incorporation of the principle of the separation of Church and State into Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession would be of very doubtful wisdom, since no one can as yet tell, to what practical results the application of this principle may yet lead, and since the results of its application in our own country so far can by no means be said to have been uniformly good.

Moreover, there is no necessity for changing Article XXXVI as it reads after the revision of 1938. For the Article mentions no specific Church or denomination to which the government should extend and limit its protection, but mentions instead, without any further specification, the sacred ministry and the kingdom of Christ. Though closely related, these two subjects are distinct and should not be confused. The question of the proper relation of the State to the specific denomination or denominations which exist or are represented within its domain will hardly allow of a uniform and permanent answer; but the duty of the State toward the Gospel and the kingdom of Christ is universal and permanent. Any one who should deny that even civil governments have obligations to Christ and His kingdom and His Gospel certainly would thereby place himself outside the Reformed pale and in contradiction with the Word of God, Ps. 2.

6. A further serious weakness of the material presented in the documents addressed to the Synod of 1940 in this matter is, that they offer no specific scriptural grounds whatever on which their desire for such a revision of Article XXXVI as they seek is based. There are general assertions and claims, it is true, such as that the present version of the Article retains remnants of the original version which is said to be unbiblical, unreformed, and uncalvinistic by way of contrast with the American political principle of the separation of Church and State; but scriptural proof for the agreement of the American principle of the separation of Church and State with the Bible is entirely lacking. The statement is offered, "that the state is nowhere in all the Word of God credited with the necessary spiritual discernment to perform this task"; to wit, the task of seeing to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere (Overture-Illinois, II, E, (c)); but who has

ever heard of the duties of a person or organization being limited by the measure of his or its spiritual discernment? Moreover, this is an argument from silence. Specifically as to the charges that the present revised reading of Article XXXVI is unbiblical, scriptural substantiation is absolutely wanting. And one turns to the deleted footnote which the documents value so highly in vain for scriptural proof for the position it takes.

Now, our Creed is a statement of what our Churches believe and teach on the basis of the Word of God. In view of that fact, when reformed men or reformed ecclesiastical assemblies suggest a revision of our Creed on one point or another because of doctrinal dissent, one would ordinarily expect them to bring forward some specific scriptural ground for such a revision as they seek. And certainly when a reformed Synod appoints a Committee to study the advisability of such a revision some specific scriptural ground ought to be indicated (Church Order, Art. 31). Any proposal of a revision of the Creed or of some part of it because of doctrinal dissent should be presented in the form of a gravamen signaling the objectionable element or elements as in conscience felt to be out of harmony with the truth; and then Synod should not give a Committee a mandate such as we received without any indication of scriptural grounds for the objections entered against the Creed as it reads today. Unless these elementary requirements are observed, we open the door to all kinds of proposals to alter statements of what our Churches profess to believe on the basis of Holy Writ, and the Church itself violates its position, that creedal statements ought to be statements of scriptural truth (see Formula of Subscription).

In view, therefore, of the facts which have been reviewed and evaluated in the foregoing paragraphs, viz.,

1. the fact of the vagueness and inclusiveness of our mandate and the disappointing results of our efforts;
2. the fact that the Synod of 1938 has faced the possibility of a complete revision of Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession and has rejected it in consideration of grounds which still stand;
3. the fact that the relationship of Church and State is not the subject of the Article the further revision of which is sought;

4. the discordant nature of the views on the relationship of Church and State which are suggested for embodiment in Article XXXVI.
5. the fact that the principle of the separation of Church and State is ill defined and relatively untried, while the present declaration of the duty of the State toward the Gospel and kingdom of Christ cannot be eliminated from our Creed; and,
6. the fact that no scriptural grounds for a further revision of Article XXXVI have so far been advanced or discovered,

your Committee feels constrained to *advise* Synod,

- a) to desist from its present efforts to make a comprehensive study of the relationship of Church and State for the purpose of determining the question of the advisability of a further revision of Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession; and,
- b) to discharge its Committee appointed for these ends.

II.

We have now expressed ourselves sufficiently with respect to our mandate. There remain, however, *the three specific objectives*, which the Advisory Committee of the Synod of 1940 has extracted from and ascribed to the documents which called forth our appointment. Perhaps it is not inappropriate, that we express ourselves with respect to them also, without recommending any synodical action. We trust, the following remarks will suffice.

1. As to the "discrepancy between the official German and Dutch, and the English version of Article 36", leaving it undecided whether or not the Advisory Committee has indicated that discrepancy correctly and completely, we offer first of all the following historical observations:

The Synod of 1906 appointed a committee to prepare an English translation of our confessional standards. The committee consisted of L. Berkhof, M. J. Bosma, W. D. Vander Werp, and J. Trompen, Syn. Acts, Art. 35, p. 18.

This Committee was not ready with its work in 1908, but reported in 1910. (That was the year which saw the adoption of the footnote to Article XXXVI of our Creed.) It reported that there was a translation in existence (that of the Reformed Church), which, however, did not include the negative side of the Canons of Dort. Therefore it did not deem it necessary to prepare a new trans-

lation. It examined the existing translation, offering some suggestions for its improvement, and further prepared a translation of the negative side of the Canons of Dort, and offered the whole of its findings to Synod for approval. Since it was not possible for any advisory committee of Synod to examine this work, Synod appointed a committee for that purpose with instructions to report at the following Synod. The original Committee made no recommendations respecting Article XXXVI of the Confession, but merely placed the Dutch and the English alongside of each other, and called attention to the differences between the two, Syn. Acts, Art. 74, 76, pp. 69, 71, 127.

The Committee to examine the work reported in 1912, made some suggestions for improvement, especially in the new translation, but with respect to Art. XXXVI merely called attention to the fact that an asterisk should be placed after the phrase "but also that they protect the sacred ministry", to call attention to the footnote that had been adopted in 1910. Synod adopted the translation as it stood. It evidently deemed it unnecessary to remove the discrepancy, Acts 1912, Art 57, XVI, pp. 47, 118.

From these historical observations it appears, that the discrepancy between the English rendering on the one hand and the Dutch and the German on the other did not arise from the revision of 1938 but existed prior to that revision. It should therefore not be charged against that revision and should have no place in a document voicing dissatisfaction with that revision.

It appears, further, that the Synod of 1912, though aware of the discrepancy, deemed it of minor importance, as is clear from its failure to see to its removal. We are in agreement with that opinion of the Synod of 1912. The discrepancy will do no harm, if it be understood, that the English revision adopted in 1938 is normative and that the Dutch and the German renderings are subordinate and, if need arises, should be interpreted in harmony with the English.

Since the discrepancy antedates the revision and since the revision was made without removal of the discrepancy, the removal of the discrepancy after the revision would be a complicated process. Instead of undertaking such a removal now, it will presumably be better to wait and see whether an actual need of its removal arises.

2. Regarding the question of a possible "readoption of footnote of 1910", which was deleted in the revision of 1938, the following facts should be duly weighed:
 - a) Since the revision of 1938 has removed the element in Article XXXVI which the footnote was meant to neutralize, the footnote could no longer serve any good purpose, as the report leading to the revision pointed out, Syn. Ag., I, p. 13.
 - b) Before readoption the footnote itself would have to undergo revision by the elimination of its first part, since in that part it erroneously attributes to Article XXXVI the heretical doctrine of State control over the Church.
 - c) What would remain of the footnote after that elimination could neither be incorporated in nor appended to Article XXXVI, since it would introduce a new topic, entirely foreign to the Article and to our Creed. Such a topic would rather call for the addition of a new article to our creed; and such an alteration is better postponed until an enlargement of the Creed as a whole can be considered with hope of success.
3. Finally, there is the question of "the need of an unambiguous formulation of the relation of Church and State in these days of totalitarianism". Here we offer the following reflections:
 - a) The prime need of the Church over against that danger is a clear maintenance, also in its Creed, of the kingship of Christ both in the sphere of the Church and in the wider sense, with the assurance that this is the rock on which the waves of totalitarianism must break. This we have retained in Article XXXVI as revised in 1938.
 - b) The question of the relationship of Church and State could not profitably be discussed without a discussion also of the moot and complicated problem of the pluriformity of the Church and of the related question of what is Church and what is not among the more than two hundred religious organizations of our land.
 - c) This problem is primarily one for the State to solve, and the Church probably can acquiesce in any solution the State may introduce as long as that solution does no violence to the kingship of Christ, the free-

dom of the Gospel ministry, and the freedom of the Church to obey its Lord.

These brief observations we trust suffice to make it clear, that three specific objectives which the Advisory Committee of the 1940 Synod found in the documents that occasioned our appointment do not demand synodical action at this time. For that reason we have no further recommendation to add to our advice concerning the broad mandate which was given this Committee on Revision of Article XXXVI of the Creed. It is, as has been said,

- a) that Synod desist from its present efforts to make comprehensive study of the relation of Church and State for the purpose of determining the question of the advisability of a further revision of Article XXXVI of the Belgic Confession; and,
- b) that Synod discharge its Committee appointed for these ends.

May the Lord guide you in all your manifold and important labors and abundantly bless them for the welfare of His Church and the furtherance of His cause.

Respectfully submitted,

L. BERKHOF
S. VOLBEDA
C. BOUMA
D. H. KROMMINGA

REPORT XI-a

MINORITY REPORT ON ART. 36 OF THE BELGIC CONFESSION

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE Synod of 1940 decided on the appointment of our Committee on Article 36 by adopting the following advice of its Advisory Committee.

"Hence, your Committee advises Synod to accede to the request of Classis Illinois, and appoint a Committee which shall study the matter of the relationship of Church and State, with a view to the reformulation of Art. 36, in its entirety, which Committee shall report in 1942." (Acts 1940, page 83.)

Your Committee requested Synod 1941 for an interpretation of its mandate. Synod replied

"It is the opinion of the Synod of 1941 that your Committee was instructed to study the matter of the relationships of Church and State. If at the conclusion of such a study you decide that another version of Art. 36 is necessary, you are expected to present such a revision to the Synod of 1942." (Acts 1941, page 31.)

As the majority committee also remarked in its report, we found this answer of less help than we at first hoped. And of course our *basic* charge is found in the original mandate. We call attention to the fact that this speaks not only of studying the relationship of church and state, but also of granting the request of Classis Illinois. Indeed, that is mentioned first. To understand our charge we must therefore refer to the request of Classis Illinois. It was as follows:

"III. In consideration of the foregoing, Classis Illinois overtures Synod to reconsider its decisions of 1938 and 1939 in re Article 36 and the Footnote of 1910. Grounds:

- (a) The position that it is the duty of the state to promote the Kingdom of Christ and to see to it that the Word of God is preached everywhere finds no support in Scripture, and gives expression to the same wrong conception of the relation of church and state and was expressed in the phrases that have been excised.
- (b) Clear and satisfactory reasons have not been given why the footnote of 1910 must be dropped. And it contains valuable elements on the subject of separation of church and state that need to be emphasized today, and that find no expression in and are even obscured by Art. 36 even as revised." (Acts 1940, page 328.)

That was the request of Classis Illinois with grounds given. That was the *only* request of Classis Illinois. It did make the suggestion that a committee be appointed to study this matter and report to the following Synod. In other words, it believed that the problem could be dealt with in a more satisfactory manner by the appointment of a committee than by an immediate discussion on the floor of Synod. But that was merely a suggestion. *The only request* was to reconsider the decision of 1938 and 1939. That request was granted. In other words Synod decided to reconsider the decisions of '38 and '39. Our first task therefore as Committee was to weigh the reasons given for re-consideration of 1938 and 1939. And secondly to study the matter of the relationship of church and state with a view to possible reformulation of Article 36.

The reply of the majority of the Committee to this mandate is given at length in their report. The following is the final advice:

"Your Committee feels constrained to advise Synod

- (a) to desist from its present efforts to make a comprehensive study of the relationship of Church and State for the purpose of determining the question of the advisability of a further revision of Article 36 of the Belgic Confession; and,
- (b) to discharge its Committee appointed for these ends."

The undersigned member of the Committee on Article 36 cannot agree with this advice for three reasons:

1. The majority report and advice do not give proper consideration even from a purely formal viewpoint to the request of Classis Illinois as adopted by Synod.
2. We believe that some action should be taken in the way of reformulation of a portion of Article 36.
3. We believe, though it may be advisable to discharge the present Committee, that a committee on Article 36 should again be appointed by this Synod. Indeed we are fully convinced that it would be a grievous mistake not to do so.

In order that Synod may be able to judge wisely between the reports rendered, we first give a brief sketch of the historical background of the present controversy in re Article 36.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Synod of the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, Utrecht, 1905, adopted a revision of Article 36 of the Belgic Confession. Strictly speaking it was a deletion rather than a revision. The following phrases were deleted:

"om te weren en uit te roeien alle afgoderij en valschen godsdienst, en het rijk des antichrists te gronde te werpen", *Acta Synode, Utrecht, 1905, p. 273 ff.*

in English

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

In the years that immediately followed, our own Christian Reformed Church in America took up the question of the revision of Article 36. Four overtures in re this question were presented to the Synod of 1906. (See Acts 1906, page 53.) It is worthy of note, as the same weakness manifested itself later on, that in all these overtures, as far as the official records of the Acts show, not a single Scriptural argument or objection was even so much as mentioned. The Advisory Committee of Synod did appeal to God's Word as condemning the use of physical force by the state in maintaining the true religion. But it gave no Scriptural proof or exegetical grounds for its position. It is also worthy of note that two of these overtures refer specifically to the revision adopted in the Netherlands.

However, the outcome of the matter was not, as might have been expected, that our church decided upon the same deletion as our sister churches across the waters. Instead, we adopted a Footnote as an appendage to Article 36, and evidently intended to be corrective of certain teachings found in that article of our Creed. This Footnote reads as follows:

"This phrase, touching the office of the magistracy in its relation to the Church, proceeds from the principle of the Established Church, which was first applied by Constantine and afterwards also in many Protestant countries. History, however, does not justify the principle of State domination over the Church, but rather a certain separation of Church and State. Moreover, it is also contrary to the New Dispensation that authority be vested in the State arbitrarily to reform the Church, and to deny the Church the right of independently conducting its own affairs as a distinct domain alongside the State. The New Testament does not subject the Christian Church to the authority of the State that it should be controlled and extended by political measures, but only to our Lord and King as an independent domain alongside and altogether inde-

pendent of the State, that it may be governed and built up only by its office-bearers and with spiritual means. Practically all Reformed Churches have relinquished the idea of the Established Church as not in accordance with the New Testament, and advocate the autonomy of the Churches and personal liberty of conscience in the service of God.

The Christian Reformed Church in America, being in full accord with this view, feels constrained to declare that it does not conceive of the office of the magistracy in this sense that it is in duty bound to exercise political authority also in the sphere of religion by establishing a State Church, maintaining and advancing the same as the only true Church, and to withstand, destroy, and exterminate by means of the sword all other Churches as embodying false religions; and also to declare that it does positively hold that within its own secular sphere, the magistracy has a divine duty with reference to the first table of the Law as well as the second; and furthermore that both State and Church as institutions of God and Christ have mutual rights and duties appointed them from on high, and therefore have a very sacred reciprocal obligation to meet, through the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and the Son. They should not, however, encroach upon each other's domain. The Church as well as the State has the right of sovereignty in its own sphere." (Agenda 1936, pages 336 and 337.)

We considered it very necessary that the Synod take careful account of the situation that was on the one hand *manifested* by, and on the other hand *created* by this adoption of an explanatory and corrective Footnote rather than a revision or deletion similar to that of the Netherlands churches. For it is right at this point that we have the very heart of our problem and the root of the difference of opinion that has arisen. We call the attention of Synod to the following points: .

(a) The situation created by the adoption of the Footnote could hardly be termed ideal. For the Confession which evidently contained elements that were no longer accepted as Scriptural, was nevertheless not changed and no new elements were incorporated into it. And the explanatory and corrective note adopted was, in parts, in conflict with certain elements of the Confession.

(b) It is extremely probable that the adoption of the Footnote rather than some kind of revision or deletion evinced a measure of dissatisfaction with the revision adopted in the Netherlands. The close relation of our church with the Reformed Churches of the mother land, the fact that Synod was even requested in at least one overture to revise Article 36 after the example of the Netherlands, the fact that following the Netherlands presented a very easy solution of the problem — all these considerations would seem to have justified the predic-

tion that our church would adopt a revision or effect a deletion similar to that already decided on in the Netherlands. When our church did *not* do this, in spite of the fact that we in so many ways lean heavily upon the leadership of the mother churches, when it struck out on an independent course, there would seem to be only one explanation — namely, a measure of dissatisfaction with the action taken in the Netherlands.

(c) It is extremely probable that the adoption of the Footnote was due to a gradually awakening American spirit, a consciousness of a specifically American approach to the question of the relation of church and state, a growing realization that in order to fulfil our destiny in America we must express ourselves on this question in our own way, and in a manner somewhat different from the prevailing views in the Netherlands churches with their very different historical and national background. That this is the probable explanation of the action of 1910 finds support in the fact that in later official communications to Synod the *American* viewpoint is repeatedly stressed. See documents of Consistory of Lafayette and of Classis Illinois, Acts 1940, pages 318 to 329. See also letter to the President of the United States sent by Synod 1940, protesting against the appointment of Myron C. Taylor as personal representative of the President at the Vatican, Acts 1940, page 43.)

(d) This note does not merely condemn the use by the state of the sword of physical force in maintaining the true religion. Among other things it emphasizes the autonomy and independence of the church over against the state, it emphasizes the very precious heritage of "personal liberty of conscience in the service of God." It warns that state and church may not "encroach upon each other's domain," and it emphatically teaches that the church "may be governed and built up only by its office-bearers and with spiritual means". This last teaching especially is very significant, for it is directly contrary to the view that prevailed in the Netherlands at that time and that is still favored, the view namely that the state, though it may not use the sword, may and must promote the Kingdom of Christ by spiritual means. (See report of the committee of the Netherlands Acta Synode Utrecht 1905, pages 276 to 314. See also Overture Lafayette, Acts 1940, page 320, where Dr. N. Y. Van

Goor is quoted from his "De Nederlandsche Geloofsbelydenis" as follows:

"De Overheid heeft wel terdege de taak om met geestelijke wapenen, b.v. door de prediking des Woords, tegen de afgoderij en den valschen godedienst op te treden, ze te bestrijden en te wederstaan." (p. 402.) This view was condemned by our Synod through the adoption in the Footnote of 1910 of the principle that the church "may be governed and built up only by its officebearers and with spiritual means", also "they (church and state) should not, however, encroach upon each other's domain". To say the least, our church would be encouraging the state to encroach upon the domain of the church by teaching that it is the task of the state to "see to it that the Word of the Gospel is preached everywhere"; for that is the task of the church. And this whole view favored in the Netherlands, is repudiated and condemned when the Footnote states: "only by its officebearers" may the church be built up.

(e) It will be agreed to by all that the teachings of the Footnote were intended to correct and therefore to *prevail over* those elements in the Confession that were not in agreement with it. In other words, if in later years the conflict between Confession and Footnote was to be removed, the teachings of the Footnote must be upheld over against the Confession. Or if this is not done, then surely very weighty Scriptural reasons must be given why the doctrinal teaching of Synod 1910 is repudiated.

Then in the year 1936 our Seminary Faculty reopened the question of Article 36. (See Agenda II, 1936, page 335 ff.) It pointed out the conflict (or rather, sad to say, only one phase of the conflict) between the Confession and the Footnote. It also emphasized the fact that this conflict hampered its members in their official teaching. Synod 1936 encouraged the Faculty to come with a fuller report and more definite advice to the Synod of 1938.

At the Synod of 1938 (see Agenda I, page 4 ff. and Acts, page 16 ff.) the committee or the Seminary Faculty advised the deletion from Article 36 of the following phrase: "and thus may remove and prevent all idolatry and false worship, that the kingdom of antichrist may be thus destroyed." It pointed out that this proposed deletion "corresponds exactly to the change adopted by 'de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland'"; and it advised that the Footnote be dropped, since it "has become super-

fluous; it no longer serves any purpose". (see especially page 13, Acts 1938.) And Synod so decided.

In order that Synod may have the matter clearly before its mind we quote that part of Article 36 as revised that concerns us in the discussion of the present problem. The English version reads:

"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."

The Holland version reads:

"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 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."

The German version reads:

"Und ihres Amtes ist es, nicht allein die Polizei zu handhaben, sondern auch den heiligen Kirchendienst unter ihren Schutz zu nehmen, und zu foerdern das Koenigreich Jesu Christi, zu sorgen, dass allenthalben das Wort des Evangeliums gepredigt werde damit Gott von jedermann geehrt und gedient werde, wie Er in seinem Worte gebietet."

* * * *

It is against the action of the Synod of 1938 that objections have been entered both at the Synod of 1939 and the Synod of 1940. It will be understood by all that there were no objections entered against the deletion as such. But it was contended on the one hand that *other* phrases should have been deleted, and secondly that no good reasons had been given for dropping the Footnote and that the Footnote contained valuable elements which we could ill afford to lose.

In view of the fact that serious objections have arisen against the action of 1938, it is well to note that the advisory material on which the action of Synod was based (see Agenda I, 1938, page 4ff.), however excellent in many respects, nevertheless reveals two weaknesses.

(a) It presents no Scriptural proof, no exegetical material whatsoever. It is well that Synod ponder this somewhat surprising fact. A rather drastic revision of one of the Articles of our Creed was effected, a lengthy Footnote that had been part of our doctrinal standards for twenty-eight years and against which no official objections were entered by any Consistory, Classis or Synod, was removed from the scene of our ecclesiastical life

without any attempt to present any Scriptural basis for such action. This method of handling the problem contrasts unfavorably with the method followed by the committee of prominent theologians that reported to the Netherlands Synod in 1905. These men gave a very thorough exegetical Scriptural basis for their concluding advice. (See Acta 1905, page 293 ff.) Nor is it sufficient to say in defense of this proceeding, that the specific form in which the material was before the Synod of 1938 was not that of a gravamen against the Creed, (Agenda I, 1938, page 8); that we have a conflict, a discrepancy, that must be removed. In itself this is perfectly true. And let it be granted that *preliminary* action, looking towards revision and perhaps removal of the Footnote, could therefore be begun without the presentation of a gravamen with solid exegetical material as its basis. Surely it will only be seen at once that that conflict could never be a sufficient guide or standard *in the actual work of revision*. For the fact that there is conflict does not prove which side is right and which side is wrong. In order to determine whether the Confession or the Footnote must be upheld, wherever there was discrepancy between the two, it was absolutely necessary that Scripture, the only final standard of faith, be appealed to. And if in defense it be pointed out that a previous Synod had already decided that the use of physical force by the state to maintain the true religion was not in accord with Scripture (see Acts of Synod 1906, page 54), then it must immediately be added that this Synod also adduced no Scriptural proof, so that the revision of our Confession was accomplished without Scriptural proof being asked or given, either now or in the past. In our opinion the prestige of the Confession demands that it be not revised except some kind of Scriptural proof is presented as was done in the Netherlands.

A possible defense of the action of Synod 1938 in proceeding to revise the Confession without Scriptural proof might seem to be found in the fact that Synod 1910 evidently intended that the Footnote should be upheld as the official teaching of our church over against all elements in Article 36 that it contradicts. No further Scriptural proof was therefore necessary. However, aside from the fact that no Synod has even established the Biblical basis of the Footnote itself, it will be agreed by all that Synod 1910 intended that the Footnote should prevail

over the Confession on *all points* where there was discrepancy. In other words, Synod 1938 must *consistently* uphold the Footnote. But even that consistency is lacking. On the question of the use of physical force by the state to maintain the true religion the Footnote is upheld by 1938 and the Confession is changed. But on the question of the church being built up only by its officebearers, the Footnote is rejected (for it is dropped) and the Confession is maintained. (For it continues to teach that the state must see to it that the Word of the Gospel is preached everywhere.) And if the question be asked, why or by what standard of judgment is the Footnote upheld on one point and the Confession on the other, then there is no answer. For there is no reasoned appeal to Scripture in the whole proceeding.

However, we shall somewhat better understand, though not approve, this unusual method of Confessional revision if we take note of a second weakness in the advisory material that led to the action of 1938.

(b) The report of the committee, the Seminary Faculty, proceeds from the fundamental misconception that the Footnote of 1910 aimed merely to correct or neutralize the teaching of Article 36 that the state may and must use physical force in maintaining the true religion. Now if this assumption had been correct then the advice given to Synod 1938 would have been very understandable indeed. The reasoning underlying the advice given and the action taken would then be as follows: The Footnote condemns the use of physical force by the state in religious matters, and that is its only thrust and purpose. That element in the Confession is then eliminated or deleted. Hence the Footnote no longer serves any good purpose and can be dropped. That is exactly the reasoning of the Committee that reported to Synod 1938. (Agenda I, page 13.) However, the fundamental premise underlying all this is utterly erroneous. As we have already pointed out, and we trust in a convincing manner, the teaching of the Footnote goes far beyond the condemnation of the use of the sword in religious matters. (See above.)

Now action taken on the basis of a fundamental misconception must be very mistaken and perhaps create a very confused situation. Such is the case today in our church on the question of Article 36 and the Footnote. In brief this is the situation:

1. A Footnote that is precious to our people, a Footnote of which even the Seminary Faculty admits that it "in the main states the correct position in the matter today" (Agenda 1, 1938, page 8), has been removed from the body of our doctrinal teaching without any gravamen being entered against it, on the basis of a supposed fact that is not a fact at all. For it is not a fact, however sincerely some may have believed this, that after certain phrases had been deleted the Footnote was superfluous and could no longer do any good. The Footnote could still serve a very good purpose in supplementing the Confession by its teaching on the freedom of religion, the church built up by its own officebearers, etc.
2. The Synod of 1938 has in more than one respect, reversed 1910. And all this without any open criticism of 1910. For Synod 1910 was evidently not satisfied with the change adopted in the Netherlands. It followed a different, more independent course. But 1938 has adopted precisely the same revision as the Netherlands and wiped out everything else that 1910 had done.
3. Synod 1938, though it perhaps had no clear understanding of this and no conscious intent, has nevertheless in the absence of any gravamen and without any Scriptural proof changed the doctrinal teaching of our church on certain points. From 1910 to 1938 it was the doctrinal teaching of our church that the church "may be **** built up only by its officebearers", "that history **** does not justify the principle of state domination over the church but rather a certain separation of church and state", that the state and the church "should not **** encroach upon each other's domain", etc. All this is no longer the teaching of our church. It has all been wiped out. Yet no one offered any Scriptural objections to these teachings and Synod 1938 perhaps did not understand that it was taking such significant action.
4. The situation created by 1938 is one that is far less satisfactory than was the situation created by 1910. Formerly certain erroneous elements in the Confession's Article 36 were at any rate neutralized by the correct teachings of the Footnote. Now that

is no longer the case. As officebearers we all solemnly promise to teach and decide in accordance with the Confession. Yet there is at least one element in the Confession, even as revised, that no one in our midst appears to be ready to defend, (namely that it is the task of the state to see to it that the Word of the Gospel is preached everywhere.) Formerly there was conflict between Confession and Footnote. Now there is a measure of conflict, it would seem, between at least one teaching of the Confession and our real conviction. And that conflict should trouble us more than the other.

* * * *

To continue the history of our problem, at the Synod of 1939 objections were entered against the revision work of 1939 by the Consistory of Lafayette, Indiana, in an overture supported by Classis Illinois. It is not necessary for our purpose to enter upon the contents of that overture. It does not concern us directly in the strictly formal sense since it was answered, however imperfectly, by Synod 1939. One remark however must be made in re the action of this Synod. It took the strange position that "the Dutch rendering is not ours but that adopted by the Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederlands in 1905. The same remark holds true of the German edition." Acts, 1939, p. 88.) This is strange indeed. First, Synod 1905 did not for the first time "adopt" this translation. It merely deleted certain phrases from the Article. But the translation had been the official version of Article 36 for many years, not only in the Netherlands, but also in our own church in America. Secondly, our Synod 1938 had adopted a Dutch and a German version as our official Confession just as well as the English version. Synod 1939 was therefore plainly in error when it took the position that the Dutch rendering "was not ours." At the same time, and that is why this incident is worthy of note, all this shows plainly that our Confession on this point (overal het Woord des Evangelies doen prediken) is not defended.

We now come to the Synod of 1940. Two overtures objecting to the revision work of 1938 were received and declared legally before Synod, one from Lafayette and the other from Classis Illinois. This Synod evidently realized more clearly than 1939 that the objections presented had real force and validity. As already stated, it

decided "to accede to the request of Classis Illinois, and appoint a Committee which shall study the matter of the relationship of Church and State, with a view to the reformulation of Art. 36, in its entirety, which Committee shall report in 1942." Acts 1940, page 83.)

However correct the general attitude of this Synod, we believe it went too far when it spoke of a reformulation of Article 36 in its entirety. No one had asked this. All Classis Illinois and Lafayette asked was a reformulation that would meet certain specific objections and a study of the question whether the Footnote had not been dropped without good grounds and whether at least certain elements of it should not be retained. It is therefore to be regretted that Synod 1940 spoke of reformulating Article 36 "in its entirety". However—for this is one reason why we must present a minority report—it is just as much to be regretted that the majority committee gives such prominence to this second part of our charge, proceeds to give all kinds of weighty reasons why such a complete reformulation of Article 36 is not advisable and hence comes with its advice that the Committee be discharged.

We feel that we will be serving the church better if we ask and answer the question—did Synod 1940 feel the need of a *partial* reformulation in the direction indicated by Lafayette and Classis Illinois? Moreover, however extreme or unfortunate the second part of the charge to our Committee may have been, the first part (and the thing mentioned first is considered of prime importance) of our charge is very simple. Classis Illinois requested Synod to reconsider the action of 1938 and 1939 and gave its grounds. It was therefore the task of our Committee to consider these grounds and after a thorough study of them, to advise Synod whether or not these grounds were valid, in other words, whether the decisions of 1938 and 1939 should be upheld or in part revised and corrected. Since the majority report does not reveal this conception of our task, we proceed to do so, believing that only thus can we be faithful to our charge.

Ground A for reconsideration reads as follows:

"The position that it is the duty of the state to promote the Kingdom of Christ and to see to it that the Word of God is preached everywhere finds no support in Scripture, and give expression to the same wrong conception of the relation of church and state as

was expressed in the phrases that have been excinded." Acts 1940, page 328.)

We believe that this ground can and should be upheld at least in part by this Synod. We believe that Classis Illinois is eminently correct when it takes the position that the teaching that it is the task of the state to see to it that the Word of the Gospel is preached everywhere finds no support in Scripture. No Scriptural support for this view has been adduced by anyone.

The objection has been raised that this ground is purely negative in form. It makes no attempt to prove that the view objected to is *in conflict* with Scripture, and, it is said, *that* is what Article 31 of our Church Order asks. It takes the position that what is once decided is settled and binding unless it be proved *in conflict* with Scripture. We do not believe that this is a valid appeal to Article 31. (And certainly if it were what must we think of the action of 1938 in dropping the Footnote? Was that whole Footnote proved to be in conflict with Scripture?)

The rule here given is first of all a rule in the sphere of church government. For this sphere the Scripture lays down only general principles. In the actual government of the church therefore many decisions must be made by Consistory, Classis or Synod, that are not based directly on some specific Scriptural teaching, though of course in agreement with the general principles. Nevertheless these decisions are binding by virtue of the authority Christ has given to His church, unless they be proved in conflict with the Word of God. But all this is not true, all this does not hold in that precise form in the sphere of Confessional teaching. *The Confession claims to be the Word of God in all its parts.* Nothing that cannot be found in Scripture either in the way of specific teaching or clear inference has any place in the Confession. Therefore when any Consistory or Classis, or for that matter, the humblest member of one of our churches comes to Synod and enters objections against a certain part of the Confession on the ground that such teaching is not found in the Word of God, then Synod must give a hearing to such objections. Then it must either take the position that the teaching objected to *is found* in the Word of God or it must declare that such teaching has no proper place in the Confession.

Synod, of course, has no duty *to prove* that such a teaching is Scriptural, no duty to convince the protesting parties, but it must dare to take the position, when that position is solemnly challenged, that the teaching objected to is indeed Scriptural teaching. For that is precisely the very nature and essence of the Confession, that it is the official ecclesiastical interpretation of the Word of God. It was therefore not necessary for Classis Illinois, in order to receive a hearing, to attempt to prove that the teaching under discussion was in conflict with the Word of God. In passing be it said that in our opinion that would not be such a difficult task. Scripture plainly charges the officers of the church with the responsibility to cause the Word of the Gospel to be preached everywhere. (Matt. 28:19). Nowhere in all Scripture is the state charged with this responsibility. Is it not then in conflict with Scripture to teach officially in our Confession that it is the task of the state to do what it is nowhere commanded to do and what is plainly spoken of as the responsibility of the church?

However, be this as it may, Classis Illinois was entitled to a hearing as soon as it solemnly declared to Synod, that, in its opinion, a certain part of our Confessional teaching finds no support in the Bible.

Ground B of Classis Illinois reads as follows:

"Clear and satisfactory reasons have not been given why the Footnote of 1910 must be dropped. And it contains valuable elements on the separation of church and state that need to be emphasized today, and that find no expression in and are even obscured by Art. 36 even as revised." (Acts 1940, page 328.)

As is evident from the foregoing, we believe that the first part of this ground is absolutely correct and valid. Synod 1943 must face the solemn fact that no Scriptural grounds nor any other valid reasons were given for dropping the Footnote that was part of our doctrinal teaching for twenty-eight years. As to the further contention of Point B that there are valuable elements in the Footnote that we can ill afford to lose, we believe this general statement is correct. We have once and again referred to such elements. But further discussion of this point can serve no good purpose until the fundamental mistake is recognized, namely, that the Footnote was removed from the body of our doctrinal teaching without good reason. If this is correct, Synod should so declare and then the whole Footnote again automatically regains

the official standing it has always had. As to the contention in B that certain elements of the Footnote are obscured by Article 36 even as revised, we believe this contention is correct. As long as our Confession teaches that it is the task of the state "overal het Woord des Evangelies te doen prediken", the teaching of the Footnote is certainly obscured when it maintains that the church must be built up only by its officebearers, and that the state may not encroach upon the domain of the church.

As we have already stated, these two grounds of Classis Illinois for reconsideration are given but scant attention in the majority report. They are briefly touched upon only as minor matters after the big (?) question has been disposed of — the question, namely, of a revision of Article 36 in its entirety. One reason why we were forced to present a minority report is that we cannot but feel that this approach does not make plain but confuses the issue. What Classis Illinois and Lafayette brought to Synod was not first of all an overture to revise the Confession, as the majority report gives the impression, but a criticism of the action of 1938 and a request for reconsideration of the decisions of that Synod. And *that* is the matter on which we as a Committee must first of all report. And those who disagree with Classis Illinois must take the position not merely that there is now no reason to revise the whole Article 36, which no one requested, but that the original work of revision done in 1938 was correctly done in agreement with the Word of God, in agreement with the decisions of 1910, and in agreement with established ecclesiastical procedure.

There is one other matter that we must briefly touch on. There is a discrepancy between a certain section of Art. 36, the English version, and the corresponding section in the Dutch version — a discrepancy that presents a problem Synod must recognize. The English version reads: "They must therefore countenance the preaching of the word of the gospel everywhere". The Holland version reads: "het woord des Evangelies overal te doen prediken". Evidently there is a discrepancy here. The majority committee also frankly recognizes that discrepancy. To "countenance" means to encourage, permit, or approve. But the Dutch version charges the state with the responsibility of *effecting or accomplishing* the preaching of the word of the gospel. The English version is therefore not really a translation. It is not even a

poor translation. It is something different. Now neither Synod 1938 nor the Committee that advised it, is responsible for this discrepancy. But the fact of the discrepancy must be faced. And we cannot for the following reasons agree with the proposal of the majority report that we just have the "understanding" in our church that the Dutch and German be interpreted in harmony with the English.

a. We believe that the Dutch and German versions of the Confession should be in the full sense of the word official, normative, dependable just as the English. Only then will the Holland and German elements in our church really have a Confession in their native tongue.

b. This proposal would give to certain words (overal het Woord des Evangelies doen prediken) a meaning which they do not have and therefore a meaning which they may not be given. This proposal is tantamount to saying that the German and Dutch versions of our Confession do not on this point really mean what they say, they mean something different. The Christian church should never approve such understandings, not in any relation of life, and surely not in the solemn sphere of Confessional teaching.

c. The Dutch version is the historic Confession of our church. The English version came into existence in our ecclesiastical life as a translation of the Dutch. If this translation is not true, as it is not, to the historic Confession, the translation must be rejected. To "interpret" the historic Confession in the light of and in subjection to a mistaken translation is (1) to maintain a serious mistake instead of correcting it; (2) to do violence to our Confession, for you change it, you arrive at a very different Confessional teaching without any Scriptural objection or proof or official decision to revise.

d. Evidently there is only one way in which we can meet the requirements of faithful adherence to the historic Confession, and that is frankly to face the question whether we sincerely believe, as do our Netherlands brethren, that it is the task of the state to see to it that the Word of the Gospel is preached everywhere. If not, let us remove this element from our Confession, or, as formerly, neutralize and correct this teaching in the Footnote. But let us not have "understandings" to the effect that the Confession does not really mean what it says. Interpretations of this kind have worked great

harm in other churches, and paved the way for a covert departure from the faith.

e. The Committee of the Netherlands warns in a somewhat different connection against such a method of interpretation or such understandings. (See Acta der Synode, Utrecht 1905, pages 277 and 278.) This same position is taken by the Netherlands brethren that originally presented their gravamen against Article 36 in its original form. They say: "Zij gaan hierbij uit van de h. i. onbetwistbare waarheid, dat wij, de Confessie onzer vaderen belijdende, onder de woorden waarin zij beleden, niets anders verstaan mogen, dan hetgeen zij zelven, blijkens het stellige getuigenis der geschiedenis, met het bezigen dezer woorden bedoeld hebben". (Acta 1905, page 273.) That is precisely the position we hope to defend before our Synod. We are opposed to any understanding or so-called interpretation that would change the historical meaning of words, while at the same time necessary revision is opposed.

* * * *

The question finally must be answered, what further practical steps must be taken by this Synod towards the solution of our problem? The majority committee advises that the Committee appointed for the purpose of studying the question of reformulation and revision be discharged. That does not, we take it, necessarily mean that the committee is convinced that no further committee work of *any kind* is necessary. However, it does not come to Synod with any definite advice in the way of reformulation; nor does it advise that some committee continue to study the problems dealt with in this report; nor does it advise a reconsideration or a rescinding of the action of 1938 in dropping the Footnote.

We do come to Synod with such advice. And we also believe that Synod 1943 should again appoint a committee on Article 36, even though it may be advisable, as the majority committee suggests, to discharge the present Committee. Our reasons for advising the appointment of a committee are:

1. There is an element in the Confession (overal het Woord des Evangelies doen prediken) that finds no defenders in our midst; against which official objections have been entered that it finds no support in Scripture. Synod should so declare (see advice below) and then the question of reformula-

tion made necessary by such decision automatically demands that a committee again be appointed by Synod.

2. No good reason has been given why the Footnote of 1910 has been dropped. Synod should so declare and then various questions in connection with the Footnote (see below) demand that a committee work on this problem.
3. To do nothing in the way of reformulation and not even to appoint a committee for further study will weaken the prestige of our official standards. If we want our members to revere the Confession, then we must keep it in agreement with the real convictions of our people.
4. To do nothing at all means that the status quo is maintained. And that status quo does not even satisfy the ideal the Seminary Faculty has itself placed before the church (Agenda I, 1938, page 10.) "Surely this situation", the Faculty is speaking of the drift of our time toward the totalitarian state, "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." Surely at present we have no such clear cut and unequivocal position.

In conformity with the foregoing we advise Synod to pass the following resolutions:

A. Synod upholds the position of Classis Illinois that Scripture does not support the view taught in our Confession, Article 36 Dutch version, that it is the task of the state to see to it that the Word of the Gospel is preached everywhere. (Overal het Woord des Evangelies doen prediken.)

B. Synod declares that Synod 1938 was in error when it dropped the Footnote of 1910, whereas (1) no Scriptural objections against the Footnote were received or considered; (2) the ground given for this action namely that the Footnote had become superfluous, is contradicted by the facts and by the contents of the Footnote itself; (3) Synod 1938 in some way reversed Synod 1910 and changed the doctrinal teachings of our church by dropping the Footnote without good reasons being advanced for such drastic action.

C. Synod appoints a committee whose task shall be (1) to advise Synod what revision of Article 36 is made necessary by the adoption of resolution A; (2) to study the following questions with respect to the Footnote: (a) Are all the elements included in the Footnote historically correct and soundly Scriptural and a necessary part of our Confessional teaching? (b) Is the teaching of the Confession that it is the task of the state "to protect the sacred ministry that the Kingdom of Christ may thus be promoted" in harmony with the teaching of the Footnote that there is "a certain separation of church and state", that the church may be "built up only by its office-bearers", and that there shall be "personal liberty of conscience in the service of God"?

If the Committee finds conflict, it must advise Synod if and how this conflict should be removed in accordance with our only standard of faith and practice, The Word of God. And thus we will give proper recognition to Synod 1910, and at the same time complete the task Synod 1938 set itself to do.

Respectfully submitted,
G. HOEKSEMA.

REPORT XI-b

MINORITY REPORT ON ART. 36 OF THE BELGIC CONFESSION

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

WITH the indication of the mandate of our Committee, as found in the Majority Report, the undersigned finds himself in agreement.

I. With the Synodical mandate of our Committee, as well as with the general position of the Committee of Praeadvices, introducing this mandate (as found in the Acts of 1940, Art. 76 VIII), he is also in accord. And he is in agreement with the interpretation of our mandate given by the Synod of 1941 (Acts 1941, Art. 49 H).

1. Our Synodical mandate fuses and combines "two types of creedal revision running together, as it does, a question of expansion and one of doctrinal correctness." (Cf. Majority Report I, 2). But there is no article of our Church Order, nor any decision of Synod, prohibiting this procedure. A similar fusing and combining is found in the overtures from the Consistory of Lafayette and Classis Illinois, and these overtures received Synodical acceptance as being legally before Synod, and they passed muster without criticism on this score by the Synods of 1940, '41 and '42 (Acts 1940, Art. 76 VIII; Acts 1941, Art. 49 H; Acts 1942, Art. 21).
2. If there were not another Minority Report before Synod, from the Rev. G. Hoeksema, representing Classis Illinois, our mandate would call for a more extensive report than the present, but under the circumstances the present report is abbreviated.
3. It can be said, on the one hand, that the Synodical mandate given to our Committee is rather broad; but, on the other hand, it is quite clear, from the context referring to the overtures from the Consistory of Lafayette and Classis Illinois, that an exegetical study of the Scriptural mandate given to the State is the leading matter required, in the study

of "the relationship of Church and State," enjoined upon the Committee by Synod. A sub-committee of our Committee, including the Professor of Practical Theology and the Professor of Church History, was appointed by our Committee to work out such an exegetical study, but it failed to come to the Committee with a report on this matter, not having found conclusive evidence, in the time allowed for the report.

4. In the main, the undersigned finds himself in accord with the present overture from the Consistory of Lafayette, Indiana, and with the supporting communication and overture from Classis Illinois (Acts 1940, Supplement XIV-a and Supplement XIV-b). However, there are a few items in these documents for which he does not wish to become responsible, some of which have received critical attention in the Majority Report coming from our Committee. Hence it seems best to present a brief, independent report to Synod, pursuant to the mandate of our Committee.
6. The Consistory of Lafayette refers to a prior effort at "creedal revision on which a committee of Synod has been working." (Cf. Acts 1940, Supplement XIV-a, page 322.) This committee, of which the undersigned was a member, may have helped to keep the subject alive. Acts 1926, page 212; 1928; page 155; 1930, page 198, IIc, "herziening van Art. 36 inzake de verhouding van Kerk en Staat.") And it is a hopeful sign that the subject of creedal revision did not die out in our midst (Acts 1936, pages 14, 151; 1938, pages 16, 129.)

II. Our present mandate from the Synod of 1940 calls for a study of "the relationship of Church and State." (Cf. Acts 1940, Art. 76 VIII.) Of course, these words need to be understood in the light of the context out of which they arise. This context involves reference to the overtures from the Consistory of Lafayette and Classis Illinois. These overtures are concerned with several items, but one requiring exegetical, Biblical study, especially, is the question whether the State must "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere." (Cf. Overture of the Consistory of Lafayette, Acts 1940, Supplement XIV-a, page 321; and overture of Classis Illinois, Acts 1940, Supplement XIV-b, page 328; the Dutch version has it: "het

woord des Evangelies overal te doen prediken," Belgic Confession, Art. XXXVI.)

1. The Majority Report of our Committee, under II, 1, admits a "discrepancy between the English rendering, on the one hand, and the Dutch and German, on the other." The question may be raised, — what does it do for the prestige of our Confessional Standards to leave an admitted discrepancy there? One discrepancy was removed by the Synod of 1938 (Acts 1938, page 16), but here is another admitted "discrepancy," between the English and the Dutch rendering. The English reads: "They must therefore countenance the preaching of the Word of the gospel," while the Dutch has the formulation: "het woord des Evangelies overal te doen prediken," or as the Consistory of Lafayette translates this Dutch rendering: "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere."
2. In creedal matters, our Church maintains that the evidence is Scriptural (Cf. Formula of Subscription). Must the State "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere"? Says Classis Illinois: We do not believe that this is the task of the State And we hold that the State is nowhere in all the Word of God credited with the necessary spiritual discernment to perform this task" (Acts 1940, Supplement XIV-b, page 328). The Consistory of Lafayette also makes on appeal to Scripture when it says: "The valuable element, which the Consistory of Lafayette had in mind when it originally came to Classis was especially this: 'The New Testament does not subject the Christian Church to the authority of the state that it should be controlled and extended by political measures, but only to our Lord and King as an independent domain alongside of and altogether independent of the State, that it may be governed and built up by its office-bearers and with spiritual means.'" Cf. Acts 1940, Supplement XIV-b, page 322.)
3. The appeal of these overtures to Scripture here is negative, "nowhere in all the Word of God;" "the New Testament does not." Both propositions are negative. The burden of proof, however, is ordinarily on the affirmative. The state must "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere," that is an affirmative. It would seem to be within our Com-

mittee's Synodical mandate to institute a search concerning the Scriptural proof for this affirmative. As a matter of fact, a sub-committee was appointed by our Committee to consider the Scriptural evidence on "the relationship of Church and State" (quotation is from our Synodical mandate). But the sub-committee failed to come with a report on this relationship or on the more limited matter of the precise moot point under discussion in the overtures of Consistory of Lafayette and Classis Illinois, when they refer to Scripture.

III. Can it be proved from Scripture that the State must "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere"? Does Scripture give any such mandate to the State? We wish, then, to attempt to indicate the chief lines of Biblical investigation involved; in other words, we wish to inquire where, in the Scriptures, we shall look for evidence on this question.

1. Do we find that the State receives the mandate "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere," according to Romans 13:1-7? This is one of the leading New Testament passages concerning the civil government.
2. If not, where shall we look next? The Apostle Paul meets leading officials of the state, — Felix, Festus, Agrippa. (Acts 24:19, 21, 25, 27; 25:8-10; 26:2-29.) Does Paul give the mandate to any of these officers of the State to "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere"?
3. Our Lord meets a high official of the State in Pontius Pilate. (Matt. 27; Mark 15; Luke 23; John 18.) Does Jesus give Pilate, as the representative of the contemporaneous Roman world-empire, such a mandate?
4. We know that our Lord gave a mandate to the Church, touching the preaching of the Word, in the Great Commission (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15-17; Luke 24:46-48). Does Christ there refer also to the State, asserting in effect that the State should "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere"?
5. Or is that implied in the words: "Render unto Caesar the things that Caesar's"? (Matt. 22:21; Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25.)

6. We will not limit ourselves to the New Testament. Classis Illinois refers not only to the New Testament, but to the Word of God in general. Do we have anything in the Old Testament to indicate that the State must "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere"? The covenant with Noah has a reference to the mandate of the State (Gen. 9:6). Is a mandate touching the preaching of the Word here also given to the State?
7. We come to Biblical data concerning the theocracy. Do we find such a mandate given to the State or the King here? Let us look at the law of the King, in Deut. 17:15-18. Is such a mandate given to the King?
8. Do the priests and Levites, who must teach the people the Word of God (Deut. 31:9-11; Lev. 10:8-11), derive their income from the king, or from the tithes independently of the royal treasury? (Num. 18:21-32; Neh. 10:39.)
9. Does the prophet (Deut. 18:14, 15) receive an income from the treasury of the king? Does the Pentateuchal reference to the institution of the prophet (Deut. 18: 14, 15) imply that the king shall cause the word to be preached through the prophet?
10. May Aaron, the high priest, and Miriam, his sister, invade the prerogatives of the human, civic ruler, Moses? Or does he become rebuked and she become a leper, for making the attempt? (Num. 12: 10, 11.) May Uzziah, the king of Judah, assume the privileges and invade the prerogatives of the priests, or does he become a leper for making the attempt? (2 Chron. 26:18-21.) Do we thus have, even in the Old Testament, some indication of "the principle of the separation of church and state"? (Cf. Acts of Synod, 1941, Art. 108, page 120, line 14.)

We are not inquiring whether the kings of Judah and Israel had religious duties unto Jehovah, of course they had; but our inquiry is whether these kings received from God the specific mandate to cause the Word to be preached, as an established task of the kings in the institutional life of the nation.

And now, are we prepared to say, on the basis of Scripture, that the government of the Netherlands should cause

the Gospel to be preached from the pulpits of our sister-church,—the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, or that our own United States government, possibly through the Federal Council of Churches, should cause the Word to be preached from the pulpits, and on the domestic mission fields, of the Christian Reformed Church? And would not any such thing lead to a measure of “state control over the Church,” (Cf. Majority Report, II, 2, b) in the end, if not at the beginning?

IV. There may be evidence, direct or inferential, in the Scriptures, that the State must “see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere,” but we have not been able to find it. Perhaps we have not looked in the right places, or we may have failed to see the evidence, where it was really present. Hence we come to Synod with a respectful request. From our Professor in Church government, we understand that such a request is technically in order.

1. We request Synod to appoint a Committee to make a further study of the Biblical evidence, and to adduce the evidence, for the part of the Dutch version of Art. XXXVI of our creed that teaches that the State must “see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere” (“het woord des Evangelies overal te doen prediken”).
2. We recommend that Synod give the mandate to this Committee, that, if it cannot adduce this evidence, it shall come to the Synod of 1944 with a specific recommendation as to the form that Art. XXXVI of our Belgic Confession should take,—in the light of the two overtures and of all the reports that shall be legally before the Synod of 1943, concerning this article of the Creed.
3. In case Synod wishes to close this matter, touching Art. XXXVI, at the session of 1943, we recommend that Synod alter the Dutch version of Art. XXXVI, so that it no longer reads: “het woord des Evangelies overal te doen prediken” (that is: “cause the word of the Gospel to be preached everywhere,” or “see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere”). We recommend that Synod cause the Dutch version to read: “de prediking van het woord des Evangelies overal toe te laten” that is: “countenance, permit, the preaching of the Word of the gospel everywhere”). The entire sentence would

then read as follows: En hun ambt is, niet alleen acht te nemen en te waken over de Politie, maar ook de hand te houden aan den Heiligen Kerke-dienst, en het Koninkrijk van Jezus Christus te doen vorderen, de prediking van het woord des Evangelies overal toe te laten, opdat God van een iegelijk geëerd en gediend worde, gelijk Hij in zijn Woord gebiedt.

Ground: In lands where the preaching of the Word is now prohibited or restricted by the State, the Church may well seek, on the basis of Scripture, and after the example of Paul before Felix, Festus, Agrippa, that the preaching of the Word shall be permitted by the State. But we and our sister-churches might come to grief with some substitute for our Reformed preaching, if we should request the State to "see to it that the Gospel is preached everywhere." Would the State see to it that the Gospel is preached among us in harmony with our Reformed Confessional Standards?

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN J. WYNGARDEN.

REPORT XII.

THE MINISTERS' PENSION AND RELIEF ADMINISTRATION

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE Board of Trustees of the Ministers' Pension and Relief Administration begs to submit the following report to your honorable body.

This Board comprises the following: Mr. H. Hekman, President; The Rev. R. J. Bos, Vice-President; The Rev. J. O. Bouwsma, Secretary; Mr. W. K. Bareman, Treasurer; Mr. N. Hendrikse, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer.

The Alternates are: Mr. F. L. Winter, The Rev. J. Geels, The Rev. J. F. Schuurmann, Mr. B. De Jager, Mr. G. B. Tinholt.

The terms of appointment of the following expire at this time: Mr. H. Hekman and Alternate Mr. F. L. Winter; The Rev. R. J. Bos and Alternate Rev. J. Geels; The Rev. J. O. Bouwsma, Mr. W. K. Bareman and Alternate Mr. B. De Jager, Alternate Mr. G. B. Tinholt.

We have endeavored to administer the Pension and Relief Funds in accordance with the Rules adopted by Synod. We have striven to serve wisely, economically and equitably. Our aim has been and is on the one hand to safeguard the interests of the Church and on the other hand to uphold the rights of the Emeriti, Widows and Orphans, who according to our Church Order are beneficiaries. Though the work required in administering these Funds has increased, we have kept down the expenditures. The administrative costs for 1942 was less than one per cent of the moneys entrusted to our care.

Since the last Synod the following pensionaries passed to their reward: The Rev. J. A. Rottier, Mrs. E. Van Korlaar; the Rev. D. J. Meyer.

One widow having re-married is no longer receiving a pension.

Two widows, who according to our Rules are entitled to receive a pension have waived their present right to receive a pension. However, they reserve the privilege to apply for a pension when in need.

Notification of emeritation was received of:

The Rev. L. Veltkamp by Classis Zeeland on the ground of ill health and years of service. His emeritation went into effect Dec. 15, 1942.

The Rev. J. M. Voortman by Classis Ostfriesland on the ground of ill health. His emeritation went into effect Oct. 25, 1942.

The Rev. K. Bergsma by the Executive Committee for Home Missions with the approval of Classis Pacific on the ground of ill health. Emeritation went into effect Jan. 1, 1943.

The Rev. L. Van Haitsma by Classis Grand Rapids East on the ground of ill health. Emeritation went into effect March 31, 1943.

As these Brethren had united with the Pension Plan they are automatically entitled to receive a pension. Since our last report the Rev. S. Eldersveld and the Rev. G. W. Hylkema, who had united with the Pension Plan, departed this life. Their widows automatically become pensionaries.

A widow, who was not a recipient of an allowance when the Pension Plan became effective Jan. 1, 1940, applied for a pension in accordance with the Synodical decision, Acts 1939, Art. 42, II, 1, c. An orphan became 19 years old Feb. 1, 1943. According to the Rules he is no longer entitled to a pension.

There are a few matters to which we call the attention of Synod.

First, the question was brought to our attention whether the victory tax should be deducted from the salary on which 3% shall be contributed to the Pension Fund. It seems to us inadvisable to allow this deduction. Reasons for our view are: (1) Such exemption would complicate book-keeping and might lead to other exemptions, for if the amount of one tax should be exempt the amounts of other taxes also should be exempt; and (2) the amount of money involved does not warrant extra book-keeping. The victory tax on a \$3,000 salary is \$118.80, of which \$47.52 is returnable. Thus the actual tax is \$71.28. 3% of this is less than \$2.15. It seems to us that the amount of the saving does not warrant the deduction.

The second matter pertains to the case of a minister, who was ordained in another Church and who was recently installed as a minister in our Church. As he was

ordained prior to Jan. 1, 1940, when our Pension Plan went into effect, we deem it just and proper that he should contribute something for the period between this date and the date of his installation as pastor in our Church, that he should contribute the amount of money, which his former Church will refund to him from its Pension Fund for this period and that this money shall be contributed when it is received by him.

A third matter is Art. 121, Acts of Synod, 1942: This Article states that "Army and Navy Chaplains shall retain their rights to support from the Pension Fund upon payment of their pension money on the basis of their last salary in their respective churches for the duration."

We call the attention of Synod to the following:

First, This does not cover all cases. A candidate, who has not received a salary from a congregation, may become a Navy Chaplain. On what salary should he contribute 3%? If he should be requested to contribute on the basis of his salary as a Chaplain, why not other Chaplains?

Secondly, This is manifestly unfair. It means that though two Chaplains receive the same salary from the United States, the one must contribute far more than the other because the church salary of the first may have been \$2,700 whereas the salary of the second may have been \$1,300.

We recommend that this Article should be revised to read: "Army and Navy Chaplains shall retain their rights to support from the Pension Fund upon payment of 3% of two-thirds of their salary received from the Government and computed according to our Rules." Such a decision would cover all cases and also allows for the added housing expenses of Chaplains.

THE PENSION FUND

The Rules adopted by Synod for the administration of this Fund stipulate that the average salary of our clergy shall be determined on or before March 1. The salaries of 291 ministers were requested. The salaries of 230 were reported. We established an average on the basis of the information at hand, the 1943 replies, some 1942 replies, and the list of salaries received by ministers serving congregations granted subsidy, Acts of Synod, 1942. This average is \$1,924.48.

A statement, containing the names of our ministers in active service and the salaries, is available for Synod.

The 1943 pension for ministers—40% of the average salary—is \$769.79. As the pension shall be in an amount at the nearest multiple of 10, it is \$770.00. This is an increase of \$30. The 1943 pension for widows,—30% of the average salary and fixed at the nearest multiple of 10—is \$580, also an increase of \$30. The pension of an orphan is \$100.

The list of pensionaries, as of March 15, 42 ministers, 44 widows, and one orphan, is available for Synod.

Synod has granted us authority to make adjustments in the pensions of those who were beneficiaries of the Emeritus Fund before Jan. 1, 1940. Changes, however, must be submitted to Synod for approval. We deemed it proper to add \$20 to a large number of pensions because of the higher cost of living and the increase in the average salary of our clergy. All of these pensionaries who were granted this \$20 increase are receiving less than the pensions fixed by the Rules for ministers and widows, who were granted a pension after Jan. 1, 1940. The list of names with pensions is available for Synod.

The following statement of receipts, disbursements and present assets of this Fund, certified by the auditor, William P. Dreyer, is herewith submitted:

PENSION FUND — CURRENT FUNDS :

RECEIPTS

From Classical Treasurers.....	\$44,525.77	
From Ministers, 3%.....	16,447.17	
From Interest	836.16	
Jan. 1, 1942, Balance brought forward.....	16,203.75	
	<hr/>	
Total Credits.....		\$78,012.85

DISBURSEMENTS

Payments to Beneficiaries.....	\$51,627.13	
Expenses for 1942.....	894.09	
	<hr/>	
Total Debits.....		\$52,521.22
December 31, 1942, Balance on hand.....		\$25,491.63

(\$10,000 of this Reserve was transferred Feb. 23, 1943, to the Pension Fund—Reserve Funds, and invested in Government Bonds.)

PENSION FUND—RESERVE FUNDS

January 1, 1942, Balance brought forward.....\$35,335.52

RECEIPTS

From Payments on Arrears, prior to 1940..... 347.92

Total Credits..... \$35,683.44

DISBURSEMENTS

None

Balance on hand December 31, 1942..... \$35,683.44
(\$10,000 was added to this February 23, 1943.)

A detailed statement of all receipts, disbursements and present assets, certified by the auditor, is available for Synod.

An estimate of the 1943 receipts and disbursements is herewith submitted:

ESTIMATED RECEIPTS

From the Quota (at the rate of \$1.60 per family)\$45,212.80
From 3% Salary Contributions..... 16,500.00
From Interest 800.00

Total..... \$62,512.80

ESTIMATED DISBURSEMENTS

Disbursements to Pensionaries.....\$54,730.00
Administration Expenses 700.00
Additional Pensions 3,000.00

Total..... \$58,430.00

Balance \$ 4,082.80

This proposed Budget provides a balance, which is desired, for the quota has never been contributed by all our congregations, and further, the Reserve Fund should be built up. It is based on a quota of \$1.60 per family, the same as last year. We recommend that Synod continue this quota. It should not be decreased for every possible deficit should be forestalled as the pension is an obligation which must be paid. It need not be increased providing all our Consistories do what they possibly can to contribute the quota in full.

THE RELIEF FUND

The Rules for the administration of this Fund authorize us to inform the Church as to the needs of this Fund. We have tried to do this. We made known that a free-will offering on the part of all our congregations was needed.

The response was gratifying, though many Consistories failed to contribute. The financial report shows a balance. However, we remind Synod that the large balance with which this Fund started in 1940 was wiped out because of deficits in 1941 and 1942. A special appeal made in the last quarter of 1942 resulted in the accumulation of the present balance.

We anticipate that, because of the higher cost of living, the requests for aid from this Fund will not decrease but increase. We reckon that the need is the same as last year, one free-will offering during this year. We recommend that Synod once more urge all our Consistories to remember this Fund and to contribute as requested.

It is our aim to administer this Fund wisely. Every request for aid is investigated. Aid is granted only then when the Consistory of the applicant has approved of the request and we are convinced that a real need exists.

The following statement of receipts, disbursements and present assets of the Relief Fund, certified by the auditor, Mr. William P. Dreyer, is submitted:

RELIEF FUND—CURRENT FUNDS

January 1, 1942, Balance brought forward.....	\$	42.92
Received from Classical Treasurers.....	\$	5,419.14
Received from Individuals.....	75.00	5,494.14
Total Credits.....	\$	5,537.06
Disbursed to Beneficiaries.....		1,823.67
Balance on hand, December 31, 1942.....	\$	3,713.39

RELIEF FUNDS—RESERVE FUNDS

January 1, 1942, Balance brought forward.....	\$15,167.78
Received from payments on Arrears.....	173.96
Total Credits.....	\$15,341.74
Disbursements—None	
Balance on hand, December 31, 1942.....	\$15,341.74

A detailed report of the receipts and disbursements, which according to the Rules shall be given to the Advisory Committee of Synod and, if Synod so desires, to Synod itself, in executive session, is submitted.

IN CONCLUSION

SUMMARY OF FUNDS—Balances, December 31, 1942

a. Balance Pension Fund—Current Funds.....	\$25,491.63*
b. Balance Pension Fund—Reserve Funds.....	35,683.44**
c. Balance Relief Fund—Current Funds.....	3,713.39
d. Balance Relief Fund—Reserve Funds.....	15,341.74

Total Balances in all Funds.....\$80,230.20

Represented by the following:

Cash in Banks:

In open account with Zeeland State Bank.....	\$19,057.97
In Savings Department:	
Zeeland State Bank.....	5,000.00
Peoples National Bank of Grand Rapids.....	5,000.00
Coupons in course of circulation.....	96.25
Total Cash in Banks.....	\$29,154.22

Bonds:

United States Savings Bonds:

Series	Maturity Value	Cost	Interest Added	
B 1936-47	\$ 6,675.00	\$ 5,006.25	\$ 667.50	
C 1937-47	6,675.00	5,006.25	600.75	
C 1938-48	5,350.00	4,012.50	364.50	
D 1939-49	10,000.00	7,500.00	600.00	
F 1942-54	18,300.00	13,542.00	
	<u>\$47,000.00</u>	<u>\$35,067.00</u>	<u>\$2,232.75</u>	<u>37,299.75</u>

U. S. Treasurer Coupon Bonds:

1960-65 2¼ % par value \$3,500.00.....	\$ 3,500.00	
Premium paid \$27,500, unamortized 12/31/42	216.23	3,716.23
U. S. Defense Bonds, Oct. 1941-53, cost, par....		10,000.00
Total U. S. Bonds at cost.....	\$51,015.98	

Other Assets:

Cert. of Participation Assets of Holland State Bank, \$5,503.22; less received,	
\$2,201.24	\$ 3,301.98
Less allowance for possible loss.....	3,301.98
Other Receivables: Loan to Mrs.	
Balance 12/31/42	60.00
Total Cash, Bonds, etc.....	\$80,230.20

* \$10,000 of this was placed, February 23, 1943, in the Pension Fund—Reserve Funds.

** \$10,000 was deposited February 23, 1943, in the Pension Fund—Reserve Funds.

LIST OF THE PENSIONARIES

Rev. H. Ahuis.....	\$770.00	Mrs. P. Bloem.....	\$580.00
Rev. J. S. Balt.....	770.00	Mrs. H. Bode.....	580.00
Rev. H. Beute.....	770.00	Mrs. W. Bode.....	580.00
Rev. K. Bergsma.....	770.00	Mrs. L. P. Brink.....	580.00
Rev. H. C. Bode.....	770.00	Mrs. M. Botbyl.....	580.00
Rev. R. Bolt.....	770.00	Mrs. P. W. De Jonge.....	580.00
Rev. M. Borduin.....	770.00	Mrs. A. Dekker.....	490.00
Rev. S. Bouma.....	770.00	Mrs. H. J. De Vries.....	580.00
Rev. J. W. Brink.....	770.00	Mrs. S. P. Eldersveld.....	580.00
Rev. J. M. Byleveld.....	770.00	Mrs. N. Fokkens.....	580.00
Rev. B. J. Danhof.....	770.00	Mrs. N. Gelderloos.....	580.00
Rev. T. De Boer.....	770.00	Mrs. J. A. Gerritsen.....	580.00
Rev. J. C. De Bruyn.....	770.00	Mrs. J. H. Gruessing.....	580.00
Rev. J. De Jonge.....	770.00	Mrs. H. J. Haarsma.....	580.00
Rev. H. Dekker.....	770.00	Mrs. H. J. Heynen.....	580.00
Rev. R. Diephuis.....	770.00	Mrs. G. L. Hoefker.....	490.00
Rev. J. J. Dyk.....	770.00	Mrs. P. J. Hoekenga.....	580.00
Rev. B. H. Einink.....	770.00	Mrs. G. W. Hylkema.....	580.00
Rev. H. Fryling.....	770.00	Mrs. J. B. Jonkman.....	490.00
Rev. A. Guikema.....	770.00	Mrs. H. Kamps.....	490.00
Rev. H. Guikema.....	770.00	Mrs. A. Keizer.....	490.00
Rev. J. B. Hoekstra.....	770.00	Mrs. W. Kuipers.....	580.00
Rev. J. Holwerda.....	770.00	Mrs. A. W. Meyer.....	290.00
Rev. J. Homan.....	770.00	Mrs. H. J. Mulder.....	490.00
Rev. M. Huizenga.....	770.00	Mrs. W. Plesscher.....	320.00
Rev. P. Jonker, Sr.....	770.00	Mrs. J. Robbert.....	580.00
Rev. H. Keegstra.....	770.00	Mrs. J. A. Rottier.....	580.00
Rev. J. Keizer.....	770.00	Mrs. J. H. Schultz.....	340.00
Rev. F. Schuurmann.....	770.00	Mrs. H. Schultz.....	580.00
Rev. R. Posthumus.....	770.00	Mrs. F. Stuart.....	580.00
Rev. J. Timmermann.....	770.00	Mrs. H. Temple.....	580.00
Rev. I. Van Dellen.....	770.00	Mrs. H. Tuls.....	580.00
Rev. W. D. Vanderwerp.....	770.00	Mrs. E. J. Tuuk.....	490.00
Rev. H. Vander Woude.....	770.00	Mrs. J. B. Vanden Hoek.....	580.00
Rev. L. Van Haitsma.....	770.00	Mrs. M. Vander Heide.....	490.00
Rev. T. Van Loo.....	770.00	Mrs. S. Vander Heide.....	490.00
Rev. W. P. Van Wyk.....	770.00	Mrs. T. Vander Ark.....	220.00
Rev. L. Veltkamp.....	770.00	Mrs. H. Vander Ploeg.....	580.00
Rev. J. M. Voortman.....	770.00	Mrs. P. Van Vliet.....	440.00
Rev. G. Westenberg.....	770.00	Mrs. J. Vissia.....	490.00
Rev. J. A. Westervelt.....	770.00	Mrs. A. B. Voss.....	580.00
Rev. L. Ypma.....	770.00	Mrs. D. Weidenaar.....	490.00
Minor: P. Yff.....	100.00	Mrs. B. Zwaagman.....	580.00

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) We advise Synod to approve the actions taken relative to the emeritation of the brethren Veltkamp, Voortman, Bergsma, and Van Haitsma.

(2) We request Synod to approve our action in increasing the pensions of some beneficiaries, who are not receiving the full pension.

(3) We request Synod to adopt our decision relative to a minister who has united with our Church.

(4) We ask Synod to revise Article 121, Acts of Synod, 1942.

(5) We recommend that the Quota for the Pension Fund shall be continued at \$1.60 per family.

(6) We request that Synod urges all our Consistories to contribute one free-will offering to the Relief Fund during 1943.

Respectfully submitted,

The Board of Trustees of the Ministers'
Pension and Relief Administration,

J. O. Bouwsma, *Secretary*.

P. S. The Secretary has been appointed to represent the Board at the Synod.—J. O. B.

REPORT XIII.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MIXED MARRIAGES

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

I. MANDATE OF THE COMMITTEE¹⁾

THE overtures relative to the question of "Mixed Marriages" originated with the consistory of the First Church of Cicero and with Classis Illinois.²⁾ Cicero I overtured Classis on five matters, two of which evoked special study. These two are: "3. To deny ecclesiastical confirmation of marriage to a believer with an unbeliever . . . ; "4. To deny our pastors the right to solemnize mixed marriage (as defined in report³⁾ in the Church, parsonage, or any other place".⁴⁾ Classis did not concur in these two specific matters immediately. Instead it appointed special committees to study the entire question. Classis discussed the question for almost a year without arriving at completely satisfactory results. This year, however, was not ill-spent, for these reports and consequent classical discussions crystallized the problems involved.

During this year Classis Illinois accomplished at least three things. At its pre-Synodical gathering of May, 1940, it overtured Synod to amend Article 68, General Rules of 1881, to read as follows: "Ecclesiastical confirmation of marriage shall not take place in the case of a marriage of a believer with an unbeliever".⁴⁾ It did not endorse Cicero I's overture to forbid the pastor to solemnize mixed marriages (as defined in the report) privately.⁵⁾ Classis also forbade its ministers the right to use "the official form of our Christian Reformed Church in marrying a believer with an unbeliever".⁶⁾

¹⁾ *Acts of Synod, 1940*, Art. 93, X, pp. 103-106. For Change of personnel of committee, the Rev. R. J. Frens instead of the Prof. elect, the Rev. Wm. Hendriksen, cf. *Acts of Synod, 1942*, pp. 112, 146.

²⁾ Now divided into Classes Chicago North and Chicago South.

³⁾ *Exhibit I* p. 2 (3, 4).

⁴⁾ *Acts of Synod, 1940*, p. 103.

⁵⁾ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁾ *Minutes of Classis Illinois*, May 21, 1940, Art. 34.

Cicero I made use of its privilege to take particularly the matter of private solemnization to Synod. It felt that Classis Illinois had spoken. Classis Illinois concurred with Cicero I's request to throw the *entire* question in the lap of Synod. Classis then discharged its own committee on Mixed Marriages.

Both Classis Illinois and Cicero I graciously submitted their splendid studies to serve as an aid to the Synodical committee to be appointed. These studies have been of benefit not only for the history and development of these discussions, but particularly for discovering the lay of the land. We hereby express our indebtedness.

Our mandate, specifically, is to consider the overtures of Classis Illinois and of Cicero I.⁷⁾ We have also been instructed to take cognizance of the reports and findings of the special classical committees.⁸⁾

Besides these overtures and reports on findings the Synodical minutes of 1940 have given your committee a "Blanket" mandate to study all pertinent angles to the question.⁹⁾ Synod sensed that the problem was too broad and complicated to be settled at once. Besides, the prevalence of the problem warrants an extensive investigation.

Although this immeasurably large territory has become our domain we must address ourselves in particular to these two problems: 1. Shall we recommend a change in the General Rules as indicated above? This is the desire of both Classis Illinois and Cicero I.¹⁰⁾ 2. Shall we recommend that the same principles that forbid ecclesiastical solemnization apply also to the private solemnization?¹¹⁾ Or, what is the relation of the pastor to his consistory regarding ecclesiastical and regarding private solemnization?

II. DELIMITATION OF INQUIRY

1. *The Term "Mixed Marriages"*

In a sense the term "Mixed Marriages" is a technical term. At the same time the difficulty of the questions involved is inseparably wrapped up in the definition we give of the term. Our definition colors our investigation.

7) *Acts of Synod, 1940*, p. 106.

8) *Ibidem.*

9) *Ibidem.*

10) *Ibidem*, p. 103.

11) *Ibidem*, pp. 103 f. This question seems to be the only difference between Classis Illinois and Cicero I.

The history of the overtures at hand verifies this point of view. Cicero I felt it obligatory to define the term.¹²⁾ The first classical committee retorted that such was superfluous labor since the term had gained common currency.¹³⁾ In the course of further investigations another committee devoted an entire section to the question: "III. What are Mixed Marriages?"¹⁴⁾ In short, as the issues became clearer the term "Mixed Marriages" became more complicated.

Our first concern is, therefore, to find an explanation that may serve as a working basis for discussion. We shall confine ourselves to mixed marriages in the religious sense of the term. We eliminate mixed marriages in the racial sense. We may regret them, but we feel that it is not the duty of the church to make any ecclesiastical pronouncements in regard to them. The pastor as pastor may serve his flock with sane and delicate advice in the matter. The church should be satisfied when there is the same spiritual community that in the Christian faith can and does transcend racial barriers.¹⁵⁾

From a religious point of view the term mixed marriages implies marriages between believers and unbelievers, or between a believer of one faith with a believer of another faith. Hence we can classify various kinds of mixed marriages.

The Roman Catholic Church has its own classification and terminology. It recognizes thereby different grades of mixed marriages. For our convenience we may classify mixed marriages: I. With Unbelievers; II. With Jews; III. With Catholics; IV. With Sectarians (Christian Scientists, Jehovah's Witnesses, etc.); V. With members of other denominations; VI. With Modernists. In a sense the last division is superfluous for modernism cuts through all denominational barriers, and is from a biblical point of view a species of unbelief. Unbelievers may be avowed atheists or baptized covenant children who in life and doctrine repudiate their covenant obligations.

Synod felt that some such classification and consequent consideration were necessary.¹⁶⁾ Our churches are con-

¹²⁾ *Exhibit I.*

¹³⁾ *Exhibit III.*

¹⁴⁾ *Exhibit VIII.*

¹⁵⁾ *Exhibit VIII*, IV, D (We do not commit ourselves herewith on such subjects known as miscegenation, *e.g.* marriage of black and white.)

¹⁶⁾ *Acts of Synod, 1940*, X, A. 4c, p. 105.

fronted with many practical questions. Our churches are seeking light and uniformity of procedure.

In this connection we must consider that in every type of mixed marriage three possibilities at least present themselves. The first possibility is that the unbelieving partner may be hostile. The second possibility is that he may be indifferent, serving merely as a spiritual dead weight on family life. The third possibility is that he may be teachable and even amenable to our views. Perhaps he may be willing to promise that children born from this wedlock will be trained in our faith. These possibilities must be kept in the picture.

At this point we must also insert another question for consideration. What shall we do in case of a forced marriage? By forced marriage we mean a marriage forced upon a couple resulting from what is commonly known as a transgression against the seventh commandment. How must we face a forced-mixed-marriage?

2. *The Legitimacy of Mixed Marriages*

The Synod of 1940 did not condemn all mixed marriages outright. Mixed marriages as a whole are usually frowned upon. Religious differences are usually serious impediments or hindrances to a truly Christian marriage. Each new family is encouraged to receive ecclesiastical confirmation as Article 70 of the church order historically implies. Compliance with this article tacitly indicates that the new family is welcomed in the House of God. Our new form for marriage puts it: "If there are no lawful objections the ceremony will take place on that date." "Since we have received no lawful objections . . ." we may proceed with solemnization. If mixed marriages, some or all, constitute impediments or hindrances, two considerations must follow. (1) How can we prevent such a situation? (2) If a mixed marriage is fixed in the mind of a couple or is an accomplished fact, how shall we deal with it?

III. EDUCATIONAL MEASURES.

1. TEACHINGS OF SCRIPTURE

We shall first of all deal with an educational approach for the prevention of mixed marriages. The first requisite is an unshakable conviction that definite types of mixed marriages are condemned by God. Any pusillanimous

halting on this score will defeat any educational build-up. That there is an unequivocal condemnation of a marriage of a believer with an unbeliever, especially one hostile, needs very little proof.

The Old Testament is replete with condemnations. The outstanding antediluvian sin was that of mixed marriages. Rachel appealed to Isaac's covenant consciousness when she delivered Jacob from Esau by pleading the dangers of marrying the heathen women round about. The feast of Baal-Peor was designed to crush Israel by immorality and consequent mixed marriages, in face of the fact that Balaam could not curse Israel into defeat. Mixed marriage via immorality would succeed where curses had failed (Numbers 25:1-5; 31:16). Also Ezra and Nehemiah knew the baneful results. Perhaps the loftiest expression and the most penetrating analysis is given by Malachi. "He sought a godly seed" (Malachi 2: 10-16, especially vs. 15). In short, Israel should not intermarry with heathen, in order that there be no confusion in the godly seed. God exercises a sovereign claim upon the offspring of His covenant people. How can one love the covenant and surrender one's offspring to an anti-covenant life?

The New Testament is also unequivocal in its condemnation of mixed marriages. Mixed marriages were not uncommon in the Corinthian Church (I Cor. 7:10 ff.). As long as an unbelieving partner was willing to dwell in peace with a believing partner, no separation was permitted. These marriages became "mixed" because one of the partners had accepted the gospel after marriage. This believing partner was told to try to win the other to Christ. From this we may not infer that Paul took a lax attitude toward this question. The opposite is the case. This rule covers *existing* marriages contracted before conversions.

For those contemplating a *new* marriage Paul enjoins upon them that such may be done "*only* in the Lord" (I Cor. 7:39). In the light of Romans 16:2, 22, and Ephesians 6:1, it is permissible to interpret this phrase to mean: "in a Christian manner". As a contrast, however, in the very context, a better explanation may be, "in the Lord" means "to marry a Christian". Others combine the two and interpret "in the Lord" to mean: "marry a Christian in a Christian Manner". Grosheide, Godet,

Hodge, Meyer, Findlay, all seem to prefer "in the Lord" to mean "a Christian" although a few assert that the second is also included. Chrysostom, Augustine, and Calvin seem to prefer the second. We prefer to take it to mean first of all "a Christian over whom our Lord holds sway." He lives in that sphere in which the Lord is recognized. If so, a widow could marry anyone she pleased, provided only he be a Christian. This is also consonant with such injunctions as given to us in II Cor. 6:1 and Eph. 5:11. We are told in no uncertain terms that we may not be unequally yoked with an unbeliever.

This consistent Biblical condemnation should answer at least the following objections that are sometimes raised. 1. God has blessed some mixed marriages by causing the unbelieving partner to come in contact with the gospel, and has even given grace to this unbelieving partner to accept. Our reply would simply be that we may not tempt God nor expose ourselves to the opposite danger that God in His displeasure may visit us with unbelief or a shattered home. We live according to God's revealed will. It is God's prerogative to use even our sin to His glory without approving of that sin. 2. We may not plead innocent simply because we "love" a certain person. Also marital love needs sanctification and education. There can be a rebellious love. As a matter of early church history prominent women were known to marry Christian slaves in preference to unbelieving social equals. Some preferred the unmarried state to a mixed marriage. Some were even persecuted for refusing a suitor's hand. Love is never sovereign in its own sphere. It must bow before the will of God.

The principles that are enunciated above, marriage in the Lord, and no confusion of the holy seed, may also apply to other types of mixed marriages. Let us single out for the purpose of illustration the Roman Catholic Church. An acceptable mixed marriage on the part of the Roman Church requires at least these two promises. First, of all, the non-Roman Catholic partner must recognize that only a *sacramental* marriage is indissoluble. This goes against the grain of a true-blooded Protestant. He should never concede that he is living in an adulterous state simply because the marriage was not performed by a priest, that is, sacramentally. In fact, if not performed in that manner the Roman partner may leave

the other at any time under the pretext that he or she is not ecclesiastically married. Secondly,—and this is even more important—Rome demands the children. A man must give his pledge that his children will be instructed in the teachings and practices of the Roman Church, which, according to our Heidelberg Catechism include “damnable idolatry”. To surrender our children wilfully to idolatry is nothing short of covenant profanation.

2. COVENANT NURTURE

The only prevention that is vital is a positive passion for the beauty of God’s covenant. We must insist upon a vital and sanctified covenantal relationship to our God. In the light of this covenantal relationship we would adopt as the proper educational approach, a well-balanced and full-orbed presentation of the truths of God’s Word, stressing the peculiar niche which the entire doctrine of the home and the church occupies in the whole body of truth. Various Christian family duties, especially the care of these children, will receive proportional emphasis. In this way we underscore the truths expressed by St. Paul that marriage is the symbol of the mystic union of Christ and His church. Each home must symbolize that union. Each family must train for that higher purpose children for the sake of the Kingdom of God.

In this connection we should not begin with emphasizing individual responsibility too late in life. Our covenant members should be trained early in life that they are responsible in a large measure for the type of training their possible children may receive. There is a crying need for education for marriage religiously considered.

3. AGENCIES FOR THIS NURTURE..

The agencies to bring this covenant training in operation are the home, the church, and the school.

The home must create an atmosphere of genuine piety. This piety must be lived in the sunshine of parental love and sacrifice. Children must see covenant sincerity. Children must drink in the charm of a devoted home so that any other type of home will be naturally distasteful. The family altar can make its contributions. Particular emphasis should be placed upon the friends of a home. If

we cater to those prominent upon the social scrolls rather than to those whose names are written in the Book of Life, we shall repeat the history of the children of Seth fellowshiping with the children of Cain to the spiritual hurt of the former. Homes must be the center of piety, sunshine, and sacrifice.

The Christian School can teach God's Word pertaining to mixed marriages not first of all (although not excluded) as a special topic, but as a natural and a truly interpretative part of the Bible stories taught. School friendships are important in the cultivation of likes and dislikes. A parent's neglect to send a child to a Christian School may issue in an unhappy mixed marriage credited to the fault of the parent.

The Church has various agencies as preaching, catechism classes, family visitating, Sunday School, and societies. All these agencies should be employed to the full. Our organizations likewise can help us face the problem in a natural way.

4. OBJECTIVES

Our great objective should be prevention of unchristian marriages. This can be achieved only by a consecrated covenant life. We should cultivate immunity to improper friendships.

All agencies must create a desire for a positively Christian Home.

We should make such sacrifices for our children that our Christian Home, Church, and School will remain the dearest spot on earth.

Each person concerned must know the weight of individual responsibility. Each one should strive to become competent religiously to train the coming children in the fear of the Lord.

IV. ECCLESIASTICAL REGULATIONS

1. PRINCIPLES RE HOSTILE PARTNERS

In the light of God's Word to marry "only in the Lord" and to realize that the purpose of Christian marriage is that there shall be "a godly seed", the only consistent position Synod can take is to forbid any ecclesiastical solemnization between a believer and a hostile unbeliever. If not, we would desecrate worship, and the covenant, and, thereby transgress the plain will of God.

This should also be true of a hostile Roman Catholic, although we cannot classify him as an unbeliever. Also many a sectarian believes things diametrically opposed to historical Christianity. The particular principles involved are the absence of spiritual unity and the desecration of the covenant. This prohibition should include not only ecclesiastical solemnizations but also what is popularly called "church weddings".

Nor should two forms be introduced to meet the emergency, one for believer with believer, and one for believer with unbeliever, or with Roman Catholic, and sectarian. This would be an affront to the plain teaching of Scripture. It would introduce a dual standard of marriage, and it would be psychologically construed as a partial endorsement of a wicked practice.

2. PRINCIPLES RE TEACHABLE PARTNERS

Life is too complex, especially this phase of it (as our present military life indicates) to legislate in every detail. There may be instances in which an unbelieving partner is eager to know the gospel. He is willing to promise that his children will be taught in the Christian faith. He will not frustrate in any way the high purpose of a wedded life.

If in the judgment of the consistory such a partner is teachable, and if he realizes the weight of his marriage vows, and promises to allow his children to be trained in the Christian Faith, there would be no objection to allow the solemnization.

It is within the province of, and it seems logically mandatory that the consistory exact a promise that the children to be born shall be brought up in the Christian faith.

3. PRINCIPLES RE MIXED MARRIAGES NOT SOLEMNIZED IN OUR CHURCH OR BY ONE OF OUR PASTORS

There will be cases of elopements, or cases in which a couple will be married by a civil officer or by a Roman priest. The fact that some will elope is already an acknowledgement of ecclesiastical disapproval.

In case a member has married a Roman Catholic and has promised to allow his children to be trained in that faith, he has profaned this covenant by surrendering his children to idolatry. Such a sin is censurable and should be confessed. It would be inconsistent to sit at the table

of the Lord, a seal of the covenant, and to disregard the sanctity of the covenant for one's children. Those who are to make profession of their faith and are guilty of the above named sin, should repudiate this before making public profession. Every consistory should realize that no one is married by a Roman Catholic priest who does not make this sinful promise.

This should apply to marriages with sectarians also if the believing partner has promised to train the children of the new wedlock in the sectarian faith. Naturally there are gradations among sects. This applies to those sects radically departed from the historical church.

What shall be done about those who have been guilty of improper mixed marriages but have not promised to train their children in a divergent or hostile faith? The refusal on the part of the minister or consistory to permit solemnization may be in a measure the only appropriate disapproval. There is no doubt that the marriage has this sinful aspect. It is questionable, however, that such a member should be censured. There does not seem to be any N. T. warrant for such an act. After the ceremony two things may take place. If a confessing member is loyal to his faith the church should do what it can to win the other partner for the Christian Religion. If a member is seeking the privilege of public profession, then it may be necessary in these circumstances to set a probationary period to see whether or no he will be true in these circumstances. If this is established the table of the Lord may not be refused to him.¹⁷⁾

4. PRINCIPLES RE INTERDENOMINATIONAL MARRIAGES

We know there are splendid Christians in other denominations who make exceptional life's partners. They have a zeal for God's Kingdom. There are also members in our own denomination who are faint-hearted. Modernists we may classify as unbelievers of the distinctive Christian hopes, but some may even repudiate modernism if the difference were made clear to them. This possibility is the result of the blurred picture the church makes today.

Besides the breaking down of the isolation and the shelter the Dutch language afforded, many of our churches are lone churches in large cities. Many members can-

¹⁷⁾ F. L. Rutgers, *Kerkelijke Adviezen*, Vol. II, pp. 145, 263 f.

not marry within their own group for various reasons. We all realize that it stands to reason that we should not even suggest a single life when a fine Christian partner is to be had.

At the same time we must not assume that mixed marriages in the denominational sense are innocent and harmless. Many homes have felt a little denominational fox gnawing at the vine of home joys. Some members of denominations farther removed from us have become loyal members. Others closer to us historically may not be able to surrender themselves to the causes of the Kingdom our church holds dear. Convictions, personalities and characters play a large rôle.

The only way we can face this situation is by setting forth why we are Christian Reformed. The principle is simply this that we believe we have a right of separate denominational existence and we must maintain that this right affects the future of our children. We should encourage as much as possible to be true to our church, for their own sake and for their children's sake. If we prayerfully and humbly seek to be a true church, we have the right to indoctrinate our youth that they by persuasion can gain their partners as members for our church.

Moreover, each church should indoctrinate its youth that defections in doctrine and neglect in Christian practices can be detected.

5. PRINCIPLES RE ECCLESIASTICAL AND PRIVATE WEDDINGS

The problem before us in this paragraph is rather a difficult one. God has given the ordinance to mankind to marry and to propagate the human race. Neither does the entrance of sin alter this ordinance. All consummated marriages of mentally and physically competent individuals are indissoluble except for fornication, Rome notwithstanding.¹⁸⁾

Rome teaches that "sacramental" marriages alone are indissoluble. Other marriages are not according to God's law, so they are not valid. Martin Luther exploded that whole conception.¹⁹⁾ The Reformed Church has largely followed Luther. The question is: If marriage is a divine,

¹⁸⁾ For a thorough history of this we are indebted to the Anglican scholar, Oscar D. Watkins, *Holy Matrimony*, Chapter VIII.

¹⁹⁾ Ernst Salfeld, *Luther's Lehre von der Ehe*, pp. 11 ff.

creation ordinance, why may a preacher not solemnize that marriage? Why may he not use forms to whose vows even unbelievers could assent?

The second question is: What rights has a preacher as preacher apart from his ordination vows and consistory supervision? May he disregard this supervision? Or, should a consistory endorse every mixed marriage or non-Christian Reformed marriage before a pastor may perform a ceremony?

It is evident that a consistory should keep control over divine worship. It is also evident that a preacher has personal liberties. But it must also be evident that if an ecclesiastical wedding is wrong from a biblical point of view then it must also be wrong in a parsonage. There is only one question: Is this new union acceptable to God?

The minister can never officiate as a citizen or even in the final analysis as a servant of the state. Technically a minister is not a servant of the state. The state allows a minister as a matter of deference to religious convictions the courtesy of accepting and recording the vows.

A minister receives his ordination from the Christian Reformed Church. He cannot divorce his ministerial status from the Christian Reformed Church. Although he has the liberty to marry friends, for performing a marriage ceremony is not only ecclesiastical, he must remember that the *moral* relationship between consistory and minister must be maintained. In life and in doctrine he remains subject to the consistory.²⁰⁾

It follows therefore that a minister can exact only such promises as are compatible with his high calling as a minister, that is promises of a christian marriage. In early days a father as the priest of the family solemnized the wedding, but in our day the minister takes the father's place so that the couple may be united in marriage by one who functions in a priestly capacity. The marriage between unbelievers may be compatible with the ordinances of God, but a higher marriage is one that symbolizes the union of Christ and His Church. Only such a marriage can a minister solemnize in harmony with the vows of his ordination.

²⁰⁾ W. Heyns, *Kerkrecht en Kerkregering*, p. 358. He claimed that if a minister should solemnize a marriage ceremony contrary to the Word of God the consistory would have to take the minister to task.

What follows? If the sinfulness of such a contemplated ecclesiastical marriage is evident, this sinfulness cannot be removed by solemnizing it privately or in a parsonage. Wrong happens to remain wrong. Neither may we allow good-will, possible conversions, or practice to affect our sense of right and wrong. We may not do evil in order that good may come. Consistently, if we allow certain things for the good-will of the couple in private marriages, what is there to prevent us from applying this standard also to ecclesiastical weddings?

Can we refuse to perform a ceremony and still invite a partner to join our church?²¹⁾ It would be more inconsistent the other way, that is, first to tell him that his marriage is not scriptural and then marry him anyway for good-will. And after a new home is begun why can he not be invited to change the home begun to the ideal home Christ demands? If he should later on come to the Lord's table it is a different man that then participates, *viz.*, one who in the meantime has become a Christian.

In private weddings as well as public weddings a minister should ask unbelievers to be willing to promise that they will not frustrate the purposes of a Christian marriage. This promise should be given in the presence of an officer of the consistory and recorded for mutual protection. This may enjoin upon the pastor a moral obligation to instruct the unbelieving, Roman Catholic, or sectarian partner, but such a duty would be a welcome opportunity.

6. PRINCIPLES RE FORCED MIXED MARRIAGES

In the case of forced-mixed-marriages no persuasion is permitted to cause the couple to desist from marrying publicly, provided there are no recognized impediments to the marriage.

The principle followed is simple. Barring legitimate hindrances, sexual intercourse in God's sight constitutes a marriage. (The principle underlying a slightly different case is evident in I Cor. 6:16.) This marriage *de facto* consummated must be publicly recognized. This the couple owe to Church and society. Religious differences in such an event do not constitute a legitimate impediment. That extremely pathetic situations may

²¹⁾ *Acts of Synod, 1940, p. 104.*

arise from such an unhappy union is common knowledge. But such is the inexorableness of the wages of sin.

The Church must recognize such a painful plight. Extreme mercy for the believer who may have fallen in an unguarded moment should be evident. The Church, however, must remain true to the lofty ideals of marriage: symbol of Christ, and the home, an institution for a godly seed. Never may the sin of sexual indiscretion frustrate the demands of God's will.

The only problem in this connection arises if the unbelieving partner is hostile or persistent in demanding the child for his own faith. He may hold a threat of desertion over the mother-to-be. If the unbeliever, Catholic, or sectarian is teachable, and promises that the child will be brought up in the faith we hold true, there is no reason that a minister cannot perform the ceremony.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS TO SYNOD

A. Ecclesiastical solemnization of marriage shall not take place in the case of a marriage of a believer with an unbeliever. *Grounds:*

1. Such marriages are contrary to Holy Writ.
2. The Church is a place of Worship. Sinful marriages cannot meet the demands of an acceptable worship.
3. A church could not tacitly approve a marriage that may become spiritually harmful to the church.
4. Promises made by an unbeliever would be an empty form.
5. Such marriages would profane the covenant.
6. Such has been the rule of the church (*Synodical Minutes, 1857-1880, p. 119 (20)*). The case in question is the refusal to solemnize a marriage of a lodge member. Although serious, unbelief is still more serious.)

B. Synod recognizes that this general rule may have an exception if in the judgment of the consistory the unbeliever is teachable and amenable to our convictions and Christian practices, and if he promises to allow children of this wedlock to be instructed in the faith of the Church. *Grounds:*

1. There are situations in life in which such exceptions are feasible.

2. The promise to train children in the truth is from a biblical point of view obligatory (Genesis 18:19, Deut. 6:7, Ps. 78:4, Eph. 6:4).
3. Consequently the consistory would be upholding the requirements of the covenant in exacting such a promise.

C. Ecclesiastical solemnization of marriage shall not take place in the case of a marriage of a member of our denomination with a Roman Catholic or Sectarian (member of a sect repudiating historical Christianity as The Jehovah's Witnesses, Christian Science, etc.). *Grounds:*

1. In all cases the profanation of the covenant is involved. (cf. Lord's Day XXX of our Heidelberg Catechism—Roman Catholic Church in its conception of the mass is guilty of accursed or "damnable idolatry".)
2. In all cases there could not be the fundamental spiritual unity indispensable to symbolize the blessed relationship between Christ and His Church. (Even other doctrines of the Roman Church closely related to its conception of the mass, as "grace", "justification", "purgatory", etc., are of sufficient moment to prevent spiritual unity.)
3. From a biblical and an historical point of view certain sects cannot even be considered Christian.

D. Synod rules that the same exception adopted in Recommendation B above should also apply to marriages contracted by members of our denomination with Roman Catholics or Sectarians. *Grounds:*

E. Synod recognizes that marriages between members of our denomination and members of other denominations may be unavoidable and even harmless at times, but issues the warning that its members should not take this matter lightly. Synod enjoins upon the youthful members of our church and upon parents and office-bearers to know and to cause to know the reasons of our separate denominational existence. Our youth should seek by persuasion to win their friends to a church which,—be it said in all humility—seeks to be true to God's Word in preaching, in administering of sacraments, and in the exercise of Christian discipline. Synod voices a special warning against the perils of marrying into modernistic and indifferent circles.

F. Synod rules that in case a marriage cannot be solemnized in a church for reasons adopted in Recommendations A and C above, a minister may not perform this marriage ceremony in a home, a parsonage, or anywhere else. *Grounds:*

1. A minister can officiate only as a minister of the Christian Reformed Church.
2. Although a minister has the personal right to officiate at private weddings, even at those outside of our denomination, he remains under the supervision of the consistory in doctrine and in conduct.
3. If a marriage is improper from a biblical point of view, this remains so whether contracted in a home or in a church.

G. Synod frowns upon any suggestion to introduce possibly two forms for marriage, one for a believer with a believer, another for a believer with an unbeliever. *Grounds:*

1. There can be only one consistent purpose of Christian marriage.
2. Psychologically this would be construed as a partial endorsement of mixed marriages.

H. Synod appoint a committee from its present membership to formulate a Synodical letter on Mixed Marriages, incorporating the decisions adopted, and the mind of Synod expressed therein.

Respectfully submitted,

C. BOUMA
R. J. FRENS
J. T. HOOGSTRA.

REPORT XIV.

REPORT OF THE SEAMEN'S HOME AT HOBOKEN

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE Eastern Home Mission Board hereby submits its report on the Seamen's Home for the year 1942.

The Board has met regularly on the second Thursday of the month, and besides held a few special meetings. One of the most important questions that confronted the Board was the appointment of a successor to Mr. Edward Apol, who resigned as of May 1, 1942, after 16 years of faithful service. As stated in our Report to the Synod of 1942, Mr. Apol desired to reside in a place where he could send his child to a Christian School. The Board appointed Mr. John J. Dahm of Berlin, Wisconsin, who arrived on August 19th, and has since been active as Manager of the Home. He was appointed at a salary of \$1,600, and free home and fuel. The Board requested him to live in the Home, but granted him the privilege to reside elsewhere, should he so desire, promising him \$40.00 a month for rent. Mr. Dahm has taken up his new duties with enthusiasm and to the satisfaction of the Board.

In the personnel of the Board no changes came, except in the case of Mr. John Faber, who was removed by death. Mr. C. P. Van Genderen, a member of the Prospect Street Christian Reformed Church of Passaic, N. J., was chosen as his successor. Mr. Faber was called to his eternal home on May 12, 1942, at the age of 69 years. For more than 2 years he might serve the cause of Home Missions and the Seamen's Home with love and devotion. His work will be remembered with gratitude.

The work among the Seamen was continued as heretofore. During the first four months of the year Mr. Apol visited the ships, barges, and other craft, distributed Bibles, New Testaments, tracts and portions of Scripture, and rendered many services to our Seamen. During the summer months Rev. Kort of Hoboken, and Elder A. Kes rendered valuable aid, and since his arrival Mr. Dahm

has assumed his new responsibilities. Gradually he is working himself into the problems confronting him. Several improvements have been made, and the new Manager states that he enjoys his work thus far.

When the opportunity presents itself, Rev. A. H. Kort conducts services in the Home. Neighboring churches of Classes Hackensack and Hudson assist him from time to time. In 1942 a total of 96 meetings were held, with a total attendance of 1,600. Many seamen have spoken of the material and spiritual good the Home has been instrumental in giving them.

As per the decision of Synod, June, 1942, the work at Halifax was terminated the last week of July. In his six months of labor among the Seamen in Halifax, Rev. David Grasman did good work. We trust that the labor and money thus spent were not in vain in the Lord.

The Financial Report of Rev. D. De Beer follows. The Board respectfully requests that the proposed budget be approved. It desires also to express its appreciation of the fact that the Synod of 1942 saw its way clear to recommend the Seamen's Home to the Churches "for an offering per year, so that funds received from the Van Agt-hoven Estate may be kept intact, if possible, in the Endowment Fund" (Acts 1942, p. 20). The Board respectfully requests that the Synod of 1943 make a similar decision.

May the Lord bless the Synod in all of its activities.

Respectfully submitted,

Eastern Home Mission Board,
E. VAN HALSEMA, Secretary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE HOLLAND SEAMEN'S HOME, HOBOKEN, N. J.

January 1, 1942, to December 31, 1942

Seamen's Home—

RECEIPTS

Balance on hand P. P. Nat'l Bank 1/1/42:		
Commercial Account	\$ 315.23	
Savings Account	10.20	
		\$ 325.43
Various Classes		1,210.85
Collected at Seamen's Home.....		817.69
Principal Payments on Mortgages.....		1,229.74
Interest on Mortgages.....		854.11
Payment on Loan—Northside Mission.....		875.00
Interest on Loan—Northside Mission.....		134.93
Dividends (Little Miami R. R. Stock).....		344.00
Donations		532.00
Borrowed Money		1,410.00
Return of Accrued Interest on Mortgage Purchased in September, 1941.....		35.62
Sale of Furniture to Passaic Chr. School.....		100.00
Return Premium on Insurance.....		17.20
Total Receipts, Plus Bank Balance.....		\$7,886.57

DISBURSEMENTS

Salaries	\$3,591.62	
Maintenance and Repairs.....	1,000.21	
Gas, Electricity and Water.....	257.62	
Coal	249.40	
Insurance	341.76	
Paid on Borrowed Money.....	60.00	
Paid on Notes to P. P. Nat'l Bank.....	1,000.00	
Interest on Notes—P. P. Nat'l Bank.....	16.16	
Interest on Loan—Monsey Cemetery Trust Fund.....	18.00	
Free Meals and Charity.....	147.75	
Miscellaneous	465.14	
Total Disbursements.....		\$7,147.60
Balance in Commercial Account.....	\$ 728.77	
Balance in Savings Account as of 12/31/42.....	10.20	
		738.97
		\$7,886.57

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1944

Salaries	\$4,000.00	
Maintenance and Repairs.....	800.00	
Gas, Electricity, and Water.....	300.00	
Fuel	350.00	
Free Meals, Small Loans, and Entertainment.....	300.00	
Miscellaneous and Incidentals.....	500.00	
Total.....		\$6,250.00

ANTICIPATED INCOME

Interest and Dividends.....	\$1,343.00
Collections at the Home.....	650.00
Collections from Congregations and Donations.....	4,257.00

Total.....	\$6,250.00
------------	------------

The Eastern Home Mission Board respectfully requests Synod for allowance of the above named budget.

Halifax Work—

RECEIPTS

Donations	\$ 15.00
From the Executive Committee—Home Missions..	1,500.00

Total Receipts.....	\$1,515.00
---------------------	------------

DISBURSEMENTS

Incidentals and Loan.....	\$ 300.00
Salaries	999.96
Traveling Expenses	130.35
Returned to the Exec. Comm.—Home Missions.....	84.69

Total.....	\$1,515.00
------------	------------

The books of the Treasurer were audited and found correct by Mr. John Zuidema and Mr. Garret Hoogerheide.

STATEMENT OF TOTAL ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF THE HOLLAND SEAMEN'S HOME AT HOBOKEN, N. J., AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1942

Invested in Six Mortgages.....	\$18,620.26
Loan to Northside Gospel Mission.....	3,075.00
Prospect Park Nat'l Bank Commercial Acct.....	728.77
Prospect Park Nat'l Bank Savings Acct.....	10.10

Grand Total Cash Investment.....	\$22,434.23
Little Miami R. R. Stock (80 shares).....	\$ 8,320.00
3-story Bldg., 334 River St., Hoboken, N. J.....	35,000.00
3-story Bldg., 310 Hudson St., Hoboken, N. J....	15,000.00

Grand Total Assets.....	\$80,754.23
-------------------------	-------------

LIABILITIES

Monsey Cemetery Fund in Trust.....	\$ 1,800.00
Borrowed Money	1,350.00

Total Liabilities.....	\$ 3,150.00
------------------------	-------------

Respectfully submitted,

D. DE BEER, *Treasurer.*

Approved by the Classis of Hackensack March 16, 1943.

JOHN BEEBE, S. C.

REPORT XV

DELEGATE LORD'S DAY ALLIANCE

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

IT gives me pleasure to submit my annual report about the Lord's Day Alliance of the U. S. It has been my privilege to represent our Church in the above named organization for about 10 years. I have taken an active part in the work as member of the Board of Managers, and as Chairman of the Finance Committee. It has been my privilege also to head the Golden Jubilee Campaign for expansion and for the raising of the necessary funds. I am sorry to say, that the last named effort has been a failure; and that for two reasons. First, it requires funds to carry on a financial campaign. It is impossible to raise money without spending some money in the effort. The Alliance asked me at that time to become the Assistant of the General Secretary, br. H. Bowlby. I foresaw, however, that most of the money would have to come from our own churches. Secondly, the Lord's Day Alliance has not the support of the larger denominations in our country. Again and again I have called the attention of the General Secretary to the need of a more extended constituency to support this great cause. Apparently without success. My conviction has become more and more confirmed that the Lord's Day Alliance of the U. S. can under such conditions never do effective work. In my report last year, I called Synod's attention to the fact that the General Secretary devoted some of his time to Camp Work. I am fully persuaded that this work is important—and attractive—but I expressed my conviction at a meeting of the Board that this is not the task of the General Secretary of the L. D. A. Our churches spend a considerable amount of money for doing that very same work through our own men. I felt it to be my duty to include that in my report of last year. And I repeat it in this report, since the General Secretary has been asked to again spend some time in that work.

During the year the beloved President of the L. D. A., Dr. John H. Willey, was taken from us by death. The Board of Managers elected as his successor the Rev. W. L. Whallen, D.D., of the Roseville Presbyterian church of Newark, N. J. He has been connected with the L. D. A. for about 17 years, and is well qualified for the position. Dr. Whallen has accepted the appointment and is at present leading the Alliance. I might add that the president is not paid for this important function.

The L. D. A. of the U. S. represents 22 denominations of the U. S. It is devoted and committed to a great cause. It is entitled to the prayers and the support of every church, and should use all its influences and efforts exclusively to the defense of the Lord's Day. I hope and pray that Synod may again recommend this cause for moral and financial support to our churches.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN J. HIEMENGA.

Midland Park, N. J., March 23, 1943.

REPORT XVI

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSLATION OF HOLLAND THEOLOGICAL WORKS

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

PROMPTED by overtures from Classes Chicago North and Grand Rapids East to translate outstanding theological works into English (Acts 1942, pp. 71-74), the 1942 Synod appointed the undersigned to "study the *desirability* and *practicability* of carrying out such a venture, and present its recommendations to the next Synod." This mandate has the double virtue of brevity and plainness.

I. AS TO DESIRABILITY

After due deliberation your Committee became convinced that the translation of leading theological works of Reformed men in the Netherlands during the past generation is highly desirable. Our conviction rests on the following considerations:

- A. Those works represent the choice fruits of a period in which Reformed thought and practice were flourishing to an unusual degree.
- B. That our church is what it is today is in no mean measure due to the fact that our leaders have had ready access to those choice works.
- C. Such works should be made readily available to the rising generation of leaders in our church if we are to maintain and develop our distinctly Reformed heritage.
- D. It may not be too idealistic to add that some Reformed leaders outside of our group could and would make grateful and profitable use of these works if they were available in the English language.

II. AS TO PRACTICABILITY

It is obvious that no private publisher could be enticed into carrying out this venture. It just simply is not a

paying proposition when figured in dollars and cents. The only alternative is that Synod engage a translator (s), a printing company to print and bind the work, and provide the necessary funds.

A. We considered the possibility of obtaining competent translator (s). From the nature of the case we could do nothing definite on this point, but our preliminary investigation convinced us that a suitable translator (s) could be obtained.

B. Your Committee considered the question as to which works should be translated, finally centering upon the following in the order given: Dr. A. Kuyper's *E Voto*; Ds. Van Andel's commentaries on *Romans* and *Corinthians*; Dr. Bavinck's *Reformed Dogmatics*; Dr. Geesink's work on *Ethics*; Dr. Kuyper's *Pro Rege*; and Dr. Kuyper's *Gemeene Gratie*.

Remarks on this proposed list:

1. Your Committee is of the definite opinion that the first work to be translated should be one in which the Reformed system of thought and practice is comprehensively set forth, such as *E Voto*, *Pro Rege*, or *Gemeene Gratie*.
2. We give preference to *E Voto* because it is not only thorough and comprehensive, but also because it could be put to wide and practical use in view of our weekly catechism preaching.
3. If one of those large and comprehensive works shall have been provided, we are of the opinion that the popular and yet thorough commentaries of Van Andel should follow.
4. The monumental works of Dr. Bavinck and Dr. Geesink also richly deserve to be translated, but the immediate urgency is partly canceled by the fact that similar works, although less comprehensive, are available in the English language.

C. Your Committee also investigated the cost angle. We found that the cost of translating, printing, and binding would total nearly four dollars per page. That means that the translation of a work like *E Voto* would cost approximately ten thousand dollars.

Ten thousand dollars is quite a sum of money, indeed, and your Committee is in no mood to deny it. However, when the cost is spread over the entire denomination

the amount per family is not utterly alarming—about 28 cents. We do not wish to contend that the proposed translation of some of these outstanding Holland works is a matter of life and death for our denomination. Nevertheless, we do think that it may have great value for the present and future preservation of our Reformed heritage for our leaders, and through them for the total membership of the church, a value which can not be computed in dollars and cents.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. We *recommend* that Synod postpone taking final action in this matter for the time being.

In the light of the foregoing it might seem logical for us to advise Synod to proceed immediately to provide the above mentioned translations. We are, however, not prepared to do so. We are restrained by the following considerations:

1. The proposed undertaking is too large to be hurriedly decided upon and executed. This is especially pertinent since there would be no great gain or loss entailed in a year's postponement of final action.
2. It is not wise to undertake a project of these dimensions until a measure of ripened public opinion has been developed in the matter. If there is a conscious need on the part of the church generally for this work, it has at least not yet come to expression, nor has there been any enthusiasm generated for it. Some even question whether the extent of the use to which it would be put would justify the expense. The mind of the church needs first to become more crystallized.
3. In rendering translations such as contemplated in this report two possibilities present themselves. It might either be a full translation of the original, or a reproduction in digest form, an abridged edition. We judge there would be no appreciable difference in the cost. But we are not prepared to offer a judgment at this time as to which of the two would be the more desirable. Possibly some discussion in the church press and at church meetings would tend to clarify this point also.

B. We *recommend* that a committee be appointed which shall, in the light of anticipated developments, present recommendations to the next Synod.

Humbly submitted,

D. H. KROMMINGA.

J. WEIDENAAR.

J. BUITEN.

H. DENKEMA.

R. J. FRENS.

REPORT XVII.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR CHURCH HELP

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

WE herewith submit to you our report for 1942.

We are happy to report that the Fund continues to enjoy a somewhat flourishing condition. Last year we reported a marked improvement over the preceding year. This year we can again report a substantial advance. The total income during 1942 was \$36,961.30.

The number of churches failing to contribute to the Fund is gradually diminishing. During 1938 there were 103 churches that failed to contribute. During 1940 there were 48. And during 1942 there were only 25 who failed to do so.

There is somewhat the same improvement in the matter of repayment. During 1938 11 churches made no repayment. During 1940 9 churches failed to do so. And during 1942 there were only 5.

We have again written the negligent churches in accordance with the instructions of Synod.

We had expected that the recommendations would diminish considerable, because of war-time influences. However, during the year 1942 recommendations amounted to \$36,00.00.

We have promised loans to the amount of \$34,000.00.

Because of the improved condition of the Fund, we have not been compelled to make such drastic cuts as we were compelled to formerly. In many cases we have promised the full amount for which the churches were recommended. However, in some of the cases we have cut down, because of the excessive amount recommended.

We suggest the same quota of 75 cts for next year.

We attach a copy of the financial report of the treasurer, properly audited by Miss Cora Hilger, public accountant, of Le Mars, Iowa.

Respectfully submitted,

The Church Help Committee

J. R. VAN DYKE, *Chairman*

A. WASSINK, *Secretary*

CHAS. R. MULDER, *Treasurer*

**SCHEDULE A
BANK RECONCILIATION
NORTHWESTERN STATE BANK
Orange City, Iowa**

Bank Balance as per statement Jan. 1, 1942		\$ 586.97
1941 Deposits (late).....	\$ 7,931.34	
1941 Checks Outstanding.....	7,500.00	431.34
Our Ledger Balance January 1, 1942		\$ 1,018.31
1942 Receipts		37,631.31
Total.....		<u>\$38,649.62</u>
Less 1942 Disbursements.....		36,968.02
Cash Available.....		\$ 1,681.60
Due from Canadian Banks.....		204.38
Our Ledger Balance Dec. 31, 1942....		<u>\$ 1,885.98</u>
Bank Balance as per statement.....	\$ 5,921.89	
Deposits Late.....	8,915.46	
Total.....	\$14,837.35	
Less Checks outstanding 12-31-42.....	13,155.75	
Cash Available.....	\$ 1,681.60	
Due from Canadian Banks.....	204.38	
		<u>\$ 1,885.98</u>

SUMMARY

Balance on hand Jan. 1 1942..			\$ 1,018.31
Classical Collections and			
Personal Donations.....	\$19,368.36		
Less: Canadian Exchange.....	175.61	\$19,192.75	
Payments by Churches.....	\$19,092.94		
Less: Wellsburg, Iowa discount			
10% on \$1000 note.....	100.00		
Allamedo, California, 5%			
discount on \$3000 note..	150.00		
Everett, Washington,			
discount on two notes....	200.00		
Canadian Exchange.....	204.38	18,438.56	37,631.31
Total.....			<u>\$38,649.62</u>

DISBURSEMENTS:

New Loans.....	\$36,500.00		
Administration Expenses.....	468.02		36,968.02
Balance on hand Dec. 31, 1942.....			\$ 1,681.60
Due from Canadian Banks.....			204.38
			<u>\$ 1,885.98</u>

CHAS. R. MULDER, Treas.

ANALYSIS — LOANS OUTSTANDING

SCHEDULE B

Church at	Outstanding Jan. 1, 1942	New Loans	Payments	Outstanding Dec. 31, 1942
Artesia, Calif. -----	\$ 1,900.00	\$ -----	\$ 100.00	\$ 1,800.00
Aetna, Mich. -----	1,211.86	-----	110.00	1,101.86
Alameda, Calif. -----	1,000.00	-----	1,000.00	.00
Alamosa, Colo. -----	5.00	-----	5.00	.00
Allison, Iowa -----	900.00	-----	50.00	850.00
Ackley, Iowa -----	-----	500.00	-----	500.00
Arlene, Mich. -----	52.70	-----	15.00	37.70
Atwood, Mich. -----	950.00	-----	85.00	865.00
Austinvillle, Iowa -----	659.25	-----	60.00	599.25
Bauer, Mich. -----	150.00	-----	150.00	.00
Bejou, Minn. -----	-----	500.00	-----	500.00
Bemis, S. D. -----	184.91	-----	14.38	120.53
Bigelow, Minn. -----	742.33	-----	742.33	.00
Birnamwood, Wis. -----	1,626.10	-----	140.00	1,486.10
Brooton, Minn. -----	992.02	-----	70.00	922.02
Cincinnati, Ohio -----	-----	3,000.00	-----	3,000.00
Corsica, S. D. -----	800.00	-----	40.00	760.00
Colton, S. D. -----	1,744.01	-----	108.10	1,640.91
Chandler, Minn. -----	781.68	-----	86.59	695.09
Chatham, Canada -----	2,975.00	-----	75.00	2,900.00
Conrad, Mont. -----	1,130.00	-----	158.42	976.58
Coopersville, Mich. -----	1,344.18	-----	78.75	1,270.43
Compton, Calif. -----	-----	2,000.00	-----	2,000.00
Crookston, Minn. -----	1,137.90	-----	70.00	1,067.90
Duvall, Wash. -----	800.00	1,500.00	50.00	2,250.00
Dearborn, Mich. -----	937.89	-----	150.00	787.89
Des Plaines, Ill. -----	2,089.87	-----	640.47	1,449.19
Delavan, Wis. -----	3,675.00	-----	200.00	3,475.00
Doon, Iowa -----	2,686.47	-----	213.00	2,473.47
Decatur, Mich. -----	3,486.09	-----	54.99	3,431.10
Denver Second, Colo. -----	7,125.00	-----	375.00	6,750.00
Dutton, Mich. -----	175.00	-----	75.00	100.00
Dorr, Mich. -----	1,262.50	-----	75.00	1,187.50
East Martin, Mich. -----	660.00	-----	-----	660.00
East Muskegon, Mich. -----	3,310.54	-----	210.54	3,100.00
Estelline, S. D. -----	1,927.17	-----	53.75	1,873.42
Everett, Wash. -----	1,200.00	-----	1,200.00	.00
Flint, Mich. -----	3,375.00	2,000.00	50.00	5,325.00
Grandville, Mich. -----	3,020.63	3,000.00	160.00	5,860.63
Goshen, N. Y. -----	3,800.00	-----	-----	3,800.00
G. R., Seymour -----	3,000.00	-----	150.00	2,850.00
Grangeville, Idaho -----	2,000.00	-----	125.00	1,875.00
Goshen, Ind. -----	1,500.00	-----	150.00	1,350.00
G. R., E. Leonard St. -----	5,039.55	-----	324.56	4,714.99
G. R., Godwin Heights -----	2,250.00	-----	150.00	2,100.00
G. R., Lee St. -----	200.00	-----	200.00	.00
Granum, Canada -----	750.00	-----	37.50	712.50
Glendale, Calif. -----	2,700.00	500.00	100.00	3,100.00
Hull, N. D. -----	2,000.00	-----	100.00	1,900.00
Hollandale, Minn. -----	797.50	-----	60.00	737.50
Hamilton, Canada -----	2,656.00	-----	300.00	2,356.00

Church at	Outstanding Jan. 1, 1942	New Loans	Payments	Outstanding Dec. 31, 1942
Hamshire, Texas	1,525.00		200.00	1,325.00
Hancock, Minn.	795.12		38.99	756.13
Hawarden, Iowa	507.97		100.00	407.97
Hills, Minn.	1,618.24		115.54	1,502.70
Holland, Iowa	1,850.00		175.00	1,675.00
Holland, Minn.	2,883.57		75.00	2,808.57
Holland Marsh, Canada	285.00		49.50	235.50
Houston, Canada	300.00		15.00	285.00
Holland Center, S. D.	620.00		245.00	375.00
Ireton, Iowa	325.00		25.00	300.00
Imlay City, Mich.	2,375.00		125.00	2,250.00
Lansing, Mich.		7,500.00		7,500.00
La Combe, Alta, Canada	2,000.00		220.00	1,780.00
Third Lynden, Wash.	2,850.00		150.00	2,700.00
Lark, N. D.	475.00			475.00
Los Angeles, Calif.	775.00		175.00	600.00
Second Lynden, Wash.	629.00		629.00	.00
McBain, Mich.	98.54		98.54	.00
Modesto, Calif.	2,700.00		150.00	2,550.00
Momence, Ill.	1,500.00			1,500.00
Morrison, Ill.	2,625.00		150.00	2,475.00
Millwood, Mich.	2,925.00		175.00	2,750.00
Mountain Lake, Minn.	16.40		16.40	.00
Montello Park, Mich.		3,000.00	150.00	2,850.00
Milwaukee, Wis.		5,000.00		5,000.00
Neerlandia, Canada	3,909.91		350.00	3,559.91
Newton, Iowa	3,000.00		150.00	2,850.00
Second Orange City, Iowa	1,500.00		112.50	1,387.50
Ocheydan, Iowa	645.85		645.85	.00
Ogilvie, Minn.	319.78		57.00	262.78
Ontario, Calif.	1,725.54		151.22	1,574.32
Platte, S. D.	1,862.75		105.00	1,757.75
Second Pella, Iowa	716.00		50.00	666.00
Preakness, N. J.	750.00		50.00	700.00
Portland, Mich.	425.00		75.00	350.00
Parchment, Mich.	2,425.00		150.00	2,275.00
Purewater, S. D.	490.10		40.10	450.00
Pipestone, Minn.	1,350.00		75.00	1,275.00
Pine Creek, Mich.	1,820.00		120.00	1,700.00
Second Randolph, Wis.	3,225.00	3,000.00	1,600.00	4,625.00
Raymond, Minn.	2,350.00		125.00	2,225.00
Rock Rapids, Iowa	4,004.45		200.65	3,803.80
Fourth Roseland, Ill.	1,775.00		725.00	1,050.00
Rudyard, Mich.	83.46		30.00	53.46
Sumas, Wash.	750.00		50.00	700.00
Sully, Iowa	3,350.00		200.00	3,150.00
South Holland, Ill.	850.00		100.00	750.00
Shepherd, Mont.	2,758.80		12.14	2,746.66
Seattle, Wash.		5,000.00		5,000.00
Sibley, Iowa	1,254.60		50.00	1,204.60
First Sioux Center, Iowa	855.00		90.00	765.00
Sioux City, Iowa	3,605.00		130.00	3,475.00
Sioux Falls, S. D.	1,780.06		190.29	1,589.77
Sultan, Wash.	645.00		146.86	498.14

Church at	Outstanding Jan. 1, 1942	New Loans	Payments	Outstanding Dec. 31, 1942
Terra Ceia, N. C.	245.00	-----	-----	245.00
Tracy, Iowa	694.10	-----	50.00	644.10
Volga, S. D.	3,175.00	-----	219.00	2,956.00
Vancouver, Canada	1,159.00	-----	300.00	869.00
Vona, Colo.	412.25	-----	-----	412.25
Second Wellsburg, Iowa.....	625.00	-----	625.00	.00
Western Springs, Ill.	1,725.00	-----	200.00	1,525.00
West Branch, Mich.	413.41	-----	173.14	240.27
Winnipeg, Canada	1,325.72	-----	130.15	1,195.57
Worthington, Minn.	1,132.41	-----	87.68	1,044.73
Wyoming Park, Mich.	500.00	-----	150.00	350.00
Totals	\$171,922.98	\$36,500.00	\$19,092.94	\$189,330.04

I HEREBY CERTIFY, that, I have examined the books and records of the Christian Reformed Church, Church Help Fund, of the Christian Reformed Church in North America, Orange City, Iowa, and that the attached is a true statement of the receipts and disbursements for the year ended December 31, 1942, insofar as disclosed by the records.

Respectfully submitted,

CORA M. HILGER, Public Accountant

CLASSICAL COLLECTIONS AND PERSONAL DONATIONS SCHEDULE C

CLASSIS	1941	1942
California	\$ 612.26	\$ 637.64
Chicago North	226.21	1,280.58
Chicago, South	433.78	1,228.94
Grand Rapids East	1,315.80	1,589.32
Grand Rapids South	1,043.52	1,704.75
Grand Rapids West	1,568.32	1,088.32
Hackensack	723.24	676.75
Holland	1,950.42	1,652.86
Hudson	1,058.50	1,097.25
Illinois	1,422.46	.00
Kalamazoo	647.33	736.27
Minnesota	636.66	589.16
Muskegon	1,505.83	1,660.61
Orange City	422.86	695.08
Ostfriesland	391.96	528.02
Pacific	787.24	749.60
Pella	833.64	988.78
Sioux Center	341.29	363.38
Wisconsin	583.45	599.01
Zeeland	1,315.12	1,252.98
Wisc. Personal	61.00	55.00
Canadian Churches00	294.06
	\$17,880.91	\$19,368.36

REPORT XVIII.

REPORT OF THE CHAPLAIN COMMITTEE

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE following report is respectfully submitted by the undersigned as Chaplain Committee and as the representatives of the Christian Reformed Church, a constituent member of the General Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains.

This twofold function of your Committee is in accord with the decision of the previous Synod, Art. 121, pp 115: "That Synod appoint a Chaplain Committee: the members to serve as *primi* and alternate members of the General Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains." This enlargement of representation and creation of a special Chaplaincy Committee for our Church was new in the history of our Christian Reformed Churches reflecting the vital importance of the chaplaincy for the Church of Jesus Christ in time of war.

We report first as Chaplain Committee in behalf of our own churches and secondly as representatives of the Christian Reformed Church on the General Commission.

I. REPORT OF THE CHAPLAIN COMMITTEE

A. INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN THE COMMITTEE

In appointing the Committee, Synod did not specify by express mandate the duties expected of it. In general it considers itself charged with matters pertaining to the procurement of our quota for the chaplaincy and the maintenance of proper ecclesiastical and fraternal contacts between the chaplains and our churches.

The Committee organized with the Revs. Henry Baker as President, John M. Van de Kieft as Secretary, Edward Boeve as Treasurer and Elbert Kooistra as General Assistant.

Specific instructions were given your Committee in regard to two pertinent matters (Art. 121, pg. 116): "Synod furthermore decides:

- 1) To authorize the Committee to contact ministers whom it considers qualified, thereby directly challenging them to take up the chaplaincy in the Army or Navy.
- 2) To request the Commisison on Army and Navy Chaplains to inform the Government (Departments of Army and Navy Chaplains) regarding our attitude towards the Sacraments, petitioning the government to acknowledge our conviction in this matter."

Your Committee has carried out these instructions. The challenge of the chaplaincy was presented to about sixty of our ministers in the form of a direct personal letter. At the same time we stressed the appeal in our Church Press urging upon all our ministers and churches to meet this challenge by providing the required number to fill our quota. (Copy of this letter is appended for the synodical Archives.)

The response to our personal and general appeals was at first rather meager. Voices within our churches were being raised expressing disappointment and dissatisfaction at the comparatively few of our Christian Reformed ministers willing to give themselves for this special service while an ever increasing number of our membership was answering the call to arms, leaving their homes to enter into the great modern dispersion of the world at war.

However, we are happy and thankful to report that the number of applicants has steadily increased. The prospects of reaching our quota as established by the government on the basis of one chaplain for every ten thousand members, is much brighter, although the coveted goal is not yet in sight. If all who made application had been accepted, the number asked from our churches would have been supplied. But the physical tests for commissioned officers are rather rigid and a number of our applicants were rejected because of physical disabilities. For the same cause one of our chaplains in the Army was placed on the non-active list and retired from the service. The law of attrition requires constant replacement in all branches of the service, including also the chaplaincy. Recruits of our young manhood and womanhood are pouring into the reception centers in streams, new divisions are being activated so that the need of adequately staffing the chaplaincy continues urgent.

The number set for this vital ministry represents the minimum needed and is below the comparative numbers as needed in the Medical and other branches of service, to provide for those in our country's service. Hence we should not relax our efforts until we have attained our full quota. When Synod meets your Committee will furnish a complete, up-to-date list of our Christian Reformed Chaplains in the service or in processing since now the number is mounting month by month.

We rendered assistance to a number of applicants in the processing of their applications, as well as granting to all acceptable candidates their final ecclesiastical endorsement. Advice was given, difficulties and objections, foreseen and unforeseen, were met and encouragement was given where needed. Financial aid to meet expenses of moving and outfitting was not extended, since the Synod had given us no authorization to do so, and since these induction outlays are in part paid for by the government.

Your Committee has taken this matter in advisement, having received specific request for this type of aid. It has concluded: 1) that Synod, representing the collective churches as a whole, has already financially obligated itself to the extent of providing for the transition stage from the chaplaincy back into the civilian pastorate; 2) that the individual church last served by the departing chaplain should, and undoubtedly would, take a special interest in having their minister answer this sacrificial call. Hence we deem it better to leave the matter of financial assistance upon entering into the chaplaincy to the local churches involved. It might be well for Synod to officially call the attention of our churches to this situation and to commend it to their care, without endorsement or stipulation as to the actual requirements which will vary with individual cases and needs.

In connection with this we wish also to inform Synod and the Churches that the Army and Navy are now offering a Chaplain's Certificate to any church which has its minister in the service. It contains appropriate inscription and signatures and can be framed or placed in a cabinet if desired, and later, in case of death, be engraved in a bronze plaque. Congregations wishing to avail themselves of this offer can apply either to the office

of the Chief of Chaplains of the Army or the Navy at Washington, D.C.

In one instance your Committee felt constrained to make a special grant of a hundred dollars to an applicant in a situation in which orders to report at the School of Chaplains were deferred and consequently he was without salary for the month of January without any fault of his own.

The second specific instruction of Synod was also carried out by your Committee. Both the Army and the Navy recognize the convictions of the Chaplains of diverse faiths in administering the word and the sacraments to the men in service. We were assured by both Chiefs of Chaplains that in administering the sacraments, as well as in preaching the Gospel, full freedom of convictions and established modes were respected. However, particularly in the Navy, when assigned to duty on a ship, the Protestant Chaplain may be called to administer baptism or the Lord's Supper to men of other Protestant denominations than his own, some of whom do not have the same standards for confession and communion as obtained in the Christian Reformed Church. This would by no means imply desecration of the holy elements by promiscuous administration of the same. We were assured by the Chief of Naval Chaplains, Captain R. Workman, that our convictions were respected and further asked "if your denomination is prepared to grant its chaplain the high privilege of ministering, in this respect, namely: Ministering the Sacraments of the Lord's Supper and baptizing those who came to him as professed Christian, who love the Lord Jesus Christ as their personal Savior and who desire to commemorate His dying love for them through partaking of the elements or declaring their faith in Him as they seek Baptism."

Your Committee consented, with this assurance given when one of our Seminarians was passed by the Naval Chaplains' Examining Board for commissioning in the Navy Chaplaincy. We saw no need of pressing this issue further with the authorities which allow full freedom of bringing the christian message and administering the sacraments to all chaplains represented in the chaplaincy. Our Christian Reformed Chaplains are finding it a matter which readily resolves itself into a situation of spiritual adjustment according to sound bibli-

cal principles and precedents. None of them have expressed to your Committee any compunctions of violating basic scriptural sanctions or restrictions as they meet and solve this problem in actual service.

B. FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS AND CHAPLAIN'S FUND

Synod further made provision for retention of ministerial Pension rights by our Chaplains upon payment of their pension money on the basis of their last salary in their respective churches for the duration (Art. 121, pg. 115). It belongs to the province of the Pension Fund Committee to ascertain and control execution of this provision.

For the interim of waiting for a call support was promised as referred to above. Your Committee has thus far received and responded to one request for partial support, namely, from the Rev. Cornelius Oldenburg, who served acceptably in the Army Chaplaincy for fully two years and attained the rank of Captain, when he was placed on the non-active list on account of a physical condition which in no wise hampers or limits his ministerial or pastoral efficiency.

Synod also commended the cause to our churches for an annual offering. This Fund is now designated as the *Chaplain's Fund*, in distinction from the *Soldier's Fund* of the Home Mission Board which provides the necessary funds for Service Pastors.

We are happy to report that our churches have responded generously to the circular letter sent out by the Committee. Attached financial report shows that receipts were well over \$5,000, while disbursements were under \$1,000. This balance should however be increased in order to build up a reserve sufficiently large to meet the heavy outlay when the war ends and our score or more of chaplains return and their salaries are to be paid until they are reabsorbed by the churches. Your Committee has paid our share of the budget of the General Commission (which will increase proportionately as the number of chaplains increases at the rate of \$15.00 per annum for each chaplain in service). We have provided communion sets requested by our chaplains and paid other expenses of the Committee as shown in the Treasurer's report.

C. CHAPLAINCY CONTACTS

Your Committee has sought to keep contact with our chaplains in the service by letter and personal visitation. The chaplains appreciate the home ties as much as any of our young men or women in the service. It was suggested by one of our chaplains that attendance at our Synods would be mutually profitable for the churches and the chaplains. The government fosters this strengthening of ecclesiastical ties by granting the chaplains special leave for attendance upon the major assemblies of their respective churches. In view of the increasing numbers your Committee scarcely dares advise that all of our chaplains be invited to attend Synod. Some practical and not too expensive plan may be devised.

It was also suggested that a weekly column in *The Banner* be devoted to the chaplaincy with a different chaplain writing each week, particularly of his human interest experiences. Your Committee has conveyed this suggestion to the Publication Committee. We have also asked the chaplains to keep us posted as to their station assignment, welfare and activities by means of a quarterly, nonstatistical report.

II. REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE GENERAL COMMISSION ON ARMY AND NAVY CHAPLAINS

This report covers the period of nine months between the previous Synod and the spring quarterly meeting of the General Commission. It will be supplemented by a report to be given while Synod is in session, D.V., presenting procedures of the next bi-ennial meeting scheduled to be held the second Wednesday in June.

A. COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE GENERAL COMMISSION

The Commission has continued to serve as medium for processing applicants of the constituent churches both for the army and the navy chaplaincy. Its Director, the Rev. S. Arthur Devan, and his efficient office staff have rendered excellent service. At the December meeting the Budget for the ensuing year was adopted amounting to approximately \$30,000. A \$2,000 deficit of the current year was included. Hence the budget was "cut to the bone", thus eliminating the services of the able assistant Director, Mr. G. F. Ketcham, and the publication of the monthly *News Bulletin* which was mailed gratis by the Commission to all the chaplains. This curtailment of the

Commission's activities was deemed necessary, but it was unfortunate. It reflects the strong, preclusive emphasis which the denominations are placing upon their own special service ministering to the members of their respective churches.

Under sponsorship of the Commission, preaching missions, Seminars for Chaplains on Personal Counselling, and deputation visitations for Conferences and personal contact with the chaplains in the various areas, have been conducted. Expenses incurred, excepting those of the Director himself, were defrayed from denominational funds of participants. The Secretary of our Chaplain representatives was also asked by the Executive Board of the General Commission to undertake a tour of Chaplain visitation in Camps and Naval Bases of the Third Service Command. During the month of February he fulfilled this request, visiting both the Army School of Chaplains at Cambridge and the Navy School of graduation of Class S at Norfolk, Va., besides a dozen camps and bases in five states, including the posts, (Camp Davis and Fort Jackson) where our own Chaplains Richard H. Wezeman and Peter Hondred are stationed.

Such visits by official representatives of the Home Church Base are greatly desired and highly appreciated by the chaplains in service. They are sincerely eager to meet the tremendous challenge of their new ministry in the war crisis. They face manifold perplexing situations and problems that call for sanctified wisdom and understanding as well as christian sympathy and faithfulness in dealing with the souls of men. They are reaching the hearts and influencing the lives of many who are away from home undergoing all the strain and stress of war tensions and temptations. Their task is not an easy one. It exacts the best that the best ministers of the Word and faithful undershepherds of the Great Shepherd have to offer. As in civilian, so also in military life, the fruits of spiritual ministrations must be left with the Lord of the harvest and the Holy Spirit. On the whole there is encouraging response especially on the part of those who had church connections in civilian life. The Chaplains are sowing what can later be reaped when the men and women return from war, and likewise they are reaping what was sown in civilian life by patient and devoted parents, pastors and teachers in christian homes, churches and schools.

Your Committee is impressed by the necessity of increasing the number of those chaplains who are wholly committed to the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice and to the truth as it is in Jesus Christ the crucified and risen Savior and Lord of the world. This is a Day of Judgment to be sure. But it is also a Day of Salvation for all that call upon the name of the Lord in penitence and faith. Let therefore, neither our churches at home, nor our Chaplains in the service, be wanting to proclaim the full, saving Gospel in this fateful hour of the history of the world and of the Kingdom of our Lord whose dominion is over all.

B. THE CHAPLAIN'S CORPS NAVY BILL

The General Commission is endorsing a bill in both houses of Congress to create a real Chaplains' Corps with a Chief of Chaplain for the Navy corresponding to that of the Army and other coordinated branches of service in the Navy. At present it is only a subsidiary of the Personnel Branch of the service. Unfortunately the Navy itself does not favor this bill and has come out officially against it in the form of a letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy to Senator Walsh who sponsored the bill in the Senate and reintroduced it in the new Congress, early in January. This will necessitate hearings and debate before the Senate and House Committees on Naval Affairs.

This Bill is of immense importance for the Navy Chaplaincy. It creates what the Navy has never had, a real administrative Chaplains' Corps. Under the Bill there will be a Chief of Chaplains appointed by the President, serving for a term of four years. His duties and responsibilities are outlined, with implied prerogatives. He will have, for the period of the war, the rank of Rear Admiral. He will have a relative degree of autonomy, comparable to that which the Chief of Chaplains of the Army has had since 1920.

The Navy at present has no real administrative system for Chaplains, though it has more than a thousand commissioned chaplains. The real Chief of Chaplains is whatever Rear Admiral of the line happens to be Chief of the Bureau of Personnel at the time. This has impaired the development of the Naval Chaplaincy in many ways. The reason why the Army Chaplaincy has devel-

oped so satisfactorily is that the Army abandoned a parallel system more than twenty years ago.

This bill may not pass unless the churches get behind it. The reason the doctors have a Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Navy is because the American Medical Association pressed hard for it years ago. So far little has been done in seeking passage by representative church bodies, congregations and organizations of our christian public. It would be well for Synod to send an official endorsement and advise our Classes and churches to take similar action without delay. The Senate Bill is numbered S. 300; the House Bill is H.R. 1023. Communications should be addressed to the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House.

C. THE ACUTE PROCUREMENT SITUATION

At the March meeting of the General Commission the urgent need of securing the minimum number of chaplains asked from the churches by the Army and Navy was again stressed. Stirring appeals were voiced by the chiefs of both departments. The Navy must have a third more, about 500 this year and the Army at least 300 per month. It was intimated that if chaplains are not forthcoming up to the measure of denominational quotas, the gaps may be filled in from qualified applicants of denominations which have already filled their quotas or from denominations not now represented because they number less than fifty thousand communicants. The Navy is contemplating pre-induction courses for the chaplaincy to be given in the Seminaries similar to those already under military sponsorship for other branches of the service in Colleges and Universities. It should not be necessary for either the Navy or the Army to undertake procurement of chaplains. The Churches should provide them in sufficient numbers. Now that the full emergency of the expansion of our armed forces is upon us, it is for the churches to rise to the opportunity which is given them. Never before in the history of the country has there been such an opportunity to exert positive Christian influence on the youth of the nation. We dare not fail to accept anything less than our full share of this united challenge to Christian America. One of our Committee members is to present the need to the graduating class of our Seminary in behalf of the Navy chaplaincy which requires no pastoral experience. It

may yet be that the age limit will be raised once more from fifty to fifty-two or even to fifty-five, although the government much prefers the younger men.

While at present our Christian Reformed Church has supplied about 65% of its quota, and we are no longer trailing in the rear, we are encouraged to go on to the full 100% and then help to fill in the shortages of other churches that are falling behind. The biblical character and spiritual emphasis of our ministry is worthy of setting this as our goal and prayerfully striving to attain to it this year.

Respectfully submitted,

THE CHAPLAIN COMMITTEE,

HENRY BAKER

JOHN M. VAN DE KIEFT

EDWARD BOEVE

ELBERT KOOISTRA

TREASURER'S REPORT COVERING THE PERIOD
SEPT. 1, 1942 TO MARCH 30, 1943

RECEIPTS

Total Receipts including gifts from individuals, churches and Societies.....	\$5,911.99
---	------------

DISBURSEMENTS

"Wachtgeld"	\$ 250.00
Annual dues to Gen. Comm.....	100.00
Traveling expenses of Comm. members, postage, etc.....	581.64
	<hr/>
	931.64
Balance on hand.....	\$4,980.35

Humbly submitted,

E. BOEVE, *Treas.*

REPORT XIX.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE RE "READING SERVICE" SERMONS

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

YOUR Committee on "reading service" sermons has the following to report:

Because of the large demand for the first volume of twenty sermons which was published three years ago fifty copies were prepared in addition to the original order of one hundred. On March 2, 1943, there were still ten copies on hand.

A second volume of twenty sermons was prepared and completed a year ago. On March 2, 1943 Mr. H. J. Voss, who is in charge of the sale of these books reported that there were still ten copies to be disposed of.

The following figures as given by Mr. Voss on March 2, 1943 may be of interest:

VOLUME NO. 1 —

Complimentary copies	24		
Copies sold:			
Paid in cash.....	113	@ \$2.00	\$ 226.00
Paid in cash.....	1	@ 1.50	1.50
Billed, not yet paid.....	3		
Copies on hand	10		
	151		

VOLUME NO. 2 —

Complimentary copies	24		
Copies sold:			
Paid in cash.....	56	@ \$2.25	\$ 126.00
Paid in cash.....	1	@ 2.50	2.50
Billed, not paid	10		
Copies on hand	10		
	101		

Cash received from Synodical Treasurer.....	\$ 150.00
	<u>\$ 506.00</u>
Cost of Volumes:	
No. 1 — 150 copies	\$ 250.00
No. 2 — 100 copies	225.00
	<u>\$ 475.00</u>
Cash on hand.....	\$ 31.00

Humbly submitted,

M. MONSMA
J. VANDER PLOEG
D. J. HOITENGA

REPORT XX.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF SYNOD FOR SOUTH AMERICA

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

AN outstanding matter to report is that the congregation of Tres Arroyos, Argentina, served by the Rev. Jerry Pott, very nearly completed its new church building by the end of 1942, and set its dedication date early in 1943.

A CHURCH BUILDING FOR REV. POTT

Thus, after many years of effort, this congregation of the Rev. J. Pott can meet in its own House of God, and now every one of the congregations of Classis Buenos Aires has a good church edifice of its own.

Some hundreds of dollars have been sent to Tres Arroyos from your South America Fund for this building, and at the time that the second part of the Agenda went to the press more than eleven hundred dollars had been received from our churches for this purpose. We hope to receive in due time the full \$2,500 allowed, as a loan, by the Synod of 1942, from the special collections recommended by this Synod, for the church building at Tres Arroyos.

It is in line with the mandate given to your Committee in 1912, that funds from our churches for ecclesiastical buildings in South America should go through your South America Fund. For that reason, as well as on other grounds, it was also appropriate that your Church Help Committee some years ago turned down a request from the Tres Arroyos Consistory for help toward a new church building, and referred this consistory to your Committee for South America.

A RESERVE FUND FOR EMERGENCIES

But our Committee needs to keep up a considerable reserve for emergencies, and therefore cannot empty the Fund for the sake of this church building. For instance,

when, after their furlough, the Rev. and Mrs. Wm. V. Muller sought passports to South America, the Federal Government of the United States first inquired from your Committee whether your South America Fund had ample reserves and a reliable source of income, before the Government was willing to issue passports to the Rev. and Mrs. Muller.

Another illustration that your South America Fund needs to keep an ample reserve is found in the fact that we have to be ready to help in case of large and burdensome hospital bills in the families of the ordained workers in Classis Buenos Aires. For instance, the Rev. Jerry Pott recently requested the privilege of borrowing from the South America Fund, in order to be able to finance an operation needed by Mrs. Pott, according to the doctors at Tres Arroyos. These doctors were not willing to perform the operation and told the Rev. J. Pott that it would have to be performed at one of the large hospitals at Buenos Aires. Your Committee did not deem it wise to loan the money to Rev. Pott, since we know that it would be practically impossible for him to pay it back out of his salary and allowances.

Many years ago, your Committee had met a large medical bill for the Rev. A. C. Sonneveldt by a donation out of the South America Fund. Our mandate of 1912 is broad enough to enable us to do so. And so, considering that Rev. Pott is doing good work, your Committee now decided to follow a similar procedure, and therefore donated to the Rev. Jerry Pott the funds necessary for this operation. It is true that this donation will appear in the financial report for 1943 and not in that for 1942. But we are here reporting this matter, in order that our people may be able to remember this family in prayer at the appropriate time, and in order that the general condition of the South America Fund may be appreciated.

If any churches or individuals wish to make a special donation for this hospital bill, the funds will promote the highly appreciated work of our Rev. Jerry Pott at Tres Arroyos, Argentina. We consider it necessary for your South America Fund to be able to meet such emergencies in the families of all the ordained workers in Classis Buenos Aires at any time, since their South American churches are financially unable to do so. Hence we cannot empty the treasury of the South America Fund

for the sake of meeting the \$2,500 allowed by the Synod of 1942, as a loan to Tres Arroyos, to help them in paying for a part of their new church building.

We are grateful that the last Synod authorized our Committee to appeal to all our congregations for a special offering for this plain but distinguished church building at Tres Arroyos. We hope that offerings will continue to come in so well that it shall not be necessary for your Committee to make a request to the Synod of 1943 for another special offering to complete the \$2,500 loan to Tres Arroyos approved by the Synod of 1942.

FROM REV. SONNEVELDT'S REPORT

The Rev. A. C. Sonneveldt, pastor of Buenos Aires and Chubut, reports that the attendance at the public services has increased, since the Reformed Church of Buenos Aires received its new church building about a year ago. Without any great financial help from North America, this congregation was supplied, in God's providence, first with a smaller chapel and now with this new House of the Lord. This congregation is incorporated as an "Association" under Argentinian law.

A mortgage still rests upon the Buenos Aires church property of about twelve thousand pesos, while special expenses, including those of incorporation involved a couple of thousand pesos more of debt.

This congregation has made some contacts with the Hungarian Reformed people of Buenos Aires.

As editor of the bilingual Dutch and Spanish church paper, "Kerkblad voor Zuid-Amerika," Rev. Sonneveldt also renders an important service, in which others, especially Rev. Jerry Pott, bear the burden with him. However, this paper is not self-supporting now that the costs of printing have risen, and it may need ecclesiastical subsidy.

Twice a year, Rev. Sonneveldt spends a couple of months in the congregation of Chubut, in Southern Argentina. This church is reputedly nearer the South Pole than any other church in the world, and it is here that the Rev. Sonneveldt is a circuit rider to half a dozen or more sites, where services are held and the sacraments are administered. Each such site has an elder belonging to the consistory of Commodoro Rivadavia, in Chubut. These elders have an unusually great responsibility.

Statistics concerning the four congregations of Classis Buenos Aires can be found in our Yearbook of the Christian Reformed Church, for 1943.

BONUSES AND ALLOWANCES

The rapidly rising cost of living in South America, as reported by both the Rev. Muller and the Rev. Pott, creates a problem for your Committee. The solution attempted, so far, is that of a special bonus of ten percent, without disturbing the salary schedule on which our Synod has placed these brethren. Hence we hope that all of our churches will find it possible to meet their quotas. This schedule includes allowances for children, and 1943 is the first year that such an allowance comes into the picture for the Rev. and Mrs. Wm. V. Muller. They have adopted a child left motherless by the death of the wife of a very poor man. Before the death of the mother, who had been a Chr. School teacher at Carambehy, Brazil, the parents agreed to request the Rev. and Mrs. Muller to adopt the child, who are happy with it. They have received a legal paper for its adoption. The child is a baby boy, and the mother died shortly after the Rev. and Mrs. Muller had returned from the United States to South America, so that the child grows up from infancy in their home and receives the covenantal training that it should have.

REV. MULLER'S FIELD OF LABOR

In response to the repeated requests of Classis Buenos Aires, for another ordained worker for Argentina, to labor there as Home Missionary (or "predikant in algemeenen dienst," as they prefer to say), your Committee had deemed itself fortunate in finding that the Rev. Wm. V. Muller was prepared to acquiesce in doing this work for a year.

He had been loaned to Classis Buenos Aires, and had been stationed at Carambehy, Brazil, working with the Lords' blessing for some six years among these staunch Reformed people, largely from Dortrecht.

When he visited this congregation on the way to Argentina, very special needs were apparent, because of the fact that some youthful Dutch citizens belonging to this congregation had been called up by the Dutch government for military service. The question had arisen as to their moral and legal obligations to the Dutch gov-

ernment and the entire congregation was much in need of pastoral care from an experienced shepherd.

A rather critical situation had developed and the Rev. Wm. V. Muller felt that he was more needed at Carambehy, Brazil, than in the Home Mission fields of Argentina, for the time being, at least. And so he continues to labor at Carambehy with the approval of your Committee. We request your prayers for all our South American workers.

THE CHALLENGE FOR MORE WORKERS

But this still leaves the needy home mission fields of Galvez near Buenos Aires and San Cajetano near Tres Arroyos, and other places, without the Home Missionary repeatedly requested by Classis Buenos Aires, from our denomination. At present, these fields are receiving help from the ministry and from a number of laymen in the Classis.

Although the times are uncertain, and though your Committee must therefore exercise considerable caution, before we can make any recommendations to Synod, we wish to report that several students in the Seminary have manifested some interest in laboring in South America, but that no one has yet volunteered for service in Classis Buenos Aires.

If any Seminarian or any Minister wishes to volunteer to our Committee, or to meet our Committee to consider South American service, we shall be glad to receive communications to this end.

Although our Synodical mandate of 1912 is broad enough for your Committee to make promises relative to work among the Reformed people in South America of Dutch ancestry, the Committee does not usually commit itself, when the matter can be handled by Synod itself, except for a recommendation. If we had one or more definite volunteers for South American service, we would be in a better position to make specific recommendations, to Synod.

Moreover travelling is dangerous and can only be undertaken with much caution,—for instance after their furlough, the Rev. and Mrs. Muller travelled to South America by airplane because of war conditions; and such transportation may be necessary again to South America, if the war continues. Passports and visas are more

difficult to obtain now than before the war, but we hope for success.

Now that our Church needs a closed door in China, much might be said concerning the challenge to our Churches for increased foreign work elsewhere, perhaps in South America. We would like to commend this matter to the prayerful consideration of our people.

THE IDEAL OF AN INDIGENOUS MINISTRY

The ideal, of course, is that these South America churches should, as soon as possible provide for their own ministry. One of the sons of the congregation at Tres Arroyos went to the Kampen Theological School of the Netherlands, to study for the ministry. His father, now deceased, was a deacon, and the well-known church leader and elder of this congregation, Don Diego Zylstra, is his uncle.

We have hopes that this theological student may return in due time to Classis Buenos Aires, in order to serve there. We plan to contact him, as soon as he is available. And we unite our prayer with those of others unto the God of the covenant that He may incline the hearts of other South American youth to the gospel ministry, in order that an indigenous ministry may arise in the course of time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Your Committee recommends an annual offering of twenty-five cents per family for adoption by Synod.

II. The following budget for 1944 is presented for our denominational work in South America, all in U.S. currency:

Salary of the Rev. Wm. V. Muller (\$100 raise—five years)	\$1,300.00
Child's allowance, Rev. Wm. V. Muller.....	75.00
Salary of the Rev. Jerry Pott (\$100 raise—five years)	1,300.00
Children's Allowances, Rev. J. Pott.....	150.00
Loan to Buenos Aires and Chubut for Rev. A. C. Sonneveldt	900.00
Home Mission Expense.....	1,200.00
Administrative Expense	125.00
Furlough Reserve and Other Expenses.....	250.00
	<hr/>
	\$5,300.00
Expected from Tres Arroyos at least.....	120.00
	<hr/>
	\$5,180.00

Respectfully submitted,
Committee for South America

HENRY BEETS, *President*
D. D. BONNEMA, *Vice-Pres.*
M. J. WYNGAARDEN, *Sec'y*
HARRY BLYSTRA
PETER JONKER, JR.

REPORT XXI

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE IN RE THE REVISED COMPENDIUM

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

YOUR committee submitted a Revised Compendium to the Synod of 1942. Synod endorsed the directive principles which guided the committee in its work of revision, and declared that the Revision itself was substantially what was required by the Synod of 1941 (Acts, 1942, p. 83). In accordance with the committee's own advice, Synod further decided "to re-appoint the present committee with instructions to continue its labors for another year, and, after taking due cognizance of all suggestions, to present its final draft to the following Synod" (Acts, 1942, p. 83). Synod also charged its committee with the task of supplying "suitable and fully quoted references to Scripture, these references to be placed directly underneath the answers" (Acts, 1942, p. 84).

Your committee now respectfully submits its final draft. The Revision is substantially that which was presented to the Synod of 1942, but the whole has been carefully edited, and some material changes have been introduced. Questions 2, 14, 15, 24, and 73 of the former draft have been considerably modified, questions 16 and 17 have been transferred to a new position (32, 31), and question 40 has been deleted. New questions have been added concerning Election (42), the Church (54), the Missionary Task (58), Christian Discipline (60, 61), and Justification (67), and the answers throughout have been fortified by fully quoted references to Scripture.

The Compendium herewith submitted is neither the work of a day, nor the product of a party. It is the result of several years of earnest labor, and it incorporates ideas that have come from every quarter in the Church. Your committee regards it as a basic text suitable for the thorough and uniform instruction of all those seeking admittance to the Table of the Lord. Your Committee therefore advises Synod to adopt this Compendium as

the manual for catechetical instruction in the Church,
and to authorize its publication.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN MONSMA
HENRY J. STOB
GERRIT HOEKSMAS

A COMPENDIUM OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

Being an abbreviation and adaptation of the Heidelberg Catechism, and designed for the instruction of those seeking admittance to the Lord's Table.

INTRODUCTION

Question 1. What is your only comfort in life and in death?

Answer. My only comfort is that I, with body and soul, both in life and death, am not my own, but belong to my faithful Savior Jesus Christ.

Rom. 14:8—For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die we are the Lord's.

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.

I Cor. 6:19b, 20a—And ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price.

Q. 2. What must you know in order to enjoy true comfort?

A. To enjoy true comfort I must know first, how great my sin and misery is; second, that in Christ I have complete deliverance from sin and misery; third, that in gratitude I daily strive to do the perfect will of God.

John 17:3—And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ.

Rom. 7:24, 25a—Wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

THE FIRST PART

SIN AND MISERY

Q. 3. Whence do you know your sin and misery?

A. I know my sin and misery out of the law of God.

Rom. 3:20b—For through the law cometh the knowledge of sin.

Gal. 3:24—So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

Q. 4. Where are the principles of God's law laid down?

A. The principles of God's law are laid down in the Ten Commandments, or the two tables of the moral law.

Exod. 31:18—And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, the two tables of the testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.

Deut. 5:1—And Moses called unto all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and the ordinances which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and observe to do them.

Q. 5. What does God require of you in the two tables of the law?

A. God requires of me, in the first table, to love the Lord my God with all my heart, with all my soul, with all my mind, and with all my strength; and in the second, to love my neighbor as myself.

Matt. 22:37-40—Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments the whole law hangeth and the prophets.

Lev. 19:18b—But thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Deut. 6:5—And thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.

Q. 6. Are you able perfectly to keep the law of God?

A. I am utterly unable to keep the law of God, for by nature I, with all men, am inclined to hate God and my neighbor and to transgress the commandments of God in thought, word, and deed.

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.

Rom. 3:10-12—As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; There is none that understandeth, There is none that seeketh after God; They have all turned aside, they are together become unprofitable; There is none that doeth good, no, not so much as one.

Jer. 17:9—The heart is deceitful above all things, and it is exceedingly corrupt: who can know it?

Q. 7. Did God create man wicked and perverse?

A. God created man good and in his own image, endowed with true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness.

Gen. 1:27a, 31a—And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him. . . . And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

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

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

Q. 8. How did man become wicked and perverse?

A. Man became wicked and perverse through the fall and disobedience of Adam and Eve in paradise.

Gen. 3.

Rom. 5:12—Therefore as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned.

Rom. 5:18, 19—So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life. For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous.

Q. 9. What was the disobedience of our first parents?

A. Our first parents disobeyed God by eating of the fruit of the forbidden tree.

Gen. 2:17—But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

Gen. 3:6—And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and she gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat.

Q. 10. What divine institution did Adam violate through his first sin?

A. Through his first sin Adam violated the Covenant of Works, in which God promised man eternal life in the way of obedience and pronounced the penalty of death upon disobedience.

Hos. 6:7a—But they like Adam have transgressed the covenant.

Q. 11. What are the results of Adam's disobedience?

A. The guilt of Adam as our covenant head is imputed to all men, and our nature is become totally corrupt, so that we are all conceived and born in sin.

Ps. 51:5—Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.

Rom. 5:12—Therefore, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned.

Q. 12. What is involved in the total corruption of our nature?

A. We are incapable of doing any spiritual good, and are inclined to all manner of wickedness, unless we are regenerated by the Spirit of God.

Jer. 17:9—The heart is deceitful above all things, and it is exceedingly corrupt: who can know it?

Isa. 53:6a—All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way.

John 3:3b—Except one be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

Eph. 2:1—And you did he make alive, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins.

Q. 13. Will God allow man's disobedience and corruption to go unpunished?

A. God by no means allows sin to go unpunished, but in His righteousness inflicts the penalties of sin both in this life and in the life to come.

Gen. 2:17b—For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

Rom. 6:23a—For the wages of sin is death.

Nah. 1:3a—Jehovah is slow to anger, and great in power, and will by no means clear the guilty.

Gal. 3:10—For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse: for it is written, Cursed is everyone who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them.

THE SECOND PART

DELIVERANCE

Q. 14. Can man save himself from the punishment of sin and again restore himself to the favor of God?

A. Man cannot save himself; divine redemption is his only hope.

Eph. 2:1, 8—And you did he make alive, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins. For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.

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.

Jer. 17:14—Heal me, O Jehovah, and I shall be healed; save me, and I shall be saved: for thou art my praise.

Isa. 49:26b—And all flesh shall know that I, Jehovah, am thy Saviour, and thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob.

Q. 15. What is divine redemption?

A. Divine redemption is the salvation of God's people through the blessed work of Christ, who is given of the Father as the Mediator between God and man.

John 3:16—For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.

Eph. 1:7—In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace.

I Tim. 2:5, 6a—For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.

Q. 16. What does our Mediator do to save us?

A. Our Mediator delivers us from the wrath of God and endows us with eternal life, by bearing the punishment which we deserve and rendering the obedience required of us.

I Thess. 1:10b—Even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come.

Rom. 6:23—For the wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Heb. 9:28—So Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation.

Rom. 5:19—For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous.

Q. 17. Will all men be saved by the Mediator, Jesus Christ, as they are all condemned in Adam?

A. Not all men will be saved, but those only who receive Christ by a true faith.

Mark 16:16—He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned.

John 3:18—He that believeth on him is not judged: he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God.

Heb. 10:39—But we are not of them that shrink back into perdition; but of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul.

Q. 18. What is true faith?

A. True faith is an assured knowledge of God, and of his promises revealed to us in the gospel, and a hearty confidence that all my sins are forgiven me for Christ's sake.

Heb. 11:1—Now faith is assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen.

John 6:40—For this is the will of my Father, that everyone that beholdeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

Eph. 3:11b, 12—Christ Jesus our Lord, in whom we have boldness and access in confidence through our faith in him.

I John 5:13—These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, even unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God.

Q. 19. What should every Christian believe?

A. Every Christian should believe the Holy Scriptures, since they are God's inspired revelation of Himself in Christ.

II Tim. 3:16—Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness.

Gal. 1:12—For neither did I receive it from men, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ.

John 17:17—Sanctify them in the truth: thy word is truth.

I Cor. 2:10—But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.

Q. 20. What is to be understood by the inspiration of the Bible?

A. The Holy Spirit moved men to write the Scriptures and guided them in their work so that they wrote the Word of God without error.

II Peter 1:20, 21—Knowing this first that no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.

I Cor. 2:13—Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; combining spiritual things with spiritual words.

Q. 21. What do you confess as a member of the Church of Christ of all ages?

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

And in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the virgin Mary;

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

The third day He rose again from the dead;

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

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

I believe in the Holy Spirit.

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

The forgiveness of sins;

The resurrection of the body;

And the life everlasting.

Rom. 10:9, 10—Because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

Q. 22. What is the one great confession of the whole Apostolic Creed?

A. In the Apostolic Creed we confess our faith in the one true God, who exists in three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

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.

II Cor. 13:14—The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all.

Q. 23. How are the articles of the Apostolic Creed divided?

A. The articles of the Apostolic Creed are divided into three parts: the first is of God the Father and our creation; the second, of God the Son and our redemption; the third, of God the Holy Spirit and our sanctification.

Q. 24. What do you confess when you say: I believe in God the Father, Almighty?

A. I confess my faith in the almighty maker of heaven and earth, who is the eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and my Father for Christ his son's sake.

Gen. 1:1—In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

Ps. 124:8—Our help is in the name of Jehovah, who made heaven and earth.

I John 3—Grace, mercy, peace shall be with us, from God the Father, and from Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love.

Matt. 3:17—And lo a voice out of the heavens, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

I John 3:1a—Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God.

Eph. 1:5—Having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.

Q. 25. What do you believe when you say that God is "Maker of heaven and earth"?

A. I believe that all things came not of themselves, but were made by God of nothing by the word of His power, in the space of six days, and all very good.

Gen. 1:31a—And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

Exod. 20:11a—For in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.

Heb. 11:3—By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear.

Q. 26 What is meant by the providence of God?

A. The providence of God is His almighty and everywhere present power whereby he upholds heaven, earth, and all creatures, and governs them according to His wise and gracious plan.

Ps. 36:6c—O Jehovah, thou preservest man and beast.

Matt. 10:29, 30—Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father: but the very hairs of your head are all numbered.

Ps. 103:19—Jehovah hath established his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all.

Acts 17:28a—For in him we live, and move, and have our being.

Q. 27. What are miracles?

A. Miracles are events wrought by the extraordinary operation of God's power for the purpose of revelation and redemption.

Ps. 72:18—Blessed be Jehovah God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things.

Acts 2:22—Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs which God did by him in the midst of you.

John 2:11a—This beginning of his signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested his glory.

Q. 28 What do you believe when you confess the sonship of Jesus Christ?

A. I believe that Jesus Christ is the eternal and only begotten Son of God, not made, nor created, but Himself God, having life in Himself of the Father..

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

Col. 2:9—For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Isa. 9:6b—And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father Prince of Peace.

Q. 29. Why do you call the Son of God our Lord?

A. Christ is our Lord because He has redeemed us from all our sins, has delivered us from all the power of the devil, and has made us His own possession.

Acts 2:36—Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified.

I Cor. 6:19b, 20a—And ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body.

Col. 1:13—Who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love.

Q. 30. What did the Son of God do to redeem us?

A. In order to redeem us the eternal Son of God, who is and continues to be true God, took upon Him the very nature of man in personal union with the divine.

John 1:14—And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth.

Phil. 2:6, 7—Who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.

John 2:28—Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.

Heb. 1:3a—Who being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power.

Q. 31. Why must the mediator between God and man, Himself be God?

A. Only by His divine power can our mediator bear in His human nature the burden of God's wrath so as to deliver us from it and restore to us righteousness and life.

Ps. 130:3—If thou, Jehovah shouldest mark iniquity, O Lord, who could stand?

Nahum 1:6a—Who can stand before his indignation? and who can abide in the fierceness of his anger?

Q. 32. Why do we need a mediator who is truly human, yet without sin?

A. The justice of God requires that the same human nature which has sinned should make satisfaction for sin; and one who is himself a sinner cannot satisfy for others.

Heb. 2:14—Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.

Ezek. 18:4b—The soul that sinneth, it shall die.

1 Cor. 15:21—For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.

Rom. 5:19—For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous.

Q. 33. Whence did Christ derive His human nature?

A. Christ took on His human nature from the virgin Mary, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and is thus become like unto us, His brethren, in all things, sin excepted.

Luke 1:35—And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also the holy thing which is begotten shall be called the Son of God.

Heb. 2:17—Wherefore it behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people.

Heb. 4:15—For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

Q. 34. Why is the Son of God called Jesus, that is Savior?

A. The Son of God is called Jesus because He saves His people from their sins, and because there is salvation in none other.

Matt. 1:21—And she shall bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins.

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. 35. Why is the Son of God called Christ?

A. The Son of God is called Christ, the Anointed One, because He is ordained of God the Father, and anointed with the Holy Spirit, to be our chief Prophet, our only High Priest, and our eternal King.

Psa. 45:7b—Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

John 6:38—For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

John 1:41b—We have found the Messiah (which is, being interpreted, Christ).

Mark 1:10—And straightway coming out of the water, he saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him.

Acts 3:22—Moses indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me; to him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall speak unto you.

Heb. 5:10—Named of God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.

I Tim. 6:15b—Who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

Q. 36. What is the redemptive work of Christ as Prophet?

A. As Prophet Christ reveals to us, through His Word and Spirit, the counsel and will of God concerning our redemption.

Deut. 18:18—I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.

John 18:37b—To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.

Heb. 1:1, 2a—God, having of old times spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son.

Q. 37. What is the redemptive work of Christ as Priest?

A. As Priest Christ bore the curse of sin in our stead and makes continual intercession for us with the Father.

Isa. 53:12b—Because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors: yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

Heb. 7:25—Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.

Q. 38. What is the redemptive work of Christ as King?

A. As King Christ governs by his Word and Spirit and defends and preserves us in the salvation obtained for us.

Luke 1:33—And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.

Matt. 28:18—And Jesus came to them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth.

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.

Rev. 12:10a—And I heard a great voice in heaven, saying, Now is come the salvation, and the power, and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Christ.

Q. 39. How did Christ bear the curse of our sin?

A. Christ suffered for us, both in body and soul; He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; He was buried; and He descended into hell.

1 Peter 2:24a—Who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree.

Matt. 26:38a—Then said he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.

Phil. 2:8—And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.

Luke 23:53—And he took it down, and wrapped it in a linen cloth, and laid him in a tomb that was hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain.

Matt. 27:46—And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

Q. 40. What do we confess when we say Christ descended into hell?

A. We confess that Christ, when He was forsaken of God on the cross, was plunged into hellish agony, and that He delivered us from the curse of sin and everlasting hell.

Matt. 27:46c—My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

Rom. 8:1—There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.

1 Thess. 1:10b—Even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come.

Q. 41. For whom did Christ die?

A. Christ died for all whom God out of sovereign grace has chosen unto faith, obedience, and glory.

John 10:11—I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep.

John 15:13, 14—Greater love hath no man than this; that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends, if ye do the things which I command you.

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.

Rom. 8:29, 30—For whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren: and whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

Q. 42. What is divine election?

A. Divine election is the eternal and unchangeable counsel of God by which He chose a definite number of men out of the fallen race unto redemption in Christ, of grace alone, and according to His sovereign good pleasure.

Eph. 1:4-6—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: having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, which he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved.

Rom. 8:30—And whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

Acts 13:48—And as the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of God: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.

Q. 43. What do you understand by the resurrection of Christ?

A. We believe that Christ rose the third day, with the body once crucified, as the conqueror of death and the grave.

1 Cor. 15:4b—And that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures.

John 20:27—Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.

Rev. 1:17b, 18—And he laid his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not; I am the first and the last, and the Living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for ever more, and I have the keys of death and of Hades.

Q. 44. What does the resurrection of Christ profit us?

A. Our Lord Jesus Christ arose unto our justification, and by His resurrection power we are now born again unto a new life, and at the last day will be raised in glory from the grave.

Rom. 4:25—Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification.

Eph. 2:4-6—But God, being rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ (by grace have ye been saved), and raised us up with him, and made us to sit with him in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus.

1 Cor. 15:22, 23—For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits; then they that are Christ's, at his coming.

Q. 45 Where is Christ now as to His human nature?

A. Christ is ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of God, the Father, exalted in the highest glory, far above all creatures.

Acts 1:9—And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight.

Eph. 1:20b, 21—And made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.

Q. 46. What is the redemptive work of Christ our Lord in heaven?

A. In heaven our Lord intercedes for us with the Father, bestows His grace and Spirit upon us, rules His church as its glorified head, and governs all things unto the coming of His kingdom.

Heb. 7:25—Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.

Acts 2:33—Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear.

Eph. 1:22—And he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church.

1 Cor. 15:25—For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet.

Q. 47. Is our Lord not with us even unto the end of the world, as He has promised us?

A. With respect to His Godhead, majesty, grace, and Spirit, our Lord is never absent from us, but with respect to His human nature He remains in heaven until He shall come again to judge the living and the dead.

Matt. 28:20b—And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.

Acts 3:21a—Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restoration of all things.

Acts 1:9—And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight.

John 14:16, 17—And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beareth him not, neither knoweth him: ye know him; for he abideth with you, and shall be in you.

Q. 48. What do you confess when you say that Christ shall come to judge the living and the dead?

A. I confess that the very same person who once died for my sins shall come as Judge from heaven, and shall cast all His enemies into everlasting condemnation, and shall take me with all His chosen ones to Himself into heavenly joy and glory.

Acts 1:11—Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven? this Jesus, who was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven.

Matt. 25:41—Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels.

Matt. 25:34—Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.

II Tim. 4:1—I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom.

Rev. 20:12—And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works.

Q. 49. Who is the Holy Spirit?

A. The Holy Spirit is God eternal, the third person of the Holy Trinity, one in essence with the Father and the Son.

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

Matt. 28:19b—Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

II Cor. 13:14—The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all.

Q. 50. What is the work of the Holy Spirit in your redemption?

A. The Holy Spirit, being given to me of the Father through Christ, regenerates me and leads me into all truth, comforts me, and will abide with me forever.

Gal. 4:6—And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

John 14:26—But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.

John 14:17—Even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him: ye know him; for he abideth with you, and shall be in you.

John 3:6—That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.

Q. 51. What is regeneration?

A. Regeneration is that gracious and irresistible work of the Spirit by which men dead in sin are raised to new life in Christ.

John 3:8—The wind bloweth where it will, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.

John 1:13—Who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

I John 3:14—We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in death.

Rom. 9:15, 16—For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy.

Q. 52. How does the new life manifest itself?

A. The new life manifests itself in true conversation.

Eph. 2:10—For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them.

I Peter 1:22, 23—Seeing ye have purified your souls in your obedience to the truth unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one another from the heart fervently: having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God, which liveth and abideth.

Eph. 4:23, 24—And that ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, that after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth.

Q. 53. What is true conversion?

A. True conversion consists in a hearty repentance and avoiding of sin and a glad acceptance of Christ as Savior and Lord.

Acts 16:30b, 31—Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house.

Acts 3:19—Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord.

Ezek. 33:11a—As I live, saith the Lord Jehovah, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live.

II Cor. 7:10a—For godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation, a repentance which bringeth no regret.

Q. 54. What is the holy catholic Church?

A. The holy catholic Church is the body of the redeemed of all ages in Jesus Christ our Lord.

Eph. 1:22, 23—And he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

Rev. 5:9b, 10a—For thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests.

I Peter 2:9—But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that ye may show forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.

Q. 55. What do you believe concerning the Holy catholic Church?

A. I believe that the Son of God gathers by His Word and Spirit out of the whole human race, those chosen to eternal life, thus building His Church in the unity of true faith; and of this Church I believe I am and always shall remain a living member.

Acts 13:48—And as the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of God: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.

Acts 2:47b—And the Lord added to them day by day those that were saved.

Rom. 10:17—So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ.

Matt. 28:19a—Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations.

Eph. 4:4-6—There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all.

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.

Q. 56. What do you confess concerning the communion of saints?

A. I confess that all believers as members of Christ are partakers of Him through His Spirit, and are knit together in the fellowship of Christian love and service.

I Cor. 12:12—For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ.

Rom. 12:4, 5—For even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office: so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another.

I John 1:7—But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

Col. 2:2—That their hearts may be comforted, they being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, that they may know the mystery of God, even Christ.

Q. 57. How does the Church of Christ manifest itself before men?

A. The Church of Christ manifests itself in the communion of the saints and in the offices and functions of the organized church.

Acts 2:46, 47a—And day by day, continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they took their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people.

Phil. 1:1—Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus, to all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.

Titus 1:5—For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city, as I gave thee charge.

Q. 58. What is the missionary function of the Church?

A. The Church must go out and make disciples of all nations, proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation in Christ.

Matt. 28:19, 20—Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.

Isa. 61:1, 2—The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me; because Jehovah hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison

to them that are bound; to proclaim the year of Jehovah's favor, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn.

Q. 59. How is the purity of the true Church on earth maintained?

A. The purity of the true Church is maintained through the pure preaching of God's Word, the proper administration of the Sacraments, and the faithful exercise of Christian discipline.

II Tim. 4:1, 2—I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom: preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and teaching.

I Cor. 11:26—For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.

Mark 16:16a—He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.

I Cor. 5:13b—Put away the wicked man from among yourselves.

Q. 60. What is Christian discipline?

A. Christian discipline is the Church's loving admonition and chastisement of its unfaithful members and the exclusion from its fellowship of those who persist in unchristian doctrine or wickedness of life.

Gal. 6:1a—Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass, ye who are spiritual, restore such a one in a spirit of gentleness.

James 5:16a—Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.

I Thess. 5:12, 13a—But we beseech you, brethren, to know them that labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them exceeding highly in love for their works sake.

II Thess. 3:14, 15—And if any man obeyeth not our word by this epistle, note that man, that ye have no company with him, to the end that he may be ashamed. And yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.

Titus 3:10, 11—A factious man after a first and second admonition refuse; knowing that such a one is perverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned.

Q. 61. What is our duty towards fellow believers who sin in doctrine or life?

A. Believers are obliged to admonish each other in love and to inform the Church regarding such as persist in their sins.

Matt. 18:15-17—And if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two

witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the Church: and if he refuse to hear the Church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican.

Q. 62. What do you believe concerning the forgiveness of sins?

A. I believe that God, who graciously grants me the righteousness of Christ, no longer remembers my sins, nor reckons unto me the sinful nature against which I have to struggle all my life long.

Eph. 1:7—In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace.

Ps. 103:12—As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us.

Rom. 7:24, 25a—Wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Q. 63. What do you believe concerning the resurrection of the body?

A. I believe that at the last day my body, raised by the power of Christ, shall again be united with my redeemed soul from heaven, and made like unto the glorious body of Christ.

1 Cor. 15:42-44—So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.

Phil. 3:20, 21—For our citizenship is in heaven; whence also we wait for a saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself.

John 5:28, 29—Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment.

John 6:40—For this is the will of my Father, that everyone that beholdeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

Q. 64. What do you believe when you confess the life everlasting?

A. I believe that in the fellowship of God I now feel in my heart the beginning of eternal joy, and that in the life to come I shall possess perfect and never ending bliss in His praise and service.

John 3:36a—He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life.
John 17:3—And this is life eternal,, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ.

1 Cor. 2:9—Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man, whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him.

Rev. 21:4—And he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, anymore: the first things are passed away.

Q. 65. What is the blessed state of the Christian believer?

A. The Christian believer, though he has kept none of the commandments of God, is righteous in Christ before God.

Rom. 5:1—Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Rom. 4:5—But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness.

Q. 66. How is the Christian believer righteous before God?

A. The Christian believer is justified by faith alone.

Rom. 3:21-24—But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

Gal. 2:16—Yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law; because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

Q. 67. What is justification?

A. Justification is that act of God whereby He grants and imputes to the believing sinner the perfect satisfaction and righteousness of Christ.

Eph. 2:8—For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.

Rom. 5:18—So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life.

Q. 68. How are we justified by faith?

A. Faith does not merit justification; it is the gracious gift of God by which we receive the righteousness of Christ.

Gal. 2:16b—That we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law: because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

Isa. 64:6a—For we are all become as one that is unclean, and all our righteousnesses are as a polluted garment.

Q. 69. Why cannot our good works be our righteousness before God?

A. We cannot be justified by works, for even our best deeds are polluted by sin and cannot stand before the tribunal of God.

Luke 17:10—Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

Isa. 6:5a—Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips.

Rom. 7:24a—Wretched man that I am!

Q. 70. Does not God reward the good works of the Christian?

A. God assuredly rewards our good works, but merely out of grace, and not on the basis of merit.

Matt. 6:4—That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee.

John 5:28, 29—Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment.

Rom. 2:9, 10—Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek; but glory and honor and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

Heb. 6:10—For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and the love which we showed toward his name, in that ye ministered unto the saints, and still do minister.

Phil. 2:13—For it is God who worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure.

Q. 71. Whence is the faith by which we are justified before God?

A. Faith proceeds from the Holy Spirit, who works it in our hearts by the hearing of the Word.

Eph. 2:8—For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.

Acts 16:14—And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, one that worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul.

1 Cor. 12:3b—And no man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit.

Q. 72. How does the Holy Spirit strengthen our faith?

A. The Spirit strengthens our faith by the hearing of the Word and the use of the Holy Sacraments.

Acts 20:32—And now I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you the inheritance among all them that are sanctified.

Acts 15:32—And Judas and Silas, being themselves also prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them.

Acts 22:16—And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.

I Cor. 11:24, 25—And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

Q. 73. What are the Sacraments?

A. The Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace.

Rom. 4:11a—And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in uncircumcision.

Gen. 17:10, 11—This is my command, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: every male among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of a covenant betwixt me and you.

I Cor. 11:25—In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as we drink it, in remembrance of me.

Q. 74. What is the Covenant of Grace?

A. The Covenant of Grace is the gracious agreement wherein God promises His people complete salvation in the way of faith.

Gen. 17:7—And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.

Ps. 25:14—The friendship of Jehovah is with them that fear him; and he will show them his covenant.

Acts 2:39—For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him.

Acts 16:30b, 31—Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house.

Q. 75. What do the Sacraments signify and seal?

A. The Sacraments signify and seal that God graciously grants us remission of sins and life eternal for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ finished on the cross.

Rom. 4:11a—And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in uncircumcision.

Acts 2:38a—And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins.

Q. 76. How many Sacraments has Christ instituted in the New Testament?

A. Christ has instituted two Sacraments, Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

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.

I Cor. 11:23c-25—The Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat, This is my body which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

Q. 77. What is the outward sign of Baptism?

A. The outward sign of Baptism is the water with which we are baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Acts 8:36—And as they went on the way, they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch saith, Behold, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?

Acts 10:47—Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?

Q. 78. What does Baptism signify and seal?

A. Baptism signifies and seals the washing away of our sins by the blood and Spirit of Jesus Christ.

Mark 1:4—John came, who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins.

Acts 2:38—And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Rom. 6:4—We are buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life.

Q. 79. Who are the subjects of Baptism?

A. Believers and their children are the subjects of Christian baptism.

Gen. 17:7—And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.

Gal. 3:29—And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise.

Acts 2:39—For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him.

Acts 16:33b—And (he) was baptized, he and all his, immediately.

Q. 80. Why does the Church baptize the children of believers?

A. Children of believers are baptized inasmuch as they, as well as their parents, are in the Covenant and members of the Church of God.

Gen. 17:12—And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male throughout your generations.

Matt. 19:14—But Jesus said, Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for to such belongeth the kingdom of heaven.

1 Cor. 7:14c—Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.

Q. 81. What are the outward signs of the Lord's Supper?

A. The outward signs of the Lord's Supper are the broken bread that we eat and the poured out wine which we drink in remembrance of the sufferings and death of Christ.

Matt. 26:26-28—And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins.

1 Cor. 11:26—For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.

Q. 82. What does the Lord's Supper signify and seal?

A. The Lord's Supper signifies and seals that Christ, with His crucified body and shed blood, once purchased my redemption on the cross, and now feeds and nourishes my soul to everlasting life.

1 Cor. 10:16—The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?

1 Cor. 11:23-25—For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

Q. 83. What is it to eat the crucified body and drink the shed blood of Christ at the Lord's Table?

A. To eat Christ's body and to drink His blood is to embrace with a believing heart the sufferings and death of Christ, and thus to become more and more united to Him as our Head.

John 6:35—Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.

John 6:47, 48—Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth hath eternal life. I am the bread of life.

John 6:55, 56—For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him.

Q. 84. Is the bread and wine changed into the body and blood of Christ?

A. The bread and wine are not changed into the body and blood of Christ, but they are visible signs and pledges of His broken body and shed blood.

Luke 22:19, 20—And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he break it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you.

I Cor. 10:17—Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread.

Q. 85. Who are called to partake of the Supper of the Lord?

A. The call to Holy Communion comes to all who bear Christ's name and have come to years of understanding.

I Cor. 11:24b, 25b—This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

I Cor. 11:28—But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup.

Q. 86. Who, by God's grace, are worthy partakers of Holy Communion?

A. All those are worthy partakers of Holy Communion who, upon earnest self-examination, are displeased with themselves for their sins; who yet trust that these are forgiven them for the sake of Christ; and who therefore sincerely desire to live the new life of Christian gratitude in obedience to God's holy law.

I Cor. 11:28, 29—But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto

himself, if he discern not the body.

I Cor. 13:5a—Try your own selves, whether ye are in the faith; prove your own selves.

I Cor. 10:21—Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons: ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of demons.

Ps. 130:3, 4—If thou, Jehovah, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who could stand? But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared.

Q. 87. How must the Church guard the holiness of the Lord's Table?

A. The Church, in the exercise of the power of the Keys, must refuse Holy Communion to the unbelieving and ungodly, lest the covenant of God be profaned and His wrath kindled against the whole Church.

Joshua 22:20—Did not Achan the son of Zerah commit a trespass in the devoted thing, and wrath fell upon all the congregation of Israel?

I Cor. 10:21—Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons: ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of demons.

Titus 3:10—A factious man after a first and second admonition refuse.

Matt. 7:6a—Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine.

Q. 88. What are the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven?

A. The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are the power given by Christ to His Church to open and close the doors of the Kingdom by the preaching of the word and the exercise of discipline.

Matt. 16:19—I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

John 20:23—Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.

Luke 10:16—He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me.

Q. 89. How does the Church open the doors of the Kingdom?

A. The Church opens the doors of the Kingdom by promising eternal salvation, in the name of Christ, to all who repent and believe, and by receiving such into its sacred fellowship.

Acts 10:42, 43—And he charged us to preach unto the people, and to testify that this is he who is ordained of God to be the Judge of the living and the dead. To him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name everyone that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins.

Acts 2:38, 42—And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins: and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. And they continued steadfastly in the apostle's teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers.

I John 1:3—That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son, Jesus Christ.

Q. 90. How does the Church close the doors of the Kingdom?

A. The Church closes the doors of the Kingdom by declaring the wrath of God upon the unbelieving and unrepentant, and by excluding such from its sacred fellowship.

Matt. 18:17—And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the Church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican.

I Cor. 5:5—To deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

I Cor. 5:13b—Put away the wicked man from among yourselves.

THE THIRD PART

GRATITUDE

Q. 91. What manner of life does the Christian live?

A. The Christian, in humble gratitude for his deliverance, lives a new, godly life in the service of his Lord.

I Peter 2:9—But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that ye may show forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.

Col. 3:14, 15—And above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to the which also ye were called in one body; and be ye thankful.

Rom. 12:2—And be not fashioned according to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.

Q. 92. What is the new life?

A. The new life is a continual dying unto sin and a living unto God in all good works.

Rom. 6:11—Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus.

II Cor. 5:15—And he died for all, that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again.

1 Peter 2:24—Who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed.

Q. 93. What are good works?

A. Good works are those which proceed from a true faith and are done according to the law of God and to His glory.

Rom. 14:23b—Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.

Lev. 18:4—Mine ordinances shall ye do, and my statutes shall ye keep, to walk therein: I am Jehovah your God.

1 Cor. 10:31—Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.

Q. 94. What is the place of good works in the life of the redeemed?

A. Our good works do not merit heaven, but doing the will of God is the very essence of the Christian life, wherefore without good works there is no salvation.

Rom. 3:20a—By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight.

Eph. 2:10—For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them.

1 John 1:6, 7—If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

James 2:26—For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead.

Q. 95. What are the blessed fruits of a life of good works?

A. A life of good works glorifies God, assures me of the sincerity of my faith, edifies my fellow believers, and serves to win others to Christ.

Rom. 14:18—For he that herein serveth Christ is well pleasing to God, and approved of men.

Matt. 7:16a—By their fruits ye shall know them.

James 2:18b—Show me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will show thee my faith.

Rom. 14:19—So then let us follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another.

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. 96. What is the law which we must observe to live the life of good works?

A. To live the life of good works we must observe the law of the Ten Commandments, which God proclaimed from Sinai, 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 loving kindness 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.

Exod. 20:1-17.

Deut. 4:13—And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even the ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.

Joshua 1:7a—Only be strong and very courageous, to observe to do according to all the law, which Moses my servant commanded thee.

I Sam. 15:22b—Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.

Rom. 7:12—So that the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and righteous, and good.

Q. 97. What is the significance of the solemn preface to the law?

A. In the preface to the law God claims our love and obedience by revealing Himself as our sovereign Lord and gracious Redeemer.

Ps. 119:73—Thy hands have made and fashioned me: give me understanding, that I may learn thy commandments.

Luke 6:46—And why call me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?

Titus 2:14—Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works.

Q. 98. What does God require in the first commandment?

A. In the first commandment God requires that I know and acknowledge Him as the only true God, and that I give to none other the homage and service that is due to Him alone.

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

1 John 5:21—My little children, guard yourselves from idols.

Isa. 44:8b—Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no Rock; I know not any.

Matt. 4:10—Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

Q. 99. What does God require in the second commandment?

A. In the second commandment God requires that I know and acknowledge Him as Spirit, and that I worship Him not through images or any mere form, but in spirit and in truth.

Deut. 4:15, 16—Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of form on the day that Jehovah spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire; lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image in the form of any figure, the likeness of male or female.

Acts 17:29—Being then the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man.

John 4:24—God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth.

Q. 100. What does God require in the third commandment?

A. In the third commandment God requires that I know and honor the revelation which He has given of Himself, that I stand in awe of His majesty, and that I never profane or abuse, but ever honor His holy name.

Lev. 19:12—And ye shall not swear by my name falsely, and profane the name of thy God: I am Jehovah.

James 5:12—But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath: but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; that ye fall not under judgment.

Rev. 4:11—Worthy art thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honor and the power: for thou didst create all things, and because of thy will they were, and were created.

Q. 101. What does God require in the fourth commandment?

A. In the fourth commandment God the Creator, because He rested on the seventh day and hallowed it, requires that I rest on that day from my labors and that I keep it holy by devoting it to Christian worship and service.

Isa. 66:23—And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith Jehovah.

Exod. 35:2a—Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day there shall be to you a holy day, a sabbath of solemn rest to Jehovah.

1 Tim. 2:8—I desire therefore that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing.

Q. 102. What does God require in the fifth commandment?

A. In the fifth commandment God requires that I show due honor and obedience to my father and mother, and to all in authority over me, since it pleases God to govern us by their hand.

Eph. 6:1, 2—Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honor thy father and mother (which is the first commandment with promise).

Rom. 13:1—Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God: and the powers that be are ordained of God.

1 Peter 2:18—Servants, be in subjection to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.

Q. 103. What does God require in the sixth commandment?

A. In the sixth commandment God requires that I show due respect for the sacredness of human life by preserving and promoting it with all that is in me, and by never taking it unjustly or endangering it without cause.

Gen. 9:6—Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.

1 John 3:15—Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer:

and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.

Rom. 12:20a—But if thy enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink.

Rom. 12:18—If it be possible, as much in you lieth, be at peace with all men.

Q. 104. What does God require in the seventh commandment?

A. In the seventh commandment God requires that I honor the divine institution of marriage, maintain its sanctity, and detest and avoid all sexual impurity in thought, word, and deed.

1 Thess. 4:3—For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye abstain from fornication.

Heb. 13:4—Let marriage be had in honor among all, and let the bed be undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God will judge.

Phil. 4:8—Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.

Q. 105. What does God require in the eighth commandment?

A. In the eighth commandment God requires that I respect the property rights of my neighbor, abhor all theft and fraud, and be a faithful steward of that which is mine.

Lev. 19:11—Ye shall not steal; neither shall ye deal falsely, nor lie one to another.

Eph. 4:28—Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have whereof to give to him that hath need.

Q. 106. What does God require in the ninth commandment?

A. In the ninth commandment God requires that I speak the truth in love and uprightness, defend and promote the honor of my neighbor, and shun all falsehood and slander as the proper work of the devil.

Prov. 19:9—A false witness shall not be unpunished; and he that uttereth lies shall perish.

John 8:44—Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and standeth not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father thereof.

Eph. 4:25—Wherefore, putting away falsehood, speak ye truth each one with his neighbor: for we are members one of another.

Q. 107. What does God require in the tenth commandment?

A. In the tenth commandment God requires that I, in grateful recognition of His all-wise providence, be content with His gracious gifts, rejoice in the prosperity of my neighbor, and never, in envy and selfishness, desire what God withhold from me.

Phil. 4:11b—For I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content.

Luke 12:15—And he said unto them, Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.

Acts 20:33—I coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel.

Q. 108. Can they who are converted to God keep His commandments perfectly?

A. Because of indwelling sin no Christian can attain to perfection in this life; even the holiest of men have but a small beginning of true obedience.

I John 1:8—Again, a new commandment write I unto you, which thing is true in him and in you; because the darkness is passing away, and the true light already shineth.

Rom. 7:14, 15—For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I know not: for not what I would, that do I practise; but what I hate, that I do.

Eccles. 7:20—Surely there is not a righteous man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.

Q. 109. What is the place and purpose of the preaching of the law in the Christian Church?

A. The law must be constantly preached as the teacher of sin and as the rule of Christian gratitude unto the progressive sanctification of God's people.

Rom. 3:20—Because by the work of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for through the law cometh the knowledge of sin.

Ps. 19:7—The law of Jehovah is perfect, restoring the soul: the testimony of Jehovah is sure, making wise the simple.

Isa. 8:20—To the law and to the testimony! if they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them.

I Thess. 4:3a—For this is the will of God, even your sanctification.

Q. 110. What is sanctification?

A. Sanctification is that gracious operation of God's Spirit whereby we are enabled in ever fuller measure to cleanse ourselves from sin, and to press on to the goal of Christian perfection.

Rom. 12:2—And be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.

II Cor. 7:1—Having therefore these promises beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.

Phil. 3:14—I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Eph. 4:22a, 24—That ye put away, as concerning your former manner of life, the old man . . . And put on the new man, that after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth.

Q. 111. What is the place of prayer in the sanctified life?

A. Prayer is the chief part of the thankfulness which God requires of us, and it is only in answer to earnest prayer that God grants His sanctifying grace.

Matt. 7:7—Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.

I Thess. 5:17, 18—Pray without ceasing; in everything give thanks: for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus' to you-ward.

Ps. 50:14—Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the Most High.

Luke 11:13—If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

Q. 112. What is true prayer?

A. True prayer is the humble recognition in confession, petition, and praise of the God of our salvation as the supreme fountain of all good.

Ps. 34:18—Jehovah is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart, and saveth such as are of a contrite spirit.

John 4:24—God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth.

Ps. 138:1—I will give thee thanks with my whole heart: before the gods will I sing praises unto thee.

I John 5:14—And this is the boldness which we have toward him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us.

Q. 113. In whose name must we pray?

A. We must pray in the name of Christ, our Mediator, in whom alone we have access to the throne of grace, and for whose sake our heavenly Father will always hear our prayers.

John 14:13, 14—And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in my name, that will I do.

John 14:16—Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me.

John 16:23—Verily, verily, I say unto you, If ye shall ask anything of the Father, he will give it you in my name.

Q. 114. After what manner has our Lord taught us to pray?

A. Our Lord taught us to pray as follows:

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.

Matt. 6:9-13—After this manner therefore pray ye . . .

Luke 11:2-4—And he said unto them, When ye pray, say . . .

Q. 115. How do the words "Our Father who art in heaven" teach us to approach God in prayer?

A. Our Lord teaches us, as we address God in prayer, to confess His almighty power and heavenly majesty, and to express our own childlike trust and reverence.

Isa. 64:8—But now, O Jehovah, thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand.

Isa. 66:1a—Thus saith Jehovah, Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool.

Luke 11:13—If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

Acts 4:24—And they, when they heard it, lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, O Lord, thou that didst make the heaven and the earth and the sea, and all that in them is.

Q. 116. What do we pray in the first petition: Hallowed be Thy name?

A. In the first petition we pray that we and all men may honor God's revelation of Himself as the Holy one, who is forever to be praised.

Ps. 81:1—O Jehovah, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth, who hast set thy glory upon the heavens!

Isa. 6:3b—Holy, Holy, Holy, is Jehovah of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.

Luke 1:46, 47—And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.

Ps. 71:8—My mouth shall be filled with thy praise, and with thy honor all the day.

Q. 117. What do we pray in the second petition: Thy Kingdom come?

A. In the second petition we pray that God may by His Word and Spirit rule ever more fully in the hearts and lives of men, until the perfection of His Kingdom arrive wherein God shall be all in all.

Ps. 145:3—Great is Jehovah, and greatly to be praised; and his greatness is unsearchable.

Matt. 6:33—But seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

Ps. 51:18—Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: build thou the walls of Jerusalem.

Q. 118. What do we pray in the third petition: Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth?

A. In the third petition, we pray that we may, by God's grace, renounce our own wills, and gladly and faithfully obey the will of God, as do the angels in heaven.

John 5:30b—Because I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

John 6:38—For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

Rom. 12:2—And be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.

Matt. 16:24—Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

Q. 119. What do ye pray in the fourth petition: Give us this day our daily bread?

A. In the fourth petition, withdrawing our trust from all creatures, we pray that our heavenly Father may daily provide for all our bodily needs.

Ps. 145:15—The eyes of all wait for thee; and thou givest them their food in due season.

Acts 14:17—And yet he left not himself without witness, in that he did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness.

Jer. 17:5, 7—Thus saith Jehovah: Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from Jehovah. Blessed is the man that trusteth in Jehovah, and whose trust Jehovah is.

Q. 120. What do we pray in the fifth petition: And forgive us our debts, as we have forgiven our debtors?

A. In the fifth petition we ask our heavenly Father to forgive us our sins for the sake of Christ, and this we ask in confidence since He by His grace enables us to forgive our neighbor.

Ps. 51:1—Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness: according to the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.

1 John 1:9—He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in the darkness even until now.

Matt. 6:14, 15—For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

Q. 121. What do we pray in the sixth petition: And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one?

A. In the sixth petition, knowing our weakness, we pray that we may not be exposed to the assaults of the tempter, and that if temptations must come we may stand in the strength of God.

Matt. 26:41—Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.

1 Thess. 5:23—And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Eph. 6:12—For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places.

Q. 122. What do we confess in the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer: For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the Glory, forever. Amen?

A. In the conclusion to the Lord's prayer we confess that all authority, might, and honor belong to God alone, and that He is both able and willing to hear us, His children, in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Ps. 115:1—Not unto us, O Jehovah, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory, for thy lovingkindness, and for thy truth's sake.

Ps. 115:11—Ye that fear Jehovah, trust in Jehovah: He is their help and their shield.

1 Peter 1:5— . . . who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.

John 14:13—And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.

Ps. 44:8—In God have we made our boast all the day long, and we will give thanks unto thy name for ever.

REPORT XXII.

REPORT OF THE CHICAGO JEWISH MISSION

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

THE Board of the Chicago Jewish Mission of the Christian Reformed Church again welcomes the privilege and opportunity of presenting to your honorable body a report of the activities of the Chicago Jewish Mission in the past year and of acquainting you somewhat with the work which we are attempting to carry on among the Jewish population of our city.

As Board we feel that we have abundant reason for gratitude. Materially our churches and people have responded well with their gifts so that in this respect the work was made easy for the Board. And we are confident, too, that the contributions of our people for this work evidence their love and interest for this work. No doubt many prayers have ascended to God's throne of grace from pulpit and family altar that God might bless and prosper this work. And this is as it should be.

The Board was privileged to meet at least once per month in the interest of this work. The meetings we are happy to say are faithfully attended by the members. At each meeting the workers too are present, and together the needs and problems of our work are discussed by the Board and the Mission Staff. A fine spirit of cooperation prevails.

The workers have again pursued their labors with devotion and fidelity. A full schedule of class work and meetings with children, young people and adults is maintained through out the week. In all these classes and meetings the emphasis is laid upon the Scripture teachings respecting the Messiah and salvation through Him. The attendance in all of these classes and meetings is measured up to that of previous years. And though we cannot report any actual conversions for the past year, we can say that several are evidencing an unusual interest in the Word of God and in the claims of Christianity. We are praying that the Spirit of God may move them to publicly acknowledge Christ as their Savior. At any

rate we are confident that God's Word will not return to Him void, and that in His time the Lord of the harvest will bless the seed that has been sown. In addition to sowing the seed by means of the spoken word, our workers are also sowing the seed of the Gospel by means of the printed Word and tracts.

The work in the dispensary has also continued as heretofore under the able direction of Dr. William Yonker. By means of our clinic many contacts with the Jews are made, and here too an opportunity is given our workers to speak to the Jews about matters of the soul. During the past months an average of forty cases were treated per week in the clinic or one hundred and sixty per month.

The Christmas season of course is always a very opportune time to direct the thoughts of the Jew to the Christ. Our worker accordingly prepared a fine Christmas program given largely by the children and young people attending our mission. To this program many Jewish fathers and mothers were invited and the response was very encouraging. A gospel message on this occasion was delivered by our acting superintendent, Mr. Huisjen. And so in all these ways, Christ is being preached to the Jew.

During the past year our workers have been carrying on an intensive home visitation program in the vicinity of our mission. Many of the Jewish parents and young people are at present employed in the various war industries and, as a consequence, are not in a position to attend the gospel meetings as regularly as in times past. This meant that our mission program had to be revised somewhat. We are happy to report, however, that our workers recognized the challenge, and after the example of our Lord, they have been going out "into highway and byways" seeking the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" and testifying to them of the Savior. A large number of personal visits have been made by our staff and for this we rejoice.

The complexion of our mission personnel has changed a bit since our last report to Synod. Miss Delis, who has served our mission for many years as nurse in our dispensary, saw fit to resign. The Board reluctantly accepted her resignation. In her place, however, another efficient nurse has been secured in the person of Miss Marie De-Bruin who assists the doctor three mornings per week and at times helps out in the class work. Miss Vander

Meulen continues to render faithful service as religious worker for our ladies' and girls' group, though of late she has been confined to her home because of illness. May our Heavenly Father graciously spare and restore.

The Board feeling the need of enlarging the work, has also been very fortunate in securing the services of Miss Wilhelmina Tut as an additional lady worker. She is a recent graduate of our Reformed Bible Institute and comes to our mission highly recommended. We pray that she may prove to be a real blessing for our work here.

In the past year the Board in conjunction with the Classical Committee of Classis Chicago North issued calls respectively to the Reverends Arnold Brink, Peter H. Eldersveld and Henry Evenhouse to assume the duties of ordained worker at our mission. None of these brethren, however, felt free to accept our call. The Board thereupon, with the approval of Classis Chicago North, appointed the Reverend Jacob Zandstra, Minister in good standing in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, to labor at our mission for the period of one year. We are happy to report the Reverend Zandstra has accepted this appointment and hopes to take up his labors at our mission about June 1st. The Reverend Zandstra is a son of our Church, a graduate of our College and received his seminary training at Westminster Seminary of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. He has had considerable experience in mission work and with God's benediction, he promises much for our work.

We trust this brief report will serve to acquaint your honorable body somewhat with the work that is being performed by your workers at the Chicago Jewish Mission, and by the Board who is charged with administering the affairs of this mission. We are confident, too, that Synod will again pass favorably upon our proposed budget and upon our request for continued financial and moral support for this very worthy Kingdom endeavor. We humbly solicit your fervent prayers for this Mission, for the workers, for the Board and for those labored with to the end that many of God's old covenant people may be led to the Christ and God's saving grace be magnified by them and by us all.

Respectfully submitted,

BOARD OF THE CHICAGO JEWISH MISSION
SECRETARY

Rev. T. M. Verhulst

**ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE
CHICAGO JEWISH MISSION OF THE CHR. REF. CHURCH**
From January 1, 1942, to December 31, 1942

RECEIPTS

Balance on hand.....	\$ 1,252.17
Synodical Treasurer	9,600.00
Donations and Collections.....	296.40
Interest	980.15
Medical Fund	1,000.00
African Methodist Episcopal Church (14th St. Church sold)	8,321.61
Principal on Mortgages.....	752.29
General Tax Escrow.....	270.47
Rebates	22.40
Terborg Estate	100.00

\$22,505.49

DISBURSEMENTS

U. S. Government Bonds.....	\$12,000.00
Salaries	6,746.07
Mission Petty Cash Disbursements.....	200.00
Exchange	4.55
Phone	58.45
Gas and Electricity.....	107.09
Medicine	389.27
Supplies	135.52
Cleaning and Repairing.....	285.74
Fuel	381.26
Services and Traveling Expense.....	105.50
General Tax and Special Assessment.....	299.63
Insurance	272.02
License	75.00
Balance on hand.....	1,445.39

\$22,505.49

**STATEMENT OF THE
CHICAGO JEWISH MISSION OF THE CHR. REF. CHURCH**
as of January 1st, 1943

ASSETS

Cash on hand.....	\$ 1,445.39
Property and Equipment (Nathaniel Institute)	19,000.00
U. S. Government Bonds.....	12,000.00
Federal Savings & Loan Assn. Stock.....	7,000.00
Mortgages and Real Estate Contracts.....	11,404.65

\$50,850.04

LIABILITIES

Tax Escrow	\$ 114.72
Net Assets	50,735.32

\$50,850.04

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1943

Pastor's Salary	\$ 2,000.00
Religious Worker's Salary.....	2,300.00
Doctor's Salary (half time).....	1,340.00
Nurse's Salary (full time).....	1,260.00
Lady Worker's Salary.....	1,200.00
Janitor's Salary	780.00
Pastor's Rent	600.00
Gas, Electricity, Phone and Fuel.....	825.00
Insurance, Tax, and License.....	350.00
Repairing and Decorating.....	400.00
Medical Supplies, etc.....	400.00
Traveling Expenses	100.00
Mission Supplies and Equipment.....	200.00

\$11,755.00

January 9th, 1943.

Chicago Jewish Mission,
1241 S. Pulaski Road,
Chicago, Illinois.

Gentlemen:—

In accordance with your request I have completed an audit of the accounts and records of the Chicago Jewish Mission for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942.

I have examined the cash book and found that all entries were properly made. I have reconciled the bank account and have satisfied myself that all disbursements have been properly recorded and accounted for. All extensions, totals, and footings were thoroughly checked.

I am of the opinion that the Statement of Income and Disbursements and the Balance Sheet as of December 31, 1942, reflect the true financial position of this institution.

Respectfully submitted,

M. VANDER VELDE, *Auditor.*

REPORT XXIII.

WAR RELIEF FUND, FINANCIAL REPORT

To the Synod of 1943.

ESTEEMED BRETHREN:

Balance, May 31, 1942..... \$4,008.58

RECEIVED

Gifts in June, 1942	\$ 286.44	
Gifts in July, 1942	340.23	
Gifts in August, 1942	89.23	
Gifts in September, 1942	89.85	
Gifts in December, 1942	176.03	
Gifts in February, 1943	527.01	
Gifts in April, 1943	6.00	
		<hr/>
		\$1,514.79

Total..... \$5,523.37

PAID OUT

Surinam Missions, South America..... \$2,000.00

Balance, April 30, 1943..... \$3,523.37

VAN LONKHUYZEN FUND

Balance, May 31, 1942..... \$ 261.41

Paid out Sept. 28, 1942..... \$ 200.00

Paid out April 20, 1942..... 61.41 261.41

Balance..... \$ 00.00

J. J. BUITEN, *Treasurer.*

DEPUTATI SYNODI

Primi

Secundi

Classis California

G. S. Kok	Minister	F. De Jong	Minister
E. Tanis	M	S. Struyk	M
H. Vermeulen	Elder	J. Bosscher	Elder
Geo Oppenhuizen	E	P. Hekman	E

Classis Chicago North

R. O. De Groot	Minister	B. Essenburg	Minister
W. H. Rutgers	M	J. Van Beek	M
L. Bere	Elder	J. Kooy	Elder
S. Hoving	E	J. Vander Velde	E

Classis Chicago South

G. Hoeksema	Minister	Minister
J. H. Monsma	M	I. Westra	M
E. Posthuma	Elder	Henry Hanstra	Elder
J. Kuiper	E	Fred Broertjes	E

Classis Grand Rapids East

J. Weidenaar	Minister	J. O. Schuring	Minister
J. Entingh	M	H. J. Kuiper	M
L. J. Rooks	Elder	P. D. Bouma	Elder
G. Daverman	E	H. Boersma	E

Classis Grand Rapids South

J. L. Bult	Minister	E. Masselink	Minister
M. Vander Werp	M	G. Hofmeyer	M
R. Haan	Elder	R. De Groot	Elder
J. Vander Ploeg	E	B. A. Mulder	E

Classis Grand Rapids West

R. Veldman	Minister	H. Verduin	Minister
M. Vander Zwaag	M	J. De Haan, Jr.	M
C. Goudzwaard	Elder	P. Westveer	Elder
B. De Jager	E	J. Langeland	E

Classis Hackensack

Hessel Bouma	Minister	John Rozendaal	Minister
Henry Radius	M	John Beebe	M
P. Hoodiman	Elder	A. Van Essendelft	Elder
H. Fokens	E	Albert De Vries	E

Classis Holland

R. J. Danhof	Minister	D. H. Walters	Minister
G. Gritter	M	C. Witt	M
N. Stielstra	Elder	J. Menken	Elder
F. Oldemulders	E	H. Van Faasen	E

Classis Hudson

H. Evenhouse	Minister	P. Van Dyk	Minister
E. Kooistra	M	R. Rienstra	M
N. Bos	Elder	C. J. Bult	Elder
J. De Leeuw	E	B. De Vries	E

Classis Kalamazoo

Donald Drost	Minister	A. Poel	Minister
John O. Bouwsma	M	J. H. Schaal	M
F. Bosker	Elder	H. C. Bode	Elder
D. Hutt	E	O. Streekstra	E

Classis Minnesota

R. A. Rozeboom	Minister	Wm. Terpsma	Minister
J. H. Rubingh	M	H. Vander Klay	M
Herman Vande Riet	Elder	B. Den Ouden	Elder
John Bonnema, Jr.	E	Fred De Groot	E

Classis Muskegon

J. P. De Vries	Minister	J. C. Verbrugge	Minister
L. J. Lamberts	M	A. Brink	M
H. Ten Hoor	Elder	H. Van Laar	Elder
B. Zenderink	E	C. Meyering	E

Classis Orange City

J. H. Geerlings	Minister	A. Jabaay	Minister
A. D. Folkema	M	J. A. Mulder	M
Peter Wiersma	Elder	E. Brunsting	Elder
Henry Heynen	E	N. Hibma	E

Classis Ostfriesland

K. Tebben	Minister	H. Zwaanstra	Minister
L. F. Voskuil	M	R. S. De Haan	M
Jacob Ploeger	Elder	Ben A. Abbas	Elder
Louis Gruis	E	G. F. Pommer	E

Classis Pacific

J. De Jong	Minister	G. Pars	Minister
J. Vanden Hoek	M	S. G. Brondsema	M
Reynard Bos	Elder	J. Ebbers	Elder
B. Koops	E	J. Olthuis	E

Classis Pella

John Vander Ploeg	Minister	John D. Pikaart	Minister
Wm. Van Peursem	M	Elco H. Oostendorp	M
G. De Boer	Elder	J. Lanser	Elder
H. Stek	E	G. Rooy	E

Classis Sioux Center

W. Hekman	Minister	J. Hanenburg	Minister
J. Guichelaar	M	H. J. Triesenberg	M
J. Ten Harmsel	Elder	J. Vogel	Elder
J. C. De Bruyn	E	J. Krediet	E

Classis Wisconsin

E. Joling	Minister	J. C. Schaap	Minister
H. De Mots	M	J. J. Holwerda	M
Henry Kuiper	Elder	Lambert Dykstra	Elder
H. Veenstra	E	Wm. Vander Velde	E

Classis Zeeland

J. H. Bruinooge	Minister	M. Bolt	Minister
N. Beute	M	J. Geels	M
B. H. Brouwer	Elder	W. K. Bareman	Elder
C. Besteman	E	H. Blauwkamp	E

AGENDA

Part II - - - Overtures

I. CALVIN COLLEGE AND SEMINARY MATTERS

REPORTS OF CURATORIUM AND REPORTS ON KINDRED MATTERS IN AGENDA, PART II, INCLUDING REPORT ON REFORMED BIBLE INSTITUTE

1. In accordance with the requirement of the Synodical ruling, Acts of 1941, p. 98, 111, Classis Minnesota informs your body that seven of our congregations did not pay in full their quotas for Calvin College and Seminary. Classis has conferred with these Churches and is convinced they could not fully meet the quotas and that in most cases commendable efforts have been put forth.

In one case the non payment was due to an error in computation and in such cases as demanded greater efforts Classis has admonished the congregations to do all in their power to meet their quotas. A fuller report on each case is in hands of our delegates in case Synod desires to look into the records.

(Classis Minnesota.)

II. GENERAL MISSIONS: Indian, Chinese and African Mission Matters.

REPORT ON INDIGENOUS CHURCHES; REPORT CHRISTIAN REFORMED BOARD OF MISSIONS; SEE OVERTURE NO. 27

2. Classis has adopted the following:
That Synod adopt the term "Field", as proposed by the Chr. Ref. Board of Missions. *Grounds:*

1. It would eliminate the source of present misunderstandings which arise in connection with the exact import of the call of some of the missionaries and their field of labor.
2. It would both clarify and unify this matter for all concerned.

< Blank Page >

3. It would open the way for changes which are sometimes very desirable or even necessary, but which in some cases are now impossible. Thus it would be better for all concerned.
4. It safeguards the rights and privileges of the missionary, the Consistory, the Board, and Synod.
5. It provides for a harmonious introduction of the new order which it proposes.
6. We believe there is no principle involved in the proposed change.

Therefore, Classis recommends to Synod the adoption of this plan.

(Classis Chicago North.)

3. In re "Mission Calls to Post or Field" of Acts 1942, p. 94 and report on p. 256, Classis Wisconsin adopted the conclusion of its own committee appointed at our October, 1942, meeting.

The conclusion reads as follows:

OUR CONCLUSION is that the Committee is in substantial agreement with the Board, and **WE RECOMMEND**, therefore, that the Classis go on record as favoring the change as the Board proposes: i.e. that a man shall be called to a field rather than to a definite post. Grounds:

(1) It is in harmony with the practice of the church since 1939—Synodical control. (2) It may avoid unpleasant situations on the field. (3) It may effect greater efficiency in the work of Missions.

(Classis Wisconsin.)

4. At the meeting of Classis California held Feb. 24, 1943, it was decided to overture Synod as follows:

That Synod reject the proposal of the Board of Foreign Missions to call missionaries to the field in general.

Reasons:

1. It would be another step in the direction of complete centralization leaving little or no power to the congregation. The emphasis should be on the autonomy of the local church as the manifestation of the body of Christ, and commissioned to do mission work.
2. It opens the way to the violation of the Reformed principle that all ministers are equal. If the board

< Blank Page >

has its way, one minister, or a small group of ministers, will be able to lord it over another minister. It would invest a few ministers with episcopal authority to place a fellow minister wheresoever they see fit.

3. It would be another step in removing the missionary farther away from the calling church.
4. The proposal of the Board tends to weaken the sense of call,—and if a missionary is shifted from place to place, it would constitute an infringement upon his personal rights, and do violence to his conscience, since he would not be at liberty to follow what he deems a call from God.
5. In his memorandum the Secretary of Missions says it is “practically desirable” since it would simplify matters in case a change in location of any missionary is considered desirable. Indeed, it would simplify matters, but at what price! The Board, or a few members of the Board, would judge as to the desirableness of transferring a missionary, and they would effect the transfer.
6. Another practical reason given is that it would make it possible for the Board to promote a missionary, who has done good work, by giving him a post which offers greater opportunity. This practical consideration, and the one previously mentioned, to make the proposal seem acceptable really condemn it.

(Classis California.)

- 5.** Classis Minnesota, In session at Prinsburg on March 31, 1943, adopted the following Report and ordered it sent to Synod:—

Calling of Missionaries.

The Committee appointed to advise Classis re calling of missionaries to Posts on the Indian Field or to the field as a whole has the pleasure to report the following: We advise Classis to recommend to Synod to abide by the present usage.

While it is undoubtedly true that our present Mission Order gives the Board authority to call missionaries to the Field as well as for specified posts, we believe that the usage which has sprung up in our Churches is well founded and has proved its value, and should be adopted

< Blank Page >

as the official procedure. No sufficient reasons have been advanced to proceed to change as advocated by the Board. There are weighty considerations against the proposal of the Board to call to the Field rather than to specified posts. We mention four of these.

I. As the Board concedes, the connecting link between missionary and his calling Church is already very slender. And now to proceed still farther along the lines proposed would virtually destroy all congregational interest in the field, and all Consistorial regard for it. This is certainly unwise at a time when we have just emerged from so much agitation on the field, and unwise in general with a view to the mission zeal of the churches.

II. As it tends to further lessen the bonds between the missionary and his post, and the calling Church and his labors, so too the proposed method of calling would tend in the direction of still greater Board control. We believe the Board has more than sufficient powers even now to care for emergencies. To wit:

- 1) It can make temporary arrangements (As in the case of Kamps at Shiprock.
- 2) It can take over missionaries from calling Churches to transfer them. (It took B. Pousma from Sherman St. to place him in Farmington.)
- 3) It can transfer a field from one calling Church to another if it deems the missionary of that Church more suitable (to another field) Synod decided that De Vries should go to Two Wells, and then that post would no longer be under the supervision of Orange City but under that of Roseland, as calling church of De Vries.

All these instances, and others which could be adduced, abundantly show that the authority of the Board is even now sufficient. There is much wisdom in preserving a way which restrains the Board in its actions without making necessary action impossible even if a bit tedious.

III. A move in this direction leaves the missionaries in a highly undesirable position. The Board concedes that the move would probably be unpopular with the missionaries. Such a move should be avoided if at all possible, especially since there is good reason for the missionaries to look askance at such a move.

We believe that if at all possible the decision to transfer should be left with the individual. The Board wanted

< Blank Page >

Rev. Kamps at Shiprock. According to present usage he had to be duly called. He declined. This was his right and we feel that this sacred privilege of making the final decision should be left with the missionary, as long as possible. Likewise the Rev. Vander Stoep was called to Shiprock, and accepted. The decision was his, and should ever be. This is one of the most fundamental rules of our Church policy, and the sanctity of conscience, the sacredness of the call must be preserved by all means.

IV. A move in this direction would undoubtedly tend to weaken the development of native Churches. In any given community the missionary is the living center, the only manifestation of the Body of Christ. It is around him, and his person and work that the Church first manifests itself locally and then grows. Then, as the Church grows, he must seek to efface himself so that the Church may come to its own inherent manifestation as institute. Now we believe that the more firmly entrenched such a missionary is at a certain specified post to manifest the Church locally, the better it will be for the development of that Church indigenously, and the very possibility of his being moved or removed must be kept at the lowest minimum.

(Classis Minnesota.)

* * * * *

See Overture No. 27.

III. HOME MISSION MATTERS

REPORT EXECUTIVE COMM. HOME MISSIONS; REPORT
YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS; JEWISH MISSION REPORTS
AND BUDGETS; SEAMEN'S HOME; CHURCH
HELP COMM. REPORT; CHAPLAIN COMM.
REPORT; COMM. FOR SOUTH AMERICA
REPORT

6. Classis Chicago North respectfully requests Synod to reconsider its decision in re the constituency of the Executive Committee for Home Missions as defined in Article 104, B, 1, page 106 of the Acts of Synod, 1942. The article in question reads as follows:

"That Synod declare that the Executive Committee shall consist in part of the representatives to the General Board from the following Classes: Grand Rapids East, Grand Rapids South, Grand Rapids West, Holland, Muskegon and Zeeland."

< Blank Page >

The Committee thus constituted to carry out the work of Synod and of the General Home Missions Committee is highly centralized, viz., three Grand Rapids Classes, Holland, Muskegon and Zeeland, and with the choice of three members at large, it so happens that the entire committee is composed of members of the Michigan Classes, and at present three from one Classis. We believe it to be a sound principle and wise as well that as many sections as is reasonably possible be represented in the executive committees of our church. We see no good reason why the executive committee for Home Missions, functioning for the entire church, must be composed solely of members from the Michigan Classes and living in the mediate vicinity of Grand Rapids. (We ought to avert even all semblance of sectionalism in our denominational projects.)

We, therefore, as Classis Chicago North humbly request Synod to revise this decision, so that the Constituency of the Executive Committee for Home Missions will allow the delegate of the General Home Missions Committee for Classis Chicago North to be a member of said Committee.

(Classis Chicago North.)

7. The Classis of Chicago South overtures the Synod of 1943:

Synod declare that the representatives to the "General Board of Home Missions" from Classis Chicago South and Classis Chicago North shall be members of the "Executive Committee for Home Missions." *Grounds:*

1. To give representation to the Churches of Illinois and Indiana on this executive committee will serve to preclude an undue dominance of our Michigan Churches in this highly important branch of denominational work.
2. This will be in harmony with our practice in re the "Executive Committee of the Board of Missions" and in re the "Executive Committee of the Board of Calvin College and Seminary."

(Classis Chicago South.)

8. The Classis of Chicago South overtures the Synod of 1943:

Synod eliminate from the "Home Mission Order" adopted by the Synod of 1942 the following sections:

< Blank Page >

from article 4a the words "In addition to these, Synod shall also elect three members at large to serve as members of the Committee. These shall be chosen from a nomination bearing the names of centrally located men. The members at large shall serve for three years and Synod shall elect one each year together with his alternate." And from Article 4b the words "the three members at large and." *Grounds:*

1. The three members at large must in the nature of the case be Michigan men. Their membership on the "Board for Home Missions" and on the "Executive Committee of this Board for Home Missions" gives the Michigan Churches an undue preponderance of influence in Home Missions matters.
2. There is no apparent need of having these members serve on the Board of Home Missions in addition to the representatives elected by the various Classes.

(Classis Chicago South.)

9. The following churches were recommended to the fund of needy churches: Hawardan for \$350, Middleburg for \$300, Sibley for \$700, Worthington for \$150.

(Classis Orange City.)

10. Classis Wisconsin recommends the following subsidies to the following churches: Birnamwood, \$700; Delavan, \$600; Second Randolph, \$600; Vesper, \$600.

(Classis Wisconsin.)

11. Classis Pacific requests Synod to continue the aid given to Classis Pacific for Classical Expense at the rate of 60 cents per family for 1944.

Ground: The expense involved is very high. For 1942 it amounted to \$1.40 per family.

(Classis Pacific.)

< Blank Page >

IV. CHURCH ORDER MATTERS

REPORT SYNODICAL COMM.; REPORT ON REFORMED ALLIANCE AND P. S. ON ECUMENICAL REFORMED COUNCIL; REPORT CHRISTIAN LABOR; TRANSPORTATION SECRETARY REPORT; MAJORITY AND MINORITY REPORTS RE REVISION OF ART. 36 OF THE CREED; REPORT MIXED MARRIAGES; REPORT DELEGATE TO LORD'S DAY ALLIANCE ET. AL.; REPORT HISTORICAL COMM.; REPORT DELEGATES TO CORRESPONDING CHURCHES ET. AL.

12. At the meeting of Classis California, Feb. 24, 1943, it was decided to overture Synod as follows:

A. To reject A. and B. as formulated (See Agenda for the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church, Part I, 1943, pp. 24, 25). *Grounds:*

1. There are self-contradictions in these recommendations. Notice Agenda, p. 24, recommendation A. where it is recommended that Synod take over the positions of 1916, 1928, and the conclusions of 1930.

See Agenda, p. 10, point 14, Question 2b, where it is stated that "A Christian becomes fully responsible either by consent or silence for whatever is sinful in the decisions and practices of the organization to which he belongs."

Compare this with Agenda, p. 11, Question 3c, where it is stated that "Here, too, the rule shall be applied that only if one is personally guilty of censurable sin shall one become the object of ecclesiastical discipline."

In the first statement corporate responsibility is assumed. But in the second statement it is denied.

Then in the recommendations on p. 24, B. 2 and 4, this conflict is apparently dealt with, but unsuccessfully. For, if according to the first statement, a person becomes fully responsible for sinful decisions and practices of his organization, he must become censurable whether or not he be implicated in personal acts of violence.

2. Agenda, p. 24, B. 5, is in practice impossible to carry out, especially in the light of the position taken in Agenda,

< Blank Page >

p. 10, point 14, Question 2b, for these organizations are nation-wide. And since in practice impossible to carry out Synod should not make it mandatory upon Consistories, lest we get another dead-letter decision.

B. To adopt C. and D. of the recommendations, Agenda, pp. 24 and 25.

C. That whereas the church is evidently not clear on the question of how far corporate responsibility extends, Synod appoint a committee to study the question of corporate responsibility further. Also the question of whether the sphere of Unions is not a matter from which the church should refrain from legislating, since church discipline is a matter which concerns individuals, not organizations.

(Classis California.)

13. Classis Kalamazoo overtures Synod as follows:

"Since the cost of living has advanced at a rapid rate during the past year and will no doubt continue to rise for the duration of the war, Classis Kalamazoo overtures Synod that subsidy to needy churches be raised to such an amount, that each minister is guaranteed a minimum salary of \$1,500."

(Classis Kalamazoo.)

14. Classis Orange City overtures Synod to request the President of the United States to proclaim a National Day of Prayer as well as a National Day of Thanksgiving. (This National Day of Prayer to fall on the second Wednesday of March.) *Reasons:*

1. Our present war situation and our present food situation most urgently call for such a National Day of Prayer. Our present food situation may even continue for some time after the war. But not only in a time of dire need do we need such a National Day of Prayer, it is even necessary to have such a day in time of peace and in time of normal conditions. At all times it is well for the people of our nation unitedly to call upon God in prayer and beseech Him for His blessing upon agriculture and industry.
2. We believe that right now is the proper time to present such a request as this to our President because

< Blank Page >

many government officials and a large number of the people of our nation are open for convictions on this score.

3. We believe that such a proclamation of a National Day of Prayer by the President will help to bring the people of our country to the realization of our utter dependence upon God.
4. We believe that such a National Day of Prayer will give force and meaning to our National Day of Thanksgiving. For Prayer uttered in humble dependence upon God will also create in the soul a deep sense of gratitude.

(Classis Orange City.)

15. Classis decides to overture Synod to petition the President of the United States to declare a National Day of Prayer annually in early spring for the purpose of acknowledging God as the supreme Giver of all good and perfect things. *Ground:* The seriousness of the times brings home to us as a nation on the one hand our duty to recognize God as the supreme Ruler and Lord of all; and on the other, our utter dependence on Him for all material and spiritual blessings.

(Classis Sioux Center.)

16. Classis Pella requests Synod to interpret its decision in re Art. 41 so that it may be clear how the questions are to be asked and answered. *Grounds:*

a. The decision of Synod in regard to this matter is ambiguous because it has decided on the one hand that "Synod approve the method of asking the questions under Art. 41, C.O., by the written questionnaire method as well as the oral method," and on the other, "to revise the second paragraph of Art. 41, so as to read: 'Furthermore, *the President shall, among other things, put the following questions to the delegates of each church;* (italics ours) which questions may be answered either orally or in written form.'"

b. We have been informed that another Classis has also wrestled with the same ambiguity. Classis Pella further overtures Synod to couch the supervisory questions of Art. 41 in such a fashion—as far as possible—that the replies cannot be made by a bare "yes" or "no," but will require the respondents to formulate the replies with

< Blank Page >

some words of elucidation. For examples, we refer Synod to the questions 3, 4, and 5 as found in the Synodical Committee's Report to Synod of 1942. (Cf. Agenda, part I, p. 34, 1942.) *Grounds:*

a. This will assist in avoiding a mechanical and perfunctory compliance with the requirements of Art. 41.

b. This will promote the discussion of the spiritual life of our congregations and also foster the mutual supervision which Art. 41 was originally intended to do.

(Classis Pella.)

V. EMERITI MATTERS

REPORT EMERITUS BOARD

17. Classis Sioux Center asks approval of the honorable emeritation of Dr. R. L. Haan on the following grounds:

1. On account of his 45 years of service.

2. On account of his advanced age.

(Classis Sioux Center.)

18. At its session held January 20, 1943, Classis Grand Rapids East has granted honorable emeritation to the Rev. L. Van Haitsma of Portland, Mich., on account of continued ill health.

(Classis Grand Rapids East.)

VI. PUBLICATION AND LITURGICAL MATTERS

REPORT BOARD OF PUBLICATIONS ET. AL.; REPORT MISSION SUNDAY SCHOOL PLANNING COURSE; REPORT FAITH, PRAYER AND TRACT LEAGUE; REPORT DELEGATE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY; REPORT ON TRANSLATION OF HOLLAND THEOLOGICAL WORKS; REPORT RE "READING SERVICES" SERMONS; REPORT RE REVISED COMPENDIUM; RADIO COMM. REPORT.

19. The Classis of Chicago South overtures Synod to decide that The Banner be sent free of charge to every one of our members in the armed forces of our country for the duration. *Grounds:*

1. At present about half of our churches are furnishing their members in the armed forces with a free

< Blank Page >

copy of The Banner but a considerable number of churches do not follow this practice.

2. The Banner can prove to be a real help in stimulating the spiritual life of our soldiers.
3. To send The Banner to each one of our soldiers will be a method of doing Home Mission work at a very small cost.

(Classis Chicago South.)

20. I. Classis Pacific sustains a request of Conrad that Synod continue the work of its committee in publishing English sermons for reading service for another year. *Grounds:*

1. There is a constant need for new sermons.
2. The previous books are highly appreciated.

(Classis Pacific.)

VII. VARIA

REPORT ON BETTER PROTECTION OF ARCHIVES; REPORTS OF SYNODICAL DELEGATES AD EXAMINA

21. A. Classis Holland overtures Synod to create a special Benevolent Fund to be used for spiritual Post-war Reconstruction Work for our spiritual brethren in the Netherlands. *REASONS:*

1. Biblical: Such planning for post-war help would be in harmony with the teaching and the practice of St. Paul (I. Cor. 16: 1-4).
2. Confessional: Question 55 of Lord's Day XXI of our Heidelberg Catechism enjoins this giving and planning upon us in its summary of the doctrine of the Communion of the Saints: "that every one must know himself bound to employ his gifts readily and cheerfully for the advantage and salvation of other members."
3. Historically: The Reformed Church of Reformation days has always responded with help for churches of other nationalities.
4. Practical: a) The demands of reconstruction will be so great that the only common sense way of meeting them will be by early planning. b) After the war, transitional depression may make us frantic, and consequently dim our vision of the opportunity to help those who have suffered beyond description. c) Many of our local benevolent funds are lying idle. d) Modernists are planning extensive reconstruction projects. We should be willing to help our spiritual brethren. e) By helping our brethren we give them the needful courage. f) By helping our capable brethren who have been confronted with paganism directly we shall serve our own church, nation, and the Kingdom of God, in resisting the work of the devil.

< Blank Page >

B. Classis Holland overtures Synod that the allocation and the distribution of these funds be in charge of the Synodical Committee on Netherlands Relief in consultation with the president and secretary of the Synodical Committee on Ecumenical Calvinism. **CONSIDERATIONS:** 1) This would prevent multiplication of committees. 2) Such a set-up would insure wise and equitable distribution.

C. Classis Holland overtures Synod that all moneys received be labelled by the consistories "Special Benevolent Fund" with the understanding should it be impossible or impractical to distribute them according to the intention of the contributing congregation, these moneys automatically revert to the funds of the donating congregations.

D. Classis Holland overtures Synod that it instruct the Committee for Netherlands Relief to deposit the money held in charge by this committee into the "Special Benevolent Fund," as created by Synod. **REASONS:** 1) "The Special Benevolent Fund" is of somewhat wider scope than the "Netherlands Relief Fund." 2) The same Committee will have charge of the newly created fund in behalf of Synod.

E. Classis Holland overtures Synod that both the Committee on Netherlands Relief and the Committee on Ecumenical Calvinism be instructed to inform themselves of the spiritual needs of our Reformed brethren and to be authorized to act as a Committee on Post-war Reconstruction Advice. **CONSIDERATIONS:**

- 1) When God in His mercy sends us peace new problems will constantly arise. Such committees would be in constant touch with changing situations.
- 2) No matter what the outcome of the war may be, a well-informed committee will be highly desirable and its advice will be greatly appreciated by inquiring consistories.

(Classis Holland.)

22. Firstly, since the "Gereformeerde Kerken van Nederland" have on account of the war sustained almost irreparable losses in church property both at home and in the East Indies, and since our people in the Netherlands will be unable for years to come to do

< Blank Page >

full justice financially to the Kingdom of God according to need, Classis Sioux Center overtures Synod to appoint a committee whose duty it shall be to collect funds immediately *through the local deaconates* to help at least in part repair the present losses named above, *these funds to remain in the hands of these deaconates until the time when needed. Each deaconate shall make a report to this committee at stated times.*

Secondly, to have this committee of Synod work with a committee of the "Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland" after the war is over, that the funds collected for that purpose may be distributed for the best interest of the Kingdom, either in the Netherlands or East Indies, or both.

Thirdly, in case these funds are collected and cannot be distributed according to the above named purpose, the committee of the Chr. Ref. Synod of America in conjunction with the advice of Synod will use these funds for the best interests of God's Kingdom anywhere. *Reasons:*

- 1) Our confession "I believe the communion of saints" warrants in a time like this that we demonstrate this through deeds.
- 2) This is in conformity with the charge given by Paul in Cor. 16:2.

(Classis Sioux Center.)

23. Classis California, February 24, 1943, decided to overture Synod:

That Synod urge all our churches to establish funds with a view to helping the needy Reformed Churches in the Netherlands after the war. *Grounds:*

1. Now is the time that we can raise money for such funds.
2. It is clear today that the need for such help will be overwhelmingly great.

(Classis California.)

24. Classis Wisconsin at its spring session, March 16, 1943, decided to express itself as being in agreement with the essence of Classis Holland's overture in re Netherlands Benevolence.

(Classis Wisconsin.)

< Blank Page >

25. Classis Pacific overtures Synod at the request of Zillah to establish a special Benevolent Fund to be used for Post-war reconstruction work for our spiritual brethren in the Netherlands.

For grounds, see report of Classis Holland in *Banner*, February 19, 1943, p. 189.

Classis accepts these grounds en toto.

(Classis Pacific.)

26. The Classis Kalamazoo overtures Synod: Since it has come to the attention of the Classis that there is much profanity on the part of the officers in our armed forces in commanding the men in their charge, the Classis requests the Synod to petition the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces to take measures toward the prevention of the use of profanity and cursing on the part of the officers. *Grounds:*

1. While profanity is a national evil also in civil life we do not hold that the President is responsible since that concerns the private lives of the citizens. When officers, however, use profane language in commanding their men, since they are responsible to the Commander-in-Chief, we feel that he can do something about this matter.
2. We feel that the blessings of God cannot rest upon our nation if we consciously tolerate this evil of profanity on the part of our leaders in the armed forces, therefore we feel it incumbent upon us to use our influence to eradicate this evil if possible.
3. As a church we instruct our men who enter the armed forces to serve their country patriotically and to submit themselves to their superiors. We are convinced that this duty toward God and country does not entail that the Christian men in our forces must submit themselves to forms of address and commands, in which the holy Name of God and of His Christ are desecrated. These men are constantly offended; yet you will admit that their position hardly allows them to object to such treatment. For that reason we feel that our Synod should make an appeal to the President to take the necessary measures for the prevention of this great evil."

< Blank Page >

The Classis is also sending a petition of its own to the President.

(Classis Kalamazoo.)

VIII. PROTESTS AND APPEALS

Appeal of K. W. Fortuin; answer of Classis Wisconsin and further appeal by the brother. (Report of Digest Comm. on Protest and Appeals.)

Communication from Synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches.

Communications from D. Strooboscher (?) (Report of Digest Comm. on.)

Statement of Synodical Delegates re George Weeber case.

Appeal re Emeritation of Rev. J. R. Brink.

(Too late to classify.)

27. The Rehoboth consistory respectfully requests Synod to designate the Rehoboth congregation as the calling church for the missionary pastor at Rehoboth, according to the Mission Order adopted by Synod of 1942, Art. VI, Sec. 2. *Reasons:*

- a. Rehoboth is better able to judge about its peculiar needs than a distant consistory.
- b. The present method of designating a calling church for Rehoboth ignores the autonomy of the local consistory.
- c. Rehoboth consistory was recognized as the calling church for the Two Wells post, when Rev. J. W. Brink was called. This post belongs to the Rehoboth field.
- d. The Rehoboth congregation contributes a just share towards the salary of the missionary.

Rehoboth Consistory

< Blank Page >

C O N T E N T S

REPORT

PAGE

Part I

Reports of Committees in regard to:

I.	Christian Labor	3
II.	Youth Organizations	26
III.	Reformed Alliance	34
	Ecumenical Reformed Council.....	41

Part II

Report of:

IV.	Mission Sunday School Lesson Planning Committee	47
V.	Comm. Re Better Protection of Archives.....	50
VI.	Faith, Prayer and Tract League.....	51
VII.	Comm. on Reformed Bible Institute.....	53
VIII.	Delegate to the American Bible Society.....	57
IX.	General Treasurer: General Fund, Jewish Missions	59
IX.-a	Paterson Hebrew Mission Board.....	63
X.	Transportation Secretary	67
XI.	Majority of Comm. on Revision of Art. 36 of the Creed	70
XI.-a	Minority on Art. 36 of the Belgic Confession	82
XI.-b	Minority on Art. 36 of the Belgic Confession	101
XII.	Ministers' Pension and Relief Administration.....	108
XIII.	Comm. of Mixed Marriages.....	117
XIV.	Seamen's Home at Hoboken.....	133
XV.	Delegate Lord's Day Alliance.....	137
XVI.	Comm. on Translation of Holland Theological Works	139
XVII.	Comm. for Church Help.....	143
XVIII.	Chaplain Comm.	148
XIX.	Comm. Re "Reading Service" Sermons.....	158
XX.	Comm. of Synod for South America.....	160
XXI.	Comm. in Re The Revised Compendium.....	167
XXII.	Chicago Jewish Mission.....	205
XXIII.	War Relief Fund.....	210
	Deputati Synodi	211
	Overtures	214