

their position also over against each other. Notwithstanding the now clearer and better knowledge of the Gospel, the Romish Church held fast to her doctrine and so expressed herself at the Council of Trent.

The Lutheran Confessional Writings are: the Large Catechism and the Small Catechism (1529) of Luther, the Augsburg Confession (1530), the Apology of the Augsburg Confession (1530), the two latter written by Melancthon, the Smalcald Articles, written by Luther (1537), and the Formula of Concord (1580).

The Reformed Confessional Writings will not all be mentioned here. We refer only to the most important: the Heidelberg Catechism (1562), the second Helvetic Confession (1566), the Westminster Confession of Faith (1648), finally, by way of settlement of the controversies about the doctrine of predestination, the Canons of the Synod of Dortrecht (1619).

The Confessional Writings of the Roman Catholics are: the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent (1545-1563), the Confessions of the Tridentine Faith (1564), the Romish Catechism (1566), and finally the Decrees and Canons of the Vatican Council (1870).

Of the Confessions of the Greek Catholic Church we mention the Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith of the Oriental Church (by Peter Mogilas, 1643), the Confession of Dositheus (1672), and finally the Catechism of Philaret (1839), approved by the Holy Synod in St. Petersburg.

If in the following we attempt to characterize the Evangelical Lutheran conception of Christianity in its fundamentals, it is eminently proper to begin with Luther's confession of faith. In 1528, hence prior to the origin of the Augsburg Confession, Luther, in his "Large Confession concerning the Lord's Supper," directed against the Zwinglian doctrine of the Lord's Supper, published in full outline a final Confession of Faith which embraces every single point of doctrine. We give this Confession in the following chapter.

Then follows Chapter II — Luther's Confession of Faith (1528)

THE DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES

OF THE

Different Christian Confessions
in the Light of the Word of God

ALSO A

Presentation of the significance and Harmony of
Evangelical Doctrine and a Summary of
the Principal Unsound Religious
Tendencies in Christianity

By

DR. KARL GRAUL

Edited by Dr. Reinhold Seeberg, Professor of Theology
in Erlangen

Translated from the Twelfth German Edition by
D. M. MARTENS, D.D.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN
COLUMBUS, OHIO
MADE IN U. S. A.

*"But strong meat belongeth to them that are
of full age, even those who, by reason of use,
have their senses exercised to discern both good
and evil."* HEBREWS 5:14

PREFACE

IN 1862 the undersigned gave the Church the first English translation of *Graul's Distinctive Doctrines*. That was a translation of the *Fifth German Edition*, and in it, as stated in the Preface, "Luther's Confession of Faith and the Appendix" were omitted.

Under the skillful hand of Dr. Seeberg the latest, the twelfth, German edition has been much enlarged and improved, and we here give the English-reading portion of our Church the benefit of the entire work.

References to the Book of Concord are always, as will be seen, to the page in Jacobs' edition; but in a few instances the translation differs slightly from that of Jacobs.

The thanks of the undersigned — and of all who use this book — are due to the committee of the Publication Board who revised the manuscript before it was placed in the printer's hands. Their work enhances the value of the book.

The many words of encouragement the undersigned has received from men occupying positions of influence in the Church — in the East and the West — to furnish a new translation of this treatise, justify the hope that its appearance will be generally welcomed.

May the blessing of God rest on this book and on those who read it!

D. M. MARTENS.

Columbus, Ohio, March, 1897.

powers into the souls of men; upon the doctrine that man has been only wounded by sin, but that after he has received the Powers of grace he can do good works and thus acquire merit which will avail before God; and upon indulgences, the adoration of saints, Mary, etc.

For a while it seemed, too, as though the Church could find rest and peace under that false conception of Christianity. But in the fifteenth century, at the close of the middle ages, men's hearts experienced great anguish. All the means which the Church recommended were applied in feverish avidity. Still the desired end (peace of conscience) was not attained. There appeared many who severely condemned the notorious errors of the Church in doctrine and life (*e.g.* Wickliffe, Huss, Wesel, Wessel), but no one succeeded in presenting anything new and approved in their place. Then God raised up Martin Luther. In the burning anguish of his heart he learned to know the Gospel. And what he experienced in his heart he found confirmed by the Holy Scriptures. And now his conscience impelled him to rise and rend the fetters in which the hierarchy had bound the people. Luther did not invent a new, but *renewed* the old apostolic conception of Christianity. In doing this he retained all the good, true doctrines that the old Church had established, at the same time more firmly establishing and enriching them. This is true as well of the conception of the person of Christ as of the doctrines of sin and grace. What Luther did in Germany, was partially accomplished, - true, as we shall soon see, from another point of view and in another manner - by Zwingli and Calvin in Switzerland. The Gospel found favor in still wider and widening circles. Soon two other Confessions stood opposed to the old Roman Catholic Church.

What they objected to in the Romish Church, why they had to separate from her and again what they themselves taught - this was expressed in their respective Confessions. Later on, when the antitheses between the German and Swiss Reformation became more clearly defined, when in their own ranks divergent views as to important doctrines became apparent, the two new churches (*i.e.* Lutheran and Reformed) were compelled to defend

promulgated the doctrine of absolute predestination, and thus fell into the error that God determined beforehand that certain ones should be saved, the others left to destruction. In the case of the former grace works in an irresistible manner, and they cannot be lost; in the case of the latter the operation of God's word on them is such only in appearance; they cannot be saved. After many conflicts Augustine's doctrine of sin and grace received churchly sanction at the Synod of Orange (529). - In opposition to the Donatists, a fanatical sect claiming that the Church must be absolutely pure, Augustine referred to this, that in the Church there must necessarily be chaff along with the wheat; but as for the rest he also adopted the view, predominant in his day already, that the bishops are the Church, and that to belong to the Church means to yield obedience to the bishops.

Besides these doctrines, to which much importance was attached, and which consequently gave rise to severe conflicts, the ancient Church naturally had her views with reference to the other component parts of Christian doctrine. If we look at her conception of the Christian religion, we can only say in general that she departed widely from the pure, clear knowledge of the Gospel as found in the New Testament Scriptures. But just at the point where the opponents tried to corrupt the Gospel with specifically unchristian errors, she succeeded in bringing to light and establishing views of lasting worth. Of these we have just been speaking.

The middle ages did not further the knowledge of Christian truth. In the Orient they clung to their interest in the cultus, which had gradually come to the front and supplanted the interest in matters of doctrine. The history of the iconoclastic controversy, ending with the Council of Nice (787), furnishes a very suggestive picture of this one-sidedness. In the Occident they held fast, during the middle ages, to the doctrine they had received. But the evils and defects of ecclesiastical affairs naturally cast their darkening shadow also upon matters of doctrine. Men laid stress upon the unlimited authority of the priesthood, with the pretended vicar of Christ, the pope, at the head; upon the external view of the sacraments, which infuse new

CHAPTER I

CONCERNING THE USE OF THE PURE DOCTRINE AND CONCERNING THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

We live, dear reader, in trying, portentous times. The Evangelical Lutheran Church has occasion to learn, by experience, that our Lord did not come to send peace on the earth, but a sword (Matthew 10:34). She is opposed and sorely tried by unbelief, by indifference, by practical materialism; enemies that always find adherents among the masses of our people. The Roman Catholic Church today opposes the Evangelical Church with greater might and better equipped for the fray than ever. The Evangelical Lutheran Church is made little of and antagonized by the sects who, if possible, would represent her as unable to break to the people the bread of life. Thus the cry of battle and the clash of arms are again heard without the gate of the citadel.

But, is harmony to be found, at least within the citadel itself? This, alas, we cannot claim. What a number of half-way - or even less than that - believers there are within our own camp, who declare that with full consciousness they confess the Gospel! There are those among us who are for the Gospel, simply because they regard it as a means for restraining the masses of the people, expecting help from the Church in the many social troubles of the present time; then again we meet others who, it is true, accept the Gospel in part but, with a shake of the head, reject a great deal more as being antiquated doctrine, not adapted to our times; then we hear of others who are quite willing to enjoy the fruits that mature on the Gospel-tree but dread to let the keen plow-share of repentance, without whose work the Gospel-tree cannot take root within us, enter the field of their hearts.

At such a time, dear reader, it is necessary to assure ourselves of the inheritance we have received from our fathers in the faith. This inheritance is the faith of our Church, the faith of

Luther. The question here is not about any mere views or opinions, which at best are only a helpful supplement for this life, but of that precious boon that makes man free, glad and happy, as our Luther was. Our inheritance not only contains doctrines, but offers the treasures of faith to every one who will enter into the spirit of the faith of our fathers. O that this faith might be kindled anew in the hearts of our people, how it would sing and purl, like the gentle breezes of spring, in our homes and in our public affairs, as it did at that time after the Wars of Deliverance, when also heart after heart learned to pray and began to confess: "The Lord hath done this!"

But, it does not seem as if the Lord would grant such seasons of refreshing to His Church at once. Many a heart in our midst grows weary, and many an ear regards it as a strikingly true assertion when it is emphatically declared that the trouble lies just in this, that so much stress is laid on confession and doctrine. We are told that faith has a double meaning. "Faith," on the one hand may be the doctrine which is believed; "faith," on the other hand is what the heart does in that we put our confidence in God. So then, we are told, not the confession saves us, *i.e.* certain doctrines do not do this, but that which takes place within our hearts; after all, but little depends on the pure doctrine; it even repels many an honest soul.

What is thus said seems to be all right. Certainly we are not saved by accepting the articles of faith as true, or because we have proper conceptions of God, of Christ, of justification, of the judgment, etc. One having the pure doctrine may go to hell, another, having only the poor confession of the malefactor, may be saved! The main point however is, not to have the proper conception of these things, but to have the things themselves. All depends on this, that the living God has become *my* God, that Christ my Savior has taken up His abode in my heart, that I myself have attained to, and experienced the grace of the forgiveness of my sins, that justification be enclosed in the faith of the heart, just as a pearl is set in a golden ring, and that my heart, in the consciousness of final accountability, has become accustomed to the atmosphere of eternity.

divinity was established, closer inquiry was made as to the relation of the human to the divine nature in Christ. Some maintained that the relation of the two natures to each other was that of two boards joined together; a loose, external relation. Thus *Nestorius* and his adherents. Others thought that we should really speak of only one nature. If the first assumption gave rise to the fear that the divinity of Christ had no part whatever in His sufferings and death, and that therefore these have no redeeming efficacy, so the other led to the doubt, which could not be ignored, whether the human nature was not so absorbed by the divine nature of Christ as to lose its self-existence (*Monophysites*). If the first relation presents to us the picture of two boards joined together, the second leads us to think of a drop of wine lost in a bucket of water. For the consideration of this matter the Synod of Ephesus (431) and that of Chalcedon (451) were held. The result of these *controversies* was the *definition* that after the incarnation of Christ the one person subsists *in* two natures, both of which are comprehended in the unity of the person, and that this union is without any confusion, change, division, or separation of the two natures.

These are the ecclesiastical tenets or dogmas which the ancient Church of the Orient brought forth. Christ, true God and true man, is the result of the labor of this - *i.e.* *the Greek* - portion of the ancient Church.

The Latin Occident took an active part in this labor and itself suggested further questions with reference to Christian knowledge, and at the same time offered their solution. When Pelagius expressed the view that there is no original sin, that all men are born as sinless as Adam created, that they are led to sin only by the teaching and example which they hear and see, and that accordingly the teachings and example of Christ suffice to save men, the mighty bishop of Hippo, Augustine, appeared in opposition to him. Augustine's own life and conduct had taught him that we as children of Adam are all by nature sinners, in a lost condition. Only grace and that alone can save us; grace makes us new creatures. But that not even the least part of redemption might be ascribed to what man does, Augustine

the doctrines of our Church, but also with those of other churches, for the express purpose of learning to know the greater excellence of our own. We learn to know the doctrine of others from their *confessional writings*. With the several Confessions as the source, we present the distinctive doctrines of the various Christian Confessions, in what follows. But we dare not be content with simply showing wherein they differ from our Lutheran faith, but shall also have to show that herein they at the same time differ and depart from the Holy Scriptures. For this is the supreme principle among us, when the question as to what is true or false in Christian doctrine is raised, that only that is true which *agrees with the Holy Scriptures*; in other words, that only is pure *Christian doctrine* which agrees with *original Christian doctrine*.

And now, dear reader, since we have seen of what great value our own Confession is, and have also come to an understanding as to our purpose in what follows, let me just show you yet in a few words how Confessions originated in the Church and which are the most important.

For three centuries the Church was content with the simple Baptismal Confession. The Church found it sufficient simply to emphasize the facts in the history of the work of redemption, both over against her heathen opponents and the half-heathen Gnostics. But when, in the beginning of the fourth century, Arius appeared, maintaining that Christ is only a creature, the workmanship of God, as we all are, a being however of a higher order than men or angels, a kind of demi-god as it were, the Council of Nice assembled (325) and, under the leadership of Athanasius, set up this declaration against Arius, that Christ is "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God, Begotten, not made, Being of one substance with the Father." Since the Council of Constantinople (381) a Confession closely related to this, but presenting more elaborately the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, has been circulated and recognized. This is the *Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed*, which is also sometimes used in our church service, viz.: under the name "Nicene."

But the Church had to engage in still further conflicts with reference to the doctrine of the person of our Lord. Now that His

That it is so, is beyond all doubt. Just as no other one can believe for me, so within myself my intellect must not arrogate to itself that which is a matter of the heart, the inner sanctuary. It depends, not on the comprehension, but on the apprehension. What God the Lord graciously permitted me to attain to and experience, this constitutes faith.

Very well! Is it then not true as has been said, that very little depends on plain, pure doctrine, that everything depends on the heart alone? Goethe says: "Feeling is everything! A *name* is mere sound and vapor, and like the vapors that dim the glow of heaven."

Pause a little, my friend! It is indeed so that our conception of anything has nothing to do with our possessing it? is it really a matter of indifference by what "name" we designate anything? Life does not confirm this. How many an one has met us in a friendly manner, both in word and deed. But we had an antipathy to him, others had prejudiced us against him. So we turned him away, misconstruing his words and actions. The man's intentions toward us were none the less good, but we deprived ourselves of the benefit and blessing of them. Why? Because we had a false conception of him, because we did not know how to give his character the right "name." It is precisely so when the personal God moves our hearts by His grace. Surely, it is not a matter of indifference how this matter has been presented to you. Whether you, by your own good deeds presume to merit grace, or whether you will let Him work, for He, He alone can do it. It is not a matter of indifference whether, at the Lord's table, where the Lord Jesus Himself comes to you, you think: Here is an emblem, here my soul must climb to heaven on the ladder of this emblem; or whether you know: He is here, I will sit still, like Mary did; I need not climb up to Him; He has come down to me. Of course, God's gift of grace is the same, no matter what or how I think of it. But whether I can receive the full gift with all its blessing, that is the question. I must know where the gift is and how it comes, else, instead of reaching out with the hand of my heart towards it I will grope around at random and lose it.

To sum up: It is not all the same what doctrine or view we

accept, or what "name" we give a thing, but in view of the blessing we may receive from it, that makes it important. If some one should arrive at the foolish idea that the light of the sun is injurious, and anxiously shade his windows, the light would still dispense its blessings, but the person in question would deprive himself of a good share of that blessing. That this is really so we see best from this, that God did not leave it to men to form a conception of Him from their own heart's experience, but revealed Himself, *i.e.* caused it to be told to men in words, who He is, what He does, and what He wills.

Therefore let us hold fast to the pure Evangelical doctrine, for it teaches us so to know God, Christ, sin and grace, as they really are. It gives to objects the right names, so that we may know how to lay hold of and keep them, when they really present themselves to us.

But, at this point I hear the objection raised, To what end do we need special confessional writings? God's revelation is given us in the Bible, is not this all-sufficient? We know that the Romanists do not admit this, but place tradition at the side of the Scriptures, and require an acceptance of that also. We have nothing in common with this answer. Certainly the Scriptures present to us divine revelation in a sufficiently clear manner, so as to meet all our demands. But "understandest thou what thou readest?" (Acts 8:30). The Bible is made up of a number of different books, written in different languages, at widely different times, under very different circumstances, each with a special object in view. Hence it is very easy to misunderstand the Bible, or to interpret it according to our favorite, pre-conceived notions. When Paul wrote to the Corinthians that it is better not to marry than to marry (I Corinthians 7:1, 38), he knew very well why he needed to urge this at that time, namely because it "is good for the present distress" (v. 26).

Later the words were made to mean that those who remain celibates thereby acquire special merit. And when St. James wrote some "hard" words about faith without works (James 2:14- 26), it was because those for whom he wrote needed them. But he, knowing as he did the passage which underlies the doctrine of

think otherwise? Or does any one propose to frighten us by the thread-bare charge of unfashionable, antiquated intolerance? Only those can be accused of intolerance who will not tolerate others at all, who deny them the right of existence, or want to force them to think as they themselves do. But the Lutheran Church knows that she is not guilty of such conduct. She believes that she has the truth, but respects the right of free conviction on all sides. Of course, that miserable twaddle of modern semi-culture that raves about all manner of possible convictions by reason of which it claims to have the right to oppose the Church and the Bible, of that semi-culture which knows as good or nothing of any and all things, but simply repeats what it hears others say - that we cannot regard and honor as personal conviction. It shall not disturb us at all if from that quarter they continue to reproach us with intolerance. Or, what should we care for the talk of those who cannot distinguish between religious conviction and intolerance? All this, however, is not to be regarded as a reflection on other churches that stand opposed to us.

What we want to say is this, that it is our privilege and our duty to hold fast to the doctrines of our Lutheran Church.

But what means have we to ascertain the differences between other Confessions and our own Church? The title of our little book gives the answer to this question: "*Distinctive Doctrines.*" Of course the various denominations differ also as to forms of worship and morals. But since the usages and customs of different countries, as well as the sin and weakness of the individual, have much to do with such differences, these cannot help us as a standard to judge by. Thus then we must turn to the doctrine. This will soon show us what view the church in question holds concerning God and Christ, concerning sin and grace, concerning faith and works, and in general concerning Christian life. This is just what we want to know. And even if not all the individuals in a certain church are guided by the principles of their Confession, these principles still show us what they are striving after in this church, what they regard as the central and main thing in Christianity.

Thus then we propose to become acquainted not only with

In doing this it shall be far from us to even wish to disparage the individual members of other churches. Far from us be also the thought that salvation can be found only in our Church! How many true, estimable Christians have we found in other denominations! But, one thing we must of course maintain, viz., that if we regard our doctrine of Christ, of the means of grace and of the work of redemption as true, then those teaching otherwise are in error. We have already seen that these errors are not insignificant, that they may lead to grave misunderstandings with reference to grace. But we know too that they in their effects may be so restrained by the grace of God, that the person holding them may still reach the goal. The Romish Church lays much stress upon works performed by the individual; but how many a pious soul in that church - especially in the last extremity - looks to grace alone.

The Confessions are related to each other like different roads leading to the same place. But there is one road which is most sure to lead to that place, walking on which one never loses sight of the goal because it is a straight road. Then there are other roads, leading through many byways, deep ravines and over high mountains, and where one must make his way through a dense growth of underbrush. How many an one, under these conditions, may go astray until it is too late and the shades of evening begin to darken; how many an one may grow weak and weary, because he has so soon lost sight of the goal, and quit the race! Now, if you have learned to know the right way dare you thoughtlessly venture to follow one of the by-ways, in the hope that it may finally lead to the goal? No, let us thank God that He has placed our feet on the right way, and let us not depart from it either to the right or to the left!

But is it not a mark of vanity to say that we have the truth and others are in error? This objection would be justified only then if we should claim to have invented or discovered the truth ourselves. But we confess that only the grace of God has given it to us, and that we hold it to be the truth only because it agrees with God's revealed Word. And then, where can you find a real conviction that does not necessarily accuse all those of error who

justification by faith (v. 23), certainly had no idea that any one would presume to use his words to distort, nay to set aside, that fundamental doctrine of the Old and New Testament. Those holding the ancient faith (Starowérzy) in Russia went so far as to maintain that the passage Matthew 15, 18 (those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man) prohibits smoking. These are only a few examples, but the history of the Church abundantly proves that the sects especially have tried to prove the strangest and most absurd doctrines by the Holy Scriptures.

Hence the Church, from the very beginning, has taught her members what the truth of the Gospel is, how one may arrive at an understanding of the Scriptures, For this purpose, in the very earliest times already, they used the baptismal confession or rule of faith, which, as the "Apostolic Creed," is used among us also as a guide for instructing our youth in the fundamental truths of faith. Then, when errors crept into the Church, ampler confessions became necessary as a barrier against the encroachment of heresies.

But, if you ask: Of what use are such confessions, have we not ministers and teachers for the very purpose of leading our congregations into the right understanding of the Scriptures? - I answer: Are you really willing to submit unquestioningly to the wavering view, or the perhaps perverse or immature opinion of any teacher or minister? Is it not rather good and salutary that these men themselves have had the Confessions as a guide to the proper understanding of the truth of Scripture, and that they were bound by a solemn vow to teach their congregations in the spirit of Luther?

Our congregations are to be instructed in the spirit of our Confession, which, during the work of the Reformation, proved itself to be a holy spirit. The confessional writings, to which their ministers were required to subscribe, even now serve to retain for our congregations the pure Christian doctrine. But the position we assign to the Evangelical Confessions must not be confounded with that which is assigned to traditions by the Romanists. The Evangelical Christian regards the teachings of the Confessions as

true, and demands that the servant of the Church adhere to them, not because the Church has given the Confessions, *i.e.* not because he reposes his trust in the Church, but because they agree with the revealed Word of God. The Holy Scriptures alone are, of right, the final court of appeal. And Confessions themselves always refer, back of and beyond themselves, to the Scriptures. Thus too the congregations themselves should be led to make use of this precious prerogative of Christians, namely, like those noble Christians in Berea, to "search the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so" (Acts 17:11).

Would we not all do well to acquaint ourselves more thoroughly with these Confessions, which, like our Augsburg Confession or Luther's Large Catechism, tell us so beautifully what the true import of the Lutheran faith is? He whose heart is grounded in the Lutheran faith, he who lives in the grace of God, will readily see that the Confessions are not burdensome, strange, doctrinal laws which one cannot understand and to which one must therefore unwillingly submit. He will see that here just that is set forth clearly and definitely which he himself has been in possession of long ago, and from which his heart has derived nourishment and comfort in good and evil days. Our Confessions are to be looked upon, not as a police-ordinance enacted for imprisoned criminals, but as rules for God's children in the house of their Father. These household rules are intended to direct them to feel themselves at home in the Father's house, and to make use of all the treasures and privileges which it offers them, at the right time, and in the right way, for their own salvation. Thus then we will seek to conform ourselves to those household rules and love them more fervently, so that both we and those belonging to us may feel more and more at home in the house of the Church; until we pass from faith here below where it is constantly hindered and dimmed by the devil, the world and the flesh, to the blessedness of sight in our Father's kingdom. O happy those among us who will then be able to say: "Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me" (Isaiah 8:18)!

But the different Confessions, churches and sects into which visible Christendom is divided are still estranged from, nay

often inimical to each other. This is calculated to fill the Christian's heart with deep sorrow. Nay, it may even happen that, when we note so many advantages in other communions or meet exceptionally noble representatives of other creeds, we begin to grow doubtful about our own Confession or at least regard the boundary lines which separate the pious from each other with a shake of the head. Should we not, so we are asked, remove these lines now when the world with its unbelief and hatred storms so mightily against the kingdom of Christ? Should we not at such times cling together harmoniously and wage a common warfare against the powerful enemy? Many say this, and act accordingly. That we all who faithfully fight under the banner of Christ constitute one army cannot be called in question. But would we then be true soldiers of Christ, if we should seek to bring confusion into the line of battle and arbitrarily forsake our own Confession? No, our duty is to stand firm where, not chance but God has placed us, where He is according to the experience of our heart.

But we will not allow our eyes to be dimmed by sudden ebullitions of feeling. Much rather will we bear in mind that the various Confessions have not been formed by chance or without cause. There were real differences which, despite all efforts, could not be removed. And upon close examination we will find that these differences exist today yet. And those who are conscientious and sincere in their faith are the very ones in whom these differences are most clearly manifest. Those who are not earnestly concerned about their own creed will at last make terms with any one. But, shall we allow such persons to decide for us in matters of this kind? This would be a strange demand! If you will compare a pious Romanist with a pious Protestant, or even a true member of the Reformed Church with a true Lutheran, you will not fail immediately to see the great and sharply defined differences. If this cannot be denied in the case of individuals, then the same will still hold good, that the congregations also should have clear understanding of the differences between their own and other Confessions. To strengthen this consciousness is the purpose this little book would serve.