

Lutheran Observer.

Unless with proofs of Holy Writ, or with manifest, clear and distinct principles and arguments, I am refuted and convinced, I can and will recant nothing.—Luther.

In Essentials, Unity; in Non-Essentials, Liberty; in all Things, Charity.

VOL. LXIX. NO. 25.

LANCASTER AND PHILADELPHIA, FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 1901.

WHOLE NO. 3637.

Poetry.

WHEN.

BY SUSAN COOLIDGE.

If I were told that I must die to-morrow,
That the next sun
Which sinks should bear me past all fear and sorrow
For any one,
All the fight fought, all the short journey through,
What should I do?
I do not think that I should shrink or falter,
But just go on,
Doing my work, nor change nor seek to alter
Aught that is gone;
But rise and move and love and smile and pray
For one more day.
And, lying down at night for a last sleeping,
Say in that ear
Which hearkens ever: "Lord, within thy keeping
How should I fear?
And when to-morrow brings thee nearer still,
Do thou thy will."
I might not sleep for awe; but peaceful, tender,
My soul would lie
All the night long; and when the morning splendor
Flushed o'er the sky,
I think that I could smile—could calmly say,
"It is his day."
But if a wondrous hand from the blue yonder
Held out a scroll,
On which my life was writ, and I in wonder
Beheld unroll
To a long century's end its mystic clue,
What should I do?
What could I do, O blessed Guide and Master,
Other than this?
Still to go on as now, not slower, faster,
Nor fear to miss
The road, although so very long it be,
While led by thee?
Step after step, feeling thee close beside me,
Although unseen,
Through thorns, through flowers, whether the tempest hide thee,
Or heavens serene,
Assured thy faithfulness cannot betray,
Thy love decay.
I may not know; my God, no hand revealeth
Thy counsels wise;
Along the path a deepening shadow stealeth,
No voice replies
To all my questioning thought, the time to tell;
And it is well.
Let me keep on, abiding and unfearing
Thy will always,
Through a long century's ripening fruition
Or a short day's;
Thou canst not come too soon; and I can wait
If thou come late.

DUTY.

ANONYMOUS.

I slept and dreamed that life was Beauty:
I woke and found that life was Duty:
Was then thy dream a shadowy lie?
Toil on, sad heart, courageously,
And thou shalt find thy dream to be
A noonday light and truth to thee.

Contributions.

WHAT SHALL THE CHURCH DO WITH THE TEMPERANCE REFORM?

BY REV. THEODORE L. CUYLER, D. D.

What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder! Great moral evils involve great moral duties. If there be an enormous evil that is producing fearful destruction of human bodies and souls, then Christianity is bound to furnish salvation from that evil. No one disputes Mr. Gladstone's famous declaration that war, pestilence and famine are not so destructive as the curse of strong drink. God's word tells us that drunkenness shuts heaven against its victim. The chief enemy of Bible religion and the welfare of society is the intoxicating cup; no other has desolated so many homes, wrought such corruption in civil affairs, destroyed so many lives, and damned so many immortal souls. If Jesus Christ established his church for the very purpose of saving human society from its sins, then the hugest sin should command the church's most serious attention. For the Christian church to ignore the drink evil is as absurd as for the West Point Military Academy to ignore the use of artillery, or for a medical college to ignore the treatment of fevers.

Some good people regard liquor-drinking simply as a question of dietetics, and turn it over to the doctors. It undoubtedly has its physiological bearings; and in our public schools the nature and effects of alcoholic drinks ought to be thoroughly taught to the young. Thousands use alcoholic stimulants ignorantly. But if it be the duty of the physiologist to keep intoxicants out of men's bodies, it is tenfold more the duty of ministers, teachers and Christ's church to keep them out of men's souls. The moment that an evil lays its hands on a man's eternal welfare, that moment must the church of Christ lay her hands upon it. The worst symptom that I see is the strange indisposition of so many of Christ's people to take hold of an evil that takes hold on hell!

Of late years there has been a lamentable tendency to relegate the whole subject of temperance to the domain of politics. This has arisen partly from the prominence given of late to the selling of intoxicants, and to the question of licensing or suppressing the tippling houses. A mightily important question, too, is this, for both patriot and Christian. The legal suppression of the drinking haunts belongs to the ballot-box, the civil magistrate and the policeman; but unless Christ's followers put their conscience into their citizenship, no prohibitory laws are likely to be enacted, or thoroughly enforced. As an old-time prohibitionist ever since the days when I stood with Neal Dow before state legislatures advocating prohibitory laws, I was greatly gratified during a recent visit to Southern California to observe how effectively the dram-shops are closed in many towns. This is done by a stringent law of "local prohibition." People are exhorted to vote down the saloon as a Christian duty; and in the leading pulpits appeals are made to this effect. The great weight of the Christian church is

thrown on the side of public order, morality and true religion. Surely no one but a "foggy" or a fool would object to such a wise and beneficent policy for every Christian pulpit. Suppression of the saloons never will be enacted and never enforced unless God's people put their conscience and their courage into their citizenship.

But the duty of Christ's church goes down far deeper than to make public protest against the legalized sale of intoxicants; it must strike at the use of intoxicants. It must aim at more than the reformation of drunkards—a very difficult process at the best. If one mission of the Christian church is to save men out of drunkenness, then by sound logic it ought to be still more its mission to save men from falling into drunkenness. Every pulpit ought to speak out just as freely and frankly against the temptations of the wine-cup, or the social glass, as against the temptations to gambling, or dishonesty, or Sabbath desecration, or licentiousness. Every Christian church ought to be a school of instruction to teach the young and the inexperienced what a deadly serpent is coiled in every alcoholic stimulant. It ought to enforce the Pauline principle of abstinence, not only for self-protection, but for the welfare of others. By every motive of tender solicitude for the protection of its own children from the horrors of this degrading vice, by every motive of regard for its own spiritual purity, by every prompting of self-denial for the sake of the weak and easily tempted, by every regard for the honor of its King and the spread of his kingdom, every band of Christ's followers ought to come out and be separate, and "touch not this unclean thing." Nineteen centuries of sorrow, and of shame, and of soul-slaughter ought to have taught Christ's church that she never can be a nursing mother to her children while she mixes the sincere milk of the Gospel with one poison-drop of Satan's brewing.

"Would you have every church organize a temperance society of its own?" Yes, where there is material for its efficient management. Such societies have wrought an admirable work in Dr. Newman Hall's church in London, and for many years in the Brooklyn church under my own pastorate, and in many other churches. They held public meetings, and in many ways promoted the spread of temperance principles.

"Would you reintroduce the pledge of total abstinence?" Yes, by all means. In my student days I found such a pledge a strong safeguard under temptation; and so other students found it. The pledge acted as the bond of union among the hundreds of thousands of abstainers—as the vow of loyalty to Christ is the bond of union among church-members.

At the present time the most distinguished leaders of the temperance reform in Great Britain, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Newman Hall, Archdeacon Farrar, Basil Wilberforce, Lady Somers, and many others, are pledged abstainers, and advocate the principle of the pledge. It was a lamentable mistake that this symbol and safeguard has been so far abandoned in our own land; for the days when the abstinence pledge as a measure of prevention was in its widest vogue were the most successful days in the history of our reform. I deplore the abandonment of the pledge and of other methods of "moral suasion." I deplore the policy of directing the chief assault upon the sale of intoxicants, instead of warring upon the use of intoxicants; for, while the majority of people use and purchase intoxicants, all attempts at prohibiting the traffic will meet with but partial success. Moral suasion and legal prohibition must be combined; what common-sense and experience have joined together let no man put asunder.

It must never be forgotten for a moment that the temperance reform in America had a Christian birth.

The men who rocked its cradle and who girded its vigorous childhood were Dr. Lyman Beecher, and Justin Edwards, and President Nott, and Albert Barnes, and Bishop McIlvaine, and Charles Jewett, and other eminent servants of God. The reform was ushered in with prayer. Its most eloquent advocate, John B. Gough, and its most munificent supporter, the Hon. William E. Dodge, made it a part and parcel of their most profound religious convictions. Spurgeon and Moody never divorced their temperance from their other Christian graces. The one crying, burning, indispensable need of the temperance reform in our beloved land is that the church of the Lord Jesus Christ should no longer treat it as an alien, or as a mendicant; but should open her doors to it as an angel of mercy sent to do the bidding of the Lord, and as a true yoke-fellow in the mighty work of saving souls from perdition.

Borough of Brooklyn, New York.

THE DISTINGUISHING DOCTRINE OF LUTHERANISM.

BY PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

No. I.

A writer who does not give his name has recently declared that it is "a preposterous contention" and "an astounding claim that justification by faith is 'the real distinguishing doctrine of Lutheranism,'" and has asserted that her doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the real distinguishing doctrine of Lutheranism.

The point of the critic's contention is that because the Reformed churches teach justification by faith alone, therefore the doctrine of justification holds the same place in the Reformed Church that it holds in the Lutheran Church, and that, consequently, it has in it nothing distinguishing for the Lutheran Church. Now it is true that the Reformed churches do teach a doctrine of justification by faith alone; but the Reformed doctrine of justification by faith is no more the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith than the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. We wonder that our critic did not see this, and did not apply his own logic. Words, phrases and doctrines get their meaning from their setting, their environment, their place in systems. Two persons may use the same words, the same phrases, but may use them to convey very different ideas, or to represent very different things. Two persons may set forth a doctrine in the same language, but they may give that doctrine a very different place in a system of doctrines. In such a case it is *not* the same doctrine.

Now every Lutheran dogmatician, and every competent historian of doctrine, will tell you that as a matter of fact justification occupies a place in the Lutheran system *fundamentally* different from that which it occupies in the Reformed system; that as the central principle, the germinant, integrating, controlling factor of Lutheranism, it makes Lutheranism all that it is in distinction from Reformedism; that even the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is determined in its essential qualities by the far more fundamental doctrine of justification. These are such well known facts that it is surprising that they should even seem to have been overlooked by our critic.

But the real question at issue is just this: *Does the doctrine of justification by faith alone occupy a place in Lutheranism such as it does not occupy in Reformedism?* We contend that it does, and that it is the *real distinguishing doctrine of Lutheranism*. Our critic says: "We could furnish the names of two American divines who hold the same view, but we are not sure that they would be considered as adding