

EDITORIALS.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

DR. LYMAN ABBOTT, who recently paid a brief visit to this city, in an article in the *Christian Union* concerning the future life makes these remarks:

"Of course this view involves a repudiation of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. That doctrine I do repudiate; I believe it to be inconsistent with Scripture, antagonistic to science, and a product of a pagan and materialistic habit of thought. The phrase 'resurrection of the body' does not occur in Scripture. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body—if thereby is meant the rising from the grave of the self-same body laid away there—is directly refuted by Scripture. The resurrection of the body of Lazarus and of Christ were miracles; that is, they are physical signs of a spiritual and invisible truth."

If there is any doctrine of the Bible more plainly declared than another within the lids of that volume, it is the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, which Dr. Abbott directly and specifically denies. He may find it difficult of belief and still more difficult of comprehension. But that does not affect its scripturality. To deny it is to deny the scriptures. Any man may dispute both, but he cannot deny one without denying the other. He cannot believe in the Bible and disbelieve in the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

The tendency of modern so-called "Christian" thought, is away from the teachings of the Book for which all the sects pretend so much reverence. Anything it contains that does not harmonize with their beliefs or disbeliefs, they construe or spiritualize to mean something totally different from the text and the light thrown upon it by the context. They declare that the Bible is "the only guide to salvation," and that "whatsoever is not in accordance therewith and cannot be proved thereby, ought not to be received as an article of faith," and then deny some of its plainest and simplest teachings, and repudiate many of its most positive injunctions. Outside of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints there is not a sect or society, a church or a creed, that accepts the doctrines of the Bible in their entirety, not one that is governed by the principles and teachings and requirements of the New Testament, as they stand in the text unchanged by the interpretations of the theologians.

Dr. Abbott is not alone among prominent "Christian" ministers in repudiating the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection. Henry Ward Beecher holds similar views. Other prominent preachers, though not so outspoken, entertain the same opinions. That rejection is a sign of their lack of divine authority. No man is a true servant of God or sent ambassador of Christ who denies the literal resurrection exemplified in Jesus the risen Savior, who is "the first fruits of them that slept." The resurrection of his body is as essential a doctrine of the Christian faith as his atonement for the sins of the world. And the promise he made, that through him all mankind shall be raised from the dead, is as true and faithful as the promise of salvation through faith in him and obedience to his Gospel. No man who denies either was ever authorized of him to speak or administer in his behalf to the sons and daughters of men.

It may be true that the phrase "the resurrection of the body" does not occur in Scripture. But there are other phrases and saying that convey the doctrine even in a plainer manner than those words would do. Some of these we will refer to. Coming to the raising of Lazarus, cited by Dr. Abbott and which he calls a "resurrection," we affirm that the "miracle" performed on that occasion was not a resurrection in the scriptural sense. It was not that resurrection promised to those who are in Christ. That is a change of the body from mortality to immortality. Jesus was the "firstborn from the dead." None of Adam's race were resurrected on this planet before him. The resurrection of Lazarus was only a revivification to mortal existence. Lazarus was as much subject to death after as before the "miracle." He was but in the same condition as the son of the Widow at Nain, or one healed by the Savior without passing through the ordeal of death. Jesus said he would "wake him out of his sleep."

But let any rational person read the account of the occurrence in John xi, and he will find the doctrine of the resurrection recognized by the Great Teacher. The conversation between him and Martha referred to the resurrection at the last day, and this she had learned from him. He had announced to his disciples: "Marvel not at this for the hour is coming in which all that are in their graves 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 damnation."—John vi, 39. This is a promise and a prophecy. His promises are true and faithful, and "no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation." John, the beloved Apostle, beheld the resurrection to come in the vision vouchsafed to him on Patmos. He saw the dead raised who were

in Christ and who were "blessed and holy," to the royal priesthood and glory of "the first resurrection." Then he beheld the rest of the dead who lived not until a thousand years had passed away, when the small and great were brought forth out of their graves, whether on land or in the depths of the sea to stand before God and be judged. What he saw was "the resurrection of the body."

Dr. Abbott's notion, as it has been set forth at different times in the *Christian Union*, is that resurrection takes place at death, when the spirit is raised from the body into a higher life in Christ, and that in a spiritual sense it takes place when a soul is converted to belief in Christ and thus spiritually passes from death unto life. But how does this harmonize with the teachings of Christ and of his Apostles? Jesus speaks, as we have quoted, of a resurrection to life and of another to damnation. Are the wicked "resurrected" when they die? How can they be raised, when they are cast down to Hades? The resurrection taught in scripture is to be "at the last day," one of the Lord's days—a thousand years of our time—the righteous to arise in the morning's dawn, the wicked to wait till that day is past but all to come forth from their graves.

Any figurative expressions in the Scriptures relating to the passing from death unto life by faith in Christ, are based on the actual, literal fact of the resurrection of the body. One is the figure, the other the reality. One is a simile, the other a substantiality. It is not merely the spirit that is to be raised, it is the body that contains the spirit that is to come forth. It is "this mortal" that is to "put on immortality," "this corruptible" that is to "put on incorruption." It is that which "sleeps" that is to "be awakened." Is the spirit "sown" in death? No, it is the body that is placed in the ground like the seed that dies before it is "quickened." "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." In 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." All this relates to the body not the spirit of man. See 1 Cor. xv.

When the resurrection of the just takes place, it is not at the death of each individual, but at the day appointed, when the Lord "shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom (1 Tim. iv, 1.) and then "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first"—1 Thess. iv 16. And the transformation that is to come in the resurrection, when Paul says "we shall all be changed," is of the body not the spirit. "For our conversation is in heaven from whence we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus, who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body"—Philipp. iii, 21.

The resurrected, glorious body of Jesus, then, is the pattern of the bodies which his disciples are to inherit. He is the first fruits, a sample of those that are to follow. In the resurrection as well as in the spiritual birth he is "the firstborn among many brethren." That it was his body that was raised from the tomb is evident from all the accounts of those who have written upon it. In Luke xxiv it is placed beyond doubt that he was not a mere "spirit," as the disciples supposed when he appeared to them, but a being with a tangible body of "flesh and bones." And yet it was a spiritual body. He was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit." The body that was in the tomb, with the marks of the nails and the spear, was raised up by the power of God, quickened by spirit instead of blood, and fitted to ascend on high, having power over the laws that govern the grosser materials of this earth.

Dr. Abbott says this was a "miracle." He can call it what he pleases, but it was an example of that which is to come. Just such a body as Christ possessed in the resurrection, those who are in him will receive, that where He is they may be, and that when He reigns they may reign with Him as kings and priests unto God. The "miracle" wrought in one case may be repeated in any number of cases. If one body can be raised from mortality to immortality, so can any number of bodies. The process may be miraculous to those who do not understand it, and yet be perfectly natural to him who comprehends all things.

Dr. Abbott says: "The rising from the grave of the selfsame body laid away there is directly refuted by the scriptures." But he does not cite a single passage in support of his statement. If he could do so he would simply make the scriptures contradict themselves. Probably he refers to Paul's saying: "That which thou sowest thou sowest not that body that shall be," and "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." We are not aware of any others that can be supposed to lean to his view of the subject. But the Apostle's meaning is very plain. The body sown, like the seed from which the new plant arises, goes into corruption, but out of that decaying mass comes forth the new body, "and to every seed his own body." It is not that body that shall be, because it is raised a spiritual, incorruptible, immortal body. But it is a body not an unembodied spirit. It is not quickened by blood, for that is

corruptible, but it is quickened by spirit. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, but flesh and bones quickened by an immortal, incorruptible spiritual fluid can inherit the kingdom of God, for Jesus had a body of that character and will "change our vile bodies and fashion them like unto his glorious body." There is no other resurrection spoken of in scripture but the resurrection of the body, unless it be some figurative expressions which derive their force from that resurrection and but for it would have no meaning.

The doctrine of Christ teaches not only the resurrection of the just, but the resurrection of the unjust. "As is Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." By the sin of one all mankind pass through death; by the righteousness and voluntary death of one all will be redeemed from death. But "every man in his own order." Christ is the first, next "those who are Christ's at his coming," then at the end of the thousand years the dead, small and great, are to be brought forth and all receive their appropriate places. "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead." This is New Testament doctrine. It is the doctrine of Christ. It is the doctrine of all of his Apostles. It is a fundamental of the Christian faith. To deny it is to deny Christ himself.

The *Christian Union* has frequently said that the resurrection theory is not to be found in the Old Testament, that the old prophets knew nothing about it. Job, David, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, all give evidence that this is erroneous. Job declared with rapture, "though after my skin, worms destroy this body yet in my flesh shall I see God." And this was to be in the latter day, when his Redeemer should "stand upon the earth." David proclaimed that the Lord would not allow his "boy one to see corruption." Isaiah predicted that the earth should "cast out her dead;" that those who "dwell in dust" shall awake, that "together with his dead body they shall arise." Ezekiel saw the whole house of Israel brought up out of their graves, their bones covered with flesh and sinews and skin, and quickened by the spirit of God, stand upon their feet "an exceeding great army." Daniel foretold a time when "many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt." (Job xix, 25-27; Psalm xvi, 10; Isaiah xxvi, 19; Ezekiel xxxvii; Daniel xii, 2.)

This eminently scriptural doctrine is not "the product of a pagan and materialistic habit of thought," but of the teachings of divine revelation. It comes from "the word of the Lord." And it is not "antagonistic to science." It is antagonized by the "vain philosophy" of an age in which speculative theories and egotistical unbelief are often falsely called by the name of science. But science relates to that which is demonstrated or gives rules for its demonstration, and science has not demonstrated and cannot demonstrate that Christ was never raised from the dead. The evidence of the fact is above the doubts and denials which pass for science. And that one resurrection contains the promise and potency of the resurrection of the whole race, for he that is risen is "the resurrection and the life" and "all that are in their graves" shall hear his voice "and shall come forth."

We have not space and did not intend to open up the scientific aspect of this important question, but have touched upon its scripturality because that was denied by the talented editor of one of the leading religious papers of the country.

It is a doctrine full of hope and joy to the bereaved, and they are the whole human family. The certainty of clasping to our hearts again the loved and lost, of meeting them in immortal life with every part and feature and gift and charm restored, in glory and incorruption, where death cannot enter, disease invade or sorrow ever come, where families organized after the heavenly pattern shall be reunited and build for ever upon the foundations laid in time, and with countless hosts of the redeemed shall dwell with Christ and be like him in all things, is worth more than all the treasures of a thousand worlds like this.

Perish the heresies that would weaken the force of this sure and certain hope, born of the faith of the Gospel! Let no believer in the truth be robbed of his trust in the promise of the resurrection. "Beware lest any man spoil you, through philosophy and vain deceit, after the rudiments of this world and not after Christ."

A NEW SHIP CANAL.

ONE of the most dangerous of sea routes is the passage around the Florida peninsula from the Gulf to the Atlantic. It is estimated that the loss to shipping during the last ten years on that route of hidden rocks and many mishaps has been no less than \$100,000,000. This has naturally caused the question to arise, cannot something be done to avoid these dangers or lessen the fatalities which so often occur?

The answer has come to the query: It is, build a canal and so escape the risk of a voyage around the rocky coast

The success of the Suez, North Sea and Holland ship canals, which all pay good dividends upon the investment and all answer the purpose designed, prompts the undertaking of other enterprises of a similar character. The trade around this dangerous route is increasing constantly, and the necessity of speedy action is recognized.

A route has been surveyed which would shorten the trip from New Orleans to North Atlantic and European ports a distance of 800 miles, and avoid the perils of the Florida peninsula. It is up the St. Johns river to Doctor's Lake, thence by a canal to Fort Ranning, then down the Suwannee river to the gulf, total 120 miles with a cut of only 67 miles to be made.

The advantages to be gained far outstrip in importance the probable cost of the undertaking. It will open a large traffic with all European ports from the Mississippi Valley, and will aid in placing American grain upon the British markets almost to the exclusion of the American trade. The merchants of the empire of the Czar have heard of the project and have become alarmed, and a report of Russian engineers has been made to the effect that "the cost of transport of grain from the Mississippi valley to Europe will be diminished more than 50 per cent; that it will render the United States the absolute controller of the prices of grain in the British markets; that Russia will be utterly unable to compete with her, and that on its completion the United States will drive Russian grain out of the markets of western Europe."

Of course this canal, if constructed, must be built chiefly with American capital. No foreign country must be allowed to get control, directly or indirectly, of so important a scheme. British capitalists are ready with money for the undertaking, and some moneyed men of New York are understood to be willing to endorse the enterprise. It will be of great commercial advantage to this country and be the means of saving much property and many precious lives. The canal ought to be built.

HOW EACH GETS HIS "SHARE OF THE PORK."

THE *Charleston News and Courier* makes some caustic remarks on the doings of Congressmen as disclosed by Senator Vest, when he "unbuttoned himself" on the river and harbor bills and the appeals made to him by sober Senators who had "axes to grind and creeks to dig."

These Senators, said Mr. Vest, asked that appropriations should be put into the bill, not because they were needed or because the Senators thought they were needed, but to secure their own re-election. Combinations to secure such appropriations for such purposes have been made, Senator Vest declared in the present Senate, at this session, in relation to the pending river and harbor bill. The plan is for a Senator to sell his own vote for an appropriation, and to buy the vote of other Senators with the appropriations they desire in turn. They who so make a market of their integrity form a "gang," and one "cannot leave the procession" for fear of getting left. In order to secure his own share of "the pork," each Senator votes a leg, or shoulder, or spare rib to several other Senators, and all are re-elected to continue the same ignoble system.

The *News and Courier* says: "Senator Vest expresses the opinion that this plan will endure to the end of time. Perhaps so; but it is a dishonorable, a corrupt, and a corrupting plan none the less, and no Senator is a faithful and honorable public servant who adopts it."

Quite right. The inside workings of congressional legislation are not of a character to promote admiration of American statesmanship, and the facility with which anti-"Mormon" legislation of the most outrageous character can be worked through the Senate, may be understood in the light of the bargains which are made between grave and reverend Senators in relation to pet projects and profitable measures. This is a wicked world, and all the corrupt men are not kept out of the Congress of the United States.

THE CUTTING CASE.

FROM an impartial investigation of the Cutting case which has caused so much excitement on the Mexican border, it is evident that the court which tried him could do no less than pronounce judgment against the libelling editor. Under the laws of Mexico, Cutting was liable, there can be no doubt. When he first committed the libel against Medina he recognized the authority and jurisdiction of the Mexican court, and made an agreement to carry out the terms of the "reconciliation" under the order of that court. But he violated his agreement and uttered a new libel against Medina, which he published in Spanish as well as in English that it might be circulated in Mexico. The libel was printed in Texas, but it was distributed over the border, and the offense was a crime in both countries.

Cutting could have been released before trial and have had time to take any legal steps he chose, but he would not give a bond and therefore the Mexican authorities were justified under their laws, both in keeping him in custody and convicting him upon the evidence, but counsel appeared for him under instructions from the court, and the proceedings appear to have been regular.

There should be no violent disturbance of the peaceable relations existing between the two republics over this tempest in a teapot. If it were not for the strained condition of public feeling in Texas and Chihuahua, it is probable that no material difficulty would have arisen or been contemplated, and the question now should be decided on legal grounds. There is not the least necessity for a resort to violence. Under the laws of Mexico a libel on a Mexican citizen, if circulated in Mexico, is punishable, even though it was published in a foreign country, and the libeller may be arrested when on Mexican soil.

Here is the portion of the Mexican penal code under which the prosecution against Cutting has been conducted:

Article CLXXXVI, Title 5, Chapter 1.—Crimes committed in a foreign country by a Mexican against a Mexican, or by a foreigner against a Mexican, shall be punished in the republic according to law, if there appear any of the following circumstances:

First.—That the accused be found in the republic, either by having come by his own free will or brought by extradition.

Second.—That if the person offended is a foreigner, complaint be made against him by the proper party.

Third.—That the accused has not been definitely tried in the country where the offense was committed, and if he has not been released, absolved, or pardoned.

Fourth.—That the offense he is charged with be considered by him as an offense punishable in the country where it was committed, and also in the republic.

Fifth.—That in accordance with the laws extant the penalty imposed would not allow bail.

This is not singular to Mexico. It is in the line of the English common law doctrine. Texas itself has a similar law, and has punished a newspaper man for libel published in one county but circulated in a far distant county of that State. The famous Editor of the *New York Herald* has recently been convicted in London for libel against Cyrus W. Field published in Gotham but circulated in the British metropolis.

The Cutting affair may lead to a modification of the law of libel as relating to non-resident American citizens in Mexico, but a fair examination into the case as it stands, certainly shows the Mexican authorities to be right in the position they have taken under existing laws. Cutting deserves no sympathy, and the case is not worthy of the trouble it has occasioned between the two countries.

WHAT AN ANSWER!

ON Saturday, August 7th, we treated upon the assertion made by William H. Dickson, in his camp-fire speech, that Brigham Young "could not and did not repress his exultation," when the news of the assassination of President Lincoln reached here. We proved his statement untrue from an anti-"Mormon" source, and justly proclaimed a false accuser of the innocent, a slanderer, and a defamer of the dead. An insane attempt at an answer came editorially through the *Salt Lake Tribune* on Sunday morning. We herewith present it:

"A lady told the writer of this, and she told a hundred other people the same thing, that she, with several other women and men were at work in the Theatre, preparing, if we remember right, for a performance, when the news of the assassination came, and the order was given to drape the Theatre in black. A man, whose given name we think was Jacob, was arranging the work when Brigham Young came in. Dangling on one foot and then on the other he said: 'Drape her, Jake; drape her: another enemy of our people is gone, and the Lord God still reigneth in Israel.' This lady was known by all the old settlers, and there is no doubt of her perfect truthfulness."

We defy the *Salt Lake Tribune* to give the name of the lady, or that of any one of the hundred people to whom the *Tribune* writer claims she made the slanderous assertion, who can furnish it.

We defy District Attorney William H. District to give any evidence in support of his statement, which is an unmitigated and utterly inexcusable falsehood, that could only emanate from a heart pickled in depravity.

"SUPERIOR ADVANTAGES."

IN support of the position we have taken in regard to the inviting prospects held out to "Mormon" women, to "escape" from the "bondage" of Utah to the liberty of New York, we clip the following from the Cincinnati *Times-Star*. It corroborates the