

abundant drink and a refreshing bath! The gift should be received with gratitude, and with the rejoicing of nature should be mingled also the rejoicing of mankind.

### RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

There is another case of heresy. Dr. Heber Newton, the rector of All Souls' Episcopal church, New York, in a recent sermon on the Resurrection, frankly declared that it was impossible for him to believe that our Lord rose from the tomb in the physical body in which He suffered death on Calvary. He declined to discuss the question what became of this body, but maintained that what appeared to the disciples afterwards was only the spirit of Jesus, in a spiritual body, "which is the house of the living after death." In other words the clergyman takes the spiritualist view of life after death, denying the possibility of a reconstruction of the physical body after its component parts have been subjected to dissolution. His argument is:

It is clear from the manifest impossibility, according to all known laws, that the physical body shall be reconstructed, as the house of the spirit in the future life. Nature in discarding outworn bodies does not go back and pick them up again. The constituent elements in our bodies as they crumble into dust go to form the materials for other organizations. It is needless to enlarge on this point. Most thoughtful people are at one here.

It will be noted that the doctrine as expounded by Dr. Newton really amounts to a denial of the resurrection; for although it admits of the continuation of existence beyond the grave, without the rising of the body no resurrection, in the meaning in which that term is employed in the Scriptures, is possible. But this part of the Christian faith is its corner stone. "If the dead are not raised, neither hath Christ been raised; and if Christ hath not been raised, your faith is in vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which have fallen asleep in Christ have perished." So that, according to the high authority just quoted, with the doctrine of the resurrection stands or falls the truth of the Christian religion.

Some of the disciples after the death of Christ, when He appeared to them were terrified. Their first impression was that which Dr. Newton announces as his conviction, that they beheld a "spirit." But the risen Savior immediately allayed their fears and declared: "See my hands and my feet; that it is myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having." He further partook with them of food. What a sorry spectacle to see a professional minister in a modern church boldly deny the positive statements of Christ Himself and His first Apostles, in order to establish a theory that has no basis except in that doubt which is natural only to coarse rationalism!

Mystery there will always be attached to the belief in a resurrection of the body, unsolvable, perhaps, until a higher state of knowledge shall have

been reached; but mysteries surround us on every hand. We perceive that the human body never loses its identity from the cradle to the grave, and yet its component parts fluctuate constantly. Like a stream that hastens from the springs where it is born, steadily rushing forward until it reaches the ocean, never the same during all its course for a single hour and yet the same stream from age to age; so the human body preserves its identity, notwithstanding the never-ceasing dissolution and renewal to which it is subjected. There is really no reason for supposing that that identity is lost at death, after having revived all through life. In fact the mystery of resurrection is constantly before our eyes in all nature. Who can deny that there are in the natural body the life forces necessary for its renewal, whatever these forces may be? But if their existence is admitted, the conclusion that a resurrection must follow seems inevitable.

In the language of Paul, the resurrected body is the very consummation of the wondrous process of development of the physical body. It is a magnificent transformation whereby all that is corruptible in this tabernacle is thrown away and exchanged. For, "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory." Still it is always the same body, never losing its identity. The doctrine is as scientifically sound as it is comforting in contemplation of death, the grave and eternity.

### WIELDER OF TONGUE AND BROOM.

With a surplus of profanity and a deficit of patriotism which is the more surprising considering that its source is himself a veteran of the war, Col. Waring, the famous street cleaning chief of New York, characterizes the G. A. R. pensioners as a "damned lot of drunken bums." Of course the various poets and the newspapers generally have raised a scorching tempest about the devoted head of the testy colonel; with the sole result, however, that while he expresses regret for having made his remark so sweeping, he resolutely refuses to retract it; he contends that his statement contained a large dose of truth, but he admits that he would have shown more prudence had he confined his energies to the scientific and thorough cleaning of Gotham's pavements and the purification of her thoroughfares, and let the pension business alone.

With the opinion expressed in the utterance as quoted, Col. Waring will find very few who are hardy enough to coincide. In truth there is in the American mind a very profound affection for the veterans who fought to save the country, and who are now in their old age assisted to live from its bounty. The pension system no doubt has its abuses, grave and numerous; sharks and impostors have flocked upon a grateful nation hundreds and perhaps thousands of unjust and improper claims. To this extent the roll of pensioners has lost its proud distinction as a roll of honor. And yet the nation would rather err on charity's side than by hasty and ill-considered severity work injustice to a single deserving

man. To a department carefully and patriotically administered, and to the sentiment of leading spirits in the G. A. R. itself must be left the correction of the evils referred to and the purging of the lists. Intemperate denunciation is no remedy at all; it is a wrong more aggravated than that which it assails, and is, in the case in point, especially reprehensible and unjustifiable in that it includes in its terms the whole noble band of veterans, among whom are tens of thousands who are an honor to American citizenship and who will be enshrined in a republic's memory as the best type of American patriotism.

On the other hand, the effort to drive Col. Waring out of the municipal position to which he has been appointed deserves nothing but failure. He is performing its duties with uncommon efficiency. Compared with the work done by his predecessors, he has wrought a complete revolution. Not having received the appointment as a partisan, he has not introduced any partisanship in his methods. The business he had entrusted to him was to keep the streets of New York clean, and this he appears to have done to the entire satisfaction of the people. He blundered woefully in his denunciation referred to; but it does not affect his efficiency as an official, any more than the profanity of many army officers has reflected upon their courage. To insist that because the colonel was wrong and foolish when discussing one topic he should be moved from a position in which he is capable would be supplementing his folly by a crime more ill-advised and unjustifiable than the original offense. It would be to make of the much-vaunted idea of non-partisanship in municipal affairs a hollow mockery and a sham.

### A STUDY IN ECONOMICS.

Mrs. Hetty Green of New York, probably the richest woman in America, possesses the peculiarities that surely ought to make her the ideal citizen in the estimation of those economists who criticize the spending of money by those who have it, if they spend it upon themselves. According to her holdings in the town on Manhattan Island, Mrs. Green was believed to be liable to a tax of several hundred thousand dollars, and for the purpose of finding out just how much she could be required to contribute in this way toward the public fund, an official inquiry was set on foot, which of course the astute woman attended. Replying to questions, she declared that she had no home; she had been staying a few days at a lodging house in Brooklyn, but had that very morning paid her bill and taken away her personal effects, which she carried in a band-satchel. Asked where she was next going to put up, she replied that she didn't know—could his honor recommend to her a cheap place?

All this moves the New York *World* to suggest that the great need of the metropolis at present is a public charitable institution in which a home can be furnished to homeless millionaires. Mrs. Green is a lender, not a spender, and yet most people will fail to see wherein