

erected. Do not the inspired architecture and inimitable workmanship of the stately cathedrals of Europe—the work of our ancient brethren—bear eloquent testimony to the reverence underlying the erection of those glorious temples erected to the Most High? The devout cannot conceive of any edifice too rich or too beautiful for the services of their God. Any neglect or mutilation of their churches has always been regarded as sacrilege.

If such reverence is bestowed on inanimate creations of man's intellect, it seems strange to think that the "one Temple in the Universe" is so frequently neglected and abused. Is it because the true meaning of the Body of Man is not understood? No doubt that is the explanation. The Chrysostoms, Novalis and Carlyles of this world are few, and spiritual insight such as they had is rare. But we cannot fail to be impressed with their utterances, especially seeing that they give us a loftier idea of man, and show us his relationship to the Divine. Assuming the actual truth of the statement of Novalis that there is "nothing holier than that high form," are we not moved to regard our bodies in a new light? Should they not be the objects of our diligent care? Must not every act of omission or commission that tends to mar their beauty be avoided? Exercise and cleanliness now become solemn duties, while intemperance and excess should be shunned as desecration of the "emblems of the Highest God."

Lastly, the Column of Beauty suggests beauty of character. It is not enough that a man act morally and virtuously. He ought to do every duty in the most graceful and pleasing manner possible. The ancient Greeks and the Romans used the same words for expressing "manners" and "morals." And that there is a close affinity