

THE BODY OF RESURRECTION ACCORDING TO MR. HALLOCK.

Some of our readers will be astonished to find in the present number an article under the caption "The Body of the Future Life; Is it Electrical?"—a subject which *prima facie* seems to condemn itself, and we need not hesitate to say that we make room for it not because we endorse the author's theory. The author, Mr. Hallock, a member of the Biological Society of Washington, frankly admits that his proposition is bold. He submitted his views to such among his friends as he had reason to consider good critics, and he communicated to us several letters with full permission to publish them. All are critical and reject Mr. Hallock's theory. One of the correspondents is a theologian and Doctor of Divinity, another, a classical scholar and a graduate of Oxford, England, is an avowed agnostic. The former says:

"I was greatly interested in your essay, as well as in the criticism [of your friend] which could hardly have been different, from his view-point.

"From my own,—the article is suggestive, very! and most interesting. It is not supposed to be a conclusive argument as I apprehend it, perhaps not an argument at all,—but a tentative hypothesis: as such it seems to have some value. You have certainly started *thought*, and the man who does that is a benefactor. I would rather like to have you cast it into the form of a suggestion and an argument *not wholly* and avowedly based upon an ecclesiastical conception of Scripture authority,—but clearly stating your postulate and using Scripture as incidental, or confirmatory proof of your position. So considerable a fraction of even the Christian thinkers of to-day demur at your estimate of the *authority* of Scripture that you delimit the number of sympathetic readers by so unequivocal a defining of your position. You repel the scientific mind; and *many* religious men of the hour are decidedly leaning toward the scientific processes, and are largely open to deductions of that nature."

Mr. Hallock's agnostic friend is severer still. He says:

"Well, my friend, you have certainly given full play to your undoubted power of imagination in this essay, and I am not surprised that any editor, up-to-date in the history and scientific knowledge of the day, should decline to print it in any popular magazine. I almost hope Dr. Carus will decline it, for, in my opinion, it will do you no credit as a scientific thinker.

"I am quite willing to admit that your paper may be beyond the grasp of my poor intellect. I can conceive an electrical principle animating a material body; I can even conceive that electricity in some form may be the *principle of life* in the vegetable and animal worlds. But an "*electrical body*"—by which I suppose you mean a *human body made or composed of electricity* (which, by the way, you say is *not matter*), which can *think*, is to me utterly *unthinkable!*

"There may be, as I am told there are, some gifted intellects that can conceive of a fourth dimension in space, or, to put it more plainly, a geometry of four dimensions. To these I must leave the mental feat of conceiving an electrical human being who can think, as well as flash through space, and "levitate" through stone walls and steel chambers; it is quite beyond the power of my humble 'think-tank.'

"I am sorry to see that the only *reasoning* you employ in support of your thesis consists of numerous quotations from the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures; if, indeed, this can properly be called *reasoning*.

"Leaving out of this question all that "the higher criticism" by the ablest scholars has shown, let us take the facts brought to light by recent explorations of Dr. Delitzsch, Harnack, and Hilprecht in the ruins of Babylon and Nippur. . . .

"One thing is made clear past contradiction: whoever wrote the Pentateuch, Moses did not, and all that story about the God-given tables of stone, written by the finger of God, falls into its proper place as *folk-lore*, with no more claim to a Divine origin than the Rig-Vedas, the Shastras, the Puranas, or the Sagas of the Norsemen! . . .

"This being undoubtedly the case, you will perceive how worse than futile are all your quotations and references to the *folk-lore* of the Old and New Testaments to support your notion of an electrical body. Were it susceptible of irrefragable proof that all your references are inspired by God, as you believe, they would not go far to strengthen your theory in the face of other texts which are more clear and conclusive,—less free from ambiguity. I will mention only Job xix. 26: "And though after my skin, worms destroy *this body*, yet in my *flesh* shall I see God.' See also that passage of nonsense and ignorance found in 1 Cor. xv. 35 to the end. Also see John xx. 24 to the end, as to the nature of Christ's body after he got out of the tomb."

We are fully aware of the serious objections that can be made to Mr. Hallock's theory, and after some hesitation we decided to publish it because the idea is from the standpoint of the old point of view so natural that it almost suggests itself, and should have been elaborated long ere this by spiritualists, theosophists, Christian scientists, or other representatives of the New Thought. Both of Mr. Hallock's friends blame him for limiting his arguments to Scriptural evidences, but that in my opinion is one of his strongest points. It proves how deeply rooted his theory is in the best recognised source of traditional religious thought. It would be easy enough to multiply arguments from other sources. I will here only mention that according to Egyptian belief, one form in which the soul after death appears is the *khu* or *khuu*, which means "luminous." The *khu* is supposed to haunt the places to which it is attracted by some attachment formed during life. Its dim misty form appears in the shape which it possessed in its lifetime, it is dressed in the same garments which it wore on earth, and is called "the luminous," because it is said to emit a pale light.¹

Other nations possess similar ideas of ghosts and appearances. Man's imagination selects that substance for the soul which is least material, the shadow, breath, or light. Since we know that both light and electricity are phenomena of the ether, it is but natural to think that the physical substratum of a ghost should be a phenomenon of ether.

Mr. Hallock's arguments and all additional evidence from kindred sources do not prove that the body of the resurrection is electrical or luminous, but it is merely material for anthropological investigation, briefly, it belongs to the department of folklore. The truth is that certain ideas develop naturally. Animism at a certain period of man's development is all but universal, but the universality of the belief, *e consensu gentium*, as the theologians call it, is not an argument in its favor, but only a proof that the idea develops necessarily. The scriptural evidences on which Mr. Hallock relies prove only that some of the authors of the Scriptures shared with the Egyptians and other nations a belief in the luminosity of the body of resurrection.

We might enter into a physical discussion of the subject, a task which to some

¹ See for instance Maspero, *The Dawn of Civilisation*, p. 140.

extent Mr. Hallock's agnostic friend has undertaken. A thorough discussion of the difficulties to explain the body of resurrection as consisting either of light or of electricity would lead us too far, but even if the idea were tenable, we would have to insist on it that, in that case also, our body consisted of matter, however, attenuated it might be, and would be subject to decay, no less than the grosser flesh and blood.

The difficulties of a body of resurrection are certainly not removed by Mr. Hallock's theory, and we publish his article merely as an interesting suggestion.

THE GERMANIC MUSEUM AT CAMBRIDGE.

The Germanic Museum of Cambridge, Mass., affiliated to Harvard University is to be opened on Tuesday afternoon, November 10th, at 3 o'clock, by solemn exercises in which it is expected a number of representative men of both Germany and the United States will take part. The founding of this museum is not without great significance, for it has been called into existence not only through the interest of the American supporters of the idea, but also through the encouragement and material assistance of the German Emperor, whose aid was secured through the intercession of Prince Henry.

The Germanic Museum is a monument of the good relations between Germany and the United States, and may be considered as a pledge of peace and friendliness which should not be doubted in spite of what is frequently said to the contrary in newspaper columns and sometimes even by more considerate observers of the political situation.

It is well known that Prof. Albion Small on his return from Germany expressed himself very plainly in university circles of Chicago on the relation between both countries as being so strained that there was a growing danger of war. It is quite true that on both sides of the Atlantic there are hotspots, commonly called "Jingos," but they have no influence nor any chance of ever gaining an influence upon the destiny of either nation. The government of Germany sees too plainly the advantages of keeping on good terms with the United States, and the United States has too much respect for German ability, German science, and German energy, not to reciprocate the friendly feelings which the Emperor himself has repeatedly taken occasion to show. And even if the two governments were not on the best terms, what use could there be of a war between these two great nations, whose spheres of interest are so radically different! A war with the United States would ruin the most prosperous portion of the German trade, and nothing is gained by a defeat of the United States. The same is true *vice versa*: the United States cannot acquire German territory beyond the seas, and would in case of victory have a poor satisfaction from the destruction of the German navy. War from either standpoint would be so stupid as to be out of question.

The only cause of irritation is the Monroe Doctrine which is an eye-sore to the Germans, because they have always been on the lookout for colonies in South America, but even this question could easily be settled to mutual satisfaction if the German Government would only understand that the Monroe Doctrine does not exclude the Germans from colonising South America, but only prohibits there the establishment of the imperial government. The Germans can either settle in the states which already exist, or wherever they are so completely in the majority as to be able to introduce German as the official language of the country they may found German states. If these states would adopt a republican form of govern-