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Death is a profound and universal human question. When we can no longer ignore it, most of us face it with terror and helplessness, and that anxiety provokes us to search for guidance from greater predecessors. In this search, Sir William Osler holds singular fascination. As someone who ranks among the greatest doctors of the modern age, who is known for humanistic learning and common sense, who studied autopsy with zealous energy and who both witnessed and cared for many deaths, we might fantasize a brilliant response if we were to have him in front of us and ask: “so, Sir Osler, what do you think about death?”

As we study his life to construct his answer, however, this fantasy becomes fragmented. Osler did not so much think about death as have opinions and behaviors concerning the specific problems that death raises: how to grieve, how we should remember the dead, how we should react to others dying, how we should live in the face of death, etc. Each of these opinions and habits in some measure stands alone and are not articulated together in a larger philosophy. If they are united, it is through the coherence of a single personality, one life lived, rather than one argument.

Despite this complexity, studying Osler’s multifaceted relationship with death is of great value. By his nature and his station, Osler has had to resolve a great many more of these questions than the average person, and resolve them much more frequently. Although others have previously examined Osler’s views of death\(^1\),\(^2\),\(^3\),\(^4\), there has been little study of how Osler grew into his conclusions over time. This essay will trace the interactions Osler has had with death in his life, the problems they raised, and Osler’s solutions. Through it all we see the growth of a powerful character through grave experience, whose example, rather than dogma or arguments, still holds much power over medicine today.

Osler’s exposure to death was early and intimate. When he was four years old, his two year old sister, Emma Henrietta Osler, died. Although he never wrote or spoke publically about the event, a penciled manuscript of his famous address, A Way of Life, had tender imagery of his family saying

goodbye to Emma’s body\textsuperscript{5}. This was removed from the final version, yet it reminds us that growing up in rugged Bond Head is very different from the sanitized world of modern medicine. Death was harder to hide from fact or thought, and a continual stream of reflections on death through letters\textsuperscript{6} and scripture\textsuperscript{7} was a part of his young intellectual diet.

When Osler began his medical education at McGill, his familiarity with the microscope and a certain fearless insensitivity, together with the guidance from Howard Palmer, led him to study pathology and autopsy\textsuperscript{8,9}. Here he must have been exposed to dozens, if not hundreds, of dead strangers, and he even produced a thesis on this topic. We have little insight into how the young Osler reacted to all this early experience, but we might suspect that his sunny and practical disposition protected him at this stage from the morbid and fanciful streaks that run through human thoughts concerning death. Certainly the opening passages of his thesis speaks like one satisfied in received theology, and despite a gently mourning tone, gives no sense of anger, or even anxiety\textsuperscript{10}. Already he takes up the task of classification rather than argument, an approach

\textsuperscript{6} One of W.A. Johnson’s letters to Osler:

25 December 1870.

My dear Osler ... I could not ask a greater treat than such a work as ‘Preparation for Death’ by Alfonso, Bp. of Agatha. The subject is one of all others that I like best: really believing as I do that, ‘better is the day of a man’s death, than the day of his birth’, and it is divided into short meditations just suited to my time early in the morning...


\textsuperscript{7} One of Osler’s letters to his sister, Charlotte:

On Sunday last Mr Wood preached a Sermon on it & acknowledged that though he could not hold it all himself he would not quarrel with any of his Parishioners if they did. He took exception principally to ‘prayers for the dead’. It was a regular ‘Confession of Faith’ on his part & was splendidly given.


\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{10} The thesis opens thus:

\textit{In that Trinity of being – of body mind and soul – which so marvellously make up the Man, each one has its own special ills and diseases. With the first of these – the body – have we here anything to do, leaving the second to be attended to by that class of men whose duty it is, , to minister to minds diseased’, i. e. the Psychologists, while those of the third class beyond a Physician’s skill seek aid elsewhere. Few indeed are permitted to end their days in a natural manner, by a gradual decline of the vital powers, till that point reached, where nutrition failing to supply the fuel, necessary to keep the lamp of life alight, leaves decay to drag back the fabric to the dust .... The number of avenues through which death may reach us, the natural frailty of our bodies the delicate and intricate machinery which maintains us in a condition of health may well make us exclaim with the Poet:}

\textit{Strange that a harp of thousand strings}
that will continue strongly. So despite his great familiarity with death, the youthful Osler seemed to give the subject no great reflection except as a practical problem that is the physician’s role to hinder.

This non-reflection stayed with Osler until the early 1890’s. It was then that he produced his famous statement on the *crise de quarante ans*\(^\text{11}\). Just after he turned forty, married, having recently written the best medical textbook in the world and counted among the great leaders of medicine and medical education, Osler was pessimistic about the effects of aging in a way that seemed unusual for his character\(^\text{12}\). He himself left the autopsy table, that place which absorbed so much of his youthful labor, even as he began to express a much more spiritual and humanistic vision of medicine.

This was the period that Osler really began to expound on death as more than something to be staved off by medicine. His thoughts on the afterlife are especially fascinating. In a lifetime of speeches and reflection, Osler never explicitly stated what he believed will happen after one dies. Although he grew up with Anglican teachings of eternal life in the world to come, Osler’s modern biographer, Michael Bliss, believes that in time Osler came to think of death as nothingness:

*No wonder he never celebrated birthdays. The prophet of medical progress... must have realized that his and his generation's life expectancy was infinitely less than that of his parents*\(^\text{13}\).

If Osler did indeed come to this belief, he did not believe it very strongly. In fact, we might suspect people of Osler’s phlegmatic nature to not spend much time, even in their ruminations, arguing for or against these sorts of beliefs at all. Osler’s patron saint and Bible were, after all, Thomas Browne and his *Religio Medici*, and nowhere are found more artful dodges and feints on the most profound metaphysical questions of existence\(^\text{14}\). In Osler’s own fullest account of his views on death, the speech “Science and Immortality” that he gave to the Ingersoll Lectures on Human Immortality in 1904, he averted the philosophical bullets in a likewise acrobatic fashion:

*Should keep in tune so long.*

*To investigate the causes of death, to examine carefully the condition of organs, after such changes have gone on in them as to render existence impossible and to apply such knowledge to the prevention and treatment of disease, is one of the highest objects of the Physician.* . . .

---


Some of you will wander through all phases, to come at last, I trust, to the opinion of Cicero, who had rather be mistaken with Plato than be in the right with those who deny altogether the life after death; and this is my own confessio fidei.

Whether he means that those who deny life after death are “in the right”, or that we should not join with those who deny life after death even if they were “in the right”, is anyone’s guess.

The main theme of Osler’s Ingersroll lecture was the classification of human responses to death, an urge to create order preserved, it seems, from his undergraduate days. He described three groups of humans, the Laodiceans for whom death is an itchy corner in the mind, difficult to scratch but easy to ignore, the Gallionians who have forgotten death altogether, and the Teresians for whom death is the vital force that gives life all meaning. But how ought we think about death? Osler more or less tells us he does not know. Just as the Religio Medici said:

How shall the dead arise, is no question of my faith; to believe only possibilities, is not faith, but mere philosophy. Many things are true in divinity, which are neither inducible by reason nor confirmable by sense; and many things in philosophy confirmable by sense; yet not inducible by reason...

Osler would also finish his speech by agreeing that human reason is too weak as a method of approach:

Like Simias, in the Golden Dialogue of the great master, a majority of sensible men will feel oppressed by the greatness of the subject and the feebleness of man...

It is reasonable to think that Osler never made up his mind about this subject, and in fact had made up his mind to not make up his mind. The degree of ambiguity and contradiction people can hold in their own mind is very great, and there is a side to Osler that is rarely written about: that of the mystic, whose approach to the world is not encapsulated in argument or doctrine, but in imagery and emotion.

There is much to suggest, and it is a pleasing fancy, that outside our consciousness lie fields of psychical activity analogous to the invisible yet powerful rays of the spectrum. The thousand activities of the bodily machine, some of them noisy enough at times, do not in health obtrude themselves upon our consciousness, and just as there is this enormous subconscious field of vegetative life, so may be a vast supra-conscious sphere of astral life, the manifestations of which are only now and then in evidence, a

---

16 If he did make up his mind, he made sure to tell no one. Bliss documents that Osler usually responded to religious inquiries thus:
“What is your religion, sir?”
“Mine is the religion of all sensible men.”
“And pray, what is that?”
“Why, all sensible men keep religion to themselves.”
sphere in which, when all the nerve of sense is numb, in unconjectured bliss or in the abyss of tenfold complicated change, the spirit itself may commune with others, “Spirit to Spirit, Ghost to Ghost,” and do diverse wonders of which we are told in the volumes of the Society for Psychical Research, and which make us exclaim with Montaigne, “The spirit of man is a great worker of miracles.”

Concurrent with the scientist, the evidence-based practitioner who casted a skeptical eye on almost all of extant pharmacology in his great textbook, is the gentleman-bibliophile who has a section of his library referred to as “Death, Heaven and Hell”. In there are books on “spiritualism… dreams and ghosts, on witchcraft, on immortality, longevity, premature burial, pre-existence, resurrection…” Surely this is a tasty list for even the most esoteric New Age hippy.

In sharp contrast to such determined murkiness, Osler was fully made up in his mind about death as a practical matter. Osler was a serious reader of Montaigne, who frequently expressed how death is no dreadful thing:

\[
\text{If you do not know how to die, never mind. Nature will tell you how to do it on the spot, plainly and adequately. She will do this job for you most punctiliously, do not worry about it.}
\]

Elsewhere Montaigne describes an episode where he was knocked off his horse. He recovered despite brutal injuries where his friends believed him to be dead. Strangely enough, Montaigne’s experience of this event was not unpleasant:

\[
\text{Meanwhile my condition was truly most agreeable and peaceful: I felt no affliction either for myself or for others… When they got me into bed, I experienced a feeling of infinite rest and comfort… I felt myself oozing away so gently, and in so gentle and pleasing a fashion, that I can think of hardly any action less grievous than that was.}
\]

Osler, for whom Montaigne is a part of the bedside library of ten books he recommended to every medical student, must have been intimately familiar with these sentiments. They almost

\[
\text{After having been taken for dead for two hours, on the way I began to make movements and to inhale because such a quantity of blood had been discharged into my stomach that my natural powers had to be restored to me to void it… I threw up a bucketful of pure clotted blood.}
\]

---

17 Ibid
21 Ibid.
certainly strongly influenced his own view that the natural process of death is nothing to be feared, and is rarely full of suffering for the patient. Through exposure to Munk’s “Euthanasia” in his Pennsylvania years, Osler expressed enthusiasm for the physician who promoted this comfortable outcome by the regime of “free but judicious” use of opium, a belief he carried into practice. Montaigne’s own near-death experience must have also been on Osler’s mind when he began his first investigations patients’ death experiences. Between 1900 and 1904, Osler collected nurse observations of the death of 486 patients in the John Hopkins Hospital. From this data he concluded that death, more often than not, arrives with peace rather than suffering, which he believed occur in only 21% of patients. When recent analysis further scrutinized the data, it showed that as many as 38% of Osler’s patients experienced suffering. On the other hand, numbers are hardly the point. This work convinced him that a great proportion of deaths can be comfortable and peaceful. Osler disagreed with Maeterlinck, a playwright and poet who wrote an essay “Death” that describes the event in fearful and miserable terms, to the point where Osler shot out a letter describing both his observations that in death, “very few, suffer severely in body, fewer still in the mind”, and his conviction expressed in a quote of Thomas Fuller: “when he can life no longer keep in, he makes a fair and easy passage for it to go out.”

The knowledge that death can be peaceful and that the physician can facilitate this sort of death must have informed Osler’s interaction with the dying. Although they can no longer hope for cure, Osler can help them hope for other things: a reduction of physical discomfort, psychological peace, fun in the days they have left, and a course of grief among the living that is uncomplicated by regret. His methodology for doing so can be unconventional and sometimes involve the acting of a goblin.

26 Osler, Science and Immortality. Riverside Press, New York, 1908
28 Osler, W. Mateterlinck on death. Spectator. 1911;57:740
29

He [Osler] visited our little Janet twice every day from the middle of October until her death a month later, and these visits she looked forward to with a pathetic eagerness and joy. There would be a little tap, low down on the door which would be pushed open and a crouching figure playing goblin would come in, and in a high-pitched voice would ask if the fairy godmother was at home and could he have a bit of tea. Instantly the sick-room was turned into a fairyland, and in fairy language he would talk about the flowers, the birds, and the dolls who sat at the foot of the bed who were always greeted with, 'Well, all ye loves.' In the course of this he would manage to find out all he wanted to know about the little patient...

The most exquisite moment came one cold, raw, November morning when the end was near, and he mysteriously brought out from his inside pocket a beautiful red rose carefully wrapped in paper, and told how he had watched this last rose of summer growing in his garden and how the rose had called out to him as he passed by, that she wished to go along with him to see his little lassie. That evening we all had a fairy teaparty, at a tiny table by the bed, Sir William talking to the rose, his ‘little lassie’ and her mother in a most exquisite way; and presently he
This approach to death, the mitigation of pain and discomfort and the encouragement of the giving and receiving of forgiveness, is also the heart of the modern field of palliative care. That Osler would have agreed wholeheartedly is a point that has not been missed.³⁰

Thus, after he passed his forties, we managed to gain a clearer view of Osler’s thoughts on death both as a philosophical and as a medical matter. Unfortunately, this is also the time when his loved ones began to die. Although his mentors Bovell and Johnson have passed away previously, they were still not as personal blows as the deaths of his first son, the death of his parents, and finally the death of his second son.

The first of these grave events was treated with sensitivity and humor. A few days after Paul Revere Osler died at a few hours of age, Grace, Osler’s wife, found a letter on her desk. It was written for “Dear Mother”, postmarked from Heaven, and contained these sorts of passages:

...If we are good & get on nicely with our singing & if our earthly parents continue to show an interest in us by remembering us in their prayers, we are allowed to write every three or four tatmas (i.e. month). I got here safely with very little inconvenience...³¹

Explicit admissions of sorrow from Osler were very rare. His accounts of his parents’ death to his friends were brief to the point of being jarring:

Dear White, Thanks for your kind note of sympathy. The cable was very unexpected as we had only a day or two before a letter saying that she was keeping so well. A brother had been at death’s door with acute gout and as he lives with her she had insisted upon going to his room very often and it worried her greatly. She had a fine outlook on life -- ohne Hast, ohne Rast -- and even the vagaries of her sons did not disturb her tranquility. I hope you have killed your cook and settled down to a Chittenden diet -- eating nothing you do not grow yourself and avoiding all roots, red meats, sweets, whiskey, champagne and tobacco...³²

We should remark that this laconic habit was not the norm in Victorian England. This was a period obsessed by death, bereavement and memento mori, led by Queen Victoria herself in her life-long

---

slipped out of the room just as mysteriously as he had entered it, all crouched down on his heels; and the little girl understood that neither fairies nor people could always have the colour of a red rose in their cheeks, or stay as long as they wanted to in one place, but that they nevertheless would be very happy in another home and must not let the people they left behind, particularly their parents, feel badly about it; and the little girl understood and was not unhappy.

mourning for Prince Albert. Although the degree of expression varied, the overall culture was one that found torrential, even sappy, grief to be acceptable. This was true even in the colonies, where a modern careful examination of two sets of family letters, one in Manitoba and one in Prince Edward Island found frequent and graphic descriptions of death.

Thus, the brevity of Osler’s expressions of grief marks him as an individual rather than something that proceeds naturally from the times. This has been interpreted as the expression of positive thinking in Osler, of optimism and of avoiding “negative emotions”, but Bliss was more likely closer to the truth when he wrote:

...his [Osler’s] jauntiness seemed a thin cover over an underlying spiritual melancholy.
No one doubted the reality of Dr. Osler’s grief at the loss of a relative, a friend or a promising Hopkins student, or a patient he thought could not be saved. At times he admitted to whistling that he might not weep...

There is no doubt that Osler was capable of intense sorrow. Certainly the death of his second son, Revere, showed us that he is not fully defended against the final farewell, perhaps not even well defended. As is well known, Revere, with his fondness for literature and classics (discovered sadly late in life -- early Osler letters frequently said that "The boy keeps well— not a student but interested in butterflies & fish") was the pillar of Osler’s old age. When Revere was killed in the Great War, Osler could no longer conceal his grief, although his letters were still taciturn. Nancy Astor writes:

The men saw what had happened and we all knew his heart was broken. He went through the wards in his same gay old way, but when he got to the house—

33 In terms of the traditional milestones in the cycle of life—birth, education, marriage, and death—the Jarvis and Ross correspondence exhibit sentiment most openly and frequently on the subject of death. Indeed, nearly half of the Jarvis letters between 1828 and 1852 contain some reference to death: reporting one, responding to a report, or mourning the death of a loved one. The incidence is little different in the Ross letters. This emphasis is not surprising, since death and its aftermath were matters that often provoked a correspondent to take pen in hand. For the modern taste the sentiments expressed may border on the morbid and maudlin, but they filled a real need for those involved. Those familiar either with Victorian novels or the literature of Victorian piety will not be surprised, for example, to learn of the fascination of both our families with detailed descriptions of death-bed scenes. We are given two eyewitness accounts of the final sufferings in 1841 of Maria. One, by her son, is of her last hours, and another, by her daughter, describes the terminal weeks.


In his own letters, Osler’s consolation seems to depend mostly on the fact that Revere had as painless a death as could be expected from shell shrapnel, that he was treated by Cushing, a close family friend, and was among friends when he died. In this most terrible event of his life, the second of Osler’s traits, concerned with the practicalities of dying, proved to be more useful than the first, his mystical uncertainty on the afterlife.

Indeed, Osler’s easygoing nature on the various possibilities of the afterlife changed on Revere’s death. He became impatient with the rise of Spiritualism, especially as typified by Sir Oliver Lodge, a physicist who also researched psychic phenomena and promoted rituals to communicate with the dead. Lodge’s ideas and practices were popular among many in that cruel period, but Osler said that Lodge should “put up or shut up”, presumably as a response to Lodge’s less-than-rigorous studies. Cushing further remarks that Osler felt Spiritualism “had done many people enormous more harm than it had brought them comfort... Spiritualism was distasteful and appeared to him to be unreligious”. It is impossible for a reader to not see in this reaction a new bitterness not present in the young Osler, or even the middle-aged Osler who wrote “Science and Immortality”.

There is more to say about Osler’s relationship with death, not the least of which is how he saw medicine as a great apostolic succession. On the other hand, the goal of this essay is not to document every encounter Osler had with death, but rather to show that Osler’s relationship with death did not come in philosophical epiphanies or even articulated arguments. It proceeded from his character and his experience, both of which are complex and full of contradiction. In his cheerful and pragmatic disposition, he was not a subtle theologian or even a rigorous philosopher. Perhaps he was not even naturally reflective; at least the young Osler gave no hint of talent to this respect. However, with his choice of profession and the enormous responsibilities that found his shoulders, we see a contemplative, perhaps even melancholic, streak slowly assert itself through him over the years. In answer to it, he adopted a habit of hard, day-to-day work that did not allow too much consideration to the theoretical, and his deliberate vagueness on the great metaphysical questions concerning death may be an outcome of this. On the other hand, he was capable of poetic literature, and in the absence of dogma that literature showed signs of the mystical. In practical considerations he was quite clear minded, he saw that peaceful, comfortable

---

38 Ibid.
deaths were possible and he pursued that outcome with the best medicine can offer. This was all packaged in a man who met the deaths of intimates with very human sorrow and privacy.

By the time his own turn came, he met it with an equanimity that was fully Oslerian, working on his letters, knowing that his end was near, but cooperating nevertheless with his doctors and treatments, including thoracentesis and surgery. He expressed neither fear nor anxiety, only gratitude for a good life well-lived:

*Except in one particular I have had nothing but butter and honey*[^45].

Montaigne would have been proud.
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