

Proof Order

ROMEIKE & CURTICE

Press Cutting Agency . .

Ludgate Circus Buildings

London, E.C.

Telegr
ROME

Telephone
4554 HOLB

Dec. 04

101

TIM
Harvar
ting t
paid to
Immor
n Profe
Profes
lliam
pine i
soll e
be c
restr
ed M
publi
en
'if
ofe
do
es
e
ner
H
, a
e

a sucking child, nor did the temptation return to

The L

to a meeting in Aldersgate Street. Someone was reading Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans. 'About a quarter before nine,' says Wesley, 'while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me, that He had taken away *my* sins, even *mine*, and saved *me* from the law of sin and death.'

Bishop Welldon quotes the case of Colonel Gardiner also. You smile: 'Very old and very familiar.' Well, he has other cases which are not so old nor so familiar. But what has age or acquaintance to do with it? Bishop Welldon quotes the case of Colonel Gardiner, and we refer to it here because it is so appropriate. For Colonel Gardiner was converted when he was waiting to commit a sin. And he says that, though that particular kind of sin had so great a hold upon him that he thought nothing short of shooting through the head would cure him of it, from that day forth 'all desire and inclination to it was removed as entirely as if I had been a sucking child, nor did the temptation return to this day.'

And then Bishop Welldon says for himself: 'When I was a schoolmaster, people used to ask me, Do you believe in conversion? I would answer, I do not believe in it; I know it.' 'Yes,' he says, 'I know. If there is anything in the world I know, I know the changed aspect, the softened manner, the grace, the smile, the radiance of the boy who has begun, in God's mysterious providence, to live a new life.'

* 'If a man die, shall he live again?' There is no question in the Bible that seems to some to need an answer more imperatively. There is no question that seemed to need an answer more imperatively to Miss Caroline Haskell Ingersoll. So she founded a lectureship. She bequeathed

to Harvard University five thousand dollars, directing that the annual interest thereof should be paid to some lecturer who should lecture on the Immortality of the Soul. One lecturer has been Professor Royce, one Professor James, and one Professor Osler.

William Osler, M.D., F.R.S., is Professor of Medicine in the University of Oxford. For Miss Ingersoll emphatically said that the lectureship was not to be confined to America, and that it was not to be restricted to the Church. Professor Osler delivered his lecture in the session of 1903-1904. It is published now by Messrs. Constable. The title given to it is *Science and Immortality* (2s. 6d.).

Well, 'if a man die, shall he live again?' What does Professor Osler say? He does not say. At least he does not say at once. He is within three sentences of the end of his lecture before he says what he himself believes. First he says what other men believe. There are three classes of men. He calls them the Laodiceans, the Galilionians, and the Teresians. He tells us first what the Laodiceans believe.

The Laodiceans believe that if a man die he shall live again. No, they do not believe it. They only say that they believe it. They do not always take the trouble even to say. They are never sure. They are never sure if they want to be sure. And the Laodiceans are the great majority of mankind.

The Laodiceans are the great majority of mankind. And the great majority of mankind have but two primal passions—to get and to beget. Satisfy these—the passion to get the means of sustenance (with, to-day, a little more) and to beget his kind—and the average man looks neither before nor after, but 'goeth forth to his work and to his labour until the evening.' And when the evening comes?—'Sweats into oblivion,' says Professor Osler, 'without a thought of whence or whither.'

How does Professor Osler know? He observes that the future life is not once mentioned in the drawing-room. He finds that the columns of the public press, so sensitive to all that agitates men, keep silence on the life to come. He sees that 'except officially from the pulpit,' the topic is too delicate for even the clergy to allude to. And if a Teresian (we shall come to them in a moment) should be found in ordinary society to buttonhole his acquaintances and inquire earnestly after their souls, he is shunned like the Ancient Mariner. But he knows best of all, because he is a physician and sees how men die.

Professor Osler has studied how men die. He says: 'I have careful records of about five hundred deathbeds, studied particularly with reference to the modes of death and the sensations of the dying.' And he finds that 'ninety suffered bodily pain or distress of one sort or another, eleven showed mental apprehension, two positive terror, one expressed spiritual exaltation, one bitter remorse.' The rest, and they are the great majority, 'gave no sign, one way or the other; their death was like their birth, a sleep and a forgetting.'

So the great majority of men, even of the men who in our day and country are the heirs of all the ages, are lukewarm Laodiceans—they think they believe in a future life, but they are really concerned with the price of beef or coal. The second class Professor Osler calls the Gallionians.

The Gallionians care for none of these things. They are mostly men of science. Immortality does not belong to their range of study. It has, besides, some suggestion of the supernatural about it, and they do not believe in the supernatural. There are those who violently deny the reality of a life to come. The greater number do not trouble to deny it. 'It was my privilege,' says Professor Osler, 'to know well one of the greatest naturalists of this country, Joseph Leidy, who reached this standpoint, and I have often heard him say that the question of a future state had

long ceased to interest him or to have any influence in his life.' And then Professor Osler adds: 'I think there can be no doubt that this attitude of mind is more common among naturalists and investigators than in men devoted to literature and the humanities.'

Why is it that so many students of physical science have no interest in the question of a life to come? There are four reasons. The first is that the idea of man, his origin and nature, and consequently his destiny, has been completely altered by physical science. The old idea, the idea we teach our children still,—Professor Osler calls it the 'Sunday story from orthodox pulpits,'—is that man is an *angelus sepultus*, who had

Forsook the courts of everlasting day,

And chose with us a darksome house of mortal clay; that he was created in the image of God, 'sufficient to have stood, though free to fall,' and that he fell; that he is now an outlaw from his Father's house, to which he is privileged to return 'at the price of the Son of God.'

To the student of physical science man has moved all the other way. He has had no fall, he has slowly but steadily risen. He is 'the crowning glory of organic life, the end-product of a ceaseless evolution which has gone on for æons'; he is the heir of all the ages; 'with head erect and brow serene, he is confident of himself and confident of the future, as he pursues the gradual paths of an aspiring change.'

The second reason is that science—modern psychological science—dispenses now with the soul. The old psychologists found 'something in us that can be without us, and will be after us'—in the language of Sir Thomas Browne. The new psychologists have no place for this something. 'The association of life in all its phases with organization, the association of a gradation of intelligence with increasing complexity of organization, the failure of the development of intelligence with an arrest in cerebral growth in the child, the

slow decay of mind with changes in the brain, the absolute dependence of the higher mental attributes upon definite structures, the instantaneous loss of consciousness when the blood supply is cut off from the higher centres—these facts,' says Professor Osler, 'give pause to the scientific student when he tries to think of intelligence apart from organization.'

The third reason is that science in our day has searched for the spirits of the dead and has not found them. But Professor Osler is not so confident here. He is not quite sure that there are no ministering angels around us. He is not sure that there is not a world of spirit somewhere; he is not sure that that is not the real world, ours the shadow. Is the poet right?—

I tell you we are fooled by the eye, the ear :
These organs muffle us from that real world
That lies about us ; we are duped by brightness.
The ear, the eye doth make us deaf and blind ;
Else should we be aware of all our dead
Who pass above us, through us, and beneath us.

Professor Osler is not sure.

Nor is he sure that science has been altogether baffled in its search. If only science had undertaken the search before it fell into the hands of those untrained devotees who throng the banks of the spiritualistic river, amid whose solemn incantations one can now hear the mocking laughter of Puck and of Ariel, as they play among the sedges and sing the monotonous refrain, 'What fools these mortals be.' Professor Osler is not sure that science has been baffled yet. Give him time. The Society for Psychical Research has done something; 'that earnest soul,' F. W. H. Myers, did something to pierce the veil and explore the mysteries behind it. But after all, after a careful review of all the literature, for he has studied it, Professor Osler comes to the conclusion that the uncertainty has not been rendered less uncertain, or the confusion less confounded. He comes to the conclusion that no message from the spirit-land has yet arrived legible enough and sensible

enough for the National Academy of Sciences to call a meeting to discuss it.

The fourth reason is that just when it had lost the immortality of the soul, science discovered the immortality of the flesh.

This is the great discovery of the day. Professor Osler calls it a revelation, an astounding revelation. He calls it one of the fairy tales of science. What is it? Professor Osler must tell what it is himself.

He calls it 'the morphological continuity of the germ plasm'; and he says: 'The individual is nothing more than the transient offshoot of a germ plasm, which has an unbroken continuity from generation to generation, from age to age. This marvellous embryonic substance is eternally young, eternally productive, eternally forming new individuals to grow up and to perish, while it remains in the progeny, always youthful, always increasing, always the same.' And then Professor Osler takes refuge in the words of another. Quoting from the *Review of Neurology and Psychiatry* of January 1904, quoting the words of the naturalist Noll, he adds: 'Thousands upon thousands of generations which have arisen in the course of ages were its products, but it lives on in the youngest generations with the power of giving origin to coming millions. The individual organism is transient, but its embryonic substance, which produces the mortal tissues, preserves itself imperishable, everlasting, and constant.'

Whereupon Professor Osler ventures to say that 'science minimizes to the vanishing point the importance of the individual man, and claims that the cosmic and biological laws which control his destiny are wholly inconsistent with the special-providence view in which we were educated—that beneficent, fatherly providence which cares for the sparrows and numbers the very hairs of our head.'

The third class of men are the Teresians. They

and abstract. Let us have no such paraphrases as this—

Shall He who with transcendent skill
Fashioned the eye and formed the ear,
Who modelled Nature to His will,
Shall He not hear?

The Hebrews had no such word as 'Nature'; they had not the idea of Nature, which implies an abstraction of the world from God which has no place in devotional thought.

(2) The entire absence of the idea of Nature, the indifference to the order of natural causes, and the full conviction that all events are direct from God's hand, and that their true cause is moral, is a feature of immense value, which is very often lost. Thus Tate and Brady in Ps 91, not knowing that, in the Psalms, Nature is simply the interpreter of God's love or anger towards man, lose the whole ideal character of the description and give us such lines as—

direct and personal in every mouth. Some of the Psalms are of this kind. Many especially of the later poems in our collection seem to have been written from the first for Temple use, and to have purposely avoided all special allusions which would detract from their generality of application. The use of these Psalms in public worship is therefore still easy; and most of these Psalms are still leading favourites in our churches, though, as a rule, they have not nearly the freshness and depth of earlier Psalms. But the earlier and nobler Psalms are generally much more special in tone. Many of them were not first written for public worship; or, if even from the first they expressed the praises of the Church, they at least are specially written for some event in the Church's history. There is

are called Teresians because they are mostly women and under the control of their emotions. These are they who believe in the life to come. 'Not always the wise men after the flesh (except among the Greeks), more often the lowly and obscure, women more often than men, the Teresians have ever formed the moral leaven of humanity. Narrow, prejudiced, often mistaken in worldly ways and methods, they alone have preserved in the past, and still keep for us to-day, the faith that looks through death. Children of Light, Children of the Spirit, whose ways are foolishness to the children of this world, mystics, idealists, with no strong reason for the faith that is in them, yet they compel admiration and imitation by the character of the life they lead and the beneficence of the influence they exert. The serene faith of Socrates with the cup of hemlock at his lips, the heroic devotion of a St. Francis or a St. Teresa, but more often for each one of us the beautiful life of some good woman whose

Eyes are homes of faithful prayer,

Whose loves in higher love endure,

do more to keep alive among the Laodiceans a belief in immortality than all the preaching in the land.'

They are mostly women. It is a little disturbing. When they are not women they are very emotional men. It is a little disconcerting. And it is not that they are emotional besides being intellectual. It is not that they have head as well as heart. They are 'under the dominion of the emotions,' their deeds are 'the outcome of passion and prejudice, of sentiment and usage much more than of reason.' If they believe in immortality they do so in spite of reason and science, for 'from the standpoint of science, representing the head, there is an irreconcilable hostility to this emotional or cardiac side of life's problems.'

We shall not stay to enumerate the men who have believed in the life to come. We shall not stay to prove that they were not always so emotion-

ally one-sided. The choice of the name itself is enough to arrest the sweep of Professor Osler's generalities. For Saint Teresa had an intellect that could not easily be despised, and she had some considerable capacity for the management of affairs. And when we are arrested, we become utterly amazed at the simplicity of Professor Osler's methods.

Why has he swept all the believers in immortality into the company of women and the emotions? Because he has found that they *are* either women or emotional men? Not so. It is because 'on the question of immortality the only enduring enlightenment is through faith.' Now faith is to Professor Osler a purely emotional act. The head is not in it; it comes entirely from the heart. It is in direct antagonism to reason and to science. '*Only believe, and he that believeth,*—these are the commandments with comfort; not *only think, and he that reasoneth,* for these are the commandments of science.' And without a moment's hesitation Professor Osler fortifies his amazing statement from Scripture, and says, 'unfortunately, with the heart man believeth, not alone unto righteousness, but unto every possible vagary, from Apollonius of Tyana to Joseph Smith'; not knowing apparently, and never suspecting, that in the language of Scripture the heart is the seat, not of the emotions at all, but just of the thinking and reasoning faculties.

Was Professor Osler called to bless? Miss Ingersoll founded the lectureship in memory of her father. What comfort has he for her? As a student of science his philosophy 'finds nothing to support' a belief in the future life. But as a student of science he is ready to acknowledge the value of a belief in the hereafter 'as an asset in human life.' The noblest of his fellows have clung to it, it has been of incalculable comfort to those sorrowing for precious friends hid in death's dateless night; it has served humanity in a way that demands the gratitude and reverence even of the student of science—but that is all. Professor

Osler says that that is all. Was he called to bless? Surely he did not know it, but he came to curse.

What is it that the student of science does to himself, not merely to make him incapable of belief in immortality, but capable of such preposterous belief in his fellow-men? Does Professor Osler honestly think that, when we believe in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead, we are suffering from excess of emotion? He does not once mention Christ. As if the Resurrection from the dead had never been named, he makes his own confession of faith, and says that like Cicero he would rather be mistaken with Plato than in the right with those who deny altogether the life after

death. But what business has he, as a student of science, to be content to be mistaken with any man? If his science makes immortality impossible, let him say so and reject the belief in immortality. He does not say so. All through the lecture he seemed to be saying so. He does not say so at the end. He says at the end that science is organized knowledge, and knowledge is of things we see. 'Now the things that are seen are temporal; of things that are unseen science knows nothing, and has at present no means of knowing anything.'

If, then, science does not say that belief in the life to come is impossible; if it merely says that it is outside its province; why does not Professor Osler leave science for a little and consider Christ?