

UC-NRLF



QB 74 923

THE  
TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY  
OF THE  
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

GIFT OF

*Johns Hopkins Univ.*

*Accession* ..... **100710** ..... *Class* .....



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

*a*  
NOV 10 1902



10  
NOV 1'

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

THE

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY





# JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

## CELEBRATION

OF THE

## TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNIVERSITY

AND

## INAUGURATION

OF

IRA REMSEN, LL. D.

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY



FEBRUARY TWENTY-FIRST AND TWENTY-SECOND

1902

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

LD 2636  
1902

*Gift of J. H. Davis.*

JOHN MURPHY COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.

## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE.
LIST OF DELEGATES.....	2
FIRST DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.....	9
President Remsen's Address.....	10
President Gilman's Address.....	12
Professor Wilson's Address.....	37
Principal Peterson's Address.....	44
President Hadley's Address.....	49
President Dabney's Address.....	52
President Harper's Address.....	58
SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.....	64
Governor Smith's Address.....	65
Inauguration of President Remsen.....	70
President Remsen's Address.....	72
Conferring of Honorary Degrees.....	95
President Eliot's Address.....	104
ALUMNI BANQUET.....	109
Professor Royce.....	112
President Eliot.....	118
President Remsen.....	120
President Gilman.....	128
President Angell.....	133
President Patton.....	139
President Alderman.....	141
President Hadley.....	144
List of Invited Guests.....	147
List of Subscribers.....	149
PRESENTATION TO PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE.....	157
RECEPTION AND CONVERSAZIONE.....	167
OTHER RECEPTIONS AND REUNIONS.....	175



PROCEEDINGS  
AT THE  
PUBLIC ASSEMBLIES,

FEBRUARY 21 AND 22, 1902.





CELEBRATION  
OF THE  
TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDATION  
OF  
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,  
FEBRUARY 21, 22, 1902.

---

ON the twenty-second of February, 1902, the Johns Hopkins University completed the twenty-fifth year of its existence. As this was also the date fixed for the installation of its second president, President Ira Remsen,—thus closing, as it were, the first chapter of its history and beginning the second—it was thought that the occasion should be celebrated in a manner more than usually imposing. The principal institutions of learning in the United States and Canada were invited to be present by their representatives; and the extraordinary number of delegates that attended, despite the extreme inclemency of the weather, showed the deep and wide-spread interest felt in the proceedings.

The universities and colleges that were represented by delegations, were as follows:—

## CANADA.

*Toronto University:*

President James Loudon, LL. D.  
Professor Archibald Byron Macallum, Ph. D.

*McGill University:*

Principal William Peterson, LL. D.  
Professor J. George Adami, M. D.

## UNITED STATES.

*Harvard University:*

President Charles William Eliot, LL. D.

*Yale University:*

President Arthur Twining Hadley, LL. D.  
Professor Russell Henry Chittenden, Ph. D.

*University of Pennsylvania:*

Vice-Provost Edgar Fahs Smith, Ph. D., Sc. D.

*Princeton University:*

Reverend President Francis Landey Patton, D. D., LL. D.

*Washington and Lee University:*

President George H. Denny, Ph. D.  
Mr. Robert Ernest Hutton.

*Columbia University:*

President Nicholas Murray Butler, Ph. D., LL. D.  
Dean James Earl Russell, Ph. D.  
Professor William Howard Carpenter, Ph. D.

*Brown University:*

Professor Francis Greenleaf Allinson, Ph. D.



*Rutgers College:*

President Austin Scott, Ph. D., LL. D.

Professor Louis Bevier, Ph. D.

*Dickinson College:*

Professor William Weidman Landis, Ph. B.

*Franklin and Marshall College:*

Reverend President John Summers Stahr, Ph. D., D. D.

*St. John's College (Annapolis):*

President Thomas Fell, LL. D.

*Georgetown University:*

Reverend President Jerome Daugherty, S. J.

Reverend Vice-President John A. Conway, S. J.

Reverend Dean Henry J. Shandelle, S. J.

Reverend Professor David Hillhouse Buck, S. J.

*Williams College:*

Professor Samuel Fessenden Clarke, Ph. D.

*University of Tennessee:*

President Charles William Dabney, Ph. D., LL. D.

Professor Charles Albert Perkins, Ph. D.

*University of North Carolina:*

President Francis Preston Venable, Ph. D.

*Union University:*

Professor Frederick Robertson Jones, Ph. D.

*Middlebury College:*

Professor Charles Baker Wright, A. M.

*Washington and Jefferson College:*

Reverend President James David Moffat, D. D., LL. D.

*South Carolina College:*

Professor William B. Burney, Ph. D.

*University of Maryland:*

The Honorable John Prentiss Poe.

*Mount St. Mary's College :*

Reverend President William L. O'Hara.

*Central University :*

Professor Chase Palmer, Ph. D.

*Indiana University :*

Professor James Albert Woodburn, Ph. D.

*Amherst College :*

Professor Arthur Lalanne Kimball, Ph. D.

Professor William Stuart Symington, Jr., Ph. D.

*Columbia University :*

Professor Howard Lincoln Hodgkins, Ph. D.

Professor Charles Edward Munroe, Ph. D.

Professor James Hall Lewis, D. D. S.

Professor Emil A. de Schweinitz, Ph. D., M. D.

Professor Charles Willis Needham, I.L. D.

*Gonzaga College :*

Reverend President E. X. Fink.

*Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute :*

President Palmer C. Ricketts.

*Trinity College (Hartford) :*

Rev. President George Williamson Smith, D. D., LL. D.

Professor Robert Bayard Riggs, Ph. D.

Professor Charles Lincoln Edwards, Ph. D.

*Kenyon College :*

Professor William Peters Reeves, Ph. D.

*University of Virginia :*

Chairman Paul B. Barringer, M. D., LL. D.

Professor John W. Mallet, Ph. D., LL. D., F. R. S.

Professor James Morris Page, Ph. D.

Professor William M. Thornton, LL. D.

*Randolph-Macon College:*

Professor Arthur Clarence Wightman, Ph. D.  
 Professor Robert Emory Blackwell.  
 Professor Hall Canter, Ph. D.

*Delaware College:*

President George Abram Harter, Ph. D.

*Oberlin College:*

Professor John Roaf Wightman, Ph. D.

*Tulane University:*

President Edwin Anderson Alderman, LL. D., D. C. L.  
 Professor Brown Ayres, Ph. D.

*University of Michigan:*

President James Burrill Angell, LL. D.

*University of Missouri:*

Professor George Lefevre, Ph. D.

*Virginia Military Institute:*

Professor Francis Mallory, C. E.

*Baylor University:*

Professor George Ragland, A. B.

*Bucknell University:*

President John Howard Harris, LL. D.

*Iowa State University:*

Louis Alexander Parsons, A. M.

*College of the City of New York:*

Professor William Stratford, Ph. D.

*William Jewell College:*

Professor Charles Lee Smith, Ph. D.

*University of Wisconsin:*

Professor Richard Theodore Ely, Ph. D., LL. D.

*Northwestern University:*

President Edmund Janes James, Ph. D.

*Loyola College :*

Reverend President John F. Quirk, S. J.

*Trinity College (N. C.) :*

Professor William Francis Gill, A. B.

*Washington University :*

Chancellor Winfield Scott Chaplin, LL. D.

*Peabody Institute :*

President Samuel C. Chew, M. D.

*Maryland Agricultural College :*

President R. W. Silvester.

*Vassar College :*

Professor John Leverett Moore, Ph. D.

*Gallaudet College :*

President Edward Miner Gallaudet, LL. D.

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology :*

President Henry Smith Pritchett, LL. D.

Professor William Thompson Sedgwick, Ph. D.

Professor Davis Rich Dewey, Ph. D.

*Worcester Polytechnic Institute :*

President Edmund Arthur Engler, LL. D.

*University of Kansas :*

Professor Frank Wilson Blackmar, Ph. D.

*Lehigh University :*

President Thomas Messinger Drown, LL. D.

Professor William Cleveland Thayer, A. M.

*West Virginia University :*

President Daniel Boardman Purinton, LL. D.

*University of California :*

President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, Ph. D., LL. D.

Professor Elmer Ellsworth Brown, Ph. D.

Professor Irving Stringham, Ph. D.

*Cornell University :*

Dean Thomas Frederick Crane, A. M.

*University of Illinois :*

Professor George Theophilus Kemp, Ph. D.

*University of Minnesota :*

Professor Henry F. Nachtrieb, S. B.

*University of the South :*

Vice-Chancellor Benjamin Lawton Wiggins, M. A.

*Western Maryland College :*

Reverend President Thomas Hamilton Lewis, A. M.

*Boston University :*

Reverend William S. Edwards, D. D.

*Swarthmore College :*

President William W. Birdsall, A. M.

Professor Edward Hicks Magill, LL. D.

Professor Jesse Herman Holmes, Ph. D.

Professor William Isaac Hull, Ph. D.

*Ursinus College :*

Reverend President Henry Thomas Spangler, D. D.

Professor Henry Volkmar Gummere, A. M.

Professor Karl Josef Grimm, Ph. D.

Mr. C. Ernest Dechant, A. B.

*Woodstock College :*

Reverend President William Pierce Brett, S. J.

Reverend Professor A. A. Maas, S. J.

*University of Cincinnati :*

Professor Joseph Edward Harry, Ph. D.

*St. John's College (Washington) :*

Reverend Brother Abdas.

*Wellesley College :*

President Caroline Hazard, Litt. D.

*Ohio State University :*

Professor Henry Adam Weber, Ph. D.

*Purdue University :*

President Winthrop Ellsworth Stone, Ph. D.

Professor Thomas Francis Moran, Ph. D.

*Smith College :*

Professor Charles Downer Hazen, Ph. D.

*Bryn Mawr College :*

President M. Carey Thomas, Ph. D., LL. D.

Professor Charles McLean Andrews, Ph. D.

*St. Joseph's Seminary :*

Very Reverend J. R. Slattery.

*Woman's College of Baltimore :*

Reverend President John Franklin Goucher, D. D., LL. D.

*Catholic University of America :*

Right Reverend Thomas James Conaty, D. D., Rector.

Professor George Melville Bolling, Ph. D.

Reverend Professor John Joseph Griffin, Ph. D.

*Clark University :*

President Granville Stanley Hall, LL. D.

*Leland Stanford Jr. University :*

President David Starr Jordan, LL. D.

*University of Chicago :*

President William Rainey Harper, LL. D.

*Drexel Institute :*

President James McAlister, LL. D.

*Jacob Tome Institute :*

Director Abraham Winegardner Harris, LL. D.

Letters of congratulation were received from a large number of institutions and individuals at home and abroad.

The University having no hall capable of accommodating the concourse of participants and spectators, the exercises were held in Music Hall, and extended over two days, February 21 and 22.

---

## FIRST DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

---

At 3 o'clock the President, the President Emeritus, the Governor of the State, the attending delegations and other distinguished guests, the Faculty of the University, followed by present and former students, entered the Hall in procession and took their allotted places. The predominance of academic costume in the assemblage on the stage, gave the scene a picturesque character unusual in large gatherings in Baltimore.

The Rev. J. Houston Eccleston, D. D., then offered the following

### PRAYER.

O Almighty God, the fountain of light and wisdom, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy, look with favor we beseech Thee upon this University. Enlarge the number of its friends and benefactors, and reward them with Thy mercy for whatever of good in its behalf they may design or do. Make it a blessing to Thy Church and to

our country. Preserve it from every enemy and every evil. Give Thy grace to all those to whom the management of its affairs and the instruction and government of its members are confided, that they may discharge their respective duties acceptably to Thee. And to the students from time to time assembled, give Thy grace and blessing, that they may successfully pursue their studies, may be saved from the snares of indolence and vice, and may perform their duties in Thy holy fear, and may lead a sober, righteous and godly life. Let Thy Fatherly hand, we pray Thee, ever be over all these Thy servants. Let Thy Holy Spirit ever be with them, and so lead them in the knowledge and obedience of Thy truth that, in the end, they may obtain everlasting life. And all of this we ask in the name of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

Our Father Who art in Heaven, etc., etc.

President Ira Remsen then opened the proceedings:

#### PRESIDENT REMSEN'S ADDRESS.

Friends of the Johns Hopkins University: The authorities of this University have invited you to join with them in celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation. They rejoice that their invitation has been so generally and so generously accepted, and they only regret that they have not



been able to secure an auditorium large enough to accommodate all who have expressed themselves as desirous of being present, and whom they would be glad to see. We welcome you. Your presence here and the messages of many who are not present, will, I can assure you, serve as the greatest stimulus for us. The main object of this—our first public meeting—is to talk over old times. It is, as it were, the celebration of the attainment of our majority; we are still young, and we are aware of the fact; we are not ashamed of it; we are glad to have with us so many distinguished representatives of our older, and still younger, universities from one end of the land to the other, and from our neighbor, Canada. We are glad also to welcome the representatives of the Nation, the State and the City, and above all, we welcome our Alumni, who are our jewels. It is our earnest desire that their home-coming may be to them as pleasant as it is to us to have them here. To-day is to be devoted to our brief past. There is only one who can speak authoritatively on this theme, and I ask your attention to the words of one who has many titles, old and new, but I am sure that none is more agreeable to him than that which I shall venture to use now: I call upon our President:—

President Emeritus Daniel Coit Gilman then delivered the following address:

## PRESIDENT GILMAN'S ADDRESS.

This is not the time, although it is a birthday, to review the infancy of this University. Reminiscences of the cradle and the nursery are profoundly interesting to a very small number of the near and dear, but according to a formula, which may be stated with mathematical precision, the interest varies inversely as the square of the distance.

It is meet and right and our bounden duty to commemorate the munificence of the founder, who in his grove at Clifton, and at his residence in town, spent the close of his life in perfecting a plan by which his fortune might be made to benefit humanity. Two noble purposes, the education of youth and the relief of suffering,—the Johns Hopkins University and the Johns Hopkins Hospital,—became the objects of his thought and bounty. It would be pleasant to dwell upon the personalities of his early advisers,—three of whom may now witness our fervent congratulations. We might journey with them to Cambridge, New Haven, Ithaca, Ann Arbor, and Charlottesville, as they engaged in enquiries respecting the nature and offices of those leading universities, an example of original research, praiseworthy and beneficial. We might sit with them in a little room on North Charles Street, and listen to Presidents Eliot,

Angell, and White as they were subjected to 'interviews,' recorded by the swift strokes of the stenographic pen, and now preserved in our archives. We might wonder by what process the Trustees selected a president, and be willing to learn what he said to them in his earliest conversation. It would gratify some curiosity to review the correspondence carried on with those who afterward became members of the faculty,—and with those who did not. It would be an extraordinary pleasure to the speaker on this occasion, to awaken the memories of those early days of unbounded enthusiasm and unfettered ideality, well described in a periodical by one who was here at the outset,—days which surprised and delighted intelligent observers.

These temptations must be avoided. The occasion is too important, the audience too varied, the visitors too many and too distinguished, to warrant the employment of this brief hour in personal reminiscences and local congratulations. We are rather bound to consider some of the grave problems of education which have engaged, during a quarter of a century, the study of able and learned men, and have led to the development, in this country, of the idea of the University. This period has seen marvellous improvements in higher education, and although, in the history of intellectual development, the nineteenth century may not be as

significant as the thirteenth, when modern universities came into being at Bologna, Paris, and Oxford, yet we have lived at a time when forces have been set to work of the highest significance. Libraries, seminaries and laboratories have been enlarged and established in every part of the land.

Let us go back to the year 1876, that year of jubilee, when the centennial celebration in Philadelphia brought together, in open concord, states and peoples separated by dissension and war. Representatives from every part of the land assembled, in the City of Brotherly Love, to commemorate the growth of a century. The triumph of liberal and industrial arts, the progress of architecture, sculpture, and painting, were interpreted by the music of our Sidney Lanier. The year was certainly propitious. So was the place. Maryland was a central state, and Baltimore a midway station between the North and the South. The people had been divided by the war, but there were no battle fields in our neighborhood to keep in mind the strife of brethren. The State of Maryland had been devoted to the idea of higher education ever since an enthusiast in the earliest colonial days projected the establishment of a university on an island in the Susquehanna. Liberal charters had been granted to colleges, of which St. John's, the successor of the first free school, must have honorable mention, a college

likely to be increasingly useful during the twentieth century. The University of Maryland, with scanty resources, encouraged professional training in law, medicine, and the liberal arts, (nominally also, in theology,) but its efforts were restricted by the lack of funds. Nathan R. Smith, David Hoffman and other men of eminence were in the faculty. The Catholic Church had established within the borders of the state a large number of important schools of learning. One of them, St. Mary's College, under the cultivated fathers of St. Sulpice, had been the training place of some of the original promoters of the Johns Hopkins University. Yet there was nothing within the region between Philadelphia and Charlottesville, between the Chesapeake and the Ohio, which embodied, in 1876, the idea of a true university. Thus it appears that the time, the place and the circumstances, were favorable to an endowment which seemed to be extraordinarily large, for the munificence of Rockefeller, Stanford and Carnegie could not be foreseen.

The founder made no effort to unfold a plan. He simply used one word,—UNIVERSITY,—and he left it to his successors to declare its meaning in the light of the past, in the hope of the future. There is no indication that he was interested in one branch of knowledge more than in another. He had no educational 'fad.' There is no evidence that he had read the writings of Cardinal Newman

or of Mark Pattison, and none that the great parliamentary reports had come under his eye. He was a large-minded man, who knew that the success of the foundation would depend upon the wisdom of those to whom its development was entrusted; and the Trustees were large-minded men who knew that their efforts must be guided by the learning, the experience, and the devotion of the Faculty. There was a natural desire, in this locality, that the principal positions should be filled by men with whom the community was acquainted, but the Trustees were not governed by an aspiration so provincial. They sought the best men that could be found, without regard to the places where they were born, or the colleges where they had been educated. So, on Washington's birthday, in 1876, after words of benediction from the President of Harvard University, our early counsellor and our constant friend, the plans of this University were publicly announced in the President's inaugural speech.

As I cast my thoughts backward, memories of the good and great who have been members of our society rise vividly before us,—benefactors who have aided us by generous gifts, in emergencies and in prosperity; faithful guardians of the trust; illustrious teachers; and brilliant scholars who have proceeded to posts of usefulness and honor, now and then in Japan, in India, in Canada, but

most of them in our own land, from Harvard to the Golden Gate.

I must not linger, but lead you on to broader themes. May I venture to assume that we are an assembly of idealists. As such I speak; as such you listen. We are also practical men. As such, we apply ourselves to useful purposes, and to our actions we apply the test of common sense. Are our aims high enough? are they too high? are our methods justified by experience? are they approved by the judgment of our peers? can we see any results from the labors of five and twenty years? can we justify a vigorous appeal for enlargement? These and kindred questions press themselves for consideration on this memorial day. But in trying to answer them, let us never lose sight of the ideal,—let us care infinitely more for the future than we do for the past. Let us compare our work with what is done elsewhere and with what might be done in Baltimore. In place of pride and satisfaction, or of regret that our plans have been impeded, let us rejoice that the prospects are so encouraging, that the opportunities of yesterday will be surpassed to-morrow.

If it be true that “the uses of Adversity” are sweet,—Adversity that “wears yet a precious jewel in his head,”—let us look forward to leaving our restricted site for a permanent home where our academic life will be “exempt from public haunt,”

where we shall "find tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, sermons in stones, and good in every thing." In faith and hope and gratitude, I have a vision of Homewood, where one person and another will build the structures of which we stand in so much need,—where scholarship will have its quiet retreat, where experimental science will be removed from the jar of the city street, where health and vigor will be promoted by athletic sports in the groves of Academus. The promised land which Moses sees from Pisgah, our Joshua will possess.

At the close of our civil war came the opportunity of Baltimore. It led to an extraordinary and undesigned fulfilment of an aspiration of George Washington. As his exact language is not often quoted, I venture to give it here. In his last will and testament, after expressing his ardent desire that local attachments and State prejudices should disappear, he uses the following words:

"Looking anxiously forward to the accomplishment of so desirable an object as this is (in my estimation), my mind has not been able to contemplate any plan more likely to effect the measure, than the establishment of a University *in the central part of the United States*, to which the youths of fortune and talents from all parts thereof may be sent for the completion of their education, in all the branches of polite literature, in arts and sciences, in acquiring knowledge in the principles of politics and good government, and, as a matter of infinite importance in my judgment, by associating with each other, and forming



friendships in juvenile years, be enabled to free themselves in a proper degree from those local prejudices and habitual jealousies which have just been mentioned, and which, when carried to excess, are never-failing sources of disquietude to the public mind, and pregnant of mischievous consequences to this country."

You will please to notice that he did not speak of a university in Washington, but of a university "in the central part of the United States." What is now the central part of the United States? Is it Chicago or is it Baltimore?

Let me now proceed to indicate the conditions which existed in this country when our work was projected. You will see that extraordinary advances have been made. The munificent endowments of Mr. John D. Rockefeller and of Mr. and Mrs. Leland Stanford, the splendid generosity of the State legislatures in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and other Western States, the enlarged resources of Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Pennsylvania and other well established universities, and now the unique and unsurpassed generosity of Mr. Carnegie, have entirely changed the aspects of liberal education and of scientific investigation.

As religion, the relation of finite man to the Infinite, is the most important of all human concerns, I begin by a brief reference to the attitude of universities toward Faith and Knowledge. The earliest universities of Europe were either founded

by the Church or by the State. Whatever their origin, they were under the control, to a large extent, of ecclesiastical authorities. These traditions came to our country, and the original colleges were founded by learned and godly men, most of them, if not all, ministers of the gospel. Later, came the State universities and later still, the private foundations like that in which we are concerned. Gradually, among the Protestants, laymen have come to hold the chief positions of authority formerly held by the clergy. The official control, however, is less interesting at this moment than the attitude of universities toward the advancement of knowledge. To-day, happily, apprehensions are not felt, to any great extent, respecting the advancement of science. It is more and more clearly seen that the interpretation of the laws by which the universe is governed, extending from the invisible rays of the celestial world to the most minute manifestations of organic life, reveal one plan, one purpose, one supreme sovereignty—far transcending the highest conceptions to which the human mind can attain respecting this sovereign and infinite Power. Sectarian supremacy and theological differences have dwindled therefore to insignificance, in institutions where the supreme desire is to understand the world in which we are placed, and to develop the ablest intellects of each generation, subservient to the primeval injunction “replenish

the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Notwithstanding these words, the new biology, that is the study of living creatures, encountered peculiar prejudices and opposition. It was the old story over again. Geology, early in the century, had been violently attacked; astronomy, in previous centuries, met its bitter opponents; higher criticism is now dreaded. Yet quickly and patiently the investigator has prosecuted and will continue his search for the truth,—heedless of consequences, assured by the Master's words,—“the Truth shall make you free.”

Still the work goes on. Science is recognized as the handmaid of religion. Evolution is regarded by many theologians as confirming the strictest doctrines of predestination. The propositions which were so objectionable thirty years ago are now received with as little alarm as the propositions of Euclid. There are mathematicians who do not regard the Euclidean geometry as the best mode of presenting certain mathematical truths, and there are also naturalists who will not accept the doctrines of Darwin, without limitation or modification, but nobody thinks of fighting over the utterances of either of these philosophers. In fact, I think it one of the most encouraging signs of our times that devout men, devoted to scientific study,

see no conflict between their religious faith and their scientific knowledge. Is it not true that as the realm of Knowledge extends the reign of Faith, though restricted, remains? Is it not true that Science to-day is as far from demonstrating certain great propositions, which in the depths of our souls we all believe, as it was in the days of the Greek philosophers? This university, at the outset, assumed the position of a fearless and determined investigator of nature. It carried on its work with quiet, reverent, and unobtrusive recognition of the immanence of divine power,—of the Majesty, Dominion, and Might, known to men by many names, revered by us in the words that we learned from our mothers' lips, Almighty God, the Father Everlasting.

Another danger, thirty years ago, was that of conflict between the advocates of classical and scientific study. For many centuries Greek and Latin were supreme in the faculty of liberal arts, enforced and strengthened by metaphysics and mathematics. During the last half century, physical and natural sciences have claimed an equal rank. The promotion has not been yielded without a struggle, but it is pleasant to remember that in this place, no conflict has arisen. Among us, one degree, that of Bachelor of Arts, is given alike to the students of the Humanities and the students of Nature, and the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

may be won by advanced work in the most remote languages of the past or in the most recent developments of biology and physics. Two illustrious teachers were the oldest members of the original faculty;—one of them universally recognized as among the foremost geometricians of the world,—the other, renowned for his acquaintance with the masters of thought in many tongues, and especially for his appreciation of the writers of ancient Greece, upon whose example all modern literature is based.

Our fathers spoke of “Church and State,” and we but repeat their ideas when we say that universities are the promoters of pure religion and wise government. This university has not been identified with political partisanship,—though, its members, like all patriots, have held and expressed their opinions upon current questions, local and national. Never have the political views of any teacher helped or hindered his preferment; nor have I any idea what would be the result of the party classification of our staff. This, however, may be claimed. The study of politics, in the sense of Freeman, “History is past politics, and politics present history,” has been diligently promoted. The principles of Roman law, international arbitration, jurisprudence, economics and institutional history have here been set forth and inculcated,—so that in every part of the land, we can

point to our graduates as the wise interpreters of political history, the strong promoters of democratic institutions, the firm believers in the merit system of appointments, and in local self-government.

A phrase which has lately been in vogue is original research. Like all other new terms, it is often misapplied, often misunderstood. It may be the highest occupation of the human mind. It may be the most insignificant. A few words may therefore be requisite to explain our acceptance of this word. When this university began, it was a common complaint, still uttered in many places, that the ablest teachers were absorbed in routine and were forced to spend their strength in the discipline of tyros, so that they had no time for carrying forward their studies or for adding to human knowledge. Here the position was taken at the outset that the chief professors should have ample time to carry on the higher work for which they had shown themselves qualified, and also that younger men, as they gave evidence of uncommon qualities, should likewise be encouraged to devote themselves to study. Even those who were candidates for degrees were taught what was meant by profitable investigation. They were shown how to discover the limits of the known; how to extend, even by minute accretions, the realm of knowledge; how to coöperate with other men in the prosecution of inquiry; and how to record in exact language,

and on the printed page, the results attained. Investigation has thus been among us the duty of every leading professor, and he has been the guide and inspirer of fellows and pupils, whose work may not bear his name, but whose results are truly products of the inspiration and guidance which he has freely bestowed.

The complaint was often heard, in the early seventies, that no provision was made in this country for post-graduate work except in the three professional schools. Accordingly, a system of fellowships, of scholarships, and of other provisions for advanced study was established here, so well adapted to the wants of the country at that time that its provisions have been widely copied in other places. It now seems as if there was danger of rivalry in the solicitation of students, which is certainly unworthy, and there is danger also that too many men will receive stipendiary encouragement to prepare themselves for positions they can never attain. In the early days of the French Academy when a seat in that body was a very great prize, a certain young man was told to wait until he was older, and the remark was added that in order to secure good speed from horses, a basket of oats should always be tied to the front of the carriage pole as a constant incitement. It would indeed be a misfortune if a system of fellowships should be open to this objection. Nevertheless,

whoever scans our register of Fellows will discover that many of the ablest men in the country, of the younger generation, have here received encouragement and aid.

When this university began, the opportunities for scientific publication in this country were very meagre. The American Journal of Science was the chief repository for short and current papers. The memoirs of a few learned societies came out at slow intervals and could not be freely opened to investigators. This university, in the face of obvious objection, determined to establish certain journals which might be the means of communication between the scholars of this country and those abroad. Three journals were soon commenced: The American Journal of Mathematics; the American Journal of Philology; the American Chemical Journal. Remember that these were "American" journals, in fact as well as in name, open to all the scholars of the country. Other periodicals came afterwards, devoted to History and Politics, to Biology, to Modern Languages, to Experimental Medicine and to Anatomy. Moderate appropriations were made to foreign journals of great importance which lacked support, the English Journal of Physiology and the German Journal of Assyriology. Nor were the appropriations of the Trustees restricted to periodical literature. Generous encouragement was given to the publication of important treatises,



like the researches of Dr. Brooks upon Salpa: to the physiological papers of Dr. Martin; to the studies in logic of Mr. Peirce and his followers; to Professor Rowland's magnificent photographs of the solar spectrum; to the printing of a facsimile of the earliest Christian document after the times of the Apostles; and recently, with the coöperation of the University of Tübingen, to the exact reproduction by Dr. Bloomfield of a unique manuscript which has an important bearing upon comparative philology.

I am not without apprehensions that our example to the country has been infelicitous, not less than thirty institutions being known to me, which are now engaged in the work of publication. The consequence is that it is almost impossible for scholars to find out and make use of many important memoirs, which are thus hidden away. One of the problems for the next generation to solve is the proper mode of encouraging the publication of scientific treatises.

I cannot enumerate the works of scholarship which have been published without the aid of the university by those connected with it,—studies in Greek syntax, in mathematics, in history, in chemistry, in medicine and surgery, in economics, in pathology and in many other branches. The administration now closing can have no monument more enduring than the great mass of contributions

to knowledge, which are gathered, (like the cairn of boulders and pebbles which commemorates in Cracow the burial place of Kosciusko), a bibliothecal cairn, in the office of the Trustees, to remind every officer and every visitor of our productivity in science and letters.

There are many who believe that the noblest work in which we have engaged is the advancement of medical education and science. Several agencies have been favorable. The munificence of the founder established a hospital, which was recognized as soon as it was opened, as the foremost of its kind in Christendom. He directed that when completed it should be a part of the University and, accordingly, when the time came for organizing a medical and surgical staff, the principal professors were simultaneously appointed to the chairs of one institution, to the clinics of the other. They were to be constantly exercised in the relief of suffering and in the education of youth. For the lack of the requisite funds, the University at first provided only for instruction in those scientific branches which underlie the science of medicine. At length, the organization of the school of medicine was made possible by a very large gift of money, received from a lady of Baltimore, who was familiar with the requirements of medical science, and eager to see that they were met. By her munificence the University was

enabled to organize and maintain that great department which now reflects so much honor upon this city, and which does so much by example, by publication, by systematic instruction, and by investigation to carry forward those varied sciences, anatomy, physiology, physiological chemistry, pharmacy, pathology, and the various branches of medicine and surgery. In accordance with the plans of the University, the generous donor made it a condition of her gift that candidates for the degree of Doctor of Medicine should be those only who had taken a baccalaureate degree based upon a prolonged study of science and the modern languages. A four years' course of study was also prescribed and women were admitted to the classes upon the same terms as men. The liberal and antecedent aid of women throughout the country in the promotion of these plans is commemorated by a building inscribed "the Women's Fund Memorial Building." The excellent laboratory facilities, the clinical opportunities, the organization of a training school for nurses, and especially the ability of the physicians and surgeons, have excited abundant emulation and imitation in other parts of the country,—a wonderful gain to humanity. It is more and more apparent among us that a medical school should be a part of a university and closely affiliated with a hospital. It is also obvious that

the right kind of preliminary training should be antecedent to medical studies.

I must ask the indulgence of our friends from a distance as I now dwell, for a moment, on the efforts which have been made to identify the Johns Hopkins University with the welfare of the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. Such a hospital and such medical advisers as I have referred to are not the only benefits of our foundation. The journals, which carry the name of Baltimore to every learned society in the world are a minor but serviceable advantage. The promotion of sanitary reform is noteworthy, the study of taxation and in general of municipal conditions, the purification of the local supply of water, the advancement of public education by courses of instruction offered to teachers, diligent attention to the duties of charity and philanthropy, these are among the services which the faculty have rendered to the city of their homes. Their efforts are not restricted to the city. A prolonged scientific study of the oyster, its life history, and the influences which help or hinder its production, is a valuable contribution. The establishment of a meteorological service throughout the State in connection with the Weather Bureau of the United States is also important. Not less so is the Geological Survey of Maryland, organized with the coöperation of the United States Geological Survey, to promote a

knowledge of the physical resources of the State, exact maps, the improvement of highways, and the study of water supplies, of conditions favorable to agriculture, and of deposits of mineral wealth, within this region. To the efficiency of these agencies it is no doubt due that the State of Maryland has twice contributed to the general fund of the university.

Nor have our studies been merely local. The biological laboratory, the first establishment of its kind in this country, has carried forward for many years the study of marine life at various points on the Atlantic and has published many important memoirs, while it has trained many able investigators now at work in every part of the land. Experimental psychology was here introduced. Bacteriology early found a home among us. The contributions to chemistry have been numerous and important. Here was the cradle of saccharine, that wisely diffused and invaluable concentration of sweetness, whose manufacturers unfortunately do not acknowledge the source to which it is due. In the physical laboratory, light has been thrown upon three fundamental subjects:—the mechanical equivalent of heat, the exact value of the standard ohm, and the elucidation of the nature of the solar spectrum. For many years this place was the chief seat in this country for pure and advanced mathematics. The study of languages and litera-

ture, oriental, classical, and modern, has been assiduously promoted. Where has the Bible received more attention than is given to it in our Semitic department? where the study of ancient civilization in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Palestine? where did the Romance languages, in their philological aspect first receive attention? To American and institutional history, persistent study has been given. Of noteworthy significance also are the theses required of those who are admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, which must be printed before the candidate is entitled to all the honors of the degree.

I might enlarge this category, but I will refrain. The time allotted to me is gone. Yet I cannot sit down without bringing to your minds the memories of those who have been with us and have gone out from us to be seen no more: Sylvester, that profound thinker devoted to abstractions, the illustrious geometer, whose seven prolific years were spent among us and who gave an impulse to mathematical researches in every part of this country; Morris, the Oxford graduate, the well trained classicist, devout, learned, enthusiastic, and helpful, most of all in the education of the young; accomplished Martin, who brought to this country new methods of physiological inquiry, led the way in the elucidation of many problems of profound importance, and trained up those who have carried

his methods to every part of the land; Adams, suggestive, industrious, inspiring, versatile, beneficent, who promoted, as none had done before, systematic studies of the civil, ecclesiastical, and educational resources of this country; and Rowland, cut down like Adams in his prime, honored in every land, peer of the greatest physicists of our day, never to be forgotten in the history of physical science. I remind you also of the early student of mathematics, Thomas Craig, and of George Huntington Williams, the geologist, whose memory is cherished with admiration and love. Nor do I forget those who have here been trained to become leaders in their various departments throughout the country. One must be named, who has gone from their number, Keeler, the gifted astronomer, who died as the chief of the Lick Observatory in California, whose contributions to astronomical science place him among the foremost investigators of our day; and another, the martyr Lazear, who, in order that the pestilence of yellow fever might be subdued, gave up his life for humanity.

Like clouds that rake the mountain summit,  
Or waves that own no curbing hand,  
How fast has brother followed brother  
From sunshine to the sunless land.

It is sad to recall these interrupted careers. It is delightful to remember the elevated character of

those I have named, and delightful to think of hundreds who have been with us, carriers to distant parts of our country and to other lands of the seeds which they gathered in our gardens of science. It is delightful to live in this age of bounty; it is delightful to know that the citizens of Baltimore who in former years have supplemented the gifts of the founder by more than a million of dollars have come forward to support a new administration with the gift of a site of unsurpassed beauty and fitness. A new day dawns. 'It is always sunrise somewhere in the world.'

[The speaker then turned to the Faculty, who were seated upon his left. They rose, and he addressed them as follows:—]

*Dear Brothers:*

We have been comrades on the field, seamen on the deep, toilers in the mines, but we have been delving, sailing, striving not for fame or pelf, but for that which is more precious than rubies. Each one has shared in the acquisitions of others, has rejoiced in their honors. Consider our pursuits. Some have discovered in cuneiform tablets and in Egyptian hieroglyphics clues to the origin of religion and government. The Bible has been studied in its original texts and in modern versions, with the reverence that is its due. The



teachings of Plato and Aristotle, the poetry of Pindar and Sophocles, the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides have been presented to us as living authors. We have listened to the eloquence of Cicero, reviewed the Annals of Tacitus. Dante is no stranger here. Chaucer and Shakespeare are our friends. The writers of modern Europe are likewise known and honored. Ancient and modern history has had strong votaries.

So too in science. The regions of abstract thought have been penetrated by mathematicians and logicians. The arcana of nature have been opened to the researches of chemistry, physics and biology.

In such companionship, it has been delightful to live and study and teach and work in Baltimore, to watch the unfolding of talents and the preparation of bright youth for the activities of life. In the face of difficulties our standard has never been lowered. In joyous exhilaration we have breathed the oxygen of high altitudes.

Now I look forward five and twenty years. In a spacious lawn, surrounded by noble trees and beautiful shrubbery, stands a majestic building devoted to the library, the very heart of academic life.

Near by, two halls are consecrated to museums of natural history and the fine arts. There are working rooms for all branches of science. The spire of a chapel points heavenward. Here is a

fountain, there a statue. An open field is well trodden by athletic exercises. The colonial dwelling, once the home of an illustrious patriot, is now the president's house. On the borders of the ground are residences of the faculty and students. An air of repose, of reflection, and of study pervades the place. It is the home of bright and earnest youth fitting themselves for the various pursuits of life. Beneath the Wyman oak, sits an antiquary, reading in a musty pamphlet the record of the nineteenth century, and I hear him say: "Those men were the modern knights of King Arthur, pledged to a noble quest, the quest for truth, and bound to their university by ties of loyalty, affection, and lofty aspiration."

At the close of President Gilman's address, President Remsen introduced Professor Woodrow Wilson, in the following terms:—

Our next experience is, in one respect, somewhat unusual. A secret is to be revealed to us—a secret that has been published in the newspapers, like all our other secrets. This being a secret, I shall not of course reveal it myself, for it is not my secret. I call upon Professor Woodrow Wilson.

Professor Wilson then arose, holding in his hand a sumptuous volume, and made the following address of presentation:—

## PROFESSOR WILSON'S ADDRESS.

Doctor Gilman, the part I have to play is very small, but very gratifying. I hold in my hand a beautiful volume in which is engrossed an address from the Alumni, Graduates and Faculty of the Johns Hopkins University. It is an address of affection and congratulation, and I esteem it, Sir, one of the most pleasureable privileges and honors of my life that I should have been asked to represent such a body of men, for, in representing them,—as you yourself have said,—I feel that I am representing men who have taken from this University an ideal which has lifted their lives to a plane they might not otherwise have attained; an ideal, Sir, of the service of truth not only, but of the service through truth, of the country of which they are citizens.

It is a significant thing, Sir, that the service of this University, inconspicuous in its methods, should nevertheless have drawn the attention of the nation upon it, and have led the government of this country to call upon men of the Johns Hopkins to assist in pushing forward the affairs of the nation. For, Sir, in encouraging the kind of study for which the Johns Hopkins has stood, the study which has its face forward toward the future and whose object is the extension of the realm of

knowledge, it has been made evident that knowledge lives; that it is but a part of the power of achievement, fit to serve the nation in the present and in the future. America is not a child of books, she is a child of action,—and the sort of learning which you have fostered, is learning in action, not in reminiscence. If men have tired of classical study, it is because they have forgotten,—and sometimes even those who profess those ancient studies have themselves forgotten,—that though the language is dead, the stuff of thought which the language carries is still an integral part of the stuff of the world's thinking. They have here seen the classical learning live again, and it is for this reason that you and others who have stood with you have been honored by being called into the counsels of the nation; for at last learning is abroad, it has not kept within its cloister. And this, Sir, it seems to me, is the significance of this address,—coming from these men, some of them themselves distinguished, who thus come back to the source of their inspiration to show with friendly affection and acknowledge the signal obligations under which you have placed them.

#### CONGRATULATORY ADDRESS.

“To Daniel Coit Gilman, Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Doctor of Laws, formerly Pro-

fessor in Yale University and President of the University of California, organizer and first President of the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, on the occasion of his retirement from the presidency. Presented on commemoration day, the twenty-second of February, in the year of our Lord, 1902.

“We, members of the Johns Hopkins University, upon this, the occasion of your laying down the burdens of your high office, greatly desiring to make formal acknowledgment of our personal obligation to you, unite in a common testimonial of our respect, our gratitude and our affection.

“We believe that the services which you have rendered to education have not been surpassed by those of any other American. If it be true that Thomas Jefferson first laid the broad foundation for American universities in his plans for the University of Virginia, it is no less true that you were the first to create and organize in America a university in which the discovery and dissemination of new truths were conceded a rank superior to mere instruction, and in which the efficiency and value of research as an educational instrument were exemplified in the training of many investigators. In this, your greatest achievement, you established in America a new and higher university ideal, whose essential feature was not stately edifices, nor yet the mere association of pupils

with learned and eminent teachers, but rather the education of trained and vigorous young minds through the search for truth under the guidance and with the co-operation of master investigators—*societas magistrorum et discipulorum*. That your conception was intrinsically sound is attested not only by the fruitfulness of the institution in which it was embodied at Baltimore, but also by its influence upon the development of the university ideal throughout our country, and notably at our oldest and most distinguished seats of learning.

“Your catholicity of spirit was such that you looked at each part of the university in its relation to the whole, at the whole university in its relation to the whole system of American education, and at that system of education as a vital force in the life of the State. Moreover, it has brought to you opportunities of varied and public service, of which you have honorably acquitted yourself—now from a learned society, again from an organization of some of the most patriotic of your fellow citizens; now from the City of Baltimore, again from the State of Maryland, yet again from the Chief Magistrate of the United States.

“We affirm that through the influence of the Johns Hopkins University the whole country has been led to place a higher and juster estimate upon the ‘improvement of natural knowledge,

the cultivation of liberal learning and the development of power in culture.

“We affirm that your wisdom and ability in the choice of those who should aid you in the making of the new university were extraordinary. You also first recognized the importance of publication as a function and a duty of a modern university, and by your demonstration of its feasibility and value you set a quickening example which has been widely followed.

“We affirm that you displayed remarkable insight in appreciating the necessity and practicability of providing for the highest medical education and more abundant medical investigation in America, and we rejoice that you had the foresight and the patience to wait until the Johns Hopkins Hospital and the Johns Hopkins Medical School could be so established, organized and equipped that they should forthwith exert a commanding influence upon the methods and aims of medical education in the United States.

“You have encouraged the study of languages, literature and poetry; you have guarded the interest of religion: you have stimulated the development of the exact sciences; you have promoted the wider exploration of the heavens and of the earth, and you have been influential in diffusing a better knowledge of the world.

“These and many other things you have done.

And now that you have chosen to lay down the honorable but heavy burdens of leadership in our beloved University and to seek in well-earned retirement the quiet and repose which befit the afternoon of life, we, who have served under you—we, who have been disciples of so admirable a master—do give you hail, and tender to you our loyal, filial devotion. Your ideals have become our inspiration.

“Your sympathy in its fullness and kindness has been an unspeakable help and blessing to more of your colleagues and students than you can ever know. Undaunted in adversity you have given us the example of resourcefulness and cheerful confidence. In your position as a leader of men, who were themselves to become leaders, your course has been informed by a masterful courage, a lofty faith and a noble idealism which will continue to illumine our land when you and we are no longer here.

“And in token of our confidence in the validity and permanence of the ideals which you have set before us, and in grateful acknowledgment of all that you have done for us and for the world, we have hereunto subscribed our names.”

Then follow, Sir, the signatures of one thousand and twelve men. Some of them are here in body; all are here in spirit.



This address, Sir, has spoken of your having retired to enjoy the afternoon of life. I venture to say, Sir, in view of your new and responsible undertaking, that that afternoon promises to be like our generous autumn in this country, which seems to contain all the tonic of the year for a long season through, in which men rejoice to be strong.

We not only give you hail, but we give you God-speed.

President Gilman then acknowledged the gift in the following words:—

#### PRESIDENT GILMAN'S ACCEPTANCE.

The deepest streams are those most silent. I do not know what to say in return for this magnificent evidence of your affection. Least of all do I know what to say in return for these kind words, except that I could not receive them were I not sure that they belong as well to those gentlemen on the left with whom I have been associated. It is their work, let me tell you, and not mine; it is their work which has made possible the occasion which we are celebrating, and which has been the occasion of your getting this beautiful volume,—those that are here and those that are gone. I wish I had a thousand hands, and I wish I could shake hands with every one who is here, and

with all those whom you represent. Go on, my brothers; bear the banner wherever you go, the banner of our University. God's blessing be with you.

President Remsen next called upon Principal William Peterson of McGill University, Montreal, in these words:—

We turn now to those who represent our sister Universities for special messages. We have received many from those who are not present; I wish I had time to read some of them, or most of them, but time forbids; it will be impossible, as well, for us to hear from all who are present; the circumstances are such that we shall have to content ourselves with listening to a very few who represent the larger body here assembled.

I call first upon the representative of McGill University of Montreal, Principal Peterson.

Principal Peterson responded as follows:—

#### PRINCIPAL PETERSON'S ADDRESS.

Mr. President, Dr. Gilman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Over six and twenty years ago I learned from some American fellow students at Göttingen that a new star had arisen in the west,—a university which was to begin where other universities

left off. And after such an interval it is for me a matter of great pride and pleasure to be so prominently associated with this great day of glad commemoration and gratifying retrospect.

Perhaps I owe the distinguished compliment which has been paid to me, in a great measure, to the fact that I come before you as the citizen of another country. I am almost afraid to admit, especially on what I am told is the eve of George Washington's birthday, that I am a foreigner. I have taken part at other University gatherings in this country, as what you call a "foreign delegate," and I never like to accept the estranging designation, without a protest, before such an assembly as this. But if I am to be a foreign delegate, let me try to pose as a composite and cosmopolitan example of the type. I have just spoken of Göttingen, Mr. President, but I bring you also, as a graduate of each, compliments and congratulations from the University of Edinburgh, from Oxford, from little St. Andrew's in Scotland, that shall soon celebrate her five-hundredth birthday, as well as cordial greetings from your Canadian sister up in Montreal. And here, let me say at once for McGill,—I am sure I shall be allowed to speak also for my colleagues from Toronto,—how highly we in Canada appreciate the great hospitality which the Johns Hopkins University has ever extended to our graduate students. Many of

them owe much of the success they have achieved in after life to the opportunities of further study which they have enjoyed in your halls. If anything, you are perhaps a little too hospitable: you have kept, and you are still keeping from McGill, Dr. William Osler.

Mr. President, I understand that the list of colleges and universities that send their graduate students to the Johns Hopkins totals nearly two hundred; and if they were all here they would speak with one voice, and the homage they would render would be offered in identical terms by all.

We have all been shining—as it were—in the reflected glory of the high ideals with which your University began her course twenty-five years ago, and the stimulus of your example has penetrated every department of university activity, not in the smaller colleges alone, but also—as stated in the address that has just been read by Professor Wilson—in the larger and more distinguished centres of learning. Nowhere more than here has a forcible and a real expression been given to the view that the higher teaching cannot claim to be fully inspired when it does not go hand in hand with zeal for extending the boundaries of human knowledge; that it is not enough for a University to teach science and learning ready made, as it were, instead of taking an active hand in the making of them; that professors must never cease

to be students; and that the crown and coping-stone of thorough education comes only through training in research and independent investigation.

Mr. President, it is not for me to add my poor words of eulogy to those which have been already spoken in regard to your distinguished predecessor, although I may be permitted to say of Dr. Gilman, that we all recognize in him at once the type of college president who steadfastly refuses to look upon his institution as a mere academic ornament, and strives instead to make it a centre of practical usefulness in the community.

I have been told that the sympathies of the Johns Hopkins are so wide and comprehensive as to range from local industries like the oyster culture of Maryland and Virginia to a study of the economic conditions of Porto Rico. In all this we see the guiding hand of your emeritus president. And now he is going to serve your country in another capacity, as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Institute at Washington. A sum of money equal to that which he had previously distributed among the four universities of his native land, Mr. Carnegie has now made available at one centre in the country of his adoption. Surely at this rate of progress in all departments, and not as Dr. Osler lately said, in reference to medical science only, the centre of gravity is crossing the

Atlantic and will soon be found in the United States.

Gentlemen of the Johns Hopkins University, the century that lies before us is big with issues of the utmost importance for human life and happiness. Under improved conditions, with greater material means of betterment, the work and office of our universities will go forward on lines that Mr. Jowett, the late master of Balliol, liked to picture himself when he thought of the university, not perhaps as a ladder let down from heaven to earth, but rather as a bridge that might connect the various branches of human learning, so apt to become estranged from one another, and that might also unite the different classes of society, and at the same time help to bring about a more friendly feeling among the different sects of religion. That ideal is one which I am sure the Johns Hopkins of the future, as well as the Carnegie Institute, will do much to realize for this fortunate, free and highly favored land. To all, as well as to you, sir, I bring cordial congratulations and heart-felt greetings from the sister universities for which I am speaking,—from McGill and from others in your neighbor country, Canada.

President Remsen then rose and in the following words introduced President Arthur Twining Hadley of Yale University :—



I cannot refer to the next speaker without recalling the very pleasant days of last October when Yale was celebrating her two hundredth anniversary. If the president of Yale has a sense of humour, and I am sure he has, he must be smiling in his sleeve—if not laughing, for his sleeve is large enough to-day—when he speaks of this celebration of twenty-five years in comparison with the celebration of two hundred years. The ratio of one to eight will naturally suggest itself, and possibly it has suggested itself to others. However, I am sure that is not the dominant thought in his mind. I take great pleasure in calling upon President Hadley of Yale.

PRESIDENT HADLEY'S ADDRESS.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I can assure your President—if indeed any assurance were needed—that this twenty-fifth anniversary of Johns Hopkins shows that it is true of universities, as of men, that we “live in deeds, not years.” And yet, when all has been said of your glories, so well set forth in your President's address, there is one of them upon which we of the older institution may make our special claim. We have this special share in the glory of Johns Hopkins,—that President Gilman was an alumnus of Yale; that President Gilman is one of the best Yale men in the world

and that the best thing he ever did for Yale was to found Johns Hopkins. And we number also among our alumni Dr. Welch, and other men equally eminent in the service of the Johns Hopkins, if such equality were possible. For these reasons we have special pleasure in an occasion like this, and a special interest in everything that Johns Hopkins does. Just as a father is sometimes proud when one of his sons grows a little taller than he was himself; so we of the older universities of the United States—not from Yale alone, but everywhere,—are proud to welcome the men of Johns Hopkins as members, not of one university only, but of the larger brotherhood of scholars and scientific men of America.

It is a rare pleasure to watch the moment when the leadership passes from Moses to Joshua; to sit at the feet of one and listen to his prophecies just as he is being translated to a sphere of influence which may be wider, but which as I look upon this assembly I dare not call any greater, and with Joshua, to go on over the river of Jordan through which we pass into the promised land. I am glad to think that this accident of the weather, which some of us have deplored, is no mere accident, but rather a symbol of the passage from the plain living and high thinking of the days of old, to the land flowing with milk and honey.



Baltimore has been called the Monumental City ; it is distinguished among all other places in the United States for its memorials ; but there is no memorial whose beauty is so subtle, none whose power is so great, none which reaches so widely as this memorial, more eternal than bronze, conceived in the mind of Johns Hopkins, cast by the hand of Gilman, and destined to grow greater and shine brighter under the leadership of Remsen.

The President next introduced President Charles William Dabney of the University of Tennessee, remarking :—

The relations of the Johns Hopkins University to the South have always been of special interest. Our graduates are teaching in many a Southern institution, and possibly some of them are exerting an influence for good, as I think, many of our graduates do wherever they may go.

It is therefore to me a special pleasure that I have an opportunity to greet a representative of one of the great universities of the South—one of the most earnest workers at the present time in the cause of Southern education. I present to you President Dabney of the University of Tennessee.

## PRESIDENT DABNEY'S ADDRESS.

Mr. President, and our President,—for you have given us the right to call you so,—our president for Southern universities, since we claim Johns Hopkins as a university for the whole South as well as for Maryland.

As I listened, Mr. President, to the magnificent commemorative address, I was reminded of a similar occasion, four months ago this week, when almost the identical company upon this platform to-day, was assembled to celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of Yale College, and when we heard the same eminent gentlemen discuss the influence of that venerable institution upon the development of science and letters in America. We cannot fail to connect, in thought, these two great celebrations; and all who have heard them, have noticed, with great pleasure, that these two superb orations contained a large portion of the history of American higher education.

From Yale College, of 1701, to Johns Hopkins University of 1902—what a span! and what a history! When we consider the influence of American thought and achievement upon the world of to-day—and it is growing yearly, yes, almost monthly—must we not say that this is the

most important period in the history of the race, since the Renaissance?

But, our attention is directed especially, to-day, to the development of the great institutions, which, like Yale and Johns Hopkins, have influenced most powerfully the intellectual development of the race. Taking educational institutions as the mile-stones of our progress, we may divide the history of science and education in America into four great periods:—

1st. The Harvard—Yale—William and Mary period—the earlier state—church colleges. *Pro Christo et ecclesia* was their motto, but they also trained the men for the State, who inaugurated our American system of free public schools, and so made popular government possible.

2nd. The Princeton period—the dissenters' college—the mother of the "log" colleges. Those small colleges of the people, established everywhere throughout the country, laid broad and deep the foundations of classical scholarship, and trained the majority of the great men who founded, defended, and finally established our most important American institutions, church, state and nation.

3rd. The State University period, inaugurated by Thomas Jefferson at the University of Virginia, which was the first institution in this country to break the shackles of the old learning, to introduce the doctrine of freedom of teaching and learning,

with the so-called elective system, and to summon, by its example, all the new States to their duty in the advancement of science and education ; and,

4th. The Johns Hopkins period ; the period of the real graduate Universities,—for Johns Hopkins was the first institution to make research in philosophy, philology, history and science the main objects of its existence, and so became the model for all the other true universities. These are familiar facts, but worth recalling now.

Each of these institutions, in its own way, has filled its day, and all are destined, we hope, to live and serve their country and the world for many generations to come. All honor to each and all !

But, history will, I think, declare that, as Harvard was the great institution of the seventeenth, Yale, the characteristic institution of the first half, and Princeton that of the second half, of the eighteenth century ; as the University of Virginia was the characteristic institution of the first half of the nineteenth, so the Johns Hopkins was the epoch-making university of the last half of the century. How each prepared the way for the others ; how they all grew and multiplied ; how little by little, the truth was discovered and disseminated among the whole people ; how their influence was combined to advance both science and letters in America ; and how all together have contributed to extend American civilization through-

out the world, Dr. Gilman has told us in his two magnificent orations. The orator has left little for us to-day to say, except to point out his own far-seeing thought and masterful activities in making a new epoch in American science and education.

In the sense in which the Germans conceive it, we have in this country no national system of education, and we are glad we have not. Such a system would be totally inconsistent with our free American institutions. We have no place in this country for a machine for manufacturing civil officials, soldiers, diplomats, or even legislators, much less scholars. We have no such national system, but we have a great body of educational institutions; not a machine, but a living organism, potent to beget, nourish and train men competent to discharge all the duties which belong to them as members of a free republic.

This body of institutions is, as we have just seen, a growth, not a creation; the product, not of any government or series of men even, but of the genius of the whole American people, working for two centuries in their own field, with the help of the whole world, to be sure, but guided by the spirit of their own institutions.

First, we laid the foundations of the public schools; upon this was erected the broad platform of the people's colleges. We next erected the superstructure of State Universities. When these

were all ready, and not before, the Johns Hopkins was established, and became the chief corner-stone in the rank of the graduate Universities which have since followed it so rapidly. Like a pyramid, each part rested upon the one which preceded it, and the latest institution bound all the earlier structure together.

This is the occasion of our Jubilee to-day; the rejoicing on the birth-day of the first University distinctly for graduate study and research, the beginning of the topmost course of our American pyramid of education.

But, greater than the institutions, are the forces which made them. Institutions make men, and men make greater and better institutions. We see this grandly illustrated here to-day. This son of old Yale, which belongs to the first period of American history, this heir of all that is best in our earlier institutions, more than any one man ever was before, was the creator of this epoch-making University. Pupil of our elementary schools, graduate of Yale, Superintendent of public schools, Professor in college, President of a State University, and then, President of the first great graduate University of America—what a magnificent career! How nobly representative of our country! Properly, and happily, we are come together to-day, to celebrate the jubilaem of Johns Hopkins University; but more properly, and more

happily do we hail this great father of the University, and rejoice that America has produced such a man.

And, we rejoice to-day, not alone in what he has done, but also in what he is going to do. How appropriate it is that this masterful organizer, this product of our best and creator of our first establishment for graduate work in America, should go from this to the presidency of the greatest scientific institution in the world. We have seen in the Johns Hopkins the type of our most advanced universities, so we hail, in the Carnegie Institute, the type of a new order of scientific institutions.

After the close of President Dabney's address, the President thus called upon President William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago:—

I do not know which side of the next speaker to refer to—he has so many sides—but when I consider his work—and we have all known of it for the past ten years—I am almost inclined to use the word “magician” in characterizing him. He has shown us a number of tricks that some of us would like to learn, and I wish we might all take lessons at the University of Chicago, in one line of activity at least, though there are many in which we should be glad to be instructed.

I call upon President Harper of the University of Chicago:—

## PRESIDENT HARPER'S ADDRESS.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:—We are celebrating, in these days, not only the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Johns Hopkins University, the completion of a quarter of a century of magnificent work by a great University—we are celebrating, also, the close of the first period of University Education in these United States.

During this first period, the University idea has been introduced and established. Nor does the time within which this has taken place, date far back. There were no universities in this country before the war. There were, in fact, no large colleges. But, within thirty years, institutions have come into existence, possessing not only the name, but the character of universities; and old institutions have changed, not only their character, but their names. In other words, the University idea has, beyond question, established itself upon a strong foundation.

(2) The first period has seen the substantial beginning of a differentiation between the college and the University. Some Universities, which include also college work, are drawing a sharp line between the two. Some colleges are recognizing the fact that their future usefulness depends upon their remaining colleges, rather than upon making



an effort to become Universities. There are still some institutions in which this distinction is not appreciated; that is, institutions in which the college work is conducted as if it were a kind of University work, or in which the University work is conducted as if it were still work of a college character. But, the separation is proceeding as rapidly as could be expected; perhaps even more rapidly than could be desired; and it is a change full of significance for the future of University education.

(3) This first period has seen a remarkable growth in the recognition given the work of research and investigation. The professor of former times had little or no opportunity for any work aside from teaching. It is undoubtedly true that in most of our institutions too much lecture work is still required of certain men who have shown special skill in research. But, how different is the situation to-day in comparison with that of thirty years ago. William Dwight Whitney, if he were living to-day, would not be compelled to teach French and German to engineering students, in order to eke out a livelihood.

The spirit of research, once hardly recognized in our higher educational work, is now the controlling spirit, and opportunities for its cultivation abound on every side.

(4) In its very last days, this first period has

seen tangible evidence that a new period, a second period, is being ushered in; for what other interpretation than this may be suggested for the remarkable things that have recently taken place? With the many millions of dollars given directly for research and higher education, with the new foundations which have recently come into being on the Atlantic Coast, in the Mississippi Valley, and on the Pacific Coast, with the results already obtained in the several lines of research and investigation by University men, whose names have become famous for the work they have accomplished; with the maturity that comes from many years devoted to the highest educational ideals, as witnessed by the splendid history of this University, surely there is reason to believe that in the East, in the West, and in the far West, we are preparing to enter upon a new period in the development of University Education.

That this is a common belief, it seems to me, is shown by the fact that within two years the leading universities in the country—fourteen in number—have joined themselves as institutions in an association for the study and consideration of problems which concern university as distinguished from college work.

It would be interesting, if one had time and ability to perform the task acceptably, to consider, in a prophetic way, what, perhaps, this new period

on which we now enter, will produce. Perhaps I may be allowed a sentence or two.

(1) It will see still greater development. Up to this time, we have known what could be done by a university with an annual expenditure of one million dollars or so. In this next period, there will be institutions which will have ten millions of dollars with which to conduct a year's work. This will mean not merely growth, but in large measure, reorganization; at all events, organization on new lines.

(2) The new period will see still greater differentiation; the higher work of the university will be separated more clearly from the lower work of the college; many colleges will undertake to do work of a more distinctly college character than that which they are now doing; and many high-schools will rise to the grade and dignity of colleges. But further,—institutions will distribute the work of higher education—some undertaking work in one group of departments; some, work in another group. Only a few institutions will endeavor to cover the entire ground. The principle of specialization will be applied to institutions.

(3) In the new period, the United States will receive proper recognition for university work, and, while American students, it is hoped, will always find it advantageous to visit Europe, the time is near at hand when the students of European

countries will take up residence in our American Universities.

(4) The new period will see an intermingling of University work and University ideals in all the various activities of our national life; in the business world, in the political world, and in the literary world. The old idea of separation from the world at large is fast disappearing, and the new day has already dawned, in which the University is to do notable work in fields hitherto almost unknown; and by methods hitherto almost untried.

In all this change which has come about in thirty years, the Johns Hopkins University has been the principal factor. The ideals of its founders, the contributions of its professors, and the work of its alumni, have constituted the principal agency which has brought about this wonderful growth.

During this first period, the Johns Hopkins University has been the most conspicuous figure in the American University world, and, to its achievements we are largely indebted for the fact that we may now enter upon a higher mission.

I desire to present, upon this occasion, the greetings and the congratulations of the scores of institutions in the West and far West, which have been strengthened by the presence in their faculties of Johns Hopkins men, and which have been encouraged and stimulated to higher work by the influence of Johns Hopkins ideals.

At the close of President Harper's address, the audience, rising, joined the University Glee Club in singing "My Country, 'tis of Thee," after which the meeting was adjourned until the following day.

---

SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

---

The proceedings of the second day began at 11 a. m. The assemblage having taken their places, President Remsen, thus introduced his Excellency, John Walter Smith, Governor of Maryland :—

After a night's rest we are prepared to take up the exercises where they were broken off yesterday. The conditions, so far as the outer world is concerned at least, are somewhat more favorable than those of yesterday, and we can all be thankful for that.

There was one feature lacking in our program yesterday, necessarily lacking, as the gentleman who is involved had urgent engagements which he could not break, but I am very glad to welcome here this morning the Chief Magistrate of the State of Maryland. I have the pleasure of presenting to you his Excellency, the Governor of Maryland.

## GOVERNOR SMITH'S ADDRESS.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I consider it a rare good fortune to have the opportunity to welcome this body of distinguished citizens, the alumni and guests of the University, in the name of the State of Maryland.

I feel you have honored our university and our State by lending your presence on this occasion, which marks the inauguration of President Remsen, and commemorates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of that superb memorial to the enlightened generosity of the late Johns Hopkins.

It is a gratification to know that this great gathering includes not only alumni of this university, but also many distinguished scholars from other institutions of learning, who have been attracted from all parts of our country as well as from beyond our borders by a common interest in higher education, which is above section or territorial boundaries, and to attest your love and interest for the Johns Hopkins University, and your good wishes for and sympathy in the success of the great work of its development, which has been begun anew by Dr. Remsen.

The men who have for the past twenty-five years given their time and devoted their best talents to the building up of the Johns Hopkins, and have

succeeded in making it a source of pride at home and respected abroad, deserve the grateful consideration of the many friends of the University, and especially the citizens of this city and State, who have profited so much by its advantages, and who are distinguished on account of its presence.

As a resident of this State I desire to pay tribute to the high regard in which Dr. Gilman is held for his long service as the executive head of this University, and also for his services as a public-spirited citizen, always ready to respond to the call of civic duty, and whilst I deeply regret that his field of usefulness hereafter is not to be within this State, I hope the future has in store for him the happiness and success I believe he deserves.

Dr. Remsen has entered upon a task which is difficult, and which will require wonderful patience and skill successfully to accomplish, but which I have no doubt he will accomplish.

I believe that this twenty-fifth anniversary is the beginning of a new era of prosperity for the Johns Hopkins, which will cause its influence as an institution of learning to widen in the future as in the past was thought impossible.

I believe Dr. Remsen can confidently count on the coöperation of the people of this State in the performance of the arduous duties devolving upon him, as he is already certain of the assistance of the alumni of the University, because the welfare



of the University and of the State of Maryland are intimately connected. Having an institution of such importance, dignity, usefulness and fame in the State of Maryland, a question which every citizen should always bear in mind is this: "What relation should the State bear to the Johns Hopkins University?"

I quite understand that the institution is a private corporation, conceived and endowed by a private citizen. I well know that neither the State of Maryland nor the City of Baltimore has any control over it, or anything whatever to do with its management. I am aware of the fact that its Board of Trustees is self-perpetuating, and entirely independent of the public. But I conceive that notwithstanding these facts there is a reciprocity of duty existing between the public and this educational corporation.

On the one hand this private corporate body has public functions to perform. It was never intended to serve merely private interests in any sense. It was founded for the public good. Its portals of learning are open to any student of the requisite mental and moral qualifications: no matter who he is or whence he comes, he is admitted to the courses of study and given an opportunity to partake of all the benefits and advantages to be derived therefrom. This in a general sense is what the University does for the public at large.

To the people of Maryland, and more especially to the residents of this great and growing city of Baltimore, the benefits conferred, directly and indirectly, are really beyond computation. Besides educating in the undergraduate department a large number of young men, and bringing to their very doors a University curriculum of study which they have an opportunity to pursue, besides giving our young men who may have chosen to go elsewhere to pursue a college career at some other seat of learning, an opportunity to supplement what they have there acquired by some special or higher study, research or investigation, the literary atmosphere generated by it over the whole community is of no inconsiderable value to our people.

If then, these are the benefits conferred by the Johns Hopkins upon the public at large and more especially upon the State of Maryland and the City of Baltimore, what is the reciprocal obligation due by said State and City to the University? Can there be any doubt about it? Can any one question the propriety, aye, the public policy, of fostering and nourishing, of promoting and aiding in any and every way necessary the welfare, the prosperity, the great mission and work of such an institution?

The reputation of the University sheds lustre on Maryland in some circles where otherwise Maryland might be little known, and in turn the State

has displayed in connection with the University a broad intelligence in encouraging this institution, which is doing a great work, educating hundreds of young men from this and other States, so that they may adorn any station in life to which they may be called, and reflect credit on their alma mater, and on that beneficent citizen of this State, whom we delight to honor, and whose name the University bears.

I am delighted to hear of the magnificent donations the University has recently received. I extend my hearty congratulations to the President and Trustees, and also to the public, upon the munificent gifts of land and money lately made by generous and public-spirited citizens; I congratulate those citizens who have been thus bountiful of their means, that they have such an opportunity to do so much good in their life time with a part of the wealth with which God has blessed them.

I doubt if an audience such as this was ever before collected in this State, containing as it does so many men who have devoted their time to science and literature, and who have resisted the temptations of business and money-making to dedicate their lives and talents to acquiring and imparting knowledge.

We profoundly appreciate the trouble you have taken to be here to-day and dignify this most

notable occasion. It is a pleasure to extend to you the most hearty welcome to our State, and it is our sincere desire to do that which will contribute most to your happiness so long as you are on the soil of Maryland.

President Emeritus Gilman then rose and spoke as follows:—

Governor Smith, in behalf of all these gentlemen upon the platform,—I think I may venture to say, in behalf of this vast audience,—we thank you for those invigorating words; and through you, may I say to this company a few words regarding the ceremony—the very simple ceremony—upon which we are entering.

#### INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT.

President Gilman, continuing, said: The distinguished scholar who has been called to the presidency of this University by the unanimous vote of the Trustees, and with the hearty concurrence of the faculty, is no stranger to the duties and cares that will devolve upon him. He has been a member of our society from the earliest days, and has won the increasing affection of the students, the increasing respect of the authorities, the increasing admiration of the community. And now, with the

knowledge of a colleague and the devotion of a friend, I welcome him in the name of the governing board of this high station, and bespeak for him perpetual confidence and support.

On the first of September last, in a haven of rest, on the coast of Maine, I formally yielded to him the authority of the office. Now, my high privilege is to induct him into this presidential chair; and as I do so, let me in a word, remind you of its historic associations. It is a chair given to the President of the Johns Hopkins University by the graduates of Harvard resident in Maryland. It is an exact copy of an antique chair which has been handed down for many generations and occupied by successive presidents of that venerated institution. It is now an outward sign of that historic continuity which universities so much prize, by which a new foundation is united to one that is venerable.

[President Gilman then, amid great applause and cheers, conducted President Remsen to the chair, the audience rising.]

President Gilman: You are thrice welcomed, Mr. President, Ira Remsen, Doctor of Laws, in Yale, Columbia and Princeton. May the blessing of God be with you.

And now, Trustees, Colleagues, Visitors, Alumni,

Students, Benefactors, all rise and greet the second President of the Johns Hopkins University.

[The audience arose, cheered and applauded.]

After taking his seat amid the enthusiastic applause of the assemblage, President Remsen arose and delivered the following

#### INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

It has been said that "old men tell of what they have seen and heard, children of what they are doing, and fools of what they are going to do." Your speaker, fearing to furnish data that may suggest to you his place in this system of classification, prefers this morning to deal with matters that are largely independent of time.

The American University as distinguished from the College is a comparatively recent product of evolution—or of creation. Being young, its character is not fully developed, and we can only speculate in regard to its future. On an occasion of this kind, when one of the young universities of the country is celebrating in a quiet way the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation, and when a new presiding officer makes his first appearance before a large assembly, it seems fitting that he, upon whom has been placed the responsibility of guiding, for the present, the affairs of the Univer-

sity, should take the opportunity thus afforded of giving expression to a few thoughts that suggest themselves when one begins to reflect upon the significance of the University movement in this country. Every one at all acquainted with educational matters knows that the differentiation of the University from the College is the most characteristic fact in the history of higher education during the past quarter century. It is well that we should ask ourselves, What does this tendency mean? Whither is the movement likely to carry us?

While, from the beginning, the authorities of the Johns Hopkins University have maintained a collegiate department as well as a graduate or university department, and have endeavored to make this as efficient as possible under existing circumstances, the subjects that present themselves in connection with this branch of our work are so familiar and have been so much discussed that I can pass over them now without danger of giving the impression that we consider these subjects of less importance than those more directly connected with the work of the University. At all events, in what I shall have to say, I propose to confine myself to the latter.

The idea that a student who has completed a college course has something yet to learn, if he chooses the career of a teacher or scholar, does not appear until quite recently to have taken strong

hold of the minds of those who had charge of the educational interests of our country. Perhaps it would be better to put it in this way: They do not appear to have thought it worth while to make provision in the system for those who wanted more than the college gave. The college has for its object the important work of training students for the duties of citizenship, not primarily the duties of scholarship; and no one doubts that, in the main, they have done their work well. Nor does any one doubt that, whatever may come, the college has a leading part to play in this country. Collegiate work by its very nature necessarily appeals to a much larger number than university work. But college work requires no apologist nor defender. It appeals strongly to the American people, and it is well that this is so. The college is in no danger of annihilation, though the indications are that it will undergo important modifications in the future as it has in the past. Upon this subject much might be said, and I feel strongly tempted to enlarge upon it, notwithstanding the intention already expressed of confining myself to problems more directly connected with the university proper.

There is, however, one phase of the college problem that is so closely connected with that of the university that I cannot avoid some reference to it. There is a marked and rapidly growing tendency to make college work the basis of the work in pro-



professional schools. As is well known, some of our medical schools now require a college degree for admission. The average age of graduation from our leading colleges is so high that the students cannot begin their professional courses until they are from twenty-two to twenty-three years of age on the average. Then, too, the length of the professional courses is greater than it formerly was, so that some of the best years of life are taken up in preparatory work. One thing seems to admit of no denial, and that is that, in so far as it prevents students from beginning their professional studies or their work in business life until they have attained the age of twenty-two or twenty-three, our present system is seriously defective. The defect is one that must be remedied. Various efforts are now being made looking to improvement, but it is not yet clear how the problem will be solved.

In this country the name university in the new sense is frequently applied to one department, and that is the philosophical department. This has to deal with philology, philosophy, history, economics, mathematics, physics, geology, chemistry, &c.; in short, it comprises all branches that do not form an essential part of the work of the departments of medicine, law and theology. A fully developed university, to be sure, includes at least four departments—the medical, the legal, the theological, and the philosophical; or, in other words, the univer-

sity faculty comprises faculties of medicine, of law, of theology and of philosophy.

*The new thing in educational work in this country is the philosophical faculty of our universities.*

This meets the needs of those students who, having completed the college course, and having, therefore, had a good general training that fits them for more advanced study, wish to go forward in the paths of learning, and, so far as this may be possible, to become masters of some special branch. Most of these students are preparing to teach in colleges and elsewhere, so that the philosophical department of the university is to-day a professional school just as much as the medical or the legal department. On the completion of the college course, the student holds the same relation to the philosophical department of the university as to the other departments, or to the professional schools; and the age question is fully as important in the case of the student in the philosophical faculty as in the case of those who are to enter the professional schools. Now, if it be conceded, that the training of specialists—not necessarily narrow specialists, but necessarily those who are thoroughly grounded in some one subject—I say, if it be conceded that the training of specialists is essential to the growth of the highest scholarship, then by advancing the age of graduation from our colleges, we are interfering with the development of schol-

arship in the highest sense, because the greater the age of graduation from the colleges the less will these graduates be inclined, or be able, to take up the advanced work that is essential to convert them into scholars. But let me close what I have to say on this subject by the safe prediction that the time will come when the work of our colleges will be adjusted to the work of the various faculties of the university so that the passage from the one to the other will not involve something unnatural—either hardship to the student or a telescoping of college and university which now on the whole furnishes the best way out of the existing difficulty.

I have said that the new thing in educational work in this country is the philosophical faculty of our universities. The growth of the work of the philosophical faculty has, however, undoubtedly influenced that of the other faculties—more particularly the medical. Gradually the medical schools, those connected with the universities at least, are adopting university standards. The same is true to some extent of schools of law and of theology, so that, I think, it is safe to assert that the great activity that has characterized the work of the philosophical faculties of our universities has tended in no small measure to the improvement of the work of our professional schools. It has lifted them to a higher level, and that is a result that the world at large may congratulate itself upon.

One of the most remarkable facts in connection with what we may call the development of the university idea in this country, is the surprisingly rapid increase in the attendance upon the courses offered by our philosophical faculties during the last few years. In what I shall have to say I shall for the present use the term graduate student in the restricted sense which it has come to have, meaning a college graduate who is following courses offered by the philosophical faculty of some university, and excluding, therefore, those who are studying medicine, or law, or theology in universities.

I have recently asked the United States Commissioner of Education to help me answer the following questions :

1. How many graduate students were in the United States in the year 1850?
2. How many in 1875?
3. How many in 1900?

The answers are these :

1. In 1850 there were 8 graduate students in all of the colleges of the country. Of these 3 were enrolled at Harvard, 3 at Yale, 1 at the University of Virginia and 1 at Trinity College.
2. In 1875 the number had increased to 399.
3. In 1900 the number enrolled was 5,668.

At present the number cannot be far from 6,000.

In order that these facts may be properly interpreted we should know how many Americans are studying in foreign universities. The records show that in 1835 there were 4 American students in the philosophical faculties of German universities; in 1860 there were 77; in 1880, 173; in 1891, 446; in 1892, 383; in 1895, 422; and in 1898, 397.

These figures show clearly that the increase in the attendance at American universities is not accounted for by a falling off in attendance at German universities. On the other hand, they do show that for the last ten years at least there has been no increase in the attendance at German universities, but rather a slight decrease.

Six thousand students are, then, to-day pursuing advanced courses in our American universities, while not longer ago than 1875 the number was only about 400. In this connection it must further be borne in mind that during this period the colleges have not relaxed in their requirements. The tendency has been in the opposite direction. So that it means to-day more rather than less than it did in 1875 to be a graduate student. That there is an increasing demand for university work is clear, and it seems to be destined to play a more and more important part in the development of our educational methods.

Now, what is the cause of the rapid increase in the demand for university work, or the rapid

increase in the attendance upon university courses? No simple answer would be correct. Probably the principal direct cause is the increased demand on the part of the colleges, and to some extent of the high schools, for teachers who have had university training. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy being the outward and visible sign of such training, many colleges have virtually taken the ground that none but Ph. D.'s need apply. This would, of course, tend directly to increase the attendance at the universities. Operating in the same way is the multiplication of chairs in the colleges. While not long ago one man often taught a number of subjects, sometimes related, sometimes not, the college authorities are coming more and more to entrust a single subject to a single man. The old-fashioned professor who would teach any subject in the curriculum with equal success is a thing of the past except in a few remote regions. The university-trained man has largely taken his place, and the universities are spreading their influence into the nooks and corners of the country through these men.

I need not discuss this phase of the subject further. It will, I am sure, be acknowledged without argument that it is desirable that our college faculties should be made up of men who have enjoyed the best educational advantages. In supplying such men the universities are doing a work of the

highest value for the country. If nothing else were accomplished by our universities they would be worthy of all the support they get. The results of their work in this direction are not as tangible as that of the work of the colleges, for the latter reach much larger numbers and in ways that can be more easily followed. But, if we keep in mind the fact that the college is dependent upon the university for its faculty and that the character of the college is in turn dependent upon the character of its faculty, it will be seen that whatever good may come from the college is to be traced directly to work done by the universities. In order to keep our colleges up to a high standard it is absolutely necessary that our universities should be maintained on a high plane. This university work is not something apart, independent of other kinds of educational work. It is a necessary part of the system. It affects not only our colleges, but our schools of all grades, and must, therefore, have a profound influence upon the intellectual condition of the whole country. It is difficult, perhaps, to prove this, but it seems to me that the statements just made are almost self-evident truths.

But the universities are also doing another kind of work of importance to the country. Through their specially prepared men they are doing something to enlarge the bounds of knowledge. To be sure, such work is also being done to some extent

in our colleges and elsewhere, but the true home of the investigator is the university. This work of investigation is as important as the work of training men. What does it mean? All persons with healthy minds appear to agree that the world is advancing and improving. We see evidences of this on every side. Those results that appeal most strongly to most of us are, perhaps, the practical discoveries that contribute so much to the health and comfort of mankind. These are so familiar that they need not be recounted here. If great advances are being made in the field of electricity, in the field of medicine, in the field of applied chemistry, it is well to remember that the work that lies at the foundation of these advances has been done almost exclusively in the universities. It would be interesting to trace the history of some of these advances. We should find that in nearly every case the beginning can be found in some university workshop where an enthusiastic professor has spent his time prying into the secrets of nature. Rarely does the discoverer reap the tangible reward of his work—that is to say, he does not get rich—but what of it? He has his reward, and it is at least a fair question whether his reward is not higher than any that could be computed in dollars and cents.

The material value to the world of the work carried on in the university laboratories cannot



be overestimated. New industries are constantly springing up on the basis of such work. A direct connection has been shown to exist between the industrial condition of a country and the attitude of the country towards university work. It is generally accepted that the principal reason why Germany occupies such a high position in certain branches of industry, especially those founded upon chemistry, is that the universities of Germany have fostered the work of investigation more than those of any other country. That great thinker and investigator, Liebig, succeeded during the last century in impressing upon the minds of his countrymen the importance of encouraging investigations in the universities, and since that time the German laboratories of chemistry have been the leaders of the world. In Germany the chemical industries have grown to immense, almost inconceivable, proportions. Meanwhile the corresponding industries of Great Britain have steadily declined. This subject has recently been discussed by Arthur C. Green in an address read before the British Association at its meeting at Glasgow last summer. The address has been republished in "Science," volume 2, page 7, of 1902. I call the attention especially of our business men to this address. I think it will show them that university work in some lines at least is directly and closely connected with the industrial position of a

country. Speaking of the coal tar industry, the author of the paper referred to says: "In no other industry have such extraordinarily rapid changes and gigantic developments taken place in so short a period—developments in which the scientific elucidation of abstract problems has gone hand in hand with inventive capacity, manufacturing skill, and commercial enterprise; in no other industry has the close and intimate interrelation of science and practice been more clearly demonstrated." And further on: "Again, besides the loss of material wealth which the neglect of the coal-tar trade has involved to this country, there is yet another aspect of the question which is even of more importance than the commercial one. There can be no doubt that the growth in Germany of a highly scientific industry of large and far-reaching proportion has reacted with beneficial effect upon the universities, and has tended to promote scientific thought throughout the land. By its demonstration of the practical importance of purely theoretic conceptions it has had a far-reaching effect on the intellectual life of the nation. How much such a scientific revival is wanted in our country the social and economical history of the past ten years abundantly testifies. For in the struggle for existence between nations the battle is no longer to the strong in arm, but to those who are the strongest

in knowledge to turn the resources of nature to the best account."

What I want to make clear by these quotations and references is that universities are not luxuries, to be enjoyed or not, as we may please. They are necessities. Their work lies at the very foundation of national well-being.

But there is another aspect of university work of greater importance than that of which I have spoken. I mean the intellectual aspect in the highest sense. The world is advancing in other ways than along material lines. While, as I have pointed out, the material interests of the world are connected with the intellectual condition, there are thoughts, there are ideas, that are above material considerations, ideas pertaining to the history of mankind, to the origin and development of the universe, to the phenomena of life, to the development of thought, to the significance of religions. All these are of importance, and the character of a nation is determined by the extent to which these ideas are cultivated. There is call for investigation in every subject—in the various branches of philology, in history, in economics, in archæology, as well as in the natural sciences, and here again the universities furnish the workers and the workshops.

There are, then, deep-seated reasons for encouraging the work of our universities in every possible

way. We cannot afford to let them languish. The interests involved are too great. The more clearly this is recognized the better for us.

The rapid advances that have been made in university work in this country have brought us somewhat suddenly face to face with new educational problems, and we have not yet had time to adjust ourselves to the new situation thus created. We are in the experimental stage. We are trying to determine how we ought to deal with our graduate students in order to get the best results; how, in general, to make the work as efficient as possible.

As one who, with others, has been engaged for twenty-five years in studying the new problems and in attempting to solve them, I may be permitted to say a few words in regard to one of the most important problems that the universities have to deal with at present. I refer to the problem of the professors. Having been a professor for about thirty years, and having during that time known intimately many of those who belong to this class and worked with them, I feel that I may speak of the professor problem with some confidence.

The university is what the professors make it, and the president has no more important duty to perform than that of seeing that the various chairs are filled by the right kind of men. He should not take the full responsibility of selection. He should take all the good advice he can get. He is sure to

have some that is bad. He should, however, not only take advice, but he should endeavor to determine for himself by every available means whether or not the persons recommended to him are worthy of appointment. He should not shirk this responsibility. A mistake in this line is almost as difficult to rectify as a mistake in the matrimonial line—perhaps more difficult. It is, therefore, doubly important that an appointment should be made with great deliberation and with a full realization of the gravity of the act. It is not, however, the process of appointing that I wish especially to speak of, though much that is interesting to university circles might be said on this subject. It is rather the principles that are involved. What constitutes a good professor? What kind of men are the universities looking for? Is the supply of this kind of men equal to the demand? These are some of the questions that suggest themselves in this connection. Let me attempt to answer them briefly.

The development of universities in this country has created a demand for a kind of professor somewhat different from that demanded by the college. It would not be difficult to describe the ideal university professor, but we should gain little in this way. I shall assume that he has the personal traits that are of such importance in those who are called upon to teach. A man of bad or question-

able character, or of weak character, is no more fit to be a university professor than to be a college professor or a teacher in a school. That is self-evident. At least it seems so to me. Leaving these personal matters out of consideration, the first thing that is essential in a university professor is a thorough knowledge of the subject he teaches and of the methods of investigation applicable to that subject; the second is the ability to apply these methods to the enlargement of the field of knowledge; and the third is the ability to train others in the use of these methods. But a knowledge of the methods, the ability to apply them, and the ability to train others in their use, will not suffice. The professor, if he is to do his duty, must actually be engaged in carrying on investigations both on his own account and with the co-operation of his most advanced students. This is fundamental. It may be said, and this cannot be denied, that there is much research work done that is of little value to the world, that, in fact, much of that which is done by our graduate students is trivial judged by high standards. It would be better, no doubt, if every professor and every advanced student were engaged upon some problem of great importance to the world. But this is out of the question in any country. Few men possess that clearness of vision and that skill in devising methods, combined with the patience and power

of persistent application that enable them to give the world great results. If only those who can do great things were permitted to work, the advancement of knowledge would be slow indeed. The great is built upon the little. The modest toiler prepares the way for the great discoverer. A general without his officers and men would be helpless. So would the great thinker and skillful experimenter without the patient worker, "the hewer of wood and drawer of water."

Of so-called research work there are all grades. A man may reveal his intellectual power as well as his mental defects by his investigations. But it remains true that the university professor must be carrying on research work or he is failing to do what he ought to do. It is part of his stock in trade. He cannot properly train his students without doing such work and without helping his students to do such work. One of the best results of carrying on this research work is the necessary adoption of world standards. A man may teach his classes year after year and gradually lose touch with others working in the same branch. Nothing is better calculated to keep him alive than the carrying on of a piece of work and the publication of the results in some well-known journal. This stimulates him to his best efforts, and it subjects him to the criticism of those who know. He may deceive his students and himself—no doubt he



often does—but he cannot deceive the world very long. The professor who does not show what he can do in the way of adding to the knowledge of the world, is almost sure to become provincial when he gets away from the influence of his leaders.

Other things being equal, the professor who does the best work in his special branch is the best professor. The universities want leaders. Unfortunately, the number of these is quite limited, and it is not surprising that there are not enough to go round. It is becoming very difficult to find properly qualified men to fill vacant university professorships. Given sufficient inducements and it would be quite possible to “corner the market.” There are at least half a dozen, probably more, universities in this country on the lookout for young men of unusual ability. They are snapped up with an avidity that is a clear sign of the state of the market. One of the greatest obstacles in the way of the advancement of our American universities to-day is a lack of enough good professional material. Fortunately, the universities are themselves providing the means by which this obstacle may be overcome, though not as rapidly as we should like. That is, however, not the fault of the universities. Some deeper cause is operating. Nature does not seem to supply enough raw material. It is often raw enough, to be sure, but its possibilities are limited.



This, too, suggests another question of deep import for the intellectual development of our country. Do our ablest men enter universities and engage in advanced work? This is a question which it is very difficult, if not quite impossible, to answer. I think it is not uncommonly assumed that they do not; that our ablest men, our best thinkers, are not in the universities. It is often said that they are in the law or in business. It may be. Certainly the great jurists and the great business men seem to be relatively more numerous than the great university teachers. I should not think it worth while to touch upon this subject were it not for the fact that recently the suggestion has been made that some of the men who become great in other lines might be induced to enter the academic career if only sufficient inducements were offered. The proposition is that a marked increase in the emoluments of professors would tend to attract some of the best material from other fields. I do not feel sure of this. In any case, the subject is hardly worth discussing. Whatever improvement is to come will come slowly, and this is fortunate. A sudden increase of the salaries of the leading professors of this country to, say, \$10,000 or more, would not suddenly change the status of these professors among their fellow men, and, while the professors might be pleased, and probably would be, the main question is, would this change have any

effect in the desired direction? Speculation on this subject seems to me of no value. If it be true that the men of the best intellects do not find their way into university circles, it is safe to assume that this is due to a great many conditions, and that the conditions are improving. The intellectual standards of our colleges and universities are gradually being raised. We cannot force matters.

The best thing we can do for our students is to give them good professors. Sumptuous laboratories, large collections of books and apparatus, extensive museums are well enough. They are necessary, no doubt. But I fear they are too much emphasized before the public. A university is, or ought to be, a body of well-trained, intelligent, industrious, productive teachers of high character provided with the means of doing their best work for their students, and therefore for the world.

The Johns Hopkins University cannot live on its past, however praiseworthy that past may have been. If the contemplation of the past has the effect of stimulating us to our best efforts, it is a profitable occupation. If it lulls us into inactivity, it is fatal. We should not, nor can we, escape criticism for present misdeeds by referring to a glorious past. We have, to be sure, inherited certain ideals that we should cherish. So, also, we have probably done things that we ought not

to have done; and the study of our past may help us to see where we have made mistakes and to show us how to avoid them in the future. There is only one way to make a university what it ought to be, and that is by doing good work according to the highest standards. Professors and students must co-operate in this. With the right professors we shall have this co-operation. Students have the power of collective judgment that is probably fairer than the judgment of any individual. They will work well if their masters work well. The professor is teaching all the time. His duty to his students is not done when he dismisses them from the lecture room or the laboratory. His influence for good or evil is continuous and lasting.

Will you allow me a few personal words? Those of you who know most of the occurrences of last year know best that the office, the duties of which I formally assume to-day, came to me unexpectedly and against my wishes. My life up to the present has been spent as a teacher. I ask no higher occupation. There is none more rewarding. It would have been agreeable to me to continue in this occupation to the end. Indeed, even as matters now stand, I hope it will not be necessary for me to withdraw entirely from the work to which my life has thus far been devoted. On the other hand, I recognize to the full the impor-

tance of the new work to which I have been called, and I accept the new duties with the intention of using every effort to further the interests of this university. Having taken the step, I accept the responsibility. I cannot permit anything to interfere with the work of the presidency. I believe, however, that I shall not be obliged to give up that which is dear to me in the science of chemistry.

In conclusion, I wish to express my hearty thanks to my distinguished predecessor, to my colleagues, to the students of the University, and to this community for the kindness with which they have accepted my election. I could not ask for better treatment. In return, I can only promise to do all that in me lies to make this University worthy of its history, to make it as helpful as possible, not only to this community, of which I am proud to be a member, but to the State and to the country. It is my earnest wish, as I am sure it is yours, that the period upon which the University now enters may be at least as useful as that which now ends.

We have passed through a time of great anxiety. Causes have been in operation that have of late seriously interfered with our development. It is not strange that the world at large should have received the impression that the Johns Hopkins University has seen its best days. The fact is, that the doleful stories that have been going the

rounds have a slight basis. It is this: The growth of the University has been temporarily checked. It has not gone backward, but, for a time at least, it has stood still. I believe that a new day has at last dawned and that the onward march will soon be taken up. Our difficulties have by no means been overcome, but a magnificent beginning has been made. The public spirit and generosity of William Wyman, of William Keyser, of Samuel Keyser, of Francis M. Jencks, of William H. Buckler and Julian LeRoy White, are worthy of the highest commendation. These high-minded men have started the new era. They have shown their confidence in the work of the University and set an example to their fellow-men. I would not detract in the least from the praise due to every one of the gentlemen, but I am sure the others whom I have named will pardon me if in conclusion I exclaim, Long live William Wyman and William Keyser!

#### CONFERRING OF HONORARY DEGREES.

President Gilman then rose and said:

*To the Assembly:*

From time immemorial, it has been the custom of universities at festive celebrations, to bestow upon men of learning, personal tokens of admiration and gratitude. In conformity with this usage,

our university desires to place upon its honor list the names of scholars who have been engaged with us in the promotion of literature, science and education. In accordance with the request of the Academic Council and in their name, I have the honor and the privilege of presenting to the President of the Johns Hopkins University those whose names I shall now pronounce, asking their enrolment as members of this '*Societas magistrorum et discipulorum.*'

*To the President :*

Mr. President; In the name of the Academic Council, I ask that several scholars, who pursued advanced studies under our guidance, without proceeding to degrees, be now admitted to the degree of Master of Arts, *honoris causa*, and assured of our hearty welcome to this fraternity.

WILLIAM THOMAS COUNCILMAN,  
BENJAMIN IVES GILMAN,  
JOHN MARK GLENN,  
CLAYTON COLMAN HALL,  
THEODORE MARBURG,  
WILLIAM L. MARBURY,  
ROBERT LEE RANDOLPH,  
LAWRASON RIGGS,  
HENRY M. THOMAS,  
JULIAN LEROY WHITE.

PRESIDENT REMSEN. By the authority of the State of Maryland, granted to the Johns Hopkins University, and committed to me, I declare that those whose names have been read are now admitted to the degree of Master of Arts of the Johns Hopkins University.

PRESIDENT GILMAN: Mr. President, I have now the honor of presenting to you, one by one, a number of eminent men, recommended by a committee of the professors, and of asking you to admit them to the degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causâ*, in the Johns Hopkins University.

Three of these scholars were friends and counsellors of the Trustees before any member of this Faculty was chosen. They pointed out the danger to be avoided, the charts to be followed, and during seven and twenty years they have been honored friends, by whose experience we have been guided, by whose example we have been inspired.

CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT, President of Harvard University, oldest and most comprehensive of American institutions,—the Chief, whose wisdom, vigor, and devotion to education have brought him honors which we gladly acknowledge, which we cannot augment.

JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, teacher, writer, diplomatist, scholar, excellent in every calling, whose crowning distinction is his service in developing the

University of Michigan, a signal example of the alliance between a vigorous state and a vigorous university.

And with these two I associate the name of one whose high responsibilities and official station prevent his leaving the post in Berlin where he is the representative of the United States: the degree we ask to be bestowed upon him *in absentia*.

ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, honored Ambassador of the United States in Germany, the organizer of Cornell University, whose diplomatic success increases the distinction he had won as an able professor, a learned historian, and a liberal promoter of science, literature and art.

With these early friends I now present to you several men who have been associated with us in carrying on the work of this University:—

JOHN SHAW BILLINGS, able adviser of the Trustees of the Johns Hopkins Hospital respecting its construction, an authority on the history of medicine, a promoter of public hygiene, a famous bibliographer and the wise administrator of public libraries in the City of New York.

GRANVILLE STANLEY HALL, who planned and directed the first laboratory of experimental psychology in the United States, and who left a professorship among us to become first President of Clark University in Worcester,—a learned and



inspiring philosopher, devoted to the education of teachers in schools of every grade from the lowest to the highest.

JAMES SCHOULER, successful lecturer and writer on law and history, a lover of truth, a diligent explorer of the historical archives of this country, author of a history of the United States, comprehensive and trustworthy.

JOHN WILLIAM MALLETT, of the University of Virginia, one of that brilliant band of lecturers to whom we listened in the winter of 1876-77, an ornament of the University founded by Jefferson, where scholars of every birthplace are made to feel at home; where two of our earliest colleagues had been professors. He is a chemist of international renown, whose researches are an enduring contribution to the science that he professes.

CHARLES DOOLITTLE WALCOTT, Superintendent of the United States Geological Survey, a government bureau of the highest standing, that extends its investigations to every part of the land, securing for other States, as it does for Maryland, an accurate knowledge of the structure and resources of the earth. The chief of this survey is a geologist whose administrative duties have not prevented his personal devotion to scientific research in which he maintains acknowledged eminence.

SIMON NEWCOMB, Professor of mathematics in the United States Navy, once professor here, who

has carried forward the researches initiated by Copernicus. His astronomical memoirs, above the ken of ordinary minds, have caused his name to be enrolled in the learned academies of Europe among the great investigators of celestial laws.

I have now the honor to present to you two scholars from a neighboring commonwealth, the Dominion of Canada, the representative of the University of Toronto, and the representative of McGill University in Montreal, who came to rejoice with us in this our festival,—JAMES LONDON and WILLIAM PETERSON. We welcome them in the brotherhood of scholarship which knows of no political bounds, appreciating what they have done to uphold the highest standards of education in two great universities, with which we are closely affiliated.

It is not easy to discriminate among our own alumni, so many of whom we honor and admire, but on this occasion I have been asked to present four candidates, all of whom are widely known as scholars.

JOSIAH ROYCE, a graduate of the University of California, one of the first to be called to a fellowship among us, and one of the first four Doctors of Philosophy in this University, Doctor Subtilis, now Professor in Harvard University, Gifford lecturer

at the University of Aberdeen, historian, man of letters, and philosopher.

JOHN FRANKLIN JAMESON, of the University of Chicago, one of the most accurate and serviceable students of the Constitutional History of this country, an editor of historical papers, whose rare erudition is always placed at the command of others in a spirit of generous co-operation.

EDMUND B. WILSON, of Columbia University, a profound investigator and an acknowledged authority in biological science,—one of the men not seen by the outer world, who look deeply into the fundamental laws of organic life.

WOODROW WILSON, of Princeton University, writer and speaker of grace and force, whose vision is so broad that it includes both north and south, a master of the principles which underlie a free government, whom we would gladly enrol among us a Professor of Historical and Political Science.

I now present to you nine men, the number of the muses, each of whom, like others already presented to you, is a leader of high education,—two from New England, two from the Central States, two from the far South, one from the Northwest, and two from the Pacific coast. There are all our collaborators,—sentinels on the watch towers, heralds of the dawn.

FRANCIS LANDEY PATTON, under whose presidency 'old Nassau Hall,' the College of New Jersey, has become the University of Princeton, revered as a preacher of righteousness, admired as an Abelard in dialectics, beloved as an inspiring teacher of theology and philosophy.

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER, interpreter of the Sacred Scriptures, a fearless leader, a skillful organizer, who has brought into the front rank the University of Chicago.

CHARLES WILLIAM DABNEY, of the University of Tennessee, a man of science, and EDWARD A. ALDERMAN, of Tulane University in New Orleans, a man of letters,—two leaders in the advancement of education in the South, advocates of schools and colleges of every grade, and their zealous promoters.

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, whose enthusiasm, energy, and knowledge of the principles and methods of Education have given him distinction throughout the land and have led to his promotion to the presidency of Columbia University in the city of New York.

HENRY SMITH PRITCHETT, astronomer and geodesist, who went from his home in Missouri to distant lands, now to observe an eclipse, now a transit, who has been the distinguished head of the United States Coast Survey, and is now the head of a vigorous foundation in Boston, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

I present to you the two representatives of learning and scholarship in 'the new world beyond the new world,' a Grecian and a student of Natural History, BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, President of the University of California,—an idealist worthy to represent the aspirations of Berkeley, and DAVID STARR JORDAN, the naturalist, who has led in the organization of the Stanford University, chiefs of two harmonious institutions, one of which was founded by private bounty, the other by the munificence of a prosperous State.

As this roll began with Harvard it ends with Yale. I present to you finally one of the strongest and most brilliant of this strong and brilliant company,—ARTHUR TWINING HADLEY, a writer and thinker of acknowledged authority on the principles of finance and administration, the honorable successor of Timothy Dwight as President of Yale University.

The degrees having been conferred, and the recipients having resumed their seats, President Remsen arose and introduced President Charles William Eliot of Harvard University in these words :

And now, what more fitting than a few words from that great leader in education who was pre-

vented from being with us yesterday, but whom we are all glad to see here to-day? I ask President Eliot to say a few words.

#### PRESIDENT ELIOT'S ADDRESS.

Mr. President, twenty-five years ago I had the honor of congratulating President Gilman on his accession to the presidency of this University. We were both then in our prime, and I welcomed him to a task which I knew would call for all his devotion and all his wisdom. And now, President Gilman, I congratulate you on your achievement. This body of alumni is the fruit of your labors. How different they look to me from the gathered alumni at Harvard—no old men, all in their vigorous youth; but all hard at work with trained powers for the advancement of learning and for the welfare of our country. As I look at this large body of the faculties assembled by you, sir, its aspect reminds me of a few words I spoke when I was myself inaugurated and was trying to deal with the selection of professors. That is the chief work, the gravest responsibility, of a university president; and I remember saying concerning it that “two kinds of men make good teachers,—young men and men that never grow old.”

President Gilman, your first achievement here, with the help of your colleagues, your students, and your trustees, has been, to my thinking—and I have had good means of observation—the creation of a school of graduate studies, which not only has been in itself a strong and potent school, but which has lifted every other university in the country in its departments of arts and sciences. I want to testify that the graduate school of Harvard University, started feebly in 1870 and 1871, did not thrive, until the example of Johns Hopkins forced our Faculty to put their strength into the development of our instruction for graduates. And what was true of Harvard was true of every other university in the land which aspired to create an advanced school of arts and sciences.

Next, I congratulate you, sir, on the prodigious advancement of medical teaching, which has resulted from the labors of the Johns Hopkins faculty of medicine. The twenty-five years just past are the most extraordinary twenty-five years in the whole history of our race. Nothing is done as it was done twenty-five years ago; the whole social and industrial organization of our country has changed; the whole university organization of our country has changed; but among all the changes there is none greater than that wrought in the development of medical teaching and research; and these men whom you, sir, summoned here have

led the way. I read a letter a few days ago from a high authority in comparative pathology, addressed to a man who had made one great gift for the advancement of medical teaching and was contemplating another, in which he said that the great threatening dangers of our modern, social and industrial state are the contagious and infectious diseases. That, ladies and gentlemen, is strictly true. Were it not for vaccination, the American people would have buried their millions within the last six months from the ravages of small-pox. Among the achievements of Johns Hopkins University in the last 25 years, let this improvement of medical teaching be counted as one of superb beneficence.

And, thirdly, sir, I wish to mention as an achievement of this university under your leadership, that it has promoted, and taught others to promote, research, scientific investigation, the careful probing of external nature and man's nature in the hope of discovering some new thing which may lead on to another new thing. That is a very genuine, substantial and durable achievement of this young university, and I desire here to congratulate you all upon it, and to recognize the full scope and meaning of the policy which led to this great issue.

These three are enough for the achievements of a seat of learning in twenty-five short years; but, President Remsen, I congratulate you, sir, on



something further, namely, on the labors before you. I congratulate President Gilman on the laborious conflict which lay before him. How has the result confirmed the anticipation? Has he not had joy and gladness in his labors? For you, sir, I wish the same delights.

And to the citizens of Baltimore and of Maryland, let me say, labors and sacrifices are before you. This is an institution whose development must depend upon private endowment; and I know no juster test to apply to an American community—the test of intelligent and public-spirited devotion to the high moral ends of living—than this test,—do they endow the higher education? I welcome you, Gentlemen, the Trustees of Johns Hopkins University, to this high function. I welcome all capable citizens of the city and the State. Emulate little Massachusetts, emulate your commercial rival Boston in this noble work. A fortnight ago, a citizen of New York offered Harvard University one million dollars for the promotion of medical teaching and research, provided we would raise in addition to his gift the sum of seven hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars. We have raised five hundred and seventy thousand dollars already.

Alumni of Johns Hopkins, Citizens of Baltimore, friends of learning, as illustrated in Johns Hopkins, wherever living, I beg you to go and do likewise.

The audience by request then rose and joined the University Glee Club in singing one stanza of the "Star Spangled Banner."

The exercises were concluded by a benediction pronounced by the Reverend Joseph T. Smith, D. D.

---

ALUMNI BANQUET.



BANQUET  
OF THE  
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY  
ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.

---

**A**T 8 p. m., of February 22, a large number of guests attended a Banquet given by the Association of the Johns Hopkins Alumni.

After the removal of the cloth, the President of the Association, Jeffrey R. Brackett, Ph. D. ('89), introduced the first speaker, in these words:—

It is most fitting that this splendid celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the University should close with such a gathering as this, of so many alumni and friends, around one family table—cheerful in the realization of all that this University has done for them and others in the past, and confident, not merely hopeful, but confident of all that it is to do in the future.

Here are gathered over six hundred alumni and friends of the University. Some of them have

come from fields of work as far away as the Carolinas on the South, Canada on the North, and Kansas and California in the West.

My duty to-night is merely first, to remind you of the tie that should bind us together, wherever we may be, as workers for more sound thinking and more useful living; secondly, to thank these distinguished guests of the University who come here to-night to give us pleasure and profit; and lastly to present to you, as our chairman,—I will not say our toast-master, for we will not go through the form of drinking toasts,—one who was among the very first to take a high degree here, who was the first president of the association of the alumni, who is a distinguished professor at Harvard, and who since this morning has been a Doctor of Laws of this University, Professor Royce.

#### PROFESSOR ROYCE.

Brethren of the Alumni of Johns Hopkins University :

I regret indeed that it is not possible for the committee to put in my place some venerable alumnus of the Johns Hopkins University. I happen to be here as being one of the first company of those who received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. But, as President Eliot reminded us this morning, this is a body of young alumni. To

be venerable is not yet our office, we are in the midst of the battle of life. Wherever we are engaged in it, our concern is with work. At such a time, when we have so many distinguished guests, when we have heard the words of those who have done so much for the cause of learning, it would indeed be well if we could speak in return with the authority that the alumni of a more aged institution would have. But to my mind, at this very moment, our very youth suggests as our first thought:—For all that has been given to us, for all that this City, this State, this University, and this occasion have meant for us, what can we as alumni, in our various walks of life, do in return? For us, it is the thought of work that is first suggested by all these experiences, by the very joys of this occasion. We remember that this occasion means that the body of alumni inevitably gains, from this time on, a place of greater and greater importance in the affairs of their university; that they have more and more to do with supporting the leadership of the university; that, coming into more intimate relations with the public about it, they must establish sympathy between their university and community. They should work in their community. I feel also that more and more the influence of the Johns Hopkins University is about to be expressed in the way the University has always wished it to be expressed, viz. by our taking

a more active part in the great academic movement to which the University has contributed so much. And, therefore, in the very few words that I have attempted to speak to you this evening, it occurs to me to try to express more definitely at least the question,—What in particular can the alumnus of the Johns Hopkins University learn as the lesson of this occasion with regard to his own office?

And first, that I may speak briefly to the large number of those present who are residents of the City of Baltimore, I want to remind you that from henceforth it becomes more and more important that you establish a close sympathy between your community and your University. And how is this to be done? First, gentlemen, by remembering that the alumnus of a University like this, whatever his walk of life is, must be a public servant, and he must teach the public in the long run to look to his university for providing it with public servants. As the servant of the State, and of the City, and of the community, let every alumnus be a missionary, a representative, a prophet, to show that his university means service to the community, and that it is represented by the work that each individual does.

Consequently, gentlemen, it is true indeed of all alumni—but above all—all of you who are here in Baltimore—that by increased organization, and by increased efforts, you can do more and more to



interpret the purposes and the plans and the happiness and the meaning of your university to your community. And finally, it is possible for you to give that constant support to your new president, that all alumni of universities owe to their officers.

It is not enough, gentlemen, that we wait until our great leaders have toiled for us half a life time, with all the zest and self-sacrificing character of the great administrators; it is not enough that we should wait until they have resigned, and then honor them and support them. It is true that every great work of administration needs constant watchfulness and criticism; it is true that taking counsel, and free counsel, with all who are concerned in such work, must aid the progress of it. But it is also true, especially in regard to alumni of great institutions, that they do not always understand how much they can help their administrative officers by sympathy, and by sympathy which is patient. If they do not wholly understand their methods in some respects, let them wait, and the results will gradually show themselves. It is not freedom from criticism that the administrator desires, but it is a cordial willingness to comprehend. Therefore, be near to your university, endeavor to understand it, and endeavor to support its administration.

And now, to speak, especially to those also who are, like myself, working in other communities,—

it is for us to remember more and more what the spirit of the Johns Hopkins University has meant in the past, and in what way we can express that spirit in our work. There are two things that I connect in mind especially with the general influence of the Johns Hopkins University upon academic development. Both of these things have been mentioned in our discussion of the past few days; both of them can be well remembered by every scholar, who has served, or is to serve the cause of the Johns Hopkins University. In the first place, the Johns Hopkins University has stood in its influence for *academic coöperation*. The local pride that rightly guides the interest and the designs of every university in many respects, has not been permitted in the case of this University to stand in the way of a universality of interests, which has made this University willing to be known by its fruit,—not merely by its direct influence, but by its indirect influence upon other academic life elsewhere; so that from all sides, in this celebration, we have heard how much the University has done to bring to pass similar movements elsewhere. And another thing that the University has stood for is mutual coöperation among most varied types of study; that is to say for mutual coöperation among all academic interests. Whatever limitations fortune may have determined here in this place, the influence of the Johns Hopkins,

in connection with the whole academic movement, has been to insist upon the principle that various lines of work need not be kept utterly separate, but that, as they advance, they help one another. Thus, the advance of the study of pure science, means also the advance of the industrial world; and so the reverse too is the case. The modern university, as our President to-day reminded us, is teaching more and more that the medical sciences, that the prosecution of all the sciences of life, stand in the most intimate connection, both with the advance of pure theory, and with the advance of the practical interest of humanity; so that the pursuit, in general, of the most recondite sciences, and of all the most practical human interests, can be connected; and so that not one branch can prosper without the others prospering also. That is one of the great lessons that the Johns Hopkins University has taught us; and, therefore, my fellow-scholars, in our work in the various universities, let us remember this as a lesson that we, above all, learned here;—coöperation and cordial mutual aid amongst universities, on the one hand; and on the other cordial aid of every department of study by other departments. No true academic interest can stand in the way of this coöperation. If all of us, both those who work here, and those who work elsewhere, can learn thus to coöperate, then the lesson of this hour is not lost. Let us then

not merely experience and enjoy, let us not merely congratulate and thank, but let us go forth to further work in our communities. For the Johns Hopkins University needs workers; while we still have the youth to work.

And now, it is a great joy to me, to be able, at this point, to call upon my own honored chief, President Eliot, to say something to us concerning the relations between university and alumni, as this occasion may suggest them to him.

President Charles William Eliot, of Harvard University, being next called upon, responded as follows:—

#### PRESIDENT ELIOT.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen :

I feel that I ought to tell you why this extraordinary order of speakers. It is simply because I am soon going to a train, that I am now called upon. Perhaps an impending train might be helpful to after-dinner speakers in general.

Dr. Royce requests me to say something on the relation of the alumni to the university. It is one of great simplicity. The alumni are children of a devoted mother. What honors a mother? The good lives of her children. What honors and

serves a university? The good, useful, and devoted lives of her alumni.

Now here you are, men from all parts of the country, taught here how to teach, and how to serve in all the professions, and in the various business pursuits. If you wish to do everything within your power for the Johns Hopkins University, do your life-work well; seek the fact; seek the largest inference from each fact; but also seek the ideal.

I was listening last night, to a speech from an admirable example of the Harvard graduate, a business man, the head of one of the most useful and successful corporations in the country; his main contention was that the best effect of education is the training of the imagination. When one studies physical science, it is not only the facts he seeks, it is the imaginative theory which connects the facts; and so, through all your lives, seek the ideal—the imaginary good likely to become the real good; and seek, also, the highest ethical ideal. Universities, more and more, come into close contact and sympathy with the people. This is, indeed, the most cheerful, hopeful, and desirable educational tendency of the twenty-five years covered by the life of the Johns Hopkins University. This broadening sympathy is an ethical movement. Let us all work together, to lift the universities and their communities to a higher level. We cannot

set up a higher standard than that great sentiment of the New Testament, "We are all members one of another."

*The Chairman:* And now it is my honor to be able to call upon our own President for his words of counsel, and of encouragement, at this time.

#### PRESIDENT REMSEN.

After the exercises of this morning, I am not sure that my voice will hold out to speak more than a very few minutes, and it is well that this is so, for there are others here whom, I am sure, you would rather hear; others whom you will not have an opportunity to hear every day of the week, as many of you will have an opportunity to hear me. I have done, or at least tried to do, my duty this morning, and I feel that my time has passed. This is an opportunity for us to meet and greet our guests, whom we are delighted to have with us. It is they who have made this celebration such a success. We thank them for coming. Without their presence, there would have been enthusiasm, and there would have been a good many things, but, after all, the main thing would have been lacking, and this celebration could not have been the success that I believe it has been, in consequence of their presence.

I have been thinking, and have been wondering; in other words, that imagination to which President Eliot has so well referred, has been working, as it always will, because we cannot help it. I have been wondering what underlies these celebrations. Why are they held? celebrations are common, not only in universities, but in families and in nations. Events have been celebrated from time immemorial. Why is this? Well, that is a subject for a lecture, and I do not propose to give you the lecture. There are, however, a few thoughts that come to mind, in this connection, especially, in connection with the celebrations of universities, that are becoming rather the fashion, the fashion having been set by the older and more prominent colleges of this country. Why have they gone on; why have the other colleges imitated them? Because, I think, all who have been present at these great celebrations have come away with a feeling of brotherhood that has been very helpful. They have come in contact with their fellow-workers, and learned to know them; they have learned to sympathize with them, and, in consequence of that, have been able to do better work.

I am a great believer in personal contact. I have a feeling—I cannot say it is a theory, for I think it is a well established fact—I have a feeling, at all events, that much of the trouble in this

world, comes from a lack of knowledge of facts. I get back to that every time I begin to think about difficulties that I know of. The discussions that I hear on every side are generally based, not upon a knowledge of facts, but upon an ignorance of facts. People do not know what they are talking about. Read the daily discussions that are presented to us in our papers, and I think you can detect in nearly every case, an underlying foundation of ignorance. People do not know the facts, and therefore they disagree, and discuss, and get into all sorts of turmoil; whereas, if they had time enough, and would use what I might call the scientific method, stop long enough to investigate, to find out what the facts actually are, half, yes, more than half of the bitter denunciations and discussions that we are all familiar with, would cease. Now, that feeling, that thought, comes to me in connection with these associations or meetings of the members of the Universities. We get to know each other. We do not sit off in corners, and imagine that other people are doing so and so; but we learn what they are doing, and we learn that we are all working very much in the same way; trying to accomplish the same object; and we do not talk, in any slighting way, I hope, of our neighbors and our friends. Sometimes we call them our rivals, but I do not like that word. I do not believe in it; we are all working for the same end, in different



localities; sometimes with different material, but with the same object in view, and these celebrations, these meetings of the representatives of different universities, have, as their principal object, if I understand the situation, or have for one of their principal objects, at least, the cultivation of that feeling of brotherhood, which I consider one of the most valuable things to cultivate.

Those of us, for example, who were at Yale last October, feel, somehow, differently towards Yale, if we were not Yale men before. We have a tender feeling; we cannot get over it now. We had a delightful time there; we felt that we were among friends, and we feel that we have friends there now, and shall always feel that way. Well, that feeling is one that can be cultivated more extensively, and I hope that this meeting will have that result to some extent.

Gentlemen, I have said that I should not speak long; I did not intend to, and do not intend to; but I want to say a word in regard to a matter that I know you are all thinking about; do not be alarmed. There the imagination comes in again. I have been a victim of imagination for the last two or three months; I have heard more freaks of imagination, and have seen more freaks of imagination in the last two or three months, than I ever imagined could exist. My own imagination has failed to cope with the imagination of others. Now,

that is a very poor introduction, I must confess. It is, however, intended to prepare you for—nothing. I want to say, simply, a word in regard to this magnificent gift that has been referred to repeatedly during our exercises of the past few days. You have seen, and you have learned all about it from my friends, the newspapers. If I had had my way, you would not have heard about it until to-day. I cherished the thought for many days, that I should be able to make the announcement of that gift on the 22nd of February, but the announcement was made to me more than a week ago, in my office. I knew it, but the one who made the announcement to me, was a newspaper man, knew it also; he had it in type, and there was no escape from it; and, after due consideration of all the circumstances, we, who were most directly interested in the negotiations, resolved to make no further objections, and let the newspapers do their worst. Well, we have no complaint; it was meant well, and, after all, a year hence, as one of the principal donors said to me, it will make no difference. It is the same gift; we have got the land. The matter is in our control, thanks to Mr. Wyman, who sits at this board, with whom, as you know, has been associated Mr. William Keyser. Mr. Keyser would have been with us this evening, would have been with us to-day and yesterday, had it not been for the fact that he is indisposed, and did not think it

wise to come out, especially yesterday ; and no one can blame him.

In regard to this gift, you have seen all its details, and I can really tell you nothing, except this, that, after due consideration, the gentlemen who have shown this magnificent public spirit, resolved that, in spite of the facts, the original condition that was imposed should no longer be imposed ; they would give the land without conditions ; but they have, not only the hope, but the strong belief, that the old condition which they imposed originally will be fulfilled. I am sure, after talking with one of these gentlemen, specially, that he and all of them would be grievously disappointed if the condition which we heard about so much last year, that was imposed, at that time, should not be fulfilled. I believe it will be, but I am unable to make any definite statement, or any statement at all, in fact, upon that subject, because, I know, there the imagination begins to operate, and it has operated in such a way that I have had untold millions at my disposal during the last week. They all come to me through my friends, the newspapers, again. I wish you to rejoice with me over the consummation of this great gift. If you are not familiar with the beautiful piece of land, go out and visit it. It would be a joy to you, I am sure. Any one who loves the country, will love that beautiful sight ; the trees, the valleys, the

brooks, and everything that can cheer the heart of the lover of nature, will be found combined there. The mere thought that this, some day—I hope soon—is to be the site of the Johns Hopkins University, gives me the greatest satisfaction. It gives us all something more to live for. You know that the gift is a combination of a site for the University, and a park for the City—Wyman Park. The southern end—I will not go into details; they are a little complicated down there, but simple enough to those who have looked into the matter—the southern end, beginning at Twenty-ninth Street, and including property a little below it, adjoining Charles Street Avenue, you will find a little valley, and from that up as far as what will be Thirty-second Street, I believe, is to be included on Charles Street Avenue, in the boundaries of the new park. The rest of it I will not attempt to describe; but I may say that the judgment of the best landscape architects of the country has been taken in connection with this matter, as I hope it will be taken in connection with every move made in the laying out of that land. This park is not a simple, regular piece of land, but has irregular outlines on the West, and then extends, or will extend, along an old lane on the western border of the property, and up to the valley of Stony Run; the outlines have not been fixed, but, at all events, the plan contemplated, as you have seen in the papers, is a mag-

nificent one, extending that park up along the western border of the property, until it reaches Merryman's Avenue. That view is most inspiring to any one who will look into it, and see what it all means. As I stood on the bluff on the north-western corner of that property, and looked off into this valley of Stony Run, with those who were interested in the matter, and with the landscape architect, and heard each one, in turn, express his views of the site, I felt inspired; and I am sure that any one who would go out and look at that, and think of it, would be charmed with it as a place for a park, devoted to the purposes of the City; along which will be, if I may venture a prediction, and I think I can, the most beautiful driveway in the neighborhood of Baltimore, leading us out into a beautiful country beyond, which is also capable of development. It is a magnificent opportunity, and it must be borne in mind, that the laying out of this park will be of great value to the university, as the property develops, and the buildings are put up. We shall be saved on the West; we have Charles Street Avenue on the East, and the park on the South, so that the whole site will be protected as well as any site can be protected. I could not help saying a few words in regard to this subject, but I have said more than I intended, and, for fear of getting prolix, or more prolix than I have been, I simply will take this opportunity in

conclusion, to thank you all most heartily for the reception which you have accorded me to-day. It has been a great pleasure to me, that I shall never forget, both this morning and this evening. Gentlemen, I thank you very much.

*The Chairman:* You have heard how facts have been passing into imagination, and you have heard how these imaginations and ideals have been passing into facts. I hope that we may have many more messages of such merit, and of such import, but now, let us hear, once more, from our honored President of the beforetime, President Gilman.

#### PRESIDENT GILMAN.

The moments are precious. I shall take but a very few of them, although I am induced by those words, the relation of imagination to fact, to take a few moments. What I have to say is indirectly connected with the Johns Hopkins University; is, in fact, I believe, the outgrowth of imaginations which we cherished here, five and twenty years ago, and which have not yet been lost sight of.

I want to take this opportunity, when so many men are here, from all parts of the country, to say one or two words, if you will allow me, about the Carnegie Institution. Ten millions of dollars are given, in securities that yield five hundred thou-

sand dollars per annum, not for the benefit of any one place, or for the benefit of any one institution of learning, but for the encouragement of science in all parts of this country, if a right plan of procedure can be devised. Science, not merely of material things, but other branches of science, like economics and others that I might mention. This large sum of money is merely to carry out the conceptions of original research, of investigation, of endeavor to extend the bounds of knowledge, with which we are so familiar. It is a great gift, and I do not believe, in the history of humanity, there has ever been a gift of that amount so free from conditions, so wide in its scope and helpful in its prospects as that which has just been given. Now, to correct, if you please, two or three current errors. Never let it be said that its function is for a university. One function of a university is to encourage investigation, indeed, but it has many functions, and it is only the first of these that the Carnegie Institution is called upon to promote.

Secondly; do not suppose that the money is to be spent in large buildings, or a great staff of professors and secretaries, and the adjuncts. Not so; it is to be spent in those various departments; but, who is wise enough to say what should be done? Not any president; not any executive committee; not any Board of Trustees. Whom, then, shall it devolve upon? As these suggestions are coming in

from many of you who are within the sound of my voice, and from many that I shall reach by correspondence; as they come in, they will be divided up, they will be examined by experts in the various branches of human knowledge; what can be done with them? They must be put in various classes; chemists' papers, physical papers, geological papers; some of them will be very brief, and will have bright ideas in them, while some of them will be elaborate treatises; what then, is to be done? They will be put into groups, and each of these groups of papers will have to go over into the hands of the specialists; chemists will take the chemical papers; astronomers will take the astronomical papers; and so forth, and so it will go; and when these gentlemen, thus engaged to render the service, not merely for the good will, but for a fair compensation, when they have gone over them, and critically examined them, they will present their views in different reports, and we shall have, next autumn, a series of reports, showing the present condition of science in this country; and then, when we know what is going on in this country, and what the great leaders, far and near, think is wise, it will be time to formulate plans for the expenditure of the money which is entrusted to this Board of Trustees; and you may imagine, my friends, how gratified I am, to be called upon, a veteran in the cause, to take hold of the new work.



I thoroughly believe that when that ancient explorer came to this country—was it Ponce de Leon? Yes, Ponce de Leon came to this country, searching for the fountain of youth, he did not come to Baltimore. Here is a place, where a man, the longer he works, the longer he wishes to work.

I cannot sit down without thanking you a little more explicitly than I did yesterday, for—is *dumfounded* good English, Professor Royce?

*The Chairman*: I think that is a good English word.

Well, then, I say, I was dumfounded, yesterday morning; I had heard, or these newspapers had told me, that something was coming to me, and that Dr. Wilson was going to present it, but I had no idea what it was, and did not discover until I came here. Do you know what you have given me? One gentleman says that I have selections from a thousand of the best writers of the world; brief selections. I think he is right. Another says, "Beware of the man of one book." Another says, "Daniel is no longer a prophet; he is a historian." Another one says, "It is worth its weight in gold." And I answer "Yes," to all of them. It is a precious book. In the first place, it is beautifully bound, and beautifully stamped; in the second place, there is a portrait of a venerable gentleman, but, as I look at him, I say to myself, "It is the other fellow ;

it is not I, but somebody whose portrait they have put in there." And then, it is in the most beautiful form of illumination; I have never seen anything finer; nor do I believe that in the Middle Ages, when illumination was the mode of perpetuating literary work, anything better was done than this. It is really an exquisite piece of penmanship, as well, but as to the words of affection and friendship, I cannot say anything more, except that I am very proud, and very grateful for these tokens of your affection and regard. I shall value that book among the most precious possessions that I have, and, by and by, I shall hope to have it handed down among the archives of the Johns Hopkins University.

*The Chairman:* The force of all the great academic movements is brought to us with every one of these new suggestions. One enterprise leads to another; one task brings a fresh one. We have with us to-night, one who represents one of the great academic movements of this country; that which has had to do with the foundation of the State Universities in the West. That has been, indeed, a fruitful movement, and it has been one with which we have great interest. I call upon President Angell, of the University of Michigan.

## PRESIDENT ANGELL.

I should hardly presume to rise, even in response to this courteous invitation, at this late hour, were it not that I have a little bit of early history in my experience, that concerns the Johns Hopkins University, and you will allow me, therefore, for a moment or two, to figure as a prehistoric relic.

As long ago as 1874,—and that seems very long ago to most of these young gentlemen before me, I am sure,—as President Gilman intimated yesterday, at least three college Presidents were invited by the Trustees to confer with them when they were maturing their plans for the organization of the university. I had the honor to be one of them, and my experience, I suppose, was like that of the others. I was shut up in a room with these Trustees and a stenographer, and what few ideas I had in those early days were squeezed out of me remorselessly, and, I suppose President Eliot and President White went through the same process. After these gentlemen had conferred with us here, several of them, about half a dozen, among whom was my distinguished friend, Mr. White, whom I have had the pleasure of seeing here to-night, one of the Trustees, visited various universities, and, among others, the University of Michigan. After

giving me the pleasure of dining with me one evening, in company with the late Dr. Frieze, the great Latin scholar, who was better versed in university problems than almost any man of his time, we sat up until midnight, and discoursed upon the future of the Johns Hopkins University. The only idea, and I say it not in the way of boasting, and not because I have any reason to suppose that it had any effect upon the minds of those gentlemen, but the only idea that Doctor Frieze and I labored to impress upon them, according to the best of our ability, was that, in our judgment, the thing to do was not to go and erect another college like the four hundred already existing in this land, but to strike out boldly at once, and make a great graduate university. Whether we made any impression upon them, or not, I do not know.

After they came home, they did me the honor to write me a letter, and, as I was afterwards informed, they wrote a similar letter to President Eliot and to President White, asking whom we would suggest for the office of President. And now I have this remarkable statement to make to you; that, without the least conference between us three, we all wrote letters, telling them that the one man was Daniel C. Gilman, of California. That is one of the few acts of my life which I have never regretted. And I was never more proud of it than yesterday and to-day; and, when President Gilman took it

upon himself to resign, I felt that it was not obtrusive in me to write a letter to him, and respectfully protest against his resignation. He professed to me that he was getting old. I told him that I had never heard any such remark as that; and, moreover, that I thought that was not the proper age at which to begin to think one's self old. The truth is, that we have been confessing, I think, our inferiority to our English cousins too long on that subject. We talk about Mr. Gladstone; we talk about Lord Salisbury; we talk about the ability of Englishmen to continue at their posts until they are well within the septuagenarian period, and yet my friend here was going to retreat on the ground, that he had reached the age of seventy; and, when we look about this country, we see men like Thomas W. Higginson, writing as beautiful essays as he ever wrote in the world, at the ripe age of seventy-five, or more; we see George F. Hoar standing in the United States Senate, with undiminished vigor; we see men like George F. Edmunds yet standing at the head of the United States Bar; we see men like the gentleman at my right here, [Professor Gildersleeve], as vigorous as he ever was; we see a man like my friend who has just left the hall, who has been thirty-four years, or more, in the chair of the President of Harvard University, and if any one should talk about his beginning to break in strength, why, we would remind him that he

might as well talk about Bunker Hill Monument beginning to tremble at its base.

If there were time, I would like to say something about the great features of the Johns Hopkins University which have impressed us in the West, but I will content myself by expressing my approbation of all that has been said upon that subject by the many speakers during the past two days. There is, however, one thing which I wish to say a single word about, an idea that so distinguished the early years of the administration of President Gilman, an idea than which I think none has contributed more to the strength and glory of the Johns Hopkins University; an idea that has been alive in this University from the day that he came until now; and I consider it to be a fundamental one in great university administration: that idea is this, that what makes a great university, is not bricks and mortar, but men.

I could not conceal my joy, in the early days of the institution, at the self-restraint which led the President and the Trustees to content themselves with these modest homes in which this University was housed, scarcely to be distinguished from the business houses upon the streets around them, while they went scouring the world for the best men that could be found on the two continents to bring here.

I speak only of those of whom you have been

robbed by death ; such men as Martin, and Sylvester, and Rowland, and Herbert Adams. If you have no building but a shanty on an open field for them, these men would make a great university anywhere. Better have an Agassiz on Penikese island, with nothing but a jelly-fish before him, than to have a house full of pretended scientists, even in Kensington Museum. Abelard under his tents of osier, Socrates, bare-footed in the streets of Athens ; these men were universities worth more than marble palaces crammed full of pedant teachers. To my mind, one of the great glories of this institution has been that it has had the wisdom to look, first of all, for great men and great teachers, and patiently to wait for the time, which, thank God, is now breaking for the Hopkins, when it shall have great mansions in which to house its stores.

Oh, my friends ! Citizens of Baltimore ; citizens of Maryland, if you travel over this wide world, and hear what it is that makes Baltimore and Maryland, with all their heroic history, chiefly famous in the great homes of learning now, remember it is that great fact that you have here this University upon your soil.

Can it be ever true that those ominous words which the President spoke, to-day, shall have a real foundation ; that this University has been suffered to pause in its career ? Oh, my friends, lay

this to heart; when a university like this stops growing, it is beginning to die.

There is nothing more true than that. I do not mean growing in numbers; I do not mean, necessarily, growing in great palaces; but I mean when it stops growing in the possession of great scholars in its chairs; in the power the University has been wielding throughout this land, and throughout the world; in the power that it has wielded, as President Eliot so truly told you to-day, without one spark of exaggeration in his words, of lifting every university in this land to a higher level of endeavor, to stop in that career is indeed to begin to die; and, I would think the people of this State of Maryland should appreciate more, as we do throughout the country, what a great treasure you have here, some of you, I fear, without knowing it. Why should the Legislature halt for an instant? I come from a State where we expect the Legislature to help the University, and they have never been too poor for that. They are voting us, this year, four hundred thousand per annum. Our State is no richer than Maryland. Where are you, citizens of Baltimore? Are you asleep? Do you know what opportunity you have here, in the midst of your houses and palaces? Does the State of Maryland realize what a treasure it has been nursing all these years? I sometimes fear that it does not. I was cheered, immensely, by those promising words of the



Governor to-day. God grant that he represents, truly, the spirit of your Legislature. Your State will never be the poorer for any gift that it shall bestow; for every dollar that it shall pour out upon this institution will be given back with interest, good measure, pressed down, shaken together and running over; there is nothing more true than this. Pardon me for taking so long a time at this late hour.

The Chairman then called upon President Francis Landey Patton, of Princeton University.

#### PRESIDENT PATTON.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, there is less regret that it is too late for me to say anything, inasmuch as everything has been said that can be said on this subject. We have congratulated President Gilman on his splendid achievement, and I wish simply to repeat what has already been said, coupling it with the further remark that we should consider the splendid opportunity that he had and the great advantages that he enjoyed. For instance, he had no alumni and no faculty; and he had a body of trustees gifted with the supreme wisdom of doing whatever he said.

Contemplating the possibilities of the university about to be, he seems to me, in that time, to suggest

the lonely grandeur of a creator. I was struck with what was said to-day in regard to the growth of universities, and the splendid material equipment that is before them; and I wondered what I would do when my University came to have an endowment that would yield an annual income of five millions of dollars. I made up my mind instantly what I would do. I said, in the first place I would provide liberally for the professors; that even before the professors, I would provide very liberally for the instructors; for, although we follow the rules laid down by President Remsen, which commands us to give a single subject to a single man, my experience is that he very soon becomes a married man and needs a larger salary. And then, I think that in the necessary evolutions of university life, some advantages would come to the President too, for he is greatly burdened with multitudinous duties. There was a time, it is true, when he had all the discipline of the University, but he is relieved of that; in most cases the Dean takes charge of that. There was a time, and that time has not quite passed, when he was greatly burdened with the financial interests of the University, but he is in a measure relieved of all anxiety on that subject; and, with this growing differentiation of functions, I hope that the time may come, and that speedily, when, relieved of duties not necessarily pertinent, or not chiefly concerning the



highest phases of his office, he may devote himself strictly to his legitimate work, and his undivided attention be given to the attending of academic celebrations, and receiving honorary degrees, and entertaining those high hopes. With feelings of profound gratitude for the honor conferred upon me to-day, and wishing the new President God-speed, I give place to those who are to follow me on this occasion.

At the conclusion of President Patton's remarks, the Chairman called upon President Edwin Anderson Alderman, of Tulane University.

#### PRESIDENT ALDERMAN.

President Remsen remarked a moment ago, in describing Wyman Park, that he had "stood upon a bluff." The phrase, had somehow, a strangely familiar sound to me. In some previous existence I seem to have heard it. Last week when this banquet began, I had some idea of making a speech to you, but the hands upon the clock admonish me that, after all, perhaps, I had better "stand upon that bluff."

Still, I have come a long distance from the southernmost University of this continent, and from a city and state that command its southern gateway, to bring to Johns Hopkins University,

and to its loyal sons, a message of congratulation, and faith, and duty, and I am going to do that, though the spectacle of this weary company, already feeling the touch of Sabbath peace, reminds me of the story of an old preacher, who had preached for two hours on the major and minor prophets, and, at the end of that time, suddenly said, "Now where shall we put Hosea?" and a man who had "gone 'way back and sat down" and gone to sleep, woke up, at that moment, and said, "Parson, you can let Hosea have my seat; durn me if I ain't going home."

I repeat that I have come to bring a message of faith and duty, and pride to Johns Hopkins University: There is no University in the history of the world that ever passed through its era of origins—usually so full of stumbling blocks and costly errors—with such dignity of achievement, with such steadiness of purpose, with such grand verity and simplicity of educational ideals.

Twenty-five years ago, as a mere boy, I read the inaugural address of Daniel C. Gilman, whose clear voice, heard yesterday, as he laid down this task, and entered upon an enterprise of such import as to stir the blood as adventures of war and conquest once did, rang with the honest emotion of a man who looked upon the work of his hands, and beheld it to be good and enduring. This address told simply how it was proposed to erect here a founda-

tion to conserve, to augment and to disseminate knowledge among men. Twenty-five years is an atom of time in institutional life. This day the whole world has a juster conception of what a real University should be because of the service of Johns Hopkins University. Fortunate in the hour of its birth when the nation was just recovering from the paralysis of war, and was entering upon real national self-consciousness; fortunate in its home here in the middle city of the Atlantic Slope; fortunate in its leader, and in its teachers and scholars, it is no mere compliment to say that Johns Hopkins has been one of the great forces in American life—quickening and energizing the public will, and giving soberness and exaltation to the public spirit. An old merchant's gold has changed its form. Once it was a thing of gold and paper, now it is a thing of spirit diffused over the continent, enriching American life with some thousands of brave, free scholars—living the creed that it is fruitful to follow truth, that it is good to find truth, and that it is better still to apply truth to the service of the dim toiling thousands that make up our turbulent democracy.

Johns Hopkins has taught a young land the sobering gospel of investigation and verification; but it must not be content simply to raise this standard of truth and freedom; it must seek to flash it in the eyes of assertive and unlovely men, beset

by the democratic peril of inefficiency, arrogant self-confidence, and vulgar strength.

Next to Mr. Peabody's great gift for the sustenance of schools for the plain people of the South, this foundation of Johns Hopkins did most to serve the Southern States. For when those States were struggling on without energy in law, or order in society, when grim, true men, beaten in war but unconquerable in spirit, were seeking to find the clew to a changed social order, when almost all the ancient lights had been blown out by the angry gusts of war, Johns Hopkins University was born, and with its birth, scholarship showed its bright face again to the war-smitten land, and high hopes, good cheer, and fresh courage visited the stout hearts of her scholars.

Long life and unending useful service to Johns Hopkins University.

*The Chairman:* Yale University gave us our first President. It is fitting that now we should have a few words of benediction from President Hadley, of Yale.

#### PRESIDENT HADLEY.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I have no prehistoric history to bring forward. If the trustees had asked me who should be the first President of

Johns Hopkins University, I should have answered them as did these gentlemen, "Daniel Coit Gilman." I was only an undergraduate then, and they omitted to ask me. But, one year ago, the Trustees did ask me who, in my opinion, was best fitted to succeed Daniel Coit Gilman, and, without one moment's hesitation, I dictated to my type-writer, "Ira Remsen." I felt sure I was right even then; but, when, Dr. Remsen, this evening, described in the phrase which so struck my friend from Louisiana, how, when the land was given to the Johns Hopkins on certain conditions, he went out on that land, and stood on a bluff, I felt still surer than I was before.

But, gentlemen, Johns Hopkins has had a career greater than can be credited to the work of any one man or two men. You know the story of the school-boy who was being educated in the principles laid down by your honored graduate, President Hall, where they talk at once of the form and the substance, and allow them to correct the exercises on both of those grounds. He was asked to correct two sentences in succession, "The hen has four legs." "He done it." The school-boy's correction was, "He didn't done it; God done it."

President Eliot has said that you are the children of the University. I say one thing more; you, the Alumni of the Johns Hopkins, *are* the University. It is for what you are that Johns Hopkins stands.

It is because you have developed into men, working all over the country, doing deeds of righteousness, and advancing knowledge and truth, that Johns Hopkins is, to-day, a leader in the country's affairs. The undergraduate work, and even the graduate student work, is but the preparation for life such as you are leading. Your life has shown, as nothing else can do, the wisdom of Gilman; and the life of your children will show it, when we meet again, at your hundredth anniversary, seventy-five years hence. For I doubt not that Doctor Welch and Dr. Osler, in the experiments made in those magnificent laboratories, will have solved the problem which shall enable us to meet, with our children, in a larger hall than this, seventy-five years hence. It will show what the University is, and what it has the power to do for all the universities affiliated with Johns Hopkins, for the world of science, and for God's truth.

*The Chairman:* And, now, my brethren, on behalf of all the visiting alumni who have come to this celebration, I want to utter a word of hearty thanks for the kind care that has presided over the preparations for this meeting. We have felt the care that has been taken in the celebration by the University, and by the Committee of the alumni here, upon this point; and, with this word of thanks,—thanking you, also, for the honor that you have



shown me in giving me this office, I bid you, my brothers, farewell.

The assembly then dispersed.



---

INVITED GUESTS.

---

J. George Adami, Professor in McGill University.  
Edwin Anderson Alderman, President Tulane University.  
James Burrill Angell, President University of Michigan.  
Clarence Degrand Ashley, Dean, New York University.  
William Olin Atwater, Professor in Wesleyan University.

Paul Brandon Barringer, Chairman University of Virginia.  
John Shaw Billings, Director New York Public Library.  
William W. Birdsall, President Swarthmore College.  
Robert Emory Blackwell, Professor in Randolph-Macon College.  
Elmer Ellsworth Brown, Professor in University of California.  
Nicholas Murray Butler, President Columbia University.

Russell Henry Chittenden, Professor in Yale University.  
Oscar Henry Cooper, President Baylor University.  
Thomas Frederick Crane, Dean, Cornell University.  
Jabez L. M. Curry, General Agent Peabody Education Fund.

Charles William Dabney, President University of Tennessee.  
George Hutcheson Denny, President Washington and Lee University.  
Thomas Messinger Drown, President Lehigh University.  
Edward K. Dunham, Professor in New York University.

William S. Edwards, Professor in Boston University.  
Charles William Eliot, President Harvard University.  
Richard Theodore Ely, Professor in University of Wisconsin.

Edmund Arthur Engler, President Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

Edward Miner Gallaudet, President Gallaudet College.  
Arthur Pue Gorman, Senator-elect from Maryland.

Arthur Twining Hadley, President Yale University.  
Granville Stanley Hall, President Clark University.  
William Rainey Harper, President University of Chicago.  
Abraham Winegardner Harris, Director Tome Institute.  
William Torrey Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education.  
Thomas Gordon Hayes, Mayor of Baltimore.  
Joshua W. Hering, Comptroller of Maryland.

Edmund Janes James, President Northwestern University.  
David Starr Jordan, President Stanford University.

Samuel Pierpont Langley, Secretary Smithsonian Institution.  
James Loudon, President Toronto University.  
Graham Lusk, Professor in New York University.

E. Hicks Magill, Professor in Swarthmore College.  
John W. Mallet, Professor in University of Virginia.  
James McAllister, President Drexel Institute.  
Louis Emory McComas, Senator from Maryland.  
Henry Mitchell McCracken, Chancellor New York University.

Francis Landey Patton, President Princeton University.  
William Peterson, Principal McGill University.  
John B. Pine, Trustee Columbia University.  
Henry Smith Pritchett, President Massachusetts School of Technology.  
Daniel Boardman Purinton, President West Virginia University.

Palmer C. Ricketts, President Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.  
James Earl Russell, Dean, Columbia University.

Austin Scott, President Rutgers College.  
James Schouler, Professor in Boston University.

Isaac Sharpless, President Haverford College.  
 John Walter Smith, Governor of Maryland.  
 Edgar Fahs Smith, Vice-Provost University of Pennsylvania.  
 George Williamson Smith, President Trinity College, Hartford.  
 William Waugh Smith, Chancellor Randolph-Macon College.  
 John Summers Stahr, President Franklin and Marshall College.  
 George Miller Sternberg, Surgeon-General, U. S. A.

Hannis Taylor, Former Minister to Spain.  
 William Mynn Thornton, Professor in University of Virginia.

Francis Preston Venable, President University of North Carolina.

Charles D. Walcott, Director U. S. Geological Survey.  
 Rev. William Hayes Ward.  
 Ethelbert Dudley Warfield, President Lafayette College.  
 Henry Adam Weber, Professor in Ohio State University.  
 George L. Wellington, Senator from Maryland.  
 Benjamin Ide Wheeler, President University of California.  
 William Wyman, Esq.

---

## SUBSCRIBERS.

---

Alexander C. Abbott, M. D.	Charles M. Armstrong.
John R. Abercrombie, M. D.	Edward C. Armstrong.
Harry N. Abercrombie.	Charles W. Artz.
William H. Adkins.	Brown Ayres.
Cyrus Adler.	
Adolph H. Ahrens.	John P. Baer.
Theodore G. Ahrens.	Thomas S. Baer.
Francis G. Allinson.	William S. Baer, M. D.
Joseph S. Ames.	B. N. Baker.
John McE. Ames.	Thomas S. Baker.
Charles M. Andrews.	Charles G. Baldwin.
Ethan A. Andrews.	Rignal W. Baldwin.

- |                            |                           |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| William D. Baldwin, M. D.  | Thomas R. Brown.          |
| George E. Barnett.         | H. M. Brune.              |
| Bolling W. Barton, M. D.   | Edward N. Brush, M. D.    |
| L. A. Bauer.               | Murray P. Brush, M. D.    |
| Walter Baumgarten, M. D.   | William H. Buckler.       |
| Richard H. Bayard.         | Francis Bullard.          |
| Edward W. Bemis.           | Henry A. Bumstead.        |
| Robert P. Bigelow.         | Horace Burrough, Jr.      |
| V. Edgeworth Bird.         | Trigant Burrow, M. D.     |
| William W. Birdsall.       | Samuel C. Bushnell, Rev.  |
| Gustav Bissing.            | Joel I. Butler, M. D.     |
| John Black.                | B. J. Byrne, M. D.        |
| Frank W. Blackmar.         | Harry S. Byrne.           |
| R. E. Blackwell.           |                           |
| Clarence J. Blake, M. D.   | Angus Cameron.            |
| John F. Bledsoe.           | Charles H. Carey.         |
| William J. A. Bliss.       | George Cary.              |
| Joseph C. Bloodgood, M. D. | J. McK. Cattell.          |
| Maurice Bloomfield.        | James R. Chadwick, M. D.  |
| G. Herbert Boehm.          | James W. Chapman, Jr.     |
| Joseph A. Bolgiano.        | W. Calvin Chesnut.        |
| Walter Bolgiano.           | Francis M. Chisolm, M. D. |
| Leigh Bonsal.              | Henry A. Christian, M. D. |
| John M. Booker.            | E. J. Clark.              |
| William D. Booker.         | Friend E. Clark.          |
| James L. Bost.             | John G. Clark.            |
| Henry J. Bowdoin.          | William B. Clark.         |
| W. Graham Bowdoin.         | W. W. Clark.              |
| James M. Bowyer.           | Walter B. Clarkson.       |
| Jeffrey R. Brackett.       | Abraham Cohen.            |
| T. Kell Bradford.          | Moses S. Cohen.           |
| James H. Brady.            | H. B. Cole.               |
| R. F. Brent.               | Rufus I. Cole, M. D.      |
| James W. Bright.           | W. E. Cole.               |
| Charles E. Brooks.         | William R. Cole.          |
| Isaac Brooks.              | Sydney M. Cone, M. D.     |
| William K. Brooks.         | Robert S. Coupland, Rev.  |
| George S. Brown.           | Kosciusko W. Constantine. |
| Shellman B. Brown.         | A. S. Cook.               |

- |                           |                           |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| E. J. Cook.               | Thomas Fitzgerald, Jr.    |
| Henry W. Cooke.           | George A. Fleming, M. D.  |
| Edward Cowles, M. D.      | Robert Fletcher, M. D.    |
| Rheinart P. Cowles.       | Simon Flexner, M. D.      |
| H. Crawford, M. D.        | Richard H. Follis, M. D.  |
| William C. Crawford.      | Clarence H. Forrest.      |
| J. Bascom Crenshaw.       | S. J. Fort, M. D.         |
| Henry Crew.               | Frederick Foster.         |
| C. W. Cross.              | R. Carll Foster.          |
| Thomas S. Cullen, M. B.   | William L. Foushee.       |
| Harvey Cushing, M. D.     | Charles M. Franklin.      |
|                           | Fabian Franklin.          |
| W. M. Dabney.             | Aaron Friedenwald, M. D.  |
| David T. Day.             | Harry Friedenwald, M. D.  |
| Percy M. Dawson, M. D.    | Herbert Friedenwald.      |
| Robert B. Dixon.          | Julius Friedenwald, M. D. |
| William T. Dixon.         | John S. Fulton, M. D.     |
| George W. Dobbin, M. D.   | Thomas B. Futch, M. B.    |
| John J. Dobler.           |                           |
| Alfred R. L. Dohme.       | George W. Gail.           |
| Daniel B. Dorsey.         | George R. Gaither.        |
| William R. Dorsey.        | Thomas H. Gaither, Jr.    |
| N. Ernest Dorsey.         | Edgar H. Gans.            |
| Howard W. Doughty.        | Amory Gardner, M. D.      |
| James F. Driscoll, Rev.   | W. A. Gardner.            |
| James E. Duerden.         | William C. Gardner.       |
|                           | Robert Garrett.           |
| Herman L. Ebeling.        | Basil L. Gildersleeve.    |
| Charles K. Edmunds.       | John Gill of R.           |
| A. Marshall Elliott.      | William F. Gill.          |
| Charles P. Emerson, M. D. | Daniel C. Gilman.         |
| Frank Emerich.            | G. Houghton Gilman.       |
|                           | D. Sterrett Gittings.     |
| Oliver L. Fassig.         | Otto C. Glaser.           |
| Albert B. Faust.          | Henry H. Glassie.         |
| F. Felber, M. D.          | John Glenn, Jr.           |
| George W. Field.          | John M. Glenn.            |
| John H. Finley.           | Robert E. Golladay, Rev.  |
| John M. T. Finney, M. D.  | Edgar Goodman.            |

- |                           |                           |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| E. R. L. Gould.           | Charles W. Hawkins, M. D. |
| G. W. Gould.              | C. Willard Hayes.         |
| M. Brayton Graff.         | Daniel H. Hayes.          |
| Caswell Grave.            | William A. Hedrick.       |
| Leon E. Greenbaum.        | John C. Hemmeter, M. D.   |
| David I. Green.           | O. F. Hershey.            |
| Herbert E. Greene.        | John Hinkley.             |
| Edward H. Griffin.        | Abel H. Huizinga, Rev.    |
| Nathaniel E. Griffin.     | Bert H. Hite.             |
| B. Howell Griswold, Jr.   | H. W. Hitzrot.            |
| Joseph P. Grogan.         | James M. Hitzrot, M. D.   |
| Isaac Guggenheimer.       | Clifton F. Hodge.         |
| J. C. Guggenheimer.       | Edwin R. Hodge.           |
| Adolph Guttmacher.        | Samuel V. Hoffman.        |
| Louis K. Gutman.          | Jacob H. Hollander.       |
|                           | Jesse H. Holmes.          |
| Clayton C. Hall.          | Henry Holt.               |
| William S. Halsted, M. D. | Lewis N. Hopkins.         |
| B. Howard Haman.          | W. O. Horsey.             |
| Louis P. Hamburger, M. D. | Theodore Hough.           |
| William C. A. Hammel.     | Benjamin C. Howard.       |
| W. Browne Hammond, Jr.    | Charles M. Howard.        |
| Arthur B. Hancock.        | Frederick C. Howe.        |
| James G. Hardy.           | William H. Howell, M. D.  |
| W. Beatty Harlan.         | Lorrain S. Hulbert.       |
| George Harper.            | William I. Hull.          |
| Norman McL. Harris, M. D. | Guy L. Hunner, M. D.      |
| W. Hall Harris.           | Reid Hunt, M. D.          |
| Ross G. Harrison, M. D.   | J. Rufus Hunter.          |
| J. Edward Harry.          | John E. Hurst.            |
| Stephen C. Harry.         | Edward P. Hyde.           |
| Edward Hart.              |                           |
| Edward T. Hartman.        | Elihu E. Jackson.         |
| Edward M. Hartwell, M. D. | H. Barton Jacobs, M. D.   |
| Percy M. Harvey.          | Norman James.             |
| Roland B. Harvey.         | N. W. James.              |
| Stephen P. Harwood.       | J. Franklin Jameson.      |
| Louis W. Haskell, Jr.     | A. F. Jamieson.           |
| Paul Haupt.               | Stuart S. Janney.         |

Francis M. Jencks.  
 George C. Jenkins.  
 Michael Jenkins.  
 M. Ernest Jenkins.  
 Charles W. L. Johnson.  
 G. W. Johnson.  
 Samuel Johnston, M. D.  
 C. Hampson Jones.  
 Harry C. Jones.  
 Lyman C. Josephs.

J. Albert Kalb.  
 Joseph H. Kastle.  
 F. W. Keating, M. D.  
 Harry W. Keating.  
 George T. Kemp.  
 R. Brent Keyser.  
 William Keyser.  
 Frank A. Killmon, Rev.  
 Arthur L. Kimball.  
 John H. King.  
 Stephen H. King, M. D.  
 S. Wardwell Kinney.  
 Francis J. Kirby.  
 Harris E. Kirk, Rev.  
 George W. Knapp, Jr.  
 Henry McE. Knower.  
 J. F. Kohler.  
 George F. Kunz.

Benjamin W. Lacy.  
 Robert Lacy.  
 Arthur L. Lamb.  
 Eli M. Lamb.  
 Henry Lanahan.  
 Charles R. Lanman.  
 Ferdinand C. Latrobe.  
 Sylvan H. Lauchheimer.  
 Henry Lauts.

Frederic S. Lee.  
 George Lefevre.  
 Eugene J. Leopold.  
 Edwin S. Lewis.  
 Charles F. Lindsay.  
 G. Milton Linthicum, M. D.  
 J. Charles Linthicum.  
 Arthur S. Loevenhart.  
 Frank W. Lynch, M. D.

Arthur W. Machen.  
 Arthur W. Machen, Jr.  
 J. Gresham Machen.  
 Leonard L. Mackall.  
 Thomas Mackall.  
 Arthur S. Mackenzie.  
 James C. Mackenzie.  
 John N. Mackenzie, M. D.  
 Hugh S. Magruder.  
 Franklin P. Mall, M. D.  
 Francis Mallory.  
 Theodore Marburg.  
 C. Carroll Marden.  
 Richard E. Marine.  
 John W. Marshall.  
 William S. Marston.  
 E. G. Marston.  
 Frank J. Mather, Jr.  
 Edward B. Mathews.  
 J. Clarke Matthai.  
 William H. Matthai.  
 W. Howard Matthai.  
 Reginald L. McAll.  
 Edward G. McDowell.  
 George K. McGaw.  
 W. J. McGee.  
 Allan McLane.  
 Robert M. McLane.  
 E. Lindon Mellus, M. D.

- |                           |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| William R. Mertin.        | Arthur A. Oehm.          |
| Maynard M. Metcalf.       | Wesley M. Oler.          |
| George W. Middlekauff.    | Thomas Opie, M. D.       |
| L. Wardlaw Miles, M. D.   | William Osler, M. D.     |
| Benjamin L. Miller.       |                          |
| C. W. Emil Miller.        | Walter H. Page.          |
| Edgar G. Miller.          | Chase Palmer.            |
| G. Brown Miller, M. D.    | Omar Pancoast, M. D.     |
| Joseph G. H. Miller.      | Louis A. Parsons.        |
| J. J. Mills, M. D.        | Stewart Paton, M. D.     |
| Charles S. Minot.         | Nathan A. Pattillo.      |
| James F. Mitchell, M. D.  | Harold Pender.           |
| Thomas F. Moran.          | George D. Penniman.      |
| G. Emory Morgan.          | Thomas D. Penniman.      |
| Thomas H. Morgan.         | John S. Pennington.      |
| J. Leverett Moore.        | Charles A. Perkins.      |
| Thomas B. Moore.          | Henry F. Perkins.        |
| Frank Morley.             | William H. Perkins, Jr.  |
| Thomas J. Morris.         | John Phelps.             |
| George C. Morrison.       | Gifford Pinchot.         |
| William E. Moseley, M. D. | Walter B. Platt, M. D.   |
| Jacob M. Moses.           | J. Hall Pleasants, M. D. |
| Roland J. Mulford.        | Richard H. Pleasants.    |
| A. S. Murray.             | John P. Poe.             |
| Daniel M. Murray.         | Charles L. Poor.         |
| Nicholas Murray.          | Louis M. Potts.          |
| William S. Myers.         | E. B. Prettyman.         |
|                           | Herbert L. Price.        |
| Henry F. Nachtrieb.       | J. Dyneley Prince.       |
| A. C. Nelson.             |                          |
| Simon Newcomb.            | G. L. P. Radcliffe.      |
| Waldo Newcomer.           | George Ragland.          |
| Thomas Newhall.           | John B. Ramsay.          |
| L. H. Nice.               | Blanchard Randall.       |
| W. W. Nichols.            | Daniel R. Randall.       |
| William A. Nitze.         | Wyatt W. Randall.        |
| W. A. Noyes.              | Albert W. Rayner.        |
|                           | Jesse S. Reeves.         |
| B. F. O'Connor.           | William P. Reeves.       |



- |                            |                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Henry O. Reik, M. D.       | Daniel N. Shoemaker.        |
| Charles M. Remsen.         | Alfred J. Shriver.          |
| Ira Remsen.                | Ernest G. Sihler.           |
| Lawrence A. Reymann.       | W. Simons, M. D.            |
| Paul O. Reymann.           | St. George L. Sioussat.     |
| Edward Rhoads.             | Robert F. Skutch.           |
| Palmer C. Ricketts.        | J. R. Slattery, Rev.        |
| Albert C. Ritchie.         | Charles L. Smith.           |
| David E. Roberts.          | Charles S. Smith.           |
| Franklin Roberts.          | Frank R. Smith, M. D.       |
| Adoniram J. Robinson.      | Kirby F. Smith.             |
| G. Canby Robinson.         | W. F. Snow, M. D.           |
| Ralph Robinson.            | Siegmund B. Sonneborn.      |
| Edward B. Rosa.            | A. M. Soper.                |
| William Rosenau, Rev.      | Morris A. Soper.            |
| Brantz M. Roszel.          | Mase S. Southworth, M. D.   |
| John J. Rothermel.         | William F. M. Sowers, M. D. |
| Josiah Royce.              | Lindsay C. Spencer.         |
| Glanville Y. Rusk, M. D.   | Edward H. Spieker.          |
| William W. Russell, M. D.  | Charles M. Stearns.         |
| F. Roy Rutter.             | Julian S. Stein.            |
| Moses R. Ryttenberg.       | Simon H. Stein.             |
|                            | Bernard C. Steiner.         |
| Benjamin R. Schenk, M. D.  | Hugo Steiner.               |
| Charles C. Schenk.         | Arthur Steuart.             |
| Alex. van R. Schermerhorn. | Morris P. Stevens.          |
| Lawrence F. Schmeckebier.  | C. Morton Stewart, Jr.      |
| Ernst Schmeisser.          | John Stewart.               |
| Samuel D. Schmucker.       | Redmond C. Stewart.         |
| William Schnauffer.        | William R. Stokes, M. D.    |
| William T. Sedgwick.       | John S. Stone.              |
| William G. Seiple.         | Samuel W. Stratton.         |
| George B. Shattuck.        | Theodore E. Straus.         |
| Albert Shaw.               | Irving Stringham.           |
| J. Eustace Shaw.           | W. Stuart Symington, Jr.    |
| Thomas L. Shearer, M. D.   |                             |
| J. F. Shemwell, M. D.      | G. Lane Taneyhill, M. D.    |
| N. W. Shields.             | G. Lane Taneyhill, Jr.      |
| Charles C. Shippen, M. D.  | Archibald H. Taylor.        |

- W. C. Thayer.  
 Samuel Theobald, M. D.  
 J. Pembroke Thom.  
 Douglas H. Thomas, Jr.  
 Henry M. Thomas, M. D.  
 Henry O. Thompson.  
 William H. Tolman.  
 John A. Tompkins, M. D.  
 Charles B. Torsch.  
 James McC. Trippe.  
 Edwin L. Turnbull.  
 Lawrence Turnbull.  
 Benjamin Tuska.  
 Jesse Tyson.  
  
 Joseph N. Ullman.  
 Nathan Ullman.  
  
 George L. VanBibber.  
 Richard M. Venable.  
 John M. Vincent.  
 Bert J. Vos.  
  
 Charles W. Waidner.  
 George Wallace, M. D.  
 Edwin Warfield.  
 F. Howard Warfield.  
 Minton Warren.  
 Campbell E. Waters.  
 Francis E. Waters.  
 William T. Watson.  
 Charles S. Watts.  
 Stephen H. Watts, M. D.  
 Robert W. H. Weech, Rev.  
 William S. Weedon.  
 William H. Welch, M. D.  
 Wm. George Weld.  
 James R. Wheeler.  
 A. W. Whitaker, M. D.  
  
 Francis White.  
 Miles White, Jr.  
 Richard J. White.  
 John B. Whitehead, Jr.  
 George Whitelock.  
 J. Edwin Whiteman.  
 Morris Whitridge.  
 William Whitridge, M. D.  
 C. C. Wholey, M. D.  
 Henry H. Wiegand.  
 Bernard Wiesenfeld.  
 Arthur C. Wightman.  
 John R. Wightman.  
 Lewis W. Wilhelm.  
 A. Williams, M. D.  
 Dudley Williams.  
 J. Whitridge Williams, M. D.  
 Henry W. Williams.  
 Westel W. Willoughby.  
 Gordon Wilson, M. D.  
 Harry L. Wilson.  
 Frederick H. Wines.  
 Charles K. Winne, Jr., M. D.  
 John R. Winslow, M. D.  
 Adolph G. Wolfe.  
 M. Wilton Wolf, Jr.  
 Frank A. Wolff, Jr.  
 Henry Wood.  
 Robert W. Wood.  
 James A. Woodburn.  
 John F. Woodhull.  
 Charles F. Woods.  
 Arthur Wright.  
 Charles B. Wright.  
 J. B. Noel Wyatt.  
 Douglas M. Wylie.  
  
 Hugh H. Young, M. D.  
 Jacob F. Young.

PRESENTATION

TO

PROF. BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE.



PRESENTATION  
TO  
PROF. BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

---

ON the evening of Thursday, February 20th, the volume of studies which a number of the former students of Professor Gildersleeve had prepared in honor of the seventieth anniversary of his birth, was formally presented to him at a banquet held in the rooms of the University Club. There were present beside Professor Gildersleeve himself the following former students: F. G. Allinson, of Brown University; M. Bloomfield, of J. H. U.; G. M. Bolling, of the Catholic University at Washington; Mitchell Carroll, of Columbian University; W. B. Daniel, of Marston's University School; Herman L. Ebeling, of Haverford College; W. F. Gill, of Trinity College, N. C.; Roscoe Guernsey, of J. H. U.; J. E. Harry, of the University of Cincinnati; C. Johnston, of J. H. U.; James W. Kern, of Belair Academy; Wilfred P. Mustard, of Haverford College; C. W. E. Miller, of J. H. U.; J. L. Moore, of Vassar College; Robert S. Radford, of Elmira College; E. G. Sihler, of the University of the City of New York; Kirby F. Smith, of J. H. U.; A. M. Soho, of Baltimore City College; Edward H. Spieker, of J. H. U.; Bert J. Vos, of J. H. U.; B. L. Wiggins, of the University of the South; Harry L. Wilson, of J. H. U.; and Professors Edward H. Griffin, of J. H. U.; M. Warren, of Harvard University, and J. R. Wheeler, of Columbia University.

Professor Bloomfield acted as toastmaster. Addresses were made by Messrs. Sihler, Allinson, Miller, Warren, Griffin, Wheeler, and Wiggins.

Professor Spieker made the presentation address. He spoke as follows :

Professor Gildersleeve, I know that it is no item of news which I bring when I tell you that for some time past a number of your former students have been at work on a volume of studies in your honor. Even had we intended to keep the matter a secret it is quite certain that the all-discovering reporter would have found us out and have published the fact to the world. It is my pleasure and my privilege to tell you to-night that this book of ours is at last finished. It is true, it issues from the press a little later than we had intended, for we were desirous that it should appear on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of your birth, but after all, it is perhaps better that it is as it is; and our regret is tempered by the reflection that this is not an inappropriate moment to present the book to you, when that university with the upbuilding of which you had so much to do is celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding, and when more of our co-workers can be with us to rejoice in the completion of a work which has meant so much to us because we hoped that it might give pleasure to you. I shall not speak of the many vexatious delays with which we have had to contend: you have had many years of experience in this kind of work and know full well the many hindrances in the way of a prompt publication.

Nor shall I speak of the character of the work which this volume represents: it would not benefit me and it would be useless, for you will be better able to judge of our failure, or our success, than any one of us could be. I can assure you, however, that the work was done with an enthusiastic interest and a devotion to yourself which, I am sure, will go far to atone for any shortcomings which you may still find in it. We can only hope that it will not be found unworthy of yourself and of the university which we are proud to represent.

The list of contributors is in every way a representative one. It covers the entire period of your activity here, from

Sihler to Sanders the several triennia are in the line, and in the positions which these men now hold, they are no less representative: the contributions come from California as well as from Maryland, from Canada and from Texas; nor are they by any means restricted to that particular field which you have made in so peculiar a sense your own: Sanskrit and Hebrew, English and German are here, and the first article to be put in the hands of the committee, and which leads the way in the book, in its able treatment of the Apostolic Commission deals with a phase of the study of Greek which has never been made the subject of your seminary work.

On the members of the committee having the matter in charge fell more than the average labor incident on the production of such a work, but I am sure that it will not be felt as an invidious distinction when I single out two as worthy of special mention; I mean Dr. Miller, who gave unstintingly of his time and labor to the promotion of the work, and Dr. Sutphen, whose restless energy and tireless activity were ever an incentive to those who were privileged to be associated with him. His sad death is rendered all the more sad that he was not enabled to see this day.

It has been our desire to show you that we honor you. We honor you as a profound scholar, as an original thinker, as a great teacher. We rejoice that you have passed the age limit set for himself by the effeminate Mimnermus, who must have been afflicted with rheumatism or dyspepsia. We sincerely hope that with undiminished vigor you will show that Solon, too, was wrong in his correction of the clear-voiced singer, as he certainly was in the estimate which he gives in his poem on the ages of men.

And now, dear Professor Gildersleeve, I have the pleasure to hand you this book. Its 530 pages represent work done by forty of those who have drawn inspiration from you and from your work. The excellent copy of a recent photograph of yourself which has been prefixed we have added for ourselves and for all others who may see the book. It will always serve to recall to our minds the familiar features of

him we all admire, and the auspicious fact that at seventy he still continues to be physically vigorous, able to do for many others yet to come what he has done for us.

Professor Gildersleeve responded as follows :

I will not say that this is the proudest moment of my life. The only line of Lincoln's favorite poem that I can recall is "Oh! why should the spirit of mortal be proud?" but it is a line that in one form or another I have been saying to myself ever since I learned the Book of Proverbs and the Shorter Catechism. I will not say that this is the supreme moment of my long career, because I do not conceive life as a race course or a circus, but as a climb, and I am still climbing. But your loving kindness, your devotion, your self-sacrifice have brought me to a high point from which I can look back on the long way that has been traversed, and look forward to the still longer way that is to be trodden by your feet and the feet of your successors. And my heart is full of joy, full of gratitude that I have been permitted to lead, if only after a fashion, such a company of eager and consecrated spirits. One of the most dashing rough riders that have ever curveted on the plains of philology, or performed feats of lofty tumbling on the heights of scholarship, has said one thing that has been much in my mind during the last few days. *A nullo libentius discas quam a discipulo.* True, there is a dangerous element of pride lurking in this sentiment, that very pride which one would keep down; and yet love and gratitude will not allow that pride to be a mortal sin; and, as I look over the names of the contributors to this superb volume, names written high in the annals of their chosen domains of work, names that are associated with the forward movement of our world of research; when I glance over the various themes that have been handled, and think of the light that has come from all this patient and intense study, I feel how good and pleasant a thing it is to learn from those who have once called me teacher, or haply here and there in early enthusiasm, master. Every-



one who has ventured out of the class-room into the larger world, everyone who has brought his wares into the open market, who has delivered addresses and compiled text-books and written essays, is more or less tempted to measure his success in life by the reception which has been accorded to the work that is intended for the public ear, the public eye. The author multiplies himself by the man that he reaches directly; and the teacher with his narrower circle shrinks in his own estimation. This false standard seems inevitable; and I do not deny that I have been at times under its domination and have called myself a respectable failure. But an hour like this rectifies the count; and as the most successful writer in our line of work can only live on, and live on impersonally in the few little contributions he has made to the vast sum of that which is known, so a teacher who has done his duty day by day, a teacher, who has been privileged to guide and inspire the studies of so many high and enthusiastic spirits, may be reconciled with his lot in life, may rejoice in it.

No one, let me add, is in a better position than I am, to know what such a volume as you have offered me has cost the givers. Every little monograph represents many hours of hard work and intense thought. Who knows this better than the paragraph writer of 'Brief Mention?' The volume which you have given me has been brought together by editorial labours which no one can better appreciate than the man who has been over a score of years in the editorial harness.

But as I look from one to another of the group of men who have made me their debtor for the rest of my life, I miss the lithe form, the flashing eye, the kindly presence of one who threw himself into the task with all the ardour of his nature. May I ask a pause for a silent tribute to the memory of Morris Sutphen.

This sad note could not be kept out of this joyous meeting. But after all, be a course short or long, it is complete in the eyes of the great Master, to whom we reverently commit all our ways. There is no broken column. The Supreme Architect finishes the shaft.

And so back to life and all its claims. You have cheered my heart for what remains of toil and endeavour. You have shown, what after all appeals to me most, that you have recognized in the brazen bowels of a Didymus Chalkenteros, the great grammarian—that you have recognized in one who has spared you as little as he has spared himself, something that yearns and loves. Else there had not been this manifestation of affection, for it is love that begets love. And so to all the little band in this upper room, and all the absent brothers who live in the airy regions of high thought and high purpose, my best wishes, my heartfelt thanks.

The volume of studies contains 527 pages, with a photographure of Professor Gildersleeve, and bears the following dedicatory page.

TO  
 BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE  
 IN COMMEMORATION OF  
 THE SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH  
 THESE STUDIES ARE DEDICATED  
 AS A TOKEN OF AFFECTION, GRATITUDE, AND ESTEEM  
 BY HIS PUPILS

*θεὸς εὐφρων εἶη λοιπαῖς εὐχαῖς*

OCTOBER 23, 1831

OCTOBER 23, 1901.

The following is the table of contents :

The Apostolic Commission. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS.  
 Homeric Echoes in Matthew Arnold's "Balder Dead."  
 By WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

- Ad Catull., XXX, 4-5. By WILLIAM HAMILTON KIRK.
- The Symbolic Gods. By MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.
- The Use of the Simple for the Compound Verb in Persius.  
By HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.
- The Motion of the Voice in Connection with Accent and  
Accentual Arsis and Thesis. By C. W. L. JOHNSON.
- Augustus Princeps. By E. G. SIHLER.
- The Athenian in his Relations to the State.  
By CHARLES ALBERT SAVAGE.
- Use of the Suffixes *-ānus* and *-īnus* in forming Possessive  
Adjectives from Names of Persons.  
By ROBERT S. RADFORD.
- The Fall of the Assyrian Empire.  
By CHRISTOPHER JOHNSTON.
- Ne emisses, ne poposcisses*, and Similar Expressions.  
By H. C. ELMER.
- Notes on the Latin Verbs of Rating. By GORDON J. LAING.
- The Pentapody in Greek Poetry. By E. H. SPIEKER.
- Horace and Lucilius: A Study of Horace, Serm. I, 10.  
By GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON.
- The Aim and Results of Plato's Theaetetus.  
By W. J. ALEXANDER.
- On the Uses of the Prepositions in Homer.  
By A. S. HAGGETT.
- An Erroneous Phonetic Sequence. By EDWIN W. FAY.
- The Connection between Music and Poetry in Early Greek  
Literature. By H. RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH.
- Some Statistics on the Order of Words in Greek.  
By HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.
- The Athens of Aristophanes. By MITCHELL CARROLL.
- On the Theory of the Ideal Condition in Latin.  
By GONZALEZ LODGE.
- On the Case Construction of Verbs of Sight and Hearing in  
Greek. By JAMES WILLIAM KERN.
- The Scenic Value of the Miniatures in the Manuscripts of  
Terence. By JOHN W. BASORE.
- Pupula Duplex. By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

- Ingenium* in the Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality. By GEORGE VAIL EDWARDS.
- Magic in Theokritos and Vergil. By MORRIS C. SUTPHEN.
- The Interpretation of Euripides' Alcestis.  
By AUGUSTUS TABER MURRAY.
- Chiasmus in the Epistles of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny and Fronto.  
By R. B. STEELE.
- On Causes Contributory to the Loss of the Optative, etc., in Later Greek. By FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.
- The Etymology and Meaning of the Sanskrit Root *īd*.  
By JENS A. NESS.
- The Technic of Shakspeare's Sonnets. By THOMAS R. PRICE.
- The Attitude of Alcuin toward Vergil.  
By OMER A. FLOYD LONG.
- Notes on Lucian's Syrian Goddess. By DANIEL A. PENICK.
- The Greeting in the Letters of Cicero. By E. M. PEASE.
- Oration XI of Dio Chrysostomus. A Study in Sources.  
By WALTER A. MONTGOMERY.
- The Use of *atque* and *ac* in Silver Latin.  
By EMORY B. LEASE.
- Indicative Questions with *μή* and *ἄρα μή*. By J. E. HARRY.
- Rime-Parallelism in Old High German Verse.  
By BERT JOHN VOS.
- Did Euripides write *σκύμνων*, Hipp. 1276?  
By HENRY N. SANDERS.
- The Participle in Apollonius Rhodius.  
By GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.
- Μή* for *οὐ* before Lucian. By EDWIN L. GREEN.
- A Tragic Fragment of Ion. By JOHN ADAMS SCOTT.
- The Metaphor in Aeschylus. By J. T. LEES.
- The Relation of the Rhythm of Poetry to that of the Spoken Language with especial reference to Ancient Greek.  
By C. W. E. MILLER.
- Index.
-

RECEPTION  
AND  
CONVERSAZIONE.



## RECEPTION AND CONVERSAZIONE.

---

IN the evening of February 21, there was a reception to the visiting delegates, alumni, and friends of the University in McCoy Hall. About two thousand persons were present. The guests were received by the President and members of the faculty in the large assembly room on the first floor. On the third and fourth floors exhibits were made by the library of manuscripts, early printed books, art works, engravings and etchings. Exhibits were also made by the geological, chemical, biological and physical departments. There were also special displays of Oriental antiquities and books by the Semitic department, and of books and historical and archaeological relics by the historical department.

A list of some of the more interesting exhibits is appended.

### LIST OF ARTICLES EXHIBITED AT THE RECEPTION AND CONVERSAZIONE, FEBRUARY 21, 1902.

#### LIBRARY EXHIBIT.

A portion of the collection of Americana and Art Works presented by John W. McCoy.

A set of the Publications of the University and Hospital.

Case containing manuscripts and early-printed books.

The volumes of the *Reproduction of the Kashmirian Atharva-Veda* recently published under the editorial direction of Professor Bloomfield.

A number of illustrated books and matters of interest.

Among these are the portfolio volumes describing the Ceramic Collection of W. T. Walters, recently presented by Mr. Edgar G. Miller of Baltimore.

Reproductions of early Mexican manuscripts, given by the Duke de Loubat.

A set of books given by the King of Siam.

Medals belonging to the University.

Fragments of Greek manuscripts on papyrus.

The volume of Studies in honor of Professor Gildersleeve.

The volume of Studies in honor of Professor Welch.

Engravings, etchings, etc., from the McCoy Collection.

The collection of Antiquities from Cyprus presented by Mr. Theodore Marburg.

Facsimiles of the antique gold cups found at Mycenæ.

A replica of the bronze portrait of Chief Justice Marshall.

A collection of facsimiles of manuscripts.

The Works of Frederick the Great given by the German Emperor.

#### GEOLOGICAL EXHIBIT.

Large geological maps of the six continents, and hypsometric and physiographic maps of Maryland used in teaching.

Early maps of Maryland and specimens of the types of maps which are now being prepared under the direction of the Geological Department.

A series of portraits of prominent scholars who have established the science of geology on its present basis.

A large group of the Fellows of the Geological Society of America, representing the more prominent contemporaries engaged in geological work in this country.

A series of published and manuscript maps and monographs showing some of the work accomplished by the members of the Geological Department.

Interesting specimens from the region about Baltimore.

Models and apparatus used in instruction in geology.



## CHEMICAL EXHIBIT.

Experiments illustrating certain physical-chemical principles.

A collection of chemical specimens.

## BIOLOGICAL EXHIBIT.

1. Illustrations of Zoölogical and Botanical Researches which have been carried on in the Biological Laboratory.
2. Preparations under microscope to show actions of fresh-water animals, structure of plants, oyster eggs and action of gills, young of starfish, movements of protoplasm, etc.
3. Part of a collection of butterflies recently presented to the University by Dr. Howard A. Kelly.
4. Case of Corals from the West Indies.
5. Collection of Sponges from the West Indies.
6. Books from the Biological Library.
7. Living microscopic plants.
8. Seeds of Baltimore plants.

## PHYSICAL EXHIBIT.

1. Photographic Map of Normal Solar Spectrum.
2. Spectrum of the electric arc shown with the Concave Grating.
3. Demonstration of the ultra violet light in the spectrum with the Quartz Spectrograph.
4. The Zeeman Phenomenon exhibited by means of Michelson's Echelon Grating.
5. Various specimens illustrating the recent processes of photography in natural colors by the methods of Lippman, Ives, Joly, and Wood.
6. Representation of
  - (a) A total Eclipse of the Sun.
  - (b) An artificial Desert Mirage.
7. Various experiments with polarized light.

## SEMITIC AND ARCHÆOLOGICAL EXHIBIT.

A collection of Assyriological objects.

Greek pottery belonging to the Baltimore Society of the Archæological Institute of America.

The Cohen Collection of Egyptian Antiquities.

Jewish Ceremonial Objects given by Mr. Henry Sonneborn.

Hebrew Manuscripts presented by Mr. Leopold Strouse.

The Polychrome Bible edited by Professor Haupt, in both Hebrew and English.

A collection of books in the Cuneiform Text, including Professor Haupt's edition of the Nimrod Epic.

Facsimiles of Egyptian Papyri.

Various books illustrating Biblical Research of the present day.

A reproduction in color of a recently discovered work of antique art (the Babylonian Lion).

## HISTORICAL EXHIBIT.

An exhibit of historical and archæological relics;—among these are :

*Primitive.*

Mayer Collection of Implements of the Stone Age.

Ellinger Collection of Relics of the Lake Dwellers.

Stone Implements, Maryland and America.

Relics of American Indians, Ancient and Modern.

Weapons from the Pacific Islands and Oceanica.

Implements from Alaska, Mexico, etc.

*Classical Antiquity.*

The Helbig Collection of Greek and Roman Coins, presented by gentlemen of Baltimore.

Engravings of the Ruins of Rome, by Piranesi.

*Modern.*

Manuscript Books and Documents, 16th and 17th Centuries.  
Facsimiles of Mediæval Documents and Engravings.  
Early Colonial Pamphlets.  
Relics of Early Maryland.  
Colonial and Confederate Paper Money.  
The Greenway Autograph Collection.  
The Gilmore Autograph Collection.  
Portraits of Distinguished Historians and Statesmen.  
Murray Collection of Japanese Relics.

---



OTHER RECEPTIONS

AND

REUNIONS.



## REUNION OF THE HISTORICAL SEMINARY.

---

ON Thursday evening, February 20, 1902, a reunion of the Historical Seminary took place in the Historical Library in McCoy Hall. This was a gathering of former students in History, Politics and Economics, and was held in connection with a regular meeting of the Historical and Political Science Association.

This Association was founded December 19, 1877. The first president of it was Dr. D. C. Gilman, and the first secretary was Professor Henry C. Adams, now of the University of Michigan. This meeting was the 536th mentioned in the records, and was called to order by Dr. J. M. Vincent in the Bluntschli Library, the members being seated about the long table, which has been the center of the Seminary work for more than twenty years.

A paper on "The Human Side of the Continental Congress" was then presented by Dr. Herbert Friedenwald (A. B., J. H. U., 1890), formerly Chief of Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, now of Philadelphia. At the conclusion of this address several of the visiting members were called upon for reminiscences of seminary life. Dr. L. W. Wilhelm, of Baltimore, (Fellow, 1883, Ph. D., 1884) recalled the beginnings of the Historical Museum and early methods of study. Professor J. F. Jameson (Ph. D., 1882) of the University of Chicago was Fellow in History at the time when the Bluntschli Library was presented. He gave some account of the Seminary at that time, and his long connection with the University as Associate gave rise to other interesting recollections.

Professor Davis R. Dewey (Fellow, 1885, Ph. D., 1886) of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology spoke for the economists, and recalled the inspiration he had received while here. Dr. E. M. Hartwell (Fellow, 1879, Ph.D., 1881) formerly Associate in Physical Training, now Secretary of the Department of Municipal Statistics, Boston, was one of the early contributors to the Historical and Political Science Association. He had been a friend since school days of the late Professor Adams and gave interesting reminiscences of his career. All of the speakers paid warm tributes to Professor Adams and the meeting became spontaneously a memorial occasion.

After adjournment of the Association light refreshments were served. Sixty-six persons were present, all of whom had been in some way connected with the department. One hundred and eight Doctors of Philosophy have been graduated in History, Politics, and Economics, and of these one hundred and three are now living. Out of this number thirty-two were present at the reunion.

#### PERSONS PRESENT.

##### *Former Lecturers and Literary Contributors.*

Dr. D. C. Gilman.	Mr. Theodore Marburg.
Dr. E. M. Hartwell.	Mr. J. G. Whiteley.
Dr. G. M. Fisk.	Mr. L. B. Fifield.

##### *Doctors of Philosophy.*

J. F. Jameson.	B. C. Steiner.
L. W. Wilhelm.	W. H. Tolman.
D. R. Dewey.	W. W. Willoughby.
B. J. Ramage.	F. C. Howe.
C. M. Andrews.	Wm. I. Hull.
C. L. Smith.	C. D. Hazen.
J. M. Vincent.	J. H. Hollander.
J. A. Woodburn.	J. C. Ballagh.



W. A. Wetzel.	J. R. Ewing.
J. W. Chapman, Jr.	St.G. L. Sioussat.
F. E. Sparks.	C. W. Sommerville.
J. M. Callahan.	W. T. Thom.
S. E. Forman.	L. F. Schmeckeber.
B. B. James.	W. S. Myers.
F. R. Rutter.	G. L. Radcliffe.
G. C. Lee.	G. E. Barnett.

*Former Students not proceeding to the Doctor's Degree.*

Mr. G. W. McCreary, Librarian Maryland Historical Society.  
 Prof. H. R. Seager, of the University of Pennsylvania.  
 Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, of Philadelphia.  
 Rev. E. L. Watson, of Baltimore.  
 Mr. E. T. Hartman, of Boston.  
 Mr. R. J. Mulford, of Baltimore.  
 Mr. E. C. Johnson, of Baltimore.  
 Prof. St. James Cummings, of Charleston, S. C.

*Resident Students in History, Economics and Politics.*

E. J. Benton.	P. Hollis.
J. F. Bledsoe.	K. Kodera.
J. L. Bost.	J. S. Moore.
N. Boyer.	T. B. Moore.
O. P. Chitwood.	A. W. Rayner.
J. J. Crumley.	T. J. Stubbs.
H. J. Eckenrode.	J. M. White.
R. Garrett.	M. Wingert.
J. W. Harry.	J. M. Wright.
Y. Hattori.	R. H. Wright.

---

REUNION OF BIOLOGISTS.

---

ON Friday evening, February 21, there was an informal reunion in the Biological Laboratory of those who are now or have been in the past identified with the department of Biology.

Among those present were :

Professors William Keith Brooks, W. H. Howell, F. P. Mall, J. J. Abel, and E. A. Andrews, and Doctors R. G. Harrison, R. Hunt, D. S. Johnson, B. W. Barton, W. G. MacCallum, J. E. Duerden, H. M. Thomas, A. C. Abbott, G. T. Kemp, and H. McE. Knowler, of the Johns Hopkins University ; Dr. R. P. Bigelow, Librarian of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Editor of the *American Naturalist* ; Professor Samuel F. Clarke of Williams College ; Professor E. G. Conklin of the University of Pennsylvania ; Dr. G. W. Field of the Rhode Island Agricultural Station ; Professor C. F. Hodge, Clark University ; Professor Theodore Hough of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology ; Professor T. H. Morgan of Bryn Mawr College ; Professor M. M. Metcalf of the Woman's College, Baltimore ; Dr. George Lefevre of the University of Missouri ; Professor H. F. Nachtrieb of the University of Minnesota ; Professor W. T. Sedgwick of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology ; Dr. T. E. Shields of St. Paul's Theological Seminary, Minnesota ; Professor E. B. Wilson of Columbia University, and Professor A. C. Wightman of Randolph-Macon College.

Professor C. S. Minot of Harvard University and Dr. F. E. Lloyd of Columbia University were present as invited guests.

Short addresses were made by Professors Brooks, Howell, Morgan, Sedgwick and others.

---

RECEPTION AT JOHNS HOPKINS  
HOSPITAL.

---

ON the afternoon of the 22d there was a reception by the Trustees and Faculty of Medicine to the invited guests from other cities, at which from seven to eight hundred persons were present. After a collation, the guests were conducted through the Medical School and the various laboratories.

---

GENERAL COMMITTEE OF ARRANGEMENTS.

---

The arrangements for the celebration were in charge of the following Committee :

PRESIDENT IRA REMSEN.

PROFESSORS

J. S. AMES,	E. H. GRIFFIN,
W. B. CLARKE,	PAUL HAUPT,
A. M. ELLIOTT,	WM. OSLER,
B. L. GILDERSLEEVE,	W. H. WELCH.

---

The music at all the exercises was furnished by the Symphony Orchestra under the direction of Mr. Edward Heimendahl of the Peabody Conservatory of Music.















THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE  
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS  
WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN  
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY  
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH  
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY  
OVERDUE.

DEC 15 1940	
	REC.CIRC. FEB 24 1995
JAN 29 1967 7 2	RECEIVED
	MAR 11 9 1995
RECEIVED	REGISTRATION DEPT.
FEB 19 '67 7 PM	
LOAN DEPT.	
JUN 22 1990	
AUTO DISC JUN 18 1990	
JUN 26 1994	
AUTO DISC CIRC JUN 24 '91	
JAN 03 1995	
REC.CIRC. JAN 03 1995	
ED	
APR 03 1995	
	LD 21-100m-7,40 (F)

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C031929578

□ 2634  
1902

100710

J. Hopkins

