



Daniel Coit Gilman (1831-1908)

Author(s): Charles R. Lanman

Source: *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. 52, No. 13 (Oct., 1917), pp. 836-839

Published by: American Academy of Arts & Sciences

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20025721>

Accessed: 25-10-2018 08:37 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

American Academy of Arts & Sciences is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*

Mining Engineers, entitled "Secondary Enrichment of Ore Deposits" in which for the first time attention was drawn to the rich sulphides just below the water level which owe their origin to the descending surface waters. Emmons' contributions to geological literature were contained in nearly 100 monographs, reports and papers.

Emmons' name, as a mining geologist, is known all over the world. Thoroughness, efficiency and good judgment characterized his work throughout. His kindly and unselfish personality endeared him to all who had the privilege of his acquaintance and he was a potent influence in the work of younger geologists in the organization in which he for many years directed the investigations in mining geology.

WALDEMAR LINDGREN.

DANIEL COIT GILMAN (1831-1908)

Fellow of Class III, Section 2, 1875.

Daniel Coit Gilman was born July 6, 1831, at Norwich, Connecticut, and died in the town of his birth, October 13, 1908. He was the son of William Charles Gilman (1795-1863) and his wife, Eliza Coit (1796-1868), and connected with many of the best-known families immigrant from England to New England in the seventeenth century.¹ The facts of his life are briefly and admirably told by his brother, William Charles Gilman, in the *Johns Hopkins University Circular* for December, 1908; and more fully in *The Life of Daniel Coit Gilman* by Fabian Franklin, New York, 1910. But nowhere, now that he is gone, can one get a better idea of his character and personality than from his own public addresses, especially the collection made by him, and published at New York in 1906 under the title, *The Launching of a University, and other papers: a sheaf of remembrances*.

Mr. Gilman received the bachelor's degree at Yale in 1852 and spent the following year there as a resident graduate. "On the whole," he says, "I think that the year was wasted." And his experience at Harvard in the autumn of 1853 was similar. So far as his then

¹ See *The Gilman Family*, by Arthur Gilman, Albany, N. Y., 1869; *The Coit Family*, by F. W. Chapman, Hartford, Conn., 1874.

immediate purpose was concerned, his estimate of these two experiences is doubtless true. But nothing could be further from the truth, if we consider his experience of the scantiness of opportunity for advanced non-professional study at Yale and Harvard in its bearing upon the great problems that were to confront him twenty-two years later. We may well deem it the most happily fruitful failure of his whole life.

His public service began even in that "wasted year." For in August, 1853, the first annual convention of American Librarians was held, largely as the result of his efforts. In December, 1853, he and his life-long friend, Andrew Dickson White, sailed for Europe as attachés of the American Legation at St. Petersburg. Here his official position gave him uncommon opportunities for learning about libraries and schools and other institutions for public welfare, an admirable preparation for the work of his life as a leader in educational and social progress. On returning, he became librarian at Yale (1856-1865), and then professor of physical and political geography in the Sheffield Scientific School, and indeed virtually its chief executive, improving its working-plans and strengthening its finances. From 1872 to 1875 he served as president of the University of California, and, in the face of most discouraging obstacles, succeeded in placing it upon a much securer foundation. Then came the call to organize the new institution created by Johns Hopkins at Baltimore. The Trustees, a group of enlightened and devoted men, sought the advice of President Eliot of Harvard and President White of Cornell and President Angell of Michigan, invited them to come to Baltimore to give it by word of mouth, and wrote to each of them after their return home asking whom they would suggest for the office of president. They all with one accord, and without any previous conference on the matter, replied that "the one man" was Daniel C. Gilman.

Now that university education in America has grown to be what in large measure Mr. Gilman's initiative and example have made it, it is hard to realize what the problem then was. The will of Johns Hopkins left the utmost freedom to the Trustees. Should they, as was suggested, "raise an architectural pile that shall be a lasting memorial of its founder"? should they establish one more college? At his first meeting with the Trustees, Mr. Gilman urged them to create a "means of promoting scholarship of the first order," something, as he himself says, that should be "more than a local institution" and that should "aim at national influence." Those whose privilege it was to hear the testimony of such men as President Eliot or Francis

A. Walker in the early eighties, were abundantly assured of the fact that President Gilman's broad and noble ideals were indeed becoming realities, and realities of great influence as examples the country over. On the occasion of Mr. Gilman's retirement after twenty-five years of service, Mr. Eliot's address specifies three great achievements: the creation of a school of graduate studies, the prodigious advancement of medical teaching, and the promotion of scientific investigation. The first overtures looking to Mr. Gilman's appointment as president of the Carnegie Institution came some six months after his resignation of the presidency of the university. Although past the limit of three score and ten, he served the Institution for three years at the critical time when the fundamental purposes of so novel an undertaking were yet to be determined.

Of the amount and variety of Mr. Gilman's public service outside the sphere of strictly official duty, it is not feasible in a brief paragraph to give an adequate idea. The very important position of Superintendent of the Schools of New York City he felt obliged in 1896 to decline. But as member of the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore, as president of the Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, as member of the General Education Board, as a trustee of the Russell Sage Foundation, as president of the National Civil Service Reform League, and of the American Oriental Society (with whose early history and most eminent members he was intimately acquainted), he was a fellow-worker of amazing constancy and faithfulness,— "a fellow-worker," for he always thought and spoke of his associates, not as subordinates, but as colleagues.

As one looks back on Mr. Gilman's presidency at Baltimore, it seems as if he could not have fitted himself better for it, even if he had known that just *that* was to be the main business of his life. His personal acquaintance with men eminent in science and letters, men like Huxley and Cayley and Lord Kelvin, men like Lowell and Child and Whitney, his wide and studious observation of great technical schools and his experience in the building up of the one at Yale, his realization of the unity of knowledge, his intelligent comprehension of the aims of the most diverse fields of study,— these were factors of his equipment for the work of "naturalizing in America the idea of a true university." Many men of equal industry and force have failed because they did not realize as he did "the inanity of rivalry, the pettiness of jealousy, and the joyfulness of association for the good of mankind." The informing principle of his life was service to others. As an old-time New Englander, he was brought up in obedience to

“Duty, stern daughter of the voice of God.” But to him the paths of duty were also ways of pleasantness. For it was a supreme delight to him to see his pupils and associates and colleagues become men of distinguished usefulness to their fellow-men. It was, I believe, one of the greatest secrets of his success as president of the university that he made his associates feel sure that he took a genuine and sympathetic interest in what they were doing. He was wont to quote Emerson’s saying, “Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm.” With Mr. Gilman, enthusiasm was a divine gift, and from his living flame he was able to kindle the sacred torch in the hand of others. The belief that “the things which are not seen are eternal” was part of his very life, and sustained his courage in the absence of showy results for which many were hoping. To few lives do the words of St. Paul at Antioch more fitly apply: He “fell on sleep, after he had served his own generation by the will of God.”

CHARLES R. LANMAN.

FRIEDRICH KOHLRAUSCH (1840–1910)

Foreign Honorary Member in Class I, Section 2, 1900.

Friedrich Kohlrausch was born in Rinteln, Oct. 14, 1840, and died in Marburg, Jan. 17, 1910.

There is a commonly accepted belief that successive generations of the same family do not attain great distinction. To this the family of Kohlrausch is an exception. Rudolf Kohlrausch, the father of Friedrich, was a distinguished physicist and professor in the University of Göttingen, well known because of his determination, with Wilhelm Weber, of the relation between the electrostatic and electromagnetic unit of current, which forms one of the great landmarks in the history of our science. His grandfather, it may be noted, was a historian, also of national reputation, whose history of Germany, in two volumes, ran through sixteen editions at a time when such occurrences were less common than now.

The father died when the son was but eighteen (1858), leaving Friedrich to pursue his studies alone. He obtained his doctor’s degree at Göttingen with his father’s colleague, Weber, in 1863, and