HARRIS HANCOCK—IN MEMORIAM

The death of Harris Hancock on March 16, 1944, at Charlottesville, Virginia, constituted a notable loss, both to the University of Cincinnati and to American mathematics. During his active career in Cincinnati, Hancock had always been a stout champion of scholarship at the highest possible level. After his retirement in 1937 he continued, in his letters to his friends and colleagues, his service in the good cause. In the last letter from him received by the writer of the present notice, written two days prior to his death, he expressed his great interest in our coming mathematical symposium and in addition made certain cogent suggestions as to the development and improvement of mathematical scholarship at our institution.

In choosing mathematics for a career Harris Hancock was motivated by an interest in the subject that was genuinely enthusiastic. This interest he succeeded in communicating to all his more able students and to many of his friends who were not professional mathematicians. He was at all times thoroughly convinced of the major importance of mathematics, both as a fundamental and virtually indispensable discipline in education at the secondary and collegiate level, and as a most powerful aid in mankind's unceasing quest to understand himself and the universe in which he lives. Hancock's constant stress on the human interest of mathematics bore substantial fruit in the inclusion of mathematics as one of eight departments of the University of Cincinnati to be aided by the Charles Phelps Taft Memorial Fund, a fund explicitly designated as being created in support of the humanities.

In his recent obituary notice on William Fogg Osgood, published in this Bulletin, Professor Koopman ventured the opinion that Osgood's excellent sense of balance in scientific fields was due in no small measure to his early training in the classics. As a former student under Hancock and Osgood and as one who has likewise profited by his own study of the classics, I wish to record here my concurrence in Professor Koopman's opinion and my further belief that a similar educational background had much to do with the broad and balanced viewpoint manifested by Harris Hancock in his approach to scientific and educational questions. Like Osgood, Hancock had received a thorough classical training in his early years. Later both men received the inspiration to be found at the great mathematical centers of Europe in the late eighties and the early nineties. Finally they both returned to this country imbued with a desire to gradually