

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ADELAIDE.

COMMEMORATION DAY.

ADDRESS BY PROFESSOR SALMOND.

The annual commemoration of the University of Adelaide was observed on Friday afternoon, the ceremonial taking place in the library in the presence of a large assemblage, too large, in fact, for the hall. Fortunately the weather was much cooler than was the case last year when the atmosphere in the crowded room was almost unbearable. But this year, as last, even the adjoining lecture-room was filled, and numbers heard what they could from the stairs. Overlooking the orchestral selections of the students, who were stationed at the eastern end of the hall, and were more heard than seen, the proceedings began at 3 o'clock. The Chancellor (his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor), who was present, of course, presided, and on the platform were the vice-chancellor (Dr. Barlow), the warden of the senate (Mr. F. Chapple), Professor Salmond, and the registrar (Mr. C. R. Hodge). Immediately in front of the platform were Mrs. Way and Captain Wallington, the Premier and Mrs. Kingston, and the Minister of Education and Mrs. Butler. The professional staff of the University and the members of the senate and council, who wore the academic costume proper to their respective degrees and offices, mustered in strong force. Their gay robes lent color to the scene, and so did the dresses of the fair sex, which was largely represented. As soon as his Excellency took the chair, the

CONFERRMENT OF DEGREES

was proceeded with. Most of the ladies and gentlemen as they appeared for their honors were welcomed with a specially written verse, set to a popular air, and sung by the students. The deans of the faculties, presented the undermentioned candidates, whom the Chancellor conferred their different degrees:—
Alfred Burton Hardy, LL.B.
James Watson Brown, B.Sc., LL.B.
Rupert Bramwell Stuckey, LL.B.
Isaac Herbert Solomon, B.A., LL.B.
Percy Emerson Johnstone, B.A., LL.B.
Samuel Walter Goode, B.A.
Ebel Roby Holder, B.A.
Phoebe Chapple, B.Sc.
Alfred Maurice Paton, B.Sc.
William Reynolds Bayly, B.A., B.Sc.
Cyri Beaumont Marryat, B.Sc.
William John McBride, B.Sc.
Franziska Helena Marie Kelly (formerly Putmann), Mus. Bac.
William Margary Hole, Mus. Bac.

In conferring the degrees the Chancellor made the following remarks:—

Mr. Hardy—I congratulate you on passing your final examinations in the first class. I shall have the pleasure later on of further congratulating you.

Mr. Brown—I think you did wisely in graduating in science before you began your study of the law. I am sure you will find that the knowledge which you have obtained in that faculty, and the experience also, useful in the practice of your profession. I am glad to recall that you were the winner of the Roby-Fletcher scholarship of 1896.

Mr. Solomon—This is the second occasion on which I have conferred upon you a degree. I may congratulate you on having the wisdom and patience to take a degree in arts before you began your study of the law. I may mention that you won the John Howard Clark scholarship in 1894.

Mr. Johnstone—I congratulate you also on having before entering the study of the law taken your degree in arts.

Mr. Goode—I have to congratulate you upon a distinguished career in graduating for your degree. I find that you won the Roby-Fletcher scholarship in 1897, but vacated it because you had won the more valuable University scholarship in that year. You were the winner of the John Howard Clark scholarship in 1897, and in your final examination this year you have passed with first-class honors in classics and mental and moral philosophy. I hope and believe that these are the arguings of a distinguished and successful career.

Miss Holder—I find in referring to your course as a student that you were the holder—(laughter from the students)—some day there may not be the same opportunity for play on your name—you were the holder of the Roby-Fletcher scholarship in 1897. You are the only woman graduate of this University who has won it.

Miss Chapple—I find from the records of this University that you won the University Scholarship in 1895, and held it against competitors in the two succeeding years. You are the only woman graduate in this University who has taken that distinction, save one. The University scholarship has been in existence since 1876, and the only other lady who has won it beside yourself was Miss Heyne, in 1880. May I present to the warden—Miss Chapple, Bachelor of Science, the fourth member of his family who has graduated in this University.

Mr. Paton—I am glad to find from our records that you won the Angus Engineering Exhibition in 1895, and I shall ask Dr. Paton, a much honored member of our council, to allow me to have the great pleasure of presenting to him Mr. Alfred Maurice Paton, Bachelor of Science.

Mr. Bayly—I have already on previous occasions had the pleasure of conferring upon you the degree of Bachelor of Arts. You are an example of the advantage of the series of higher public examinations held owing to our lamented friend the late vice-chancellor (Mr. Hartley), and it is highly to your credit that during your undergraduate course for both degrees you were practicing your profession as a schoolmaster.

Mr. Marryat—I am glad to remind you and inform this assembly that you were the winner of the University scholarship in 1897. I am glad also to find that you have entered upon the post-graduate course for a diploma in metallurgy and engineering, which we have been able to establish in conjunction with the School of Mines by the bounty of our benefactor, the late Sir Thomas Elder.

Mr. McBride—I have to congratulate you upon the fact that you were the University scholar in 1895, and that you have taken in your last examination first-class honors in metallurgy.

Mrs. Kelly—You were one of the 25 students who entered for the course of Bachelor of Music in 1885. Three only of that number have proceeded to the degree which you have taken. You are thus one of a distinguished triumvirate on our annals.

Mr. Hole—We have all the greater pleasure in seeing you here, because during your graduate course you have been prosecuting your laborious profession as a master at St. Peter's College.

The following graduates of other Universities were admitted ad eundem gradum:—The Right Honorable Charles Cameron Kingston, D.C.L., University of Oxford.

Rev. Frederick John Jervis-Smith, F.R.S., M.A., University of Oxford.

Rev. Thomas Worthington, M.A., University of Cambridge.

Bazett David Colvin, M.A., University of Cambridge.

Rev. George Davidson, M.A., University of St. Andrews.

Patrick McMahon Glynn, LL.B., University of Dublin.

Francis John Douglas, M.B., Ch.B., University of Melbourne.

Frederic John Chapple, M.B., Ch.B., University of Melbourne.

To Mr. Jervis-Smith the Chancellor said—We have seized upon the opportunity afforded by your presence in Adelaide to reciprocate in your person the courtesies which the University of Oxford has shown both to the colony of South Australia and to the University of Adelaide. The celebrations last year in honor of her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee were marked by signal demonstrations of the affection of the mother country for her distant dependencies. Amongst the most striking of these demonstrations was the conferring of honorary degrees by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge on the Premiers who visited England as the guests of the Queen and representatives of her Colonial Empire. In the distribution of these distinctions it fell to the lot of our own Premier, the Right Hon. C. C. Kingston, to receive the degree of D.C.L. from the University of Oxford. But there was an earlier courtesy on the part of that venerable University, which more directly and more closely concerned ourselves. It was the great compliment which the University of Oxford paid this University in 1891 by conferring an honorary degree upon your chancellor, Mr. Jervis-Smith. In grateful acknowledgement of these courtesies, as well as on account of your own academic status, the council of this University invited you to do us the honor of accepting the degree which I have just conferred. We are proud to number you amongst our graduates because of your honorable place as a teacher in the University of Oxford, as University lecturer in mechanics, and as Millard lecturer in Trinity College, and also because of your eminence in the domain of physical science and its practical application. The value of your inventions and discoveries, and your distinction as a scientist, have been recognized by the Royal and other scientific societies in England and on the Continent of Europe, as well as by the English and French Governments and by the whole scientific world. We trust

that for many years you may be a living bond of union between the University of Oxford and the University of Adelaide.

THE STOW PRIZEMEN.

The dean of the faculty of law presented to the Chancellor the Stow prizemen—

Alfred Burton Hardy (student in law of the fourth year) and Stanley Herbert Skipper (student in law of the first year).

The Chancellor said—Mr. Hardy, I congratulate you very heartily on being the winner of the Stow prize in your fourth year. As I have already mentioned you passed your final examinations in the first class, and I remember also that this is not the first occasion on which you have taken the Stow prize, as you were the winner of it in your second as well as your final year.

Mr. Skipper—I congratulate you on having made such a successful beginning of your undergraduate course for the LL.B. degree. If you do as well in the successive years of your course as you have done in the first; I shall some day or other have the gratification of congratulating you not only upon winning the Stow prize, but upon being the Stow scholar.

OTHER PRESENTATIONS.

There were also presented—

The Elder Prizemen.—Theodore Ambrose (student in medicine of the second year), and Ethel Mary Murray Ambrose (student in medicine of the first year).

The Dr. Davies Thomas Scholar.—Henry Harper Formby (student in medicine of the third year).

The John Howard Clark Scholars.—Alexander Livingstone Nairn and Walter Franz Wehrstedt.

The Roby-Fletcher Scholar.—John Howard Vaughan.

The Angus Exhibitioner.—Harold Chapple.

The Chancellor congratulated the winners in these terms:—

The Elder Prizemen—I am told that you are brother and sister, and I congratulate you on having brought distinction on your family and on your success in your studies.

Mr. Formby—This is not the first occasion on which I have had the pleasure of congratulating you. You won the Elder prize last year, and I have great pleasure on the present occasion in congratulating you on winning the still higher distinction which you have obtained.

Messrs. Nairn and Wehrstedt—You have run a neck and neck race for this distinction, and we have had to divide the prize between you. I congratulate you both on your success. I wish also, Mr. Wehrstedt, to congratulate you on having passed first in the examination for the Roby-Fletcher scholarship. You have relinquished that scholarship for a more valuable, but your merit is none the less.

Mr. Vaughan—I congratulate you on having won the Roby-Fletcher scholarship, for your success in examinations in mental and moral philosophy, and I am all the more pleased because you are studying in a faculty in which I take special interest—the faculty of law.

Mr. Chapple—You also I congratulate on your success in obtaining the valuable Angus exhibition. You are the fifth member of your family whose acquaintance I have had the pleasure of making at these demonstrations and I have no doubt that I shall have the pleasure of congratulating you on still further distinctions on future occasions.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS.

In calling upon Professor Salmond to deliver the annual address the Chancellor said that that gentleman, the head of the school of law, had addressed himself with so much zeal and ability to the performance of his duties, and had shown such a great interest in the working of the University, that they looked upon his accession to the professorial staff as a very great advantage indeed.

Professor Salmond then addressed the gathering on "Intellectual Interests." He said—All those who in their youth were nourished on the strong meat of Scottish theology are familiar with the question which rightly stands at the commencement of the Shorter Catechism—What is the chief end of man? This is a question that was not first asked or first answered by the Presbyterian divines who sat at Westminster in the year 1647. It was familiar to the Greek philosophers. It was one of the problems which possessed a never-failing interest for the active intellects of the men of Athens. What, they asked, is man's highest good, the worthiest object of human desire and endeavor? What may a mortal man best seek and strive for in that brief period that is permitted to him upon the earth? What end shall he most worthily set before him, and for what prize shall he most wisely run, so that at the last, when it is too late, he shall not know the bitterness of efforts that have been futile, desires that have been unfulfilled, and opportunities that have been thrown away? Such was the question. What was the answer which the Greeks gave to it? Some said that the highest good and the supreme end of human life was pleasure—that he lived best who, before death knocked him on the head, had drunk his fill of all the pleasures of life. Like the author of Ecclesiastes, they "commended mirth, because a man hath no better thing under the sun than to eat and to drink and to be merry, for that shall abide with him of his labor the days of his life." Others, of a less sanguine and optimistic temper, took a different view, and said that the highest good was the avoidance of pain and misery—that one might count himself lucky if he so prospered in his life as to escape the calamities and afflictions which overtake so many of the sons of men—that a wise man should strive, not to satisfy his desires, but to diminish his wants. And others said that the highest good consisted in the practice of virtue, and that virtue was its own reward, which others, again, denied, saying that virtue and justice and righteous dealing and self-sacrifice were no better than folly, seeing that a man got no recompense for them in this life, and as likely as not none in the next. So some said one thing and some another, and there was no certainty nor any agreement. And, among others, Aristotle undertook to answer the question—Aristotle, the most illustrious of all the heathen philosophers, and accounted by many, even to this day, as the greatest thinker that has ever lived. And his answer, so far as it concerns us to-day, was this—Inasmuch as man is distinguished from all the beasts of the field by the possession of a rational soul, his highest excellence must consist in the development and activity of his reason. Inasmuch as it is to his brains that a man owes his pre-eminence over all created things, it follows that he is most a man, that he realises most perfectly the ideal of humanity, when he leads a life in which his brains play the leading part, and are put to their highest uses. The greatest good, therefore, is reason and intellect in its fullest development and activity. The best life for a man is the life of reason. The supreme end for a man is to grow to his full strength and stature as a rational being, to seek truth and to ensue it, to know and to understand himself and the universe in which he lives. Aristotle did not mean, I need scarcely say, that this should be the sole end and aim of a wise man. He did not picture the perfect man as a reasoning machine and nothing more. Many other things must be added to the life of reason to complete the ideal life. The wise man will seek earnestly, but not too earnestly, after health, friends, leisure, honor, and moderate riches. These are all good, but they are not the highest good, and a man may have all of them, and yet lack the essential excellence of human nature. Such was the teaching and such the practice of the greatest of the Greeks. I wish to-day to commend it to your acceptance. One of the most wonderful characteristics of the wonderful age in which we live is its intellectual activity. Never before since the world began has such a multitude of men been busy in the search for truth. In every quarter of the world, and in every department of thought and knowledge, keen and restless intellects are ceaselessly at work. Night and day the earth resounds with the unceasing thunder of the printing press. Books are being multiplied beyond all computation. Already a great library is an appalling spectacle. Every day that stream of printer's ink, which began in so small a rivulet 30 years ago, is swelling more and more into a black and turbid torrent, the end and issue of which is known to no man. Day by day the sum of human knowledge grows. Day by day the boundaries of that which is known are broadened, and the territories of the unknown explored. Already the results attained are great and wonderful beyond all description. The powers of that amazing instrument, the human brain, seem infinite. We have weighed the planets in our balances, we have laid our measuring line across the heavens, we have analysed the chemical constitution of the fixed stars.

We have tamed the lightning, and made them do our bidding. We know the secret structure of the material world. We have discovered the history of the earth, and can foretell its future. We know the nature and relations of those hidden forces by which the universe is moved. All this and far more, mankind has already accomplished, and yet the great task, so far from being nearly finished, is scarcely begun. It is an illusion by which, I suppose, men have at all times been possessed, that they themselves are living in the old age of the world. They look back with regret rather than forward with hope, and the Golden Age is in the past, not in the future. Yet a very little reflection is needed to make it plain that even we ourselves, at the end of the nineteenth century, are privileged to live in the springtime of the

world. The history of mankind and of human civilization lies in front of us. How long is it, even now, since the first dawn of science and philosophy? Since Aristotle died it is little more than 2,000 years, since the night of the Dark Ages lifted from the face of Europe, and the career of modern thought began, it is not 400 years. What is that more than one day in the long future of the human race? We are not so much the heirs of all the ages as the pioneers of the earth. If in so short a time we have done what we have done, what illimitable prospects must be hid in the innumerable centuries still to come? I am persuaded that it has not entered into the heart of man to conceive the revelations that the future holds in store. The riddle of the universe is yet unread. The secrets of life and death are still inscrutable. It is too early by many and many a century to say despairingly—"The thing that hath been it is that which shall be and there is no new thing under the sun." What attitude then will best become us in respect to these labors and victories of the human intellect? Shall we stand aside indifferently, taking no share or interest in them? Shall we not rather play our part like men in such a warfare between truth and error, knowledge and ignorance, wisdom and folly, as has never been seen in this world before? Let us preserve in our hearts the sacred fire of intellectual enthusiasm. This may or may not—in most cases will not—be of that finer quality which marks the original investigator. Intellectual insight—the power of discovering new truth and of advancing human knowledge—is like the wind that bloweth where it listeth. If a man by good fortune possesses some measure of it, it is well for him. But even if not, it is his duty and his interest none the less to bear himself like a rational being, to concern himself as far as in him lies with the affairs of the mind, and to promote by his sympathetic enthusiasm the cause of truth, and the fulness and worthiness of his own life. By all means in our power, therefore, let us seek intellectual enthusiasm and rational interests, the love of truth and of learning for their own sake, the restless curiosity that is never satisfied, the keened spirit that welcomes difficulty and delights in conflict. I believe that this spirit is commonly not lacking in men of brains so long as they are young. The difficulty is to keep it alive. Too often in later life it fades like the morning dew, and falls amid the distractions of the world and the importunities of personal affairs. We are accustomed to ridicule in good-humored fashion those mental qualities which are characteristic of youth—omniscience, self-confidence, definiteness of views on all things in heaven and earth, disdain of compromise. As a man grows older he prides himself on leaving behind him these defects of his youth. He takes credit to himself for humility, moderation, impartiality, suspension of judgment, ability to see all sides of a question. Yet I never heard that in this or in any other respect the process of growing old is an unmixt advantage. A man as he travels on the road of life is apt to lose something else besides his hair and his teeth. Too often he loses that spark of divine fire with which he began his course. Too often he loses that freshness of outlook upon the world and life which constitutes the charm of youth. Too often his impartiality is mere indifference, his moderation mere dullness, and his suspension of judgment the suspension of all true and vigorous mental life. Let a man keep young in spirit, even if the defects of youth are to cling to him along with its virtues. Is not a living dog better than a dead lion? Intellectual enthusiasm is not the same thing as erudition, scientific requirements, or the skill of the expert. Each may exist without the other. I have known men steeped to the lips in science, philosophy, and learning, who were nevertheless dead in spirit. Their mental activity, such as it was, was a matter of habit or a matter of business. It was not from them that any young man would catch the infection of the intellectual life. On the other hand there are innumerable men and women who make no claim to learning or ability, but have yet the right spirit in them, whose lives are filled and ennobled by rational interests, and whose companionship and example are a refreshment and an encouragement to others. There are two sorts of men who more especially fall short of Aristotle's definition of the wise man—those who make no effort after any such standard themselves, and do their best to discard themselves in others. There are others, the first of all the lotus eaters, the idlers, the triflers. These are the men who say to themselves, if not to others, life is exceeding short and art exceeding long; let us live enjoy ourselves while we may; let us live in the sunshine; let us leave books to the bookworms, let all the juices be no fit up within us; dust and ashes are no nourishment for living men, with bodies as well as minds, and hearts as well as heads. That there is such a being as the erudite or scientific mummy, unadly dedicated in human interest and human emotions cannot be denied (though I imagine cannot be denied rather than is commonly supposed), and all reasonable precautions should be taken by any wise man lest he become one of such. Let us seek happiness and fulness of life by all means. But let us be assured of this, that an absorbing intellectual interest is an abiding element in the happiness of him who is so fortunate as to possess it. I have known men born as to affluence, to whom the world lay open,