

Scholars and gentlemen is an expression which has always been held the proper designation of public school and university men, and this is a union which should never be dissolved. We are willing to take on trust the scholarship of the Adelaide undergraduates, but their exhibition of manners on Wednesday showed a singular capacity for divesting themselves of the essential characteristics of gentlemen. If Commemoration is to be simply a bear garden it will repel friends and visitors instead of attracting them to it, as one of the most important and interesting incidents in the life of each year. There seems to us a very obvious means of preventing a repetition of Wednesday's scene. The authorities should insist upon all undergraduates being seated in the very front of the hall nearest the platform. We believe the University is not as yet possessed of such valuable aids to discipline as the proctors and their bulldogs, more or less familiar to Oxford and Cambridge men. But some University official might well be placed in a coln of vantage to take note of offenders and request the favor of their company at a private interview later on. If young gentlemen find they are liable to be sent down for a term or two they will have very substantial reasons for mending their manners. At all events we trust that the hall of the University will never witness a repetition of the exhibition on Wednesday.

The annual address, which is one of the principal features of the Commemoration, was delivered by Professor Pennefather. His predecessors have, naturally, dealt with the subjects with which they are most familiar and the studies to which they are devoted. Mr. Pennefather reminds us that eight years have elapsed since he was present at Commemoration, and makes a rapid survey of now and then. The University has made great strides in the interval, as any one can judge by comparing the later with the earlier calendars. Turning to the future the professor indicates as the subject of his address the most pressing needs of the University, more particularly with reference to the School of Law and the University as a whole. Mr. Pennefather begins by congratulating himself and his colleagues of the professional staff that they are prohibited from taking part in local politics. This disability, if so it is to be reckoned, does not apply to those holding similar or higher positions on the Isis and Cam. But, as everybody knows, those great bodies have the privilege of Parliamentary representation, which has not as yet been conceded to their younger sister on North-terrace. The loss, however, is Parliament's, not theirs. We imagine a visit to either House during the present session would be sufficient to disenchant any one, and cure him of any rising ambition to be enrolled in the army of representatives of the people. The idea of federation is in the air, and Professor Pennefather is not uninfluenced by it. He pleads for the federation of the law of Australia and the federation of the Universities. By the federation of the law he means something more than the conferring upon Australasia a common and uniform legal system. What is uppermost in his mind is rather a federation of the profession. It certainly is an anomaly that a lawyer, however high his attainments, even if a Q.C. or the Attorney General of his province, should, the moment he crosses an imaginary line, be treated as an alien and stranger, or at best but as a proselyte of the outer court by his brethren of the same

profession, speaking the same language, and fellow-citizens of the same empire. Mr. Pennefather attributes this to local jealousies, intolerable in these great colonies, though excusable in the ancient cities of Greece or the Italian towns of the Middle Ages. Agreeing with the professor in his censure, is he not rather hard upon the Greek cities and the Italian republics? There are many who think that in literature, art, and the science of government, and in some conditions of social life, the Athens of Pericles and the Italian cities have nothing to fear when compared with the leading States under the Southern Cross. Turning to the question of the federation of the Universities, Professor Pennefather feels that while generations must pass before our provincial seats of learning can rival those older foundations of the old world, an Australasian University would come to the front and quickly establish a claim to recognition throughout the world. Of course there is something in the idea. But there are some very obvious and practical difficulties in the way of its realisation. We question if such an institution would grow into anything different from a great central examining body, which would subject candidates in pass and class to a more severe and searching test than the local universities apply. In this way its degree and its class-lists might bear a stamp which would be recognised the world over.

But there is a reform in university life which is far more needed. A university which is merely an examining body fulfils but a very small part of university work. A university which combines teaching with examination has advanced a step further. But each misses the most important functions. And these functions can only be discharged where the collegiate system exists in full force. A university whose staff has no other functions but teaching and examining may manufacture scholars more or less brilliant in their respective branches, but it will not train men as men should be trained. To a man his college is what his regiment is to its officers. To belong to a good college is an education of itself. We have not space to follow Professor Pennefather through his interesting discussion upon the wide range of study which mastery of the science of law includes. It is to be hoped that not a few of the many young gentlemen who are reading for the bar will be persuaded to prepare themselves on the lines laid down by the professor. Of all the learned and scientific professions there is none which more urgently demands liberal and general culture. Law by itself cramps and fetters the intellect. Mr. Pennefather, if we understand him correctly, regrets the exclusion of the science of theology or divinity from this University. This at least is what we take him to refer to as the loftiest of sciences. We have never heard, or read, any definition of science which would allow either theology or divinity to be classed as a science. We would suggest to Mr. Pennefather that he should accurately define science, and then see if theology can be made to square therewith. A moment's reflection will show that, taking into consideration the questions and subjects with which theology is concerned, a science of theology by finite minds is a contradiction of terms. Speculation is not science. And speculation is the limit of the powers of the finite in dealing with the infinite problems of theology.

---