

their own cause! the study of the Greek language and literature with a zeal that was almost akin to worship; and the habit of looking at nature through the medium of a foreign language had the effect of stunting the growth of powers of original thought. It may be questioned, however, whether the Greeks, with their almost purely sensuous ideas and worship of the intellect, ever attained to so high an ideal of life and its duties as did the best of the Roman writers. And the same indeed may be said of a comparison of Greek literature with that of England. It is not merely as Professor Boulger says, that the genius of English literature has been tinged with the spirit of Puritanism. That certainly is true. But it is also true, as Ruskin has pointed out in his lectures on art, that "the Greeks were not fully conscious of, and could not therefore either mythically or philosophically express, the deep relation within themselves between their power of perceiving beauty and the home of domestic affection which found their sternest themes of tragedy in the infringement of its laws; which made the rape of Helen the chief subject of their epic poetry; and which fastened their clearest symbolism of resurrection on the story of Alcesteis." If the spirit which prompted the foundation of the John Howard Clark Scholarships were more generally acted upon—that is to say, if the wide and generous study of the best in English literature were more fully encouraged in our Universities, the new tendency would be some atonement—although we confess that in our judgment it must be regarded as an inadequate alternative—for that neglect of Greek which Professor Boulger and Mr. Williams deplore. The address was marked throughout by that enthusiasm in the cause of learning which makes the true teacher. It carried the audience with it, and appealed to them as few written discourses could possibly do; and that, too, in spite of the disadvantageous conditions brought about by the heat of the weather and the closeness of the densely packed room.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE.

COMMEMORATION DAY.

Wednesday, December 29, was Commemoration Day at the University of Adelaide. The Chancellor (His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor) presided, and there was a large attendance in the library of the University, where the commemoration was held. Members of the Council and Senate were present in the Academy in costume proper to their respective degrees and offices. On the platform besides the Chancellor were the Vice-Chancellor (Mr. J. A. Hartley, B.A., B.Sc.), the Warden of the Senate (Mr. F. Chapple, B.A., B.Sc.), and the Registrar (Mr. C. R. Hodge).

Degrees were conferred on the under-mentioned candidates:—

M.A. Degree.—Frederick Stanley Butler and Walter Froesevan.

LL.B. Degree.—Richard Edward Hourigan, M.B. and Ch.B. Degree.—John Bernard Gunson, Henry Oflay Irwin, Edward Ernst Moulle, Alfred Edward James Russell, John Sam Sangster, and Patrick Francis Shanahan.

B.A. Degree.—Charles Bickerton Blackburn and Leslie Herbert Nicholls.

B.Sc. Degree.—James Watson Brown, Stella Horwin, Thomas Abram Le Mesurier, Violet May Plummer, Frank Joseph Webb Richardson, and Walter Treleven.

In his absence Leslie Durno, M.A., of the University of Aberdeen, was admitted *ex coequo* graduate.

The Deans of the various Faculties then presented to the Chancellor:—

The *Stare Profrum* (Law)—George Ash and Carl Louis Sauer.

The Winner of Sir Thomas Elder's Prize for Physiology (Medicine)—Allan Elliott Randall (student in medicine of the first year).

The John Howard Clark Scholar (Arts)—Marian Chapple.

The Eversard Scholar (Medicine)—John Ikin Sangster.

The CHANCELLOR congratulated Mr. Ash very sincerely upon his being for the second time obtained the distinction of *Stare Profrum*. This distinction, he said, was all the more honourable to Mr. Ash because a great deal of his time had been occupied in other places than the halls of justice and academic groves. (Laughter and cheers.)

The CHANCELLOR, in congratulating Mr. Randall, hoped that his success in the first year would follow him throughout his course at the University.

To Miss Chapple the CHANCELLOR said the John Howard Clark Scholarship had been awarded twelve times, and for eleven years in succession it had been won by men. Miss Chapple's success was therefore a victory for her sex as well as for herself. He congratulated the Lady. (Cheers.)

When the Eversard scholar was presented the Chancellor congratulated Mr. Sangster upon having won the scholarship founded in memory of their lamented friend, the late Mr. Eversard.

Professor BOULGER, M.A., D. Lit., delivered the annual address. The Professor spoke of science and literature as educational elements. He was simply an exponent of what he believed to be true. He could not say he knew it to be true; he could only say he thought it was. It was a mistake to suppose that science and literature were antagonistic; they were rather sisters that had met and kissed each other. Literature and science divided between them the whole domain of knowledge.

As a literary man he found the dissecting-room attractive. This was an instance in which a literary man could learn much from science. The absolute certainty with which science pegged down what she had explored in the map of human nature could not be overrated, but science did not take into consideration what the human heart was. Of theology he did not wish to say anything. But he did claim to know something of literature. In a poor democratic community like ours there was not much to say for literature. Literature would not gain a fortune for a man at the Court; in fact he did not know what literature would do except gain perhaps a second-rate appointment as a second-rate school—(laughter) unless the person be fortunate enough, like himself, to be a University Professor. That was from a practical point of view. It enabled them to get their bread, but he was not quite so sure about the butter. (Laughter.)

But literature gave them something far better than butter and jam even, as it did what even science could not do. Literature brought us into contact not only with our fellow-men who were moving about us, but with the men who had moved and stirred the universe ages and ages back. That was the value of literature. What was the use of all the exhaustive treasures of a Broken Hill without the congenial association with our fellow-men and fellow-women of the past? He wished first to deal with literature in general, then with English literature in particular, thirdly still more particularly with English poetry, and lastly, should there be time, with the scientific aspect of the question, or what was called mental and moral philosophy or science.

There should be no solution of continuity in literary history. The Greeks, for instance, were a people who did not care about any other affairs except their own, as like the modern French they said—"Wash the pedant, and those who do not know our language are not to be counted as anything else but barbarians." The importance of the Greeks from a literary point of view was that their heroic development was coincident with their literary capabilities. Latin was very important, but entirely from a linguistic point of view, as it held the key to six or seven of the most important languages of the present day.

Regarded, however, from a literary aspect Latin had hardly any importance at all. In fact, with but one exception, he did not think there were any original writers in that tongue. His knowledge of Latin enabled him to deal with the Italian, Spanish, and French with quite half the amount of labour and trouble that he would have incurred if he did not know Latin. The importance of Latin and Greek in science was, in his opinion, over-estimated. The Englishman was as far removed as possible from the Greeks and Romans. In one point he did resemble the Roman, as the grandeur of the Roman was his, but the glory of the Greek was not. The Englishman was a God-fearing individual with a strong mark of the Puritan about him, who carried the Bible in one hand and opium in the other into *Rita*, but he was not a Greek. In spite of the vandalism of the middle ages, of what the Moors, who were converted, did, of what the Christians did at Alexandria, and of what Australia was trying to do with its fearful Philistinism, they would never as long as the human heart beat displace Greek from its position of Queen of Hellenic literature.

If any of his hearers who had spare time—and he spoke especially to the ladies—would give their attention to the study of Greek they would find the work its own recompense. They should not take merely a provincial view of literature. If they read merely English literature they would become provincial. One could not count on the fingers of his two hands those who had read Dante in the original. Next to Homer and Milton he did not think they could find a superior to Dante, Shakespeare and Goethe being inimitable. How many had read "Don Quixote" in the Spanish? Those who had not knew nothing about it. As far as English literature was concerned, first came Chaucer; but when Chaucer was referred to as "the well of English undefiled" it was rather humorous to find, upon reflection, that that author's sympathies were entirely French—(laughter)—although his poetry was in a tongue that was understandable by the people.

From Chaucer down to Elizabeth's time there were no very remarkable names. When, however, they entered the Elizabethan period, a tremendous array of names appeared. Although in the hands of that lustful and lazy brute