Advertiser 14.12.22

SCHOLARS AND PRIZEMEN FOR 1922.

Faculty of Arts.—Roby Fletcher prize (logic and psychology)—Reginald K. S. Adams, John Howard Clark prize—Iris E. Robertson. Barr Smith prize (Greek)—Ida M. Dorsch. Andrew Scott prize (Latin)—Ida M. Dorsch, John L. Young (for research)—Thomas S. Opie. Tormore prize (for essay in English literature)—Elsie Morriss.

Faculty of Science.—Ernest Ayers Scholarship in Forestry—Donald R. Moore. David Murray Scholarship—Frank K. Carter. John Bagot Botany Scholarship and Medal—Harry K. Lewcock.

Faculty of Laws.—David Murray Scholarship, in private international law—Gwendolen H. Ure. Stow prizes—Harold N. Tucker, Gwendolen H. Ure.

Faculty of Medicine.—Dr. Davies Thomas prize (third year)—Alfred S. de B. Cocks.

GRADUATES WELCOMED.

AN AL FRESCO LUNCHEON.

In the shade of stately elms and cedars in the Botanic Park 100 members of the Graduates' Association of the University of Adelaide assembled at luncheon on Wednesday to welcome the new graduates who were that afternoon to receive degrees. The president of the association (Professor T. Brailsford Robertson) presided, and among those present was Professor Duffield (professor of physics at the Reading University, England, and a graduate of the University of Adelaide).

Professor Robertson expressed pleasure that fine weather had prevailed for the third year at their annual luncheon.

Mr. W. A. Magarey welcomed the new graduates with earnestness and genuine goodwill. His advice to the young men and women who were about to have their degrees conferred upon them was that they need have no fear of the future if they worked. If they worked they would succeed, although there were various degrees of success. If by any chance they were able to establish harmony with their work and if they could find some callings with which their inclinations were in tune there was no limit to the possibilities ahead of them. On the other hand, if they were thrown into avocations with which they were not in harmony, they would find their lives would end, after the exercise of much will-power, in more or less complete boredom. If they found that the avocation selected was not congenial it was not too late to change it. Since work was the keynote of success they must make it as vigorous as circumstances permitted. Their work in the University was not like that in the outside world. At the University they had a course well laid down, with guides in the professors and lecturers to answer questions if necessary, whereas they would find their paths outside were badly paved, apparently without proper or certain direction. They would find themselves surrounded by social dwellings and machinery, both of which were out of date. They would find they would be very much tempted to leave the work they were called upon to do and to undertake what was called constructive work. In this new world the graduates would find strange beings, most of them human. (Laughter.) They would come into contact, for instance, with the predatory capitalist, the even more predatory labor man; they would meet the lawyer, the doctor, the coal-miner, the religionist, the new woman, and the old woman. (Laughter.) All those would present to them a perfect tangle, and the diversity of outlook would make things very difficult for them, but they should not be daunted. If they felt in doubt they should stick to their work, whatever it might be, and later on they might be able to enter upon constructive work. One advantage of joining the association was that new graduates would find that the control of the body was largely in the hands of their old guides. (Applause.)

Messrs. R. W. Semk and R. K. S. Adams replied on behalf of the ad eundem and new graduates respectively.

Register 14.12.22

For the first time in the history of the University of Adelaide, the Diploma in Education was conferred upon students at the annual commemoration on Wednesday afternoon. There were three successful candidates—Messrs. Samuel Foster Robinson and James Henry Williams, and Miss Flossie Elizabeth Reine Batchelor, B.A. In bestowing the Diplomas the Chancellor (Sir George Murray) said now that those recipients had set the example, he hoped many others would be found to follow them. (Applause.)

PUBLIC BENEFACTORS.

Generous Bequests to University.

£50,000 for Medical School.

Another fine gift has been made to the University of Adelaide. By a bequest under the will of the late Mrs. Jane Marks £30,000 has been left to the Medical School; and property valued at £20,000, which was owned jointly by the late Mrs. A. M. Simpson and her sister, Miss A. F. Keith-Sheridan, has been given for the advancement of medical research.

The generosity of the people of South Australia in the direction of benefactions to charitable and educational institutions is well known throughout the Commonwealth, and it has been largely owing to the gifts of citizens that such progress has been made in the establishment of places for the care of the sick and needy, the higher education of the youth of the State, and for the progress of scientific research. The names of the public benefactors of the past are well known, and the news indicated above, which was announced by the Chancellor of the University (Sir George Murray) at the annual commemoration gathering on Wednesday, shows that the wealthy people of the present, or immediate past, days are no less desirous than those of the past century to assist the great work of educational advancement.

—Details of the Bequests.—

The remarks of the Chancellor, in making the foregoing announcement, were as follow:—"Our munificent benefactor, Mr. Peter Waite, passed away on April 4. He was followed by his wife on the 21st of last month. Singularly happy lives were theirs, in perfect sympathy with one another, and of great and lasting benefit to the people of South Australia. The task Mr. Waite entrusted to us will be gradually carried into effect. It requires careful consideration and organization, in which the valuable advice delivered by Sir Adihbald Weigall in this hall shortly before his departure in April last, will be of great assistance. We have already made a beginning, however, by the establishment of a lectureship in plant pathology which has been offered to and accepted by Mr. Geoffrey Samuel, one of our most promising graduates, who has been specially trained in that subject. Much of the present prosperity of the University is due to the generous aid rendered to it from time to time by Parliament, and more especially by the Parliament now in session. But the University took its origin from private liberality, and it is satisfactory to note that the springs of private beneficence have not been dried up. The instances freshest in your memory are the splendid gifts of Mr. Peter Wood, Sir Langdon Bonython, Mrs. Charles Jury, and the family of the late Mr. John Darling. (Applause.) I have now to announce two others which are entitled to rank with these. The first is a legacy of £30,000, free of duty, under the will of Mrs. Jane Marks, of Grange road, Hindmarsh West, who died last month, for the purpose of perpetuating the memory of her late husband (Mr. George Richard Marks) and herself, and for the better endowment of the Medical School. (Applause.) The income of the legacy is to be applied either in founding a professorship or a scholarship to bear the name of Marks, or in such other manner as the council of the University may from time to time think best in the interests of the Medical School. (Applause.) The second is a gift of property which was owned jointly by the late Mrs. A. M. Simpson and her sister (Miss A. F. Keith-Sheridan) during their lives, and which, by arrangement between them, was to be devised by the survivor to the University for the advancement of medical research. The value of this gift is estimated by the executors at about £20,000. (Applause.) By these bounteous endowments, which appear to be so wisely placed, prestige of the Medical School of the University, already very high, cannot fail to be vastly increased. (Applause.)

A WELL-KNOWN PHILANTHROPIST.

Apart from the splendid bequest of £30,000 to the Adelaide University, the late Mrs. G. R. Marks has bequeathed £10,000 to various charitable organizations. The residue of her estate is to be divided between her six nieces and nephews. The deceased, who was 80 years of age, was born in Ireland, and arrived in Australia when she was about 19 years of age. She first lived in Western Australia, and later removed to Victoria, residing at Geelong and Ballarat. At the latter place she met Mr. Marks, and at the age of 22 years was married to him at St. Peter's Church of England, Ballarat. Some years later the couple came to South Australia, and lived at Brompton, where Mr. Marks established a pottery. Mrs. Marks subsequently travelled extensively with her husband, visiting America, the 1900 Paris Exhibition, and, on three occasions, journeying to England. Since Mr. Marks's demise, nearly five years ago, his widow had mostly remained at her home, and during the latter months of her life had been an invalid. She was never actively associated with public affairs, but was always ready to assist a deserving case of distress. There was no family of her marriage.

EVOLUTION OF LANGUAGE.

A Valuable Analysis.

Address by Professor Darnley Naylor.

The University commemoration day address was delivered this year by Professor Darnley Naylor, who took for his subject "The evolution of language," and gave a critical and interesting analysis of a recent valuable publication on the subject by Otto Jespersen. He said that just 100 hundred years ago Jacob Grimm published his great work on phonology. It was not unfitting then to speak on some branch of linguistics; above all, when the year had been signalized by the publication of another work, Otto Jespersen's "Language, its Nature, Development, and Origin." From that book he had taken the material of his address. Professor Jespersen was always stimulating, and it would be hard to find a dull page. He was courageous, too. More than one old theory had been taken down from the shelves, dusted, and renovated. A few illuminating comments caused it to be realized that, after all, those neglected problems must be faced again, and that our predecessors were nearer the mark than some had thought. Take, for instance, such topics as the origin of language, or attempts to construct a universal language. Both appeared in Jespersen's book, and yet only 56 years ago, when La Societe de Linguistique was founded in Paris, its statutes expressly stated that "The society shall receive no communication either on the origin of language or on the creation of a universal speech." That attitude had been fashionable until our own day. Then, again, the old view, which Dr. John Peile, of Christ's College, Cambridge, made popular, that phonetic changes were largely due to laziness, was sanely defended after many years of contemptuous neglect.

—Child Language.—

After having given a brief historical review of language, the professor spoke of Jespersen's sound observations concerning child language, wherein he had said:—"The linguistic development of a child is not always in a steady rising line, but in a series of waves, and some children develop very rapidly for some years until they have reached a certain point, where they stop altogether." Again, "Little girls, on the average, learn to talk earlier and more quickly than boys; they outstrip them in talking correctly; their pronunciation is not spoilt by the many bad habits and awkwardnesses so often found in boys. It has been proved by statistics in many countries that there are far more stammerers and bad speakers among boys and men than among girls and women. The general receptivity of women, their great power of, and pleasure in, imitation, their histrionic talent, if one may so say—all this is a help to them at an early age, so that they can get into other people's way of talking with greater agility than boys of the same age." That volubility of women had been commented upon by male observers through the ages. Rosalind said—"Do you not know I am a woman? when I think, I must speak." In Jespersen's own works, "A woman's thought is no sooner formed than uttered." There was also Oscar Wilde's sneer—"Women never have anything to say, but they say it charmingly," and the words of a girl in a modern novel, "I talk so as to find out what I think."

—New Languages.—

Referring to this aspect of the question, the lecturer said that Hale's theory in "The Origin of Languages" might be put briefly thus:—If children were, for any length of time, separated from their elders, they were found to invent languages of their own. In countries where the climate was mild children who had strayed from the tribe could find food, and therefore survived. In after years their offspring would speak the language invented by the parents. Thus in Oregon, a country not much larger than France, there were at least 30 different families of languages; but, in the whole of Europe, there were no more than four or five language stocks. Every European child who had strayed would die in a very short time. So in Australia, where the climate was mild, there were hundreds, perhaps thousands, of petty tribes, as completely isolated as those of South America, but all speaking languages of the same stock—because the other conditions were such as would make it impossible for an isolated group of young children to survive.

—Women and Language.—

On the whole, continued the professor, women tended to be more conservative in words and pronunciation. They preferred softer sounds also, and a mincing utterance. Professor Daniel Jones had written that men said "sawft" and women "soft;" that women mostly said "gairl" and men "gurl;" and that men said "weskit," while women said "waiskote." But one might be permitted to have doubts. As to choice of words—there were more convincing illustrations. It might be agreed that women used the word "person" in order to avoid "lady," where they thought "lady" unsuitable, and that "common" for "vulgar" was a feminine peculiarity. Professor Jespersen asserted that woman objected to anything that smacked of bad language. With her, "He told an infernal lie," became, "He told a most dreadful fib," and so on. He did not forget, however, that "many young ladies have begun to imitate their brothers" in respect of swearing. He quoted, on the other hand, a friend, who had told him that "The best Englishmen hardly swear at all . . . I imagine some of our fashionable women now swear as much as the men they consort with." The fact seemed to be that women's entrance into the smokeroom had tended to lower her rather than to raise the standard of her new environment. But, after all, vigour of expression was not unneedful in a language, and, personally, he should regret the loss of such lines as "The Devil damn thee black, thou cream-faced loon." Thus the man was the chief invigorator of language. Jespersen seemed to attribute to the woman's love of hyperbole such curiosities as "terribly nice," "awfully pretty." He (the lecturer) dared not suggest that she was responsible for the veritable nonsense of "pretty ugly," "precious cheap," and "jolly miserable." As to literary form, women were said to prefer parataxis, men hypotaxis; that was to say, women would write a series of short sentences, while men could find their way through the mazes of an involved period. In general, said Jespersen, the highest linguistic genius, and the lowest degree of linguistic imbecility were very rarely found among women. Genius indeed was more common among men than among women. This dogma was offensive to women, but they did not question the companion statement that idiocy was more frequent among men.

—Causes of Change.—

Speaking of causes of change in language, he said it was surprising to find no mention in Jesperson's work of the vowels which decorated the British-Australian dialect. To say that they were Cockney was to destroy any theory of climatic influence. Rather, it may be held that "paiper" for "paper" was the result of weariness, in Australia due to heat, in London due to reiteration. A London newspaper boy was calling the Westminster Gazette as "Westminister." A gentleman protested, and the boy replied, "If you had to shout the blasted thing all the afternoon, you'd say 'Westminister.' " The boy was right: "Henery" was easier to repeat continually than "Henry," and so was "umberella" than "umbrella." Sweet considered that the Cockney drawl in "now," for instance, was due to "the habit of speaking with a constant smile or grin," and Jespersen seemed to approve. But what the Cockney had to smile or grin at was beyond his comprehension. That led to Jespersen's revival of the ease theory. He took the sensible line that an "all or nothing" attitude was indefensible, that a tendency towards ease may be at work in some cases, though not in all, because there are other forces which may at times neutralize it or prove stronger than it. The final chapters of Jespersen's great book dealt with the topics of progress and decay in language, of the merits or demerits and synthesis and analysis, of concord, case-endings, and