ADV. 9.8.26.

REG. 7.8.26.

DREAMS OF THE ABORIGINAL.

ADDRESS BY DR. A. J. LEWIS.

A meeting of the Anthropological Society was held at the rooms of Dr. R. H. Pulleine on Monday evening. The meeting was well attended, and Dr. Pulleine occupied the chair. The subject for the evening's discussion was "Native Dreams," and an address on the study of aboriginal dreams was delivered by Dr. A. J. Lewis. He said the dreams of the aboriginal were of peculiar interest, for it was from a study of the dreams of civilised man that much of the theory of psychoanalysis was derived, and for looking into the unconscious part of the healthy mind dreams had proved to be a most useful window. Any window into the unconscious mind of the aboriginal must be of extreme interest to the anthropologist, for it might also let in light upon his social system, his ceremonies and customs, myths, and beliefs.

What Freud did with the people of Vienna, someone else must do with the blackfellows of Australia. Symbolism, transference, condensation, wish-fulfilment—were these commonplaces of their dream life as they were of the white man's? Most of the dreams of children were undisguised wish-fulfilments: the distortion so characteristic of adult dream work was seldom encountered. Were the dreams of the Australian aboriginal, who had so often been said to have the psychology of a child, as simple and straightforward? It seemed improbable. The life of the aboriginal was strictly hedged round with prohibitions and positive ordinances, and whenever there were these, it might be assumed they had been called forth by a strong natural inclination in the opposite direction, so that all the material for a psychic conflict and for the exercise of a dream-censorship was there with its concomitants—distortion and anxiety. Symbolism was an inconspicuous feature of the dreams of children: it was the outstanding feature of the customs of the aboriginal. He would not, probably could not, explain the significance of the symbols he was so constantly using. Might they not hope to find the key to this fascinating mystery in the analysis of his dreams and the symbolism there employed? To invent a story on the spot was no easy matter, with the best will in the world. It was much less effort to relate an actual dream, and when a native ran dry of dream information, it was probably for much the same reasons as a white man did. Those that he put forward were the same any rate. He said either that he could not remember any more, or that it was too trivial to repeat—exactly what patients at the hospital said, with very often the same half-embarrassed, half-deprecatory giggle.

Speaking of the work of attempting to obtain information at Ooldea, Dr. Lewis said no response could be obtained to questions as to the group-significance or conventional meaning attached to dreams. Prophetic value did not seem to be one of the attributes of dreams among them, nor did they interpret by opposites, as many skilled teacup-readers and dream interpreters among white people did. The following type dreams were specially asked for:—Flying, fire, climbing, toothloss, meat eating, being incompletely clothed, and inhibition dream. What these type dreams signified was a field of enquiry he would not attempt to enter nor would he venture into the larger and more troubled place where the contest raged bitterly and the battle-cry was "Sex." It might be that all dreams had a sexual significance. Certainly it was not sitting in an armchair, and reading about it that would enable them to reach a conclusion, least of all about the Australian aboriginal. The work was at hand and must be done quickly. It would certainly teach them much about the aboriginal. It might help them to know themselves better.

Speakers in the discussion which followed were Dr. Pulleine and Messrs. Garnett, Jennison, and Tindale. Exhibits were shown by Drs. Pulleine and Campbell, and Messrs. Tindale, Stapleton, and Mountford.

REG. 7.8.26.

IDEALS OF PHARMACY.

Value of University Work.

The first annual dinner of the Adelaide University Pharmaceutical Students' Association was held at The Grosvenor on Thursday evening. The President of the Association (Mr. S. V. Hagley) occupied the chair. Mr. E. N. Howard proposed "The University."

In submitting "The Pharmacy Board and Society," Mr. L. J. Gurry, humorously described the alleged functions of each body. Mr. E. F. Gyst responded, stating that the students were a part of the board and part of the society. It was the earnest wish of the board that the students should pass their examinations and get on to take the places of the old men on the Pharmacy Board.

"The professors and lecturers" was submitted by the secretary of the association (Mr. R. J. Allen), who said that while the lecturers were teaching the students were unconsciously studying them. They were men of culture, and left a certain impression on those who listened to them. He thought some students were inclined to look on lectures as something to be set ordinarily gives fear. He felt sure that this was not the wish of the lecturers themselves. They were only too willing to be of any service they could, and one of the aims of the students was to foster intimacy between the students and the staff.

Responding, Dr. W. T. Cooke said a good relationship between students and staff was essential. The greatest contribution a lecturer could make to a university was through the students as a medium. Everybody took on something of his environment, which opened up the question of what an ideal lecturer would be with ideal students. (Laughter.) Whatever students did to help their profession was to the advantage of all those who were interested in them.

In proposing the toast "The Pharmaceutical Students' Association," Mr. H. V. Moore commented upon the rapid growth of the body in recent years. It was fulfilling its various functions admirably. He spoke in terms of high praise of the work of Mr. Gryst on the board and council for the last 22 years, and as lecturer in materia medica. He spoke also of the assistance received by the students from Mr. O. H. Walter, the secretary of the Pharmaceutical Society. He suggested that all students should become associate members of the society.

Mr. S. V. Hagley (President of the Association), in response, said that the rapid progress of the association was the result of the individual co-operation of its members, supplemented by the ever ready help of Mr. Walter, Mr. Gryst, and other members of the board and society. He took this opportunity of paying tribute to the pioneers of the association, two of whom were present that evening. They were Messrs. C. C. Daniel and H. Wearne, the first secretary and President, respectively. (Applause.) The idea of the students becoming associates of the Pharmaceutical Society was an excellent one, insomuch as it encouraged the students on receiving their diploma to become members. By attending the society meetings while students they would be enabled to get an insight into the function of that body.

Mr. R. W. Goldsack proposed "Kindred societies," to which Mr. C. G. Bartholomaeus, of the Engineering Students' Society, responded. Musical and elocutionary items were contributed by Messrs. Faulkiner, Arthur Mayne, and Hartshorne ably assisted by Mr. Laurie Waldie at the piano.

REG. 7.8.26

AN ANCIENT COLLEGE.

Devotion to higher learning is happily marked by a disposition to overlook racial barriers and religious differences, and the rivalries of educational institutions are usually accompanied by a sense of fraternity due to the realization that mutual aid is both desirable and attainable in the acquisition of knowledge and intellectual culture. To British communities the work and influence of universities are essential to communal advancement, and all classes of people are proud of the far-reaching and beneficent effects of the universities upon Great Britain's character and activities. The University, with its attendant colleges, is intimately bound up with the Mother Country's national existence, and in Australia the State universities are performing functions no less important. While South Australians are preparing to celebrate worthily the jubilee of the University of Adelaide, it is interesting to note that on June 26 the sexcentenary of Oriel College, Oxford, was impressively commemorated. The origin of that seat of learning is obscure. Every Oriel man, however, knows the legend of the founding of his college. In a moment of stress at the Battle of Bannockburn, Edward II. is credited with having vowed that if he escaped alive he would dedicate a House to the Blessed Virgin. Repenting later of his rash vow, he cast about for a thrifty evasion of it, and finding that his almoner, Adam de Brome, was about to found a college in Oxford, His Majesty piously assumed the duties of founder, and left his almoner to provide for the necessary endowment. Recorded facts are that in 1324 Adam de Brome, a courtly ecclesiastic, was minded to establish a college on the lines laid down by Walter de Merton. It was to consist of a small body of students living a common life, free from monastic vows, and enjoying the mutual comfort and encouragement which friendly con-

Whether this society ever saw the light is doubtful; but in 1326 the college and its possessions were handed over to the King; and by letters patent granted on January 21, 1326, the King refounded the college, with Adam de Brome as Provost, restored its endowments, granted to it the advowson of St. Mary's, and became its Visitor. The name of Oriel is derived from a tenement known as "Seneschal" Hall or La Oriole, which was granted to the college in 1327. "There is no trace of the reason why the tenement was so called, but it would seem that it referred to one of the earlier applications of the word to a gallery or porch, rather than to a window." By 1349 the name Oriel is found in a public document, and in 1367, it was used by the College itself. Dr. Phelps, the present Provost, in a brief historical survey, says that Oriel as a rule was less disturbed than most colleges by interference from without; but when the University of Oxford was honeycombed with the heresies of Wycliffe and of Lollardism, their stoutest supporters were in Oriel. In the troublous times of the seventeenth century the college plate went to replenish the Royal Exchequer, and its income fell off, but the personnel was little affected. The choice of a Provost was often fruitful of discord and bitterness. The Visitor and even the Courts were called in to decide between rival candidates for fellowships. The Bishop was accustomed to enjoin attendance at St. Mary's, abstention from blasphemous speech and profane swearing, and adoption of the monastic spirit. Manners varied according to the standard set by those in authority; discipline was sometimes strict, at others lax.

The seventeenth century saw a new college built from the design of some wandering band of masons, as it would seem, leaving little or no trace of the older building. Oriel men cherish the claim of their college to have been the nursing mother of Sir Walter Raleigh that "superb adventurer and statesman whose name shone like a star" in the spacious days of Queen Elizabeth. To the bench of prelates went Archbishop Arundel; John Robinson, the trusted Counsellor of Queen Anne; and Joseph Butler, of "Analogy" fame. To the law went Sir John Holt, a Lord Chief Justice famed for his integrity and independence; Sir John Blencome, and Lord Chancellor Talbot. Other Oriel men of olden time were William Prynne, the zealous and discontented Puritan, a true friend to the college in the days of the Commonwealth; Braithwaite, the writer of "Spiritual Spicerie," and Gilbert White, whose "Natural History" rivals "The Pilgrim's Progress" in the multitude of its editions. In the eighteenth century Oriel played a notable part in reforming the University. It opened its fellowships to all comers, and the names of Davidson, Whately, Keble, Hawkins, Hampden, Arnold, Hartley Coleridge, Newman, Pusey, and Froude are among the fellows who justified this adventurous spirit. The centre of the "Oxford Movement" was Oriel, and the prime mover in it a fellow of the college, John Henry Newman. Later, it was an Oriel man, Cecil Rhodes, who "with real statesmanship and a princely generosity taught men to realize the kinship which unites us with our colonies and with America and to give it expression in common ideals." Oriel has produced many great men, but perhaps her chief claim to the gratitude of Great Britain and the Empire is that she has been essentially a training school of typical Britons, men who have honourably fulfilled the duties laid upon them as civil servants, country gentlemen, and business magnates or workers in the various professions.

UNIVERSITY JUBILEE.

Mr. Fred. Johns, author of "Notable Australians" writes:—

I trust that the quotations I make from the daily newspapers, The Register and The Advertiser—those indisputable chronicles of the times—will settle finally the controversy which has been proceeding regarding the first great gift in connection with the foundation of the University of Adelaide. In its biographical notice of the late Rev. Dr. James Jefferis on the occasion of his death, The Register of December 27, 1917, states:—"In 1872 Dr. Jefferis was appointed Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Union College. It was during the occupancy of this office that the late Sir W. Watson Hughes offered £20,000 for the endowment of the college. Dr. Jefferis, however, suggested that the money would be more useful as a nucleus for a university. With this recommendation the council and the donor agreed; another £20,000 was given by Sir Thomas Elder; the Government made a grant of £2,400 per annum and 50,000 acres of land; and thus the Adelaide University came into being." In its fine eulogy paid to Dr. Jefferis The Register's leading article of the same date has the following:—"In relation to the credit due to him as the virtual founder of the Adelaide University there is a pathetic interest in the record that a week or two ago doubtless conscious of his impending death, he declined re-election to the office which he had held so many years in the seat of learning practically created by him."

The Advertiser of December 27, 1917, under the heading, "A leader of public thought," says of the late Dr. Jefferis—"An important memorial by his foresight his broadmindedness, and his generosity, is the University of Adelaide, from the council of which he retired but a few weeks ago, and which will always honour him as its virtual founder. Dr. Jefferis was invariably an advocate of the higher culture, and in Union College, which long ago was a centre of training for ministers in Adelaide, he held the important office of Professor of Mathematics, Natural History Sciences, and Ecclesiastical History. The college was doing such efficient and such valuable work that Sir Walter Hughes offered £20,000 to form a permanent endowment fund. To Dr. Jefferis it was due that this munificent gift was diverted to form the basis for the broader fund afterwards augmented by Sir Thomas Elder and other large-hearted citizens as well as by the Government which resulted in the establishment of the University of Adelaide."

One does not question the accuracy of the statements that have been advanced in favour of the recognition of the late Rev. James Lyall for the part he doubtless played in connection with the Hughes benefaction. But it is unfortunate that the claim made in behalf of the late Dr. Jefferis should have been challenged so late in the day and years after the newspaper statements I have quoted. Similar statements so long and generally accepted as historic facts, were published

REG. 7.8.26

THE UNIVERSITY.

Its Wonderful Growth and its Future Development.

By the Rev. F. Slaney Poole, M.A.

Reminiscence is one of the solaces of old age; there are, I suppose, many unsatisfactory pages in the book of each man's life, but it must have been a poor life indeed if there are not some that are bright and encouraging. There are few of the latter kind which have given me so much pleasure to look back upon than the fact that I was not only present at the birth of the Adelaide University, but I was one of those whose privilege it was to rock its cradle, and to stand by with the soothing syrup when its administration was necessary. I confess that I never expected that the early stages of its life gave such promise that in a few short years—and what a brief period in the life of a University is a year—it would grow into such a lusty boy as it stands to-day. It has passed, and successfully passed, through the trifling ailments of its infancy, for it has had its teething troubles, its measles, and its whooping cough, but the wise men who in the subsequent years were its guardians saw it safely through all these juvenile disorders, and now in its fiftieth year it stands in all the flush of early youth, ready to do and dare. I spoke in a previous article of those guardians having to cut the coat according to the supply of cloth. Just as in a poor family father's clothes have to be cut down, altered, and fitted, with more or less deftness, to the growing boy, so the authorities of the University had to use their knowledge of the ancient universities, and modify it, to the new and scanty conditions of the infant they had in charge. It speaks well for their wisdom, forethought, and economy,