

Lumen ex Oriente: Academic Dress of the University of Hong Kong, 1911–1941

By Alexander Yen

Introduction

The story of the development of academic dress at the University of Hong Kong (henceforth, the University) is, for a long-standing University established under colonial auspices and along British lines, remarkably under-researched. With the recent expansion of interest in the study of academic dress in the Eastern hemisphere, however, it may indeed be an opportune moment for a fuller investigation into the traditions of academic dress at a university which was, by all accounts, founded as a profoundly British colonial institution.¹

Insofar as can be traced through an examination of primary archival material, this article aims to produce a narrative of the development of the University's academic dress for officials and graduates from its founding in 1911 to the cessation of formal operations in 1941 with the Second World War. I hope to deliver a chronological narrative of the appearance of various items of academic dress at the University in this immensely formative period in its history, and hence produce a broad overview of development that will be useful to both scholars of academic dress and of the history of the University. The reasons that academic dress at the University took the forms they did will fall outside the scope of this article: however, speculation along such lines may fruitfully form the basis of further research and another article.

Methodology

The original research on which this article is based consisted principally of assessing archival primary sources held by the University. In particular, two sources were of especial importance: minutes of the University's Senate, and *Academic Calendars*.

Because the Senate—one of the three governing bodies of the University—is charged by the University Ordinance of 1911 (a charge unchanged by successive amendments to the ordinance) with oversight of affairs relating to education in the University,² it is the body

I am grateful to Dr Andrew North, FBS, for his supervision and advice and to Dr Jonathan Cooper, FBS, for stewarding the project, originally submitted for the Fellowship, as Dean of Studies of the Burgon Society. I am additionally grateful to the University Archives at the University of Hong Kong and its staff, in particular Mr Garfield Lam, for allowing me access to the materials required to complete my research, and assisting my examining of them. I am further grateful to Ms Gemma Field, company archivist at Ede & Ravenscroft, for allowing me to examine documents relevant to the academic dress of the University in the period under review.

1 This interest has produced Testar, 'Academical Dress in Japan'; Ko, 'Academic Regalia in China'; and Chiu, 'Academic Dress in China'.

2 Hong Kong Government, *The Hongkong Government Gazette*, 31 March 1911 (Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government Printer, 1911), pp. 126–32. See also successive amendments, as well as schedules to the ordinances which set out the statutes of the University. This is not the precise for-

most linked to decision-making regarding academic dress.³ Its minutes were therefore the prime source for records of policymaking with regard to the development of academic dress for the University. But Senate minutes were not the only source available from the University's decision-making hierarchy. Because the Senate would have made recommendations regarding academic dress to the Council—the second of the three governing bodies and the 'executive body' of the University⁴—which would have then, by its assent, caused such regulations to come into force, minutes of the University's Council are a subsidiary source on academic dress policymaking. However, though in theory Council's assent could have been withheld, in practice—at least with regard to matters of academic dress—Council did not seem interested in exercising its veto: Council minutes hence often contain only reiterations of Senate decisions (occasionally in even less detail), with Council's assent appended. Where a Senate decision was reached regarding a certain item of academic dress, therefore, unless Council altered, reversed, or otherwise substantially commented on the decision, the latter's assent is taken as granted and references to that body are omitted.

The third of the three governing bodies, the Court, though in principle the 'supreme governing body' of the University,⁵ appears to have had little opinion in the matter of academic dress and thus warrants little mention in the remainder of this article.

Academic Calendars, on the other hand, were useful because they provided an official record of the regulations on academic dress that obtained in the relevant year, and hence what the University authorities intended and reckoned to be the University's academic dress, even if—though there is little indication that this was actually the case—the regulations were not adhered to in practice. They hence provide not only an important holistic picture of academic dress schemes—insofar as they record the scheme in its entirety—across time, but also, inasmuch as changes to the overall scheme of academic dress can be traced by comparing one year's regulations to another's, an important comparative perspective unavailable anywhere else. In the absence of significant amounts of pictorial or physical evidence, *Academic Calendars* are, I feel, the best chance of acquiring an impression of the overall academic dress scheme of the University for what is essentially an overview article.

Photographs of graduates throughout the period in academic dress were an additional source of information. They were invaluable in providing some concrete evidence as to how academic dress in the relevant year appeared in practice, and hence served as direct evidence for details not provided for in the perhaps more 'minimalist' regulations. Unfortunately, few were available and not all details of academic dress which could otherwise be supplied by reference to them could be gleaned from those viewed.

mulation used in any ordinance but, as the wording does change over our period, can be considered representative of the intent.

³ Though for our period this link is implicit. This does become explicit by the time the (now the University of Hong Kong) Ordinance (Cap. 1053) was published in 1989 by the Government Printer: Section 2 of Statute xxiii (under Schedule 2), established that 'The Senate may by regulation provide for any of the following matters or for any of the following purposes ... (d) academic dress.'

⁴ As the same ordinance, and amendments to it, in footnote 3 outline.

⁵ This language is preserved virtually verbatim in the relevant ordinance and its successive amendments in our period.

What the archives say

The University of Hong Kong was founded in 1911 under the auspices of the then-Governor of Hong Kong, Frederick Lugard.⁶ Modelled on the ‘newer’ British universities,⁷ the institution was intended not only to ‘promote “Western knowledge” and assist in the “awakening” of China’ as a ‘Light of the Orient’, but to further British imperial policy in the Far East by raising British prestige.⁸ Like some other colonial foundations which had roots in medicine, the new foundation absorbed the existing Hong Kong College of Medicine, initially complementing the medical faculty with donations that established an engineering faculty and (slightly later) an arts faculty.⁹

The substantive part of this article covers the development of academic dress at the University of Hong Kong from 1911, its founding, to 1941, when the University ceased operations due to the Japanese Occupation of Hong Kong during the Second World War. It would probably be fair to say that the archival material for this period is relatively incomplete when compared to that of other Commonwealth universities, in no small part due to the Japanese Occupation, during which significant portions of the Registry and faculty archives were ‘wantonly destroyed’.¹⁰ With the incompleteness of the material in question, such as the failure to preserve minutes of subcommittees or submissions to the Senate or Council, the use of documentary evidence must be qualified in that, inasmuch as I do not doubt the veracity or accuracy of what is recorded, I feel the possibility that what is recorded does not encompass the entire picture of decision-making over academic dress must at least be entertained. What is available, however, does allow the reconstruction of the broad contours of development in these early—formative—years, of the University.

It should be noted at this juncture that what appears below represents a complete reproduction of all archival material available for the present period concerning academic dress. Any details not supplied must therefore, at least for the period under review, be considered indeterminate and the subject of speculation. Speculative analysis that is immediately apparent to the author has been ventured into in this article; the remainder, however, will have to be the subject of a further piece on the subject.

Initial forays

Something that is immediately apparent is that academic dress received little attention in the preparatory stages of the University’s formation. Though it had been founded in 1911, by May 1914 the Senate nonetheless decided:

6 Cunich, *History*, pp. 148–61. The University officially came into existence on 30 March 1911 with the Governor’s assent to the University Ordinance 1911 (No. 10 of 1911), though the Ordinance only received royal assent from King George V in early 1912; its buildings were only officially opened in March 1912.

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 102, 142. Lugard’s intention was to follow in the footsteps of the ‘civic university’ model of Birmingham or Leeds, rather than the Oxbridge, London, or Calcutta models; the University Committee, formed as a preparatory committee for the establishment of the University, also favoured a constitution modelled on ‘the Birmingham-Leeds-Liverpool group of Universities’.

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 100–07; Ch. 10. Perhaps indicative of this sentiment is Cecil Clementi’s anthem for the University, which concludes ‘*Dei Semper auxilio novum Splendeat sapientia Lumen ex Oriente!*’ from which the title of this article is taken.

9 *Ibid.*, pp. 175–84.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 403.

12. ... [That] no Gowns should be worn at the coming Graduation Ceremony.¹¹

It would be highly unlikely (though not impossible) for a university today that had academic dress to nonetheless decide for its graduates to forgo, in a ceremonial context if nothing else, the wearing of gowns and hoods suitable to their degrees: to say nothing for a university and a ceremony more than a century ago, when gown- and cap-wearing were frequent even in daily student life.¹² The evidence admits the explanation, therefore, that academic dress for graduates was simply not in existence at that juncture: that it did not exist three years after the University's founding must be interpreted as evidence that academic dress was a low priority for the administration.

This conjecture is supported by an entry in the Senate's minutes of a November 1915 meeting, which records that:

3. The Senate inspected a specimen gown and hoods for Graduates, and decided on the following modifications:—

Gown:—To be bigger over the chest, and fuller in the sleeves, the yoke to be cut smaller, and the smocking to be more extensive and neater.

Hoods:—To be longer. Those for Bachelors and Masters to be of the same colour, but the Bachelors' to be grey, with an edging of colour, and the Masters' to be coloured, with an edging of grey.

Colours and Materials:—Gowns and hoods to be of the grey material shown. The distinctive colours of the hood lining to be Red for Medicine, Blue for arts and the colour for Engineering to be selected later. The Faculties to report on the actual shades of colour.¹³

That the Senate viewed *specimen* gowns (and suggested modifications) seems to imply that a scheme was being built from scratch, and that a tailor (likely Ede, Son, & Ravenscroft, given their later appointment in May 1920 as the University's roblemakers)¹⁴ had sent over gowns to be examined; this is supported by the list of modifications the Senate proposed. This scheme received the authorization of the Council ('The council approved the material and colour of a specimen gown for Graduates'),¹⁵ and thus represents the first foray into academic dress proper for the University of Hong Kong. For ease of reference, this will be referred to in the remainder of this article as the 1915 Scheme.

Importantly, however, this is the first official mention of one key plank of the University's academic dress scheme, that of faculty colours ('... [hoods] for Bachelors and Masters to be of the same colour ...'). First adopted by the University of London in the mid-nineteenth century,¹⁶ the idea of assigning to each faculty a unique colour, and basing academic dress for graduates taking degrees taught by that faculty on that colour, was to persist at the University of Hong Kong throughout our period. It is also an important juncture in that, following the Council's authorization in the abovementioned minute, it also decided that 'a design for robes for the Chancellor should be obtained from England', marking the

11 Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, Minute for 8 May 1914, Item 12. All minutes cited are in the University Archives, University of Hong Kong.

12 See Keenan, 'How Can Academic Dress Survive', for a lament on the decline of academic dress wearing into the third millennium in comparison to its survival in the early years of the ultimate century of the second.

13 Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, 23 Nov. 1915, Item 3.

14 Minutes of the Council 1911–1941, 14 May 1920, Item 15.

15 Ibid., 26 Nov. 1915, Item 5.

16 Christianson, 'Lined with Gold', p. 80.

first mention in the material surveyed of academic dress for officials.¹⁷ That an English pattern should explicitly be preferred also illustrates the University's close connection, academic dress-wise, to the British tradition, an impression that is reinforced by later records that surround the 1918 Scheme.¹⁸

With 1916 came another development that added to the overall academic dress scheme and perhaps best evidences the formative nature of this period. The Senate resolved in September 1916:

1. ... [That] the honorary degree conferred by the University should be Doctor of Laws (LLD).
2. ... [That] the academic costume of a Doctor of Laws should be as follows:—
Gown:—cherry red and grey.
Hood:—grey and a simple green.¹⁹

It is interesting to note that grey features prominently in the academic dress provided for up to this point: it is possible that academic dress policy-makers considered it the 'corporate colour' (to use an anachronism) of the University, the colour that would set it apart from others and hence to be incorporated into most, if not all, dress.

That the new academic dress specification (the '1916 LLD dress') was decided on immediately after the decision to establish the degree shows that academic dress development at the University was a reactive process: instead of some scheme being established in advance of degrees being awarded, the presence of individuals who were to take the degree prompted development.²⁰ Academic dress schemes thus can be said to have been part of the growing pains of the University's development in this period. This impression is further reinforced by noting that another doctoral degree, that of the Doctor of Medicine (MD), as well as the other higher degree in the Faculty of Medicine, the Master of Surgery (MS), was established in January of the same year: however, little mention of the academic dress proper to those degrees can be found in the same period.²¹ If this was not an oversight on the part of either the Senate or Council, then it might be taken as further evidence that the administration of the University considered academic dress in general a matter for reaction and not proactivity: a quality which we will see also applied to later developments in this period.

The selection of caps for academic dress followed two years later after the 1915 Scheme, with a brief flurry of activity in November–December 1917 and May 1918. Minutes for the former period are more confusing, with the Senate initially deciding to recommend that Council approve 'a new design for Graduates' caps (pattern No.1 submitted by Messrs. Ede Son & Ravenscroft),²² but Council eventually approving 'a new pattern of cap for Graduates. (No. 5 of Messrs. Ede Son & Ravenscroft)'.²³ Unfortunately, what these two patterns

¹⁷ Minutes of the Council 1911–1941, 26 Nov. 1915, Item 5.

¹⁸ See 'Further development', *infra*.

¹⁹ Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, 22 Sept. 1916, Items 1 and 2. These were confirmed by the Council in Minutes of the Council 1911–1941, 12 Oct. 1916, Item 16.

²⁰ 'HKU: The Honorary Graduates', The University of Hong Kong, updated 2019, online at <www4.hku.hk/honggrads/graduates/past/0th-1916/LLD?name=> [retrieved 17 May 2020]. For the avoidance of doubt the University did, it seems, immediately begin awarding these degrees in the same year they were established, 1916.

²¹ Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, 27 Jan. 1916, Item 13.

²² Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, 29 Nov. 1917, Item 6.

²³ Minutes of the Council 1911–1941, 7 Dec. 1917, Item 12.

entail precisely, and the differences between them, is not clear, and may indeed prove to be a subject of further inquiry.²⁴ Similarly, reasons for rejecting Senate's recommendations do not appear to be recorded in the relevant papers from the University's Archives; these may indeed be lost to history. The next set of minutes, however, serve substantially to clarify the matter: Senate recommended and Council decided to adopt the 'common Academic cap known as the "Mortar board"' as the official dress for graduates.²⁵ The naming of the cap in question by an appellation commonly associated with [h1] of the Groves Classification Scheme gives every reason to conclude that this item of headdress was decided on for the common use of graduates.²⁶

Further development

However, both the 1915 Scheme and the 1916 LLD dress were not to last. The minutes of the Senate for a meeting in August 1918 record a new scheme of academic dress (the 1918 Scheme):

2. The Senate decided to recommend that Messrs. Ede, Son & Ravenscroft be asked to design and make the University academic costume according to the design usual in British Universities with such modifications as they think necessary to distinguish it from the costumes of other universities. The colours to be as follows:—

Bachelors—Black gown and mortarboard cap. Dark grey hood edged with the Faculty colour.

Masters—Black gown and mortarboard cap. Dark grey hood lined with the Faculty colour.

Doctors—Full dress scarlet gown, cap of the usual shape. Hood of the Faculty colour. Green hood for the LLD.

The Registrar was instructed to write to the Vice-Chancellor that ... the Senate thinks it desirable that the costumes of the officials of the University should be altered so as to bring them into harmony.²⁷

It must firstly be observed that this minute is extraordinary in that it reveals at least some justification for the scheme: while the academic costume was to be modified such that it could be distinguished 'from the costumes of other universities', the broad direction was to be conformist, 'according to the design usual in British Universities' (the modifications to be made only those 'necessary'). Precisely what influence these two motivations, especially the latter, had on the scheme is not fully established in the material available, but the existence of this note does shed some light on the motivations of academic dress design at the University in this period, and allows this article to make at least some reference to the academic dress of contemporary British universities. This influence, however, might very well be seen as par-for-course: Hong Kong was then a British colony, and the University was established under the auspices of the colonial government.

Developments from both the 1915 Scheme and the 1916 LLD dress are immediately apparent. Unlike those in the 1915 Scheme, the gowns of the 1918 scheme are black, instead of grey, and the grey on the hoods is now a 'dark grey' instead of merely 'grey' (though this could be merely describing the same colour in greater detail). Most importantly, however,

²⁴ Possibly with reference to the archives of Ede & Ravenscroft.

²⁵ Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, 17 May 1918, Item 3; Minutes of the Council 1911–1941, 21 May 1918, Item 5.

²⁶ Groves, *Shaw's Academical Dress*, p. 40.

²⁷ Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, 1 Aug. 1918, Item 2.

the method of distinguishing the hoods of masters and bachelors has changed from the slightly awkward system of a grey hood edged with the faculty colour for bachelors and a faculty-coloured hood edged with grey for masters, to a more conventional system where bachelors have hoods edged, and masters have hoods lined, with the faculty colour. This resembles the contemporary dress of the University of London.²⁸ With no specific mention being made of faculty colours, it may be safely taken as implied that these did not change from those specified in the 1915 scheme.²⁹ In comparison to the 1916 LLD dress, the LLDs exchanged their cherry gowns for scarlet ones; if they were to retain their grey facings is unclear, but given that the hood was now prescribed as just 'green' instead of 'green and grey', on the balance of probabilities it seems likely that the grey elements of the dress (slightly surprising, given our hypothesis of 'corporate colours' earlier, though the grey has been retained for graduates at other levels) had been got rid of altogether.

It must be noted, however, that the archival records in this case conflict with other contemporary sources of information. The 1927 (third) edition of Haycraft's *The Degrees and Hoods of The World's Universities and Colleges*,³⁰ which describes the University's academic dress in this period, records the LLD's hood as 'scarlet cloth lined with light green silk',³¹ and an Ede & Ravenscroft ledger records that '1 LLD scarlet hood' was ordered on 23 November 1918, after the new scheme had been promulgated.³² It seems, therefore, that though the grey was removed from the LLD's hoods, they were not entirely green either (or at least they were not supplied as such), as the regulations seem to prescribe. Of course, the regulations could have been taking the scarlet shell of the LLD's hood as given, and merely updating the prescriptions regarding the lining.

Moreover, the MD degree, mentioned above as having been introduced in 1916 without provision for academic dress, now received dress (as the plural 'Doctors' and provision for a 'hood of the faculty colour' betrays): perhaps in anticipation of the first graduate to proceed to it.³³ A detail that requires a modicum of textual exegesis is the question of caps: while bachelors and masters were to take a mortarboard, the dissimilarity to language used for doctors—that they were to take a 'cap of the usual shape'—implies the latter's caps were not mortarboards. So what is this 'cap of the usual shape'? A later scheme, promulgated in 1928, seems to prescribe for the honorary doctors a velvet bonnet [h2] and ordinary doctors a 'John Knox' cap [h3].³⁴ Unable to decide whether a velvet bonnet or a John Knox cap is meant by the 'cap of the usual shape', we might conclude that, because that entry at a stroke prescribes dress for both honorary and ordinary doctors (the latter seen by reference

28 Goff, *University of London Academic Dress*, pp. 37–39.

29 The 1915 scheme specified red for medicine, blue for Arts, with Engineering 'to be selected later'. However, as we shall see, the colour for Engineering must have been confirmed (though the official minutes again make no record of this) as being yellow: see 'New degree, new faculty, new order of dress', *infra*.

30 The 1927 edition is referenced in preference to the 1924 (2nd) edition, which not only records the hoods as 'not yet determined', but (erroneously) maintains that the University had an LLB degree.

31 Haycraft, *Degrees and Hoods*, 3rd ed., p. 46.

32 Ledger for the University of Hong Kong 1916–1938, entries for 23 Nov. 1918, Company Archives, Ede & Ravenscroft. Fifth entry.

33 Cunich, *History*, p. 239. G. H. Thomas (Tam Ka Sze, MB, BS 1914) was the 'first medical graduate to be awarded the MD degree'; the award was made in 1920.

34 See discussion of the velvet cap, *infra*, and Appendix A.

to hoods of the faculty colour), the ‘cap of the usual shape’ was intended to mean that cap which was by convention prescribed to either class of doctor, with the construction meant to catch both in the same phrase.

While the minimalism of these regulations means that many details are not known (and may never be known), on at least one point, the shape of bachelors’ gowns for this scheme, pictorial evidence exists to confirm contemporary practice. Pictures (Figs 1 and 2) of graduates of the University under the 1918 Scheme seem to indicate that, in practice, while the bachelor’s gown had plain open sleeves, the point reached only around the knee, what is now the Basic Bachelor [b1] of the Groves Classification Scheme.³⁵ Reference to the third edition of Haycraft also reveals an additional detail, in that the hoods of the bachelors and masters are listed as of the simple shape, while the LLD is listed as taking a full shape hood.³⁶

Slightly more speculatively, another important point of divergence seems to be—based on the pluralization of ‘officials’—that by this point, more officers than the Chancellor had official dress, which therefore needed to be ‘harmonized’ into the new scheme.³⁷ With three officials (the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Registrar) listed in the 1937/1938 *Academic Calendar* as possessing robes for their offices, there is every possibility that by 1918 (given that no further material refers to the introduction of dress for these three officers) they were ‘begowned’: but whether this was the case is unfortunately not addressed in the material surveyed.³⁸

It is worth noting that even though the University had established a general form of doctor’s dress, it did not intend in this period to award substantive doctoral degrees other than that of the MD, the LLD being honorary. This can be seen from a Senate Minute of December 1921 when the Senate, in reply to the Revd Stanley McKelvie, DD (Oxon), regretted that it could not admit him to a postgraduate degree ‘as such degrees are not at present conferred by the University’,³⁹ but also from *Academic Calendars* up to 1941, which seem to indicate under the section describing doctoral academic dress that the section’s intended users were Doctors of Medicine.⁴⁰

The Senate also, in a minute of April 1922, considered the question of undergraduate academic dress:

14. A communication from the Secretary of the University Union was laid on the table with reference to the wearing of cap and gown by undergraduates on ceremonial occasions. In view of the small majority [author’s note: possibly ‘small minority’ is meant here, or that the Senate considered that the majority of undergraduates in favour of

35 Groves, *Shaw’s Academical Dress*, p. 26.

36 Haycraft, *Degrees and Hoods*, 3rd edn, p. 46.

37 See Council’s authorization of the 1915 Scheme, p. 4, which mentions only the procurement of dress for the Chancellor. Because this is modern practice at the University, it is probably safe to assume that the [b1] shape persisted throughout our period as the gown for bachelors.

38 *Academic Calendar* for 1937/1938, p. 188. Hence we can only conclude that the Vice-Chancellor and Registrar likely received academic dress some time between 1915 and 1937. The minutes surrounding the introduction of academic dress for the Treasurer (*infra*) also refer to the process as a ‘re-introduction’: whether the Treasurer at this point in time (1918) had academic dress or had already lost it, and the pattern of dress prescribed, is unfortunately lost to history.

39 Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, 29 Dec. 1921, Item 15.

40 See for example the regulations recorded in Appendix A, which specifically indicate ‘—RED’ under ‘Doctors (*full dress*) Gown’.

academic dress was inadequately large] of undergraduates in favour of the scheme the Senate decided that no action should be taken.

As distinct from prevailing practice in other contemporary British universities, the University of Hong Kong did not specify academic dress for its undergraduates from its founding.⁴¹ What is perhaps more surprising is that the undergraduates, unlike some of their contemporaries who considered such dress ‘a pleasure and an honour’, did not seem to welcome in significant enough terms a proposal to introduce academic dress for them to justify Senatorial assent.⁴² This was in contrast to the ‘considerable success’ with which such dress was received when it was finally introduced in 1952.⁴³

With the 1918 scheme, the University finally had a relatively stable set of academic dress that would remain in use for the next decade. By 1922 and the rejection of the Secretary of the University Union’s suggestion of academic dress, the subject would not be discussed in any official material until half a decade later.

Before proceeding on to the next period, however, it would be interesting to compare the results of my research to that of secondary sources available for the period up to this point. These are Haycraft’s second (1924) and third (1927) editions of *Degrees and Hoods*. The former edition’s record of the University’s academic dress is most puzzling: Haycraft maintains that, even by 1924, hoods have ‘not yet been determined’.⁴⁴ Yet not only does our archival material show that two iterations of academic dress schemes had already been produced by that point (in 1915 and 1918), but a ledger from Ede & Ravenscroft shows that that company provided, in an order of 18 November 1920, 24 MB hoods, 24 BSc hoods, and 24 BA hoods.⁴⁵ It would be highly unlikely for a university which had not yet determined its



Image Courtesy of the University Archives,
University of Hong Kong

Fig. 1. An HKU graduate who received a ‘wartime degree’ at the end of the First World War.

41 Shaw, *Academical Dress*, pp. 35–92. Taking Shaw’s (1st edn) as accurate, and universities listed therein as having been founded between 1900 and 1941 as a representative sample of the context of the University of Hong Kong’s foundation, only two (Queen’s University Belfast, and Leeds) out of eight (the remainder being Birmingham, Bristol, Liverpool, Reading, Sheffield, and the National University of Ireland) did not prescribe academic dress for undergraduates.

On the other hand, if we take this context to be those universities *in existence* by 1941 (again taking Shaw’s years of foundation), the proportion declines to three (with the addition of Manchester) out of seventeen (the pre-1900 foundations being Cambridge, Oxford, Aberdeen, Trinity College Dublin, Durham, Edinburgh, Glasgow, St David’s Lampeter, London, St Andrews, and Wales). It must be noted, however, that this number includes the four Scottish universities, which have their distinctive scarlet undergraduate academic dress (see Cooper, ‘The Scarlet Gown’).

42 See Wolgast, ‘A Pleasure and an Honor’.

43 Minutes of the Senate 1952, 7 Oct. 1952, Item 2(c). The Senate ‘... noted with pleasure that the innovation of undergraduate Academic Dress had met with considerable success’.

44 Haycraft, *Degrees and Hoods*, 2nd edn, p. 39.

45 Ledger for the University of Hong Kong 1916–1938, Entries for 18 Nov. 1920. Company



Fig. 2. Graduates and staff, 1923, including the first female graduate.

Image Courtesy of the University Archives, University of Hong Kong

hoods to have commissioned some from robemakers, and in such quantity. This situation is rectified in the third edition, however, where Haycraft's record of the University's scheme finally seems to match our understanding.⁴⁶ Perhaps it took some time for his records to be updated, or for the University's administration to furnish him with the information he required.⁴⁷

A new degree, and the 1928 Committee and scheme

In the meantime, developments in degrees proceeded apace. Regulations for the degree of Master of Arts (MA) were first mentioned as established in 1924, to allow a certain Ms Carter to submit her thesis and attempt the examination for the degree.⁴⁸ Yet the academic dress for that degree does not appear to have been discussed until December 1927, when the Senate, having been referred from the Standing Committee of the Senate the 'question of the colour of the hood for the MA Degree', decided:

3. ... [That] the hood should be the same colour as the bachelors' hood, grey, but that it should be lined throughout with light blue silk.⁴⁹

Archives, Ede & Ravenscroft. Fifth entry.

⁴⁶ Haycraft, *Degrees and Hoods*, 3rd edn, p. 46. Haycraft matches our understanding in recording that bachelors have grey hoods edged faculty silk, masters grey hoods lined faculty silk, and indeed supplements our understanding by recording the LLD's hood as being of scarlet cloth lined light green silk.

⁴⁷ C. A. Ealand, *Athena; A Year-Book of the Learned World; The English Speaking Races* (London: A & C Black, 1920), p. 119. reads: 'HONG KONG (China). Hong Kong University. No particulars received.' Online at <archive.org/details/athenayearbookof00ealarich/page/118> [retrieved 17 May 2020]. (Although styled a 'Year-Book', only one issue was published.) Perhaps HKU was not good at responding to enquiries!

⁴⁸ Minutes of the Senate 1911-1928, 30 Oct. 1924, Item 16.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 31 Dec. 1927, Item 3.

It would firstly seem that this referral was unnecessary: after all, it is a logical extension of the 1918 scheme, where the faculty colour of the Faculty of Arts (blue—though now specified to be ‘light blue’)⁵⁰ is applied to the master’s-level hood in the manner laid down. What is important, however, is the timing. Why was this hood developed (or addressed) in 1927, and not in 1924 with the laying down of regulations? Minute 7 of the same meeting records that:

7. ... The Senate took note that the MA degree had been taken for the first time since the establishment of the University ...

The answer, it would appear, lies in the same reactive quality of decisions on academic dress that characterized the development of the 1916 LLD dress: dress would only be decided on (or addressed) when actually required for an individual to graduate in. With an individual who was to take the MA, the relevant academic dress had to be (and would be) confirmed: but not before.

The designation of the MA’s hood, however, might have been the last development under the 1918 Scheme. By February 1928 some concern must have arisen over the current state of academic dress at the University because the Senate decided:

11. ... [To] accept the motion proposed by Prof. Hinton and seconded by Prof. Byrne ‘that a Committee of the Senate be appointed with instructions to consider the question of academic costume in this University, and to recommend a complete series of designs for all official costumes and costumes for all graduates, after consultation with experts in England’.⁵¹

A (sub-)committee was therefore established (the ‘1928 Committee’), and appears to have made quick progress: by March 1928 the Senate, having viewed (‘laid on the table’) the minutes of the ‘Sub-committee to consider the question of the revision of academic costumes’, ‘agreed that action should be taken on the lines of the recommendation of the Sub-committee’.⁵² Council does not seem to have dissented, with further minutes being laid on the table without comment.⁵³ Further progress came steadily: by November 1928 ‘hoods, caps, and gowns ... had been received from Messrs. Ede & Ravenscroft, London’, and were to be discussed by the sub-committee who were, in turn, ‘to submit a report to the Senate on the subject’.⁵⁴ By October 1929, when a minute noted that:

17. The Senate inspected the remodelled gowns for the Vice Chancellor, LLD, and the revised hoods for the Bachelor degrees. The general view of the Senate was that these gowns and hoods were now suitable.⁵⁵

it appears work was completed. From the scope of work undertaken and the time it took to undertake the job, it would be reasonable to conclude that major reforms had been undertaken and that academic dress had changed significantly.

⁵⁰ This is important insofar as though the 1918 Scheme does not address the question of faculty colours (and hence we assumed that faculty colours remained identical to those used in the 1915 Scheme), the 1915 Scheme only calls this colour ‘blue’. Whether this is a matter of adopting more precise language, a slow drift in colours from a darker towards a lighter blue, or the product of an unrecorded decision, is not addressed in the material surveyed.

⁵¹ Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, 23 Feb. 1928, Item 11.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 29 March 1928, Item 4.

⁵³ Minutes of the Council 1911–1941, 12 Oct. 1928, Item 14.

⁵⁴ Minutes of the Senate 1911–1928, 20 Nov. 1928, Item 5.

⁵⁵ Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Minute for 31 Oct. 1929, Item 17.

But what were these reforms, which produced what we shall now term the ‘1928 Scheme’? Unfortunately, the minutes and recommendations of the 1928 Committee, which would have provided the most direct evidence, have been lost. However, between 1928 and the first *Academic Calendar* with regulations for academic dress (published for the 1937/1938 academic year), neither Senate nor Council minutes reveal any moves to reassess academic dress in such broad terms. Any changes that were mooted were in the nature of specifying additions to a broader existing scheme, such as the introduction of the hood for the degrees of the MSc in Engineering and the BSc in Science, and the introduction of a separate gown and hood for Masters of Surgery and Doctors of Medicine in undress. If we take the minutes to reflect reality in omission as well as in commission,⁵⁶ it follows that the 1937/1938 *Academic Calendar* records academic dress as it was reformed by the 1928 Committee, and hence the 1928 Scheme. The full scheme is appended in Appendix A, but the sections where differences from the 1918 Scheme are significant, which concern graduates both honorary and otherwise, are reproduced here:

Bachelors’, masters’, and doctors’ undress gowns

A robe of black colour and a hood of deep blue basis with faculty colour edge lining for *BACHELORS*, or a hood of deep blue basis with faculty colour lining throughout for *MASTERS* and *DOCTORS* (undress) ... [the faculty colours are then recited] ... College cap.

Doctors (full dress) Gown.

A robe of scarlet with silk facings of faculty colour—*RED*, with a square soft cap. And a hood of scarlet with lining of faculty colour [*sic*] throughout.

LLD Gown.

A robe of scarlet colour with facings of deep blue and hood of scarlet basis with lining of deep blue throughout. Velvet cap.⁵⁷

It is evident that significant developments on the 1918 Scheme have been made. Grey has now been excised completely from the scheme of academic dress insofar as it pertains to graduates, having been replaced as the University’s ‘corporate colour’ (that which unified the hoods of the various graduates) by ‘deep blue’. Grey survives, to this day, only in the facings of gowns of the officers of the University (see Appendices). The honorary doctorate has also had its colour altered from green to the new ‘corporate colour’ of the University. Ordinary doctors also gained undress hoods and gowns: the former implicitly identical to the masters’ hoods, the latter only described in passing as a ‘robe of black colour’. While regulations regarding headdress for bachelors, masters, and doctors in undress—that they were to wear the ‘college cap’—did not change,⁵⁸ those prescribing headdress for doctors became more specific, with the ‘cap of the usual shape’ of the 1918 Scheme superseded by prescription of a ‘square soft cap’ for ordinary doctors and a ‘velvet cap’ for the honorary doctorate.

While the identity of the velvet cap may reasonably be subject to some speculation, the second (the ‘square soft cap’) may be supposed to be the ‘John Knox’ cap [h3]. This is because the cap matches the two descriptive parameters provided, and because there is precedent among contemporary universities of that cap’s assignment to ordinary doc-

⁵⁶ Not a definite proposition: see my qualification on use of sources under ‘What the archives say’, *supra*.

⁵⁷ *Academic Calendar* for 1937/1938, p. 188.

⁵⁸ Almost certainly the mortarboard: see second note to Appendix A, and hence identical to the prescription of the ‘mortarboard cap’ in the 1918 Scheme.

torates.⁵⁹ With this in mind, the ‘velvet cap’ of the LLD, because of the dissimilarity in language, must necessarily not be the ‘John Knox’ cap. But neither is it a velvet mortarboard: or else, as for the officers, a ‘velvet college cap’ would be specified. On the balance of probabilities it seems that a ‘velvet bonnet’ [h2] is likely, both in terms of contemporary precedent and with reference to later descriptions of the dress.⁶⁰

Comparison with Haycraft, however, again proves instructive. The 1948 (fourth) edition of *Degrees and Hoods*, which should have incorporated the changes made under the 1928 Scheme, instead records a scheme very much akin to the 1918 Scheme (with grey hood shells) but with extra degrees added. Though hesitating to ascribe inaccuracy to Haycraft or his reviser, Stringer, it appears the only conclusion possible given the 1928 Scheme was promulgated at the latest in 1937,⁶¹ and that moreover the entry for the MCh (MS) fails to account for the development in 1939 of the new gown and hood for MSs and MDs in undress. Baty, however, is more up to date: his 1934 *Academic Colours* already records the dark blue shells, and the LLD’s assumption of dark blue, of the 1928 Scheme.⁶²

New degree, new faculty, new order of dress

The first development under the 1928 Scheme was the institution of the hood for the degree of a Master of Science (MSc) in Engineering. Occasioned by the pressing need—the first degree of its kind was approved for award in December 1929,⁶³ and doubtlessly was to be conferred shortly after—the Senate in January 1930 addressed the question of that degree’s academic dress:

8. The Senate approved the design of the MSc hood, namely, that the hood should be as the MA hood except that the colour yellow should be used throughout for the lining of the hood.

The gown to be as that for the MA degree.⁶⁴

Importantly, this is the first documentary evidence for the faculty colour for Engineering, which was mentioned as ‘to be selected later’ in materials relating to the 1915 Scheme. However, given that from the start it seems that the University looked to create

⁵⁹ Groves, *Shaw’s Academical Dress*, p. 40; Shaw, *Academical Dress*, pp. 45–85. The precedents among contemporary universities for the use of a ‘John Knox’ cap for doctors (the others using round velvet bonnets or mortarboards, the latter of which are not ‘soft’), are, Aberdeen, Durham, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and St Andrews.

Cambridge assigns the Bishop Andrewes cap [h4]—the other cap that might fit the parameters—to its Doctor of Divinity (Shaw, *Academical Dress*, p. 40), but given that while the former universities prescribe the John Knox cap for doctors in general while the Bishop Andrewes is associated particularly at the one university that uses it with divinity, on the balance of probabilities the John Knox cap is more likely.

⁶⁰ Groves, *Shaw’s Academical Dress*, p. 40; Shaw, *Academical Dress*, pp. 40–83. Of the universities in existence by 1941, ten (Cambridge, Oxford, Queen’s Belfast, Birmingham, Bristol, Trinity College Dublin, Leeds, London, Manchester, Reading) prescribe velvet bonnets for doctors. See also Appendix D, where the velvet bonnet is specified for all doctors (*honoris causa* or not) in full dress by 1960–61.

⁶¹ Where it is recorded in the 1937/1938 *Academic Calendar*: See Appendix A.

⁶² Baty, *Academic Colours*, p. 47.

⁶³ Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Minute for 19 Dec. 1929, Item 3; Cunich, *History*, p. 275.

⁶⁴ Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Minute for 23 Jan. 1930, Item 8.

a scheme of academic dress based on faculty colours, and that the BSc (in Engineering) degree had been in existence for a considerable amount of time already, it may be inferred that yellow was, previous to this innovation, already the faculty colour for Engineering, and that the Senate was merely sanctioning the application of an existing faculty colour in the prescribed fashion to a new master's hood. The 1927 (third) edition of Haycraft, however, lists the Engineering colour as orange.⁶⁵ Given that Haycraft's 1948 (fourth) edition still lists the Engineering colour as orange,⁶⁶ however, despite clear evidence in the University's regulations to the contrary,⁶⁷ I think it may be safe to say that responsibility for the discrepancy may lie either with a differing interpretation of the same colour, or with Haycraft's sources. Alternatively, Baty's *Academic Colours* records the Engineering colour as gold, which is near enough to our records to be reckoned accurate.⁶⁸ Perhaps the discrepancy in both secondary sources as compared to each other and to the University's own regulations may really be ascribed to differing interpretations of the same colour.

The next development in academic dress was to come in October of 1939, when the Senate was (presumably) asked to examine the question of academic dress for Masters of Surgery and Doctors of Medicine.⁶⁹ Precisely why this issue was re-opened is unclear, as at first glance the former falls under the regulations for masters while a decision had already been made regarding academic dress for the latter degree as early as the 1918 Scheme. Perhaps it was felt that both these higher degrees of the medical faculty, after all the senior faculty of the University (in virtue of the University's incorporation of the College of Medicine), deserved dress more appropriate to their status.⁷⁰ Formed in 1939 to consider questions more efficiently with a reduced membership, the Standing Committee of the Senate was delegated this question, and, in November:

III. Resolved to recommend to the Senate that the following academic dress be prescribed for the Master of Surgery Degree:

Gown—Ordinary black gown as for Masters with purple silk facings 2½ inches wide

Hood—Purple

Hat—Mortar board cap⁷¹

The Senate⁷² and Council⁷³ both granted their approval to this recommendation. It is immediately apparent that this dress is an anomaly.⁷⁴ Purple is not the faculty colour of

⁶⁵ Haycraft, *Degrees and Hoods*, 3rd ed., p. 46.

⁶⁶ Haycraft, *Degrees and Hoods*, 4th ed., p. 60. The record of orange silk extends even to the MSc(Eng.), whose colour is specifically in the primary material under discussion prescribed as yellow. Haycraft (or Stringer) also neglects in this 1948 update the 1940 introduction of the BSc and its faculty colour of white, as indicated in the use of 'B.Sc.', 'M.Sc.', and 'D.Sc.' in his publication without the suffix of '(Eng.)'.

⁶⁷ See Appendices A to C, showing the *Academic Calendars* from 1937 onwards already listing the faculty colour of Engineering as yellow.

⁶⁸ Baty, *Academic Colours*, p. 47.

⁶⁹ Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Minute for 26 Oct. 1939, Item 3.

⁷⁰ This might have had to do more with the faculty than with class of degree: the same item on the minutes refers to the MD, MS, MA, and MSc collectively as the 'higher University degrees'.

⁷¹ Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Standing Committee Minute for 25 Nov. 1939, Item III.

⁷² Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Minute for 14 Dec. 1939, Item 7.

⁷³ Minutes of the Council 1911–41, 5 Jan. 1940, Item 7.

⁷⁴ And indeed it continues to be so to this day.

the faculty of medicine: red (which continued as the colour for the MB, BS hood and for MDs in full dress) is. Also, the hood is, as the regulations when published (see Appendix C) reveal, black lined purple instead of deep blue lined purple (as for bachelors, masters, and doctors in undress), scarlet lined purple (as for doctors in full dress), or indeed just purple (as the recommendation seems to suggest). Facings for a master's gown are also seen nowhere else in the scheme. This dress was moreover initially listed in the *Academic Calendar* for 1940/1941 (see Appendix B) as only for the MS, but by 1941 (see Appendix C) the MD gained the dress in addition to its scarlets; though the designation 'undress' is not appended to its use by the latter, it may be safe to assume—with reference to later material—that this was the intention.⁷⁵

With the approval of regulations for 'the institution of a Degree of Science to be called the BSc [Bachelor of Science]' and the creation of the Faculty of Science for the purpose of teaching the same degree in January 1939, it would have been natural to create academic dress proper to that degree.⁷⁶ This came in March 1940, when the Standing Committee of the Senate:

16. Resolved to submit to the Senate and Council a recommendation that the hood for the Degree of Bachelor of Science should be of dark blue silk with a lining of white silk.⁷⁷

It appears that this was again in anticipation of an impending award: item 1 of the same minutes records that a lateral transferee had been admitted to the Faculty of Science in the fourth year, with only two examinations remaining for the completion of his degree.⁷⁸ This is confirmed by reference to later minutes: the same meeting of May 1940 when the Senate approved the proposed hood (item 7 of the minutes), also saw (item 3(d)) the abovementioned candidate recommended, in consequence of his having passed the requisite examinations, for the BSc. With the recommendation, however, the faculty colour for the Faculty of Science was confirmed as white, which is as it appears in the *Academic Calendar* for 1940/1941.⁷⁹

The final piece of documentation for our period concerns the Treasurer's gown. The Senate on the 3 March 1941:

24. ... [Decided] to re-introduce a gown for the use of the Treasurer. A grey silk gown was recommended, the colour of the facings left open in the meantime.⁸⁰

This minute seems to indicate either that the treasurer used to have a gown but then lost it, and that a new design was now being made up, or that an old gown was to be re-introduced for his use. The latter is unlikely: the position of treasurer is an old one, having existed from 1912 onwards, so this was not a case of a newly created officer re-using an already existing old gown;⁸¹ if an old gown was to be re-introduced, why would the colour of the facings be 'left open in the meantime'? Why, however, the treasurer was to regain his gown at this

⁷⁵ See Appendix D.

⁷⁶ Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Minute for 26 Jan. 1939, Item 26(1). However, the Faculty did not begin meeting until April 1939 (see Cunich, *History*, 339).

⁷⁷ Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Standing Committee Minute for 28 March 1940, Item 16.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, Item 2.

⁷⁹ See Appendix B.

⁸⁰ Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Minute for 3 May 1941, Item 24.

⁸¹ Cunich, *History*, Appendix.

juncture, and indeed what his old gown entailed, or why he lost the right to wear it, are unfortunately not recorded. The details were quickly decided on, and on the 26th, the Senate:

10. Took note that the Treasurer's gown will be grey silk with red facing and his cap a black velvet-covered mortar board with black tassel.⁸²

It is worth noting that the choice of grey can be seen as a survival of the old 'corporate colour' of the University, possibly chosen with a view to overall harmony with the existing gowns for the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor.⁸³

Some final comments can be made with reference to secondary sources. Baty's short introduction to the hoods of the University, which accompanies his record of the colours, serves to illuminate one possibility for a detail unspecified in the archival material: hoods for doctors in undress.⁸⁴ Doctors, Baty records, wore 'on ordinary occasions (when hoods are worn) the Master's hood', a situation which he lamented '[relegated] the Hong-Kong Doctor to the appearance of an inferior degree'.⁸⁵ On the one hand, this may be interpreted as to indicate that doctors wore the master's gown in undress, hence the 'appearance of an inferior degree'. On the other hand, Baty might simply be commenting on the relevant doctor as seen from afar, and in which case only referring to the hood.

Another insight which might be drawn, though from a source that appears well past the period under review, is the shape of the hood for bachelors and masters. Smith's 1970 *Academic Dress and Insignia of the World* contains a plate illustrating the pattern of the hood, which appears in essence similar to the Oxford simple shape [s1], and hence to Edinburgh [s4] and Victoria [s9] shapes as well.⁸⁶ If we take the hood, as we take the pattern for the Chancellor's gown that appears opposite in the same volume, to not have changed significantly in the intervening years between the period under review and Smith's gathering of information, this represents a useful guide to the appearance of academic dress in the period under review.

By the introduction of the Treasurer's gown in 1941, the Second World War was already on the horizon. Hong Kong would succumb to the Japanese Occupation in December 1941, and the University would cease formal operations, though some business was still conducted clandestinely.⁸⁷ With the advent of war and the end the period under review, the academic dress scheme of the University was that as recorded in Appendix C.

Conclusion

It can be seen that the first thirty years of the University of Hong Kong's existence, from 1911 to 1941, were the field over which many different innovations in academic dress were tried, an overall scheme fleshed out, and extended to encompass new degrees or roles in the University. And it was a laborious process: it is apparent that the University's administra-

⁸² Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41, Senate Minute for 26 May 1941, Item 10.

⁸³ The 'corporate colour' is last mentioned under 'Bachelors', masters', and doctors' undress gowns', *supra*. Both the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor's gown (see Appendix C) have grey facings.

⁸⁴ Undress for doctors first appears in connection with the 1928 Scheme; see 'A new degree, and the 1928 committee and scheme', *supra*.

⁸⁵ Baty, *Academic Colours*, p. 47.

⁸⁶ Smith, *Academic Dress and Insignia of the World*, p. 347.

⁸⁷ See Cunich, *History*, Ch. 9.

tion was both apt to change its mind regarding the suitability of previously agreed schemes of academic dress, and often too busy to consider the question of new dress until it became pressing with the expectation of an imminent graduation. But they were, ultimately, fruitful and indeed formative years, for they established a scheme of academic dress that was to endure both after the war, and up to the present day.

This article, aside from very superficial comments making readily available conclusions, has not managed to delve into the realm of speculation regarding the reasons one choice or another was made at the University of Hong Kong for its academic dress, nor supply the want of details of the various schemes that are not provided in the archival material. However, I have every confidence that further research along those lines regarding the British influence on dress at the University, especially with reference to the possible influence of the University of London,⁸⁸ will prove fruitful ground on which to base a future article.

If we see today, therefore, at the University of Hong Kong, the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Treasurer, or Registrar in their respective gowns; when we are enabled to tell an undergraduate who has just taken their degree apart from their professors looking on benevolently; when we can tell that someone is a graduate of the faculty of Arts, Medicine, Science, or Engineering, what we are seeing is people today wearing a garb that owes its shape and colour to the laborious product of thirty years of development and change almost a century ago. I wonder how many today, when they receive their rented dress for their ceremonies, think on this and marvel, instead of merely considering it a chore.

Bibliography

Primary material

Hong Kong Government, *The Hongkong Government Gazette*, 31 March 1911. Hong Kong: Government Printer, 1913.

Primary Material held in the University Archives, University of Hong Kong:

Academic Calendar for 1937/1938.

Academic Calendar for 1940/1941.

Academic Calendar for 1941.

Academic Calendar for 1960/1961.

Minutes of the Senate 1911–28.

Minutes of the Senate 1929–41 and of Standing Committee of the Senate 1939–41.

Council Minutes 1911–29.

Council Minutes 1929–41.

Minutes of the Senate 1952.

Primary material held in the company archives, Ede & Ravenscroft:

Ledger for the University of Hong Kong, 1916–38.

Secondary Material

Baty, Thomas, *Academic Colours* (Tokyo: Kenkyusha Press, 1934).

Chiu, Peter, 'Academic Dress in China from 1994 to 2011', *TBS*, 16 (2016), pp. 67–86.

⁸⁸ With which the University of Hong Kong shared a robemaker (Ede, Son, & Ravenscroft) during the period under review, and from which the faculty colour scheme was most likely inspired.

- Christianson, Bruce, 'Lined with Gold: London University and the Colour of Science', *TBS*, 5 (2005), pp. 80–89.
- Cooper, Jonathan C., 'The Scarlet Gown: History and Development of Scottish Undergraduate Dress', *TBS*, 10 (2010), pp. 8–42.
- Cunich, Peter, *A History of the University of Hong Kong: 1911–1945*, Vol. 1 (no more published) (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2012).
- Ealand, Charles Aubrey (ed.), *Athena: A Year-book of the Learned World – the English-Speaking Nations*, Vol. 1 [no more published] (London: A. & C. Black, 1920).
- Goff, Philip, *University of London Academic Dress* (London: University of London Press, 1999).
- Groves, Nicholas, ed., *Shaw's Academical Dress of British and Irish Universities*, 3rd edn, 2 vols (London: Burgon Society, 2011–14), Vol. 1: Universities and Other Degree-Awarding Bodies.
- Haycraft, Frank W., *The Degrees and Hoods of The World's Universities and Colleges*, 2nd edn (London and Cheshunt: The Cheshunt Press, 1924).
- 3rd edn (London and Cheshunt: The Cheshunt Press, 1927).
- 4th edn, revised and enlarged by E. W. Scobie Stringer (Cheshunt: The Cheshunt Press, 1948).
- Keenan, Oliver James, 'How Can Academical Dress Survive in the Third Millennium?' *TBS*, 10 (2010) pp. 99–125.
- Ko, Charles Ka Shing, 'The Development of Academic Dress in China', *TBS*, 14 (2014), pp. 60–68.
- Shaw, G. W., *Academical Dress of British Universities* (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1966).
- Testar, Jason T., 'The Introduction and Contemporary Practice of Academical Dress in Japan', *TBS*, 14 (2014), pp. 48–59.
- Smith, Hugh, assisted by Kevin Sheard, *Academic Dress and Insignia of the World: Gowns, Hats, Chains of Office, Hoods, Rings, Medals and Other Degree Insignia of Universities and Other Institutions of Learning*, 3 vols (Cape Town: A. A. Balkema, 1970), Vol. 1.
- Wolgast, Stephen L., '“A Pleasure and an Honor”: Students' Writing on Academic Dress at Columbia University, 1820–1950, and Updates on Previous Notes', *TBS*, 14 (2014), pp. 94–106.

Appendix A: Regulations for Academic Dress, Academic Calendar 1937/1938¹

Chancellor's Gown.

A robe of rich black silk trimmed with grey silk facings and collar, rich gold lace and rich gold ornaments on back, sleeves and wings to match. Velvet college cap² with gold braid and gold tassel.

Vice-Chancellor's Gown.

A robe of rich black silk, trimmed with grey silk facings and collar, rich silver lace and rich silver ornaments on back, sleeves and wings to match. Velvet college cap with silver braid and silver tassel.

Registrar's Gown.

A robe of rich black silk with black velvet robe lace on front, cape and shoulders. Velvet college cap with black silk tassel.

Bachelor, Masters and Doctors undress Gowns

A robe of black colour and a hood of deep blue basis with faculty colour edge lining for *BACHELORS*, or a hood of deep blue basis with faculty colour lining throughout for *MASTERS* and *DOCTORS* (undress). The Faculty Colours are:—

Faculty of Medicine: RED.

Faculty of Engineering: YELLOW.

Faculty of Arts: BLUE College cap ['College Cap' is appended here without divider: possibly to indicate that the 'College cap' is to be worn by bachelors, masters, and doctors in undress].

Doctors (full dress) Gown.

A robe of scarlet with silk facings of faculty colour—*RED*, with a square soft cap. And a hood of scarlet with lining of faculty colour [*sic*] throughout.

LL.D. Gown.

A robe of scarlet colour with facings of deep blue and hood of scarlet basis with lining of deep blue throughout. Velvet cap.

1 Hong Kong University Archives, p. 188. For accuracy and completeness all typographical arrangements are reproduced as far as possible.

2 The 'college cap' can, I think, with virtual certainty be identified as a mortarboard with reference to the 'caps' section of Appendix D.

Appendix B: Regulations for Academic Dress, Academic Calendar 1940/1941¹

Chancellor's Gown.

A robe of rich black silk trimmed with grey silk facings and collar, rich gold lace and rich gold ornaments on back, sleeves and wings to match. Velvet college cap with gold braid and gold tassel.

Vice-Chancellor's Gown.

A robe of rich black silk, trimmed with grey silk facings and collar, rich silver lace and rich silver ornaments on back, sleeves and wings to match. Velvet college cap with silver braid and silver tassel.

Registrar's Gown.

A robe of rich black silk with black velvet robe lace on front, cape and shoulders. Velvet college cap with black silk tassel.

Gowns for Bachelors, Masters and Doctors.

A robe of black colour and a hood of deep blue basis with faculty colour edge lining for *BACHELORS*, or a hood of deep blue basis with faculty colour lining throughout for *MASTERS* and *DOCTORS*. The Faculty Colours are:—

Faculty of Medicine: RED.

Faculty of Engineering: YELLOW.

Faculty of Arts: BLUE.

Faculty of Science: WHITE.

Master of Surgery: Black gown with purple silk facings: hood of black silk lined with purple.

Doctor of Medicine.²

A robe of scarlet with silk facings of faculty colour—*RED*, with a square soft cap: hood of scarlet with lining of faculty colour throughout.

LL.D. Gown.

A robe of scarlet colour with facings of deep blue and hood of scarlet basis with lining of deep blue throughout. Black velvet cap.

¹ Hong Kong University Archives, p. 95. For accuracy and completeness all typographical arrangements are reproduced as far as possible.

² Since this line ends with a period, and precedes an indented section, it is likely that it was intended to be set off in italics and returned to the left margin, forming the title of sub-section (cf. Appendix A).

Appendix C: Regulations for Academic Dress, Academic Calendar for 1941¹

Chancellor's Gown.

A robe of rich black silk trimmed with grey silk facings and collar, rich gold lace and rich gold ornaments on back, sleeves and wings to match. Velvet college cap with gold braid and gold tassel.

Vice-Chancellor's Gown.

A robe of rich black silk, trimmed with grey silk facings and collar, rich silver lace and rich silver ornaments on back, sleeves and wings to match. Velvet college cap with silver braid and silver tassel.

Treasurer's Gown.

A robe of grey silk with scarlet silk facings. Velvet college cap with black silk tassel.

Registrar's Gown.

A robe of rich black silk with black velvet robe lace on front, cape and shoulders. Velvet college cap with black silk tassel.

Gowns for Bachelors, Masters, and Doctors.

A robe of black colour and a hood of deep blue basis with faculty colour edge lining for BACHELORS, or a hood of deep blue basis with faculty colour lining throughout for MASTERS and DOCTORS. The Faculty Colours are:—

Faculty of Medicine: RED.

Faculty of Engineering: YELLOW.

Faculty of Arts: BLUE.

Faculty of Science: WHITE.

Master of Surgery: Black gown with purple silk facings: hood of black silk lined with purple.

Doctor of Medicine: in similar type as foregoing

Doctors of Medicine:² A robe of scarlet with silk facings of faculty colour—RED, with a square soft cap: hood of scarlet with lining of faculty colour throughout.

LL.D. Gown.

A robe of scarlet colour with facings of deep blue and hood of scarlet basis with lining of deep blue throughout. Black velvet cap.

¹ Hong Kong University Archives, p. 85. For accuracy and completeness all typographical arrangements are reproduced as far as possible.

² It is unclear what the precise significance of the plural here is, but given later regulations (see Appendix D, though this appear in calendars beginning 1950) the intention is very likely that the MS's dress would be undress for MDs, while MDs would retain scarlet full dress.

Appendix D: General Regulations G16. Academic Dress, Academic Calendar 1960/1961¹

A. OFFICIAL AND HONORARY

Chancellor

A robe of rich black silk trimmed with grey silk facings and collar, gold lace and gold ornaments on back, sleeves and wings to match. Black velvet college cap with gold braid and gold tassel.

Vice-Chancellor

A robe of rich black silk, trimmed with grey silk facings and collar, silver lace and silver ornaments on back, sleeves and wings to match. Black velvet college cap with silver braid and silver tassel.

Pro-Vice-Chancellor

A robe of rich black silk, trimmed with silver lace and silver ornaments on back, sleeves and cape. Black velvet college cap with silver tassel.

Treasurer

A robe of grey silk with scarlet silk facings. Black velvet college cap with black silk tassel.

Registrar

A robe of rich black silk with black velvet robe lace on front, cape and shoulders. Black velvet college cap with black silk tassel.

Bursar

A robe of grey silk with black silk facings. Black velvet college cap with black silk tassel.

Chairman of Convocation

A robe of blue silk with grey silk facings and collar trimmed with gold. Black velvet college cap with grey silk tassel.

Doctor of Laws (honoris causa)

A robe of scarlet panama with facings of deep blue silk and a hood of scarlet panama with lining of deep blue silk throughout. Black velvet cap, bonnet-shaped and soft, with a hard round brim and a narrow cord of gold at the junction of the crown and brim.

Doctor of Letters (honoris causa)

A robe of scarlet panama with facings of royal blue silk and a hood of scarlet panama with lining of royal blue silk throughout. Black velvet cap, bonnet-shaped and soft, with a hard round brim and a narrow cord of gold at the junction of the crown and brim

Doctor of Science (honoris causa)

A robe of scarlet panama with facings of white silk and a hood of scarlet panama with lining of white silk throughout. Black velvet cap, bonnet-shaped and soft, with a hard round brim and a narrow cord of gold at the junction of the crown and brim

¹ Hong Kong University Archives, pp. 60–64. Though the academic dress recorded in this appendix falls out of our period, it is included as an indication of what future academic dress was like. For accuracy and completeness all typographical arrangements are reproduced as far as possible.

B. UNDERGRADUATES

A short-sleeved gown of dark green material, of length six inches above the knee, with a black college cap,

The President and members of the Union Council may wear upon their academic dress such distinguishing marks as may be laid down from time to time by the Union Council.

Undergraduates shall wear academic dress when attending Congregation, at official dinners in Hall, and at such other times as the Vice-Chancellor shall direct.

C. GRADUATES

Gowns

Bachelors	—A robe of black stuff of the simple traditional shape with pointed sleeve.
Masters	—A robe of black stuff, Oxford M.A. pattern.
Doctors (undress)	—A robe of black silk, Oxford D.Phil. pattern.
Doctors (full dress)	—A robe of scarlet panama with silk facings of appropriate colour (D.Sc. white; M.D. red).
Doctors of Philosophy (full dress)	—A robe of maroon panama with facings of deep blue.
Doctors of Medicine (undress) & Masters of Surgery	—A robe of black silk with purple silk facings 2½ inches wide.

Hoods

<i>Faculty of Arts</i>	
B.A.	—Deep blue with royal blue silk edge lining, 1⅜ inches wide.
M.A. and M.A.(Ed.)	—Deep blue with royal blue silk lining throughout, the lining being turned over to the depth of ⅜ inch.
<i>Faculty of Science</i>	
B.Sc.	—Deep blue with white silk edge lining, 1⅜ inches wide.
D.Sc. (undress) and M.Sc.	—Deep blue with white silk lining throughout, the lining being turned over to the depth of ⅜ inch.
D.Sc. (full dress)	—Scarlet panama with white silk lining throughout.
<i>Faculty of Medicine</i>	
M.B.,B.S.	—Deep blue with red silk edge lining, 1⅜ inches wide.
M.D. (undress) and M.S.	—Black silk with purple silk lining throughout.
M.D. (full dress)	—Scarlet panama with red silk lining throughout.

Faculty of Engineering and Architecture

- B.Sc. (Eng.) —Deep blue with yellow silk edge lining, $1\frac{3}{8}$ inches wide.
- B.Arch. —Deep blue with grey silk edge lining, $1\frac{3}{8}$ inches wide.
- M.Sc. (Eng.) —Deep blue with yellow silk lining throughout, the lining being turned over to the depth of $\frac{3}{8}$ inch.
- M.Arch. —Deep blue with grey silk lining throughout, the lining being turned over to the depth of $\frac{3}{8}$ inch.
- Doctors of Philosophy* (undress and full dress) —Maroon panama with lining of deep blue throughout

Caps

- Bachelors, Masters, and Doctors (undress) —College cap, “mortar-board” pattern.
- Doctors (full dress) — Black velvet cap, bonnet-shaped and soft, with a hard round brim and a narrow cord of gold at the junction of the crown and brim.