

the world" financially, and gives us much hope for the future. The present managers feel that they have been very fairly treated by the Regents, and are determined to make the paper worth more than it costs to the University. A little more enthusiasm among the students would make the carrying out of that resolve a much easier undertaking.

THE Senior class is unanimous in the desire for a change in commencement exercises. This paper believes, with the class of '86, that it is time for the University to do away with the old arrangement. The size of future classes will make the appearance of every graduate on Commencement day a physical impossibility. Even the ten members of '86 will tire the audience if all are required to speak, and no sufficient reason has yet been given for boring the public to the extent threatened. The class is now in suppliant attitude, asking that the burden of commencement oratory be put upon one representative from each course, and the authorities will show wisdom in granting the request.

In the opinion of the Faculty and Regents the time is at hand for entrusting the elocutionary work to the chair of Rhetoric. Heretofore training in that line has been confined to the two preparatory years, and has necessarily been very elementary. It is now proposed to take Rhetoric and Elocution at the same time, and to make the practice in writing and speaking continue during the major part of the course. It is but one of the steps now being taken to introduce the very best methods of instruction in every department. The new chair will be a difficult one to fill, requiring more special training than is given the average college instructor, and on account of the added requirements of the position Mrs. Dearborn has found it necessary to sever her connection with the University. For several years she has worked conscientiously with her classes, and those who have been under her will note her departure with sincere regret.

The very difficulty of finding a person competent to fill the new double chair may delay putting the new plan into operation for some months, but we are assured that whatever can be done will be done speedily. Rumors that may be but idle gossip have been in the air that the change will not bring with it the increased efficiency that is expected. Ugly rumors they are, and there is but one way for the University to put them down. That is the immediate employment of the best talent that can be secured. Even the temporary engagement of instructors that are not thoroughly competent, will indicate that the University does not mean *business* to the extent that it has made pretensions.

MISCELLANY.

"Dickens, with a preter-natural apprehension of the language of manners and the varieties of street life; with pathos and laughter, with patriotic and still enlarging generosity, writes London tracts. He is a painter of English details, like Hogarth; local and temporary in his tints and style, and local in his aims. Thackeray finds that God has made no allowance for the poor thing (man) in the universe,—more's the pity, he thinks,—but 'tis not for us to be wiser; we must renounce ideals and accept London."

Thus Emerson characterizes the two great English novelists. The criticism must be accepted as just. As regards Thackeray with all his genius in portraying human nature, we can but regret that he gives us no hope of a higher type of man than Barnes Newcome or Charles Honeyman. Realism is good, but when it is taught that our destiny is forever to be fools, knaves and gulls, we are not greatly encouraged by such an out-look. It is true there are pigeon-livered men, and women, whose cold, glaring worldliness sends a chill over us. But it is not inspiring to dwell long on these Arctic wastes, with no relief from the dreary, gloomy, scenery,—the ice-deserts. We might become resigned and wish nothing better. We generally shun packing-houses, and I do not know that any thing would be gained by being forced to become accustomed to them. It is sufficient to know they exist, without making the painful fact more prominent. Nor is it best to hold up before our view constantly, a shriveled, shrunken humanity, and grimly delight in its pusillanimity. There are plenty of opportunities to do this, it is true. But perhaps it is better to dwell on the fairer picture of what man is capable of reaching, than what he falls short of. If heaven and hell are constantly enacted in this world, as Swedenborg claims, we do not want the latter to usurp all the attention.

* * *

It is about time the question is raised whether a man should be a gentleman or a "bully" in literature. The tone which some professional critics adopt would not be tolerated in good society. There is no reason why we should allow the manners of a "cow boy" to pass as current in the literary world. The instincts of a gentleman certainly ought to prevail among writers, as well as the rest of humanity. They are not a privileged class, but subject to the established laws of decency and justice which they ought to respect. Nor is there any excuse for allowing egotism to obtain complete sway over them. A little Christian charity and tolerance would not diminish their worth. It is not necessary for them to go off on a tangent because the universe is not plastic in their hands. Perhaps if they had more interest in their work, and cared less for the figure they cut in it, matters would be improved. Disinterestedness is a valuable trait. Many would be benefitted by cultivating it.

The custom of tearing an author to pieces because the critic fails to understand the merit awarded to him, is not very laudable. It is hard for a man to acknowledge that he cannot understand some things, but he had better do this than to cover up his deficiency by arbitrarily assuming that there is no worth in a thing because he fails to see it. This is not exactly the highest motive from which to act. I do not know that it is positively necessary for every literary critic to assume that he is the centre and source of knowledge. Perhaps he only need to mention the results of his observation, and even condescend to compare them with others, and tolerate the idea that some may exist more far-sighted than he.

That is the way some regard the conduct of authors. Perhaps they are wrong, it may be that the "shot