

to teach is not made a specialty, ample inducements are offered, and of which many have availed themselves. Thus with the advantages that the state offers, for the preparation of teachers, and with the many who are fitting themselves to serve in that capacity, it is an erroneous idea and one contrary to all reason, in making that field of labor, so significant, so weighty, within the grasp of those so utterly incompetent.

The University, since its establishment, has not escaped the attacks and criticisms which have flowed so freely from the many indiscreet and prejudiced minds. It has been assailed from all sides. Abuse and criticism have been flung with listless unconcern, striking where they might, having what effect they might, all to show that spirit of opposition which cowers in its lair, eager to grasp the first straw that will serve as a vent for its slanderous and beguiling tongue. Others for the redress of some slight grievance have shown the pusillanimous spirit that exists in their malicious breasts, and have hurled their malignant figments, regardless of truth and honor. From such was the late article appearing in the *Omaha Herald*.

The writer, clothed in the garb of a *nom de plume*, claiming to be a citizen of Lincoln, makes a weak and debilitated attempt at criticism and fault finding. The grievance which calls forth the attempt to cut, perhaps to the writer is great, but to the people of the state a blessing. We believe in plain talk, and had the writer come forth like a man and if there was error shown it, he would have acted far more honorably.

The miserable attempt made by the Lincoln correspondent, to create a sensation, only exposed his weakness and ignorance, showing an object to injure, and revenge rather than adhere to the truth.

Otherwise the article is not of much import

CRITICISM.

This is a subject about which much is said and written. Much more might be said, but perhaps without the desired result. Criticism, it seems to us, can be compared very appropriately to a medicine. And, in fact, it may be said to be a kind of medicine that is an antidote for many diseases, if properly administered. But whether or not it be fatal in its results depends, to a great extent, upon the quantity and strength of the dose. As the efficacy of medicine depends upon the strength of its ingredients, and also upon the nature of the disease, so the power of criticism depends upon the quantity and quality, which must always conform more or less to the condition of the patient. But whatever be the disease, or whatever be the stage of its progress, this medicine of which we speak should be administered with the utmost care. As one kind of medicine is particularly adapted to a certain disease, so a certain kind of criticism is most efficacious when applied to a certain fault in the production of the mind.

But in all cases go carefully. If it be a fault in expression, "speak gently to the erring one." If it be ignorance, instead of administering a severe dose of criticism, give a little encouragement, so that another trial will be sure to follow. We do not conceive it to be the province of the critic to rake every author over the coals, and pick out every flaw that may be detected by the critic and the scholar. But he should correct all gross errors, give instructions, and promote as best he can the progress of all who happen to fall under his rod of correction.

There seems to be a tendency among our modern critics to find fault with everything. Yet we are glad to say that there are a great many exceptions to this rule. But the real intrinsic value of an author is known only to a few. For if a certain critic can find one little flaw in the writings of one who may be far superior to