

wonderful. Collegians seem to have an especial attachment to the term, for in the titles to their literary productions it may be seen in connection with almost any other noun in the language. It would be a relief to the reader, or hearer as the case may be, if its occurrence were made less frequent by the use of paraphrases. *

THE TWO OFFICES.

While it is true, in the intercourse of nations and people, that some are eminently calculated to lead, it is also true that others are calculated to follow. Some are not satisfied unless they can be at the head superintending and commanding with undisputed authority—others, on the contrary, are not only satisfied to follow, but are quite unwilling to assume the responsibility of leaders, and are content in their humbler sphere of subordination. Let us illustrate this by looking at it in the light of military operations.

Were we to look for the highest merit, it would probably be a serious question whether we should find it among the leaders or the lead. Were we to look over the fields of human carnage from the earliest times until now, we probably would search the records in vain to find a man whose motives could not be questioned at some particular period of his career. The leaders are brought more prominently before the world, because they stand, as it were, representatives of the whole. Their deeds are recorded; their successes and failures: their virtues and vices are spread out upon the pages of history, but generally tainted more or less by the prejudice and partiality of the historian. Lauded by a friend, and blamed by an enemy, the character of history suffers to a greater or less degree at the hands of unscrupulous men.

Those who have conducted nations through their most perilous struggles, those whom we call military leaders, are

praiseworthy on account of the service they have rendered in bringing a nation back to a state of prosperity, and in restoring the natural order of things, which results in human happiness.

They are men of responsibility, watched and criticised by others looking on, who are interested in the result.

Their success does not depend solely upon their own devotedness to their country and their cause, but, to a great extent, upon the devotedness, fidelity and obedience of subordinates.

Take now a visit to the battle field for the purpose of observation. Look upon the faces of those noble heroes whose countenances are stern even in death. Look at the humble soldier, whose name never appears upon the page of history. Scrutinize closely the face of another, and notice the honesty, fidelity, and loyalty depicted upon the face of him whose grave is not strewn with flowers, and at whose memory no tear is shed, save by the family living in obscurity in some distant part. Consider the man who, being sacrificed upon his country's altar, regretted that he had "but one life to lose" in the holy cause.

Let your thoughts also revert to the prisoner in his dungeon. Commence at the bottom of the ladder, and proceed upwards, taking in all ranks from the highest to the lowest; take the noblest and best from each class, and search for the highest merit. Where does it lie? I think you will conclude that *representative men* from each class are equally meritorious. In the broad sense, they are not of equal responsibility. Neither is the service of one equal to that of another, but personal merit or demerit belongs to each, regardless of the sphere in which he moves. While the leader and follower are equally responsible for personal deeds yet this is not true in regard to the final result of great military enterprises. The leader is the one looked too by the waving multitude, as the one to whom they have committed their dearest interests, with the