

## + Maximus. +

ADALAIDE PROCTOR.

I hold him great, who, for love's sake  
 Can give with generous, earnest will.  
 Yet he who takes for love's sweet sake  
 I think I hold more generous still.  
 I bow before the noble mind  
 That freely some great wrong forgives:  
 Yet nobler is the one forgiven  
 Who bears that burden well and lives.  
 It may be hard to gain, and still  
 To keep a lowly steadfast heart:  
 Yet he who loses has to fill  
 A harder and a truer part.  
 Glorious is it to wear the crown  
 Of a deserved and pure success:  
 He who knows how to fail has won  
 A crown whose lustre is not less.  
 Great may he be who can command  
 And rule with just and tender sway:  
 Yet is diviner wisdom taught  
 Better by him who can obey.  
 Blessed are they who die for God  
 And earn the martyr's crown of light:  
 Yet he who lives for God may be  
 A greater conqueror in His sight.

## Is Contentment only a Virtue

AND AMBITION ONLY A VICE?

Man is an antithesis, made up of opposites. Does he possess many virtues? he has also many vices. Has he many appetites and passions, which lead him to seize upon present gratification heedless of consequences? self-love seeking ever a future good, comes in as an opposing principle. Is he generous? he has also a desire to acquire. Has he justice? it is tempered with mercy. Thus many of his virtues stand in opposition, which, like the centrifugal and centripetal forces, would unless perverted, keep him moving in the right direction, such is the relation existing between Contentment and Ambition. We have no hesitation in asserting that these were originally pure virtues. Granting this, how account for the "Yankee Philosopher" who is perfectly content with the world as he finds

it, knows it could get on very well without him, and who has not the least ambition to leave behind him "foot-prints on the sands of time?" or for the man who in eager, ambitious, fery chase oversteps the limits of humanity and morality? Assuredly these are not instances of virtue. Popular opinion generally assigns Ambition to a place among the vices, while the same infallible decree designates Contentment to the foremost rank among the virtues. But will careful and impartial examination confirm the opinion? Actuated by contentment alone life would become monotonous. Acquiescence in the present portion of good, unmoved by the gales of hope and fear would produce stagnation, the number of Sam Lawsons would be greatly increased, or if the man with his content became thoroughly lazy, we should have many veritable "Macawbers" always waiting for something to turn up. Surely Contentment is not always a virtue. The self-complacent tendency is tracable in the history of past and present, lowering the standard and making less frequent types of a nobler existence. The Newtons, Shakespeares, Miltons, Wellingtons, and Macaulays would be less rare though not less revered, with less of this tendency pervading society. Stolid content among the masses must, and does drag down the aims of those who would be great. Let contentment become the only or the guiding principal and with widening sway it gives a nation of men who are not wanting in genius or intellectual vigor. Who are the renowned discoverers of the mariner's compass, gunpowder and printing? yet who leave their ambitions to be employed and perfected by others, while with folded arms, they display as they imagine, the most consummate wisdom by doing only that which has been done by their predecessors. Is this a life to satisfy? Can we, will we admit that contentment is in this case a virtue? It is not natural for man to be satisfied with his present condition. Active, vigorous spirits cannot remain at rest. If they do not aim at a noble object their desires will have a downward tendency, as in the case of