

Cash in Hand. On May 1, there was in the various public depositories \$24,223,730.39...

Personnel. The Comte de Lasteyrie of Paris, a member of the French Institute, and until the accession of Louis Napoleon a prominent representative in the French Assemblies, arrived in town yesterday.

Brevet Colonel B. E. Johnson, V. R. C., and Colonel John Mansfield have been ordered to report to General Howard for duty in the Freedmen's Bureau.

A Financial Flurry. The failure of the Merchants' National Bank has caused a general feeling of dissatisfaction among depositors in other institutions...

Virginia Freedmen. The Inspector-General of the Freedmen's Bureau in Virginia has just reported to the Assistant Commissioner at Richmond the results of a thorough investigation of the affairs of the freedmen in the State...

The Merchants' National Bank. The doors of the Merchants' National Bank remain open, and the officers remain there, making promises of future redemption...

Horrible Butchery—The New Funding Scheme—The Trouble in the Union Party, Etc. Baltimore, May 8.—In the western part of the city last evening, James Gibbons murdered a young German, named Henry Misnering...

From Baltimore to Day. A woman born without arms is giving exhibitions in writing with her feet in Georgia.

The Colored Methodist of Charleston, South Carolina, have purchased the Second Baptist church in that city for \$20,000 in gold.

The Parisian proprietor of L'Africaine is said to have realized \$215,000 on his performance.

San Francisco, May 5.—The steamship Sierra Nevada has arrived from Portland with \$7000 in treasure.

Ship News. New York, May 8.—Arrived, steamer Palmyra, Liverpool April 26, and Herman Livingston, Savannah May 4.

Markets by Telegraph. New York, May 8.—Cotton is quiet at 44 3/8c. Flour has advanced 1/2 cent; sales at 10 5/8c.

The Steamer "Aries." Boston, May 8.—The steamer Aries has arrived from Philadelphia.

Marine Intelligence. New York, May 8.—Arrived, steamer Saragosa, from Charleston.

Markets by Telegraph. New York, May 8.—Cotton is quiet at 44 3/8c. Flour has advanced 1/2 cent; sales at 10 5/8c.

FURTHER FROM EUROPE.

The Financial Panic.

BARNE'S BANKING COMPANY LIVERPOOL. From the London Times, April 23. We believe that Messrs Harwood, Banier & Son, of Liverpool, accountants, have been engaged to prepare a balance sheet...

LEGAL INTELLIGENCE.

Court of Quarter Sessions.—Allison, P. J.—Henry Gladding was charged with carrying concealed weapons. The witnesses for the prosecution stated that they saw him raise a "back-jack" with the intention of striking George Reynolds...

FINANCE AND TRADE IN FRANKFORT.

From the London Times (City Article), April 23. The advices from Frankfort describe continued leviness on the Bourse. Every rumor sends Austrian funds violently up or down, and the fluctuations of last week were five per cent.

THE JUMEL WILL CASE.

Supreme Court New York.—May 7. Before Justices Barard, Nelson, Cuss and others. Aft. Howard, et al. and others. The case of the will of the late John Jumel, deceased, was argued...

THE SHIP OF PERSEUS OUT SHOOTING.

The official journal of Tehran gives the following account of a shooting party in which the Shah had taken part. The royal personage who casts on the earth the shadow of God, has passed his time very agreeably in the chase at Diadrone.

The Ex-Rebel Privateer's CLAIM OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE "TALLAHASSEE."

AIRMAIL COURT, London, April 24, before the Right Hon. Dr. Lushington. The "TALLAHASSEE," OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE "CAMELION," INTERWITNESSE "BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO AN POSSESSION OF THE VESSEL (IN REVENUE), OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE "TALLAHASSEE."

A NEW SCIENTIFIC TOY.—There is a successor to "Pharaoh's serpents," called the "magic photograph."

The application of this reducing agent to his secretions and the two subscribing witnesses. These witnesses swear to a state of facts which, if standing alone, would, if their statements are to be received without many reservations, be an important part of the case sufficient to establish the competency of the testator.

Christy Will Case in New York.

Decision by the Supreme Court General Term—The Will Made to Mrs. Miller, Null and Void—The Property Left to Mr. Christy's Wife and Children—\$150,000 Involved.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM.—Before Chief Justice Barard, Ingraham and Sutherland.—Harriet E. Christy and Edwin B. Christy, as plaintiff, against Clark, Peter, Elsey, and John J. Nathan. Proprietors of a paper writing properted to be the last will and testament of Edwin P. Christy, deceased.

This is the celebrated will case arising from a paper-writing called the will of Edwin P. Christy, familiarly known as the originator of negro manacles. The contest, commenced on the 9th day of May, 1862, by the paper in question, his wife and children were excluded from all benefit of his property. The will, as it is called, was made by Edwin P. Christy, deceased.

The first question has been raised and argued: 1. Whether Harriet E. Christy was the lawful wife, and Edwin B. and William A. Christy the legitimate children and heirs-at-law of Edwin P. Christy, deceased, and if so, whether the will is valid.

Although this recital is not a recital on the point, yet it shows that the testator intended to admit the paper to probate, assumed, for the purposes of the litigation before him, that Harriet E. was the lawful wife of Edwin P. Christy, and is his widow and that William A. and Edwin B. are his legitimate children and heirs-at-law.

It is well settled that marriage may be proved by evidence of acts of recognition, matrimonial cohabitation, general reputation, and declarations of the parties. In this case, the evidence is abundant to prove the marriage between Harriet and Edwin P. Christy, and to show that she is his widow and that William A. and Edwin B. are his legitimate children and heirs-at-law.

It is well settled that marriage may be proved by evidence of acts of recognition, matrimonial cohabitation, general reputation, and declarations of the parties. In this case, the evidence is abundant to prove the marriage between Harriet and Edwin P. Christy, and to show that she is his widow and that William A. and Edwin B. are his legitimate children and heirs-at-law.

In his letter of January 27, 1848, he says—"Has Miller put that plate with my name on it in my pocket? I have looked at the plate and I do not see it. I regret to say that I do not see that confidence in you which a person should have who is connected by such a long and intimate association with me as my business from my family is no incentive to produce a want of affection; on the contrary, that very fact should endear them more to me."

In his letter of March 6, 1848, he says—"I sometimes think I will purchase a house and lot for the property." In his letter of March 16, 1848, he says—"As regards my coming to Buffalo, I am not particularly anxious to see that city unless it is on account of my family."

In his letter of March 26, 1848, he says—"I am invited to hear of Mr. Ingersoll's attention, also your invitation to attend the sewing society on the 30th of April 8, 1848. I am glad to have you make me acquaintance of respectable persons, and I do not see how it can be otherwise. You are a young and beautiful, Harriet, or a lump of gold, as you say, I would not be more anxious to see you than I am, but my business would go to the devil if I should lose you."

In his letter of May 3, 1848, speaking of the illness of his son, B. Ron, he says—"God knows, I hope you are all well. I do not see how it can be otherwise. You are a young and beautiful, Harriet, or a lump of gold, as you say, I would not be more anxious to see you than I am, but my business would go to the devil if I should lose you."

were present coincides substantially with the testimony of a witness who was admitted.

The testimony of Harriet was objected to as incompetent; but it having been received, we must consider it, and, moreover, it is clear, competent in behalf of her son under the principle of the law in Chamberlain vs. The People, 20 N. Y., 85. A marriage thus proved by the direct evidence of one of the parties, and by the various admissions and proofs above mentioned, requires strong evidence to controvert it, especially when there is issue born of the parties between whom the marriage is alleged to have taken place.

In this case it is contended that there are objections which destroy the force of the evidence above referred to, and that there are facts which show that such marriage could not have taken place. These objections and facts are:— 1. That in none of the letters to Harriet does she refer to her husband, or style him as her husband.

2. That Harriet at the time of the alleged marriage with her husband was married to one Harrington, who was then alive. 3. That Harriet has stated that she was never married to her husband, and that she was married to one Harrington, who was then alive.

4. That although Christy abandoned Harriet many years ago, and lived with another woman, yet Harriet has never been married another woman. 5. That although Christy has since married another woman, yet Harriet has never been married another woman.

The objection is almost too trivial to notice; persons have different ways of opening and closing their letters, and many have a habit of using the same words in different parts of their letters. It is not, therefore, to be inferred that because Harriet does not refer to her husband in any of her letters, that she was not his wife.

The objection of the second objection, that she was married to one Harrington, who was then alive, is also unavailing. It is shown that Harriet was married to one Harrington, who was then alive, and that she was never married to any other person.

With respect to the third objection, that Harriet has stated that she was never married to her husband, and that she was married to one Harrington, who was then alive, it is shown that Harriet was married to one Harrington, who was then alive, and that she was never married to any other person.

With respect to the fourth objection, that although Christy abandoned Harriet many years ago, and lived with another woman, yet Harriet has never been married another woman, it is shown that Christy abandoned Harriet many years ago, and lived with another woman, yet Harriet has never been married another woman.

With respect to the fifth objection, that although Christy has since married another woman, yet Harriet has never been married another woman, it is shown that Christy has since married another woman, yet Harriet has never been married another woman.

These witnesses swear to a state of facts which, if standing alone, would, if their statements are to be received without many reservations, be an important part of the case sufficient to establish the competency of the testator.