NEW PUBLICATIONS.

"Bryan Maurice; or, The Seer," is the title of a religious novel just published by J. B. Lippincott & Co. It was written by the Rev. Walter Mitchell, of St. Mark's Church, in this city, and published originally in one of the Episcopal periodicals of New England. The purpose of this novel is to prove the superiority of "The Church"—meaning the Anglican Church and its American descendant, over all other forms of religious faith, or rather to assert its claim as the only true Church. The hero of the novel is an ardent young New England Unitarian, who is carried through the various stages of conversion to Episcopalianism, through the means of small Prayer Books and Gothic chapels. The only person in the book who seems to have made the Bible his principal spiritual guide, is a rough old Martinhead sea-captain, and the two or three pages devoted to him form one of the gems of the book. All forms and creeds which are non-Episcopal come in for their share of satire or ridicule, and Quix ote Nazareth of Protestantism the author permits no good thing to come. Moderate Episcopalians will regret some of the strictures of the book, such as the introduction of a sort of confessional at the bedside of "Mr. Graham," and the prominence of the doctrine of baptism to save himself without any direct intervention of the third Person of the Trinity. Non-Episcopalians will be impressed, as they usually are, by the assumption of the exclusive claims of the Anglican Church, and High-Church Episcopalians will be correspondingly edified. It is proper to say that there is no admixture of the absurdities of the fashionable ritualism of the day in Mr. Mitchell's novel.

The love-passages of the novel are pleasantly and prettily drawn. Where the author took as model for his Philadelphia Quakeress, we do not know. The personal picture of Ellen Winow, is well drawn, but her Quaker peculiarities are overstrained in her boldness to the Philadelphia school. The author was, we believe, at one time a Quaker himself and his portrait is probably sketched from a New England model. The other women in the book are well done.

As a whole, "Bryan Maurice" is a well-written novel of its kind. The author avoids sentimentalism and sickly religious cant, and yet he is not occasionally betrays a little ignorance in his portraiture of worldly men and women, it is only just to be common sense to all members of the clerical profession. He is not one of the "utterly unpractical book-worms" of which he refers, but he may fairly be doubted whether any great progress will be made either in the work of saving souls or converting extreme Episcopalians by writing novels about them.

"Miss Beaveel's Conversion from Secession to Loyalty" is the name of a capital novel by J. W. De Forest, published by Hurd & Houghton, New York. As its title indicates, it is another contribution to the "literature of the war" which has become so numerous that a book of this description now needs some special merit to secure for it a reading. Mr. De Forest has established a good claim for a most enjoyable perusal of his romance. His heroes and his heroine and the minor characters who move around them are admirably and artistically drawn. Colonel Carter, a Virginia ex-West-Pointer, seeking his military fortune in the Union side, Mr. Colburne, a young lawyer of "New-Boston," Dr. Ravenel, a Louisiana loyalist, and Miss Beaveel, a Louisiana secessionist, are all drawn to the life, types of characters which were familiar to ought to maintain their hostile attitude. Every village of rural authority, so far as the United States were concerned, was utterly overthrown. After a war of four years, attended with great expense and great loss of life, the government of the United States succeeded by force of arms in crushing out these inimical governments, in overthrowing the enemy. What then was the duty of the people in the spring of 1865 in those rebel States? Confessedly they had no civil government whatever. The government that existed before the war had been for years extinguished, overthrown and destroyed. The governments of the countries of the country so conducted by force of arms had put down.

Now, as a necessity resulting from this conflict of arms, and growing out of the belligerent character of this contest, our military have conquered the people of these States. Why? Because there was no other government there. The enemy's government, of course, could not be tolerated, because, at an expense of millions and hundreds of millions of money and thousands of lives, we had destroyed it. The enemies of the country had destroyed the legitimate government. Then, to prevent anarchy and to preserve the peace, our military commanders had authority to control temporarily the people whom they had conquered, for this was a sequent.

It was the overthrow of the government of the enemy, and the authority of our armies to govern them by the power of the bayonet, which alone was just as complete in Carolina as in California, when we conquered it from the Indians. We think all will admit that for some period of time, some make it shorter than others, but for some period of time, whether a day or a week, or a month or a year, the military had authority to preserve the peace and to govern the country, so far as necessary for that purpose, until civil government could be inaugurated. Now, how long this military government could be continued is a question left to the discretion of the Congress, under the power of the United States, exercising its authority, and its legitimate consequence, the abrogation of the Constitution.

I agree, if any military power should not be continued a day longer than is necessary to the restoration of civil government in those rebel States which are loyal to the Union and true to the Constitution; but how long that rule is to be decided by the circumstances, of which the sovereign government, the Congress of the United States, is the judge, at one time or another the judicial tribunals. It is a question of war within the political tribunals and not in jurisdiction. They cannot try political questions. They will be bound by the decisions of the political department of the government. Now, sir, this military authority was continued by the President of the United States for a time, in the absence of any Congressional action, and then continued. The President of the United States, then, with the authority of the government undertook to inaugurate civil governments in these States.

Had the civil governments which we made look to loyalty and obedience to the Union, and to the country and loyal to the Union, they would have been recognized, and the question would have been settled long ago. But unfortunately the members of the country, who were the very men who set up the hostile government which it cost so much money and blood to overthrow, took possession of the new governments, and the Congress of the United States, when it assembled, finding this to be the condition of things, and that the President had withdrawn the military power and left these governments in the hands of the very men who had conquered them during the war, decided that they were not legal governments, but provisional merely, and absolutely null and void. This was by sufferance only. Congress then proceeded to declare, that there being no loyal governments in those States, the military power should be restored and should be exercised in those States until civil governments could be set up therein.

Mr. Trumbull then adverted to the opinion of the Attorney-General, which he characterized as an able and elaborate document, and then proceeded to explain the provisions of the bill before the Senate.

Mr. Wilson regretted that the Committee on the Judiciary had not reported the section of the bill, which authorizes the commanding generals to appoint civil officers, instead of repealing the section vacating all civil offices in the south, as contained in the bill which he (Mr. Wilson) had offered. He believed if this had been done, as he asked it yesterday, the friends of reconstruction would to-day be fifty to one hundred thousand stronger in the rebel States than they are. Nine-tenths of a hundred of these officials are disloyal men. In some States they are universally so. There were no military officers in the south to fill the vacancies as provided in this bill, and if there were it would not be proper to use them for this purpose.

Mr. Conkling (of New York) inquired of Mr. Wilson where the authority was to be conferred, not by military commanders of civilians to fill offices in the south, and if such were appointed by what is the nature of the offices they hold, whether civil or military.

Mr. Wilson contended that Congress had a right to authorize military commanders to make these appointments in the manner he had suggested. The operations of the military bill had been so prompt, he said, that it would be necessary to put the friends of the country into the civil offices of the South, in order to secure the success of the measure. It was not true that there were not loyal men enough in the South to fill these offices. There were plenty of them all throughout these States.

Mr. Wilson moved to amend the bill by striking out the section vacating all civil offices in the rebel States, and authorizing the military commanders to fill them by appointments or re-appointments.

Mr. Conkling desired the right to authorize military commanders to appoint civilians, who were not and could not be members of the Congress. It might be a consumation devoutly to be wished, but it was surrounded with difficulties as an examination of the grounds upon which it need only be suggested. Now, how long this military government could be continued is a question left to the discretion of the Congress, under the power of the United States, exercising its authority, and its legitimate consequence, the abrogation of the Constitution.

Mr. Wilson said it was true there was an apparent inconsistency here, but the amendment was retroactive only, and if not constitutional it could not say that no harm in the future. Mr. Wilson's proposition was prospective in its operations, and if adopted and afterwards found to be inoperative, the whole system established under the bill would fail.

Mr. Frelinghuysen (N. J.) opposed the amendment of Mr. Wilson. The bill as it passed the Committee rendered all the civil officers in the South responsible for evil, and he did not see the necessity for Mr. Wilson's proposition. He (Mr. Frelinghuysen) would not add one to the list of those who are declared to be a finality, and he would not, therefore, vote to create a new class of thousand civil officers out of office. He believed a policy of mildness and conciliation, conquered by justice and right, would do more for the peace and harmony and peace than any policy of conciliation by civil officers out of office.

After further debate, which was participated in by Messrs. Howe, Drake and others, the yeas and nays were demanded on Mr. Wilson's amendment, and it was disagreed to.

The question then recurred on the amendment of Mr. Wilson, Drake and others, and these votes were still properly subject to military control. This was the theory upon which the reconstruction acts were enacted. The reconstruction acts, were intended to furnish the machinery for bringing back proper civil governments in these States, and restore them to their legitimate positions in the Union. Congress was wrong in this position, then this whole legislation was wrong, has no foundation in the Constitution, and cannot be sustained for a moment. I will ask the attention of the Senate to consider that question. What was the condition of the country when these bills were passed, or rather, of those rebel States. Five, yes, sir, six years before the legitimate State governments in every one of them had been overthrown, in every one of them by force of arms, and the enemies of the country had taken full and complete possession of those rebel States, and had set up hostile governments in every one of them.

They were as completely hostile to the United States as was the government of Great Britain during the war of 1812. They raised armies and were no legal governments in the South, and there could be no objections whatever to this particular part of it. We created military law or military work, but there were loyal men in the South, fully equal to bear duties, and wanted to do their part in the work.

Mr. Wilson said the people were then ready and able to govern themselves, and to do the work. There were no military officers in the south to do that work which was provided in this bill, and if there were it would not be proper to use them for this purpose.

Mr. Conkling (of New York) inquired of Mr. Wilson where the authority was to be conferred, not by military commanders of civilians to fill offices in the south, and if such were appointed by what is the nature of the offices they hold, whether civil or military.

Mr. Wilson contended that Congress had a right to authorize military commanders to make these appointments in the manner he had suggested. The operations of the military bill had been so prompt, he said, that it would be necessary to put the friends of the country into the civil offices of the South, in order to insure the success of the measure. It was not true that there were not loyal men enough in the South to fill these offices. There were plenty of them all throughout these States.

Mr. Wilson moved to amend the bill by striking out the section vacating all civil offices in the rebel States, and authorizing the military commanders to fill them by appointments or re-appointments.

Mr. Conkling desired the right to authorize military commanders to appoint civilians, who were not and could not be members of Congress. It might be a consumation devoutly to be wished, but it was surrounded with difficulties as an examination of the grounds upon which it need only be suggested. Now, how long this military government could be continued is a question left to the discretion of the Congress, under the power of the United States, exercising its authority, and its legitimate consequence, the abrogation of the Constitution.

Mr. Trumbull then adverted to the opinion of the Attorney-General, which he characterized as an able and elaborate document, and then proceeded to explain the provisions of the bill before the Senate.

Mr. Wilson regretted that the Committee on the Judiciary had not reported the section of the bill, which authorizes the commanding generals to appoint civil officers, instead of repealing the section vacating all civil offices in the south, as contained in the bill which he (Mr. Wilson) had offered. He believed if this had been done, as he asked yesterday, the friends of reconstruction would to-day be fifty to one hundred thousand stronger in the rebel States than they are. Nine-tenths of a hundred of these officials are disloyal men. In some States they are universally so. There were no military officers in the south to fill the vacancies