

Poetry.

For the Herald. A VALENTINE. FOR LITTLE MARGARET. BY EDWARD STILES EDE.

A kind good girl is Margaret— of all her kindred "charming pet"—

Dear child, remember this, with care, The kind and good are ever fair.

Original Essay.

For the Herald. HUMILITY.

BY W. T. H.

There is a peculiar power in a silent spirit. It acts secretly, but unceasingly; and every one feels its influence.

Solomon said, that "The fool is known by the multiplicity of his words."

The power and beauty of a silent spirit is its Humility. To the student of Human Nature, it conveys the most beautiful conceptions; while it subdues the envy and jealousy, which are always hovering upon the surface of the heart.

But the beauty of Humility! Who can depict it?—It is not the harmonious blending of colors;—it is not regularity and symmetry of proportions;—it is not that fantastic splendor, with which art is dressing everything to strike the eye and pervert the heart!

Every one should be humble; the Lawyer, because he subsists by the errors and misdoings of men; the Physician, because he is the servant of all; the Divine, because he is the follower of the meek and lowly Saviour—all should be humble, because all are dependent!

MEN AND BRUTES.—"Now, gentlemen," said a nobleman, to his guests, as the ladies left the room, "let us understand each other; are we to drink like men, or like brutes?"

Miscellaneous.

THE POPE'S TEMPORAL POWER

Letter from Professor McClintock to Hon. Joseph R. Chandler

DEAR SIR:—I beg leave to offer a few remarks upon your speech made in Congress on the 11th instant. It has been widely circulated among "the people," and is therefore open to criticism from the humblest citizen.

You deny the Bishop of Rome any "right resulting from his divine office, to interfere in the relations between subjects and their sovereigns, between citizens and their governments." Had you confined yourself to this denial, expressing it merely as your own private and personal opinion, or even as that of many jurists, theologians and doctors, of your church, you would have shown only that you and they were bad Papists,* nothing more.

In maintaining such a thesis as this before the American people, you have shown yourself either exceedingly disingenuous, or else thoroughly ignorant of the history of the question, and of the state of opinion in your own church. For many years I have been accustomed to rely upon your integrity.

The rhetoric of your speech is quite effective. One piece of it seems to have touched the sensibilities of your audience so strongly that I cannot forbear to quote it, and to furnish you with a criticism on it, from a Roman Catholic hand, written months before your speech was delivered, with prophetic foreknowledge of what "was to be." "If," you say,

"If, by any providence, the Bishop of Rome, should become possessed of armies and a fleet, and, in a spirit of conquest or any other spirit, should invade the territory of the United States, or assail the right of our country, he would find no more earnest

* I use the word "Papists" as it is employed by controversialists within the Church of Rome, to designate those who are not inclined to restrict the Papal power.

antagonists than the Roman Catholics. And for myself, if not here in this Hall to vote supplies for a defending army, or if too old to take part in the active defence, I should, if alive, be at least in my chamber or at the foot of the altar, imploring God for the safety of my country and the defeat of the invaders."

The anticipatory criticism on this "eloquent passage" you will find in a Review edited by the ablest Roman Catholic writer in America, and endorsed on its cover by nearly every Bishop of your church in the country:

"It has been customary here (i. e. among the Catholics in Great Britain and America) to deny in the most positive terms all authority of the Pope in temporalis ex jure divino, and to indulge in no little abuse of the Sovereign Pontiff hypothetically. We have read in Catholic journals, and heard from the rostrum, and even from the pulpit, expressions with regard to buckling on ones knapsack and shouldering one's musket, and marching against the Pope, in case he should do so or so, that have made our blood run cold—expressions which we should hardly have ventured on ourselves even when a Protestant. The writers or speakers know very well that the case they suppose could never occur, and that therefore they were safe; but they little considered, we must believe, the impression they conveyed, or the effect they were producing on the minds of the simple catholic public, or that they were teaching, or at least favoring, that very doctrine of courtiers and demagogues which create so many difficulties for the Holy See, and which apparently justifies the non-Catholic world in its war against the Papacy."—Bronson's Review, April 1854, p. 214.

So much for your rhetoric; now for what logic and history can be found in your speech. You admit that the Pope has "proceeded to dethrone kings and thus to release subjects;" but at the same time you deny that this was "ever done under claim of divine right."

You adduce as a crucial instance, the case Gregory VII., (not Gaiganeli, as you unfortunately styled him, but Hildebrand), that great and in many respects good man, whose life was spent in efforts to correct abuses in the Church, and at the same time to consolidate the Papal power. Your startling assertions about Hildebrand are enough to disturb his mighty bones in their grave. He "deposed Henry IV.," you admit; but "he did not claim that his action in deposing the Emperor was of divine right." This is sufficiently explicit. You shall be held to this declaration. True, you qualify the assertion a little in other parts of your speech, by such words as "merely," "solely" &c., in connection with "Divine right;" but I have too much confidence in your native American honesty to think that you mean to use evasion in this matter.

Let us begin, then, with Gregory VII. The whole aim of his pontificate, as stated by the Roman Catholic (Gallican) historian Dupin, "was to bring all his crowned heads under his subjection, and to oblige them to hold their kingdoms as fiefs of the Holy See, and to govern them at his discretion."—(Dupin ix. 48.) I might fill up this whole letter with passages from Gregory's bulls and epistles, vindicating this very "Divine right," which you so boldly assert he never claimed. Did you think your speech was to blot out all history? Or am I, with the same charity that I have extended to you heretofore, to infer that you have never even read so much of the life of Gregory as to learn that his name was not Gaiganeli, that you have never so much as seen his act excommunicating Henry IV., from which I extract the following:

"It has pleased thee, O Peter, Chief of the Apostles, and does please thee, that the people of Christendom (Christianus populus) committed specially to Thee, should render obedience to me. In this confidence, for the dignity and defence of Thy holy Church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from imperial and royal administration King Henry, son of Henry, sometime emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy Church. I absolve all Christian subjects to the empire from that oath whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true kings; for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity who doth endeavor to diminish the majesty of the Church."—Conc. Rom. iii. ap. Bingham, vii. 484.

Gregory used even still stronger language in his letter to the Bishops, accompanying the above act, and especially in one written from Tivoli, Aug. 25, 1076, to Bishop Hermann, of Metz, who had informed him that

his authority in the premises was questioned. In that letter he grounds his right upon the Scriptures; upon the power of the keys given by Christ to Peter, and from him descending to the Popes; and upon the usages of his predecessors. He calls the opposite doctrine "madness" and "folly" (insania et fatuitas). Want of space hinders me from giving more ample citations; though they are needless, except for such persons as have never looked into the controversy.

The doctrine established by Gregory, (and maintained by his successors with greater or less strictures from that day to this), is, that the Pope is Christ's viceregent and representative in the administration of human affairs; and that "the deposing power is inherent in him as head of the spiritual authority, as the guardian and judge of the law under which Kings and Emperors hold their crowns, and have the right to reign," (this last is the language of a Romanist writer, not mine.) By this authority Paschal II. in 1099 deposed Henry IV.; Innocent III., in 1210, deposed Otho IV.; Gregory IX., in 1239, excommunicated Frederick II., and absolved his subjects from their allegiance; Innocent IV., in 1245, pronounced sentence of deprivation against the same Frederick II.; Boniface VIII., in 1302, thundered forth against Philippe le Bel of France, the famous bill Unam Sanctam, containing the most extravagant assertions of the power of the Holy See; Paul III., in 1536 and 1538, deposed and damned Henry VIII. of England and absolved his subjects from all oaths of allegiance; Pius V., in 1570, uttered a bull against Queen Elizabeth, in which "out of the fulness of Apostolic power" he deprived the said Queen of "her pretended title to the Kingdom," and released her subjects from "all manner of duty, dominion, allegiance and obedience." The list need not end here; but I am tired of citing facts known to all mankind—except yourself.

The remainder of Prof. McClintock's letter, which our limited space precludes our copying entire, is made up of quotations from Roman Catholic authors clearly establishing his position and demolishing the argument of Mr. Chandler.

ALL OF A SIZE.—The American Courier, reporting a case of disputed title in pigs which had been suffered to run wild, gives the following examination of a deaf witness: Lawyer—Do you know plaintiff's pigs? Witness—Eh? (very loud.) Lawyer, (raising his voice)—Do you know—plaintiff's pigs? Witness—Yes. Lawyer—How long have you known them? Witness—Eh? Lawyer, (louder still)—How long have you known them? Witness—Fed 'em all last spring. Lawyer—Were they all about a size? Witness—Eh? Lawyer, (rises on his feet petulantly, and shakes his forefinger at the conclusion of each word, at the witness)—Were they—all—of—a—size? Witness—Some ov um wur and some ov um wourn't.

PUBLIC EXECUTION IN ILLINOIS.—The Galena (Ill.) Jeffersonian relates the following occurrences at the execution of Taylor:—"One man was drowned in crossing the Mississippi opposite Dubuque, another was killed by a blow upon the head received near the place of execution, by a team running away. A mother fell from the fence near the scaffold with a child in her arms and broke its arm; another woman's foot was crushed in going to the execution, and she poor creature, in different to the pain, wept bitterly because "she couldn't see the man hanged!"

A WELCH PATRIARCH.—There has just been interred at Blaiza Church, South Wales the body of William Rees, aged 104 years. The deceased was a hard-working man at his profession as a "baller," which is the heaviest department in an iron manufactory. He is also remarkable for his moderate living. He could see to read his bible in his hundredth year, and dress himself and take his food up to his death. He lived with his daughter, who is the mother of 16 children, and whose age is 66 years. Her husband is 72 years old.

"SARVED HIM RIGHT."—A few days ago a young lady, of Cincinnati, Ohio who had received an offensive valentine, suspecting a neighboring bachelor of having a hand in the matter, took a convenient opportunity in the afternoon, while he was passing an alley entrance overlooked by the window, of emptying the contents of a slop bucket over his devoted head.

SATISFACTORY EXPLANATION.—A few years ago a schoolmaster was wanted for the village of Limkens, Scotland. A pompous little fellow, one of the applicants, being asked to give, in writing, a philosophical reason why cream was put amongst tea replied, "Because the globular particles of the cream render the acute angle of the tea more obtuse."

THE WINKING MADONNA COMING.

The New York Express is informed, by what it considers good authority, that his Holiness the Pope, in token of his gratitude to Archbishop Hughes, and the other dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, from the zeal and earnestness exhibited in the Immaculate Conception, has consented that the famous Winking Madonna, of Rimini, shall come to this country. Arrangements were making at last dates for its transportation hither, and the distinguished stranger may be looked for on or about the 1st of April. The most of our readers, probably, are well acquainted with the supernatural powers attributed to this wonderful picture. The winking of its eyes, superinduced by no apparent human agency, is considered an especial manifestation of the favor of the august original above, and the priesthood who have it in keeping, as might naturally be supposed, were disinclined to have so good a card taken from them. The good Pio Noio, however, insisted that the Madonna should come to America, and come it will, if wind and tide favor. The Winking Madonna must not be confounded with the medals having her likeness, which the Holy Father had previously presented the American Bishops were deservng of—it was thought at first—but, in view of the troublous state of the times, as affect the church, on this side of the Atlantic, on second thought, it was resolved that the original picture should be transmitted, in order to make all due impression upon the laity.

The Express is also informed that the Weeping Madonna is also coming to the United States. Probably they will both come in one and the same vessel. Their appearance here—time and circumstances considered—will be an event in the Roman Catholic world of no ordinary interest and importance.—Newark Advertiser.

ONE DROP AT A TIME.—"Life," says the late John Foster, "is expenditure; we have it, but are as continually losing it; we have the use of it, but are as constantly wasting it. Suppose a man confined in a fortress, under the doom to slay there till death; and suppose there is there for his use a dark reservoir of water, to which it is certain none can ever be added. He may suppose the quantity is very great; he cannot penetrate to ascertain how much, but it may be very little. He has drawn from it, by means of a fountain, a good while already, and draws from it every day. But how would he feel each time of drawing, and each time of thinking of it? Not as if he had a perennial spring to go to. Not, "I have a reservoir, I may be at ease."—No! but "I had water yesterday—I have water to day; but having had it, and my having it to-day is the very cause that I shall not have it on some day that is approaching. And at the same time I am compelled to this fatal expenditure! So of our mortal, transient life! And yet men are very indisposed to admit the plain truth, that life is a thing which they are in no other way possessing than as necessarily consuming and that even in this imperfect sense of possession, it becomes every day a less possession."

AN INTELLIGENT BANKER.—At a hearing before the Supreme Court of New York, last week, on the question of appointing a receiver to take charge of the affairs of the defunct Empire City Bank, Mr. Binger, the President, was examined, but could not tell what the assets were, or what they amounted to. The close of his examination was as follows:

Judge—Were you not selected as President because you had the same name as your well known namesake, the grocer.

Answer—No.

Judge—What was the reason then?

Answer—I do not know, but suppose it was because I lived in the neighborhood of the bank.

Judge—Have you had any experience in banking?

Answer—No.

Judge—Do you know anything about banking?

Answer—No.

Judge—Was that the reason you were appointed?

Answer—Yes.

A USEFUL HINT.—The difference between rising every morning at six, and at eight, in the course of forty years amounts to 29,200 hours, or three years, one hundred and twenty-one days and sixteen hours, which at eight hours a day for exactly ten years, is that rising at six, will be the same as if ten years of life were added, wherein we command eight hours every day for the cultivation of our minds, and for the dispatch of business.