MARRIED.

In Maryland, N. Y. on 5th inst. Thomas Dean to Miss Mary Dean.
In Gloucester, on 18th inst. Rev. Judson Davis of Maryland, to Miss Mary Tompkins of Gloucester.
In Brooklyn, N. Y. on 21st inst. Mr. Charles Hendershott to Miss Louisa Wolcott.
In Springfield, Ohio, Wm. White of Guernsey Co. to Miss Eliza A. Clarkson, daughter of Dr. Isaac Holloway to Catharine South.
On Nov. 8, Isaac Holloway to Catharine South.
In Burlington, Iowa, Nov. 20, Rev. Solomon T. Vail to Miss Mary Ann, all of Des Moines Co.
In the Parish of Terrebonne, La. on 6th inst. Col. John McGavock of Tennessee to Miss Caroline Winder.
At River Creek, Md. on 22d inst. E. W. Taylor to Miss E. A. Arnold, all of Oswego, New York.
At Grape Grove, Ray Co. Mo. on 30th Nov. Theodore V. Taylor of St. Louis to Harriet E. Weaver.

DIED.

On Monday evening, 26th inst. in consequence of the lungs, JOHN BOWEN, infant son of John L. and Matilda T. Schieffelin, aged 10 months.

☞ New-Haven, Ct. papers please copy.

Suddenly, on Tuesday morning, 27th inst. CORNELIUS S. WHITE, aged 21 years and 8 days.

The relatives and friends of the family are respectfully invited to attend the funeral this day at 10 o'clock from 118 Division-st.

Boston—The hour for the funeral of Dr. H. H. SEYMOUR is necessarily changed to 1 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, instead of 3, at which time it will take place at Greenwood Cemetery.

In Trenton, Grundy County, Mo. on 21st ult. Dr. Wm. P. Tompkins, late a native of Virginia—had been in the Legislature of that State, and was in the war of 1812.

In Redfield, N. Y. on 16th inst. Nemesia Case, aged 27—a mother of the Revivalists.

In Washington, Ky. on 17th inst. Wm. H. Beatty, aged 40.

In Yonkers, N. Y. on 15th inst. Wm. Warner, aged 46—a soldier of the Revolution.

In Montague, Mass. on 20 inst. Joseph Case, aged 81. He was the Representative from Montague in the last Legislature.

In Lancaster, Wis. on 1st inst. Jonathan J. Holden, a printer, aged 29.

In New Orleans on 9th inst. Walter A. Egan, a medical student, son of Dr. Egan.

In Morgan, Butler Co. Ohio, on 7th Nov. Wm. Gwynn, aged 86, a native of Downingtown, South Wales, G. B.

Court Calendar.—This Day.

Supreme Court.—Nos. 30, 6, 108, 34, 35, 2, 36, 11, 53, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87.

Law Courts.

Supreme Court.—Slave Case.—The argument in the matter of Joseph Jack, claimed to be the slave of Mr. Law of Maryland, on a charge of assault and battery preferred by Long Branch, without warrant, has been recently referred to, was heard yesterday. As a short sketch of it has been made by Mr. Jay, in which it recapitulated the substance of what he said, for the benefit of those who have not read the report, it may be worth while to give it. It appears that the parties were in a stage on Broadway, where Mr. Law was, and said "he would give Jack a dollar if he would get out." It appears that he was then in a place in another house, and ready to a place in another house, where he was requested by officer Long, a constable, to take a warrant against Jack for assault and battery. Mr. Jay said that he had no doubt that he is a free man of the State of New York, and that the proceedings on the part of those who attempted him were illegal; that he was seized in a manner contrary against the peace of the State, and is entitled to be discharged. He said that he was not taken on the warrant to Maryland in a different direction.

Mr. Choate, one of the counsel for Bell, contended that in order to bring himself within the act of Congress, Mr. Law was bound to set up his claim to the laws of Maryland providing that he was a fugitive from labor, and which was not the case. The laws of Maryland which were adopted under the Constitution of that State, and which has not been set forth in the pleadings, was not the law bound to use, before he can arrest a slave in New York, to go through a regular process of law, and that the proceedings in this case have been against law.

The District Attorney, Mr. McKeon, appearing in behalf of the people, said that he would rest on the Constitution and the laws. The only point point for which he contended, in disagreement, was that Mr. Law, even admitting Bell to be his servant or slave (but that the question) and in possession of or temporarily in the Institution in question, in the State of New-York, or in transit, or in any other manner, must have an authority, and in a direct manner out of the state to the place where he belongs, whereas, in this case it was shown that eight different owners of runaways had offered under the laws of the State of Maryland, and that the laws of the State provide that if the owner of a slave voluntarily brings a slave into the State, or passes through the State with him, the slave shall be free. In this case, Mr. Law having kept the slave in the State of Maryland for the purpose of being taken back, and refused to release the slave in the State which forbids his right to the slave, and to carrying him away; instead of taking him, as the defendant also says, to the New-Jersey Railroad, the route for Maryland, he was carried a mile opposite way. The decision in the case of Prigg vs. State of Pennsylvania, in which the Supreme Court of the United States, that the law of Congress was a statute not detrimental to the peace of the State, while this was turbulent. So, it was also contended by the opposer, that under any circumstances the alleged owner was bound to arrest a servant and arrest the party in accordance with law, and not of arrest, with strong hand, and, as in a common action, of trover and gone with property, this is required.

Mr. Whiting, on behalf of Mr. Law, contended that he had done everything required by the law of Congress, which gives power to an owner, without warrant, to take possession of a slave and convey him to the place where he belongs, and that the only question is, before Judge Paine, a slave is brought before him, is whether or not he is a slave, in the owner or agent to be a slave, in which case he is bound to make an order that he be surrendered to the owner. In regard to the arrest in the present case, it was not turbulent, but as peaceable under the circumstances as possible. The case does not apply to cases of actual trover, that where some person sets up an adverse claim; but in this case no person made such claim, and the owner, under the Constitution and law of Congress, has as good a right, without process of law, to take possession of a slave, where he is, as he has to take a horse where he belongs, and that the only question before Judge Paine is whether or not he is