ROME.

Court Reception, Diplomacy and Temporal Prospects of the Pontiff.

Distinguished Guests—Protest of Austria Against Papal Spoliation—The Pope's Reply—The Thrones of France and Italy—Will European Power Restore the Pontifical?

ROME, March 8, 1871.

Sunday, at noon, the Pope received in his throne room a Catholic deputation of Austrians, comprising princes, barons and peasants from Styria and Carniola, in their picturesque national costumes. They were forty-three in number, headed by the Altgrave of Salm, Baron Brenner, Count Fries, the three Counts of Theen, the Counts of Avernas and Brandis, Lutzow and Perzen; Prince E., of Hohenlohe; Barons Adrian and Frankenstein and a host of ecclesiastical dignitaries. When the Pope entered the throne room, attended by Cardinals Deangelis, Barnabo and Bizzarri and a number of prelates, the Austrian deputies all fell on their knees, and in that position the Altgrave of Salm read an address in French, protesting in the name of Catholic Austria against the spoliations which the Pontiff had been subjected to, and expressing the hope that he would live long enough to witness the overthrow of the reigning House of Savoy, an essential condition of Papal independence.

REPLY OF HIS HOLINESS.

Some expressions in the Pope's reply are worthy of remark. The Pope began as follows:—

"In the midst of the impious and sad events which subvert everything in our times I derive great consolation from the sentiment of affection and piety manifested in every part of the Catholic Church. It gives me strength to support this war which, through blindness or malice, is waged by many against our religion and this See of the Vicar of Christ. We have seen a throne fall down crushed and we see another much nearer trembling." After this very plain allusion to France and Italy his Holiness went on to predict with certainty, "Although he knew not the time nor the hour that the present tempest will subside, order will return, but when those who sit upon thrones will have comprehended that with the excessive liberty of the press and the unbridled license of the present day it is impossible that their thrones should not tremble, and, like this one, allow themselves to be dragged along by the revolution in a manner so weak and wavering as to be necessarily fatal to them." The Pope went on to say that he was convinced that the Emperor of Austria desired in his heart the triumph of religion, and was a worthy descendant of that family which had so often protected the rights of the Holy See. "And you, returning there, tell him that the Pope loves him and prays for him and the imperial family, and hopes to see facts confirm the sentiments which the Emperor cherishes in his heart."

THE PRESENTATION OF GIFTS

followed the Pope's speech, first the generous offering brought by the entire deputation, and then the special presents brought by its members from separate districts or distinct individuals. His Holiness, having cordially accepted everything, invited the deputies to accompany him in his daily promenade in the garden and through the galleries, after which he detained them a little longer in the library conversing about the ecclesiastical prospects of Austria and Germany, and finally dismissed them with his renewed blessing.

On the following morning (Monday) the deputies had the honor of assisting at the Pope's private mass, and received the holy sacrament from his hands.

Yesterday morning they heard mass and communicated in the crypt of St. Peter's on the tomb of the Apostles. Thus his Holiness goes on, receiving deputations, condolences and gifts from all parts of the world. He lives more now *in formâ publicâ* than when he was in the full exercise of his temporal power, and I am assured by an ecclesiastical inhabitant of the Vatican that

THE PALACE WAS NEVER SO FULL OF VISITORS

as at present. Consequently Pius IX., relieved of the anxieties of government and of the personal fatigue of wearisome public church ceremonies, is really much happier and better in health now than at any preceding period of his reign.

AS TO HIS LEAVING ROME,

there is no foundation as yet for such a report, although doubtless a great deal of influence has been brought to bear upon the Pontiff to induce him to go forth in exile. The plan of those who advocate this plan is to drive the Pontiff to Corsica or Belgium, or no matter where, provided he has the air of a martyr, and then to preach a crusade against Italy, and get up an armed European intervention to re-establish ecclesiastical rule in the Eternal City. But the Pope is obstinate when he chooses, and hitherto to all the insinuations he only replies, "I do not feel inspired as yet to act as you suggest."

WILL THE POPE BE RESTORED TO POWER?

If the Catholic Powers mean to do battle with Italy for the restoration of the Pope's temporal throne, they can do so without a previous exodus on the part of his Holiness; but hitherto there does not seem to exist any such intention on their part. Of course France is chiefly invoked by the partisans of ecclesiastical *régime* as the *Deus ex machinâ* destined to come on the Peninsular stage at the proper critical moment; but as Prussia, or rather Italy now say Germany, has been also mentioned as an irresistible agent for restoration, it may be well to mention the following expressions of the Prussian Minister, Count Brassier de St. Simon, in his speech to the King of Italy at Florence the other day, on presenting an autograph letter from King William announcing his accession to the dignity and title of Emperor of Germany.

The Minister said:—"The government of his Majesty the Emperor of Germany, is fully convinced of the Italian government's loyalty, and can this day appreciate in its entire importance the worthy conduct which Italy has maintained during the war, and with great pleasure testifies its friendship toward the Italian nation and its sovereign."

THE FIRST CONSISTORY SINCE ITALIAN OCCUPATION.

On Monday morning Pius IX. held the first Consistory assembled at the Vatican since the entry of the Italian troops into Rome. The Cardinals attended, but not in gala costume, and the *Osservatore Romano*, in describing the ceremony, calls it merely a "Provision for Churches," and does not mention the word consistory at all. No new cardinals were created, but twenty-six bishops were nominated, of whom about one-half to Sees *in partibus*. The Benedictine prior, Father Fink, of Kansas, appointed to the See of Eucarpia *in partibus*, was the only American prelate mentioned. It is usual for the Pope to make a speech to his venerable and eminent brethren at every Consistory. On the present occasion it was rather a chronicle than a harangue, as it resumed the narrative of facts commenced by his last Encyclica, from the forcible bursting open of the Quirinal gates and the arrival of King Victor Emmanuel, Prince Humbert and Princess Margaret, to the irreverent carnival masquerade of the "Crusaders;" but the most important part of his discourse was that which protested most forcibly against the possibility of a conciliation between the rights of the Holy See and the guarantees offered by the Italian government, which his Holiness entirely condemned, and declared he never would accept.

Italian Violation of the Sanctuary—Minister Lanza's Explanations.

In the Italian Chamber of the Deputies of March 13 Señor Lanza, Minister of Finance, declared that the disorders in the Church of Gesù, in Rome, were provoked by the words of the preachers. "A priest who, after the close of the religious ceremonies, had attacked friendly guardians of the peace was arrested outside the church, but subsequently released. Other clericals and citizens have also been arrested. Rome," continued the Minister, "is not in the same situation as the other cities of Italy. There are two parties in Rome—one which is unwilling to accept the change of affairs and bent on provoking discord; the other party is too impatient and intolerant." The Minister asked all persons of influence to aid the government and to calm the anxieties of the people. "The delay in the removal of the capital," he said, "is caused by the unfinished state of some of the public buildings in Rome which are in course of erection."

TWO NEWSPAPER LIBEL SUITS IN CHICAGO.—Charles J. Guiteau, an attorney, commenced an action in the Circuit Court for alleged libel against the Chicago *Tribune*. Damages are laid at $20,000. Cause of action is presumed to be an article published in the *Tribune* under the caption, "Another Attorney in Difficulty," placing it is represented, Mr. Guiteau on an equal footing with a lawyer named Kenney, who was sent to jail from the Criminal Court on a charge of defrauding a widow. Peter M. Almini commenced an action for libel against A. Sundelius and others, proprietors of the *Nya Verldens*, a Swedish weekly, laying damages at $25,000. Discharged from the paper for refusing to support a republican candidate, it is represented that defendants charged him and one John A. Nelson with forging the names of two stockholders.

KILLING RATS.—The Catoctin (Frederick county, Md.) *Clarion* mentions the suicide of Mr. Benjamin Duncan, in Hauver's district. He was found on the 21st by his family, wounded, and stated that he loaded his musket in the morning to shoot rats, and as "I was the biggest rat of all I shot myself, because I was determined the lawyers should not tear me to pieces." He had a lawsuit in Frederick County Court, to be tried on the following Wednesday. He was fifty years of age, and died soon after he was found wounded.

DIED FROM RELIGIOUS EXCITEMENT.—Last week Mrs. Eliza Thurston, aged sixty-five, died suddenly of disease of the heart at Athens, Tenn., while giving her experience at a Methodist revival. Her decease is ascribed to undue excitement.

RELIGIOUS.

Rev. David Mitchell will preach this morning in the Canal street Presbyterian church, Greene street. Subject—"Aid for the Suffering Poor in France."

Rev. Dr. McVickar will preach in the Church of the Holy Light this morning and Rev. Dr. Weston in the evening.

Rev. Dr. Krotel preaches morning and evening in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity.

Rev. Dr. Alexander S. Leonard will preach this morning in the Memorial church of Bishop Wainwright.

"Predestination" will be the subject of a lecture by Rev. Chauncey Giles, this evening, in the New Jerusalem (Swedenborgian) church. Morning worship at eleven o'clock.

Rev. Dr. Cheever will preach to the Church of the Puritans in the church on Lexington avenue and Forty-sixth street this evening. Dr. Sanderson will preach in the morning.

Rev. E. C. Sweetser will preach this morning and evening in the Bleecker street Universalist church, corner Downing street.

Rev. Halsey W. Knapp will preach in the new Baptist church edifice at Hunter's Point, Long Island City, this morning, and Rev. William B. Smith in the evening.

Rev. Dr. Rylance, rector of St. Mark's church, will preach in St. Peter's church, West Twentieth street, this evening.

Rev. Dr. Wescott will preach in Plymouth Baptist church, Fifty-first street, this morning and evening.

Rev. J. M. Pullman will preach at the Church of Our Saviour (Sixth Universalist), Thirty-fifth street, this morning and evening.

Rev. Charles F. Lee (Fifth Universalist church), Plimpton's Building, Ninth street, will preach this morning on "The Sunday of Palms."

The bishop of the diocese will administer the rite of confirmation in St. Thomas' church, Fifth avenue, this morning. Afternoon services at four o'clock.

Rev. C. S. Harrower will preach this morning and evening at St. Luke's Methodist Episcopal church, Forty-first street. The annual meeting of the Sunday School Missionary Society will be held at half-past two o'clock.

Rev. Mr. Hepworth will deliver this morning in the Church of the Messiah the fourth lecture in his course to young men. The subject will be "Money Making and Money Spending."

Rev. Dr. Vinton will preach in Zion church, Thirty-eighth street, this evening, on behalf of the Children's Fold.

Rev. Dr. Ewer preaches morning and evening in Christ church, Fifth avenue.

"Joseph" will be the subject of Rev. Thomas Street's discourse this evening in the North Presbyterian church, corner of Thirty-first street and Ninth avenue.

Dr. H. P. Fairfield will speak before the Society of Spiritualists, in Apollo Hall, this morning and evening.

Rev. Dr. Cuyler's Sermon on Temperance.

It has been well said that a man, be he ever so great or good, who is wedded to a theory, can never be trusted either with facts or arguments in defending it. He is in a condition of monomania. Both his perceptive and reflective faculties on that one subject which runs riot in his mind are out of gear, and the intellectual machinery put in operation soon becomes a wreck. The directors of the National Temperance Society, at whose request this unhappy discourse, it seems, was delivered, did an unkind thing for their brother Cuyler, and, we think, also an unwise thing for themselves, in putting him to this task. He was no match for Dr. Duyrea. He is a popular preacher (deservedly so) and an estimable man; but he has neither the polemic furniture nor power to cope with his opponent—a sound theologian and a ripe biblical scholar and a keen dialectician. We remember reading a review by Dr. Cuyler of a certain book, which the reviewer pronounced an important production, out which contained a commendatory preface from the pen of Chancellor Crosby. The reverend critic, indulging his wit at the expense of his reverence for Holy Writ, reminded the writer of the preface in question that the Bible forbade ploughing with the ox and the ass yoked together. If the law of mercy prohibits the working of these unequally yoked animals how much more unmerciful is it to engage them in conflict—long ears against long horns?

Dr. Cuyler's temperament, too, unfits him as a guide in any great question. He is too impulsive to be firm and reliable. The public do not forget how, just before the war of the rebellion, he stood on the steps of Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, and addressed a mass meeting, urging the people to pledge themselves to the South to send back to their masters absconding slaves and to denounce the abolitionists as fanatics; and how, after the war was over, in a letter to the New York *Independent*, giving an account of what he called his "raid into Canada," he said, "God bless Canada for giving an asylum to our fugitive slaves." A man so unfixed in faith himself is not the man to fix the faith of others. But what could the temperance society do? They had for some time seen that the faith of many of their members was shaken, not in the expediency of total abstinence from alcoholic beverages, but in the divinity of the doctrine. And now a clergyman of high character and commanding influence had come out and openly assailed his position, on the ramparts of which the proudest flag in the world had for thirty years defiantly floated. Who should meet the assailant? Not a man who had reputation for biblical scholarship to lose could be found to do it. Dr. Cuyler therefore, whose zeal outstripped his prudence, was permitted to rush to the defence. With what success his sermon last Sunday, as reported in the HERALD, shows. Let us follow the redoubtable champion. He lays the foundation of his argument in the following astounding statement:—"God has written upon every human body the law of abstinence from intoxicants by decreeing that alcohol shall lessen the muscular power, diminish the animal heat and derange the digestive organs of the human body."

We have lately seen 800,000 men gathered to repel an invasion and to chastise the invaders—men who, both in their *physique* and *morale*, have been the admiration of the world. On the bodies of these men—iron-framed, enclosing heroic souls—each one of whom from his boyhood has been in the daily use of alcoholic drinks, this professed messenger of divine truth, this "legate of the skies," declares God has written the law of abstinence from intoxicants. "Alcoholic stimulants," he says, "poison body and mind." We need not go to Germany to her princes, her generals, her statesmen, her scholars, her divines, her mechanics and her peasantry, to refute the rash assertion. We can do it at home, amid the class of the community to which our temperance champion himself belongs—the American clergy. It may be assumed that nine-tenths of this honored class of men of the present generation are teetotalers. For a generation they have stood in the cold water army. Let some father among them attend a clerical convention; let him be a phrenologist and from some commanding position take in the *coup d'œuil* and study the physical, intellectual and moral character of the assembly individually. Then let him call up in his memory the appearance of a similar assembly forty years ago, when alcoholic stimulants were generally used. According to Dr. Cuyler's *ex-cathedrâ* declaration, what a contrast must these two ecclesiastical bodies present to the mind of the venerable observer! The generation passed away were men presenting all the symptoms, physical and intellectual, of having been poisoned, muscular power lessened, animal heat diminished, digestive organs deranged. Their minds—well, our temperance apostle has not much to say about the psycological effects of the temperate use of intoxicants. This was unnecessary. The prohibitory law of God which they violated was written all over their poor bodies, and we have only to remember the medical maxim, "*mens sana in corpore sano*," to know that their minds must have been terribly impaired.

It would be a very preposterous thing to say that cold water drinking is poisonous, and yet when we look at some of our cold water men a hasty judgment might lead us to this conclusion. We might refer to Dr. Cuyler himself for proof. He finds it necessary to go every year to Saratoga and drink gallons of nauseous mineral water to wash out some kind of poison from his system. We will venture to say that he has during the last five years taken more purges and tonics of this kind than old beer and wine drinking Emperor William has used in the course of his life; and yet the old warrior, with his seventy-four years, could probably take our little apostle of temperance by the slack of his pants and pitch him over a rail fence. How did the Brooklyn divine get the poison into him? Not by drinking cold water, we are sure, but by some vicious habit equally condemned by science and the Bible. Of course we do not know and it might seem impertinent to inquire. We are writing on temperance, indeed, but we have no right to make our dissertation personal, otherwise we might ask whether our clerical friend, so careful to observe Solomon's advice, "Look not on the wine when it is red," &c., is equally mindful of another injunction of the wise man, "Put a knife to thy throat if thou be a man given to appetite." There is something suspicious in the fact that Dr. Cuyler has never been known to preach from this latter text, and that this form of intemperance never comes under the cognizance of the National Temperance Society. The temperance men in our Saviour's time—the Essenes—against whose false creed of asceticism the Great Reformer set His face like flint, were not guilty of this inconsistency. They directed their attacks against gluttony as well as drunkenness, and when Jesus refused to limit himself with them to black bread and broth and cold water, but took meats and wine like other men, they called Him a glutton as well as a wine-bibber. Dr. Cuyler on one occasion declared in print that he had shed tears over his dear brother Crosby because he publicly refused to take the temperance pledge, and we have no doubt that the good Essenes shed tears quite as bitter over Christ for the same reason. When tears proved unavailing they had recourse to revilings, pretty much like our modern Essenes. Dr. Dio Lewis affirms that gluttony kills more people than drunkenness in this country. The well-known couplet in Butler's "Hudibras" derives its mordacity from its truthfulness—

> Compound for sins they are inclined to
> By damning those they have no mind to.

Englishmen are called beef-eaters, but the Americans consume twice as much animal food as the English. A friend of the writer visited England some time since. On his return he complained sadly of his diet while there. Speaking of a week spent in a private religious family he said:—"I was half starved. I got only one good meal a day; that was dinner. For breakfast it was tea and coffee, toast and a boiled egg—literally one. For tea, slices of buttered bread, so thin that you could see through one of them. For supper, bread and cheese and ale (both ale and wine at dinner), and before going to bed, for the male members, a tumbler of hot Cognac brandy and water." "Well," said we, "you are a physician; you ought to know. Did they look as if they were half starved?" "No," was the frank answer. "Did they look as if they were poisoned?" "No; no signs of that."

From the teachings of God in nature our teetotal pulpit orator goes to the teachings of God in revelation, and here he is even more shocking in his reckless disregard to the obligations of the ninth commandment, because he is dealing with the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth. "I aver," says he, "that the word of God enjoins the duty of abstinence from alcholic intoxicants. Before this assembly, as before a court, I will summon as witnesses Noah and Moses to prove this assertion." But what a mock trial where there is no counsel to cross question the witnesses and where the mock judge perverts the direct testimony which they give! "I drank too much wine," said Noah, in giving in his evidence; "I didn't know the wine was so strong in these parts." "Then, by your own admission," replies the judge, "you ought not to have drank any; God enjoined on you total abstinence." Friend Cuyler, you eat hot bread and beef steaks or fried ham and drink strong coffee for breakfast, and so you lessen your muscular power, diminish the animal heat and derange the digestive organs, and then you go to Saratoga, to one of the most fashionable and expensive hotels, where, according to your own account, published in the *Independent*, you are compelled to look at gay women shockingly *decollete*, and where you go to gambling saloons to see how the "blacklegs" cheat, although you know that your Bible teaches you to "be wise concerning that which is good and simple concerning that which is evil." These and other things you do, whereby you "wound the weak consciences of your brethren and sin against Christ." Therefore, "I aver that the word of God enjoins on all Christians" total abstinence from animal food.

Our learned divine next treats his audence to a verbal criticism of holy text, in which a most unaccountable error in the translation of the Hebrew word, so often occurring in the Old Testament, rendered "strong drink," is pointed out. It is a common expedient with men, when they find anything in the Bible which they don't like, to quarrel with the translation. But a strange blunder, it seems, has been committed here. Instead of strong drink it should have been weak drink—"a sweet drink pressed out of fruits and often drank in an unfermented state." A bold Jesuit would have pronounced this a hazardous move, it was not likely, indeed, that there were any Hebrew scholars present; but suppose the recollection of the text had flashed across the minds of the audience, and in obedience to this new reading they had repeated it—"The juice of fruits pressed out, whether fermented or not, is raging"—what a shock would have been produced! Oh, learned doctor in Hebrew, would not your hearers have hung their heads in shame of you? Fortunately for you they, as well as yourself, had forgotten the text. There was another part of the sermon which, if it had been remembered, would equally have destroyed the credibility of the preacher in this "court." But neither the speaker nor the hearers were in a state of mind to put things together, so that it was not important to remember the old proverb—"People not over fond of the truth should have good memories." The congregation were informed that their pastor had been in Palestine and had tasted the "mocker"—the raging drink commonly drank by the people. It was unfermented. He only tasted it, notwithstanding the divine injunction—"Touch not, taste not, handle not." But he only tasted it, just as he only looked in at the gambling saloons at Saratoga Springs, and at a dance house one midnight in Water street to see the "soiled doves" in company with his English reverend brother, Nathan Hall, to whom he was showing "New York by gas light." He did not say whether, when he tasted the wine, he looked at it to see whether it was "red and gave its color in the cup." If he did he knows that was another transgression of a divine command. But perhaps he happened to remember just here that the pulpit was not a confessional, and that he was not bound to tell all that he did when in Palestine. Then comes another assertion which throws his argument into a complete muddle, and makes "confusion worse confounded." "The Bible," the preacher says, "in several passages prohibits their use (that is of intoxicants), and commands total abstinence more than once." A command not to do a thing, we suppose, is a prohibition; the "several" passages and the "more than once" ones might have been grouped. Strange that the preacher did not give chapter and verse; he would have settled at once the whole controversy, and Dr. Cuyler's able opponent, Dr. Duyrea, whom this sermon was intended to refute, would have been compelled, as an honest man, to acknowledge his defeat, and as a faithful minister of Christ to have made a public recantation. Where are these prohibitory texts? Dr. Cuyler has left echo to answer, "Where?" But why claim this prohibition for intoxicants—the fermented juice of the grape—when, whether fermented or not, it is "raging?" The wine which the Saviour made at the marriage feast at Cana, in Galilee, it is claimed, was unfermented—that is, it was what Solomon had called the raging drink. "God commended it," says Dr. Cuyler, "in the Old Testament." Christ made it, the New Testament declares. What perfect chaos of thought is here.

We are grieved to the very heart to read this sermon. It is a disgrace to the Christian ministry—a disgrace to the Christian religion. We grieve for Dr. Cuyler himself. When out of this monomanical state he is a most estimable and useful man in spite of his idiosyncracy of character and oddities into which popular men of his temperament are apt to fall. Notwithstanding this feeling of humiliation and pain, still we are glad to see this sermon. We hope that it will everywhere be circulated and read, and that it will be extensively commented on both by the secular and religious press. In order to tone the latter press up to the work and rid itself of the moral cowardice which has so sad-marked it in relation to this subject we could wish that every religious paper would transfer to its columns the most admirable article entitled "Manly Christianity," which appears in the same number of the HERALD that contains the report of Dr. Cuyler's temperance sermon. If anything can do it this sermon will drive the National Temperance Society from its utterly untenable position and compel them to place their noble cause where it belongs—among the economics of life and not its religious duties. There are many and strong reasons why men should forego the use of intoxicants. Let the society gather them up and present them as forcibly as possible and make as many converts as they can. But let them not say, "The Lord hath spoken to us," when He hath not spoken, and thus prove themselves "lying prophets." Let them send to the paper mill all their irreligious religious books and the electrotyped plates to the foundry, sparing Dr. Cuyler's sermon as a sort of *memento mori*, and then come before the public with a new name—"The Reformed Temperance Reformers."

It was well he only tasted. Had he taken a hearty draught of the grape juice just fresh from the wine vat (as what he tasted must have been, for in that warm climate it becomes alcohol in two or three days), it would probably have produced either a "raging" vomit or a "raging" colic. In reference to the assertion that in this state the liquid is commonly drunk by the present natives of Palestine, we must alter old Horace's sneer at the credulity of the Jews and make the well known passage read, "*Non credat Judæus apella sed ego.*" Every native of Palestine or other wine-growing country knows that until the juice has undergone fermentation it is not fit to drink. Dr. Cuyler is not a Munchausen—he believes what he says; but he went to Palestine to seek facts in support of his theory, and, of course, he found them. Nothing easier. If he had wished to prove that the people of Palestine were in the habit of taking Epsom salts with their meals he would have done it. Facts to suit come to the hands of theorists with wonderful ease.

"Honi Soit Qui Mal y Pense."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

Two most absurd figures of the present day are—First, the Baptists, weeping in sanctimonious woe, because Eve's fairest daughters persist, on certain occasions, in showing their rounded shoulders and classic arms to an admiring world, thereby courting the devil and their own inevitable ruin! Then the Methodists, howling in dreadful concert over the sin of dancing, proclaiming it a device of the evil one and a special snare for unsuspecting virtue, and denounce the ballroom, declaring its floor the road direct to hell, along which, to the sound of unspiritual music, dance the young of to-day, followed, of course, by all those unfortunate old martyrs who sit in odd corners, waiting in utter misery for their several young charges, while they, poor, short-sighted mortals, never seem to think that heaven will cast them out should their dress be cut an inch lower than usual or their arms be seen above the elbow. Think, oh! misguided young woman, of the look of displeasure that must cross the divine face should you appear at Madame A.'s ball in a dress cut low in the neck; and you, young man, dare you ask your sister to try the "Boston" with you when I tell you it is prohibited above? (perhaps because of its name.) Pause a moment; it were better that you should turn from the ballroom—that "nothouse of hell"—and, with some kindred spirits, spend the night in rioting with low women, or gaming, drinking, or anything, in fact, except dancing! That, remember, is the most carnal sin of all, at least just at present it is. It is not impossible that some day the clergy may find out that young men and women employ their time in a way that savors much less of heaven than dancing, and that they can walk to hell rather faster than they can dance to the same place, and that however nicely covered a woman's breast may be outward propriety is no voucher for inward purity. It is absurd to quote Scripture either for or against such thing. Society decides what is right or wrong in these matters, and individuals constitute society, and it is pleasant to think that the majority do not look through the same impure glass that certain old women and fanatical clergymen use. Some people, believing everything to be bad, spend a lifetime searching for evil, and when any innocent looking object is found they plaster it with the impure material of which they themselves are made; then calling the world's attention to their new discovery they gloat over the obscene image created by their own hands.

Baptists and Methodists, turn your attention to better things than low-necked dresses and dancing. The young generation of to-day certainly are not filled with the impure ideas that seem to crowd all reason from the heads of clergymen. Oh, holy teachers of religion! if a bared breast suggests at once to your minds sensual and animal ideas, fling aside your Bibles and forsake your pulpits, or else preach to yourselves and let your innocent folks alone. "Evil be to him who evil thinks."

CHAS. HANCOCK.

Are Dancing and Going to Theatres Sinful?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

We hope that the intelligence of the members of the Methodist Church may not be judged from the lack of it in its ministers, as shown in their late discussions on fashionable amusements reported in Tuesday's HERALD. We beg the public to believe that there are a few of us who are sinful enough to enjoy Dickens, Thackeray and Irving. In fact we remember having heard one of our ministers so far lost to all sense of propriety as to quote from the "Marble Faun" in his sermon. Applying the only argument of Brother Ferris, how could that minister reprove his people for wasting their time over Beadle's dime novels when he read "Hawthorn" himself? There are also a few of us who, like Brother Schaffer, enjoy a little dancing in our own parlors or at a quiet church sociable; but we never supposed that by this indulgence we placed it so entirely beyond our power to reprove the frequenter of brothels as Brother Ferris would have us believe. There are a few of us who have even been known to go to Booth's to see "Rip Van Winkle" or "Othello," and are not aware but that we can speak against the "Black Crook" just as emphatically as if we were obliged to confess that "we never went to the theatre." In fact, we have the advantage in not being compelled to combat that argument all-sufficient to the offender:—"You have never been there; you know nothing about the matter; you are not fit to judge." We desire through your paper to thank Brother Schaffer for his part in the discussion. Perhaps he represented more of the laity than he knew. We are sorry his fellow preachers went for him so savagely and that no one was found to hold up his hands, but hope he was not shaken from his standpoint.

METHODIST.

The Confession of Sin.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

When the little child of five or six years meets with an accident at play, or gets hurt or injured by others, that child uniformly goes to its mother or kind nurse and, looking up in her face, tells its sorrows to her, and looks for compassion and consolation in its troubles. The wise man, who has the good fortune to have a true, wifely woman for a wife, often, when in trouble in business, opens his mind to his wife, and very often gets good and true advice from her, and is brightened up anew for the battle of life. We all, therefore, when in trouble in the ordinary affairs of life, seek advice and consolation from trusted friends. Now, when a man is lost in sin, buried in iniquity, a putrid mass of moral corruption, feeling that he is a monster on the earth, and knowing God will forgive the most abject sinner if truly contrite, to whom will he go to unburthen his conscience and get this heavy load of sin removed, that he may walk again before his fellow men as a Christian in fact, and one worthy of being called a child of Jesus Christ? Must he not confess his sins to Christ? But He is no longer on earth—that is to the eyes of men. It is nearly two thousand years since, from the midst of His apostles, He ascended to His Father's glory, and only mystically on the Christian altar, under sacramental forms, does He now appear on earth. Well, then, is He not on earth by representation? Who can represent Jesus Christ? Not St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Alphonsus Ligonsi, St. Philip Neri could even feebly impress a repentance the sinner at their feet, as did our Saviour when He changed the heart of Mary Magdalen—transformed, with one benignant look, the harlot almost into the saint. But Jesus Christ is no longer before the eyes of men, and the sinner, therefore, who wishes to unburden his conscience of sin must confess his sins to Christ's legitimate priest, however unworthy he may be to walk in the footsteps of his divine Master. As Christ chose His apostles and as the apostles in turn chose others, so the Christian priesthood has been established and preserved in an unbroken line down to the priest of our own day. He is a lone man, with no ties to bind him to the earth, a wanderer, in his outward life resembling to a certain extent his Great Captain and, therefore, a not unfit person to listen to the sinner's pitiful tale of sin and dispense healing ointment to the heart of repentance, as the agent of Jesus Christ. He is only a poor, sinful man, with no power himself, but standing only as the visible agent on earth of Him who healed the sick, gave sight to the blind and made the lame walk. And confessing our sins to a brother man humbles us, brings down our pride and makes us feel more ashamed of rushing again into sin. On the other hand, if we go into our room and there confess to Christ, it may be earnest, but it is not so searching of conscience; we do not find ourselves so humbled, nor do we hear consolatory words coming to our ears that we are heard and forgiven. Another thing is it gives the Church a chance to prevent social corruption, especially conjugal sins, which are secret, only to the confessional. In fact, it gives Christ's Church on earth the power to look into the hearts of the people, as the Saviour did when He walked the earth, like other men. Other forms of Christianity, in which this sacrament is rejected, are only outer garments of beauty, covering a body rotten with filth. Their agents to the people stand before them like "whited sepulchres," in the midst of the desolation of sin, unable to lift a helping hand. We may scout at the "confessional," we may talk of its horrors, we may avoid it, we may pass it off by a wave of the hand, but until the people of the earth, as of old, humble themselves in repentance of their sins at the feet of God's priest Christianity will be a name, and not a fact.

W. C. D.

The Ursuline Convent Lands—Their Projected Sale.

The Boston *Traveller* states that the projected sale by the Right Rev. John J. Williams, Bishop of Boston, of the Ursuline College lands in Somerville requires legislative sanction, as a part of it is held in trust, and the Bishop has accordingly petitioned for leave to sell. The estate consists of twenty-four acres of land. One lot of nine acres, held in fee simple, was sold June 25, 1829, by the attorney of William Stokes and others, heirs resident abroad, to Bishop Benedict Fenwick, Elizabeth Harrison and Mary Barber. The remaining lot of fifteen acres, in three parcels, was deeded to Catherine Mary Wiseman, a resident in the convent in 1828, and by her will, recorded in May, 1829, she bequeathed it to the three persons just named, "in trust, to apply the same towards the support and maintenance of the Ursuline Convent."

The Ursuline Convent was founded by Bishop Cheverus and Dr. Matignon, who brought to this country in 1820 four foreign born sisters. The institution was an especial favorite with Bishop Fenwick, who did all that he could to foster it. Daniel Barber was a Protestant minister of Claremont, N. H., converted to the Catholic belief by Bishop Cheverus, and we believe that Mary Ann Barber, whose convent name was Mary Benedict, was his daughter.

Miss Harrison, the second trustee, was the innocent author of the excitement that led to the destruction of the convent. After having been for thirteen years in the convent she escaped from it on the afternoon of the 28th of July, 1834, and fled to the residence of Mr. Edward Cutter, a Representative, but was induced to return to the convent the next evening. As a number of people who afterwards called at the convent to see her were refused, although several were admitted, the story went out that "a mysterious lady," as the *Mercantile Journal* had it, who was a pupil in the convent, was deprived of her liberty, or virtually had disappeared. This led to popular excitement, and on the evening of August 11, 1834, a great mob from Boston rolled out to the convent and burned it. Its ruins stand there to this day. Miss Harrison, by the way, was the Mother Assistant of the institution.

Elizabeth Harrison in 1842, and Mary Barber in 1844, conveyed all their interest in the property to Bishop Fenwick. The latter bequeathed the entire property and trusteeship to Bishop Fitzpatrick, and from the possession of the latter, also deceased, it passed by will to the present Bishop of Boston.

As the last member of the Ursuline community left Massachusetts at least a quarter of a century ago, and is now deceased, the trust is practically inoperative, and the lands are too valuable to be allowed to lay idle, eating up interest and taxes. The agreed sale of the land, or a part of it, to a capitalist, for building purposes, was recorded some weeks since.

The Bitter and Sweet of Liberal Tract Distribution.

The Boston *Herald* gives an account of a lecture delivered by Rev. J. L. Hatch on the "Bitter-Sweet Experiences of the Liberal Tract Distributor." He said he had not made tract distributing a money making business, but the hours he had spent in this avocation had been a free gift to the good cause. He said he did not believe in forcing one's views on a person reluctant to listen, but he considered that offering them tracts in a quiet, gentlemanly way could not justly be considered offensive. Tract distributing he had no doubt had been made sometimes offensive by ringing people's door bells and calling them from their work, and this he did not believe in. Mr. Hatch here gave a brief historical sketch of the tract movement, which originated in the last century among the liberals of Europe. He said it was soon taken up by evangelical people and adhered to ever since, being made a powerful engine for the effusion of repulsive ideas of religion, and so working upon young and feeble minds. The speaker said he was glad to notice that lately the liberals seemed disposed to redeem the tract movement from its ill repute and disseminate rational matter in a gentlemanly and inoffensive way. He said he had tried to be unobtrusive in his efforts in this line, and he thought he had been so, although charged with a contrary course. Mr. Hatch spoke favorably of certain Unitarian tracts, and said he had distributed many of late—perhaps fifty thousand. He was satisfied, he said, that he had done good, and he knew he had influenced others to act as distributors. He knew this from letters received asking for tracts. In this he found the "sweets" of the business. On the contrary, he said, he had been treated rudely by Fulton and Knapp; one young woman to whom he offered a tract at the door of Tremont Temple turned round and made faces at him; other women had crumpled the tracts in their hands and thrown them at his head; and one elderly female had actually spit upon him. Thus was the "bitter" mixed with the "sweet." Mr. Hatch closed with some hopeful words regarding the future of the liberal tract movement.

The Baptist Bite of the Legislative Sectarian Cherry.

The Baptist pastors of Brooklyn have adopted the following resolutions:—

Whereas the trustees of the Baptist Home Society in the city of New York have accepted a gratuity from the State in aid of an institution purely sectarian; and

Whereas that action has been interpreted as in some sort representing the Baptist denomination; therefore,

Resolved, That we, the undersigned Baptist pastors of Brooklyn, pained and mortified by this act of degeneracy, which we deem unscriptural and in opposition to our antecedents and to our strenuously avowed principles, do hereby enter our fixed and solemn protest against such action of the trustees.

JOURNALISTIC NOTES.

The Leavenworth (Kansas) *Evening Call* has been enlarged.

The Georgia Press Association at its last meeting resolved to send no more papers without payment in advance.

F. R. French, formerly of the Big Sandy (Ky.) *Herald*, will shortly begin the publication of a radical paper at Ashland.

Orville Brown, editor of the *Record*, has been appointed Postmaster at Mankato, Minn., vice Griswold, of the *Union*, of that city, removed.

Mr. H. Erb retires from the editorial chair of the Appleton (Wis.) *Volksfreund*, having sold his interest in the establishment to H. W. Meyer, a teacher in the German free school of that city.

A keeper was placed in the Portland (Me.) *Argus* office Saturday, on a suit commenced against that paper by Mr. H. N. Jose for libel, the damages being laid at $20,000. It is reported that other suits against the *Argus* are to follow, from parties named in connection with Mr. Jose in the articles which gave rise to the suits already commenced against the *Argus* and Mr. Neal.

RELIGIOUS NOTICES.

CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH, CORNER PARK AVENUE and Thirty-fourth street.—Mr. Hepworth will deliver the fourth lecture in his course to young men. Subject, "Money Making and Money Spending." Service at 7½. Services in the morning as usual at 10½.

CHRIST CHURCH, FIFTH AVENUE, CORNER OF Thirty-fifth street.—The Rev. F. C. Ewer, D. D., rector—Services at 10:30 A. M. and 7:30 P. M. Strangers are invited and will be provided with seats.

NORTH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, CORNER OF Thirty-first street and Ninth avenue.—Preaching this morning and evening, by the Pastor, Rev. Thos. Street. In the evening, at 7½ o'clock, third of course of sermons on Scripture characters. Subject—"Joseph."

ST. LUKE'S M. E. CHURCH, FORTY-FIRST STREET, near Sixth avenue.—Preaching on Sunday, at 10½ A. M. and 7½ P. M., by Rev. C. S. Harrower. Annual meeting of Sunday School Missionary Society at 2½ P. M.; addresses by Rev. D. W. Bartine, D. D., and others.

THE REV. DR. VINTON WILL PREACH IN ZION church, Thirty-eighth street and Madison avenue, on behalf of the Children's Fold, Sunday evening, April 2, at 7½ o'clock.

YACHTS, STEAMBOATS, &C.

A JIB AND MAINSAIL BOAT, 25 FEET LONG; built in the best possible manner; new last August; fast and a good sea boat. Apply at 503 Fifth avenue.

FOR SALE.—SCHOONER YACHT "MATTIE," IN PRIME order; good sailer; five years old; 40 tons, o. m., price very low. WILLIAM H. H. GLOVER, Southold, N. Y.

FOR SALE—IN GOOD ORDER, THE FOLLOWING Sails from a schooner yacht:—Mainsail, Foresail, Jib, Flying Jib, Jib Topsail, Hemp Maintopsail, Maintopmast Staysail. Can be seen at W