

## SEVEN SCORE AND FOURTEEN

- FOUR SCORE AND SEVEN YEARS AGO AND WHEN IN THE COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS
- THE LOST ART OF THE WRITTEN MESSAGE AND ORATORY DISCOURSE- THE POWER OF WELL WRITTEN AND SPOKEN WORDS

When in the Course of Human Events-think about that phrase. Why not just say we have had it with king George the Third and we want out? Because when we read “When in the Course of Human Events” it tantalizes us to read further to see what Jefferson really meant by his step-by-step construction of the Declaration of Independence. And when we read that George the Third’s government has, and I quote from the Declaration, “plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns and destroyed the lives of our people”, Jefferson has accomplished exactly what he means when we say, ORATORY GENERATES EMPATHY, NOT RATIONALIZATION and empathy is of utmost importance when one is trying to hold the attention of the listening or reading public.

NOV 19<sup>TH</sup>, 1863 IN GETTYSBURGH PENNSYLVANIA-

Four Score –only two words BUT WORDS THAT EVOKE A SENSE AND A SCENE OF A THOUSAND PICTURES. Gettysburg- Oratory at its best!!!!

Two Hundred and seventy two words spoken on an Autumn afternoon in November 1863, a week shy tonight of 7 score and fourteen years ago, Abraham Lincoln delivered what most historians assess as one of his most eloquent speeches, one many say rivals

Pericles funeral oration some 2,500 years previous. A speech that Gary Wills said in his 1992 Pulitzer Prize winning book 'Lincoln at Gettysburg,' "'words that remade America.'" Wills book is devoted primarily to the word and working of the Gettysburg address. I don't intend to compete with a Pulitzer Prize winner. Therefore my paper this evening will be my interpretation of the meaning of words, the linguistics in other historical works, as well as the importance of the Gettysburg 272-word speech including cadence, style and the delivery method of Lincoln's speech. This is marginally about The Gettysburg Address – it is more about the decline of both oral and written discourse and dialogue. I will intersperse comparisons of other historical discourse, to illustrate the diminution of civility and perhaps the travesty against the first amendment. I will also endeavor to show that it is NOT uncommon for parallel thoughts to be, shall we say, lifted from and found in more than one scholarly presentation. Lincoln, Pericles as well as Jefferson and other writers and orators reach back to known treatises when constructing what have become remembered works.

Several years ago I gave a talk to this group in which I covered the 1858 Lincoln Douglas debates: ones that elevated Lincoln to the National stage and were a primary marketing tool that led to his election as President in 1860, a scant two years after his senate election loss to Judge Douglas. In that paper I reiterated how Lincoln would deliver a typical stump speech in the northern geographical area of Illinois, concluding all gerunds with ING but in the southern part of the state giving much the same speech, all of the ING's were abandoned. Our #44th President, Mr. Obama, when addressing predominately black audiences adopted the same changing vernacular, interchanging words such as Folk

and Folks when addressing different ethnic audiences. Obama's body posture also changed when addressing different groups. In the black churches he leaned forward-in a sway delivering a cadence that sometimes sounded sing song, but when raising funds in Pacific Heights, his physical stature was ramrod straight and he used his six foot three height to convey the importance of his elected position. .

Allow me to return to Lincoln and his oratory ability. He was a master of words knowing how to use them, when to use them, and the importance of sentence construction in order to get his message across. He accomplished this with his formal boyhood schooling of no more than one year, and an ownership of perhaps 6 books brought into the household by his stepmother most notably the Bible, Pilgrims Progress and the life and times of George Washington. His grammar during the 1858 debates with Douglas was reminiscent of the Illinois frontier- double negatives and structure such as "He don't" but by the time he reached 1600 Pennsylvania he had refined both his written and oratory skills.

So why has the Gettysburg address remained so memorable? A quick history lesson! In June of 1863, General Lee marched his army westward into a Northern state, Pennsylvania, for the first time with the objective of forcing the North to come to a compromised settlement. Like all well laid-battle plans, Lee confronted the Union Army NOT where they had originally planned but just outside the small town of Gettysburg. No need to go into the intricacies of that three day confrontation – but most historians will tell you in the late afternoon of the third day of battle the repulse of the confederate charge by Pickett was the high water mark of war for the South. Although the conflict

was to last another 18 months, the South never again made a major foray into the North. But in November of 1863 Lincoln could not have known the ultimate outcome. He chose Gettysburg for other reasons, reasons that are interwoven into his choice of words throughout his 272-word speech. It is apocryphal belief that Lincoln constructed the speech on the back of an envelope on his way from the White House to Gettysburg. Lincoln was tenacious in his preparations and prided himself in this endeavor throughout his career. He composed the first draft in Washington during the days leading up to his trip to Gettysburg and constructed a final revision while in his Gettysburg hotel the preceding evening. It is also apocryphal to think that Lincoln believed in his phrase “The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here.” Prior to Lincoln’s delivery, the principle speaker at Gettysburg, Edward Everett, delivered a well-received two-hour oratory rich in historical detail and classical allusion. Upon hearing Lincoln’s 2 minute delivery Everett told him, ” I should be glad if I came as near to the central idea of the occasion in two hours, as you did in two minutes.” Without question the two minute delivery of 272 words, has to be considered a masterpiece of the English language and it transformed Gettysburg from a scene of carnage into a symbol giving meaning to the word sacrifice –the words full measure – the words “they did not perish in vain” – the words “what happened on this battlefield” phrases- like a nation with a new birth of freedom, were typical Lincoln word and sentence structure.

So—“four score- and seven”- why not just say 87 years ago? The word ‘score’ was in much greater use in the mid nineteenth century than today. The dictionary says it was probably first used in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Lincoln used the phraseology to underscore the

relatively short existence of our country and he also took into consideration the impact of the word-SCORE. He knew it was an attention getter-If I had titled MY talk this evening “154 years ago” instead of Seven Score-14, well some of you might not have been in attendance this evening!!

As previously mentioned, Lincoln was an ardent reader of history and relied upon the writings of several of the country’s previous Presidents. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams were still active as late as the mid 1820’s, both ex presidents corresponding with each other through the medium of letter writing – a lost art today. Adams and Jefferson serving in Washington’s cabinet as well as overseas postings early in our country’s history, fell out over their political differences, however late in life, with the encouragement of Adams’ wife and others – the two ex presidents began a correspondence that would exceed 150 letters. Without question, this correspondence helped hold the country together during a perilous period in our history. Slavery raised its angry head as early as the adoption phase of our constitution and the issue came close to severing the country during the early 1820’s. Jefferson a southern, slave owner, and Adams from Massachusetts were well aware of the divisive issue of slavery and their several letters, made public, helped sooth the fissure. Lincoln, in his early political career must have read many of these letters as he makes mention of them more than once when carrying on dialogue during his presidency.

Thus, I think it is fair to say Lincolns’ Gettysburg phraseology “our fathers brought forth onto this continent a new nation” in the Gettysburg address was a reference to the

Declaration of Independence and to Jefferson its author. The phraseology “conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that “all men are created equal” certainly was borrowed from the words in the Declaration of Independence circa 1776 as was the word construction “liberty and all men are created equal with certain inalienable rights” a reference to the Declaration. We know in drafting our own Declaration of Independence, Jefferson reached into previous 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century English political treatises as well as the Virginia Declaration of Rights crafted by the Virginian, George Mason. Jefferson framed his thoughts with the intention of placing America in the family of nations and it certainly was not just a treatise to separate us from England, but also a vehicle to elevate our status in the Western world. At Gettysburg Lincoln wanted to remind his audience and whatever readership his speech might receive, that we were still ONE country. The very next sentence, “Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated can long endure .” Again a reference to our Declaration of Independence. Lincoln, in visiting Independence Hall in Philadelphia on his way to his inauguration (Feb22, 1861) said, “I have often inquired of myself, WHAT GREAT PRINCIPLE OR IDEA it was that kept this confederacy so long together?” --- He then answered his own inquiry “It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all have an equal chance.

Two thousand years before Gettysburg, in 431 BC, Pericles, an eminent Athenian politician, gave his famous **Funeral Oration** over the ashes of the Athenian dead at the end of the first year of the Peloponnesian war, a part of the annual public funeral for the war dead. Thucydides', in his History of the Peloponnesian War, highlights the Pericles

elevated discourse probably reciting it word for word. Funeral orations have been categorized as an ancient Greek ART form. (Other cultures have used this method of attribution- The Romans- Marc Anthony over Caesar's body) Pericles, mourns the deaths of soldiers resulting from the Peloponnesian conflict, but injects a second theme on the importance of democracy and the importance of the city/ Athens. The soldiers who gave up their lives did it for the sake of the city. QUOTING Pericles "Such was the city these men fought for rather than lose to others, and shall we, their survivors not take up their labor?" ---Many are those who are praised, speaking of the rite, as if it were a fine thing to orate over men buried from our wars."

Listen to Lincoln's words. "We are met on a great battle field-final resting place-we have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives so that that Nation (Lincoln: states NATION, Pericles CITY, may live. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot hallow this ground (But of course that is exactly what happened). The brave men, living and dead who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our power."

Let's continue to look at Lincoln and Gettysburg -"The world will little note nor long remember what we say here but it can never forget what they did here. It is for the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work." Pericles, towards the end of his oration, praises the dead soldiers families- parents-children and brethren and then reminds the citizens it is now their duty to raise the children of the fallen." Lincoln

words: with—“ It is for the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work that they have so far so nobly carried on.”

Gary Wills in his Pulitzer Prize book does not suggest that Lincoln’s address lifted precise words from Pericles, but he does say that the Edward Everett speech given just prior to Lincoln lifts some ideas from the Athenian. I take some issue with Wills. When you dissect the words, I think you see Lincoln is trying to comfort- just as in Pericles funeral oration. The idea of sacrifice runs through both Lincoln and Pericles orations. Sacrifice and comfort – sacrifice and comfort—from both men.

Lincoln loved the use of language to propel an idea. He recognized the strength, of, as he said “BEAUTIFUL LANGUAGE” when he quoted the words of a journal reporting the death of Henry Clay, a shining light for Lincoln and the Whig party of the 1840’s and 1850’s. I’ll use the following Clay eulogy to illustrate Lincoln’s love of the English language, -Lincoln is reading an anti-Whig and anti-Clay newspaper—however extolling the virtues of Clay. - Lincoln begins recitation as follows:

concerned the nation the man ever sympathised; and now the nation mourns for the man.

The day after his death, one of the public Journals, opposed to him politically, held the following pathetic and beautiful language, which I adopt, partly because such high and exclusive eulogy, originating with a political friend, might offend good taste, but chiefly, because I could not, in any language of my own, so well express my thoughts--

"Alas! who can realize that Henry Clay is dead! Who can realize that never again that majestic form shall rise in the council-chambers of his country to beat back the storms of anarchy which may threaten, or pour the oil of peace upon the troubled billows as they rage and menace around? Who can realize, that the workings of that mighty mind have ceased -- that the throbbings of that gallant heart are stilled -- that the mighty sweep of that graceful arm will be felt no more, and the magic of that eloquent tongue, which spake as spake no other tongue besides, is hushed -- hushed forever! Who can realize that freedom's champion -- the champion of a civilized world, and of all tongues and kindreds and people, has indeed fallen! Alas, in those dark hours, which, as they come in the history of all nations, must come in ours -- those hours of peril and dread which our land has experienced, and which she may be called to experience again -- to whom now may her people look up for that counsel and advice, which only wisdom and experience and patriotism can give, and which only the undoubting confidence of a nation will receive? Perchance, in the whole circle of the great and gifted of our land, there remains but one on whose shoulders the mighty mantle of the departed statesman may fall -- one, while we now write, is doubtless pouring his tears over the bier of his brother and his friend -- brother, friend ever, yet in political sentiment, as far apart as party could make them. Ah, it is at times like these, that the petty distinctions of mere party disappear. We see only the great, the grand, the noble features of the departed statesman; and we do not even beg permission to bow at his feet and mingle our tears with those who have ever been his political adherents -- we do [not?] beg this permission -- we claim it as a right, though we feel it as a privilege. Henry Clay belonged to his country -- to the world, mere party cannot claim men like him. His career has been national -- his fame has filled the earth -- his memory will endure to 'the last syllable of recorded time.'

"Henry Clay is dead! -- He breathed his last on yesterday at twenty minutes after eleven, in his chamber at Washington. To those who followed his lead in public affairs, it more appropriately belongs to pronounce his eulogy, and pay specific honors to the memory of the illustrious dead -- but all Americans may show the grief which his death inspires, for, his character and fame are national property. As on a question of liberty, he knew no North, no South, no East, no West, but only the Union, which held them all in its sacred circle, so now his countrymen will know no grief, that is not as wide-spread as the bounds of the confederacy. The career of Henry Clay was a public career. From his youth he has been devoted to the public service, at a period too, in the world's history justly regarded as a remarkable era in human affairs. He witnessed in the beginning the throes

<http://showcase.netins.net/web/creative/lincoln/speeches/clay.htm>

10/4/2006

From the 1850's lets jump to the 21<sup>st</sup> century. I think many great leaders take major themes from their predecessors and as I mentioned earlier Lincoln certainly had read some of Jefferson's writings. Michiko Kakutani in the New York Times wrote that not

since Lincoln has there been a president whose convictions and outlook on the world and in his own life were fundamentally shaped by reading history as Barack Obama. Obama has said that he found it particularly helpful, when he wanted a sense of solidarity during difficult moments on the job, to read Lincoln as well as others and absorb some of their ideas.

Personally, I find it quite helpful to “lift” thoughts from others writings and I include some of the papers given here over the years at the Chit Chat Club as well as The Chicago Literary Club of which I am still a member. There are no questions that combinations of themes have been lifted from the Bible over several centuries. The word equality, as well as liberty and freedom are found throughout these ecclesiastical writings. Listen to the following: “Even so warnings are given lest LIBERTY and choice turn into licentiousness especially as the old law to some extent is set aside.” Word for word from Corinthians. ‘The struggle for sovereign independence against the yoke of imperialism of colonial subjugation” writings found in Exodus- Deuteronomy- Judges and Jeremiah. So if it is acceptable for the assembled 17th century writers of the King James Bible to include much of the Old Testament, I assume it is OK for me to steal a part of Stephen Pearce’s recent paper, in which he said, a word or two can be worth a thousand, pictures when I invoke Four score!

The genesis of this paper came to my mind in spring 2016 when a Republican friend of mine from Tennessee and I were concerned about the lack of discourse and civility in the senate. I called him and suggested that if he could get Sen. Bob Corker I could get Sen. Tim Kaine to agree to have dinner by themselves with no staff and no others in

attendance. We would pay for the dinner and make a contribution to their wives favorite charity. Both came back within twelve hours with thumbs up and we did not have to pay for the dinner or make the charitable contribution. Five months later both senators invited the two of us to breakfast in the senate dining room and the four of us sat and the senators told us they would try, I say try, to work together. As I was walking out of the dining room Bob Corker said to me “You know Tim Kaine would make a great Vice President for YOUR side.” I told Corker I would like to be considered a member of both sides if I could get the two sides to begin to converse with a modicum of decorum. Two weeks later Sen. Kaine WAS chosen for the second spot on the Democratic ticket. (Corker story elocution lessons) This breakfast occurred six months prior to last November’s election but throughout the run-up to the election I became increasingly disheartened with the loss of mutual respect and civility from both of the parties. From both sides of the debate I was appalled at the use of words in describing each other’s opponent- crazed with the number of negative ads aimed at both of the candidates and when I felt it could not get any worse, the last 12 months since the election of #45, indicates how little I seemed to know about present day political congeniality. I am not commenting on President Trump’s politics. I am commenting on his daily tweets and use of the English language.

Let me assure you Number 45 is not the first of our Presidents to have used uncivil words about their opposition or had unkind words said about him. Just one example: In 1848, Zachary Taylor, the hero of Buena Vista in the much maligned Mexican – American conflict and running for the presidency from the Whig party, accused his democratic rival

Sen. Lewis Cass, of being dull- phlegmatic, lymphatic, a lazy man whose brain was so torpid that nothing but a powerful appeal to his selfishness or his vanity could arouse it to action.” I need to be even handed. Fair is fair. With regards to Taylor, the ultimate winner in 1848, Sam Houston states, “Taylor on all occasions acknowledges his own ignorance and incompetency.” The afore mentioned Henry Clay, a member of Taylor’s own Whig party said “Taylor was apparently sleeping forty years in the woods and cultivating moss on the calves of his legs.” At least they were creative!

My relationship with #44, not a very close one, but one where either through conversation with him or verified reporting, he said, “books and words were a sustaining source of information and inspiration.” He mentioned the writings of Gandhi, Lincoln, and King were particularly helpful in conveying a sense of solidarity. Obama, and I quote “reading gave me the ability to occasionally slow down and get perspective. It was invaluable to me” Obama harkened back to what he said was a sometimes-lonely boy hood and words from books were “PORTABLE to HIM.” (Pulled me aside!

Today, early in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, emphasis on elegant speeches are rare. Twitter and the 240-word tweets rule day-to-day information. The politician that I have been accused of being has great hopes that once again any aspiring public figure running for the Presidency or occupying the office will have to incorporate enhanced language to elevate his or her place in history. Without getting into a long drawn out discussion on Hillary Clinton’s debacle in 2016, without question one of her downfalls was the vanilla type speeches she gave throughout her campaign. To quote and parse one of Lincoln’s

Gettysburg lines from 1863 – we will little remember and soon forget Hillary’s campaign oratory.” On the other hand think about the following: Washington’s- farewell address: Eisenhower’s public warning on the military industrial complex. Reagan’s city on a hill, FDR’s “December 7<sup>th</sup>, 1941 a day in infamy”, and JFK’s “Ask not what the country can do for you” will remain as memorable pieces of their Presidencies. Lincoln’s second inaugural and possibly Obama’s healing presentation in the church in South Carolina, offer us a look at two executives who were able to use empathy as major messaging strategies for historians to view their tenure, and, as mentioned earlier empathy is a key grabber in holding an audiences attention.

What about the decline of the written word in today’s need of instant gratification news. We know that Lincoln’s 1858 debate and the later printing of several thousand copies of those debates with Judge Douglas elevated Lincoln to national fame and the presidency in 1860. Without question, the then Senator Barack Obama’s semi auto biography ‘Dreams of my Father’ along with his stirring oral presentation at the 2004 Democratic convention, catapulted him to the national stage that ultimately led to his election in 2008.

I will tell you that any public servant in waiting, planning to run for major office in 2020, will have to have published a biography on his or her life. It will have to be crafted to appeal to the tastes of modern day readers but I am concerned the wording will be dumbed down for mass appeal. To date Al Franken- Claire McCaskill, and Kirsten Gellibrand have published hard cover books sharing their life stories. Be prepared for

many more!!! As I am finishing this paper, Vice President Joe Biden has just published a book, appearing on several of the major news media outlets and, surprisingly, he is being asked if he plans to run in 2020!

So let's not forget the theme of tonight's paper -the decline of civility in written and oral discourse and the fallout from this decline. The devil's advocate in some of us, especially a member of the judiciary or maybe an originalist might take the other side of this downward spiral in civility in today's writings and oral outrages. Without question #45 felt comfortable in his successful run for our highest office using slander as a motivating force. Allow me to give the Oxford dictionary's explanation of the word slander. Slander the utterance or spreading of false or malicious statement about a person intended to injure and defame, misrepresent or vilify." A second explanation from the same dictionary, one that really hits home today, Slander is a Cause to lapse or fall spiritually or morally."

Bret Stephens in a recent Op Ed article in the New York Times titled "Our Best University President" spoke of Robert Zimmer, president of the University of Chicago. Zimmer in a campus wide paper voiced his anxiety about the restriction of speech on his campus as well as others. "Concerns about civility and mutual respect, can NEVER be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community."

In a separate column when discussing our current president's inclination to use abusive language, which may not violate the law but violate our customs, the column invoked the Constitution quoting Madison "the Constitution was not created as a parchment of barriers" but- as a parchment that demands tradition and respect."

Our Democracy protects the right of freedom of speech. However, at what point does civil discourse enter into the decision to control outrageous comments. It has been said that one of the functions of free speech is to say foolish things-to speak freely – that if you cannot speak freely you lose the ability to think clearly, but at least in this writer's thinking there must be some vetting of the continual hubris that emanates every day from 1600 Pennsylvania Ave.

Judge Brandeis in a 1927 concurring decision *Whitney vs. California* wrote the following: "The constitutional right of free expression is powerful medicine in a society as diverse and populace as ours. It is designed to remove governmental restraints from the arena of public discussion, putting the decision as to what views shall be voiced largely in the hands of each of us, in the hope that the use of such freedom will ultimately produce a more capable citizenry and more perfect polity and in the belief that no other approach would comport with the premises of individual dignity and choice upon which our political system rests."

Judge Felix Frankfurter in a dissenting opinion in 1971 *Organization for a better Austin Vs. Keefe* takes a slightly different view when covering the issue of Freedom of speech-

“To many the immediate consequence of this freedom may often appear to be only verbal tumult, discord and even offensive utterance.” He then goes on to say, ”That the air may at times seem filled with verbal cacophony is, in this sense, not a sign of weakness but of strength.” Speaking of hubris: tonight I not only disagree with a Pulitzer Prize winner but also a well-respected Supreme Court justice.

I truly believe that much more can be accomplished with well-crafted English and with the dissemination of good ideas. I am of the opinion that we can be positively effective with the ability to articulate ones thoughts in a civil manner. I am also of the opinion that mellifluous words- words that are pleasing to the ear- sweet flowing words will accomplish far more good than offensive gutter type slander.

I opened tonight’s paper with the comment that Lincoln’s Gettysburg address lasted a bit over two minutes and encompassed only 272 words. Here I am a half hour later – with many more words – my guess is that many of you will assign to me the phrase Lincoln used midway through the Gettysburg address: “the world will little note nor longer remember” what I said here this evening.”

Let me close with a thought for all of you who are interested in what inspires both the written and spoken word. I suggest a visit to Gettysburg and I suggest as James McPherson-author of Battle Cry of Freedom and a professor of history at Princeton says “go there at dusk and look out over the graves in the pastoral setting and it is there that

you will contemplate the real meaning of “that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion.” Something our present day leaders ought to consider

concerned the nation the man ever sympathised; and now the nation mourns for the man.

The day after his death, one of the public Journals, opposed to him politically, held the following pathetic and beautiful language, which I adopt, partly because such high and exclusive eulogy, originating with a political friend, might offend good taste, but chiefly, because I could not, in any language of my own, so well express my thoughts--

"Alas! who can realize that Henry Clay is dead! Who can realize that never again that majestic form shall rise in the council-chambers of his country to beat back the storms of anarchy which may threaten, or pour the oil of peace upon the troubled billows as they rage and menace around? Who can realize, that the workings of that mighty mind have ceased -- that the throbbings of that gallant heart are stilled -- that the mighty sweep of that graceful arm will be felt no more, and the magic of that eloquent tongue, which spake as spake no other tongue besides, is hushed -- hushed forever! Who can realize that freedom's champion -- the champion of a civilized world, and of all tongues and kindreds and people, has indeed fallen! Alas, in those dark hours, which, as they come in the history of all nations, must come in ours -- those hours of peril and dread which our land has experienced, and which she may be called to experience again -- to whom now may her people look up for that counsel and advice, which only wisdom and experience and patriotism can give, and which only the undoubting confidence of a nation will receive? Perchance, in the whole circle of the great and gifted of our land, there remains but one on whose shoulders the mighty mantle of the departed statesman may fall -- one, while we now write, is doubtless pouring his tears over the bier of his brother and his friend -- brother, friend ever, yet in political sentiment, as far apart as party could make them. Ah, it is at times like these, that the petty distinctions of mere party disappear. We see only the great, the grand, the noble features of the departed statesman; and we do not even beg permission to bow at his feet and mingle our tears with those who have ever been his political adherents -- we do [not?] beg this permission -- we claim it as a right, though we feel it as a privilege. Henry Clay belonged to his country -- to the world, mere party cannot claim men like him. His career has been national -- his fame has filled the earth -- his memory will endure to 'the last syllable of recorded time.'

"Henry Clay is dead! -- He breathed his last on yesterday at twenty minutes after eleven, in his chamber at Washington. To those who followed his lead in public affairs, it more appropriately belongs to pronounce his eulogy, and pay specific honors to the memory of the illustrious dead -- but all Americans may show the grief which his death inspires, for, his character and fame are national property. As on a question of liberty, he knew no North, no South, no East, no West, but only the Union, which held them all in its sacred circle, so now his countrymen will know no grief, that is not as wide-spread as the bounds of the confederacy. The career of Henry Clay was a public career. From his youth he has been devoted to the public service, at a period too, in the world's history justly regarded as a remarkable era in human affairs. He witnessed in the beginning the throes