

THE GREAT MORAL TRIUMPH.

The elections which are now going on, and in which Pipelaying Whigery is universally routed, are not merely great political victories, but sublime moral triumphs, in which the foul and base practices of factious and corrupt politicians and the fraudulent part of the banks, with the Monster at their head, are all rebuked and chastized for their crimes, and driven into the obscurity from which they should never have emerged.

EXPLORING EXPEDITION.

The National Intelligencer of this morning copies the following news, omitting the last line of the sentence in italics.—Why was this? Is there any reason to apprehend, if the public were told that the ships were expected home before the appointed time, that inquiry would be made whether they were ordered home? Did Mr. Badger undertake to recall the expedition before it accomplished the objects for which it was sent? The exploration of the Northwest coast was one of the greatest importance.—Globe.

News from the Exploring Expedition.—Cape of Good Hope papers, to the 20th July, apprise us of the arrival at Table Bay of the United States ships Vincennes and Peacock; brig Porpoise, and schooner Flying Fish, constituting the American Exploring Expedition. The paper of the 20th says: "An American frigate is signaled, standing out to sea again." Probably the Constellation, bound to Saldanha bay. The Exploring Expedition remained at Table Bay, July 20th, but would soon sail for the United States, and may be expected home daily. This last intelligence we do not learn from the Cape papers, but from the Brooklyn News, which says it may be relied on.

THE WAY THE SPECIE GOES.

The money article of the New York Herald gives the following facts, which are worth a world of Pipe Laying speculation if the country would lay them to heart. "There was some drawing of specie from the debtor banks to-day for remittance, and the amount shipped will not be far from \$500,000. The Wellington has on board for London \$208,000. This is a mere trifle, however, and will in no wise inconvenience the banks, which are overflowing with specie, and must continue so to be, while the specie of the whole Union is driven here by the irredeemable currency of the South and West. The people of those sections continue to prefer the depreciated paper of fraudulently insolvent banks to the currency of the Constitution. The consequence is, that New York having a superfluity of specie, it goes to Europe, because it is more in demand there than in those States, where the community reject it in favor of bank rags; at the same time they complain of what they call high rates of exchange. Nearly \$50,000 arrived here yesterday from New Orleans, where the people tolerate the shimplasters."

Antouning Disclosure.—The Portsmouth (Va.) Chronicle says: We have it from an unquestionable source, that Mr. Secretary Ewing allowed one of his hopeful sons, a minor, not yet twenty-one years of age, the enormous sum of fifty thousand dollars for negotiating a million loan! Here is Federal economy for you—log cabin retrenchment, coon skin honesty, with a vengeance. We ask, what better is the act than downright theft? Can such infamous swindling receive the sanction and approbation of honest men? Baltimore Republican.

The following singular incident is related in the New Orleans Picayune of the 5th instant, the Editor of which vouches for its truth. "It appears that a young Spaniard was lying in the last stages of yellow fever, next door to the printing office of Mr. G. in Chartres street. The physician, Dr. B. was sent for, but, before his arrival, the young man had ceased to live, according to the opinions of those in the house, so that when he arrived he found his patient covered with a white linen, and reported as dead. That very evening they washed and cleansed the young man, and, having put on his burial dress, they laid him on his bed until the morning. In the morning a coffin was got, and all the necessary preparations were made. He was then taken and put in his coffin, but no sooner was he dropped in it than he jumped up, and asked where they were going to place him.—They then conducted him in a carriage to a colored nurse-woman's house. He is yet very sick, but may, perhaps, live.—It appears that he was in a state of lethargy."

FOR THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN.

REPLY TO EPISCOPUS. No. 1.

Mr. WILLIAMSON:—By your permission, I will make some remarks in reply to your correspondent "Episcopos."—Episcopos commences his first No. by stating and answering some objections, as he says, brought against the discussion of the subject of episcopacy. These objections lie not so much against the discussion of the subject, as against episcopacy itself.—His first objection—I say his, as Dr. Bond against whom he professes to write, did not make it—is, that the discussion is uncharitable. If Episcopos had said that the high exclusive claim of Episcopalians, alone to preach and dispense the sacraments was uncharitable, he would have made the matter much plainer than he has done, by saying the discussion is uncharitable. But why did Episcopos begin his number with this objection? From the commencement which he has made, we are brought to the conclusion, that he knew this christian community would feel that they were injured, and might resent with becoming firmness the usurpation of any man, or number of men, arrogating to himself, or themselves the exclusive privilege to minister in holy things. By resentment, we do not mean that they would employ improper tempers or words, but that they would firmly maintain the doctrines of the gospel, and resist the unscriptural encroachments of those who would cut them off from all participation in the benefits of salvation. But Episcopos professes to write against Dr. Bond's letter, and assumes objections which were never made in the letter; obviously to place himself on the defensive; as if Dr. Bond was entirely opposed to an investigation of the arrogant assumptions of prelacy.

But to convince us that we are certainly beyond the pale of the christian church, and have to share the unenvied mercies of God, he brings in the immaculate power of numbers:—"Nineteen-twentieths of the christian world are Episcopalians!!" And are we to look on that as an argument that the Episcopalians are the only people that the Lord has upon the whole earth? If so, Episcopos and Bishop Ives are at fault, for the Bishop said, "success was no mark that we are right." But it would have afforded me some satisfaction, had Episcopos descended to particulars. Who, think you, Mr. Editor, will Episcopos claim as brethren when his favorite doctrine of prelacy is to be supported? Gentle reader, have you commenced the calculation, to find what sects are to be accounted faithful? What sect shall we place first? Why, the Roman Catholics, to be sure. These, no doubt, are his brethren of the episcopacy. The old Reformers who sealed their opposition to the Roman Hierarchy with their blood and lives in the XVI century, never dreamed that their souls would become so jesuitical before the middle of the XIX century, as to claim the Roman Catholics for brethren—contend that orders is a sacrament—and even show a strong preference for the name "Catholic."

The effort of Episcopos under his second objection to bring scripture to the aid of his exclusive system, is, in my estimation, a failure. Let us examine his texts:—"I am God and there is none else." But does this text say he is the God of Episcopalians alone? Certainly not. Again, he quotes, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." But after all, this text does not say, that Episcopalians alone shall come to God the Father through Jesus Christ. Far from it. But again, he quotes, "Neither is there salvation in any other." Can it be possible that Episcopos intended to make the impression on the minds of his readers, by quoting this text, that there is salvation in the episcopal Church and in no other? If he did, it is a most daring perversion of sacred truth. And yet again; he quotes, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." Well, does this text show that God, is the God of the Episcopalians alone? No; nor does it say that they alone have the faith of the gospel; nor does it say that baptism can be valid, only when performed by Episcopalians, Catholics, and Co. Why then quote it to support, as he says, "an exclusive system?"

If, as I suppose, Episcopos is a Clergyman, his remarks under his second objection, on the unity of the ministry and membership of the church, come with a bad grace from him. Only, for a moment, look at the conduct of Episcopal Clergymen generally, and you will see the force of this remark. They do not exchange pulpits with ministers of any other denomination amongst us. So far as we in these U. States are concerned, it seems, christian Pastors, of other evangelical denominations may unite to preach Jesus and the resurrection to a lost and ruined world; but Episcopal Clergymen generally, say by their conduct, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou," Isa. 65: 5. Episcopos and his conditors talk of unity indeed! when they are so shut up in their own narrow—contracted view of things, as not to preach with ministers of other denominations who may agree with them in every cardinal point of christian doctrine, but differ with them on their unscriptural notion of prelacy!!—But, most likely, Episcopos means by unity, the unity of the English Church. He would have us understand that the Episcopal Church is united. Aye, that is it.—But what are the facts in this case? There are, and have been almost as many conflicting opinions in the English Establishment, as in the sectarian world for the same length of time. Some of them hold the very worst features of Romanism, while others demur and contend for the doctrines of

the Reformation. Some of them are sound Arminians, and others are thorough and decided Calvinists. Even the revered Clergy in the United States, belonging to the Protestant Episcopal Church, are not united. But we should not expect them to be united, when we remember that we were gravely told by the Right Reverend Bishop of North Carolina, in one of his recent discourses here on prelacy, that the 39 Articles of Religion in their Church were not binding on either Clergy or laymen.—Here, then, we have a Church claiming the unity of the gospel without a binding Confession of Faith!! But it seems all these incongruities, and this whole heterogeneous mass of conflicting sentiments, form the unity of faith and the bond of perfectness in the estimation of Episcopos.

In the next place we will give the remarks of Episcopos on Cor. 12: 28, a passing notice. He assumes three orders of ministers in the primitive Church, making the Apostles themselves an order in the Church distinct from the bishops and deacons. Might not one say there are seven orders in the Church—Apostles, prophets, evangelists, directors, bishops, and deacons, for the same reason that he asserts three? See Eph. 4: 11. But this is not the only assumption in the ground work of diocesan episcopacy. The apostles were in and of themselves all orders—not one of three, but three in one. They were for a time bishops, deacons, and every thing else that the Church in its infancy required. But before we proceed further with these remarks we wish to cite the reader's attention to a concession made by Episcopos in his first number. "We acknowledge," says he, "that the name Bishop was applied to the second order and convertible with presbyter." The Law and the Testimony, then, are on one side, and Episcopos, according to his own concession, on the other. But in his second number, he makes another concession, which, we think, does still higher honour to his candor.

He says, "No one doubts or questions that the place, or rather the office now held by bishops was then (in the Apostles' time,) occupied by Apostles. But after the death of the Apostles, it was agreed, while the office held by them should be retained, the name Apostle should be confined to the twelve &c."

These concessions are, to my mind, fatal to the claim of divine right for three orders of officers in the christian Church, and fatal especially to the cause of diocesan episcopacy. Only consider how much is contained in the facts conceded.

The facts are— 1. Bishop and Elder represented the same office in the apostolic age. 2. After the apostolic age, Elders lose the name Bishop, or it is taken from them altogether; and 3. Those divinely called Apostles being dead, a class of officers occupy their place under the name which was violently taken from the Elders; and now the Bishop is a successor, not of the first Bishops, but of the Apostles!!! Of what use, then, is the law or the testimony, seeing the names are changed, and a new appropriation unknown in that volume, has superseded the sacred style?

Had Episcopos, or, rather, those who introduced this new arrangement of three orders, retained the ancient names of apostles, bishops, and deacons, instead of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, the debate would have been simplified, the assumption would have been no less plausible, and the main issue would have been much more intelligible to the common people.

Episcopos seems to think however, that the name is a very immaterial part of this controversy; hence, he says, "the question is not about names"—"we care not by what name they (Church officers) are called"—"it was simply the name that was changed." &c. Gentle reader, there is more in a name than Episcopos would have you believe. The world is deceived by names and governed by names. Call a shilling a crown, a captain a king, a master a lord, and there is an end of all intelligibility. If your bishops, are apostles, your deacons evangelists, and your elders priests, you need not quote one passage from the New Testament. Of this, however, Episcopos appears to have been sensible; hence the babelism of his style, "the question is not about names"—"we care not for the name &c." Shall we say there is no difference between the Bishop of a Church and the Bishop of a State!!

In my next, I will examine the main argument of Episcopos, as contained in his first and second numbers.

Yours respectfully, JACOB BROWN ANTHONY. Parsonage, Lincolnton, N. C.

FOR THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN.

TO PRESBYTEROS.

DEAR SIR:—When I read the title of your piece, I expected to see some connection between a King and a Bishop; but as I found not the most remote allusion to a King, I concluded you had chosen your title to rouse the prejudices of the people, and to call forth feelings against a Bishop similar to those which exist in the country against a King. Inasmuch as we are arguing not for victory but for the truth, let us not descend to misrepresentation or abuse; for truth stands in no need of either; let us rather strive to place the argument on its true basis.

You say, that there was a commission given but to one order of Ministers, and that order was the Apostles. I suppose

you will admit that what the Apostles did, was done by the command of the Holy Spirit, and therefore if they gave a commission to any order or orders of Ministers, it was sanctioned by Jesus Christ. They themselves composed one order, in Acts xx, 28 verse, we find St. Paul commanding the Elders (Presbyters) to take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers (episcopous.) Here then was an order of Ministers who were appointed by the Holy Ghost, who composed an order distinct from the Apostles, and who are called Presbyters or Elders and Bishops. In the vi. Chapter of the Acts, we find the Apostles commanding the people to choose out seven men, whom they might appoint to the performance of certain duties; and these seven were called Deacons. In the viii. Chapter of the Acts, we find Philip, one of these Deacons, both preaching and baptising. We find our Saviour giving the commission you mentioned, and also saying "As my Father sent me, so send I you." And as His Father sent him not only to proclaim the truth but to appoint others to do it, so we find the Apostles not only proclaiming the truth but appointing others. Acting under their commission, they appoint two other orders; one called Presbyters or Bishops, and the other called Deacons, while they themselves composed a third. All Ministers then possessing the qualifications laid down by the precepts and example of the Apostles, have acted and are acting, under this commission; but I do not think that "it follows irresistibly" that every or any order of men who call themselves Ministers, "have equally the right to exercise the same powers that were originally given in the commission." But you say we must show the clause in the commission which restricts the right of ordination and vests it in the Apostles and no others, or we must "yield up the debate;" and you rush to a conclusion which exactly suits your case. We cannot assent to your logic. Let us try it in human affairs: A Minister is appointed to act as our representative in a foreign government. In his credentials nothing is said about others. These credentials only show that he is appointed. Another sets up a rival claim and demands of this Minister not only to show that he is appointed but that his appointment excludes all others. Would not this be an unreasonable demand? If it can be clearly ascertained that the government appointed but one Minister, and he can show that he is that Minister, then does not such proof necessarily exclude all others. Now if we show that Jesus Christ appointed but one order of men to ordain, and that this order retained this power for themselves and for those whom by the authority vested in them they made their equal, thus forming still but one order of men, does not such proof necessarily exclude others from the exercise of this power? But you say "in the very first ordination after the Apostles, not a single Apostle is found laying on hands," and you add "it is admitted by the ablest advocates on both sides of the controversy to be a regular ordination." Now, Sir, here I am in a dilemma. Either you have not acquainted yourself with the controversy, or you have misrepresented the fact. The ablest advocates on the side of Episcopacy, at least in the United States, deny that this is an ordination. Bishop Onderdonk, Dr. Bowden and Dr. Cooke, the ablest advocates on this subject in this Country, have denied that the instance referred to in Acts xiii. 1, 2, 3 verse is an ordination. How then could you say so positively, that the ablest advocates had admitted this to be an ordination? You must read others besides Dr. Miller of Princeton, before you make such sweeping assertions. Not only do these writers deny that the example you have adduced is an ordination, but St. Paul himself denies it in his Epistle to the Galatians, Chapter 1st, verse 1st; for in this place he declares he did not receive his commission by man nor of man. St. Luke denies it, for in the very next chapter (Acts xiv. 26.) he declares "from thence (Atalia) they sailed to Antioch from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God (not ordained) for the work which they had fulfilled." Moreover, both Paul and Barnabas are mentioned before this occurrence as performing the work of the Ministry.

Your next assertion is that Barnabas was not an Apostle, and then you represent him as uniting with Paul in ordaining to the Ministry. From thence you conclude, that this is sufficient evidence of others possessing the power of ordination. Being aware that some regard Barnabas as an Apostle, you lay down a certain test by which the claim to the Apostleship is to be tried, and conclude that the claim of Barnabas cannot stand that test. But notwithstanding your test, I think the Bible in plain terms declares Barnabas to be an Apostle. In Acts xiv. 14, it is written, "Which when the Apostles Barnabas and Paul heard of, &c." Here Barnabas is as plainly declared to be an Apostle as St. Paul. Again, St. Paul, speaking of Barnabas and himself, says, "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles. Here St. Paul makes no distinction between himself and Barnabas, but claims for both the same privileges as other Apostles enjoyed. These two plain instances drawn from the Bible, should be more than enough to counterbalance any test of Apostleship laid down by either Mr. Albert Barnes or yourself.

Yours with respect, F.



THE REPUBLICAN. LINCOLNTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1841.

The reply of Philo-aethes to the article of Dr. Bond, short as it is, must lie over till next week.

We respectfully give notice to those concerned, that the Theological discussion now going on through our paper must be concluded by the 1st of December next—or sooner if possible. Then Congress will meet, and its proceedings will demand a large share of our space—so large a share as to leave no room for lengthy essays on mooted points of theology.

SUCCESS OF THE SUB-TREASURY.

It is a fact which should be kept constantly before the people, that when the Independent Treasury system went out of operation, the Receivers General were able in a few minutes to pay over every cent of the public money in their hands to the agents appointed to receive it. This fact shows the complete success of the system, and consequently the folly of those who abolished it.

But how was it with the United States Bank? That institution ceased to be the fiscal agent of the Government more than seven years ago; and up to this day, the Government has never been able to bring it to a final settlement. It now owes the United States Treasury more than three hundred thousand dollars! and this sum will probably be entirely lost, as that institution is now notoriously insolvent.

These facts should not be lost sight of by the people.

ACQUITTAL OF McLEOD.

The trial of McLeod has come to a close; and, as was generally expected, that notorious individual comes out of the ordeal entirely unscathed. After the arguments of the counsel on both sides and the charge of the judge, the jury retired, and in 20 minutes returned with a verdict of "not guilty." He was then ordered to be liberated, and taken to the Canada line under the safe conduct of the Sheriff of Oneida county, or some police officer deputed in his stead.

This result removes one cause of apprehension of a collision between the United States and Great Britain. But is the matter to end here? Our soil has been invaded, one citizen murdered, and the property of another destroyed; and Great Britain has avowed that all this has been done by her command. Will not our Government demand satisfaction for the insult? Negotiations for the most ample reparation of the wrong should now be pressed; and if they fail, let there be an appeal to the last resort of nations. Our people are distinguished for their love of peace; but they prefer war—anything to national disgrace.

In the Charter elections of Connecticut, the Democrats have carried 48, and the Whigs 18, of the 66 towns heard from. This is one of the "glorious" 19 States that voted for Harrison.

Wm. B. Meares, a distinguished citizen of Wilmington in this State, died recently at the residence of Dr. Hawkins, in Warren county.

DEMOCRATIC HERESY.

The "whigs," while they pretend to be the only true Democrats, cannot avoid showing the cloven foot of Federalism sometimes. Thus, the New York Express, a leading Whig paper, in an article in which it is attempted to be proved that

the President in exercising the veto power should be governed by the decisions of the Supreme Court and not by his own understanding of the Constitution, says, in reference to Gen. Jackson's vetoing the United States Bank:

"This heresy was considered as characteristic of the arbitrary and despotic disposition of General Jackson; but it did not originate with him. Like most all other unsound and heretical political doctrines in this country, it came from Mr. Jefferson."

So it seems that this "Democratic Whig" attributes "most all the unsound and heretical political doctrines in this country" to Mr. Jefferson. From this it is evident that he believes, that "most all" the political doctrines originated by that great "Apostle of Liberty," and acted upon by the Republican party, are, "unsound and heretical;" and thus he shows his predilection for 98 Federalism. But if this Editor wishes to succeed, he should be cautious how he denounces Mr. Jefferson; for the people of this country ever will prefer what he terms the heresies of Mr. Jefferson to the high toned "orthodoxies" of the Federal school.

U. S. BANK. GOING—Gone!

A late number of the New York Evening Post says:

"We have frequently stated the day would arrive when the U. S. Bank Stock could not be given away—the period is rapidly approaching. The best offer for it at the stock board this morning was \$2 per share! It was offered at \$4, but no one was disposed to touch it."

And thus has turned out the "Great Regulator"—a mass of rottenness and corruption with which no one now seems willing to come in contact. Yet, strange to tell, there are men who, with the example of this rotten concern before their eyes, desire to see another such corrupt and corrupting institution fastened upon the country!

THE PEOPLE MOVING.

An unusually large and intelligent number of the freemen of Franklin county, assembled at the Court House in Louisburg, on the Tuesday of last Superior Court.—A set of spirited resolutions were proposed and passed, indicating a determined purpose to organize, in an efficient manner, the Democracy of the State at this important crisis—from which we select the following as worthy of the consideration and imitation of the Democracy in this section of the State.

Resolved: That we recommend to the good people of North Carolina to call a Convention in Raleigh on the tenth of the ensuing January; to nominate a Candidate on the democratic ticket for the Chief Executive Office of the State; and, while no doubt can exist, that there are many well qualified for that station, whom it would be our pride to support, we may be excused for expressing the partiality that we sincerely entertain towards the Hon. LOUIS D. HENRY of Fayetteville.

Resolved! That it is all important for the democracy of the State to be aroused to a sense of their danger, and awakened to the imperious necessity for instant and energetic action.

Resolved: That we recommend to the people of the County of Franklin, to hold a meeting in this place on Thursday of December Court, to nominate proper persons to represent us in the Senate and House of Commons of the next General Assembly of this State.

TRIUMPH OF THE DEMOCRACY. GEORGIA ELECTION.

The returns for Governor are not yet all in, but the Democratic majority may be set down at something over four thousand. Last fall, the Whig majority was over eight thousand. So that the recent election shows a Democratic gain in one year of over twelve thousand!

The change in the Legislature is astonishing. Last year the whigs had a majority of 3 in the Senate, and 33 in the House; making a majority of 36 on joint ballot. In the next Legislature the parties stand thus:

Table with 3 columns: Dem., whig., Dem. maj. Senate 57 35 22, H. of R. 119 88 31

Dem. majority on joint ballot 53— And a tie of one Senator in the County of Putnam.

PENNSYLVANIA. The Keystone State erect!

When we announced last week, that in a few days we should hear "the thunder of old Pennsylvania," we had no idea of the real extent of the storm that was raging there. That noble old State has indeed expressed, in a voice of thunder, her indignation at the detestable conduct of the Whigs, their unnecessary and unseasonable extra session of Congress, with all its batch of Federal measures, such as the loan bill,