

Department of State
Washington D.C.
The Lincoln Republican.

"Tendency of Democracy toward the elevation of the industrious classes, the increase of their comfort, the assertion of their dignity, the establishment of their power."

BY ROBERT WILLIAMSON, JR.

LINCOLN, N. C., NOVEMBER 10, 1841.

VOLUME V, NO. 24.

NEW TERMS OF THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN

TERMS OF PUBLICATION.
The LINCOLN REPUBLICAN is published every Wednesday at 2 50, if paid in advance, or \$3 if payment be delayed three months. No subscription received for a less term than twelve months. No paper will be discontinued but at the option of the Editor, until all arrearages are paid. A failure to order a discontinuance, will be considered a new engagement.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.
ADVERTISEMENTS will be inserted conspicuously for 1 00 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for each continuation. Court and Judicial advertisements will be charged 25 per cent. more than the above prices. A deduction of 33 1/2 per cent. from the regular prices will be made to yearly advertisers.

The number of insertions must be noted on the manuscript, or they will be charged until a discontinuance is ordered.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.
To insure prompt attention to Letters addressed to the Editor, the postage should in all cases be paid.

From the Village Star. HOLD THEM TO IT.

In the last fall campaign, when the Whigs were struggling for the power which they now possess, they promised, in the event of success,

BETTER TIMES.
They have now been in power precisely eight months, and have had a decided majority in both Houses of Congress, but still the promise is not redeemed. So far from improvement in this respect, the "times" have been growing gradually worse since the close of Van Buren's administration. Money is decidedly scarcer now, than at any time during the Administrations of either Jackson or Van Buren, and all the signs fully warrant the belief that we are yet to see the worst. Here is one promise which has wholly failed of redemption.

The same party promised the Agricultural and Mechanical portion, and the day laborers of the nation,

HIGH WAGES.
They were not, so long as Whiggery was in the ascendant, to work for less than "two dollars a day!" All the working men, if Whiggery triumphed, were to receive "High wages and abundance of work." Whiggery did triumph, but the promise is not yet redeemed.

The Expenditures of the Government were another point of attack. The people were told that Van Buren had squandered National Treasury—that profligacy and extravagance had signally characterized his administration. Give the Whigs power, and the people were promised,

REDUCED EXPENSES.
How has this promise been redeemed? They have called an Extra Congress at an expense to the nation of "Half a million of dollars"—they have voted to the wealthy Mrs. Harrison \$25,000—they have authorized "a Loan of Twelve million of dollars," which the people must be taxed to pay—and to raise the money necessary for this object they have levied a tax upon Sugar, Salt, Blankets, Molasses, all necessities of life, while they have left fiddle strings, jewellery, and all other kind of trumpery free of duty. Last year Mr. Van Buren spent \$27,000,000, and the reduction of the Whigs makes the expenditures of this year \$31,000,000!! Here then is another promise which has not been redeemed.

The magnificence of the furniture in the

PRESIDENT'S HOUSE
was another ground of attack upon the late administration. Did the Whigs, on coming into power, remove all that costly and regal furniture, and supply its place with other, correspondent to "the Republican simplicity" of the people? No. They appropriated \$6,000 to purchase additional furniture, that the President's House might be suitably and comfortably furnished.

They promised also that they would introduce a salutary Reform in regard to Proscription. If they should be elected, there would be no

PROSCRIPTION FOR OPINION'S SAKE.

How has this promise been redeemed?—By removing every capable and efficient Democrat who was in office, when they thought it could be done without injury to the Party. Gov. Gilmer declared a short time ago on the floor of the House of Representatives, "that this administration had removed more officers since it came into power, than Andrew Jackson and Van Buren had removed in twelve years!"—Each day's experience shows that they never intended to redeem that promise.

Here is a fair statement of some of their many promises, and of the manner in which they have been redeemed. Are the people—the voters and Tax payers satisfied? Have they realized by the change of rulers these rich blessings which were

promised! An indignant No! is the answer of all.

From the Mecklenburg Jeffersonian. THE BALL IN MOTION.

Our readers will recollect we some time since noticed the proceedings of a Democratic meeting in Person County, at which energetic measures of organization were adopted for the important political struggle which "comes off" in our State next summer. A meeting for a similar purpose has more recently been held by the Democracy of Franklin County, and as part of their proceedings, they propose the assembling of a State Convention of our party at Raleigh in January next, to nominate a candidate for Governor, and also express their preference for Louis D. Henry, Esq., of Fayetteville.

We are rejoiced to find our party thus early awake to the importance of redeeming North Carolina from the sway of Federalism. For several reasons, the next election for Governor and members of the Legislature will be a deeply interesting one;—and the great importance of the subject must be our apology for suggesting, for the consideration of our friends, a course of policy somewhat different from that proposed by the Democrats of Franklin.

Is a Convention to nominate a candidate for Governor necessary? If we should decide upon calling one, is it at all likely that a full representation could be obtained from all parts of the State? In answering these questions in the negative, we feel sure that we speak the voice of nineteen-twentieths of the Western Democracy. A Convention, to eventuate in any good to our cause, must speak the voice of our party in all sections of the State;—and experience has shown that the distant Counties—especially those in the extreme West, & which it is all-important to have fully represented—cannot be stirred up to send Delegates—the distance, and the inclement season of the year at which it is proposed to hold the Convention, being too strong preventive causes. How was it previous to the last year's contest, under the extraordinary excitement which then pervaded the country? In the Convention that nominated Judge Saunders, but a moiety in numbers of the heavy voting counties in the West were represented;—and, indeed, excepting a few Counties in the immediate vicinity of Raleigh, the representation was but partial, and in many cases, of Delegates casually in the City.—Can we hope for a better turn out in January next? We think not.

But there is a portion—and no considerable one, either—of our party that entertains strong objections to this mode of nominating candidates; and without discussing this point, we think their views should influence, to some extent at least, the action of our party. In regard to the selection of a candidate for Governor, there can be no necessity for the action of a Convention. The meeting in Franklin, we are satisfied, speaks the sentiments of our friends in all parts of the State, in their nomination of Mr. Henry. So far as a great portion of the West is concerned, we speak adversely, when we say that Henry's nomination is demanded by the unanimous voice of the Democracy. Let us, then, dispense with a Convention—let the Democratic Press throughout the State, and the people of the other Counties in their primary assemblies, respond to the nomination of our friends in Franklin;—let a full and complete organization, framed and carried out by the People themselves, be had in every County, and the political regeneration of our State will be as certain as that the day of election comes round.

Entertaining these views, and feeling an abiding and all-absorbing solicitude for the triumph of our party, and its glorious principles, in North Carolina, we have felt it to be our duty to speak them freely, and in time;—and we respectfully request our Democratic cotemporaries in this State to give us their response, yea or nay, at as early a day as possible. For, although the Democracy of the West prefer dispensing with a Convention, and leaving the nomination of a candidate for Governor, and the adoption of other measures of organization, to the people in their primary assemblies, yet they will doubtless cheerfully acquiesce in whatever measures may be found to accord with the sentiments of a majority of our party in the whole State.

Four dish-rag Governor, Mr. Morehead, takes the stump next Summer, he will have several handbags which he scattered in 1840 to clear up. That "golden plateau," which he said Van Buren sent five thousand dollars of the people's money to France to purchase, it is now admitted by the Whigt was purchased by President Monroe; and the defalcation of Swartwout, which Mr. M. made the burden of all his speeches against Van Buren, and the foundation of all his anathemas against the Sub-Treasury, it is also admitted by Whiggery, was a humbug, got up by "a clique in New York," evidently for the express purpose of deceiving the people.

Query: If Gov. Morehead knew these charges to be false, did he act like an honest man to give them circulation? If he circulated them through ignorance, is he a fit Governor for the people of North Carolina?—Jb.

THE ALLIES OF FEDERALISM.—The London Times denounces President Tyler for vetoing a Bank. That is all proper enough. The British aristocracy helped to elect him, and why should they not call him to account for not consulting their interest in his administration of the Government?

FOR THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN. REPLY TO EPISCOPOS. No. III.

MR. WILLIAMSON:
In my last number, I gave the prerequisites necessary to the office of an apostle, to which I will now subjoin the following remarks.

The word Apostle means one sent from or by another, on any business whatever. Of Apostles we have three orders, if you please, in the New Testament:—

1. Jesus Christ is the Apostle of God, and his only Apostle direct to the world John, xvii, 3, 8, 18, 21. xx, 21.

2. The twelve attendants, eye and ear witnesses of Messiah whom he commissioned first to the Jews; and Paul, whom he commissioned to the Gentiles, are the Apostles of Jesus Christ.

3. Those sent by men, by the Apostles of Jesus Christ, by the Churches of Christ—are also Apostles of men—Apostles of Apostles—Apostles of Churches. The last class (Apostles of Churches, see 2 Cor. viii, 23, Phil. ii, 25) may have successors, but Episcopal Bishops, so far as I have been able to learn, are not solicitous to be their successors.

The Roman and Greek Catholics made all hereditary official grace and authority flow in one channel; making Peter the successor of Christ after he was crucified; and Linus the successor of Peter after Peter was defunct; and so on in the Roman line, down to Pope Gregory XVI.

But, Episcopalians generally, give no precedence to Peter, as yet, as the vicar of Christ, "and regard all the thirteen Apostles as perfect co-ordinates: thus dividing into thirteen rivulets all that flows in one channel from the Tarpean Rock, on which stands St. Peter's Church in the eternal City, and the old-fashioned elbow-chair on which the Galilean fisherman used to sit while Cesar did homage at his feet."

In the Jewish Institution, the high priest and the common priests were of the same family, concerning whom Moses said much about office, prerogative and succession:—"Their anointing [or ordaining] shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations, Ex. xi, 15. Also see Num. xxv, 13. But Jesus Christ intimates nothing of this sort concerning the office of Apostles. In the absence of a divine right, or law, it may well be questioned whether inferential reasoning can justify an institution fraught with such serious consequences as the episcopal claim of a third order in the christian ministry.

But let us here enquire whether such a succession as the present assistant Bishop of Virginia contemplates would not be wholly anomalous on all other notions of succession in every other part of the government of God. The predecessor in every other line becomes extinct before there can be a successor. But in this we have predecessor and successor acting as contemporaneous co-ordinates! No doubt Episcopalians would be ready to cite as a precedent for this anomaly, the case of Timothy, Titus, Sylvanus, Andronicus, and others.

With regard to this class of inferior or sub-Apostles one thing must be conceded and that involves their pretensions in extreme jeopardy. It is this—their commission is not found written in the New Testament. If they are Apostles, in what chapter and verse shall we find their commission from the Messiah! These I regard not as co-ordinates of the Apostles, but as subordinate—Apostles of Apostles—initiating Evangelists—without a diocese, and without a permanent charge.

We here submit a few facts concerning Timothy, who according to Episcopos, was the diocesan Bishop of Ephesus:—

1. It does not appear that Timothy was in Ephesus when Paul addressed the Elders or Bishops of Ephesus at Miletum, Acts xx, 17—35.

2. The address itself proves that the Bishops of Ephesus (for in the original they are called Bishops,) were under no diocesan or Archbishop, and that the Church in Ephesus was constituted by the Apostle without any such superintendency.

3. Timothy was only left in Ephesus while Paul went over into Macedonia, and the first letter to Timothy shows that Paul wrote to him only to continue there for a time. Hence Timothy was never permanently located in any capacity at Ephesus. "Till I come" was the tenor of his ministry at that city; "but if I tarry long," says Paul, I instruct you how, you should behave in that Church, during my absence. All these particulars are not very flattering for a co-ordinate.

4. It is evident that Timothy did not continue in Ephesus; for he was with Paul in Rome, and is joined with him in his Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, written during his first imprisonment. Paul was more in Ephesus, it appears, than ever was Timothy.

5. Episcopos assumes that the second letter to Timothy was written to him while at Ephesus:—"The Epistles," says he, "are addressed not to the Elders, but to Timothy alone." But that he was in Ephesus is only an assumption—it ought to be proved. But, alas for episcopacy! it cannot be: for if Timothy were at Ephesus, then why should Paul have said to him in that letter, "I have sent Tychicus to Ephesus." If Timothy were the diocesan Prelate in that place, how dare Paul or any other man interfere so far, as to send another to take charge? Again, if Timothy had been at Ephesus, Paul would not have sent him to Troas for his books and parchments before his return to Rome.—It is all assumption and very improbable assumption. Now, let it be remembered, that Timothy not being at Ephesus when the second letter was addressed to him, there is no scriptural authority that he was ever in Ephesus after Paul's first imprisonment, or that he ever after officiated in any capacity at Ephesus.

6. The Epistle to the Ephesians, written some two or three years after Paul had left Timothy at Ephesus, affords not the least countenance to the opinion that Timothy was there, or then Bishop of that Church; for it has no allusion to him whatever. Is it not strange indeed, if, as Episcopos contends, he was Bishop of that place and had charge of the Elders, he should not be named in the Epistle to that church?

Without a waste of words, may we not say, that there is not the slightest scriptural evidence that Timothy was an Apostle of Jesus Christ, or that he was Bishop of the Church of Ephesus, in the Episcopal acceptance of the term?

With regard to Titus, it is needless to consume time; especially as Episcopos has not urged his claim so strongly, as the claim of Timothy. It is unequivocally evident that the unfinished business assigned him in Crete was by Paul expected to be soon accomplished; and, therefore, he was commanded to leave that place on the arrival of either Artemas or Tychicus.—His was a temporary employment in Crete.

In the next place it is abundantly clear that Titus was Paul's minister, or an itinerating Evangelist, and not a diocesan Bishop of Crete; for in 2 Cor. ii, 12, 13, he intimates that he expected him to minister to him at Troas. In 2 Cor. vii, 6—13 we find him waiting on Paul in Macedonia.—Again, we find him 2 Cor. xii, 18, Paul's minister to Corinth in reference to the collections for the poor. In 2 Tim. iv, 10, we find him on business for Paul at Dalmanis.

All these things, you know, Mr. Editor, are not very flattering to the claims of diocesan prelates.

The case of Timothy and that of Titus, together with the prelatial Angels of the seven Asiatic Churches, when candidly examined, afford no flattering encouragement to those who contend for diocesan episcopacy as a New Testament Institution.

Episcopos appears to me to confound the terms order and office, whereas, there is, to my mind, a manifest difference between them. This difference may be shown in the following manner:—

The word EPISCOPOS, signifies simply

an overseer, and is applied to any person to whom the oversight of any particular work was given, whether of a military, civil, or ecclesiastical character. When, therefore, the number of Presbyters was multiplied in any particularity, as at Ephesus, and there was a meeting for the transaction of business, it became necessary that some one of them should act as President or moderator for the time being; and from his holding this office, he was by way of distinction denominated the overseer or bishop, because he exercised a sort of oversight of the whole Church in that particular place. We may see the same thing exemplified in our own Church in this Town at the present time. We have three Elders or Presbyters belonging to the Methodist E. Church who reside in this place, two of them belong to the travelling ministry, and one of them to the local ministry. They are all of the same order, but do not all fill the same office. One of them is the Presiding Elder of the District who has the oversight of the twenty Elders, beside Deacons and Licentiate. It is his duty to preside in the Quarterly Meeting Conference of each Circuit—to take a general oversight of the whole Church within the bounds of his District—to see that the preachers whether travelling or local are faithful in preaching the word, and that those who have charge of Circuits strictly enforce the discipline of the Church. Now as to order, they are the very same, whether they be local or travelling Elders, but one for the time being has an official superiority over his brethren for the more convenient despatch of business. The same may be said of the Bishops or General Superintendants of the Methodist Episcopal Church, they claim to be of the very same order with their brethren, over whom they exercise an official superiority. The same might be shown by a reference to the proceedings of other ecclesiastical bodies, where they choose a Moderator or President at the meeting of their Synods; not that the Moderator is superior in order, but simply in office. Let these things be borne in mind and there is no difficulty in understanding how the term Bishop and Presbyter were applied to the same person in the primitive Church, but if we contend that Bishops were a distinct order from Presbyters it will be difficult for us to show why the same person had the generic names of two distinct orders applied to him.

In my next number, I will notice the call to, and qualifications for the Ministerial office, so far as they bear on this controversy.

Yours respectfully,
JACOB BROWN ANTHONY,
Lincoln Circuit, S. C. Con.

FOR THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN.
MR. EDITOR: Will you do me the favor to insert the following letter of Bishop Ives, in answer to a letter from Mr. Miller published some time since, accompanied by remarks of some writer signing himself "Presbyteros." The Bishop gives the reason why the answer has been so long deferred.

Yours with respect,
E.

NEW YORK, Oct. 21st, 1841.
REV. AND DEAR BROTHER,
Your letter, should have been answered on the day I received it, had it not found me in the House of Bishops, engrossed with the most urgent duties. Our Convention having yesterday adjourned, I am this morning, although much exhausted, at leisure, to communicate the required information.

It grieves me, not a little, on account both of Christian charity, and of that truth, in which Christian charity is said specially to rejoice, that Dr. Miller should have thought it necessary to use such asperity, and positiveness of assertion, in his communication. As to the Doctors asperity, I shall say nothing, but in prayer to God, that he may be brought to a better mind. In regard to his positiveness of assertion, I say the following.

My first position was that "Calvin favored Episcopacy." In support of it, I adduced Calvin's own words. And, now, that the people may see, that I was guilty of no unfairness;—I here repeat what he says on the point.

1. In his commentary upon 1 Tim. iv. 14, a passage so much relied upon by

Presbyterians—he gives an interpretation, which makes it perfectly consistent with the Episcopal character of Timothy.

2. In his commentary upon a text in the Epistle to Titus, he uses this language—"We learn, also, from this place, that there was not then such an equality among the Ministers of the Church, but that some one had the pre-eminence in authority and counsel."

3. In his commentary on Gal. ii. 9, he represents it as "highly probable that St. James was prefect of the Church of Jerusalem." Now, a prefect is a chief and permanent ruler of others.

4. In a letter to an old friend, who had become a Bishop in the Church of Rome (see DUKELL'S view of the Foreign Reformed Churches, page 162) Calvin expressly recognizes Episcopacy as of divine institution. His words are;—"Episcopatus ipse a Deo profectus est. Episcopi munus Dei autoritate constitutum est et legitimum definitum;—"He who is made a Bishop proceeds from God himself. The office of Episcopacy was established by the authority and regulated by the laws of God."

5. Finally, in his work de necessitate Reformandarum Ecclesiarum, Calvin holds this remarkable language;—"If they will give us such an Hierarchy, in which the Bishops have such a pre-eminence as that they do not refuse to be subject unto Christ, &c. &c. Then I will confess that they are worthy of all ANATHEMAS, if any such shall be found, who will not reverence it, and submit themselves to it with the utmost obedience." (See Joannis Calvinii tractatus theologici omnes, in unum volumen certis classibus congesti, &c. page 69.) The length of this and other passages has prevented my giving the original. The translation, however, I believe, will be found faithful.

The above testimony from Calvin's own pen, I shall not hesitate to consider sufficient with all candid persons, to justify my declaration that Calvin was favorable to Episcopacy.

My second position was that he endeavored to obtain Episcopacy from the English Church. My reasons are as follows:

1. Calvin desired, as is manifest, to retain the Episcopal regimen in his system of Church Government. See his explicit language in the confession of Faith, which he composed in the name of the French Churches. In the articles drawn up by the Delegates, of whom Calvin was one, to the Conferences at Wormes, by order of Charles v., are the following words—"Our learned men have expressly yielded ordination to Bishops." [See articles.] Calvin severely censures the Clergy of Colen, for endeavoring to put their head Bishop out of his place, inasmuch as he had declared in favor of reformation. [Vide Calv. Epist., page 517.] Writing to Ithavivus, a Polish Bishop, whom he styles illustrious, and reverend Lord Bishop, so far from advising him to lay aside his Episcopacy, he exhorts him to consider what place he holdeth, and what burden is imposed upon him. [Vide Johannes Calvinus illustri et reverendo Domino Jacobo Ithavio Episcopo Epist., page 287.] In his Epistle to the King of Poland, Calvin expresses his approbation of all the degrees of the Hierarchy of the Ancient Church; and he seems to advise the King to introduce the system into his own Dominions. [Vide Calv. Sereniss. Regi Polon.]

2. Having, by untoward circumstances, been unable to retain in the Geneva System the Episcopal regimen, Calvin made, as will appear from the following fact, an actual attempt at one period, to introduce the Episcopacy from England. This fact is related by the excellent and accurate historian Strype; a fact that has remained unquestioned for more than two centuries. "How Calvin stood affected in the said point of Episcopacy, and how readily and gladly he and other heads of the Reformed Churches would have received it, is evident enough from his writings and Epistles." (See Strype's life of Bishop Parker, page 69, 70.) "They (the foreign Protestants) took such great joy and satisfaction in this good King (Edward vi) and his establishment of Religion, that Bullinger, and Calvin, and others, in a letter to him, offered to make him their defender, and to have Bishops in their Churches, as there were in England; with a tender of their service to assist and unite together." (See Strype's memorials of Cramer, page 207.) This scheme seems to have been defeated by a forgery of the Papist. The last letter of Calvin on the subject was intercepted by Bonner, and Gardner, two Romish Bishops, who returned such an ungracious answer, as offended Calvin and led him to give up the project. This is affirmed in a paper in the hand-writing of Arch-Bishop Abbot, who was a friend to Calvin, and was apologizing for him in this very document; which was found in the archives at Lambeth. The subjoined is the Paper as published by Strype; (life of Parker, page 70.) "Perusing," says the Arch-Bishop "some papers of our predecessor Mathew Parker, we find that John Calvin and others of the Protestant Church of Germany and elsewhere, would