

Department of State
Washington D.C.

The Lincoln Republican.

"The tendency of Democracy is 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.

LINCOLNTON, N. C., NOVEMBER 17, 1841.

VOLUME V, NO. 25.

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 continuance. Court and Judicial advertisements will be charged 25 per cent. more than the above prices. A deduction of 3 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 Globe. THE GENERAL IN ACTUAL COMMAND OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES OUT FOR THE PRESIDENCY.

We publish a voluminous circular from Gen. Scott, in answer "to many letters from as many different States," which terminates in this point:

"Finally, I am asked, if nominated as a candidate for the Presidency, would you accept the nomination? I beg leave respectfully to reply, YES."

This, we take it, brings the General politically into the field at once, and is the first instance in our country of the actual military chief becoming the chief of a party, and presenting himself sword in hand for the Presidency.

We presume this autograph lithographed letter was designed for "the public eye," and, if so, we must confess it is in honorable contrast with the policy of the party in whose principles it concurs, as exhibited in their last political campaign. It is explicit in its avowal of adhesion to the recent leading measures of Federal Whiggery, & does not palter, in a double sense; in any of its replies, or deny the responsibility of a candidate to develop himself fully on all subjects of public interest, and on which he may be interrogated. The letter is, however, a little mincing on the subject of Antismasonry, and shows a disposition to get the votes of the Antismasons by a conformity of his practice to their principles, without affirming their propriety. On all the measures of the late extra session, he seems to have taken the address of the Clay caucus for his guide. He is for expunging the power of the veto, and making the majority of Congress what the French Convention was—omnipotent over everything, Executive as well as Legislative—and, as a consequence, over the People. There is nothing left in the Constitution to arrest the determination of the party having the ascendancy in Congress and to refer the most dangerous measures to the consideration of the constituent authority, if the suspending power of the veto be stripped from the President. The constitution conferred this, not to defend the President, but the people, against the usurpations of the strongest department of the Government. It is the popular tribuneship engraved on the Presidential office, enabling the only functionary elected by the vote of the whole people, to delay the exercise of the highest powers of legislation, in cases in which he deems it proper that the public will should be consulted. This feature of the Constitution, as putting obstacles in the way of his dictatorial authority as a party leader in Congress, Mr. Clay denounced, at the close of the last session, in his Baltimore letter, and to expunge it from the Constitution, is the principal reform which the address put out by the Whig Caucus demands.

The General, it will be observed, also declares himself for the Fiscal Corporation, in the nature of a Bank of the United States, which he deems not only necessary and proper, but indispensable—for the Bankrupt bill, which we confess is a very natural consequence—for the Distribution bill, which is a kindred measure of all that appertains to the system of building up Debt, Bank, Tariff as the foundation of a Government sustained by moneyed interests, to put down Democratic popular Government.

The repugnance of the General to rotation in office is in keeping with the principle which would shut out popular influences from affecting the tenures by which the official corps hold the Government, & necessarily results in giving the great body of the public agents and their emoluments. This early movement of General Scott is evidently meant to give his strength to that portion of the whigs who have resolved to "head Captain Tyler." The General's motto is, undoubtedly, "head him or die!" and he has gallantly drawn his sword and thrown himself into the breach

in the moment of the universal discomfiture of Whiggery, to stay the progress of its triumphant adversaries. This is a well timed bringing up of the reserve on the part of the General. If the party rallies now, and makes head, the routed and desperate whigs, who have lost all under Mr. Clay's lead, must look to the General as the restorer of their battle. They must then drop the Dictator and take up the General.

United States Bank Verdict.—In the case of the United States against the Bank of the United States, in a suit to recover the sum of \$251,243 34/100, retained by the Bank out of the declared dividends upon stock owned by the United States, as an offset for commissions, losses, &c. in the negotiation of a draft of the Government upon France some years ago, the jury yesterday morning gave a verdict in favor of the United States for the amount claimed and costs.—*Pennsylvanian*.

The Philadelphia United States Gazette of yesterday says—

"A verdict was given yesterday in the United States Court, in the case of the U. States vs. the United States Bank, for plaintiffs, being a claim of about \$253,000. This action arose out of the first bill drawn by the United States Government upon France for the indemnity for spoiliations. This bill was purchased by the United States Bank, and when presented at Paris, there had been no funds provided by the Chamber of Deputies, and, unfortunately, the bill was at sight, otherwise the Government might have provided means; but it was protested for non payment, and returned. The Bank then charged the Government with the customary damages, & retained in settlement with the Government the amount of damages, and then this suit was commenced, and has been continued from term to term."

Some speculation has been indulged in as regards the effect of this verdict on some of the assignments, as the Government has always the first claim; but the defendants may appeal to the Supreme Court, and thus postpone such action.

Judge Baldwin (says the Ledger) decided the following points arising from the testimony in the case, which will be sufficient to show its general features:

1. That the United States were liable to the law of set-off like any individual; their sovereignty being parted with, *pro hac vice*.
2. That the claim of the defendant to damages must be governed by the laws of Maryland, the place where the bill of exchange was drawn.
3. That by this law damages were only allowable to the actual holder of the bill of exchange at the time of the protest, or to an endorser who has paid the damages sustained upon it.
4. That the Bank was not the holder of the bill at the time of the protest, nor an agent for the holder; and that no proof had been given to show that it had paid the damages sustained by the protest.

The defendant's claim for damages was therefore rejected by the court, and the jury gave a verdict for the plaintiff for \$251,243 54 damages and six cents cost.

Mexico.—The Vera Cruz dates are to the 8th October.

Santa Anna, having arrived at the Capital with his troops, on the night of the 2d September, about three o'clock, captured by assault the fort of San Francisco, one of the strongest holds of Bustamante, and also the fort of St. Geronimo. Most of the officers and men captured, immediately enrolled themselves among Santa Anna's party.

On the 2d, President Bustamante, with 1500 infantry and 500 cavalry, attacked one of the posts of Santa Anna, but being resisted by 500 men of the corps of Puebla and Largas, was repulsed with great loss, and retired, leaving on the ground his killed and wounded.

General Galindo, on the same day, with 700 men, abandoned the cause of Bustamante and joined Santa Anna. The Censor says that at the last accounts General Santa Anna had completed the besieging line around the Capital, with the prospect of its early surrender.

Baltimore American.

FOR THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN.

To the Rev. Jacob Brown Anthony.

DEAR SIR:—You seem not to hesitate a moment to represent your opponent as saying just what suits your purpose, and then you conclude with language which has become very common from being used so frequently by others. Episcopos assumes no more than the Bible does; for that shows us that the Apostles were a distinct order, having power over elders and deacons, as shown by the conduct of St. Paul and the command he gives to Timothy. I suppose you will admit, that Timo-

thy was ordained by St. Paul. If you will read the 1st verse of the 1st Chapter of the Epistle to the Thessalonians, you will find St. Paul mentioning the names of Sylvanus and Timothy in connexion with his own. Then, if you will turn to the 2nd Chapter, 6th verse, of the same Epistle, you will find that St. Paul calls these two persons, equally with himself, Apostles of Christ. In the 14th Chapter of the Acts, 14th verse, we have these words: "Which when the Apostles Barnabas and Paul, &c." Here then are two who are called Apostles in the Scripture; but I suppose that the Rev. Jacob Brown Anthony can easily show that the sacred writers have made a mistake in calling Timothy and Barnabas Apostles; for he has given certain rules by which we are to know an Apostle, I suppose it will be unnecessary to tell one who is such a thorough theologian that the word Apostle simply means one who is sent. The purposes for which he is sent must depend upon the commands he receives. Now that the Apostles were sent not only to preach and to be witnesses of the resurrection but to ordain others who should preach and ordain, is evident from the commands given to Timothy and Titus; and surely St. Paul knew for what he was chosen about as well as any person of the xix century, however learned he may be. He took the liberty of ordaining men, and left one of these men in Crete that he "might ordain elders in every city." You assert that Episcopos assumes, that Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus. St. Paul in writing to Ephesus directs his letters to Timothy, though a young man, and tells him how he is to govern elders and deacons. And some of the most ancient writers tell us this was the fact. Polyerates, who lived towards the close of the 2nd century, tells us that "Timothy was ordained Bishop of Ephesus by the great Paul. Eusebius says it is recorded in history that Timothy was the first Bishop of Ephesus. Epiphanius says, "The Apostle speaking to Timothy who was then a Bishop advises him, &c." Chrysostom says "Paul directs Timothy to fulfil his Ministry being then a Bishop." I think this evidence enough to counterbalance the assertion you have made; for I hardly think it will be believed that you know better than the historians quoted. But I must by no means pass over a great discovery you have made in Ecclesiastical history. You say "there were only thirteen sees in the Apostolic age; twelve of which were in the confines of Judea and one in all the rest of the world," and then you make quite a flourish about Melchisedek and predecessor and successor. Then all the historians from Eusebius down to the present day stand corrected by the Rev. Jacob Brown Anthony of the "Lincoln Circuit; S. C. Conference." Eusebius tells us "that John had Asia and died at Ephesus. Thomas received Parthia. Andrew received Scythia. Peter preached through Pontus, &c.; and was put to death at Rome" while but one of the Apostles remained in Judea and this was James who, according to Eusebius, was Bishop of Jerusalem. The translator of Dr. Masheim, the learned Lutheran Historian, tells us that the Apostles left Judea and preached in different parts of the world and that "James the younger spent his life in Judea and long presided over the Church in Jerusalem." Your stand among the learned as a Commentator will be as conspicuous as that of a Historian. You have given a fanciful exposition of St. Paul's Apostleship. St. Paul declares he was not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles; and in 1 Cor. xv. 8 v. he is not speaking of his qualifications for the Apostleship but to the appearance of Jesus Christ to him.

After showing, as you think, very conclusively, that the working of miracles, &c. was a peculiar part of the office of the Apostles, you conclude with the exclamation, "To what unenviable shifts are men reduced to support an unscriptural cause." This phrase "unscriptural" seems to be very convenient for you; but we do not think that it is correctly applied. If the argument of Episcopos founded on the fact that the power of working miracles was common to the laity and Clergy was unscriptural, why did you not clearly

show it to be so from Scripture. St. Paul tells the Corinthians that they "came behind in no gift" and in the xii Chapter of his 1st Epistle, he shows that the miraculous powers of the Holy Ghost were given to different persons. Philip was only a deacon; and he wrought miracles. (Acts xiii chapter, 13 verse.) Stephen, who was only a deacon "did great wonders and miracles among the people." (Acts vi, 8 verse.) Episcopos then had Scriptural authority for saying that the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost was not a peculiar mark of an Apostle, notwithstanding the positive exclamation of Mr. Anthony. But you tell us that laymen exercised the miraculous power given them occasionally. Where did you learn this? The Corinthians made such free use of their miraculous gifts that the Apostle had to give them rules for the exercise of their different powers. Will you be kind enough to inform me where St. Paul refuses to cure a disease from his want of ability? When the Saviour called the twelve, "He gave them power to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease" (Matthew xi.) And as St. Paul came behind none of them, be kind enough to point me to the place where he found himself unable to heal some diseases. You refer us to the place where St. Paul shows that no one individual was furnished with all spiritual gifts, but does this disprove that laymen had the power of working miracles? for this was the assertion of Episcopos. You give us an illustration to show that John Adams, &c. were successors in the Presidency of George Washington. How do you know this? Simply from the records of History. Now the records of the Church for fifteen hundred years bear testimony to the fact that the Bishops were the successors of the Apostles. And what have we to counterbalance this testimony? Why the simple assertion and interpretation of the Rev. Jacob Brown Anthony! You quote a few passages about the call of the Apostles and then conclude very dogmatically that "you care not where Episcopos goes for the proof of his position." Is there no possibility that you may not be right in your position and the interpretation you have given. Why did you not inform your readers, why they were called Apostles when they were thus chosen? As I have before observed the word Apostle is derived from the Greek word signifying "to send" or "one who is sent." Being sent out to prepare the way for their Lord, it was necessary for them to be clothed with miraculous power in order to be received as commissioned messengers of Jesus Christ. And do you think they were called Apostles because they worked miracles or that the name and power they received were inseparable? Do Episcoposians hold that it is essential for a Bishop to pass through the other two offices. We as republicans contend, that there is in this State several offices: Governors, Judges, Sheriffs; and would it be any argument against a Governor, that he had not passed through the grades of Judge and Sheriff! And is it a valid argument against Episcopos, that no instance can be shown where a Bishop passed through the grades of Presbyter or Elder and Deacon? But no! you will exclaim, the laws of the State no where declare that the Governor must do this. They have only provided, that these separate offices shall exist; true! and the laws of Jesus Christ no where declare that the Bishop must pass through the grades of Elder and Deacon, but simply show these offices exist; and the examples of Timothy and Titus and Barnabas show, that the divine right of Episcopos was divinely instituted.

Yours with respect,
ECCLESIA.

FOR THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN.
REPLY TO EPISCOPOS.

No. IV.

MR. WILLIAMSON:

We now propose calling the reader's attention to the call to, and qualification for the christian ministry, so far as they have a bearing on the question at issue; therefore, I select the following remarkable passage from the first number of Episcopos as the text. It is as follows: "That the inward movement of the Holy

Spirit upon the heart, producing an ardent love for Christ's Kingdom and for the salvation of men, is necessary to qualify a person fully and profitably to exercise the office of the ministry is admitted, but that this is necessary to the validity of ministerial acts we deny." That is, if I understand him, and I see no room to doubt a correct apprehension, a person may be a valid minister of Jesus Christ—a legate of the skies—a messenger sent from God for the reformation of the fallen and depraved children of Adam—commissioned to preach repentance, faith, love, obedience and the resurrection—and at the same time be destitute of the inward movement of the Holy Spirit, have no love for Christ's Kingdom, and no desire for the salvation of men!—Believe this doctrine who may, or who can, I humbly confess I am not yet prepared to receive it. As a community, I know not what we should deprecate more, than a formal, lifeless, Christless, and timeserving ministry; and yet this professedly christian writer would have us to be reconciled to this most blighting and withering curse.

The first and grand qualification for the christian ministry is holiness. Those who prophesy or preach, and those who bear the vessels of the Lord or dispense the sacraments, undoubtedly ought to be holy.—He who preaches repentance to others, should have an experience, full and complete in all the work of repentance unto life. Not only should he have the great deep of his heart broken up, and be brought to feel the exceeding sinfulness of sin, but he should also be brought to taste the joys of pardoning love. He should be justified by faith, have a work done for him, whereby he is brought into a state of favor with God—should be regenerated, a work done in him, whereby he is brought to the image of God. Of this great work of the Spirit upon the heart he should have an abiding evidence; he should be able to say, "I know that my Redeemer liveth;" or with Paul, "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God;" or with John, "We know that we are of God;" he should receive the spirit of adoption; the Spirit itself should bear witness with his spirit, that he has been born of God," Job xix. 25; 2 Cor. v. 1, 1 Jno. v. 19, Rom. viii. 15, 16.

He should look to the example and precepts recorded in the unerring Oracles, and shape his character accordingly. Enoch was a prophet, and walked with God three hundred years, and before he was translated he had the testimony that he pleased God; Heb. xi. 5, Jude 14. Noah was a preacher of righteousness and practised what he preached, for he "was just, and perfect, and walked with God," 2 Pet. ii. 5, Gen. vi. 9. The time would fail me to tell of Abraham, of the prophets, and of the apostles and evangelists, whose highest honor it was, to approximate as nearly as they could to the character of Him, who spake, as never man spake.

Take the following precepts among many others. "A bishop or elder must be blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre! but a lover of hospitality a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; holding fast the faithful word," Tim. i. 7—9; see also 1 Tim. iii. 2—7. The deacons likewise must hold the mystery of faith in a pure conscience, 1 Tim. iii. 9.

Now Mr. Editor, do these Scriptures give any countenance to sin in the ministry? You know they do not, and I have no doubt but both you, and your readers, so far as you reflect upon these things, (and who does not have his hours of calm reflection upon matters of such momentous importance?) you cannot but appreciate the value of a holy faithful, and self-denying ministry.

In the next place, the call to the ministry must claim a share of our attention.—And here, I must confess to you, Sir, that the reasoning of Episcopos is somewhat astonishing to me. If we take the first member of the sentence, which I have placed near the head of this article, and disconnect it from what follows, we are brought to the conclusion, that he believes the inward call of the Holy Ghost moving the heart of the preacher to take upon him the sacred office, necessary; but, as soon as

we add the last sentence, and then follow up his reasoning a little, we find him opposing the doctrine as sternly as if some vital point of his creed was at stake, and depended upon his success in proving the Spirit's operation upon the heart unnecessary to a valid ministry. The Spirit's agency in the call of a minister must either be necessary or unnecessary. If we join with Episcopos and say it is both necessary and unnecessary, we place ourselves in a singular dilemma; because then we create a new distinction which must run as follows: One class or order of ministry are moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon them the sacred office, they have ardent love for Christ's Kingdom, and an ardent desire for the salvation of men: but here is another class or order who have entered into sacred office, it may be to obtain a living, for worldly aggrandizement, having filthy lucre only at heart, a hireling who is intent on the fleece alone, cares nothing for the flock, a drunkard, a glutton, guilty of fornication, adultery and everything else he can do; and yet all his ministerial acts are valid—yes as valid as the acts of the most devoted Spirit-called, God-sent minister in the land, if he is but episcopally ordained! From such a soul-destroying, and God-dishonoring doctrine, good Lord deliver us.

But probably some may think this is misrepresenting the views of Episcopos.—Well, let us consult his expressed and published opinion, in his first No: "A magistrate," says he, "to perform fidei and profitably the duties enjoined upon him in the community should be a quiet and orderly man, but no one will contend that his not being so, renders invalid his official acts." Now be it remembered, that this sentence immediately follows the one at the head of this article, and is produced by Episcopos as a comparison, to show the validity of ministerial acts when performed by an unholty and time-serving minister.—But hear him a little further. "Man is simply the agent of God, to convey certain spiritual benefits to sinners. Sinners cannot be deprived of these benefits by the unworthiness of the agent."

However unwilling you may have been to believe that Episcopos was pleading the cause of a Christless ministry, I think he will force you to yield the point. But he is not through yet: hear what follows,— "Besides, Judas was an apostle appointed by our Lord, and hence a minister who could perform valid acts, yet Judas was a thief and a traitor." Are not these things enough to turn the cheek of darkness pale?

For a moment reflect upon the arguments of this pleader for sin in the ministers of God's sanctuary. Judas was a thief and traitor; but the inquiry is, whether he was a thief and traitor at the time that our Lord called him to the apostleship. Is there a single text that asserts that he then was a thief? Where may we find it?—But for the sake of argument allow that he was, (which, however we do not believe), and what will be the result?—Christ took a devil to be his minister, to perform valid ministerial acts—yes chose a devil to be his own familiar friend, and put confidence or trust in a devil! But if he took a devil for his friend, how dare Paul forbid the Corinthians "having fellowship with devils!" 1 Cor. x. 20. Again, the enemies of Christ asserted that he cast out devils through the agency of devils, but he roundly denied the charge. But if the doctrine of Episcopos be correct, that Christ sent Judas while a thief to preach his word and to cast out devils, the charge brought by his enemies was certainly correct, and for Christ to deny it, would have been to deny the truth! Again, when Christ sent his apostles to preach and cast out devils, he told them where they were not received, to wipe the dust off for what? Why, for not having received a devil.

This division of the clergy into Christ-sent, and man-made classes I most solemnly object to—it has no countenance from Christ whatever.

But were Episcopos to admit, (as every man ought,) that holiness was necessary in every instance as a qualification for the ministry, he knows full well, that it would snap his favorite chain of succession into numberless pieces. He admits (it would seem, barely,) that if they are called of God they can fitly and profitably exercise the office of the ministry, but that all their