

# 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.

LINCOLN, N. C., DECEMBER 1, 1841.

VOLUME V, NO. 27.

## 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 1/3 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.

#### MR. NICHOLSON, OF TENNESSEE.

The brief speech of Mr. Nicholson at the festival given to Mr. Polk, condenses very strongly some parts of the political conduct of the late Cabinet, and their Whig friends, to whom they owed their stations. We think it would do good if the Democratic press would spread his testimony of the doings under his eye at Washington before their readers.

#### Correspondence of the Knoxville Argus.

NASHVILLE, Oct. 25, 1841.

You will find in the Union an account of the dinner given to Gov. Polk last Saturday, at the Nashville Inn. The Governor's speech was the best I ever heard from him. It will be reported at length hereafter. Mr. Nicholson also made a short speech at the table, in reply to a toast complimentary to the Democratic portion of the Tennessee delegation in Congress, a hasty report of which, as I presume none will appear elsewhere, I take pleasure in sending you for publication.

Mr. Nicholson said he had much cause to regret that the lateness of the time as well as the arrangement of the committee would not permit him to do more than to tender to his friends present his warmest acknowledgments for the compliment, unmerited as it was, which they had just paid to him. He would have been pleased at an opportunity to review with some care the leading measures of the late extraordinary, and to Federalism disastrous, session of Congress.

(The cries of "go on," "go on," from the crowd rose so loud and enthusiastic, that Mr. N. continued his remarks.)

He said he would not resist the calls of his friends to proceed, but he should not pursue the course of remarks which he would have followed under more favorable circumstances. He would add nothing to the very able and eloquent review of the measures of the extra session which had just been made by Governor Polk. During the few moments he should address his friends, he would hold up other matters to their view, connected with the new Administration.

Mr. N. said, that he considered it susceptible of demonstration that every profession and promise which the Whig orators made to the people during the canvass for the Presidency in Tennessee had been grossly violated by the party since they came into power. He had borne a humble part in that canvass, and he felt assured that he understood the leading professions by which they had obtained the confidence of the people. He would be fully borne out by all present when he asserted that much capital had been made by attributing to the Democrats the odious doctrine that "to the victors belong the spoils," and by promising to refrain from that abuse. He asked, if all did not now know that that promise had been most shamefully violated. He asserted that proscription for opinion's sake had been practised since the 4th of March last with a most unparagoned and cruel hand. Not only had honest, faithful, and capable officers been removed on account of their politics in every section of the country to make room for hungry office seekers, but in some instances old veteran patriots, who had risked their lives in battle for their country, had been cruelly proscribed for the heinous sin of being Democrats.

He referred to the heartless course of that butcher, Ewing, as he had been termed, in removing honest officers to make places for brawling politicians. He said that it was not surprising that Mr. Ewing knew so little about the condition of the Treasury Department—his time had been too much employed in proscribing honest officers and rewarding partisan friends, to allow him to attend to the duties of his office. He referred to the character of Mr. Ewing's report to Congress, pointed to its blunders and stated the fact that Mr. Ewing had himself made a supplemental report admitting an error of

half a million of dollars. He next referred to the proscriptions in the Post Office Department by Mr. Granger—he said that Mr. Granger had carried on a brisk business in removals, averaging over one hundred per week, and always taking care to appoint first rate Whigs, and very often the very worst men he could select. He said it was found towards the close of the session that Mr. Granger was calling on Congress for nearly half a million of dollars, to get this department out of debt; nobody at Washington was surprised at all who knew how busily employed the Postmaster General had been in the "glorious" work of reforming postmasters and clerks, and no one was astonished to hear that his Department was deranged and in debt.—He believed it was notorious that Mr. Granger had not spared time from his daily business of deciding the claims of applicants for office, to make settlements with those postmasters removed; he had understood, and had no doubt of the fact, that very many of the postmasters removed had money in their hands, which they were anxious to pay over, but Mr. Granger could not find time to receive it. He had seen an advertisement of one of them in the papers, notifying Mr. Granger that he had a considerable sum of public money, and requesting him to relieve him of it.—It was not strange, said Mr. N. with such a Postmaster General, the Department should be in debt, and that it should be quartered upon the Treasury.

Mr. N. said he should not pursue the subject of proscription through the other Departments—he regarded it now as fully settled by the practice of the party in power, that the officers of the country are rewarded by them as spoils to be fought for in elections.

Mr. N. next referred to the clamor which was raised in the Presidential election on the subject of extravagance in the expenditures. He said, no one present could have forgotten how economical the Whig orators promised to be when they got into power. They denounced the wastefulness of Mr. Van Buren, and promised great retrenchment; all would remember how industriously the misrepresentations of Mr. Ogle as to the White House had been circulated; he would not speak harshly of Mr. Ogle as he was dead—but his inventory of the royal splendor of the palace was fresh in the minds of all. Well, said Mr. N. he had been in the White House and his Whig friends might be surprised to be told that all the splendid furniture was still there—there were the looking glasses "as big as a poor man's plantation," there were the gorgeous curtains, the candelabras, the chandeliers, &c., above all, there were those famous "gold spoons," all, all were still there in the use of the Whig President—but that was not all; he said that six thousand dollars had been expended since the Whigs came into power to add to the furniture of the White House. Who, said Mr. N. did not suppose, during the canvass, that those evidences of royal extravagance and splendor would be "proscribed" by the economical Whigs; but not so; they were still in the White House, & there, they would remain.

Mr. N. said, it would be remembered that the Whig orators had relied upon the gross amount of the annual expenditures to sustain the charge of extravagance against Mr. Van Buren. They had promised to bring down these amounts by vast retrenchments to the standard of the "economical" administration of John Q. Adams. They contended that fifteen millions of dollars, annually, would be enough for them when they got into power. Well, said Mr. N. we can now bring these promises to the test of experience. Provisions for the expenses of the year have been made, and instead of fifteen, we find them very near thirty millions for the first year of Whig economy. This, said he, is an increase of nearly eight millions over the expenditures of the last year of Mr. Van Buren's administration, and nearly double the amount which we were promised would be sufficient. The Whigs had professed to be much in favor of "low taxes and high wages"—we had already the proof of their love of "low taxes" in the new Tariff bill, which has been so ably dissected to-day, and we had no doubt, that we should find their professions in favor of "high wages" equally fallacious. He should be greatly disappointed if the taxes were not raised still higher, and the expenditures swelled still further in the future policy of the party, if Capt. Tyler did not head them.

Mr. N. said, that he would not pursue the subject of broken promises further, as he knew he was violating an arrangement of the Committee. He would be glad, however, to say something in defence of Captain Tyler.

(The cries of "go on," "go on" were again renewed with great warmth.)

Well then, said Mr. N. I will "go on" a few moments longer, and trust the committee will pardon me. He said, that it was clear that Captain Tyler was not "headed," but he was greatly mistaken if another celebrated Captain was not. If the Whigs were correct in attributing their late disastrous defeats to Captain Tyler's ve-

toes, then we must admit that he is an exceeding great Captain. But the Whigs who entertain such opinions, do Mr. Tyler too much credit. As much as Mr. N. approved and applauded the two vetoes, he could not admit that they were the main cause of our late astounding victories. He attributed these victories to the effect produced upon the public mind by the system of measures adopted at the extra session.

Mr. N. said, he had heard some surprise expressed at the fact, that in the late elections there was a great falling off in Whig votes, whilst there was but a small increase of the Democratic votes over those of last November. The Whigs seemed to be surprised that so very many of their friends were absent from the polls at the late elections. He said, it was true, that great numbers of them did come up missing at the late election, and he should be as much surprised, if every man of them were ever again heard of—he did not believe that they had ever lived except in the shape of Pipe Layers, and he had no idea that they could ever be found so long as the elections were conducted with any thing like honesty. Pipelaying had, no doubt, turned out to be a very expensive business. It certainly had been carried on very extensively, and he had believed for some time, that if all the illegal votes could have been purged in the Presidential election, that Mr. Van Buren would now be the President. But as things had turned out, the Pipe Layers had got their reward, whilst their employers had reaped nothing but disappointment and exposure.

Mr. N. said he would not trespass longer on the patience of his friends; he begged pardon of the committee of arrangements for having violated their wishes, in saying a few words in compliance with the call of his friends. He would tender a sentiment, which he was sure would meet a hearty response from all present. It was—

The Federal Constitution; As it was made by Washington and Madison—as it was expounded by Jefferson and Jackson; Nor as it would be made and expounded by a Congressional caucus dictator.

#### From the Mecklenburg Jeffersonian. DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION.

We mentioned in a brief paragraph in our last week's paper, that the Democratic State Central Committee had issued a Card, calling a Convention of our party to meet in Raleigh on the 10th January next, to nominate a candidate for Governor, and to adopt such other measures of organization as will prepare us for the conflict in North Carolina next summer. The article counter to this project, which appeared in our paper of the 2nd inst., was prompted not only by our own views on the subject, but also by the expressed sentiments of a large number of our most intelligent and influential political friends in this section of the State. It was intended, however, merely to throw out suggestions for the consideration of our party in other portions of the State, and to ascertain their views on the subject of a Convention.—The call of the Central Committee sets this inquiry at rest, and we now buckle on our armor, and call upon our Democratic friends in Western North Carolina to prepare for duty.

The Federalists in our State may bluster and boast of their strength, and the harmony and firmness of their party;—their friends did the same previous to the late elections in New York, Georgia, Maryland, &c., and we now see how much Democracy need fear such artillery—what little credit is due to Whig boasting. And we are well satisfied, from the tone of popular sentiment in Western North Carolina;—from the numerous and important defections from Whiggery that we hear of almost every day, that union and concerted and vigorous action on the part of the Democracy, are alone needed to redeem our State from the sway of Federalism. Why should it be otherwise, when State after State, whose citizens were even more enthusiastically wed to conquering Whiggery in 1840 than our own, are deserting the standard of the piebald faction, and ranging themselves under the spotless banner of Jeffersonian Democracy? North Carolina is Democratic by an overwhelming majority, when a fair expression of the political opinions of her voters can be had. This our opponents know; and hence their efforts at humbugery and false issues—hence their party drill and secret clubs to spread false charges and mislead the ignorant and unthinking. They are organized like a band of well-disciplined soldiers.—We must meet them by organization, by concert of action, and now is the time to commence the work.

We call upon our friends in the Western Counties to prepare for the conflict. Let us have a full representation in the Convention at Raleigh on the 10th January.—Every County should be represented.—Look at our opponents: they are active and persevering—ever ready to give a few days and suffer a little expense for the advancement of their bad cause; and cannot we, who are engaged in a good and glorious work, emulate their example in these particulars? We should remember that

"eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and that no people can be free long, who entrust the guardianship of their rights and liberties in unfaithful or incompetent hands.

Up, then, Democrats!—call public meetings in every County without delay, and appoint Delegates who will go to Raleigh to represent you. If none can be got to go who are able to bear the expense, let the necessary sums to carry them to the Convention and home again be raised by contributions; by all means, let us have a full Convention to speak the voice of the whole State.

Since the above was in type, we received in the Raleigh Standard of Wednesday, last, the following notice:

"State Democratic Convention.—The Secretary to the late Central Committee of the Democratic Party of North Carolina, having conversed with many of the most prominent individuals in our ranks, called a Convention, to meet in Raleigh, on the 10th of January ensuing. Since the call of the said Convention, he has conversed with others, who differ in regard to the place at which the Convention shall meet. He has requested us to withdraw said notice, and state that when the place shall have been designated, he will give notice thereof."

The location of the Convention being thus unsettled, we would beg respectfully to urge upon our eastern friends the importance of bringing it farther West than Raleigh—say at Salisbury. The reasons in favor of this location are numerous, and must be too obvious to need discussing.

#### FOR THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN.

#### TO EPISCOPOS.

DEAR SIR: Some weeks ago you published an article in the Republican which I intended to notice before now, but circumstances, beyond my control, prevented me. You say, in that article, "There is one writer (who flourished in the fourth, and in the 1st part of the 5th century) who is frequently quoted as favoring Presbyterian ordination; but if the writings of St. Jerome be examined, he will be found an advocate for Episcopacy." You then quote one or two passages upon which you seem to rely as proof of your assertion. Now, sir, Jerome is remarkably explicit on this point; he gives his opinion clearly and fully about Episcopacy. Hear his language, "Let us diligently attend to the words of the Apostle, saying that thou mayest ordain Elders in every city, as I have appointed thee. Who, discoursing in what follows, what sort of Presbyters are to be ordained saith, if any one be blameless, the husband of one wife, &c., afterwards adds: 'For a Bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; a Presbyter, therefore, is the same as a Bishop; and before there were, by the devil's instigation, parties in religion, and it was said among the people, I am of Paul, and I of Apollon, and I of Cephas, the Churches were governed by the common council of Presbyters.' Now there is no reason to suppose, as you have done, that this change took place in the government of the Church by Bishops instead of Presbyters, when this dispute first arose at Corinth. Jerome does not say it did; and as proof that he did not mean it did, he quotes scripture, that was written after the first Epistle to the Corinthians, to prove the identity of Presbyters and Bishops in the Apostolic Church. The whole tenor of Jerome's remarks, on this point, forbids your construction of language. Jerome's object is to show that among the ancients, the Apostles and primitive Christians, Presbyters and Bishops were the same; but you make him say, that among the ancients, they were distinguished, Bishops were superior. His meaning evidently is, that this change was made after the Apostles' days. Jerome says again "If any suppose, that it is merely our opinion, and not that of the Scriptures, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same, let him read the words of the Apostles to the Philippians, Paul and Timothy, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, that are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons. Philippi is a city of Macedonia; and certainly in one city there could not be more than one Bishop, as they are now styled. He says again "It is written in the Acts of the Apostles, that when the Apostle came to Miletus, he sent to Ephesus and called the Presbyters of that Church, to whom,

among other things, he said, "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, over whom the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops." Here observe diligently (he says) that calling together the Presbyters of one city, Ephesus, he afterwards styles the same persons Bishops. These things I have written to show, he says, that among the ancients Presbyters and Bishops were the same. "But by little and little, that all the seeds of dissension might be plucked up, the whole care was devolved on one." As, therefore, the Presbyters know, that by the custom of the Church, they are subject to him, who is their President, so let Bishops know that they are above Presbyters, more by the custom of the Church, than by the true dispensation of Christ." He denies that Deacons are an order of Ministers altogether. He says "Who can endure it, that a Minister of tables and widows, should proudly exalt himself above those, at whose prayers the body and blood of Christ is made." Here Jerome teaches that Deacons were appointed to attend to the secular matters of the Church, and not to preach the gospel. Such, sir, are some of the sentiments of Jerome on the subject of Episcopacy. Do you say that he here advocates Episcopacy? He does indeed advocate an Episcopacy; but it is an Episcopacy devised and brought in by man, to remedy schism. And like many other man inventions, it has been a most prolific source of schism; ever since its introduction into the Church, it has been a bone of contention. What a lesson has God taught the Church in this instance? The very remedy has fed and nourished the disease; the antidote has become the poison.

Several distinguished Episcopals have frankly admitted that Jerome taught the identity of Presbyters and Bishops in ancient times, Apostolic times, and that Bishops, as now styled, came in afterwards. Bilson, Willet, Dr. Saravia, Jewel, Morton and Whitaker, all admitted it. With what grace can Episcopos, in the face of it all, assert that Jerome is an advocate of Episcopacy?

You say again, Sir, "Here then we have the united testimony of the historians of the Church for the first four hundred years, that the Christian Church in Europe, &c. was governed by three orders of Ministers." This assertion is truly amazing!!! I do not suppose you will find many, even of the most rash and bigotted of your sect, who will go as far as this. The great Chillingworth has learned to speak much more modestly and cautiously on this point than Episcopos, it seems. He says, "I, for my part after a long and (as I verily hope and believe) impartial search after the true way of eternal happiness, do profess plainly, that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my feet but upon this rock only, viz: the Scripture. I see plainly and with my own eyes Popes against Popes; Councils against Councils; some fathers against others; the same fathers against themselves; the consent of the fathers of one age against the consent of the fathers of another age." Dr. Sherlock says "The fathers many times contradict themselves and each other." But Episcopos says, "We have their united testimony for four hundred years. Now, sir, who is entitled to our confidence, Chillingworth and Sherlock, or Episcopos? How do they read so differently in the same books and writings? Will Episcopos explain this point? You find the fathers all united; Chillingworth finds them divided. How is it!

You say again, "If the Bishops owed their disjunction to their ambition, would we not have some evidence left us on the pages of history of their usurpation? Here you press the idea that we have no record in history of any complaints of the usurpation of Bishops. Your Bishop, before you, did the same thing; he boldly asserted that there was not a syllable of any complaint of aggressions by the Bishops any where to be found. These assertions are wonderful, coming as they do, from the mouths of Christian Ministers. That impartial historian, Dr. Mosheim, says, speaking of the arrogance and ambition of the Bishops of the 3rd century. "This is testified in such ample manner, by the repeated complaints of

many of the most respectable writers of the age, that truth will not permit us to spread the veil, which we would otherwise be desirous, to cast over such enormities of an order so sacred." Is there no complaint here? How have you gotten over this plain passage of history? Is the historians entitled to no credit!

Hermas says, "As for those, who had their rods green, but yet cleft; they are such as were always faithful and good; but they had some envy and strife amongst themselves concerning dignity and pre-eminence."

Cyprian says of one, who had been made Bishop, "Instead of using violence, as a certain person in this case hath done, to be made a Bishop, he suffered violence, &c." He says again, "Unless you can think him a Bishop, who, when another was ordained by sixteen of his brother Bishops, would obtrude upon the Church a spurious and foreign Bishop ordained by a parcel of renegades and deserters; and that by canvassing and intriguing for it." Is there nothing like ambition and usurpation recorded here by Cyprian? Gregory Nazianzen says, "These conveyors of the Holy Ghost, these preachers of peace to all men, grew bitterly outrageous and clamorous against one another in the midst of the Church, mutually accusing each other, leaping about as if they had been mad, under the furious impulse of lust of power and dominion. This was not the effect of piety, but of a contention for thrones." "Would to God there was no prelate; no prerogative of place; no tyrannical privileges; that by virtue alone we might be distinguished." Now, sir, with these facts before you how can you so repeatedly and so positively assert, that no such facts exist. This is what we have not yet been able to explain satisfactorily to ourselves. We cannot see how Christian men can conscientiously make such statements; but we forbear, hoping that you may clear up the matter.

#### PRESBUTEROS.

#### FOR THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN.

#### REPLY TO EPISCOPOS. No. VI.

MR. WILLIAMSON: In pursuance of our design we are now to investigate the claims of high Churchmen to the support of the first and purest ages of Christianity.

St. Barnabas, St. Clement, Hermas, St. Ignatius, and St. Polycarp who immediately succeeded the apostles and wrote previously to the time of Justinian are called Apostolical Fathers; and those who succeeded them beginning with Papias and Justinian down, we suppose, till about the fourth century were called Primitive Fathers. However, we are not able to say what year the title was withheld, nor whether all who wrote in favor of Christianity within the prescribed time were called Fathers.

Let it be borne in mind that the doctrine of prelatis is, that Christ instituted an order of ministers in the Church superior to the order of presbyters, originally called apostles, but subsequently bishops, and that these are invested with the exclusive right of ordination and government. We have seen that the word bishop and presbyter are used interchangeably for the same officer in the Church. This is admitted by the most learned high Churchmen themselves. Still they maintain that the Church received prelacy from the hand of Christ—and that it is of divine right. To prove this they go to antiquity, and allege that the Church practised this form of government "for fifteen hundred years;" that "all antiquity" is in its favor. The process of argument is to begin with the fourth or third century, and proceed up to the time of the apostles. But in this process the whole force of their reasoning depends upon the erroneous assumption that the grades of the ministry were originally what they find them in the fourth century. In opposition we allege that nothing like English prelacy was known in the Church for at least two centuries after the apostles.

1. We find during the period mentioned, that the terms bishop and presbyter were used in the same sense in which they were employed in the apostolic age.

In the epistle of Clement Romanus, we have the following:—"The apostles going