FOR THE REPUBLICAN STAR.

MR. SMITH,

Your correspondent on the subject of Episcopacy, has appeared once more in the Star of May the 27th; not, I presume, with an intention to answer the arguments of his opponent, but to amuse and divert the public from the true ground of controversy, viz. That Bishops are a divine order in the Church, distinct from Presbyters, to whom the right of ordination is committed exclusively; and that they have always been a distinct order by divine appointment, and not by the will of man. I have offered such proof to the contrary, as that gentleman allows to be respectable authorities, and they confirm the truths which I contend for. It is also plain, that your correspondent has not advanced one single argument, nor offered even the slighsest proof to invalidate that doctrine—for the confirmation of which, I have offered Lord King, Calamy, and Dr. Kemp as evidences. I have since added Dr. Cave, to the number of witnesses. (See the Star May 27th.)

I shall now add the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Maryland; who, by consequence, prove the point which I wish to establish. They, having voted their thanks to Dr. Kemp for his sermon preached before them, which contains the truths for which I contend, viz. That Bishops and Presbyters were not originally distinct orders, and by calling for a copy of that sermon for publication, they have adopted it, and the sentiments contained therein, as their own. Your correspondent will find that it is more than he can do to remove this cloud of witnesses out of his way, and until it is done, he will but *fight as one that beateth the air.*

Permit me, sir, to offer another truly respectable witness on my side of the question. His testimony cannot be controverted—at least by none who can read Greek (and I presume your correspondent can). The evidence I shall offer here is St. Paul—It will be found in the 20th chap. of the Acts, and at the 17th verse, that those "*Elders*," or Presbyters whom the Apostle *called* from Ephesus to *Miletus* are addressed by him in the 28th verse by the appellation of *Overseers*, or Bishops. Now as it is allowed on all hands, that Elders and Presbyters are synonimous, as is also Overseers and *Bishops*. Hence it is evident, the Apostle uses the terms indifferently and promiscuously, meaning by Bishop, Presbyter, and by Presbyter Bishop. This is so plain a case, that it might be thought impertinent to say any thing more upon it. This is the ground I have, and still mean to defend; and until it is made fairly appear that it is not tenable, that ordination which originated with the late Rev. John Wesley, will stand as firm as *the everlasting hills*—at least as much so as that which originated in the British Parliament; as that did which my opponent wishes to exalt above his neighbours. But we shall keep him upon an equality, let his efforts to the contrary be what they may. Every reader must see that his endeavors to raise himself and his Church above others, must be more replete with force than is discoverable in the following question, (which he calls the previous question) before he will obtain his end. He asks, "Was the late Rev. John Wesley a Bishop in any sense which Episcopalians can admit." Shall I be permitted to answer this question (which he thinks so important to his cause) by asking another: Is Bishop Celghett "a Bishop in any sense that" Roman Catholic "Episcopalians can admit?" No, sir—and that gentleman knows too little of the controversies in the General Church, to write on Church affairs. If he does not know that the Church of Rome does uniformly declare that there is no orderly Episcopacy in any of the Protestant Churches. Now, sir, does it not follow of consequence, that if the Methodist Episcopacy must fall because other Episcopalians will not admit its validity, the Protestant Episcopacy must also fall, because Roman Catholics say it is spurious? The argument is equally strong in both cases. Then it may be seen how easy it is to retort this gentleman's questions with double weight upon his own head. I I have said above, that Bishops were Presbyters, and Presbyters Bishops, according to St. Paul's view of this subject, which I further prove then in his charge to Timothy how to judge of persons and cases, and especially of the ministers of the Church. Two orders only are mentioned, (1. Tim. 3. chap.) Bishops and Deacons. Now to suppose that Bishops and Presbyters were not the same order, is to suppose the Apostle guilty of an unpardonable omission of duty, in giving no directions with respect to Presbyters; whereas on the other hand, if by them Bishops we understand the same order of officers with the Presbyters here spoken of, and consider the words Bishops and Presbyters as only different names to point out the same persons, the reason why two orders only are spoken of is plain and natural. And upon this it is proper to take notice of the perfect harmony there is between this interpretation and the Apostle Paul himself; who, when he left Titus in *Bute* to "*Ordain Elders in every city*," writes to him to acquaint him with the qualifications that ought to be found in those who were to be constituted Bishops, evidently using the words Presbyter and Bishop as signifying the same order of church officers. And that gentleman will be constrained to acknowledge that he has undertaken to defend a cause that is not defensible, when he considers the 1st chap. of St. Paul's Epistle to Titus, particularly the 5th, 6th and 7th verses, where he will see all that I contend for clearly proved. Now, sir, will it not appear to all who shall take pains to consider those scriptuaes, that St. Paul uses the terms promiscuously, meaning by Elder Bishop, and by Bishop Elder or Presbyter? I hope your correspondent will treat the Apostle with more civility than he has shewn to Mr. Wesley, when he comes to explain those scriptures.

P. S. After I had written the above, having looked in the Star of June 10th, I observed my opponent had come forward in his usual way, with bold assertions, bitter sarcasms, but no argument, no proof for any thing whereof he affirms. Your correspondent has produced a quotation from Dr. Linn. Why the Doctor should write so, I know not; nor am I sorry your correspondent has produced it at this time, as it fully proves that Mr. Wesley was what I contend he was, an Apostolic Bishop. The Dr's. words are "How vain in Mr. Wesley, a *Presbyter*, a Christian Bishop, &c." Hence it is clear that Dr. Linn holds Presbyters and Bishops to be one and the same order; and if three Bishops are necessary to create one; as the Dr. has asserted, there will be no dispute as to the succession being broken in the time of Queen Elizabeth, as it is well known that Queen Mary put all the Protestant Bishops to death, and we do not know that any of the Popish Bishops turned Protestants; nay, we are sure that none did, unless the Bishop of Landaff might, and it is far from being clear that he did.

Hence my opponent will see how little his cause will gain by Dr. Linn—no more than his friends gained by his political pamphlet.

FOR THE REPUBLICAN STAR.

(Concluded from our last.)

MR. SMITH,

The next quotation is from a letter by the late Rev. Mr. Jarratt, of Virginia, written in 1794, to a friend of his. Mr. Jarratt, it ought to be observed, was a clergyman of the Episcopal Church of undoubted piety and zeal, and before the Methodists separated from the Church, he so far favored them as to be thought by some, though very unjustly, to be too partial to them. The extract is as follows:

'O'Kelly does great things in the divine way, and I dare say he will make 'Asbury's *Mitre* set very uneasy on his 'head, so as to give sensible pain to his 'heart, and it may be to such a degree, 'that he may sincerely wish Dr. Coke 'had never given him *a Mitre* at all.—'Indeed I never expected that Mitre 'would set easy for any considerable 'length of time, as it was but a cobbled 'piece of work at first—and Dr. Coke 'was the principal agent. The divisions 'and animosities now subsisting are 'greater, perhaps, than you can conceive, and yet all these may be but the 'beginnings of sorrow. In a word, I 'have seen and heard so much of the '*party* zeal, *party* interest and *party* 'spirit of the people called Methodists, 'and the nefarious methods made use 'of to put down one and set up another, 'that I really doubt whether there would 'be any propriety in giving them the 'epithet of a *religious society*. Not 'that I doubt but there are numbers of 'good people among them. What the 'end of these things may be I know 'not.'

Both this and the quotation from Dr. Linn are from works which have been published within the present year, and have been known to me not more than a week or two. They are brought forward without any intention to irritate or grieve, merely to diminish that wonder and those objections which may arise in the breasts of some upon a question so novel and unexpected among us.

I have to conjure the gentleman whom I have undertaken to answer, to act the part of simplicity and uprightness. I will indulge the opinion, that he will not pursue the same course with Dr. Phœbus, when reduced to the same situation. "I have had strong desires," says the Doctor, 'for some years past, as I loved 'your forms, doctrine and government, 'to spend the remnant of my days in 'serving your church in some humble 'parish; but a difficulty insurmountable was in the way, that of disallowing 'my former administration, and to graduate as though I had never been a 'minister of Christ, and in so doing 'bear witness that all the worthy men 'engaged in the same cause were rash 'intruders like Corab, Dathan and Abiram!" This was extremely unworthy of a man who, professing to be a minister of the gospel, ought to have known, that it is to Christ and his Church alone that Christians owe supreme allegiance, and not to any sect or party of men, under whatever name or profession. He had fergotten the scripture which saith, (Rom. 3. 4.) "Yea, let God be true, and every man a liar.'

Mr. Smith, I care not to truuble your readers by a direct refutation of erroneous assertiens made by your correspondent respecting myself, respecting the Church of England, or the Society to which he belongs. The attentive reader will easily correct these mistakes for himself. But as he has gone about to disparage the *Episcopal Succession*, I cannot pass over the subject, without expressing my astonishment, that a gentleman undertaking to write upon the Christian Priesthood, should think to invalidate the source from whence it originates, or the channel through which it is conveyed. He differs, I assure him, from all the most respectable writers on this subject, Presbyterian as well as Episcopalian. I could shew him that *Lord King* (the very man whose authority he builds so much upon) asserts the succession in direct and explicit terms: He will find this in the 12th and 13th pages of his *Primitive Church*. In truth, the business of defending the succession properly belongs to him, if he would pretend either to Episcopalianism or Presbyterianism. At all events, should he finally oppose it, he will have the harder and Herculean work of subverting it by proof and argument. The steps he has taken will advance him nothing. His quotations from Dr. Chauncy and Dr. Calamy shew only what is readily allowed, that there has been some dispute with respect to the *precise order* in which the four first Bishops of Rome succeeded one another; but with regard to the *succession* itself in that Church, and that in the line of *Bishops*, all the first writers are agreed in maintaining it.

Bishop Stillingfleet retracted at a maturer age what he had written when young, relative to the successien: and in a sermon of his, delivered at a public ordination, there are these remarkable words. Speaking of the seven churches of Asia, he says, "The *Bishops* succeeded the *Apostles* in the government over those churches." And again—"There is as great reason to believe the *Apostolical succession* to be of *Divine institution* as the Canon of Scripture, or the observation of the Lord's Day."

Bishop Hoadly (who has also been mentioned by our writer) it is to be lamented, was extremely inconsistent with himself: and though, in his *Defence of Episcopal Ordination*, he adduced arguments sufficient to prove that "Episcopacy is of Apostolic Institution," yet he afterwards made concessions which went to destroy the whole force of his own writings. Dr. Calamy is not the only writer who was fortunate in such an antagonist. If the Bishop's writings have rendered no other substantial service to the cause of Episcopacy, they have certainly rendered this; that they have produced the ablest defence of it from other pens: especially from *Mr. Law*, (the author of a well known book, *A Serious Call*,) in a series of letters; not to mention strictures of a later date by Mr. Danbury, in his admirable work called *A Guide to the Church*. In both these the reader will see the weakness of the Bishop's conduct very properly exposed.

I have been drawn insensibly to say something of these writers, though contrary to my first plan, and as it appears to me hardly in order. This gentleman will remember, that I early told him, that neither *King*, *Calamy*, *Chauncey* nor *Kemp* would avail much to his purpose. The last of these is happily alive, and able to speak for himself. This I doubt not he will very readily do. Though, I may be permitted to say, that it can hardlp be necessarv, to satisfy any persen who has read the sermon referred to, or been acquainted with the author of it,

It is but just to remark to this gentleman, that it is a bad sign for a writer, especially in the beginning of a controversy, to have recourse to mangled and imperfect quotations to support his own opinions, as is certainly the case with regard to Dr. Kemp and his sermon.—To throw off every appearance of design or a disingenuous line of conduct, this writer has only to declare explicitly and decidedly for the ordination—by BISHIOPS or—by PRESBYTERS (for a compound of the two, or a mean between them is impossible on scriptural principles): and having then but one point to establish, he may argue with openness, with clearness, and candour.

Wishing him, very heartily, the same which I implore for myself.—"a right judgment in all things." I remain

A CHURCHMAN.

ERRATUM.

For "*ingenious*" in the beginning of the part published last week, read "*ingenuous.*"

From the Trenton True America.

The following paragraph was handed us for publication on Saturday last:—

'On Tuesday last came on at the 'circuit court for the county of Burlington, before the chief justice and by 'a special jury—the trial of the action of 'Miss Mary F. Stockton against Thomas Hopkins for slander—this interesting cause lasted until two o'clock 'of Friday—when after retiring for a 'short time, the jury returned a verdict 'for the plaintiff of five thousand dollars being the full amount of the damages laid in the plaintiff's declaration.'

To the above it may not be improper to add, that Miss Stockton, the plaintiff is daughter of lawyer Richnrd Stockton and Mr. Hopkins some time past the keeper of a boarding school in and near this city—that the action was brought for words uttered by the defendant respecting the conduct of the plaintiff while at his school—the cause was argued by Messrs. Griffith and Hopkins for the plaintiff, and by Messrs. Leake and Dallas for the defendant—Mr. Hopkins being a man in low circumstances, his sentence probably amounts to imprisonment for life!—What a contrast is there between this verdict and a judgment rendered in that county some time since—Richard Stockton's daughter recovers five thousand dollars for words spoken against her character—Judge Tucker recovered one dollar when waylaid, assaulted and beaten! We have not heard the names of the Jury, but must confess our astonishment at the political complexion they are said to bear—*eleven* federalists *one* republican—in a cause between a man of Mr. Stockton's standing and influence, and a man almost unknown in the state—in a county where the current would naturally run very strong in favor of the head of his party and his profession, and would be urged on by the strenuous exertion of the most persevering and influential man in the county—under such circumstances, it was expected the jury would have been composed of men of different political sentiments, that the prosecutor might not have every advantage over the prosecuted, and that not only the result might be righteous, but the *appearance* of partiality avoided—why it was otherwise we cannot tell, nor do we know before what judge the jury was struck. We understand the evidence and arguments were taken in short hand, and the whole trial will shortly be published. People can then form their own opinion of this, to us, incomprehensible issue.

We copy the following from the London Morning Chronicle, of February 18, 1806. *Aurora.*

"*Public office, Marlborough street*—A gentleman at the west end of the town, yesterday made an application to the magistrates of police, to have a servant who had offended him impressed. The magistrates ordered the man to be brought before them, in order that a charge might be made formally against him before his face, and that then, if he thought proper, he might have an opportunity to enlist voluntarily."

We often hear Englishmen asserting that in Britain there are *equal laws for all*—that it is never in the power of the rich to oppress the poor. To such men, we recommend the above paragraph.—A *gentleman's* servant had *offended* him, he applies to the magistrates to have him impressed for the *crime*—of *offending a gentleman!* In the *cant language* of British magistrates—they sent for him, that he might have an opportunity to *enter voluntarily*,—such infernal hypocrisy, is more detestable than the most summary punishment. *Off with his head*, in the language of an eastern *despot*—is not more fatal, than this *voluntary* entering.

We will acquaint our readers with the meaning of the term. On being brought before the magistrates, the poor wretch would be informed that he must be sent to the *receiving ship*—the consatble is ready to take him to the tower—but he may enter voluntarily—if he refuses the latter, *conscious* that he deserves no punishment—he is immediately seized and conveyed on board—the dreadful crime of *having offended a gentleman* is sent as *his character*, the severest disciplinarians are sought out for him—to his former crime is now added that of refusing to enter *voluntarily*—he is now put to the most laborious duty, the cat-o'-nine tails, of the boatswain and the rattan of the officer, is wantonly and barbarously applied for every mistake. Far from his wife and children, the poor wretch for no other crime than that of *offending a gentleman*, drags on his torments, till some merciful bullet puts a period to his existence! In this manner are hundreds of volunteers annually made. Say, you asserters of the equal laws of Britain, would the *gentleman*, be impressed for *offending* his *slave*. How then are the laws equal?—the truth is, that the system of British cruelty is more dreadful than that of Turkey—but without Turkish honesty.

GENERAL ORDERS.

Head Quarters, St. Louis,
1st March, 1806.

At a general court martial held at the city of New Orleans, by order of Lt. Col. Freeman, on the 4th of January last, and continued to the 6th of the same month,

Lieutenant Alfred Sebastian, of the U. S. 2nd Reg. Infantry, was tried on the following charges.

Charge 1st. For contempt to Lieut. Baldwin, your superior officer, when on parade, on the 20th May, 1805.

Specification. In ordering the band to cease playing, and the retreat to be beat, in violation of a garrison order of 27th May, 1804, regulating the evening parade, while he was on parade, inspecting the company to which he was attached.

Charge 2nd. For ungentlemanly and unofficer-like conduct.

Specification. For having Lieut. Baldwin arrested, and brought before a General Court Martial upon charges which you are not able to substantiate, and which he made appear to the court were malicious and false.

Lieutenant Sebastian being arraigned plead not guilty, and the court passed the following sentence (viz.) The court after weighing the testimony for and against Lieutenant Sebastian are of opinion that he is not guilty, and do acquit him with honor.

The General approves the foregoing sentence, and orders Lieutenant Sebastian released from arrest.

(Signed)
JAMES WILKINSON,
Inspectors office St. Louis,
March 1st 1806.

The foregoing is a copy from the original on file in this office.

(Signed) THOS. H. CUSHING,
Adj. and inspector.

Our federalist are mere drivellers in calculation, especially when they wish to excite wonder and astonishment in the midst of the multitude who are unacquainted with the power and magnitude of numerical calculation. As proof of this, we adduce the following as a case in point. SIXTY TONS of silver, say the federalists, have been sent to France to purshase the Floridas. SIXTY TONS of silver! This quantity of the precious metal is to be sure, somewhat sounding to those who have rarely in the course of their lives seen more than five pistareens together. But the idea is a beggarly one. It does not embrace a wider range in the internal field of human imagination, than the calculations of a school boy just emerging from the four first rules. In a word, it is the language of Mathematicians, *indefinitely* little when compared with the following articles. For example; suppose that those sixty tons were to be made into leaves after the manner of the Gold Beaters—they would cover the whole surface of the earth—and if those leaves were cut into strips, they would form a girdle equal to *Jupiter's Belt* or *Saturn's Ring*. Again if this quantity of silver, admitting it to be equally ductile with gold, was drawn into wire of the size used in making gold thread, it would form a radius that would sweep a circle larger than is contained in the whole heavens on this side of the fixed stars, the diameter of which could not be passed over by a body moving with the velocity of a cannon ball, in less than *seven millions of years!*——And lastly if this quantity of silver was coined into pieces as large as Dr. *Niewenty's* particles flowing from a burning candle, it would take to all eternity to count them! How vast the speculation—How immense the appropriation—it is equal to 2000 times the sum given by the Gen. Assembly to Mr. Wolcott, for his services, at *odd spells*, in setling the accounts of this state with the United States—or about *one fourth part* of the mentioned debt, created by that admirable scheme of finance, the funding system.

[*True Rep.*]

COMMUNICATION.

To remove and keep clear of bed-bugs.

Aloes of the Succotrina kind, to be had from most druggists and apothecaries, dissolved in any kind of spirit to the consistence which may be applied to the joints and crevices of the bedsteads, or elsewhere with a feather, will certainly kill and remove them. About an once of aloes, in a gill of spirit, will clear several bedsteads, and the cost be but a few cents. It is a good method to mark the bredth of a finger with the solution round each foot of the bed-posts.

POTATOES.

As the usual season for planting potatoes is now coming on, it may not be improper to advise the strewing Plaster of Paris in the rows as soon as they are dropped, & before covering them. This practice, from repeated experience, has been found to promote the growth of the plants, to cause them to come up quickly, deep green color; and also to increase the quantity and the goodness of the crop. If the potatoes be cut, the seed may also be plastered before planting.

There is a person now living at Leicester, who is supposed to be the heaviest man ever known in this kingdom. His name is Lambert; he weighs upwards of 46 stone, or 644 lb. and is only 43 years of age.

[*London paper.*]

THE EDITOR OF THE STAR
Has just received his Spring Supply
PRINTING PAPER,
And will thankfully receive the orders of a generous public.