

which both teaches and rules—there are names, and very strong exegetical and historical arguments on the side that denies that the verse makes any such distinction. We admit the force of much of what Mr. Stewart advances in support of his theory of the "ruling elder;" but is there not force in these facts against his position? (1.) The Westminster Assembly never gave its sanction to the distinction of teaching elders and ruling elders. (2.) The decisions of the Westminster Assembly on the Form of Presbyterian Church Government were in 1645 adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and are at present the constitution of Presbyterian Churches throughout the world. (3.) In proving a two-fold order of ruling and teaching Presbyters from this verse (1 Timothy, v. 17), one may prove too much; for thereby one proves that the ruling Presbyters should have an ample and honourable support. Double honour, *τιμης*, Theophylact and Chrysostom interpret, "liberal stipend." "And in this," says Bloomfield, "most of the recent Commentators are agreed; for from the consideration of the relief of the poor, the apostle proceeds to the support of the clergy." "From the general tenor of examples, as well as from the context, it is evident," says Alford, "that not merely *honour* but *recompense* is here in question." The Helvetic Confession quotes this passage as a proof of "the stipend due to Ministers." In his Institutes, Calvin says:—"The Apostle here refers not only to the reverence due to them (*i. e.* pastors), but to the recompense to which their services are entitled." Is the Church prepared to pay liberally for their work all its "ruling elders?" But to this issue, on the showing of these eminent commentators things must go if that verse teaches that "ruling" is the general work, of which teaching is a special function. But enough. In saying more than we intended on this vexed question, we only wish to obey the maxim, "*Audi alteram partem*," and to leave the decision with the reader after he has examined both sides of the question.

On another point, "the relation of Church and State," many of our readers will agree with what Mr. Stewart says, but some can not go as far as he goes.

"The different doctrines," our author says "held upon the relation between Church and State may be summed up in the following statements:—

1. "Church and State are identical.
2. "The Church is part of the machinery of the State, and is consequently under State control.
3. "The State is part of the machinery of the Church, and is consequently subject to ecclesiastical authority.
4. "Church and State are perfectly distinct and independent organizations."

The state of the question is well and correctly put in these sentences. Under the fourth head, however, there emerge three subdivisions, each of which is held within the bosom of the Canada Presbyterian Church. "Church and State are perfectly distinct," says one, and yet the State may pay ministers of religion, just as the State pays teachers of common schools, though the function of teaching is perfectly distinct from the legislative and executive functions of the State. "Church and State are perfectly distinct," says a second person, and though it is not wise or perhaps right for the State to endow the Church, it is the duty of the State to recognize the Church, to acknowledge its independence, to respect its righteous decisions, and to listen at times to its advice, just as it is the duty of the Government of Britain to recognize the Government of France, to acknowledge its independence, respect its lawful decisions, and listen at times to its remonstrance, though Britain should not in any shape or form subsidize France. "Church and State are perfectly distinct," says a third person, "and this to the extent that the State has no right to endow the Church, nor to recognize its existence save as it recognizes the existence of a railway company, which must be protected in its rights, and prevented from pushing them to the injury of its members." Mr. Stewart takes up the third of these positions, and defends it with acuteness and force. It is not our intention to debate the question here, as to which of the three positions is the correct