

force of this passage as an argument for a non-teaching eldership seems to me wholly fruitless. The comment of those who would confine the double honour to maintenance still leaves the ruling and teaching distinct; and the view of those who find the contrast between labouring much and labouring little, is quite unapostolic, in allowing honour, and even double honour, where labour is confessedly moderate. Hence, the great body of Presbyterians have accepted the judgment of the Westminster divines in their form of church government, as given in these words—"As there were in the Jewish church elders of the people, joined with the priests and Levites in the government of the church, so Christ, who hath instituted government and governors ecclesiastical in the church, hath furnished some in His church, beside the ministers of the Word, with gifts for government, and with commission to execute the same when called thereunto, who are to join with the minister in the government of the church, which officers Reformed churches commonly call elders." The present writer looks upon this feature as one of the distinguishing glories of Presbyterianism; and he would humbly submit to this council, whether one great cause of the comparative vigour of the Presbyterianism in the English-speaking world is not due to the carrying out of these principles, while in some at least of the churches of the Continent, notwithstanding the equally clear testimonies of confessions and reformers, such views have been less prominent in the development of Christian life and action?

2. *The second distinctive principle of Presbyterian government, as contrasted with Episcopacy, is the equal rank of all church rulers.* The Episcopal view is presented in the English Prayer Book, in these words—"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's church—bishops, priests, and deacons." This threefold order is what Presbyterians deny. They admit deacons, but not as the starting-point of a threefold spiritual ministry, only as occupied with the poor and the "oversight of the outward business of the house of God;" and they wholly deny any superiority in office of New Testament bishops over the other spiritual rulers of the Christian church. Leaving the question of the place of deacons untouched, it will be enough to prove from the New Testament the equality of bishops and other presbyters. This identification is undoubted. The presbyters of the Ephesian church, called *presbuteroi* in Acts xx. 17, are in verse 28th declared to be *episkopoi*, "all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost had made you *episkopoi*," and not less in Crete, Titus, when left to ordain elders in every city, and instructed as to their qualifications, is expressly told that the presbyter is a bishop, "for a bishop (*ton episkopon*) must be blameless," etc. This unquestionable fact is candidly admitted by many Episcopalian writers—among others by Howson and Conybeare in these words, "These terms are used in the New Testament as equivalent."

PRESBYTERIANISM AND CONGREGATIONALISM.

Having thus set forth the difference between Presbytery and Episcopacy, it remains to touch on the one ultimate distinction which separates Presbytery from Congregationalism. This respects the area over which