

"hence that all elders were bishops and all were to feed the flock *with knowledge or instruction*." But if the terms elder and bishop are used interchangeably in the New Testament to denote the same person, as is now universally admitted, a ruling-elder may as properly be called bishop as presbyter. Besides to feed the flock—two cognate words in the Greek—is not to be limited to feeding *with knowledge*, which is not the Apostle's expression, but it denotes the whole duty of a shepherd, including both government and instruction. Indeed, in the figurative use of the verb, the prominent idea is government, as may be seen in 1 Peter v. 2, 3; Psalm lxxx. 1, 2; Ezekiel xxiv. 23, 24; Revelation xix. 15. Government is also the prominent idea in the passage under consideration, as the elders were to act as *oversers*, and especially to guard against doctrinal error and schism as its consequence; evidently by subjecting to severe and effectual discipline men who should enter in, or arise among themselves, "speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." Hence as feeding includes teaching, and especially ruling, the elders in their collective capacity, in which alone they were competent to exercise discipline, were exhorted to "feed the Church of God."

3. There are two facts which *incidentally* furnish additional proof that only some ruling elders taught in the Apostolic church. One is that ruling elders who taught were entitled to adequate and even generous support from those for whose spiritual welfare they laboured. This is stated in Galatians vi. 6; 2 Corinthians xi. 7-9; and in 1 Corinthians ix. 13, 14. The last quoted passage conveys also the idea that they were to devote their whole time to their work. Now it is incredible that a *plurality* of elders in every congregation, no matter how small, could find employment in preaching, and also adequate support in the small and poor congregations formed by the Apostles and scattered throughout the heathen world, especially as one pastor is now competent to preach to a large congregation, and as he generally finds it difficult enough to obtain a respectable subsistence. But the difficulty is at once removed by supposing that one ruling-elder in each congregation taught, while the others only ruled, generously and gratuitously devoting spare time to their important work. Another *incidental proof* is that one elder in each of several congregations is designated by a particular name, conveying the idea that he occupied a peculiar position, and was specially charged with the publication and defence of sound doctrine. In the three first chapters of Revelation we read of an *angel* of each of seven churches. These chapters, if *viewed independently* of all other Apostolic teaching, can be made to prove either Prelacy or Presbytery, only by assuming on either side what amounts to begging the whole question. If diocesan Episcopacy was the Apostolic form of church government, the angels would represent Prelates, and if Presbyterianism was the Apostolic form, the angels would represent Pastors or ruling-elders who taught. But as all must admit that the Apostles appointed elders in every congregation, and entrusted to them the entire government of the church—Acts xx. 28; Titus i. 5; 1 Peter v. 1-4—and that there is not one instance of their appointing a diocesan bishop or indicating his qualifications or duties, we are bound—interpreting the symbolic passage in Revelation in accordance with numerous plain dogmatic and historical statements—to understand that the angel in each of these churches was merely the Pastor. Now this