

1. There are passages in which *teaching* and *government* are spoken of as functions not necessarily connected but belonging, in some cases at least, to different individuals. In Romans xii. 6-8, we read of different persons having different gifts. Among these there is a distinction between one that *teacheth* and one that *ruleth*. According to the structure of the passage, as the careful reader—especially of the Greek—can easily see, these belong even to different *classes*. In 1 Corinthians xii. 28, in a list of persons having different gifts or functions; there are *teachers* and *governments*, and these two separated by several intervening gifts. The objection to these two passages, that some of the gifts were extraordinary, is not valid; as our argument has to do only with their separate enumeration. The Apostle's design in both was to dissuade those who had different gifts from envying one another. Hence he very naturally named all the gifts which were then possessed; as a person might envy one having a miraculous gift as readily as one having only an ordinary gift. Nor is the objection valid, so far as our use of the passage is concerned, that one person might possess several gifts; because if all teachers were rulers and all rulers were teachers the classification in Romans xii. would be inadmissible. Now, as it is granted that all teachers were rulers, the only distinction possible is made by supposing that some rulers were not teachers. This distinction, therefore, was plainly recognized and approved by the Apostle.

2. In 1 Timothy v. 17, the distinction referred to among the elders, or presbyters, is plainly stated, "Let the elders that rule well be accounted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine." That some ruling elders taught and others did not is unquestionably the meaning of this passage. Bishop Ellicott says, "The concluding words seem to imply *two* kinds of ruling presbyters, those who preached and taught and those who did not." Dr. Owen calls this a text "of uncontrollable evidence if it had anything to conflict withal but prejudices and interest." Had the Apostle considered it to be the *duty* of all ruling elders to teach, he would not have declared an elder to be worthy of double honour, or indeed of any honour at all, for merely ruling well, which is here represented as an inferior function. It is to be very carefully noticed that this distinction in the eldership is recognized in the same Epistle in which the Apostle indicates the qualifications of bishops or elders, with the view of guiding Timothy in their appointment. There is therefore no room for any development theory here. Indeed if, as is generally admitted, elders were elected by popular suffrage, the people must have understood the distinction referred to in order to be able to make an intelligent choice. Timothy could not fail to explain it to them, when he told them what qualifications elders should possess.

It has been objected that when the Apostle states the qualifications of bishops or elders, he mentions, "apt to teach," and hence that all elders must possess this qualification. This objection would have some appearance of validity were it not refuted by the fact stated in the same Epistle that some elders exercised government who did not teach, and this, too, with Paul's express approval which he wished the people to give effect to. Another objection is that Paul, Acts xx. 28, exhorts the elders at Ephesus to take heed to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers or bishops, to feed the Church of God, and