

end of the Acherusian Lake; and in Molossia—Passaron, where the kings were wont to take the oath of the constitution and receive their people's allegiance; and Tecmon, Phylace, and Horreum, all of doubtful identification. The Byzantine town of Rogus is probably the same as the modern Luro, formerly known as Oropus.

History.—The kings or rather chieftains of the Molossians, who ultimately extended their power over all Epirus, claimed to be descended from Pyrrhus, son of Achilles, who, according to the legend, settled in the country after the sack of Troy, and transmitted his kingdom to Molossus, his son by Andromache. The early history of the dynasty is very obscure; but Admetus, who lived in the 5th century B.C., has become famous for his hospitable reception of the banished Themistocles, in spite of the grudge that he must have harboured against the great Athenian, who had persuaded his countrymen to refuse the alliance tardily offered by the Molossian chieftain when their victory against the Persians was already secured. He was succeeded about 429 B.C. by his son or grandson, Tharymbas or Arymbas I. who being placed by a decree of the people under the guardianship of Sabylinthus, chief of the Atintanes, was educated at Athens, and thus became at a later date the introducer of a higher kind of civilization among his subjects. Alcetas, the next king mentioned in history, was contemporary with Dionysius of Syracuse (about 385 B.C.) and was indebted to his assistance for the recovery of his throne. His son Arymbas II. (who succeeded by the death of his brother Neoptolemus) ruled with prudence and equity, and gave encouragement to literature and the arts. To him Xenocrates of Chalcedon dedicated his four books on the art of governing; and it is specially mentioned that he bestowed great care on the education of his brother's children. Troas, one of his nieces, became his own wife; and Olympias, the other, was married to Philip of Macedon, and had the honour of giving birth to Alexander the Great. On the death of Arymbas, his nephew Alexander, the brother of Olympias, was put in possession of the throne by the assistance of Philip, who was afterwards assassinated on occasion of the marriage of the youthful king with his daughter Cleopatra. Alexander was the first who bore the title of King of Epirus, and he raised the reputation of his country amongst foreign nations. His assistance having been sought by the Tarentines against the Samnites and Lucanians, he made a descent, 332 B.C., at Paestum, near the mouth of the river Silarus, and reduced several cities of the Lucani and Brutii; but in a second attack upon Italy he was surrounded by the enemy, defeated, and slain, near the city Pandosia, in the Bruttian territory.

Acides, the son of Arymbas II., succeeded Alexander, and espoused the cause of Olympias against Cassander; but he was dethroned by his own soldiers, and had hardly regained his position when he fell, 313 B.C., in battle against Philip, brother of Cassander. He had, by his wife Phthia, the celebrated Pyrrhus, and two daughters, Deidamia and Troas, of whom the former married Demetrius Poliorcetes. His brother Alcetas, who succeeded him, continued the war with Cassander till he was defeated; and he was ultimately put to death by his rebellious subjects, 295 B.C. The name of Pyrrhus, who next ascended the throne, gives to the history of his country an importance which it would never have otherwise possessed; but for an account of his life we must refer to the article PYRRHUS.

Alexander, his son, who succeeded in 272 B.C., attempted to seize on Macedonia, and defeated Antigonus Gonatas, but was himself shortly afterwards driven from his kingdom by Demetrius. He recovered it, however, and spent the rest of his days in peace. Two other insignificant reigns brought the family of Pyrrhus to its close, and Epirus was thenceforward governed by a prætor, elected annually in a general assembly of the nation held at Passaron. It imprudently espoused the cause of Perseus in his ill-fated war against the Romans, 168 B.C.; and it was consequently exposed to the fury of the conquerors, who destroyed, it is said, 70 towns, and carried into slavery 150,000 of the inhabitants. It never recovered from this blow. At the dissolution of the Achaean league, 146 B.C., it became part of the province of Macedonia, receiving the name Epirus Vetus, to distinguish it from Epirus Nova, which lay to the east.

On the division of the empire it became the inheritance of the emperors of the East, and remained under them until the taking of Constantinople by the Latins, in 1204, when Michel Angelus Comnenus seized on Etolia and Epirus. On the death of Michel in 1216, these countries fell into the hands of his brother Theodore. Thomas, the last of the direct line, was murdered in 1318 by his nephew Thomas, lord of Zante and Cephalonia, and his dominions were dismembered. Not long after, Epirus was overrun by the Samnians and Albanians, and the confusion which had been growing since the division of the empire was worse confounded still. Charles II. Tocco, lord of Cephalonia and Zante, obtained the recognition of his title of despot of Epirus from the emperor Manuel Comnenus, in the beginning of the 15th century; but his family was deprived of their possession in 1431 by Amurath II. In 1443, Scanderbeg,

king of Albania, made himself master of a considerable part of Epirus; but on his death it fell into the power of the Venetians, from whom it passed again to the Turks, under whose domination it still remains.

Nauze, "Rech. hist. sur les peuples qui s'établirent en Épire," in *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscri.*, 1729; Wolfe, "Observations on the Gulf of Arts," in *Jour. Roy. Geog. Soc.*, 1834; Merleker, *Darstellung des Landes und der Bewohner von Epirus*, Königsb., 1841; J. H. Skene, "Remarkable Localities on the Coast of Epirus," in *Jour. R. G. S.*, 1848; Bowen, *Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus*, 1852; Hahn, *Albanische Studien*, 1854; Bursian, *Geogr. von Griechenland*, vol. 1, 1858; Major R. Stuart, "On Phys. Geogr. and Nat. Resources of Epirus," in *J. R. G. S.*, 1869; Guido Cora, in *Cosmos*; Dumont, "Souvenirs de l'Adriatique, de l'Épire," &c., in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, 1872.

EPISCOPACY. By Episcopacy we understand that form of church organization in which the chief ecclesiastical authority within a defined district or diocese is vested in bishops (*episcopi*), having in subordination to them priests, or presbyters, and deacons, and with the power of ordination. Of this form of government there are traces in apostolic times; evidences of its existence become increasingly frequent in the sub-apostolic period; until when the church emerges from the impenetrable cloud which covers the close of the 1st and the beginning of the 2d century, we find every Christian community governed by a chief functionary, uniformly styled its "bishop," with two inferior orders of ministers under them, known as "presbyters" and "deacons." It may be regarded as an established fact that before the middle of the 2d century diocesan Episcopacy had become the rule in every part of the then Christian world, and we have now to inquire when and under what circumstances this form of government arose, and with what amount of authority it is invested. On these points the most opposite opinions have been maintained. In the words of Dr Lightfoot (to whose admirable dissertation "On the Christian Ministry," appended to his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians*, we, though differing from him in some points, would once for all acknowledge our obligation), "Some have recognized in Episcopacy an institution of divine origin, absolute and indispensable; others have represented it as destitute of all apostolic sanction and authority." Some, that is, regard it as of the *de esse* of a church, so that no Christian community can have any right to claim to be considered, in the true sense, a branch of the church catholic if it have not episcopal organization. Others, on the other hand, consider it as of the *de bene esse* of a church, desirable to its good government, and to the maintenance of evangelical truth and apostolical order, but not essential to its existence. It will be our object in this article to review the evidence as to the origin of Episcopacy afforded by history, and to present the facts and the plain inferences from them in a candid and dispassionate spirit.

I. In examining the question of the divine authority of Episcopacy, we have to consider carefully what we mean by the phrase. Do we intend that Episcopacy stands on the same level as Baptism and the Lord's Supper as a direct ordinance of Christ "generally necessary for salvation;" or do we mean that it was called into being by the apostles and first teachers of the Christian church under that most real, though perhaps to them insensible, direction of the Holy Spirit, to which their decisions and actions are continually ascribed in the sacred record (Acts viii. 29, x. 19, xi. 12, xiii. 2, xv. 28, xvi. 6, 7, xix. 21, xx. 23)? Of the former opinion, though asserted as an unquestionable fact by many learned defenders of Episcopacy, we may safely assert that there is not a trace in the New Testament. That the episcopal organization of His church was among the "things pertaining to the kingdom of God" which formed the subject of the intercourse of Christ and the twelve in the interval between His resurrection and His ascension is a mere hypothesis destitute of the semblance of proof. Neither the Acts nor the Epistles contain the slightest hint of any such authoritative communication being made before our Lord's

ascension, or of any direct revelation to that effect subsequent to that event, binding on the church for all time. The conclusion that would be naturally drawn from the brief and scanty references to the organization of the Christian ministry in Holy Scripture is that the apostles were left free to act, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, as they might from time to time judge to be most for the good of the church. There can be no question that this was so in the appointment of the seven whose office is commonly identified with the Diaconate (Acts vi.); and, though the evidence is less distinct, it appears to have been the case with the Presbyterate (Acts xiv. 23), while the authority of Timothy and Titus, in whom we see the first adumbration of diocesan Episcopacy, is plainly represented as delegated by the Apostle Paul with the view of carrying out the arrangements which special circumstances rendered desirable for the particular time and place. There is certainly nothing in the apostle's language to either of them to support the idea that by such delegation he was carrying into effect a divine ordinance of perpetual obligation.

If, however, we interpret the expression "divine authority" in the larger sense, as including all that the apostles did, as the holders of Christ's express commission—"as my Father hath sent me even so send I you" (John xx. 21)—through the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, for the edification of the church of which they were the divinely appointed governors and propagators, there need be as little scruple in allowing the divine authority of Episcopacy as there is in the case of other ordinances of the Christian church, such as the observation of the Lord's day, the baptism of infants, and confirmation. An institution of which traces are seen in apostolic times, and which is found prevailing throughout the church in the age succeeding the apostles, and continuing everywhere without a break of continuity to the 16th century, and in most parts of Christendom to the present day, cannot be looked upon as anything less than the deliberate expression of the mind of the church. In this qualified sense we may safely adopt the verdict of Hooker, "that if anything in the church's government, surely the first institution of bishops was from heaven,—was even of God,—the Holy Ghost was the author of it, . . . and is to be acknowledged the ordinance of God no less than that ancient Jewish regiment, whereof though Jethro was the deviser, yet after that God had allowed it all men were subject unto it, as to the polity of God not of Jethro" (*Ecl. Polit.*, bk. vii. c. v. § 2, 10).

II. The twelve apostles were the depositaries of Christ's commission as the founders and governors of His church (Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18, xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 47, 48; John xx. 21–23). In the Acts we find them its sole directors and administrators. The whole ministry of the church was, in the germ, included in the apostolate, from which it was gradually developed as occasion required by the successive delegation of the powers lodged with the apostles to other members of the church, first as their substitutes and afterwards as their successors. Thus the Christian ministry, as Canon Robertson has remarked (*History of the Christian Church*, vol. i. p. 8), "was developed not from below but from above," not by elevation, but by devolution. The first delegation was to the seven, for the discharge of the secular functions and lower spiritual offices for which the rapid growth of the church rendered the apostles personally unequal. This was succeeded by the delegation of the duties of teaching, government, and discipline to presbyters or elders, especially in congregations (such as those planted by Paul and Barnabas in Asia Minor) over which the apostles were unable to exercise any continuous personal superintendence (Acts xiv. 23). In Hooker's words, "the form

or regiment by them established at first was that the laity, or people, should be subject unto a college of ecclesiastical persons which were in every such city appointed for that purpose" (*Ecl. Polit.*, bk. vii. ch. v. § 1). It may be desirable here to remove the confusion which may be produced by the ambiguous use of the word "bishop," *ἐπίσκοπος*, in the New Testament. It happens in all languages that in process of time the meaning of a word changes. That which in one generation is a general term, in the next contracts into a technical term, or a word which designated one office becomes the title of another. It is so with the word "bishop." In its fundamental sense of an "overseer," "inspector," it was not originally a term of office at all. When it appears as such in the New Testament, it is simply synonymous with "presbyter," the same officer of the church being called indifferently by the one or the other name. The "presbyters" or "elders" of the Ephesian church summoned by St Paul to meet him at Miletus (Acts xx. 17) are in verse 28 designated by him "bishops," or "overseers," of the flock. In the pastoral epistles the words are used indifferently. Corresponding directions are given to Titus concerning the ordaining of "elders" (Tit. i. 5–7), and to Timothy for the ordination of "bishops" (1 Tim. iii. 1–7), while the identity of the two is further evidenced by the use of the term "bishop" in Tit. i. 7, and "elders," 1 Tim. v. 17–19. St Peter also, when exhorting the presbyters, as their "brother presbyter" (*συνπρεσβύτερος*), to the zealous fulfilment of their charge, speaks of it as "the work of an overseer," or "bishop" (*ἐπισκοπούμενος*) (1 Pet. v. 1, 2). The titles continue synonymous in the epistle of Clement of Rome (*Epist.*, i. § 42, 44). That the offices were identical in the apostolic age is also more than once asserted by St Jerome, writing towards the close of the 4th century (*e.g.*, "the apostle shows us plainly that presbyters and bishops are the same . . . it is proved most clearly that a bishop is the same as a presbyter."—*Epist.* cxlvi.; see also *Epist.* lxxix; and *Ad Tit.* i. 8), as well as by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, and may be regarded as indisputable.

Any conclusion, therefore, drawn from the use of the term "bishop" in the New Testament, as to the existence of the episcopal office, would be fallacious. "Things," however, as Hooker has said, "are always ancients than their names," and letting go the name and coming to the thing, indications may be discovered in the Acts and pastoral epistles of something closely answering to a localized episcopate in apostolic times. James, the Lord's brother, occupies a position in the church at Jerusalem, associated with and yet distinct from and superior to his presbytery, and in some respects, at least in Jerusalem, higher than the apostles themselves, which presents many features of the diocesan episcopate of later times (Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, 19, xxi. 18; Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, 12), and tends to confirm the unanimous statement of early writers that he was the first bishop of Jerusalem. (Hieron., *De Script. Eccles.*, ii.; Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 1.) But in him we have the only example of such an organization presented in the Acts. As Professor Shirley has remarked (*Apostolic Age*, p. 133), his position was in important respects exceptional. Whether one of the twelve or not, he was ranked with the apostles (Gal. i. 19), and his authority was therefore inherent, not derived from them. And therefore for years he remained the only Christian bishop. We have to pass on to the pastoral epistles of St Paul (the latest that proceeded from his pen) before we again meet with any clear traces of the existence of Episcopacy. The evidence of these epistles, however, is unquestionable, whatever the exact nature of the office to which Timothy and Titus were designated by St Paul. Whether

permanent or temporary, whether their authority was that of diocesan bishops, or, as was more probably the case, of vicars-apostolic, it is certain that their power was a delegated one,—that they were acting as the substitutes of the apostle, and that their duties were in essence identical with those of the episcopate. In Dr Lightfoot's words, "they were in fact the link between the apostle, whose superintendence was occasional and general, and the bishop who exercised a permanent supervision over an individual congregation."

If the "angels" of the seven churches addressed in the early chapters of the Apocalypse could be certainly identified with bishops, we should have a further evidence of localized Episcopacy in apostolic times of the highest value. But this interpretation, though very generally accepted, is not sufficiently free from question to bear the strain of argument.

III. An almost impenetrable cloud hangs over the closing years of the 1st and the opening of the 2d century. When it begins to disperse we see an episcopal organization everywhere established, and working with a quiet regularity, which gives no indications of its being a novel experiment, still less of its having been imposed by superior authority on a reluctant community. How is this momentous change, without a counterpart in history, to be accounted for? How, to adopt Professor Shirley's image, can we bridge over "the immense chasm which divides the rudimentary order of the churches planted by St Paul from the rigorously defined and universal Episcopacy which we find described by Ignatius? The more we look into the circumstances the more the marvel grows."

The solution of this problem which appears to satisfy the various conditions most adequately is—that episcopal organization was developed gradually according to the requirements of different churches; that, as Jerome more than once distinctly asserts, it was called into being by the experience of the need of some coercive power to check dissensions, repress rising heresies, and supplement the authority of the rapidly diminishing body of the apostles; and that, taking Tertullian as a trustworthy exponent of the traditions of the 3d century, its first appearance was connected with the latest survivor of the Twelve, the Apostle John. An examination of the early history of the various churches founded in different parts of the world during the 1st century indicates that the establishment of Episcopacy was not a single definite and formal act proceeding from a central authority, such as the apostolic council after the fall of Jerusalem, imagined without sufficient evidence by Rothe, but a gradual and progressive development, advancing faster in some places than in others, as the growth of the Christian community and the increasing inability of the apostles personally to regulate the churches they had founded required. St Paul's case presents a picture of what must have been occurring in every part of the Christian world. The apostle had at first to bear in his own person "the care of all the churches" (2 Cor. xi. 28), *i. e.*, of all those which looked up to him as their founder. His insufficiency to bear such a burden alone forced itself upon him as these churches became more numerous. Presbyters and deacons, as Epiphanius has remarked (*Her.*, lxxv. 5), could conduct the administration of a church for a while. But occasions arose, as at Ephesus and Crete, when the continuous presence of an authorized ruler became essential to check serious mischief. Letters, however "weighty," could not compensate for the want of personal influence. It was impossible for the apostle, even when there was no restraint upon his liberty, to meet all the claims upon him in his own person. He therefore delegated his authority (whether temporarily or permanently does not materially affect the question) to others who acted by his commission, and who were charged among other

duties with the perpetuation of the Christian ministry (1 Tim. iii. v. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. i. 5). We know from his pastoral epistles that St Paul did this to meet the special needs of the churches of Ephesus and Crete; and we may not unreasonably believe that the same measure was resorted to by him as well as by the other apostles in other churches where a similar emergency called for it. The language of St Jerome, which has been so often unfairly employed to weaken the cause of Episcopacy, when properly interpreted points to this origin. He asserts that the episcopal office was established as a remedy against schism, and to put a curb upon the factious spirit which, by the instigation of the devil, had sprung up in various churches, notably in that of Corinth. As long as the apostolic founder of a church was living, and was able personally to interpose, this need for a bishop's authority would not be felt. As this resort closed, as it did very gradually, the development of Episcopacy advanced, with a steady though uneven progress, until it became universal. Jerome's oft-quoted statement that the superiority of bishops to presbyters was rather due to the custom of the church than to any actual ordinance of the Lord, "ex ecclesie consuetudine magis quam dispositionis Dominice veritate" (*Hieron. in Tit. i. 5*), does not in any way contradict its apostolic origin, which is indeed implied in the context of the passage, but merely signifies that the institution does not rest upon written words of Christ.¹

If we further ask by what authority it was decided that, in Jerome's words (*u. s.*), "to root out the thickets of heresies all the responsibility should be deferred to a single person," the testimony of antiquity, scanty, it is true, but adequate, affirms that this authority was apostolic, and points to St John as its chief though not exclusive source. Tertullian expressly asserts that "the order of bishops, if traced back to its origin, will rest upon John as its author" (*Adv. Marcion.*, iv. 5). This statement is confirmed by Clement of Alexandria, who relates that St John, after his return to Ephesus from Patmos, on the death of Domitian, was in the habit of making progresses through the neighbouring districts, "in one place to establish bishops, in another to organize whole churches, in another to ordain individuals indicated by the Holy Spirit" (*Apud Euseb., Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 23). Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, whose authority on such a fact is indisputable, says that his revered master had been "established by apostles in Asia as bishop in the church of Smyrna" (*Iren.*, iii. 3, § 4), a statement which is confirmed by Tertullian (*De Præscript.*, 32). Polycarp is also distinctly mentioned as bishop of Smyrna, together with Onesimus, bishop of Ephesus, in the genuine letters of Ignatius. The names of Papias of Hierapolis, Sagaris of Laodicea, and Melito of Sardis, all contemporary bishops with Polycarp, supply "irrefragable evidence of the early and wide extension of Episcopacy throughout proconsular Asia, the scene of St John's latest labours" (*Lightfoot, u. s.*, p. 212), and, "unless all historical testimony is to be thrown aside as worthless, demonstrate that the institution of a localized episcopate—what Hooker calls "bishops with restraint," in contrast with the "episcopate at large" exercised by the apostles—"cannot be placed later than the closing years of the 1st century, and cannot be dis severed from the name of St

¹ We may compare the language of St Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, "to the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord . . . to the rest speak I, not the Lord," where the contrast is not, as is sometimes supposed, between the apostle speaking by inspiration and without inspiration, but between the apostle's words and an actual "dictum" of our Lord (Mark x. 11). Dean Stanley remarks, "the natural distinction between the sayings of Christ and the sayings of the apostles is here exemplified,—Christ laying down the general rule, the apostles applying it to the particular emergencies which arose out of the relations of the particular churches with which they had to deal" (*Corinthians*, p. 110).

John" (*Ibid.*, p. 231). There is no reason for supposing that this was the result of the deliberations of an apostolic council, or that it was enforced by an authoritative decree. The doubtful and somewhat legendary tale of Hegesippus, preserved in Eusebius, of the calling of such a council at Jerusalem after the fall of the city and the death of St James,—even if it be conceded that at that late period any considerable number of the apostolic body were alive, and were within reach of such a summons,—expressly limits its purpose to the appointment of Symeon, the son of Clopas, as a successor to St James. That this gathering had in view so momentous a step as the establishment of Episcopacy as the form of government for the church for all time is a mere hypothesis, unsupported by any ancient testimony or tradition. Neither have we evidence for any definite decree proceeding either from an apostolic council, or, if that be rejected as baseless, from St John's individual authority. In the words of Dr Lightfoot, *u. s.*, p. 205,—

"The evident utility and even pressing need of such an office, sanctioned by the most venerated name in Christendom, would be sufficient to secure a wide though gradual reception. Such a reception, it is true, supposes a substantial harmony and freedom of intercourse among the churches which remained undisturbed by the troubles of the times; but the silence of history is not at all unfavourable to this supposition. In this way, during the historical blank which extends over half a century after the fall of Jerusalem, Episcopacy was matured, and the Catholic church consolidated."

The opening epoch is the only portion of the history of Episcopacy over which any uncertainty hangs. After the commencement of the 2d century, wherever we hear of the existence of a local church we find it, without any exception, and with hardly any variety, under the government of a bishop, and that without any indication of there ever having been a time when it was otherwise. The existing bishop is usually spoken of as the successor of other bishops reaching in unbroken line to apostolic times. Episcopacy is everywhere uniformly established, and its claim to an unbroken descent from the apostles is everywhere asserted, and nowhere called in question.

In the words of Dr Arnold, no prejudiced champion of Episcopacy,

"The beginning of the 2d century found the church under the government of bishops, many of whom derived their appointment from the apostles themselves at only one or two removes,—that is to say, they had been chosen by men who had themselves been chosen by an apostle, or by persons such as Timotheus, in whom an apostle had entertained full confidence" (*Fragment on the Church*, p. 124).

Irenæus, writing at the close of the 2d century, argues for the apostolical purity of the faith of the Church of Rome from the unbroken chain by which it was connected with the apostles. "Linus was appointed by the apostles themselves; Anacletus succeeded Linus; Clemens, Anacletus; after whom followed in regular succession Euaristus, Alexander, Sixtus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter, down to Eleutherius (the bishop of his own day), who holds the episcopal position twelfth in order from the apostles" (*lib. iii. c. 3, § 3*).

The challenge given by Tertullian, a little later, to the heretics of his day, to "produce the roll of their bishops running down in due succession from the beginning in such a manner that that first bishop of theirs shall be able to show for his ordainer or predecessor some one of the apostles, or of apostolic men" (*De Præscript.*, c. 31), is equally convincing. In the following paragraph, where, after referring to the appointment of Polycarp at Smyrna by St John, and Clement at Rome by St Peter, he proceeds—"This is the manner in which the apostolic church hand down their registers, and exhibit those whom, having been appointed to their episcopal seats by apostolic law,"

Catalogues of the bishops of almost all the earlier churches are in existence. These may contain some doubtful names;

but they may be accepted as satisfactory evidence of the belief, in the age nearest to that which they refer, that, in the words of Hooker, "under them [the apostles], and by their appointment, this order began, which maketh many presbyters subject unto the regiment of some one bishop" (*Eccles. Polit.*, vii. 10).

Once established, the value, nay, the necessity, of the episcopal form of government secured its permanence. It was not only, as in its first beginnings may have been its chief object, a remedy against schisms, and a safeguard against heresies, but it was the outward symbol of the unity of the church, and one of the most effectual methods by which that unity was maintained. The individual bishop was the visible representative of the corporate life of the individuals making up a congregation. The maxim of St Cyprian, "Ecclesia est in Episcopo" (*Cyp.*, iv. *Ep.* 9), was universally recognized. "They were the representatives of the church, and without them the church had no existence; those were not the prayers of the church, that was not her communion which the bishop did not either preside at or sanction" (*Arnold, u. s.*, p. 124). The bishop was regarded as the channel of divine grace, the bond of Christian brotherhood. Episcopacy, moreover, was not only the bond tying all the members of a church into one body, but also that which united the scattered churches into one organic whole. The collective episcopate formed the system of "joints and bands" by which the body of the catholic church was knit together. This idea has been well expressed by the present bishop of Edinburgh, Dr Cotterill—

"The episcopal office was the means of the confederation of the church, whether in the several provinces or throughout the world. The office was not something isolated—the mere promotion of an individual to certain functions; it was and is the result and the means of church federation, connecting first of all each generation with that which preceded, and then each bishop with the episcopal body, and through it with the whole church, the functions of the office being exercised in union with other members of the federation, from whom mission is received, and in obedience to its laws, and not according to the mere will of the individual. From these considerations it is obvious that Episcopacy and organic unity are entirely of the same essence (*Charge to the Synod of the Diocese of Edinburgh*, 1877).

The idea of Episcopacy thus set forth, as the unifying instrumentality in the church of Christ, is that which holds the prominent place in the estimate of the first Christian writer in whom we have any detailed reference to episcopal organization, St Ignatius of Antioch. In his eyes the bishop represents the church, and is the centre of unity to the body, a safeguard against disunion, and a security for the maintenance of discipline and the harmonious co-operation of its various constituents. With Irenæus the idea of the bishop as the centre of unity undergoes some modification. Heresy was the church's danger in his day, as intestine strife had been its danger in Ignatius's time. The unity of which Irenæus, like his later contemporary Tertullian, regards Episcopacy as the safeguard and guarantee is the unity of the faith. The one undying episcopate, with its direct descent from the apostles, was the assurance of the permanence of apostolic truth. The bishop, as the successor of the apostles, was the depositary of primitive truth, the inheritor of apostolic tradition. "If you wish to ascertain the doctrine of the apostles, you must apply to the church of the apostles." The views of the necessity of Episcopacy expressed by these early writers may seem to us sometimes overstrained, and their language exaggerated. But to them these exalted terms were most real. They were no more than the natural expression of their experience of the strength and safety derived from the organization which they most certainly believed to be the gift to the church of her Great Head. Whatever divergencies of view there may be 28