

some others we failed to notice at an earlier day, from the simple fact that we could not find the requisite moments to look over its pages. Even now we have only given it a cursory and very rapid glance. The book evidently improves on acquaintance. While we discover some items of doctrine and illustration partaking of the fanciful, the greater proportion of what we have read is decidedly valid, sound, and solid. Take the following as a specimen:

D. O.

In the early ages of Christianity, in every thing that regarded the discipline and general affairs of the church, the whole congregation had a voice; but, in process of time, this was gradually taken out of their hands, and engrossed by the clergy—a body absolutely unknown in the primitive times. In proportion as the people lost their independence, the clergy heightened their claims, and became, if possible, more assiduous in their dexterous management of dark sentences; at first insinuating, and afterwards maintaining, that, in virtue of their office, they were *sacred* and *sanctified* persons, in a sense different from that in which these terms could be applied to the other members of Christ's mystical body; that those who did not belong to any of the *sacred orders* where by no means qualified to deliberate and judge in *holy things*; and that it was the height of sacrilegious usurpation for unhallowed men (comprehending under that description the saints and faithful in Christ Jesus) to arrogate any power in concerns of this nature. As the many, which primitively formed but *one body*, 1 Cor. x. 17, became thus divided into *two distinct bodies*, the *clergy* and the *laity*—terms derived from two Greek words, *cleros* and *laos*, the former signifying *lot* or *inheritance*, the latter *people*, it may not be improper that we should here examine a little what authority the Scriptures furnish to support this distinction.

Throughout the whole of the New Testament the term *cleros*, as applied to persons occurs but once, viz., in 1 Pet. v. 3, "*Med' hos katakurionutes ton cleron, allu typoi ginomenoi tou poimnion.*" Literally rendered, the passage stands thus: "*not as domineering (or lording it) over the heritage, but being examples to the flock.*" In true canonical English, we should read *not domineering over the clergy*; but unhappily *the clergy* (*cleron*) in this passage are the very individuals that are, not only in this verse, but also in the preceding, denominated *the flock* (*poimnion*.) In other words, *the clergy* here spoken of are *laymen*! But, perhaps, expressions may be found in the Old Testament which may be considered as furnishing something like a scriptural warrant for applying this term *cleros* exclusively to those whose office it was "to minister in holy things." Quite the contrary: God is, indeed, in these writings, said to be the inheritance of the Levites, because a certain portion of the sacrifices offered to God was, in part, to serve them instead of an estate in land, such as was given to the other tribes; but no where is the tribe of Levi called God's inheritance, though that term is frequently applied to the *whole nation*; as in Deut. ix. 29, "*They are thy people, and thine inheritance, which thou broughtest out by thy mighty power.*" In the