

exercised considerable influence over his countrymen. Tradition states that he was killed at Babylon by the chief of the people, for having reproved him on account of his idolatry.

Ezekiel's writings show how admirably he was fitted, as well by natural disposition as by spiritual gifts, to oppose the rebellious house, the people of stubborn front and hard heart, to which he was sent. The vigor of his conceptions is shown in the minuteness of his detail, and the sharpness of outline which belong to real existence. His whole life was kept in complete subordination to the great work to which he was called. We never meet with him as an ordinary man; he always thinks and speaks as a prophet. The chapters given from his prophecy for this Sunday, are an astonishing exhibition of liveliness of conception, force of character, and vigor of expression, while they give us lessons which may serve to instruct and guide the minister of the church. "Thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God. And they, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, (for they are a rebellious house,) yet shall know that there hath been a prophet among them."

The whole duty of man, as a Christian, is contained in the COLLECT and GOSPEL. The familiar formula of the Collect—resistance to the world, the flesh, and the devil—represents all the temptations to which a Christian is liable; and to this may be added the words of the EPISTLE, which comprehensively states the whole object of the Christian's life—"waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The duties, the difficulties, and the purpose of the Christian life are made the subjects of prayer and commemoration for practical usefulness. The connection of each of them with the grace of God and the Person of Christ is illustrated by the eloquent and comprehensive passage of St. Paul in his epistle, and also by the remarkable events recorded in the Gospel, when the Lord confuted the gainsaying of his unbelieving enemies, by proposing to them a question which does not appear to have occupied their thoughts previous to this occasion. The passage from the Old Testament Scriptures which the Lord quotes might, however, be urged with some effect upon the attention of unbelievers in the present day.

ST. LUKE.

This name is a contraction of *Lucanus*, and intimates that St. Luke was descended from heathen ancestors, and that he was either a slave or a freedman. He was a physician by profession, and therefore a man of education, as is also shewn by the classical style in which the introduction to his Gospel and the latter part of the Acts are written, as well as by the explicit and learned details which he gives on various antiquarian, historical, and geographical subjects. He is said to have painted a portrait of our Saviour, an engraving of which appeared in the

London Art Journal a few years ago. The Gospel which goes by his name contains exceedingly valuable accounts not found in the books of the other evangelists; as those concerning the childhood of Jesus, the admirable parables in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, the narration respecting the disciples at Emmaus, and the section from chap. ix. 51 to xix. 27, which contains particulars mostly wanting in the other evangelists. The statements he gives are taken from accounts given by eye-witnesses to the events he relates, which he appears to have accurately investigated. Besides the gospel which bears his name, St. Luke wrote also the Acts of the Apostles, which contains the history of the foundation of the Christian Church in two great sections: the first embracing the spread of Christianity among the Jews, chiefly by the instrumentality of St. Peter, contained in the first twelve chapters; and the second, its spread among the heathen, chiefly by the instrumentality of St. Paul, and which is comprised in the rest of the book. From the circumstance that the book of the Acts leaves St. Paul a captive, it is probable that St. Luke accompanied St. Paul to Rome, employing his leisure there in composing the Acts, and that he left off writing before the fate of St. Paul was decided.

INTERCHANGE OF PULPITS.

The Bishop of Manchester has recently preached at Penwortham Church, near Preston. His Lordship, in alluding to what is called the unsectarian Christianity of the present day, said he had not long ago been asked by a Nonconformist gentleman in Manchester, to go to his establishment and attend the mid-day prayer, being assured that he would rarely meet with any thing that would offend him. The Bishop excused himself by saying that, besides the inconvenience of the hour, there was the fact that when he was in town he could go to his own Cathedral and pray there, for there he knew what he should meet with, and that there would not be even the possibility of being offended. He had also been asked by a Nonconformist minister in London to go and preach in his pulpit. He declined the invitation, for he did not believe that any good could come out of churchmen entering Nonconformist pulpits, nor of Nonconformists entering Church pulpits. The result, he said, would be confusion and chaos. He had no faith in that vapid, hazy, indefinite sort of belief, as if indifferent to the teachings of his Church. Though he was often designated a Broad Churchman, he was not quite so broad as all that. What he would say to Nonconformists was "Go on your own way, and I will go on mine." He thought that was the way the Church and the denominations could best live in peace.

The subject might, however, have been taken up in a somewhat different manner, as there is a great principle involved in it, and one which the Bishop does not distinctly enunciate, although

he may be understood to allude to it in speaking of his dislike to a "vapid, hazy, indefinite sort of belief," and being "indifferent to the teachings of his Church." Perhaps he would have made his case stronger in reference to the interchange of pulpits generally, if he had quoted *in extenso* the preface to the ordination service of the Prayer Book. This part of the Church's teaching appears however to be very extensively ignored in some quarters; and, from what we have heard in public, we could almost imagine there are some people holding considerable ecclesiastical preferment in this country who are hardly aware of its existence. Its statements are very positive, and we can scarcely imagine more than one interpretation that could possibly be given to it. It says:—"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time, there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests and Deacons,—which offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority: and, therefore, to the intent that these orders may be continued, and reverently used, and esteemed in the Church of England, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, and examined, and admitted thereunto according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination."

EXTREMES MEET.

There may, possibly, still be left some very innocent individuals who are disposed to question the truth of the principle enunciated in the heading of this article. If so, let them pay attention to the proofs which are accumulating every hour. The *Rock* and the Pope are still on the most amicable terms in reference to the "question" now agitating Europe so deeply. But, perhaps, after all, one need not be so much surprised at this close agreement on a vital question. The occupant of the chair of St. Peter, (*Petros*) claiming to be the *Rock* (*Petra*) of the Church, it might very naturally be asked:—If their claims are identical, why should not their principles be identical also? However that may be, it happens just now that the Pope supports the Turks against the Eastern Christians; and the *Rock* with the rest of what is called "the Mohammedan Press," does the same. The Pope has two reasons for his conduct. First of all, when Italy became, or was becoming united, the Pope recommended his Italian friends to invest in that *safest of all securities*, Turkish bonds; and, therefore, he cannot now leave his