

hand upon the laity, and repelling them from the cup ; but in less than three hundred, in all the countries we have named, Presbyterianism has laid her hand upon the crown of JESUS, and torn it from his brow, and declared Him to be no God of hers. Again and again has she surrendered the Divinity of her Lord, taken off from His exalted Person the purple robe, and suffered Him to be crowned with shame and spitting. Rome, with all her abominations, never did it. Which then is *the Anti-christ* of the present day ? I dare not answer—but one, whom the catholic faith has always held to be inspired, has said, “ He is anti-christ *that denieth the Father and the Son ;*” and again he says, “ Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that JESUS CHRIST is come *in the flesh*. This is a deceiver and an *anti-christ*.” (I. John ii. 22, 23 : II. John 7.)

“ Have you heard the dreadful news ?” said a very remarkable lady, and *active* parishioner of mine, not many years ago.—“ another clergyman in England gone over to Rome !”

“ Indeed !” I replied ; “ it is really very sad ; but” (endeavouring to adapt my answer to one who had been nearly Swedenborgianized out of the doctrine of the resurrection, and liberalized and spiritualized, as I had heard, into the celebration of the communion with friend Gurney and his companions,) “ I think he might have done worse—better believe too much than too little.” But this did not damp, in the least, the ardor or the satisfaction with which, sometime afterward, she renewed the lamentation, “ O, Mr. ———, have you heard the dreadful news—have you not heard it ? another of our clergy gone over to the Papists !”

“ But why do they leave the Church,” said I ; “ do they believe the Church of England to be Erastianized and Puritanized beyond redemption ? If so, I can only say that I do not agree with them.” Still, after a certain interval,