

must of necessity be a rambling concern, without head or tail; and such is Rev. Mr. Scobie's letter. On these fifty or so subjects, the Rev. gentleman promises a series of lectures, if I do not treat satisfactorily of them all in a single letter. Well, let the lectures come. If the Rev. gentleman's letter is a specimen of what he can do in demolishing an opponent, his lectures, like the shots of a bad marksman, will hurt himself more than the target he aims at.

The Rev. Mr. Scobie pretends that I have mis-stated the thesis of his sermon. I said his thesis was that "there are certain marks of the true Church which do not belong to the Catholic Church." Now, any person with a farthing's worth of intelligence, who read the sermon, will see that Mr. Scobie attempts to prove that "there are certain marks which the true Church possesses," and those marks are, according to him, "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." In the next place, it will be seen that he endeavors to show that the Catholic Church has not these qualities or marks. It is, therefore, clear that he "maintains in argument" that "there are certain marks of the true Church which do not belong to the Catholic Church."

Webster's dictionary defines thesis, "A position, or proposition which a person advances and offers to maintain, or which is actually maintained in argument." Therefore, Mr. Scobie's thesis is, as I stated it, "there are certain marks of the true Church which do not belong to the Catholic Church." But Mr. Scobie evidently does not know what a logical thesis is: hence his blunder. To make his mud-pie more complete, he actually states that his thesis was "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, distinguishing marks of the true Church." Why, any intelligent boy or girl in Mr. Barnes' or Miss Gillan's class could tell the Rev. gentleman that what he calls "his thesis" is not a proposition at all, so that it cannot be either his or any one else's thesis. It is no *sin* for the Rev. Mr. Scobie not to know what a thesis is, but it is *amusing* for him to discourse learnedly on a subject concerning which he evidently knows as little as a four year old child.

Rev. Mr. Scobie next repudiates the doctrine that "the members of the Church of Christ are not bound to believe all the doctrines which have been taught by Christ." I attributed this doctrine to him, and he maintains that by so doing I acted unfairly. I am glad to find that he is horrified at the monstrous doctrine; but monstrous as it is, it is most undoubtedly contained in his sermon, and in the Westminster Confession of Faith, which he is bound to teach. I do not assert that either Mr. Scobie or the Westminster Confession expresses the doctrine in the same words which I have used. Oh, no! the absurdity would be too evident; so both Mr. Scobie and the Westminster Confession try to hide the monstrosity under another form of expression; and even Mr. Scobie's way of expressing it is quite different from the form used in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith; but, though the dress is different, the unholy and newly-invented doctrine is quite visible in both cases. As Rev. Mr. Scobie denies that the doctrine is his, let us recall his words. "But what is meant by internal unity? It is not that all the members of the true Church should *think* exactly alike on every point, that is impossible, and were it possible, it is not desirable." Examine this in connection with the Westminster Confession of Faith, which Rev. Mr. Scobie is bound to teach, and its meaning will be clear. C. xxv. of the Westminster Confession says: "Particular Churches are more or less pure; according as the doctrine of the Gospel is