

testimonies. Besides, I must confine myself to one subject at a time, otherwise, my letter would be as rambling as Rev. Mr. Scobie's discourse.

It is clear, then, from the Scripture, reason, and the testimony of the early Christian writers, that the authority of Peter excludes not the authority of Christ, but is founded on it, and that whosoever denies the authority of Peter and his successors, denies the authority of Christ, so that the recognition of "One Lord," while complete in the Catholic Church, is not a mark of Mr. Scobie's sect.

"One Faith" also is not found in Rev. Mr. Scobie's sect, since, as we have already seen, it is the doctrine both of himself and of his standard rule of faith that we may deny some doctrines which Christ has revealed, and as the Rev. gentleman also maintains that the neglect of Baptism will not exclude from heaven, and probably a majority of his co-religionists are unbaptized, his Church denies the efficacy of the "One Baptism," so that she does not possess truly even one of the true marks which Rev. Mr. Scobie declares to be essential to the true Church. In fact he does not attempt to prove that Presbyterianism does possess them, so that I am quite justified in saying that he has egregiously failed in proving his principal thesis. *Second*.—I must next consider the attempts at argument which are scattered through the course of his sermon. Some of these arguments have been already treated, I will therefore enumerate those which remain.

*First*, he maintains that not Peter, but Christ is the Rock on which the Church is built. I answer that I have shown already that Peter's headship does not exclude the leadership of Christ; but Christ Himself signifies as plainly as words can express a meaning, that the Rock (*Cepha*) on which the Church is built is Peter, to whom Christ gives the name purposely to show that Peter represents the Rock Christ, and is His Vicar. Hence the exact rendering of what our Lord says is "Thou art a Rock, and upon this Rock I will build my Church." The Church was, therefore, built upon Peter, and so have all the Fathers of the first four centuries taught and believed. This positive prerogative given to Peter, is not lessened or taken away from him by the reproof which our Lord finds it necessary to administer to Peter when the latter protests against the sufferings which our Lord is about to endure. "Get behind me Satan, or adversary." As the Rev. Mr. Scobie states that Pope Leo I was the first who claimed to be the successor of St. Peter, I will call his attention to the teaching of history on this subject.

Leo became Pope in 439. The Historian, Socrates, wrote in A. D. 419. He narrates the events which occurred under the Pontificate of Julius who became Pope, A. D. 337. Julius was present at the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, so that the occurrences of his Pontificate connect us with the primitive period of the history of the Church. Socrates relates in *Hist. Church, Book 2*, certain troubles caused by the Arians in the east, by the introduction of an Arian formulary of faith. The historian continues, "Julius, the Bishop of most noble Rome, was not present, nor did he send any one to fill his place, although the ecclesiastical law forbids that anything be decreed in the Church without the consent of the Roman Bishop." C. 8. Again in C. 15. "Anastasius was scarcely able to reach Italy . . . at the same time also Paul of Constantinople, and Asclepas of Gaza and Marcellus of Ancyra, a city of Galatia Minor, and Lucius of Adrianople, who had each for different causes,