

I said that he "stated that Pope Leo I. was the first who claimed to be the successor of St. Peter." He says there is "not anything of the kind" in his sermon. Now, in his sermon after describing how, as he says, corruptions became introduced into the Church, he adds: "Meanwhile errors were increasing and the desire for power among the Ministers was becoming greater and greater, till at length, early in the 5th century, Leo, who was Bishop of the Church at Rome, advanced a claim hitherto unknown; many who admired this eloquent and clever man, sanctioned the position he claimed, and cried with one voice, 'Peter speaks in Leo.' Here dates the origin of that Church which now claims to be the only true fold of God's people." A few lines above this passage he gave it to be understood that the chief difference between the original true Christian Church, and the corrupt "Church of Rome," consists in the "distinction of supremacy" which were unknown among the Apostles, and during the first three centuries; so that the Pope's authority as St. Peter's successor, is precisely the subject of which he is treating in the above extract.

Leo I. was the only Pope Leo in the 5th century; so that Rev. Mr. Scobie must have had him in view. He declares that the claim Leo advanced had been hitherto unknown; that the claim was "the position of power" and that many of his admirers acceded to the claim by saying, "Peter speaks in Leo," and that this is the origin of the Church (of Rome). Now, certainly, if words have a meaning, Rev. Mr. Scobie asserts most emphatically here that "Leo was the first who claimed to be St. Peter's successor." "Why then does he deny having said 'anything of the kind?'" Evidently because I most completely refuted the assertion, and, therefore, since he found that his position was utterly untenable, he relies on the stupidity of the public to gulp down as gospel truth whatever he asserts. He will, perhaps, find your readers not so stupid as he imagines them to be, and, if I mistake not, his effort to impose so grossly on the public will encounter that indignation which such evident dishonesty deserves.

I proved from St. John xxi., St. Luke xxii., St. Matt. xvi., &c., that Peter received from our Lord authority to direct and confirm his brethren, "the other Apostles," and that this authority being conferred as an authority essential to the Church, it should pass to St. Peter's successors. I showed from St. Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Julius, and the Arians, and from Socrates and Sozomen that this authority was as fully and universally recognized during the first 300 years of the Christian Church as it is to-day. Rev. Mr. Scobie has not even attempted to refute this argument; I have, therefore, every right to consider that I have demonstrated that the Church taught this doctrine and believed it when Rev. Mr. Scobie acknowledges that she was "pure."

Rev. Mr. Scobie does, however, bring a few counter arguments against my proof. Any intelligent person can see that he should not only have brought counter arguments, but that he should have shown my proof to be inconclusive, which he has not attempted to do. Let us see, however, what his counter arguments are worth. He acknowledges that seventeen of the passages of the first Christian writers explain that Peter is the rock on which the Church is built. But he adds that "forty-four explain that it is built upon Peter's faith." He instances St. Ambrose, who explains that the Church was built, not upon "Peter's flesh," but "upon Peter's faith." I have before me at the mo-