

ment of writing over twenty passages from the Fathers in which the rock is said to be Peter; and I have references to at least as many more, so that Rev. Mr. Scobie is evidently wrong in stating that there are only seventeen. However, he says that forty-four understand "Peter's faith," and sixteen understand that the rock here meant is Christ. Now, as regards those who speak of "Peter's faith" as being the rock, amongst whom is St. Ambrose, I must remark that their interpretation of the text is precisely the same as that given by Catholics. St. Ambrose said:—"It was not said of the flesh of Peter, but of his faith, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. But the confession overcame hell." He does not say in continuation what Mr. Scobie has put into his mouth, "therefore, the Church of Christ is built, not on Peter, but on the faith of Peter." Now, of course, no Catholic pretends that the Church of Christ is built upon the "flesh of Peter," precisely the faith of Peter; that is Peter professing the faith is the foundation of the Church, for it is his faith for which Christ prays that it will not fail. This accords with other words of the same St. Ambrose, who elsewhere calls Peter "the rock of the Church," the "strength of the Church," and the "foundation of the Church." Hence the passages which make Peter's "*unfailing faith*" the rock on which the Church is built, must be added to those which speak of Peter himself as the rock, for there is no disagreement between them.

But what of those Fathers who speak of Christ as the rock here meant? St. Augustine does so in one place; but as no one more clearly than St. Augustine, declares the "Primacy of Peter," no one would be more surprised than St. Augustine to have this brought as an argument against Peter's Primacy. In fact, in several places, he applies the word rock here to Peter; and, therefore, in his applying it also to Christ, he evidently intends us to understand that Peter represents Christ. At all events, it must not be forgotten, that this is only one of the many texts by which Peter's Primacy is proved; and Rev. Mr. Scobie has made no attempt, whatever, to lessen the demonstrative force of the others, as when our Lord tells Peter to feed His lambs and His sheep; that is His whole flock, and when He tells him to "confirm his brethren."—John xxi., 15, 17, Luke xxii., 32.

And, now, what am I to answer to Rev. Mr. Scobie's difficulty that Christ rebuked Peter for deprecating the sufferings which our Lord foretold that He was to endure? The rebuke is certainly a severe one: "Get behind me, Satan; that is to say adversary." Yet it does not appear that Peter committed a very grievous sin, when moved by affection for our Lord, to say in effect: "No, Lord, it must not be that Thou shalt suffer thus." Hence, many of the Fathers do not consider that these words were intended to be so severe as they seem at first sight. Many Fathers consider them to mean simply, "Be not an adversary to the disposition of God; but follow thou My example, in meeting the death prepared for thee, even as I shall meet the death prepared for me; for no one can be My disciple who will not take up his cross and follow Me." At all events, no matter how severe may be the rebuke, Christ does not take from Peter by these words the authority He elsewhere gives. I will further give the answer St. Jerome or Hierom, both to this difficulty and the difficulty against Peter's supremacy, drawn from his denial of our Lord three times.

St. Jerome says: "If the inquirer reflect, he will perceive that the benedic-