

of the visible Church. But surely, Rev. Father Molphy knows that our Queen with all her virtues and excellencies, is only a woman, advancing no claim to infallibility, or to any special supernatural power to rule over the Church. When she attends the house of God, she worships in common with others. And, if any poor sinner were to fall upon his knees to do her homage as a spiritual head, I am convinced she would speak to him after the manner of the angel to John, "See thou do it not, I am a woman, 'worship God.'" And our Moderator, is only a humble servant of Christ, with no claims or pretensions above his brethren. It is a weak cause that has to revert either to Her Majesty or to our Moderator for support.

The next point the Rev. gentleman takes up is, that Peter was the rock upon which Christ said He would build His Church. He does not seem to be guided by the opinion of the Fathers in this matter. Lannoy, Doctor of the Sorbonne, says that "out of seventy-seven sayings of the most famous Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, he found only seventeen who explain Peter himself as the rock: forty-four, on the contrary, understand the Faith, and sixteen Christ Himself." Saint Hilary, in the sixth book of the Holy Trinity, says, "The building of the Church is on Peter's confession; this is the foundation of the Church." Saint Ambrose, says, "The foundation of the Church is the faith of Peter, for it was said, not to the flesh of Peter, but to the faith of Peter—the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and therefore the rock is not Peter, and therefore the Church of Christ is built, not on Peter, but on the faith of Peter." So say Gregorius, Myssenus, Cyrillus, Chrysostom, Augustine, and Origen. Peter was a man, and if the Church of Rome is built on him, she is not a Divine Church, but a human one. I find that Peter was a perjurer; and if the Church of Rome is built on him, she is a perjured Church. I find also that Christ calls Peter Satan; and if the Church of Rome is built on him, she is a Satanic Church. But I am quite willing to grant that Peter was the rock on which Christ said He would build His Church, and to commend this as a good interpretation of the passage. The Rev. gentlemen says, "St. Peter first, and the Pope to-day." But I say, Christ first, Christ to-day, and Christ to the end. But to proceed; Peter was the first to confess that Christ was the Son of God; and the first preacher, and chief Apostle of Israel, (Acts i., 15; ii., 14; Mark xvi., 7), and even of the heathen, (Acts x.) In this respect he was the rock on which the true Church was built—just as a section of the Church may rest upon a preacher or missionary, whose new nature and energy in his Master's work fit him for the gathering together, and the building up of the Church. Observe—it was not upon Peter's commands as Vicar of Christ that the Church was to be built, but upon his earnest and faithful ministry. It was not upon him as Simon Barjona the sinner, (Luke v., 8), but upon *this* Peter such as grace would make him after our Lord's death. Whenever Simon the sinner will again speak rashly, he shall again be repelled as Satan. Peter was the rock, and James also, and John were pillars with him, (Gal. ii., 9); and the other Apostles were foundation stones in the same building, (Eph. ii., 20). On twelve foundations (Rev. xxi., 14), stand the names of the twelve Apostles without distinction: and in Matt. xix., 28; twelve seats upon thrones are promised to them without distinction. I have no objections that Peter should be the head, or ruler, or prince among the Twelve, but I find no trace of such supremacy in the entire New Testament. I find much, how-