no hand in that matter; nor was He hailed as King of the Jews by His discipler. He saw that the people were about to take Him by force and make Him a King, and fled from them into the mountain Himself alone. (John 6, 15.) He declared His Kingdom was no of this world. His "triumphal entry into Jorusalem" was of an entirely different character from Mr. C.'s representation. Riding on an ass colt, with their garments spread over Him, was not such a scene as would excite the suspicion of the people or incur the charge of treason or insurrection. There is no evidence that I can see that He piaced Himself in antagonism to the Roman authorities But He counselled His hearers to render unto Casar the things that were Casar's, and unto God the things that were God's. (Mat. 22, 21.) It appears that the expulsion from the Temple of those who were engaged in truffic and speculation, was legitimate, for they had made the nouse of prayer for all nations "a den of thieves." Nor was that act in defiance of the Roman power, for it was a Jewish synagogue, and under the control of the Jewish Sanhedr m. His arrest, soon after this, was not because He had committed any flagrant act, but out of malice because He was truthful and honest as well as fearless in all His expressions, and He was only convicted on false witnesses. . And Pilate said he found no fault with Him.

His eighth paragraph is such a flagrant carricature that it deserves but little notice. It closes with the idea that His "foolish functicism brought to an untimely end His, in some respects, promising career." My free thoughts lead me to conclude that Mr. C.'s wisdom would fall far short of the "foolishness" of Jeaus. The people said, "Wherefore hath this man this wisdom and these mighty works?" (Mat. 13, 54.) But His career was not cut short. They would have taken Him sooner, but His time had not come. (John 7, 30 and 8, 20).

In his ninth paragraph Mr. C. gives the idea that if "Jesus had displayed much forethought and discretion in His sayings and actions," etc., He would have accomplished much more good than really attended His brief ministry. The probability is, Jesus knew what He was about then as well as Mr. C. does now. It is also probable He accomplished all He intended to on earth; for He said He had finished the work His Father gave Him to co; and, again, on the Cross, He said "It is finished," and "He bowed His head and gave up the ghost," (or spirit.) (John 19, 30.)

His tonth paragraph professes to point out our duty if we take Jesus for an example, and is such a gross perversion of the life and conduct of Jesus that it seems strange any man of intellect and common honesty should condescend to it. Jesus is not reported as entering churches and driving out the pew-holders or stock-holders; nor proclaiming Himself a Sovereign, nor did He forfeit the esteem of respectable and law-abiding people.

His twelfth and last paragraph is a complete tissue of misrepresentation, and it would seem that he has become demented, to say the least. "No portion of the life of Jesus can be taken as an example for our imitation" Should we not strive to imitate His meekness, His gentleness, His goodness, benevolence, and sympathy, His filial love and duty? Did He not go about doing good? Healing the sick, curing the lame, giving sight to the blind and speech to the dumb, sanity to the lunatic and comfort to the mourner? Did He not teach His hearers all the graces of the Kingdom of God? To love each other, and do unto others as they would be done by? Did He not enjoin upon His hearers the importance of filial trust in the goodness of the Creator as their Father in Heaven? Did He not say, "As I have loved you, so ought yo to love one another"? Here are examples which I am free to think if Mr. C. would imitate he would be a better and happier man than he is. Bear in mind I would not accuse him of immorality any further than carricature and misrepresentation are concerned, but he seems to lack a due regard for the purity of heart that actuated the life of Jesus.

Berlin, Mich., U.S.A.

Received and forwarded to Mr. Pringle, one dollar from Ed. Payne, M. D., Marmora, Ont.

THE DENTAL OF JESUS BY PETER.

BY WILLIAM EMMETTE COLEMAN.

Peter acchared that he would be down his life for Jesus previous to Jesus' prediction of his thrice-repeated denial (John xm. 37, 38; Luke xxm. 33, 34); though it was after the pediction of the denials that Peter expressed his willingness to the for Jesus (Matt. xxvi. 34, 35; Mark xiv. 30, 31). Jesus told Peter of the prospective denials while they were at supper (John xm. 1, 2, 37, 38; Luke xxm. 14, 34, 39); but it was after supper on the Mount of Olives, that Peter was informed of his future denials by his Master (Matt. xxvi. 30, 33, 34).

Jesus told Peter that before the cock crow once he would deny him thrice, (Matt. xxvi. 34); Jesus, however, informed Peter that before the cock crow twice the three denials would occur (Matk xiv. 30), howbest, Peter denied Jesus, not three times, but once only, before the first cock-crowing (Mark xiv. 68, 70, 71), nevertheless, Peter did dony Jesus three times before the cock gave the first crow (Matt. xxvi. 69-75). The decials of Peter occurred while the trial of Jesus was going on, or after it had ended (Matt. xxvi. 57-68, 69-75); but Peter denied Jesus before the trial had commenced (Luke xxii. 54-62, 66). Peter's denials took place in the house of Annas (John xvin. 13, 15, 17, 18, 25-27), yet the denials of Jesus took place in the house of Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi. 57, 58, 69-75).

Feter's first denial occurred while he was in the court of the high priest's house (Matt. xxvi. 69); yet the first denial of Jesus took place while Peter was in the nall of the high priest's palace (Luke xxii. 55, 56, 57); notwithstanding the denial occurred while he was entering the court of the palace (John xviii. 16, 17). Peter was sitting when he first denied his Master (Matt. xxvi. 69, 70), yet when Peter denied Jesus first, he was standing (John xviii. 16-18).

Peter's second denial was to the maid servant (Mark xiv. 69, 70), but the second denial of Peter was to a man (Luke xxii. 58) which man or maid was several persons either mule or female John xviii. 25). Peter was in the court of the palace when he denied the second time (John xviii. 15, 16, 18 25); still, Peter when he made his second denial, was outside of the court in the porch (Matt. xxvi. 71; Mark xiv. 68-70).

Peter's third denial was to several bystanders without the house (Matt. xxvi. 71, 73, 74); which bystanders were one certain man (Luke xxii. 59); which certain man was the high priest's servant (John xvii. 26, 27). The third denial took place without the court, in the porch (Matt. xxvi. 71, 73, 74); it however occurred while Peter was within, in the hall of the palace (Luke xxii. 59, 60, 62) Jesus was present with Peter at the third denial, both being in the house (Luke xxii. 69-62); yet Peter was not with Jesus when he denied him the third time, Jesus being in an upper apartment of the palace, and Peter in the porch beneath (Mark xiv. 53, 55, 65, 66, 68, 70).

Peter was reminded of Jesus' prediction relative to his thrice-repeated denial by hearing the cock crow (Mark xiv. 72); but the prophecy of Jesus was recalled to Peter's remembrance by seeing Jesus looking reproachfully upon him (Luke xxii. 61). Peter made use of an oath at the second denial (Matt. xxvi. 72); but he did not begin to curse and swear until the third denial (Mark xiv. 70, 71); nevertheless, Peter neither cursed or swore either at the second or third denials (Luke xxii. 58, 60). The third denial took place an hour after the second (Luke xxii. 59); but the second denial occurred less than an hour previous to the third (Matt. xxvi. 73). Another disciple (John?) came with Peter to the high priest's house, and was present during the denials (John xviii. 15, 16, 17); but Peter came alons to the palace, and no disciple was with Peter when he uttered the denials (Matt. xxvi. 58, 69.75; Mark xiv. 54, 66.72; Luke xxii, 54-62).

Query.-Did Peter over deny Jesus at all?

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, U. S. A.