in which both Annas and Caiaphas lived.  
This is evident from a comparison of the  
narratives of Peter’s denial: see below.  
The circumstance of a fire being lighted  
and the servants sitting round it, mentioned  
by the other three Evangelists, is  
here omitted.

**59. false witness]**“As they thought, evidence, but in reality,  
false witness,” Euthymius. But is this  
quite implied? Is it not the intention of  
the Evangelist to represent that they  
*sought false witness*, not that they would  
not take true if they could get it, but that  
*they knew it was not to be had?*

This hearing is altogether omitted in  
Luke, and only the indignities following  
related, vv. 63–65.

**60.] found they  
none**, i.e. sufficient for the purpose, or  
perhaps, consistent with itself. See note  
on Mark ver. 56.

**61.]** See ch. xxvii.  
40: the *false witness* consisted in *giving  
that sense to His words,* which it appears  
by ch. xxvii. 63 they *knew they did not  
bear.* There is perhaps a trace, in the  
*different reports* of Matt. and Mark, of the  
*discrepancy between the witnesses.* There  
is considerable difference between the words  
attributed to Him here, and there.

The instance likewise of his zeal *for the  
honour of the temple,* which had so lately  
occurred might tend to perplex the evidence  
produced to the contrary.

**62.]**  
Better rendered, **Dost thou not answer  
what it is which these testify against  
thee?** i.e. wilt thou give no explanation  
of the words alleged to have been used by  
thee? Our Lord was silent; for in answering  
He must have opened to them the  
meaning of these his words, which was not  
the work of this His hour, nor fitting for  
that audience.

**63.]** See Levit. v. 1.

**I adjure thee**, ‘I put thee under an  
oath,’ the form of Which follows. The junction  
of *the Son of God* with *the Christ* must  
not be pressed beyond the meaning which  
Caiaphas probably assigned to it—viz. the  
title given to the Messiah from the purport  
of the prophecies respecting Him.  
it is however a very different thing when  
our Lord by His answer *affirms this*, and  
invests the words with their fullest meaning  
and dignity.

**64.] By Thou hast  
said**, more may perhaps be implied than by  
St. Mark’s “*I am:”* *that* is a simple assertion:  
this may refer to the convictions  
and *admissions* of Caiaphas (see John xi.  
49). But this is somewhat doubtful. The  
expression is only used here and in ver. 25:  
and there does not appear to be any reference  
in it, as said to Judas, to any previous  
admission of his.

**nevertheless** —i. e.  
*‘there shall be a sign of the truth of what  
I say, over and above this confession of  
Mine.’*

**Henceforth**—the glorification  
of Christ is by Himself said to *begin with  
his betrayal*, see John xiii. 31: **from this  
time**—from the accomplishment of this  
trial now proceeding. In what follows,  
the whole process of the triumph of the  
Lord Jesus even till its end is contained.