*thrice*, and only *thrice*, cannot be literally  
harmonized. The following table may  
serve to shew what the agreements are,  
and what the differences :—

<table>

<tr>

<td></td>

<td>MATTHEW.</td>

<td>MARK.</td>

<td>LUKE.</td>

<td>JOHN.</td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

</tr>

<tr>

<td>1st denial.</td>

<td>Sitting in the hall without</td>

<td>is charged by a maid servant with having been with Jesus the Galilean. ‘I know not what thou sayest.’</td>

<td>Warming himself in the hall below</td>

<td>—&amp;c. as Matt.—goes out into the vestibule—cock crows. ‘I know not</td>

<td>neither understand what thou sayest.’</td>

<td>Sitting by the fire is recognized by the maid and charged—replies</td>

<td>‘Woman</td>

<td>I know Him not.’</td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

</tr>

<tr>

<td>2nd denial.</td>

<td>He has gone out into the porch—another maid sees him. ‘This man also was with Jesus of Naz.’ He denies with an oath</td>

<td>‘I do not know the man.’</td>

<td>The same maid (possibly: but see note</td>

<td>next page</td>

<td>col. 1</td>

<td>line 26) sees him again</td>

<td>and says</td>

<td>‘This man is of them.’ He denies again.</td>

<td>Another (but a male servant) says</td>

<td>‘Thou also art of them.’ Peter said</td>

<td>‘Man</td>

<td>I am not.’</td>

<td></td>

</tr>

<tr>

<td>3rd denial.</td>

<td>After a little while</td>

<td>the standers-by say</td>

<td>‘Surely thou art of them; for thy dialect betrayeth thee.’ He began to curse and to swear: ‘I know not the man.’</td>

<td>As Matth. ‘Surely thou art of them: for thou art also a Galilæan.’</td>

<td>After about an hour</td>

<td>another persisted saying</td>

<td>‘Truly this man was with Him</td>

<td>for he is a Galilæan.’ Peter said</td>

<td>‘Man</td>

<td>I know not what thou sayest.’</td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

</tr>

<tr>

<td></td>

<td>Immediately the cock crew</td>

<td>and Peter remembered</td>

<td>&amp;c.—and going out he wept bitterly.</td>

<td>A second time the cock crew</td>

<td>and Peter remembered</td>

<td>&amp;c.—and when he thought thereon he wept.</td>

<td>Immediately while he was yet speaking the cock crew</td>

<td>and the Lord turned and looked on Peter</td>

<td>and Peter remembered</td>

<td>&amp;c.—and going out he wept bitterly.</td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

<td></td>

</tr>

</table>

On this table I would make the following  
remarks :—that *generally*,—(1) supposing  
the four accounts to be *entirely  
independent of one another*,—we are *not*  
*bound to require accordance*, nor would  
there in all probability be any such accordance,  
*in the recognitions of Peter by  
different persons*. These may have been  
*many* on *each occasion* of denial, and independent  
narrators may have fixed on  
different ones among them. (2) *No reader*,  
who is not slavishly bound to the inspiration  
of the *letter, will require that the  
actual words spoken by Peter should in  
each case be identically reported*. See  
the admirable remarks of Augustine, cited  
on ch. viii. 25: and remember, that the  
*substantive fact of a denial* remains the  
same, whether *I know not what thou sayest,  
I know him not,* or *I am not*, are  
reported to have been Peter’s answer. (3)  
I do not see that we are obliged to limit  
the narrative to *three sentences* from  
Peter's mouth, each expressing a denial,  
*and no more*. On *three occasions* during  
the night he was recognized,—on *three  
occasions he was a denier* of his Lord:  
such a statement may well embrace *reiterated  
expressions of recognition*, and  
*reiterated* and *importunate denials,* on