**58.]** **We** and **I** are emphatic. The  
allusion is probably to Dan. ii. 34.

**59.]** Perhaps the inconsistency of these  
testimonies may be traced in the different  
reports here and in Matthew.

**so**,—  
‘*in asserting this’*—i.e. they varied in the  
terms in which it was expressed.   
  
**60.]**  
On the most probable punctuation and  
construction, see note on Matthew, ver. 62.

**61.] the Blessed**: in Hebrew, the  
ordinary Name for God. “This is the only  
lace in the N.T. where the well-known  
Name constantly used by the Rabbis is  
thus absolutely given.” Meyer.

**62.]**  
The “*henceforth*” of Matthew, and “*from  
this time*” of Luke are here omitted.

**63.] his clothes**, literally, **his tunics**—not  
his *priestly robe*, which was worn only in  
the temple, and when officiating: see on  
Matthew, ver. 65.   
  
The plural perhaps   
is due to the wearing of two inner garments  
by persons of note.   
  
**65.] began**—when

the sentence was pronounced. The **some**  
appear to be members of the Sanhedrim:  
the *servants* follow.

**Prophesy]** St. Matthew and St. Luke explain   
this: ‘Prophesy, who smote thee?’

**66–72.]** OUR LORD IS THRICE DENIED  
BY PETER. Matt. xxvi. 69–75. Luke  
xxii. 56-62. John xviii. 17, 18, 25–27.  
See the comparative table, and notes, on  
Matthew.   
  
**66.] beneath**, because the  
house was built round the **court**, and the  
rooms looked down into it. See note on  
Matt. xxvi. 69.

**68.]** Peter’s reply is  
an union of two separate answers, which  
form the 1st and 2nd in Matthew.

**69.] the maid**—in Matthew “*another  
maid*,” in Luke “*another*,” but masculine.  
Meyer does not appear to be justified in  
asserting that this is necessarily the same  
maid as before: it might be only *the maid*