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 cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out,   
   
 thrice, only th: ice, be literally serve to shew what the agreements are,   
 harmonized. following table may and what the differences   
   
 MATTHEW. MARK. LUKE. JOHN.   
   
 1st Sitting in the| Warmi: him- Sitting by the Is recognized   
 denial. hall without, is self the as Matt. fire of ized the porteress on   
 charged by a maid — goes out into by the ‘maid. and being introduced   
 servant with hav- cock crows. ‘I charged — replies, by the other dis-   
 ing been with «Woman, I know ciple. ‘Art not   
 the Galilean. ‘I know not, neither Him not.’ thou also one   
 know notwhatthou!| thou sayest.’ this man’s disci-   
 sayest.” ples?’ He saith,   
 2nd He has gone out The same maid Another (but \*T Is not.’ and   
 denial. the porch— (possibly but see ‘male servant) warming himself.   
 another maid sees note,next col. ‘Thou also art of They said him,   
 him. ‘This man 1, line and him them, Peter said, ‘Art thou also   
 also was with «This man is of| «Man, I am not.’ lof disciples?’   
 of Naz.’ He de- them.’ He denies He denied, and   
 nies with an oath, again. said, ‘I not.’   
 «I do know the!   
 8rd man.’ a little After about an One of the   
 denial. the stand. As Matt. hour, another per- of High-priest,   
 ers-by say, ‘Surely Surely thou art saying, ‘Tru- his whose   
 thou thy dialect ;|of them: for thou ly this man was: ear Peter cut off,   
 trayeth thee.’ He/lean.’ with Him, for he says, ‘Did I not   
 began to curse and! is a Galilean.’ see in the gar-   
 toswear: ‘I know Peter said, ‘Man, den with Him?’   
 not the man.’ I know not what Peter then denied   
 Immediately the} A second time Immediately while again. the   
 cock crew, and|the cock crew, and hewas yetspeaking cock   
 Peter remembered, | Peter the cock crew,   
 otit|&e.—and when he the Lord turned   
 he wept bitterly. |thoughtthereon he and looked on   
 wept. Peter, and Peter   
 remembered, &¢.—   
 and going out he   
 wept bitterly.   
 On this table I make the follow- the admirable remarks of Augustine, cited   
 ing remarks :—that generally,—(1) sup- on ch. viii. 25: and remember, that the   
 posing the four accounts to be entirely substantive fact of a denial remains the   
 independent of one another,—we are not same, whether I know not what thow say-   
 bound to require accordance, nor would est, I know him not, or I am not, are   
 there in all probability be any such ac- reported to have been Peter’s (3)   
 cordance, in the recognitions of Peter by Ido not see that we are obliged to limit   
 different persons. These may have been the narrative to three sentences from   
 many on eack occasion of denial, in- Peter's mouth, each expressing a denial,   
 dependent narrators may have fixed on and no more. On three occasions during   
 different ones them. (2) No reader, the night he was recognized,—on three   
 who is not slavishly to the inspira- occasions he was @ denier of his Lord:   
 tion of the letter, require that the such a statement may well embrace re-   
 actual words spoken by Peter should in iterated expressions of recognition, and   
 each case be tdentically reported. See reiterated and importunate denials, on