

Monkey Trials

Jesus Goes Before Caiaphas, Pilate, and Herod

22:54 Then they seized him and led him away, bringing him **into the high priest's house** ...

63 Now the men who were holding Jesus in custody were mocking him as they beat him.

64 They also blindfolded him and kept asking him, "Prophecy! Who is it that struck you?"

65 And they said many other things against him, blaspheming him.

66 When day came, the assembly of the elders of the people gathered together, both chief priests and scribes. And they led him away to their council, and they said,

67 "If you are the Christ, tell us." But he said to them, "If I tell you, you will not believe,

68 and if I ask you, you will not answer.

69 But from now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God."

70 So they all said, "Are you the Son of God, then?" And he said to them, "You say that I am."

71 Then they said, "What further testimony do we need? We have heard it ourselves from his own lips."

23:1 Then the whole company of them arose and brought him **before Pilate**.

2 And they began to **accuse him**, saying, "We found this man misleading our nation and forbidding us to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a king."

3 And Pilate **asked him**, "Are you the King of the Jews?" And **he answered** him, "You have said so."

4 Then Pilate said to the chief priests and the crowds, "I find no guilt in this man."

5 But they were urgent, saying, "He stirs up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee even to this place."

6 When Pilate heard this, he asked whether the man was a Galilean.
7 And when he learned that he belonged to Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him over to Herod, who was himself in Jerusalem at that time.
8 When Herod saw Jesus, he was very glad, for he had long desired to see him, because he had heard about him, and he was hoping to see some sign done by him.
9 So he questioned him at some length, but he made no answer.
10 The chief priests and the scribes stood by, vehemently accusing him.
11 And Herod with his soldiers treated him with contempt and mocked him. Then, arraying him in splendid clothing, he sent him back to Pilate.
12 And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day, for before this they had been at enmity with each other.
13 Pilate then called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people,
14 and said to them, "You brought me this man as one who was misleading the people. And after examining him before you, behold, I did not find this man guilty of any of your charges against him.
15 Neither did Herod, for he sent him back to us. Look, nothing deserving death has been done by him.
16 I will therefore punish and release him."
18 But they all cried out together, "Away with this man, and release to us Barabbas" —
19 a man who had been thrown into prison for an insurrection started in the city and for murder.
20 Pilate addressed them once more, desiring to release Jesus,
21 but they kept shouting, "Crucify, crucify him!"
22 A third time he said to them, "Why? What evil has he done? I have found in him no guilt deserving death. I will therefore punish and release him."
23 But they were urgent, demanding with loud cries that he should be crucified. And their voices prevailed.
24 So Pilate decided that their demand should be granted.
25 He released the man who had been thrown into prison for insurrection and murder, for whom they asked, but he delivered Jesus over to their will.

Luke 22:54, 63-23:25

Monkey Trial

Monkey Trial. It's a phrase that many have heard. Where does it come from. Google's Ngram viewer says that it effectively did not exist prior to 1915. It has a few hits between 1920-25, which are unclear, although it does seem plausible that this is not mislabeled copyright dates.¹ Most will say that the phrase came into existence in 1925 because of the infamous *Scopes Trial* that took place in Dayton, TN in the summer of that year.

The trial was effectively a *publicity stunt* by some of the people in that small town to bring national attention to their home in hopes of revitalizing the local economy. They capitalized on the ACLU which was losing funding as their defending draft opponents from WWI was drying up, and were looking for a test case on this subject to get much needed publicity. That by itself ought to tell you something.

The case itself brought a *high school teacher* named *John T. Scopes* up on charges for violating the recently signed

¹ This excerpt supposedly comes from a 1921 Washington State Bar Association: "Even today it does not take a monkey trial to make court days in the pioneer mountain sections of Kentucky, Tennessee and West Virginia." The meaning of the phrase is unclear here, but because it mentions Tennessee, it is perhaps mislabeled in the date and is actually post 1925. See below.

Butler Act, which made it illegal for teachers to teach Darwinism in a state-funded school. Two of the biggest names in America tried the case. Democrat **William Jennings Bryan**, a **Christian**, three-time presidential candidate, and former secretary of state was the prosecutor, while **Agnostic Clarence Darrow**, perhaps America's greatest criminal lawyer, was the defense attorney. Scopes, who was himself unsure if he had actually taught it, was eventually found guilty, fined \$100, but his case was overturned on a technicality, which upset the defense which wanted the case to go before the Supreme Court.

But the trial really became popular thanks to the **Robert E. Lee's** play *Inherit the Wind*, which fictionalized the trial in an extremely biased manner, and **H. L. Mencken**, journalist and satirist, whose reporting of the trial was anything but literal. He is the one who dubbed it the "**Monkey Trial**," a kind of double-entendre since it was about evolution from monkeys and he loathed Christianity. Both of these sources essentially ridiculed anyone believing in creation, incessantly mocked and stereotyped Bryan, and made "science" the only rational alternative one would possibly conclude from this trial. **The irony**, as Marvin Olasky's book *Monkey*

Business details in its own play on the word “monkey,” is that **the true crime** was the way this trial was used by our sources of information to mock God and his creation. In this way, a “monkey trial” has taken on different nuances of meaning.

When I think of the term, I think of **a stacked court** that has no intention of actually getting at the truth of the matter. I think of the **state media industrial complex** that tries its opponents in **the court of public opinion** before they can actually get a fair trial, thus poisoning anyone and everyone against them before an honest verdict can ever be sought. I think **public circus events** that arise from the hunger of those addicted to lawlessness and their own self-importance and self-preservation. Most of all, I think of what my Lord underwent for me as he faced all of this and more on Maundy-Thursdays and Good Fridays all those years ago.

The Lukan Account of the Trials of Jesus

Enter **the Scribes and Chief Priests of Israel**. We know from **Luke 22:1ff**, that these men “**were seeking how to put him to death.**” They conspired with **Judas Iscariot**, who was himself under the great cloud of **Satan**. On Thursday night,

they seized him in the Garden of Gethsemane, and him whisked off to the high priest, Caiaphas' house (**Luke 22:54**). This is the point we now pick up the story.

Today we will look at Jesus going before the three main rulers: **Caiaphas**, **Pilate**, and **Herod**, all in a single gruesome night and morning where the powers of darkness had their hour (**53**). As Luke tells us, these three stories follow one after the other. This works in his literary favor, as he has flipped the order of the time in the High Priests house with Peter's denial from the other Gospels (or, as some think, he recalls a second event not told by the others). This allows us to see a kind of **rapid-fire blast of mockery**, false accusations, and monkey trials all meant to show us in increasingly thrilling fashion just how it was that Jesus came to be crucified on a wooden Roman device of torture and death.

While there are **mini-chiasms** found within **Luke 22:63-23:25**, it is really **the order** of the three—the Jewish High Priest, the Roman governor, and the Galilean half-breed Tetrarch that forms the outline for this part of the story. It is important to note in this regard that Luke gives us several sections that are at least **somewhat unique** to his Gospel. We will begin with one (**22:63-65**), which is the beating and

mocking Jesus took throughout those long dark hours of night before finally being taken to the high priest. The second is the Galilee discussion (23:4-6), which leads to Jesus being taken before Herod and back to Pilate (7-16), something no other Gospel tells us.

- 22:63-65: Men beating and mocking Jesus (somewhat unique in Luke²)
- 22:65-71: Jesus b-4 Sanhedrin (v. 67 unique, some missing from MT/MK)
- 23:1-5: Jesus before Pilate (much shortened; vv. 4-5 Galilee unique)
- 23:6-16: Jesus to Herod and back to Pilate (unique to Luke)
- 23:17-25: The crowd Trial (shortened from MT/MK)

Mocking Games

We will pick up our story in **Luke 22:54**. “Then they seized him and led him away, bringing him into the high priest’s house...” The “they” here refers to the “crowd” (47), which included chief priests, officers of the temple, the elders (52) and servants of the high priest (50). This was a rabble or very powerful men, assembled for one reason: to proverbially lynch Jesus of Nazareth. And what they did

² In Matt and Mark, this is found after the trial with Caiaphas (**Matt 26:66-27; Mark 14:65**). But they only specify that it was “they” or “some,” leading us to conclude it was most likely the leaders of the whole sordid affair.

puts the worst kinds of lynchings you can think of, to shame. This was truly awful on an otherworldly level.

The first people we run into once our story resumes, immediately after Peter hears the rooster crow, are “**the men who were holding Jesus in custody**” (63). These are the members of **the Jewish temple guard**, the police if you will who actually arrested the Lord. What follows is found in a different place in Matt/Mark and to some degree is unique in that it calls out specifically those who were holding him in custody,³ and so it begs the question of why he wanted to insert it here.

It says that they “**were mocking him as they beat him. They also blindfolded him and kept asking him, ‘Prophecy! Who is it that struck you?’ And they said many other things against him, blaspheming him**” (63-65). The Lord undergoes **mocking, beating, blasphemy**, and most likely, some kind of **twisted game** that the soldiers used to play. Three ideas are important to bring out.

First, **mocking and beating** may allude to Isaiah 53 and the Suffering Servant. This is as close as Luke gets to the torture Jesus underwent prior to his execution.

³ See note above.

Second, they are *blaspheming* him. It is very interesting to me that the next scene, which takes us to Caiaphas' house, is where in Matthew and Mark, they both tell us that *Jesus* is the one blaspheming (**Matt 26:65; Mark 14:64**). Luke has the same account, but it is greatly shortened and does not include the word blasphemy there (see **Luke 22:71**). Luke doing this highlights that *the blasphemer is not Jesus*, but those attacking and accusing him. Even more importantly, while the word can simply mean “*slander*” or “*insulting talk*,” to remove it from a context in which Jesus is clearly being accused of blaspheming God and put it here, well, it seems to me that Luke is telling us that these men are doing much more than insulting Jesus. Rather, in blaspheming him they are in fact attacking God. This is a terrible and powerful statement that starts off our series of monkey trials. It tells us up front what is really going on in the hearts of men. The whole thing is a frontal assault on God himself.

This becomes all the more certain when you think about the context Luke puts this in. *They blindfold Jesus* and then *dare him to prophesy who struck him*. It is possible that this was *a play on an ancient game called kollabismos* (“spank the baby”), where the player with eyes covered has to guess

which hand another player has used to strike him, or another game was *chalkē miua* (“blindman’s buff”) where a blindfolded player tries to find other players while being struck by them with papyrus husks.⁴ Whatever the case, it seems to me the reason Luke adds this is to **highlight the blasphemy**. For back in **Luke 18:32** he told us this prediction from Jesus’ own lips about himself, “**For he will be delivered over to the Gentiles and will be mocked and shamefully treated and spit upon.**” I love what Cyril of Alexandria said about this.

They ridicule, as if he were some ignorant person, him who is the giver of all knowledge and even sees what is hidden within us. He has somewhere said by one of the holy prophets, ‘Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?’ (**Job 38:2**). He who tries hearts and minds and is the giver of all prophecy, how could he not know who hit him? As Christ said, “Darkness has blinded *their eyes*, and *their minds are blinded*” (**John 12:40**). One may say of them, “Woe to them that are drunk, but not with wine! Their vine is of the vine of Sodom and of Gomorrah” (**Is 29:9; Deut 32:32**) [emphasis mine].

(Cyril of Alexandria, *Homily* 150)

⁴ David L. Miller, “ἐμπαίζειν : Playing the Mock Game (Luke 22:63-64),” JBL 90.3 (1971): 309-10. Also John Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, vol. 35C, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1993), 1099.

The Sanhedrin Monkey Trial: The Son of Man and the Son of God

Vs. 66 takes us to where Matthew and Mark have the arrest story prior to Peter's denial. "When day came, the assembly of the elders of the people gathered together, both chief priests and scribes. And they led him away to their council..." So, Jesus has been arrested sometime in the previous evening. He has endured these horrible mockings and blasphemies all night long, hours upon hours waiting for the corrupt politicians to wake up and the trials to begin. And, unless he had an earlier appearance before Caiaphas (which is certainly possible, as Luke's version is much shorter), he is now standing before the great council of Israel for the first time.

What is this council? This is the Sanhedrin. The rabbis traced its origin to the appointment of the seventy elders in **Num 11:16** (see m. Sanh. 1:6). Previously, in **Exodus 24:1ff**, in a kind of human reclamation of the divine council scene, the seventy elders of Israel went up onto Mt. Sinai to eat with God. So in other words, the whole sons of God idea that Luke has had in mind throughout Luke 22 remains in

view even to this late point going into the trials of Jesus. The Sanhedrin did not exist until the Greek period (3rd cent. B.C.). It was made up of Jerusalem nobility, lay leaders and priests, and **the high priest** who traced himself back to Aaron. When Luke refers to the “chief priests” and “teachers of the law” (22:66), he probably refers to the Sadducean and Pharisaic power blocks. At this time, the Sadducees controlled it, but the scribes had also gained a prominent place.⁵

As for **the high priest** for this spectacle, it was Joseph ben **Caiaphas** (Luke 3:2; John 18:13) who lived from 14 BC – 46 AD. He was the brother-in-law of Annas who had five sons, each of whom would later serve as high priests.⁶ Recall that Jesus very likely told a subversive story about the **rich man and Lazarus** that was aimed directly at this very man (Luke 16:19-31). He began that story with two **deaths** and ended

⁵ **Mark Strauss**, “Luke *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke*, vol. 1,” ed. Clinton E. Arnold (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 487.

⁶ Annas (6-15 AD); Eleazar ben Ananus (16-17 AD); Caiaphas (18-36 AD, married to Annas’ daughter; Jonathan ben Ananus (36-37 and 44 AD); Theophilus ben Ananus (37-41 AD); Matthias ben Ananus (43 AD); Ananus ben Ananus (63 AD). On this connection see Graham Jackman, *Luke’s Pauline Narrative: Reading the Third Gospel* (Lulu: 2019), 195. On the royal family see Josephus, *Antiquities* 20.9.2. note c. Flavius Josephus and William Whiston, *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987). Long ago Gustav Lisco wrote, “Many expositors have thought they discovered, in this story, a real history, and referred it to the family of Annas and his son-in-law, Caiaphas, whose sadducean unbelief, in regard to a future state, and Epicurean mode of life, are here delineated and reprov’d.” Frederick Gustav Lisco, *The Parables of Jesus Explained and Illustrated*, trans. P. Fairbairn (Philadelphia; New York; Boston: Daniels and Smith; Robert Carter and Brothers; Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln, 1850), 349.

it with a foreshadowing of (very likely) two **resurrections**: Lazarus' and his own! Did Caiaphas catch wind of this story? Did he realize it was about him? What do you suppose this would have done to his view of Jesus and how he would have treated him at this moment? Finally, it is worth noting that John (indeed, perhaps even Lazarus himself as John's source) at this very place tells us that **"It was Caiaphas who had advised the Jews that it would be expedient that one man should die for the people"** (John 18:14).

All of this is in the background now as the scribes and priests said (Luke 22:66), **"If you are the Christ, tell us"** (67). **"Christ"** is the Greek word that translates the Hebrew *"mashiah."* It means **"the anointed"** (coming from the Gk verb *khriein* **"to rub, anoint"**). Obviously, Messiah is a title given in many prophecies and typological passages referring to a great person who will arise out of Israel in the future. **Messianic expectations** ran rampant throughout the first century (and on past the days of Jesus) in Israel. Luke has given us this title for Jesus several times, including at **his birth** (Luke 2:11, 26; his **baptism** (3:15); immediately after his **temptation** (4:41), in **Peter's confession** (9:20), and just **earlier this**

very week in his encounter with Sadducees and Pharisees in (20:41).

They now use that very encounter to, as Hendriksen says, **out of sheer desperation, assume the role of prosecuting attorneys or accusers.**⁷ I find this language of his quite curious given that Job 1-2 is already close to Luke's mind with Satan, because **the *satan* was the prosecuting attorney** of the divine council and his title "devil" means "accuser." In other words, they are doing Satan's bidding.

Given **the huge political overtones** with the term "Christ" in those days, this question could be used to formulate a **sufficient charge** to have him put to death! It's not that they went after everyone claiming to be the Messiah (though they did go after some), it's that they see Jesus as an existential threat to their very existence, and so using a title thought by many to refer to a *political* revolutionary who would overthrow Roman rule and free Israel could be used against him if they hated him enough. And boy did they!

Luke gives us **a unique answer** that is not found in the other Gospels. "But he said to them, 'If I tell you, you will not believe, and if I ask you, you will not answer'" (22:67).

⁷ William Hendriksen and Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Gospel According to Luke*, vol. 11, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953–2001), 998.

Jesus' answer amounts to this, "No matter what I say, you will certainly not believe me, for you are prejudiced. And if I put a question to you regarding this matter, in order that by this method you might be led to the right answer, you will certain not answer."⁸ How does he know this? Because this is precisely what he did to them in that exchange earlier that very week. He asked them about **John the Baptist** and his authority (**20:3-7**). He asked them about **the son of the David also being David's Lord** (**41-44**) and they answered him not a word. This is a monkey trial. Its purpose has one end only: the put Jesus to death. He knows it. They know it. So this is his answer.

Now, **Matthew and Mark** both focus on Jesus being questioned by Caiaphas after false witnesses are brought to testify against him. Their point seems to be that Jesus is fulfilling **Isaiah 53:7**, "He opened not his mouth." But **Luke's** purposes are different. Jesus continues, "But from now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God" (**Luke 22:69**). He says the same thing, though a little longer, in **MT and MK**.

⁸ Ibid.

How can we reconcile that Jesus was both silent and gave answer? Obviously, in Luke you don't have to because Jesus isn't silent. But if you compare them, the question arises. But the answer is simple. Caiaphas at this very moment has just put Jesus *under oath* (Mt 26:62; Mk 14:61). Some say that Jesus overthrew the OT law on taking oaths at the Sermon on the Mount and that since that moment Christians must not take oaths, even in courts of law. This is pure foolishness. Jesus himself is your proof that this didn't happen. If you are put under oath, you must answer, and Jesus was no law-breaker! He came *not to overthrow the law, but to fulfill it*.

His answer clearly has two more divine council passages in mind. The first is Dan 7:13, “I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man.” The other Gospels add more of this verse that he will come “on the clouds of heaven.” This scene in Daniel has the divine council, the thrones of heaven, taking their place with the books of judgment being opened. Suddenly, one like the son of man comes to the Ancient of Days where he is given a kingdom. This is effectively *a human being given dominion over the divine council*. IT's the same kind

of reversal we see foreshadowed in the 70 elders and Sanhedrin, but now it isn't a group, but a single individual. We'll call his the Second Adam.

The other passage is **Psalm 110:1**, “The LORD says to my lord, ‘Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool.’” Importantly, this was the very same verse Jesus used in his exchange with them earlier that week, which they would not answer. It *also is a divine council*, heavenly being passage. But now, the emphasis is on the Messiah being David's Lord. In other words, *this person is God*.

This explains why they all said, “*Are you the Son of God, then?*” (**Luke 22:70**). In this, Luke follows Matthew. Here, the *Bible Backgrounds Commentary*, among many others says, “The Sanhedrin is probably not asking whether Jesus is claiming deity, but whether he is the Messiah. The Old Testament promised that the Messiah would have a special father-son relationship with God. It is debated whether ‘Son of God’ was a common messianic title in first-century Judaism.”⁹ While this is debated, I very much *disagree with this sentiment*. Of course they are asking if Jesus is claiming to

⁹ Strauss, 487.

be divine. That's why in Matthew and Mark they charge Jesus with *blasphemy* (**Mt 26:65; Mk 14:64**). Ironically, this idea simply is not accounting for how the figure in Psalm 110 must be divine, which is why he is David's Lord!

The divine council was full of **heavenly beings**, so this person must be one of them. Adam was a **human being** and was originally given a seat at the table, so he must also be one of them. Only one person in human history fits that bill—Jesus of Nazareth, fully God and fully man. Do you see how understanding this worldview actually has implications that can help us make sense of why Jesus is the only way to the Father?

It continues, “**And he said to them, ‘You say that I am’**” (**Luke 22:70**). Matthew says, “**You have said so,**” and is thus very similar. Mark on the other hand simply has, “**I am**” (*egō eimi*), which I believe is a clear allusion to the divine name. I think what Luke is highlighting is **how ridiculous this entire sham is**. Jesus is clearly being sarcastic in this remark. In other words, it doesn't matter if I really am or not, you are going to do what you are going to do. It's disgusting. It's wicked. It's *satanic*.

Their answer only highlights these things. “They said, ‘What further testimony do we need? We have heard it ourselves from his own lips’” (71). Well, no actually, they didn’t. They heard Jesus say from his own lips that *they* said he was. But that’s the point of the monkey trial before Caiaphas, you see? This wasn’t a fair hearing. It was a Jan 6th committee hearing 2,000 years previous. But the defendant was not merely someone being ushered into the capitol building by undercover agents plotting against a sitting president (too much?). It was God in human flesh who had sworn in eternity past that he would endure this very moment so that anyone who turns to God through Christ might have forgiveness of their sins—even the sins of putting Jesus himself to death on the cross.

The Pontius Pilate Monkey Trial and False Charges

This is **only one of three** monkey trials that night. Why? Perhaps it’s because in the sick and twisted minds of the satanically possessed, it is a kind of **black-mockery** of God’s law: on the testimony of **two or three satanic witnesses** may an innocent many be put to death. So we continue, “Then

the whole company of them arose and brought him before Pilate” (Luke 23:1). This is the same Pilate we saw back in 3:1, “In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea...” He’s been the Roman governor now for the entire span of Jesus’ ministry. He ruled over Judaea, the region of which Jerusalem was the capitol.

Luke at this moment skips the entire story of Judas hanging himself (found only in Matt 27:3-10), and if I was going to pick if he was using any of the Gospels at this point, he seems closest to John! “And they began to accuse him, saying, ‘We found this man misleading our nation and forbidding us to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a king’” (Luke 23:2). John is the only other one that this point who tells us that Jesus was being accused of “doing evil” (John 18:30). Notice how coy their accusation is before the Roman governor. They are master contextualizers of evil. They have just claimed before the high priest that Jesus is claiming to be God himself. But they don’t dare say that to Pilate. He would most likely be let off for insanity. So they minimize it. He calls himself “a king.” That’s

not exactly a big deal, because there are lots of vassal kings under Caesar.

But **they've added something**. They tell him that this king is misleading the nation, forbidding them to give tribute to Caesar. The idea here is that he's being **a false servant of Caesar**. Vassal kings must pay tribute to the Suzerain, the Caesar. He's telling the people not to corporate, which would be an act of insurrection. But they lie. We know they lie, because they are referring to the exchange back in **20:22-26**. Jesus has never said any such thing. He said, **"Render to Caesar what is Caesars and to God what is Gods."** False witnesses. Liars before the court. Who's committing the real insurrection here? Jesus? Or them?

"And Pilate asked him, 'Are you the King of the Jews?'" Pilate is playing along. But **I don't like the translation** here, because the "you" is placed at the beginning of the sentence for emphasis. It isn't a mere question. It's as if Pilate looks at Jesus, laughs at the pathetic sight he sees before him, and says, **"You ... king of the Jews? How absurd."**¹⁰

Jesus simply replies as he did in the previous trial. **"You have said so"** (**23:3**). Jesus' simple answer (*su legeis*) is **difficult**

¹⁰ Hendriksen, 1009.

to translate. Does Jesus mean “It is as you say?” affirming Pilate’s incredulity? In other words, “Yep, that’s exactly what I am.” Or is he essentially refusing to answer like he did previously, because he knows that no matter what he says, it won’t matter?

The other Gospels all spend more time at this trial. Matthew and Mark tell us that the chief priests and elders begin to accuse him again, but Jesus refused to answer them and this amazed Pilate. John, for his part, gives us a longer exchange between Jesus and Pilate which ends in Pilate becoming a postmodernist: “What is truth” (John 18:38). But Luke, following John, ends this phase of the trials with Pilate telling the chief priests and the crowds (which is interesting, meaning that it was all public and a great many spectators were not present), “I find no guilt in this man” (Luke 23:4). *Whoops!* It looks like they aren’t going to get their second witness after all.

The Herod Monkey Trial and the Clothing of Light

In this way, Luke takes us to a third trial, one that none of the others tell us about. It begins with the priests, the very

descendants of Aaron himself, “urgently” saying, “He stirs up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee even to this place” (5). They are desperate. They are out of ammunition. This is all they have left. It’s like the last gasp of a little child throwing a tantrum to get his brother into trouble. [*In a whinny voice:*] “But ... he said mean things to me!!!” It’s pathetic.

But it is the mention of *Galilee* that catches Pilate’s attention. For Galilee is not his jurisdiction. That honor belonged to *Herod*. And it just so happened that Herod was in Jerusalem at this very moment, because it was the Passover. So Pilate seized the opportunity to get himself off the hook. *Why not send this Jesus over to him and let him deal with these fools.* Thus Luke says, “When Pilate heard this, he asked whether the man was a Galilean. And when he learned that he belonged to Herod’s jurisdiction, he sent him over to Herod, who was himself in Jerusalem at that time” (Luke 23:6-7).

So they took him across town where Herod was. “When Herod saw Jesus, he was very glad, for he had long desired to see him, because he had heard about him, and he was hoping to see some sign done by him” (8). Remember, this is the guy who, when the daughter of Herodius, prompted by her

mother asked for Jesus' cousin's head on a platter, gave it to her willingly. As bad a Pilate was—and he was hardly a saint—Herod is that much worse.

“He questioned [Jesus] at some length” (9). “But he made no answer” (9b). He wasn't placed under oath, so why should he? You have to know that this didn't make Herod very happy. He wanted to open up his eyes and see a sign. He got sound of silence. The priests seized on the opportunity to get their second witness. “The chief priests and the scribes stood by, vehemently accusing him” (10). They would apply pressure. For his part, “Herod with his soldiers treated him with contempt and mocked him” (11a). It seemed all was going in their favor. They would get their conviction!

But suddenly, it all ends. “Then, arraying him in splendid clothing, he sent him back to Pilate” (11b). *Whoops*. Does that mean what I think it means? Is Herod not going to find him guilty after all?

This “splendid clothing” statement is very interesting and I think starts to get at why Luke wanted to add this third trial. For besides what we will see in a moment, that in fact Herod did not find him guilty, it recalls to our minds something we saw earlier—at *the transfiguration*.

In **Luke 9:29** we read that Jesus “**clothing became dazzling white**” (*ho himatismos autou leukos exastraptōn*). It’s not the same words that are used here (*esthēta lampran*), but Luke has chosen a word that seems to encapsulate the entire event. Literally, Jesus’ clothing was *a lamp*. “The adjective *lampros*, which does not occur in the other canonical gospels, has the meaning of bright, shining or brilliant. The noun *esthēs* (clothing) is used by Luke for angels (24:4; Acts 1:10; 10:30) or for a king (12:21). It has been suggested that in this occurrence the expression shining clothing might be understood as shining white clothing.”¹¹

The language is **rife with possible meanings**. It could be Luke’s way of describing **the purple robe** of the other Gospels, an idea which certain calls to our minds **royalty**, as this is the color of both kings and priests. Some see it as Luke’s way of highlighting **Jesus’ innocence**, because light and shining calls white to our minds, not purple. But it seems to me that it harkens to Jesus’ divinity, with its allusions to angels and the transfiguration. This also fits with the many divine council and sons of God motifs that Luke has had throughout this section of his Gospel. It also works nicely with what

¹¹ **Adam Kubiś**, “**Jesus’ Trial Before Herod Antipas**,” *Resovia Sacra* 21 (2014): 265.

I said was happening in the spiritual realm on the mountain. As Satan/Baal saw Jesus light up and the Father proclaimed him the Beloved Son, it enraged the old serpent. Now, he is having his revenge. *You think you are the Son of Light? Here's your robe of light. Some God of power you are. Now, go die on the cross and I'll inherit the title like I should have all along.*

But **Luke isn't finished**. The Herod episode concludes this way. “**And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day, for before this they had been at enmity with each other**” (12). People have often charged Luke with making this entire Herodian episode up. They are fools. Luke knows full well what he is talking about. The key here is the term “**friends**.”

When we read this, we probably think this means something like Pilate and Herod who “**became chums playing backgammon with each other in their spare time.**” People might see it as them being “**churlish and vindictive, rubbing it in when the unfortunately Jesus of Nazareth was crucified while they drank a toast and renewed their friendship.**”¹² That isn't what's going on.

¹² Jonathan Williams, “[Pilate and Herod at Backgammon?](#)” *Academia Letters* (2021), Article 1543. The following discussion summarizes this article.

The term “friend” refers in this context to a **very specific relationship** that had a place at every level of society from Emperor down to slaves. Any given relationship would have a **patron**—that is the one with power, good, and wealth, and a **client**—the one who received the goods. This began in the family and worked all the way up to the highest echelons of politics. The patron would give benefits to the client when it pleased him. He was expected to give freely with no thought of return, like the gods. Amazingly, this motive and energy was called **grace**! The benefits received were gracious gifts and the client was expected to return praise and honor to the patron, which was also called grace. One might call it **the reciprocal dance of grace**. If you were someone who was highly competitive and able to “**read between the lines**,” you could do more than was required and you stood a chance of acquiring great wealth and power.

That’s the background going on in this statement, and Luke knew it well. What Luke is telling us is that there was a relationship that was often strained by two powerful men, of different ethnicities, ruling over various parts of the same country. Both were **under Caesar**. So he sends Jesus to Herod

as a gift. Pilate could please his patron (the emperor) by keeping the peace with Herod and the Jews. Herod, who for his part was often at odds with Pilate for his harsh treatment of the Jews, was seen by Pilate as most likely wanting Jesus out of the way and he knew that if Jesus was put to death, it would clear the unrest of the Jews in this present scuffle.

The Pilate Monkey Trial Concludes: Jesus sentenced to Death

It's just here that we read that **Herod sent Jesus back to Pilate!** Why? He was now giving Jesus to Pilate as a gift. Both of these powerful men were trying to please the emperor, to keep the peace, and to score political clout. In doing this, their differences were temporarily settled and they became **patronage friends**, allying their power. But we don't see how this would all work its way out until Jesus is sent back to Pilate. And what we see here in the remainder of this unique story with Herod and Pilate at first turns very bad for the priests and scribes.

So we continue, **"Pilate then called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people, and said to them, 'You**

brought me this man as one who was misleading the people. And after examining him before you, behold, I did not find this man guilty of any of your charges against him” (Luke 23:13-14). *Strike one.* “Neither did Herod, for he sent him back to us” (15a). *Strike two.* They had tried with Pilate to get their second witness that would put Jesus to death by their law. They failed. But luck had it that they had another chance with Herod. Surely, this would succeed, since he was one of them (kinda). But it too failed! The monkey trial wasn’t working!

Pilate concludes, “Look, nothing deserving death has been done by him. I will therefore punish and release him” (16). Jesus has actually been found innocent of charges of death by the two most powerful leaders in Israel at the time. But it is right here that Luke now returns to following the other Gospel stories.

We’ll start in vs. 17, which you will notice is not found in the ESV. The verse reads in the KJV, “For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.” Even in the KJV, this appears in a parenthesis. What’s going on here? This verse is absent from early witnesses and it appears in different locations in later manuscripts, some put it after vs. 16

and others after vs. 19. In other words, it is a later addition by a Christian scribe, “almost certainly formulated on the basis of the other Gospels to fill a perceived gap in the Lukan text.”¹³ It does in fact parallel **Matt 27:15** and **Mark 15:6**, so it appears that someone though an earlier copiest accidentally left it out. This bold soul decided he needed to add it back in. It doesn't really matter, because all the words do is affirm the other Gospels. Nevertheless, Luke almost certainly did not pen them and that's why it is left out of the ESV and most other modern translations.

“But they all cried out together, ‘Away with this man, and release to us Barabbas – a man who had been thrown into prison for an insurrection started in the city and for murder’” (**Luke 23:18-19**). With the addition of **vs. 17**, the transition to this otherwise abrupt (and for us all these centuries later almost inexplicable, if we are only reading Luke) scream makes sense. It was **the custom to release a prisoner** on this day of the year. It's like a Presidential Pardon. It is also a kind of “**scapegoat**” tradition, that follows after the law of the Scapegoat in Leviticus 16, which is curious, since

¹³ John Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, vol. 35C, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1993), 1129.

one goat is sent to Azazel, one of the instigators of the Genesis 6 rebellion in the Jewish traditions (more divine council overlap).

Who is this Barabbas? His name literally means, “**Son of a Father**” in a human sense. Remember that Jesus is often called the **only begotten Son of the Father**. Further, some early manuscripts give him a forename. Amazingly, it is Jesus. Blomberg says, “**It is hard to imagine anyone creating this potentially embarrassing parallel if it were not true ... Certainly, having both characters named Jesus tightens the parallelism and makes the irony of the crowd’s response all the greater. Pilate’s question then becomes, ‘Do you want Jesus Barabbas or Jesus who is called the Christ?’**”¹⁴ Finally, Pilate had already prepared to kill this notorious prisoner and it is possible that the two men next to Jesus on the cross were in his gang. So **Pilate offers a deal**. He **effectively casts lots** for Jesus 1 or Jesus 2. This is the whole point of the scapegoat law.

The early church very clearly saw Jesus’ death as fulfilling this law. The Epistle of Barnabas says,

¹⁴ **Craig Blomberg**, *Matthew*, vol. 22, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992), 411.

Understand therefore, children of gladness, that the good Lord *manifested all things to us beforehand*, that we might know to whom we ought in all things to render thanksgiving and praise ... Attend yourselves to the commandments which he gave. **Take two goats**, fair and alike, and offer them, and let the priest take the one for a whole burnt offering for sins. But the other one—what must they do with it? **Accursed**, says he, is the one. *Give heed how the type of Jesus is revealed*. And do you all spit upon it and goad it, and place scarlet wool about its head, and so let it be cast into the wilderness. And when it is so done, he that takes the goat into the wilderness leads it, and takes off the wool, and puts it upon the branch... What then does this mean? Give heed. The one at the altar, and the other accursed. And moreover the accursed one crowned. For they shall see Him in that day wearing the long scarlet robe about his flesh, and shall say, Is not this He, whom once we crucified and spat upon? ... For how is He like the goat? For this reason it says the goats shall be fair and alike, that, when they shall see Him coming, then they may be astonished at the likeness of the goat. Therefore behold the type of Jesus that was to suffer.

(**Barn 7:1-10**)

Barnabas compares Jesus' way of suffering to that of **the scapegoat**. **Justin Martyr** (*Dial 40:4ff*) does the same.

Here is how the story plays out. “Pilate addressed them once more, desiring to release Jesus, but they kept shouting, ‘Crucify, crucify him!’ A third time he said to them, “Why? What evil has he done? I have found in him no guilt deserving death. I will therefore punish and release him” (20-22). Pilate retains his belief in Jesus’ innocence to the very end. Cyril of Jerusalem said,

He “did not sin, neither was deceit found in his mouth.” It was not Peter, who could be suspected of partiality, who said this, but Isaiah, who, although not present in the flesh, in spirit foresaw the Lord’s coming in the flesh. Why do I bring only the prophet as a witness? Take the witness of Pilate himself. He passed judgment on him, by saying, “I find no guilt in this man.” When he delivered him over and washed his hands, he said, “I am innocent of the blood of this just man.”

(Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures* 13.3)¹⁵

Pilate is showing that indeed, **the prophecy of Isaiah is true**. Jesus was innocent. But the plan of God must nevertheless come to pass. “**But they were urgent, demanding with loud cries that he should be crucified. And their voices**

¹⁵ Arthur A. Just, *Luke*, vol. 3, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture NT 3. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 355–356.

prevailed” (23). Matthew Henry said, “They not only will have him die, but will have him die so great a death; nothing less will serve but he must be crucified: *Crucify him, crucify him.*”¹⁶ Miles Coverdale, whose Bible was the very first complete modern English translation of the Bible (1535) said, “They chose a murderer instead of the Savior. Their request is that the murderer might live; as for the Savior and Well of life, they desire to put him to death. If we pondered this thoroughly in our hearts, that our Savior, our Jesus, was less esteemed and thought more vile than a murderer, we should be glad to suffer anything for his sake.”¹⁷

“So Pilate decided that their demand should be granted. He released the man who had been thrown into prison for insurrection and murder, for whom they asked, but he delivered Jesus over to their will” (24-25). Look, then, at what we have. Two men, alike yet different. Both with the same name, yet two different fates await them. Pilate essentially cast lots for the two men. Barabbas goes free, Barabbas the murderer is sent back to the murdering people. But Jesus,

¹⁶ Matthew Henry, *Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible: Complete and Unabridged in One Volume* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 1906.

¹⁷ Miles Coverdale, “Fruitful Lessons Upon the Passion, Burial, Resurrection, Ascension and of the Sending of the Holy Spirit,” (1593), in Beth Kreitzer et al., eds., *Luke: New Testament*, vol. III, Reformation Commentary on Scripture (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015), 459.

the Lamb of God, is sentenced to die.

Why? Because it was the plan of God. But in the plan of evil men, it was because a series of monkey trials were put together to convict the only innocent man who has ever lived. Why would Jesus endure this suffering, this sham? He endured it for you. As Hebrews tells you, “The founder and perfecter of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured ... despising the shame.” And now, through the resurrection, even as he predicted to those evil priests, he is seated at the right hand of the throne of God” (Heb 12:2).

God has given his greatest gift to you as an act of grace. Therefore, what else can you give back but your praise and thanks, knowing that he did this for your salvation. To God alone be the glory.

Bibliography

Epistle of Barnabas.

Craig Blomberg. *Matthew*. The New American Commentary vol. 22. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992.

Coverdale, Miles. “Fruitful Lessons Upon the Passion, Burial, Resurrection, Ascension and of the Sending of the Holy Spirit.” (1593).

Cyril of Jerusalem. *Catechetical Lectures*.

Hendriksen, William and Simon J. Kistemaker. *Exposition of the Gospel According to Luke*. New Testament Commentary vol. 11. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953–2001.

Henry, Matthew. *Matthew Henry’s Commentary on the Whole Bible: Complete and Unabridged in One Volume*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.

Just, Arthur A. *Luke*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture NT 3. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005.

Kreitzer, Beth et al., eds. *Luke: New Testament*, vol. III. Reformation Commentary on Scripture. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015.

Kubiś, Adam. “[Jesus’ Trial Before Herod Antipas](#).” *Resovia Sacra* 21 (2014): 239-77.

Miller, David L. “ἐμπαίζειν : Playing the Mock Game (Luke 22:63-64).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90.3 (1971): 309-13.

Nolland, John. *Luke 1:1–9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 35A. Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1989.

Strauss, Mark. “Luke.” *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke*, vol. 1. Ed. Clinton E. Arnold. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002.

Williams, Jonathan. “[Pilate and Herod at Backgammon?](#)” *Academia Letters* (2021). Article 1543.

Luke	Matt	Mark	John
<p>22:54 Then they seized him and led him away, bringing him into the high priest's house, and Peter was following at a distance.</p> <p>54ff PETER FOLLOWING</p>	<p>26:57 Then those who had seized Jesus led him to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders had gathered.</p> <p>58 PETER FOLLOWING</p>	<p>14:53 And they led Jesus to the high priest. And all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes came together.</p> <p>54 PETER FOLLOWING</p>	<p>18:12 So the band of soldiers and their captain and the officers of the Jews arrested Jesus and bound him.</p> <p>13 First they led him to Annas, for he was the father-in-law of Caiaphas, who was high priest that year.</p> <p>14 It was Caiaphas who had advised the Jews that it would be expedient that one man should die for the people.</p> <p>15ff PETER FOLLOWING</p>
<p>22:63 Now the men who were holding Jesus in custody were mocking him as they beat him.</p>			
<p>64 They also blindfolded him and kept asking him, "Prophecy! Who is it that struck you?"</p>			
<p>65 And they said many other things against him, blaspheming him.</p>			
<p>66 When day came, the assembly of the elders of the people gathered together, both chief priests and scribes. And they led him away to their council, and they said,</p>	<p>59 Now the chief priests and the whole council were seeking false testimony against Jesus that they might put him to death,</p>	<p>55 Now the chief priests and the whole council were seeking testimony against Jesus to put him to death,</p>	
<p>67 "If you are the Christ, tell us."</p>			
<p>But he said to them, "If I tell you, you will not believe, 68 and if I ask you, you will not answer.</p>			
	<p>60 but they found none, though many false witnesses came forward. At last two came forward</p>	<p>but they found none. 56 For many bore false witness against him, but their testimony did not agree.</p>	
	<p>61 and said, "This man said, 'I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to rebuild it in three days.'"</p>	<p>57 And some stood up and bore false witness against him, saying, 58 "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands.' 59 Yet even about this their testimony did not agree.</p>	
	<p>62 And the high priest stood up and said, "Have you no answer to make? What is it that these men testify against you?"</p>	<p>60 And the high priest stood up in the midst and asked Jesus, "Have you no answer to make? What is it that these men testify against you?"</p>	<p>19 The high priest then questioned Jesus about his disciples and his teaching.</p>
	<p>63 But Jesus remained silent. And the high priest said to him, "I adjure you by the living God, tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God."</p>	<p>61 But he remained silent and made no answer. Again the high priest asked him, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?"</p>	
<p>69 But from now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God."</p>	<p>64 Jesus said to him, "You have said so. But I tell you, from now on you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven."</p>	<p>62 And Jesus said, "I am, and you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven."</p>	
<p>70 So they all said, "Are you the Son of God, then?" And he said to them, "You say that I am."</p>	<p>(see vs. 63, 64)</p>		<p>20 Jesus answered him, "I have spoken openly to the world. I have always taught in synagogues and in the temple, where all Jews come together. I have said nothing in secret. 21 Why do you ask me? Ask those who have heard me what I said to them; they know what I said." 22 When he had said these things, one of the officers standing by struck Jesus with his hand, saying, "Is that how you answer the high priest?" 23 Jesus answered him, "If what I said is wrong, bear witness about the wrong; but if what I said is right, why do you strike me?"</p>

			24 Annas then sent him bound to Caiaphas the high priest.
71 Then they said, "What further testimony do we need? We have heard it ourselves from his own lips."	65 Then the high priest tore his robes and said, "He has uttered blasphemy. What further witnesses do we need? You have now heard his blasphemy. 66 What is your judgment?" They answered, "He deserves death." 67 Then they spit in his face and struck him. And some slapped him, 68 saying, "Prophecy to us, you Christ! Who is it that struck you?"	63 And the high priest tore his garments and said, "What further witnesses do we need? 64 You have heard his blasphemy. What is your decision?" And they all condemned him as deserving death. 65 And some began to spit on him and to cover his face and to strike him, saying to him, "Prophecy!" And the guards received him with blows.	
			28 Then they led Jesus from the house of Caiaphas to the governor's headquarters. It was early morning. They themselves did not enter the governor's headquarters, so that they would not be defiled, but could eat the Passover.
1 Then the whole company of them arose and brought him before Pilate.	27:1 When morning came, all the chief priests and the elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death. 2 And they bound him and led him away and delivered him over to Pilate the governor.	15:1 And as soon as it was morning, the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council. And they bound Jesus and led him away and delivered him over to Pilate.	
	3 Then when Judas, his betrayer, saw that Jesus was condemned, he changed his mind and brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and the elders, 4 saying, "I have sinned by betraying innocent blood." They said, "What is that to us? See to it yourself." 5 And throwing down the pieces of silver into the temple, he departed, and he went and hanged himself. 6 But the chief priests, taking the pieces of silver, said, "It is not lawful to put them into the treasury, since it is blood money." 7 So they took counsel and bought with them the potter's field as a burial place for strangers. 8 Therefore that field has been called the Field of Blood to this day. 9 Then was fulfilled what had been spoken by the prophet Jeremiah, saying, "And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him on whom a price had been set by some of the sons of Israel, 10 and they gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord directed me."		
			29 So Pilate went outside to them and said, "What accusation do you bring against this man?"
2 And they began to accuse him, saying, "We found this man misleading our nation and forbidding us to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a king."			30 They answered him, "If this man were not doing evil, we would not have delivered him over to you." 31 Pilate said to them, "Take him yourselves and judge him by your own law." The Jews said to him, "It is not lawful for us to put anyone to death." 32 This was to fulfill the word that Jesus had spoken to show by what kind of death he was going to die.

<p>3 And Pilate asked him, "Are you the King of the Jews?"</p> <p>And he answered him, "You have said so."</p>	<p>11 Now Jesus stood before the governor, and the governor asked him, "Are you the King of the Jews?"</p> <p>Jesus said, "You have said so."</p>	<p>2 And Pilate asked him, "Are you the King of the Jews?"</p> <p>And he answered him, "You have said so."</p>	<p>33 So Pilate entered his headquarters again and called Jesus and said to him, "Are you the King of the Jews?"</p> <p>34 Jesus answered, "Do you say this of your own accord, or did others say it to you about me?"</p> <p>35 Pilate answered, "Am I a Jew? Your own nation and the chief priests have delivered you over to me. What have you done?"</p> <p>36 Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would have been fighting, that I might not be delivered over to the Jews. But my kingdom is not from the world."</p> <p>37 Pilate said to him, "So you are a king?" Jesus answered, "You say that I am a king. For this purpose I was born and for this purpose I have come into the world—to bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is of the truth listens to my voice."</p> <p>38 Pilate said to him, "What is truth?"</p>
	<p>12 But when he was accused by the chief priests and elders, he gave no answer.</p> <p>13 Then Pilate said to him, "Do you not hear how many things they testify against you?"</p> <p>14 But he gave him no answer, not even to a single charge, so that the governor was greatly amazed.</p>	<p>3 And the chief priests accused him of many things.</p> <p>4 And Pilate again asked him, "Have you no answer to make? See how many charges they bring against you."</p> <p>5 But Jesus made no further answer, so that Pilate was amazed.</p>	
<p>4 Then Pilate said to the chief priests and the crowds, "I find no guilt in this man."</p>			<p>After he had said this, he went back outside to the Jews and told them, "I find no guilt in him."</p>
<p>5 But they were urgent, saying, "He stirs up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee even to this place."</p>			
<p>6 When Pilate heard this, he asked whether the man was a Galilean.</p>			
<p>7 And when he learned that he belonged to Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him over to Herod, who was himself in Jerusalem at that time.</p>			
<p>8 When Herod saw Jesus, he was very glad, for he had long desired to see him, because he had heard about him, and he was hoping to see some sign done by him.</p>			
<p>9 So he questioned him at some length, but he made no answer.</p>			
<p>10 The chief priests and the scribes stood by, vehemently accusing him.</p>			
<p>11 And Herod with his soldiers treated him with contempt and mocked him. Then, arraying him in splendid clothing, he sent him back to Pilate.</p>			
<p>12 And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day, for before this they had been at enmity with each other.</p>			
<p>13 Pilate then called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people,</p>			
<p>14 and said to them, "You brought me this man as one who was misleading the people. And after examining him before you, behold, I did not find this man guilty of any of your charges against him.</p>			
<p>15 Neither did Herod, for he sent him back to us. Look, nothing deserving death has been done by him.</p>			
<p>16 I will therefore punish and release him."</p>			

<p>(17 For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)</p> <p>18 But they all cried out together, "Away with this man, and release to us Barabbas"— 19 a man who had been thrown into prison for an insurrection started in the city and for murder.</p>	<p>15 Now at the feast the governor was accustomed to release for the crowd any one prisoner whom they wanted. 16 And they had then a notorious prisoner called Barabbas.</p>	<p>6 Now at the feast he used to release for them one prisoner for whom they asked. 7 And among the rebels in prison, who had committed murder in the insurrection, there was a man called Barabbas.</p>	
		<p>8 And the crowd came up and began to ask Pilate to do as he usually did for them.</p>	
<p>20 Pilate addressed them once more, desiring to release Jesus,</p>	<p>17 So when they had gathered, Pilate said to them, "Whom do you want me to release for you: Barabbas, or Jesus who is called Christ?"</p> <p>18 For he knew that it was out of envy that they had delivered him up. 19 Besides, while he was sitting on the judgment seat, his wife sent word to him, "Have nothing to do with that righteous man, for I have suffered much because of him today in a dream." 20 Now the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowd to ask for Barabbas and destroy Jesus. 21 The governor again said to them, "Which of the two do you want me to release for you?" And they said, "Barabbas."</p>	<p>9 And he answered them, saying, "Do you want me to release for you the King of the Jews?"</p> <p>10 For he perceived that it was out of envy that the chief priests had delivered him up.</p> <p>11 But the chief priests stirred up the crowd to have him release for them Barabbas instead.</p>	<p>39 But you have a custom that I should release one man for you at the Passover. So do you want me to release to you the King of the Jews?"</p> <p>40 They cried out again, "Not this man, but Barabbas!" Now Barabbas was a robber.</p>
<p>21 but they kept shouting, "Crucify, crucify him!"</p>	<p>22 Pilate said to them, "Then what shall I do with Jesus who is called Christ?" They all said, "Let him be crucified!"</p>	<p>12 And Pilate again said to them, "Then what shall I do with the man you call the King of the Jews?" 13 And they cried out again, "Crucify him."</p>	
<p>22 A third time he said to them, "Why? What evil has he done? I have found in him no guilt deserving death. I will therefore punish and release him."</p>	<p>23 And he said, "Why? What evil has he done?"</p>	<p>14 And Pilate said to them, "Why? What evil has he done?"</p>	
<p>23 But they were urgent, demanding with loud cries that he should be crucified. And their voices prevailed.</p>	<p>But they shouted all the more, "Let him be crucified!"</p>	<p>But they shouted all the more, "Crucify him."</p>	
<p>24 So Pilate decided that their demand should be granted.</p> <p>25 He released the man who had been thrown into prison for insurrection and murder, for whom they asked, but he delivered Jesus over to their will.</p>	<p>24 So when Pilate saw that he was gaining nothing, but rather that a riot was beginning, he took water and washed his hands before the crowd, saying, "I am innocent of this man's blood; see to it yourselves." 25 And all the people answered, "His blood be on us and on our children!" 26 Then he released for them Barabbas, and having scourged Jesus, delivered him to be crucified.</p>	<p>15 So Pilate, wishing to satisfy the crowd, released for them Barabbas, and having scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified.</p>	<p>4 Pilate went out again and said to them, "See, I am bringing him out to you that you may know that I find no guilt in him." 19:1 Then Pilate took Jesus and flogged him.</p>
	<p>27 Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the governor's headquarters, and they gathered the whole battalion before him. 28 And they stripped him and put a scarlet robe on him,</p>	<p>16 And the soldiers led him away inside the palace (that is, the governor's headquarters), and they called together the whole battalion.</p>	
	<p>29 and twisting together a crown of thorns, they put it on his head and put a reed in his right hand. And kneeling before him, they</p>	<p>17 And they clothed him in a purple cloak, and twisting together a crown of thorns, they put it on him.</p>	<p>2 And the soldiers twisted together a crown of thorns and put it on his head and arrayed him in a purple robe. 3 They came up to him, saying, "Hail, King of the Jews!" and struck him with their hands.</p>

	<p>mocked him, saying, "Hail, King of the Jews!"</p> <p>30 And they spit on him and took the reed and struck him on the head.</p> <p>31 And when they had mocked him, they stripped him of the robe and put his own clothes on him and led him away to crucify him.</p>	<p>18 And they began to salute him, "Hail, King of the Jews!"</p> <p>19 And they were striking his head with a reed and spitting on him and kneeling down in homage to him.</p> <p>20 And when they had mocked him, they stripped him of the purple cloak and put his own clothes on him. And they led him out to crucify him.</p>	<p>5 So Jesus came out, wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. Pilate said to them, "Behold the man!"</p> <p>6 When the chief priests and the officers saw him, they cried out, "Crucify him, crucify him!" Pilate said to them, "Take him yourselves and crucify him, for I find no guilt in him."</p> <p>7 The Jews answered him, "We have a law, and according to that law he ought to die because he has made himself the Son of God."</p> <p>8 When Pilate heard this statement, he was even more afraid.</p> <p>9 He entered his headquarters again and said to Jesus, "Where are you from?" But Jesus gave him no answer.</p> <p>10 So Pilate said to him, "You will not speak to me? Do you not know that I have authority to release you and authority to crucify you?"</p> <p>11 Jesus answered him, "You would have no authority over me at all unless it had been given you from above. Therefore he who delivered me over to you has the greater sin."</p> <p>12 From then on Pilate sought to release him, but the Jews cried out, "If you release this man, you are not Caesar's friend. Everyone who makes himself a king opposes Caesar."</p> <p>13 So when Pilate heard these words, he brought Jesus out and sat down on the judgment seat at a place called The Stone Pavement, and in Aramaic Gabbatha.</p> <p>14 Now it was the day of Preparation of the Passover. It was about the sixth hour. He said to the Jews, "Behold your King!"</p> <p>15 They cried out, "Away with him, away with him, crucify him!" Pilate said to them, "Shall I crucify your King?" The chief priests answered, "We have no king but Caesar."</p> <p>16 So he delivered him over to them to be crucified.</p>
--	---	---	--