that which they assert.

**3.**] This question is related in all four Gospels.  
Bat in John the answer is widely different  
from the distinct affirmation in the other  
three, amounting perhaps to it in substance—at all events affirming that He  
was ‘a King’—which was the form of their  
charge. I believe therefore that the Three  
give merely the general import of the Lord’s  
answer, which St. John relates in full. It  
is hardly possible, if Jesus had affirmed the  
fact so strongly and barely as the Three  
relate it, that Pilate should have made the  
avowal in ver. 4—which St. John completely explains.

**4.**] The preceding  
question had been **asked within** the pretorium—a fact which our Narrator does not adduce,—representing the whole as a continuous conversation in presence of the Jews; see John, ver. 38. We may remark  
(and on this see Matthew, ver. 18: Mark,  
ver. 10) that Pilate must have known well  
that a man who had really done that,  
whereof Jesus was accused, would be *no  
such object of hatred to the Sanhedrim.*This knowledge was doubtless accompanied  
(as the above-cited verses imply) with a  
previous acquaintance with some of the  
sayings and doings of Jesus, from which  
Pilate had probably formed his own opinion that He was *no such King* as His  
foes would represent Him. This is now  
confirmed by His own words (as related by  
St. John); and Pilate wishes to dismiss  
Him, finding no fault in Him.

**5.**] Possibly they thought of the matter mentioned ch. xiii. 1, in introducing Galilee  
into their charge. The opening words may  
mean, **they strengthened, redoubled, the  
charge—**or perhaps, **they became urgent,  
they were the more fierce, as** in text.

**6—12.**] HE IS SENT TO HEROD, AND BY HIM RETURNED TO PILATE.  
Peculiar to Luke; see remarks on ver. 12.  
Pilate, conscious that he must either do  
the duty of an upright judge and offend  
the Jews, or sacrifice his duty to his popularity, first attempts to get rid of the matter altogether by sending his prisoner  
to Herod, on occasion of this word *Galilee.*This was Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee  
and Peræa (see ch. iii, 1 and note on Matt.  
xiv. 1), who had come up to keep the feast.

**7. he sent**] or **remitted him, to  
Herod.** Grotius observes that this was the  
regular practice among the Romans, to *remit* a criminal to the ruler or judge of the  
district in which his crime was alleged to  
have been committed.

**8, 9.**] {9} The reason of our Lord’s silence is sufficiently  
shewn, in the account of Herod’s feelings  
at seeing Him. He would not use His discourses or His miracles for liberating Himself from death, any more than He did for  
ostentation, or to gratify the curiosity of  
men.

**10.**] The accusations, of *worldly kingship and of blasphemy*, would Probably  
be here *united,* as Herod was a Jew, and