able to appreciate the latter.

**11.**] **his men of war** are the *body-guard in attendance upon Herod.*

**a gorgeous robe**] Variously interpreted :—either *purple,* as  
befitting a king,—and why should this not  
be the very *“scarlet robe”* afterwards  
used by Pilate’s soldiers (Matt. xxvii. 28 ;  
*“purple robe,”* John xix. 2) ? —or *white,*as the word rendered *“ bright”* is understood by, some (but see note), Acts x. 30.

**12.**] The cause of the quarrel is  
uncertain: apparently something concerning Herod’s power of jurisdiction, which was conceded by Pilate in this sending  
Jesus to him, and again waived by Herod  
in sending Him back again. From chap.  
xiii. 1, Pilate appears to have encroached  
on that jurisdiction. The remarks  
of some Commentators about their *uniting  
in enmity against Christ,* are quite beside  
the purpose. The prosent feeling of Pilate  
was any thing but hostile to the person of  
Christ : and Herod, by his treatment of  
Him, shews that he thought Him beneath  
his judicial notice.

This remission of Jesus to Herod seems not to have been in  
the possession of either of the other three  
Evangelists. It is worthy of notice that  
they all relate the mocking by the soldiers  
of Pilate, which St. Luke omits, whereas  
he gives it as taking place before Herod.This is one of the very few cases where the nature of the history shews that *both* happened.

Let the student ask himself,  
How could St. John, if he composed his  
Gospel with that of St. Luke before him,  
have here given us a narrative in which so  
important a fact as this is not only not related, but absolutely *cannot find any place of insertion? Its real place* is after John  
yer.38 ;—but obviously nothing was further  
from the mind of that Evangelist, for he  
represents Pilate as speaking continuously.

**13—25.**] FURTHER HEARING BEFORE  
PILATE, WHO STRIVES TO RELEASE HIM,  
BUT ULTIMATELY YIELDS TO THE JEWS.  
Matt. xxvii. 15–26. Mark xv. 6—15.  
John xviii. 39, 40. Our account, while  
entirely distinct in *form* from the others,  
is in *substance* nearly allied to them. In  
a few points it approaches John very  
nearly, compare ver. 18 with John ver. 40,  
also ver. 17 with John ver. 39. The  
second declaration of our Lord’s innocence  
by Pilate is in St. John’s account united  
with the first, ver. 88. In the three first  
Gospels as asserted in our. ver. 14, the  
questioning takes place in the presence of  
the Jews: not so, however, in John (see  
xviii. 28).

**15.**] Not as A. V., is *done  
unto him,* but **is done by him:** meaning,  
such is the issue of Herod’s judgment: I  
assume that he has thus decided.

**16.**] Here, as Bengel observes, Pilate begins  
to shew culpable weakness in yielding to  
the Jews. If there be no fault in Him,  
why should He be *corrected at all?—*the  
Jews perceive their advantage, and from