the most consistent account of the matter.  
In the Roman provinces generally, the   
Proprætor or Proconsul conducted judicial  
proceedings. But Judæa, which belonged  
to the province of Syria, was an exception.  
There was there a Procurator with full  
powers, who exercised the right of judicial  
cognizance. Jerusalem however possessed  
the privilege of judging all lighter causes  
before the *three-and-twenty*, and heavier  
causes, with the sole exception of capital  
trials, before the great Sanhedrim : so that  
none but these reserved cases remained for  
the Procurator. Pilate seems to have  
judged these cases at his visits during the  
festivals; which would fall conveniently  
for the purpose, it being the custom in  
Jerusalem, to execute great criminals at the  
Feasts In other provinces the governors  
made circuits and held assizes throughout   
their jurisdictions.   
  
**32.**] See Matt.  
xx. 19, and other places ;—ch. xii. 32, 33.  
Had *the Jews* taken Him and judged Him,  
He would have been *stoned*, not crucified.  
And this whole section, vv. 28–32, serves  
to shew how the divine purpose was accomplished,   
  
**33.**] This question probably  
arose out of what Pilate had previously  
heard, not from any charge to this effect  
being made between our vv. 31 and 34.  
Had such a charge been made, our Lord’s  
question ver. 34 would be unnatural.  
  
  
Pilate summoned Jesus in, who had been  
as yet outside with the Jews. This was the  
formal *reception* of the case before him ;—  
the Roman soldiers must now have formally  
taken charge of Jesus, as servants of the  
Roman authorities: having previously,  
when granted by Pilate to the Chief  
Priests. acted as *their* police.   
  
The  
judgments of the Romans were always  
public and in the open air, see ch. xix. 13;  
— but the enquiries and examinations might  
be private. In this case Pilate appears  
to have wished to obtain an account  
from Jesus apart from the clamours of  
the chief priests and the mob.  
  
  
**34.**] On this whole interview, see note on  
Luke vv. 3, 4.   
  
I regard this question,  
**Sayest thou this thing of thyself...** as  
intended to distinguish the senses of the  
word *King* as applied to Jesus: and of  
course not for the *information* of Him  
who asked it, but to bring out this distinction   
in Pilate’s mind. If he asked *of*  
*himself*, the word could certainly have but  
one meaning, and that one would be  
wrongly applied ;—if from information derived   
from the Jews, this very fact would  
open the way to the true meaning in which  
He was King of the Jews. Stier and  
Ebrard think there may be some reference  
in the words **of thyself**, to a momentary  
earnestness in Pilate’s own mind,—a suspicion   
that his prisoner *was* what he was  
charged with being (see ch. xix. 8, 12),  
from the mention of which he immediately  
(ver. 35) recoils, and implies the other side  
of the dilemma.   
  
**35.**] Pilate at once  
repudiates the idea of *his* having any share  
in Jewish expectations, or taking any personal   
interest in Jewish matters: all his  
information he has derived from the public  
accusation of the people and chief priests.  
Then in the question, **What hast Thou  
done ?**, is implied, ‘There is no definiteness   
in their charge: let me have thine  
own account, thy ex-parte statement, that  
I may at least know *something* definite of  
the case.’   
  
**36.**] This answer goes to  
explain the injustice of the charge of “ *perverting   
the nation*” (Luke xxiii. 2), and to  
shew Pilate something of the nature of the  
kingdom which Jesus really came to establish.   
  
**My kingdom is not of this  
world**] i.e. **not belonging** to (ch. viii. 23;