deliver Him.   
  
**Cæsar’s friend**] There  
does not seem to be any allusion to this  
name being bestowed as a title of honour  
(indeed, a good deal of fancy has been  
employed in making out the fact of such a  
title having been in use) any further than  
that the appellation would naturally arise  
and be accounted honourable. The meaning   
is, ‘well affected to Cæsar.’   
  
This  
was a terrible saying, especially under  
Tiberius, with whom, as Tacitus assures us,  
the undefined charge of disaffection to the  
person of the emperor was used to fill up  
all other accusations.   
  
**every one that  
maketh himself a king**] This was true:  
their application of it to Christ, a lie. But  
*words*, not *facts*, ave taken into account  
by tyrants, and this Pilate knew.  
  
  
**13.**] **these words**—viz. these two last remarks.   
“In such a perplexity, a man like  
Pilate could not long hesitate. As Caiaphas  
had before said, it were better that one  
even innocent man should die, than that  
all should perish: so now in like case  
Pilate decided rather to sacrifice Jesus  
though innocent, than to expose himself to  
so great danger.” Friedlieb.   
  
**forth**:  
see on ch. xviii. 33. The judgment  
seat, or *bema*, was in front of the   
*prætorium*, on an elevated platform called Gabbatha,   
which was paved with a tessellated  
pavement. Such a pavement, Suetonius  
informs us, Julius Cesar carried about on  
his expeditions.   
  
**14. the preparation  
of the passover**] The signification, ‘ Friday  
in the Passover week,’ has found many, and  
some recent, defenders. But this is not the  
natural meaning of the words, nor would  
it ever have been thought of in this place,  
but for the difficulty arising from the whole  
Passover question, which I have discussed  
on Matt. xxvi. 17—19, and on ch. xviii. 28.  
  
**This preparation day** is *‘the vigil  
of the Passover*,’ i.e. the day preceding  
the evening when the passover was killed.  
And so it must be understood here, especially   
when connected with ch. xviii. 28.  
See on the whole matter the notes above  
referred to.   
  
**about the sixth hour**]  
There is an insuperable difficulty, as the  
text now stands. For St. Mark relates, ch.  
xv. 25, that the *crucifixion* took place at  
the *third hour*: and that it certainly  
was so, the whole arrangement of the  
day testifies. For on the one hand, the  
judgment could hardly have taken the  
whole day till noon: and on the other,  
there will not thus be time left for the  
rest of the events of the day, before the  
sabbath began. We must certainly suppose,   
as did Eusebius, Theophylact, and  
Severus, that there has been some very  
early erratum in our copies; whether the  
interchange of 3 and 6, which when expressed   
in Greek numeral letters, are not  
unlike one another (*Γ* and *Ϛ*), or some other,  
cannot now be determined.   
  
We certainly may bring the two accounts nearer  
together by recollecting that, as the  
crucifixion itself certainly did not (see in  
Mark) take place *exactly* at the third hour,  
and as here it is **about** *the sixth hour*, some  
intermediate time may be described by both  
Evangelists. But this is not satisfactory :  
see note on Mark xv. 25. The solution  
given by Dr. Wordsworth, after Townson  
and others, that St. John’s reckoning of  
the hours is different, and like our own, so  
that the sixth hour would be 6 A.M., besides  
being unsupported by any authority (see ch.  
i. 39; iv. 6, 52; xi. 9, and notes), would  
leave here the difficulty that there must  
thus elapse three hours between the hearing   
before Pilate and the Crucifixion. Besides   
which, we may ask, is it possible to  
imagine St. John, with the other gospels  
before him as these expositors believe him  
to have had, adopting without notice an  
independent reckoning of his own which  
would introduce utter confusion into that  
history which (again on their hypothesis)  
he wrote his gospel to complete and clear