

JESUS THE CHRIST

*A Study of the Messiah and His Mission according to
Holy Scriptures both Ancient and Modern*

By JAMES E. TALMAGE

One of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

Commentary (Indented Italics), Underlining and Bolding by
Brenda L. High

*PUBLISHED BY THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS - SIXTH EDITION -
TWENTY-EIGHTH TO THIRTIETH THOUSAND INCLUSIVE - Salt Lake City, Utah - Deseret Book Company,
1922; Copyright, September 1915, December 1915, April 1916, and November 1916, by JOSEPH F. SMITH,
Trustee-in-Trust for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; Copyright, October, 1922 By HEBER J.
GRANT, Trustee-in-Trust for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; Printed in the United States of
America - Now in the Public Domain*

PREFACE

The scope of the subject presented in this work is expressed on the title page. It will be readily seen that the author has departed from the course usually followed by writers on the Life of Jesus Christ, which course, as a rule, begins with the birth of Mary's Babe and ends with the ascension of the slain and risen Lord from Olivet. The treatment embodied in these pages, in addition to the narrative of the Lord's life in the flesh comprises the Antemortal existence and activities of the world's Redeemer, the revelations and personal manifestations of the glorified and exalted Son of God during the apostolic period of old and in modern times, the assured nearness of the Lord's second advent, and predicted events beyond—all so far as the Holy Scriptures make plain.

It is particularly congruous and appropriate that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—the only Church that affirms authority based on specific revelation and commission to use the Lord's Holy Name as a distinctive designation—should set forth her doctrines concerning the Messiah and His mission.

The author of this volume entered upon his welcome service under request and appointment from the presiding authorities of the Church; and the completed work has been read to and is approved by the First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve. It presents, however, the writer's personal belief and profoundest conviction as to the truth of what he has written. The book is published by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

A characteristic feature of the work is the guidance afforded by modern scriptures and the explication of the Holy Writ of olden times in the light of present day revelation, which, as a powerful and well directed beam, illumines many dark passages of ancient construction.

The spirit of the sacredness inherent in the subject has been a constant companion of the writer throughout his pleasing labor, and he reverently invokes the same as a minister to the readers of the volume.

JAMES E. TALMAGE.
Salt Lake City, Utah,
September, 1915.

PREFACE TO THE SIXTH EDITION

The second edition of this work appeared in December, 1915, and the third in March, 1916. The third edition presented several minor alterations in wording and contained additional notes and references. Succeeding issues, including the fifth which was printed on India paper, and the present edition are practically uniform with the third.

JAMES E. TALMAGE.
Salt Lake City, Utah,
October, 1922.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 33 - THE LAST SUPPER AND THE BETRAYAL

Judas Iscariot in conspiracy with the Jews – Preparations for the Lord's last Passover – The last supper of Jesus with the Twelve – The traitor designated – Ordinance of washing of feet – Sacrament of the Lord's Supper – The betrayer goes out into the night – Discourse following the supper – The High-Priestly Prayer – The Lord's agony in Gethsemane – The betrayal and the arrest

CHAPTER 34 - THE TRIAL AND CONDEMNATION

The Jewish trial – Christ before Annas and Caiaphas – The illegal night court – The morning session – False witnesses and unrighteous conviction – Peter's denial of his Lord – Christ's first arraignment before Pilate – Before Herod – Second appearance before Pilate – Pilate's surrender to Jewish clamor – The sentence of crucifixion – Suicide of Judas Iscariot

33

THE LAST SUPPER AND THE BETRAYAL PRIESTLY CONSPIRATORS AND THE TRAITOR

As the time for the annual Feast of the Passover approached, and particularly during the two days immediately preceding the beginning of the festival, the chief priests, scribes, and elders of the people, in short the Sanhedrin and the entire priestly party, conspired persistently together as to the best manner of taking Jesus into custody and putting Him to death. At one of these gatherings of evil counsel, which was held at the palace of the high priest, Caiaphas,[1179] it was decided that Jesus should be taken by subtlety if possible, as the probable effect of an open arrest would be an uprising of the people. The rulers feared especially an outbreak by the Galileans, who had a provincial pride in the prominence of Jesus as one of their countrymen, and many of whom were then in Jerusalem. It was further concluded and for the same reasons, that the Jewish custom of making impressive examples of notable offenders by executing public punishment upon them at times of great general assemblages, be set aside in the case of Jesus; therefore the conspirators said: "Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar among the people."[1180]

On earlier occasions they had made futile attempts to get Jesus into their hands;[1181] and they were naturally dubious as to the outcome of their later machinations. At this juncture they were encouraged and gladdened in their wicked plots by the appearance of an unexpected ally. Judas Iscariot, one of the Twelve, sought an audience with these rulers of the Jews, and infamously offered to betray his Lord into their hands.[1182] Under the impulse of diabolic avarice, which, however, was probably but a secondary element in the real cause of his perfidious treachery, he bargained to sell his Master for money, and chattered with the priestly purchasers over the price of the Savior's blood. "What will ye give me?" he asked; "and they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver."[1183] This amount, approximately seventeen dollars in our money, but of many times greater purchasing power with the Jews in that day than now with us, was the price fixed by the law as that of a slave; it was also the foreseen sum of the blood-money to be paid for the Lord's betrayal.[1184] That the silver was actually paid to Judas, either at this first interview or at some later meeting between the traitor and the priests, is demonstrated by after events.[1185]

Seventeen dollars...when this book was written in the early 1900's.

He had pledged himself to the blackest deed of treachery of which man is capable, and from that hour he sought the opportunity of superseding his infamous promise by its more villainous fulfillment. We are yet to be afflicted by other glimpses of the evil-hearted Iscariot in the course of this dread chronicle of tragedy and perdition; for the present let it be said that before Judas sold Christ to the Jews, he had sold himself to the devil; he had become Satan's serf, and did his master's bidding.

THE LAST SUPPER

The day preceding the eating of the passover lamb had come to be known among the Jews as the first day of the feast of unleavened bread,[1186] since on that day all leaven had to be removed from their dwellings, and thereafter for a period of eight days the eating of anything containing leaven was unlawful. On the afternoon of this day, the paschal lambs were slain within the temple court, by the representatives of families or companies who were to eat together; and a portion of the blood of each lamb was sprinkled at the foot of the altar of sacrifice by one of the numerous priests on duty for the day. The slain lamb, then said to have been sacrificed, was borne away to the appointed gathering place of those by whom it was to be eaten. During the first of the days of unleavened bread, which in the year of our Lord's death appears to have fallen on Thursday,[1187] some of the Twelve inquired of Jesus where they should make preparations for the paschal meal.[1188] He instructed Peter and John to return to Jerusalem, and added: "**Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house where he entereth in. And ye shall say unto the goodman of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? And he shall shew you a large upper room furnished: there make ready. And they went, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.**"

In the evening, Thursday evening as we reckon time, but the beginning of Friday according to the Jewish calendar,[1189] Jesus came with the Twelve, and together they sat down to the last meal of which the Lord would partake before His death. Under strain of profound emotion, "**He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.**" The pronouncing of a blessing by the host upon a cup of wine, which was afterward passed round the table to each participant in turn, was the customary manner of beginning the Passover supper. At this solemn meal Jesus appears to have observed the essentials of the Passover procedure; but we have no record of His compliance with the many supernumerary requirements with which the divinely established memorial of Israel's deliverance from bondage had been invested by traditional custom and rabbinical

prescription. As we shall see, the evening's proceedings in that upper room comprised much beside the ordinary observance of an annual festival.

The supper proceeded under conditions of tense sadness. As they ate, the Lord sorrowfully remarked: "**Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me.**" Most of the apostles fell into a state of introspection; and one after another exclaimed: "**Is it I?**" "**Lord, is it I?**" It is pleasing to note that each of those who so inquired was more concerned with the dread thought that possibly he was an offender, however inadvertently so, than as to whether his brother was about to prove himself a traitor. Jesus answered that it was one of the Twelve, then and there eating with Him from the common dish, and continued with the terrifying pronouncement: "**The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born.**" Then Judas Iscariot, who had already covenanted to sell his Master for money, and who at this moment probably feared that silence might arouse suspicion against himself, asked with a brazen audacity that was veritably devilish: "Master, is it I?" With cutting promptness the Lord replied: "Thou hast said."[1190]

There was further cause of sorrow to Jesus at the supper. Some of the Twelve had fallen into muttering dispute among themselves over the matter of individual precedence,[1191] possibly as to the order in which they should take their places at table, over which triviality scribes and Pharisees as well as the Gentiles often quarreled;[1192] and again the Lord had to remind the apostles that the greatest of them all was he who most willingly served his fellows. They had been taught before; yet now, at this late and solemn hour, they were suffused with vain and selfish ambition. In sorrowful earnestness the Lord pleaded with them, asking who is greater, he that sits at the table, or he that serves? And the obvious reply He supplemented by the statement: "**But I am among you as he that serveth.**" With loving pathos He added: "**Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations;**"[1193] and then He assured them that they should lack neither honor nor glory in the kingdom of God, for if they proved faithful they should be appointed to thrones as the judges of Israel. For those of His chosen ones who were true to Him, the Lord had no feeling less than that of love, and of yearning for their victory over Satan and sin.

THE ORDINANCE OF THE WASHING OF FEET [1194]

Leaving the table, the Lord laid aside His outer garments and girded Himself with a towel as an apron; then having provided Himself with a basin and a supply of water, He knelt before each of the Twelve in turn, washed his feet, and wiped them with the towel. When He reached Peter, that impulsive apostle protested, saying: "Lord, dost thou wash my feet?" That the proceeding was something more than mere service for personal comfort, and more than an object-lesson of humility, appears in the Lord's words to Peter — "**What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter.**"

Peter, failing to understand, objected yet more vehemently; "Thou shalt never wash my feet," he exclaimed. Jesus answered: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." Then, with even greater impetuosity than before, Peter implored as he stretched forth both feet and hands, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." He had gone to the other extreme, insisting, though ignorantly and unthinkingly, that things be done his way, and failing yet to see that the ordinance had to be administered as the Lord willed. Again correcting His well-intending though presumptuous servant, Jesus said to him: "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all." Each of them had been immersed at baptism; the washing of feet was an ordinance pertaining to the Holy Priesthood, the full import of which they had yet to learn.[1195]

Having resumed His garments and returned to His place at the table, Jesus impressed the significance of what he had done, saying: **"Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."**[1196]

THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER [1197]

While Jesus with the Twelve still sat at table, He took a loaf or cake of bread, and having reverently given thanks and by blessing sanctified it, He gave a portion to each of the apostles, saying: "Take, eat; this is my body"; or, according to the more extended account, **"This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me."** Then, taking a cup of wine, He gave thanks and blessed it, and gave it unto them with the command: "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."[1198] In this simple but impressive manner was instituted the ordinance, since known as the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The bread and wine, duly consecrated by prayer, become emblems of the Lord's body and blood, to be eaten and drunk reverently, and in remembrance of Him.

The proceedings at the institution of this sacred rite were afterward revealed to Paul the apostle, whose recorded testimony as to its establishment and sanctity is in accord with the accounts given by the Gospel-writers.[1199] As shall be hereinafter shown, the ordinance was instituted by the Lord among the Nephites, on the western continent, and has been reestablished in the present dispensation.[1200] During the dark ages of apostasy, unauthorized changes in the administration of the Sacrament were introduced, and many false doctrines as to its meaning and effect were promulgated.[1201]

THE BETRAYER GOES OUT INTO THE NIGHT [1202]

In saying to the Twelve, whose feet He had washed, "Ye are clean," the Lord had specified an exception by His after remark, "**but not all.**" John, the recorder, takes care to explain that Jesus had in mind the traitor, and, "**therefore said he, Ye are not all clean.**" The guilty Iscariot had received without protest the Lord's service in the washing of his recreant feet, though after the ablution he was spiritually more filthy than before. When Jesus had again sat down, the burden of His knowledge concerning the treacherous heart of Judas again found expression. "**I speak not of you all,**" He said, "**I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.**" [1203] The Lord was intent on impressing the fact of His foreknowledge as to what was to come, so that when the terrible development was an accomplished fact, the apostles would realize that thereby the scriptures had been fulfilled. Troubled in spirit, He reiterated the dreadful assertion that one of those present would betray Him. Peter made signs to John, who occupied the place next to Jesus and was at that moment leaning his head on the Lord's breast, that he ask which of them was the traitor. To John's whispered inquiry the Lord replied: "**He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it.**"

There was nothing unusual for a person at table, particularly the host, to dip a piece of bread into the dish of gravy or savory mixture, and hand it to another. Such action on the part of Jesus attracted no general attention. He dipped the morsel of bread and gave it to Judas Iscariot, with the words: "That thou doest, do quickly." The others understood the Lord's remark as an instruction to Judas to attend to some duty or go upon some errand of ordinary kind, perhaps to purchase something for the further celebration of the Passover, or to carry gifts to some of the poor, for Judas was the treasurer of the party and "**had the bag.**" But Iscariot understood. His heart was all the more hardened by the discovery that Jesus knew of his infamous plans, and he was maddened by the humiliation he felt in the Master's presence. After the sop, which he had opened his mouth to receive from the Lord's hand, "Satan entered into him" and asserted malignant mastership. Judas went out immediately, abandoning forever the blessed company of his brethren and the Lord. John chronicles the traitor's departure with the terse and ominous remark, "and it was night."

DISCOURSE FOLLOWING THE SUPPER

The departure of Judas Iscariot appears to have dissipated to some degree the cloud of utter sadness by which the little company had been depressed; and our Lord Himself was visibly relieved. As soon as the door had closed upon the retreating deserter, Jesus exclaimed, as though His victory over death had been already accomplished: "**Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him.**" Addressing the Eleven in terms of parental affection, He said: "**Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall**

seek me: and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so now I say to you. A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."[1204] The law of Moses enjoined mutual love among friends and neighbors;[1205] but the new commandment, by which the apostles were to be governed, embodied love of a higher order. They were to love one another as Christ loved them; and their brotherly affection was to be a distinguishing mark of their apostleship, by which the world would recognize them as men set apart.

The Lord's reference to His impending separation from them troubled the brethren. Peter put the question, "**Lord, whither goest thou?**" Jesus answered: "**Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterwards. Peter said unto him, Lord, why cannot I follow thee now? I will lay down my life for thy sake.**" Peter seems to have realized that his Master was going to His death; yet, undeterred, he asserted his readiness to follow even that dark way rather than be separated from his Lord. We cannot doubt the earnestness of Peter's purpose nor the sincerity of his desire at that moment. In his bold avowal, however, he had reckoned with the willingness of his spirit only, and had failed to take into full account the weakness of his flesh. Jesus, who knew Peter better than the man knew himself, thus tenderly reprovved his excess of self-confidence: "**Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.**" The first of the apostles, the Man of Rock, yet had to be converted, or as more precisely rendered, "**turned again**";[1206] for as the Lord foresaw, Peter would soon be overcome, even to the extent of denying his acquaintanceship with Christ. When Peter stoutly declared again his readiness to go with Jesus, even into prison or to death, the Lord silenced him with the remark: "**I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me.**"

The apostles had to be prepared to meet a new order of things, new conditions and new exigencies; persecution awaited them, and they were soon to be bereft of the Master's sustaining presence. Jesus asked of them: "**When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing. Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end.**" The Lord was soon to be numbered among the transgressors, as had been foreseen;[1207] and His disciples would be regarded as the devotees of an executed criminal. In the mention of purse, scrip, shoes, and sword, some of the brethren caught at the literal meaning, and said, "**Lord, behold, here are two swords,**" Jesus answered with curt finality, "**It is enough,**" or as we might say, "**Enough of this.**" He had not intimated any immediate need of

weapons, and most assuredly not for His own defense. Again they had failed to fathom His meaning; but experience would later teach them.[1208]

For such information as we have concerning the last discourse delivered by Jesus to the apostles before His crucifixion, we are indebted to John alone among the Gospel-writers; and every reader is advised to study with care the three chapters in which these sublime utterances are preserved for the enlightenment of mankind.[1209] Observing the sorrowful state of the Eleven, the Master bade them be of good cheer, grounding their encouragement and hope on faith in Himself. "Let not your heart be troubled," He said, "ye believe in God, believe also in me." Then, as though drawing aside the veil between the earthly and the heavenly state and giving His faithful servants a glimpse of conditions beyond, He continued: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know."[1210] Thus in language simple and plain the Lord declared the fact of graded conditions in the hereafter, of variety of occupation and degrees of glory, of place and station in the eternal worlds.[1211] He had affirmed His own inherent Godship, and through their trust in Him and obedience to His requirements would they find the way to follow whither He was about to precede them. Thomas, that loving, brave, though somewhat skeptical soul, desiring more definite information ventured to say: "Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?" The Lord's answer was a reaffirmation of His divinity; **"I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him."**

At this point Philip interposed with the request, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us." Jesus answered with pathetic and mild reproof: **"Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?"** He was grieved by the thought that His nearest and dearest friends on earth, those upon whom He had conferred the authority of the Holy Priesthood, should be yet ignorant of His absolute oneness with the Father in purpose and action. Had the Eternal Father stood amongst them, in Person, under the conditions there existing, He would have done as did the Well Beloved and Only Begotten Son, whom they knew as Jesus, their Lord and Master. So absolutely were the Father and the Son of one heart and mind, that to know either was to know both; nevertheless the Father could be reached only through the Son. So far as the apostles had faith in Christ, and did His will, should they be able to do the works that Christ in the flesh had done, and even greater things, for His mortal mission was of but a few hours further duration, and the unfolding of the divine plan of the ages would call for yet greater miracles than those wrought by Jesus in the brief period of His ministry.

For the first time the Lord directed His disciples to pray in His name to the Father, and assurance of success in righteous supplication was given in these words: "**And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.**"[1212] The name of Jesus Christ was to be thenceforth the divinely established talisman by which the powers of heaven could be invoked to operate in any righteous undertaking.

The Holy Ghost was promised to the apostles; He would be sent through Christ's intercession, to be to them "**another Comforter,**" or as rendered in later translations, "**another Advocate**" or "**Helper,**" even the Spirit of Truth, who, though the world would reject Him as they had rejected the Christ, should dwell with the disciples, and in them even as Christ then dwelt in them and the Father in Him. "**I will not leave you comfortless,**" Jesus assured the brethren, "**I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.**"[1213] This was followed by the assurance that Christ though unknown by the world would manifest Himself to those who loved Him and kept His commandments.

Judas Thaddeus, otherwise known as Lebbeus,[1214] "**not Iscariot,**" as the recorder is careful to particularize, was puzzled over the untraditional and un-Jewish thought of a Messiah who would be known but to the chosen few and not to Israel at large; and he asked: "Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" Jesus explained that His and the Father's companionship was attainable only by the faithful. He further cheered the apostles by the promise that when the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father would send in the name of the Son, would come to them, He would teach them further, and would bring to their remembrance the teachings they had received from the Christ. The distinct personality of each member of the Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is here again plainly shown.[1215] Comforting the yet troubled disciples, Jesus said: "**Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you**"; and that they might realize that this meant more than the conventional salutation of the times, for "**Peace be with you**" was an every-day greeting among the Jews, the Lord affirmed that He gave that invocation in a higher sense, and "**not as the world giveth.**" Again bidding them put aside their grief and be not afraid, Jesus added: "**Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.**" The Lord made clear to His servants that He had told them these things beforehand, so that when the predicted events came to pass the apostles would be confirmed in their faith in Him, the Christ. He had time to say but little more, for the next hour would witness the beginning of the supreme struggle; "the prince of this world cometh," He said, and with triumphal joy added, "**and hath nothing in me.**"[1216]

The prince of this world - Satan

In superb allegory the Lord thus proceeded to illustrate the vital relationship between the apostles and Himself, and between Himself and the Father, by the figure of a vine-grower, a vine, and its branches:[1217] **"I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it,[1218] that it may bring forth more fruit."** A grander analogy is not to be found in the world's literature. Those ordained servants of the Lord were as helpless and useless without Him as is a bough severed from the tree. As the branch is made fruitful only by virtue of the nourishing sap it receives from the rooted trunk, and if cut away or broken off withers, dries, and becomes utterly worthless except as fuel for the burning, so those men, though ordained to the Holy Apostleship, would find themselves strong and fruitful in good works, only as they remained in steadfast communion with the Lord. Without Christ what were they, but unschooled Galileans, some of them fishermen, one a publican, the rest of undistinguished attainments, and all of them weak mortals? As branches of the Vine they were at that hour clean and healthful, through the instructions and authoritative ordinances with which they had been blessed, and by the reverent obedience they had manifested.

"**Abide in me,**" was the Lord's forceful admonition, else they would become but withered boughs. **"I am the vine,"** He added in explication of the allegory **"ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit: so shall ye be my disciples."** Their love for one another was again specified as an essential to their continued love for Christ.[1219] In that love would they find joy. Christ had been to them an exemplar of righteous love from the day of their first meeting; and He was about to give the supreme proof of His affection, as foreshadowed in His words, **"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."** And that those men were the Lord's friends was thus graciously affirmed; **"Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you."** This intimate relationship in no sense modified the position of Christ as their Lord and Master, for by Him they had been chosen and ordained; and it was His will that they should so live that whatever they asked in the name of the holy friendship which He acknowledged should be granted them of the Father.

They were again told of the persecutions that awaited them, and of their apostolic calling as special and individual witnesses of the Lord.[1220] That the world then did, and would yet more intensely hate them was a fact they had to face; but they were to remember that the world had hated their Master before them, and that they had been

chosen and by ordination had been set apart from the world; therefore they must not hope to escape the world's hatred. The servant was not greater than his master, nor the apostle than his Lord, as on general principles they knew, and as they had been specifically told. They that hated them hated the Christ; and they that hated the Son hated the Father; great shall be the condemnation of such. Had the wicked Jews not closed their eyes and stopped their ears to the mighty works and gracious words of the Messiah, they would have been convinced of the truth, and the truth would have saved them; but they were left without cloak or excuse for their sin; and Christ affirmed that in their evil course had the scriptures been fulfilled in that they had hated Him without a cause.[1221] Then, reverting to the great and cheering promise of support through the coming of the Holy Ghost, the Lord said: "**But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.**"

These things had Jesus declared unto them that they might not "**be offended,**" or in other words, taken by surprise, misled, and caused to doubt and stumble by the unprecedented events then impending. The apostles were forewarned of persecution, of their expulsion from the synagogues, and of a time in which hatred against them should be so bitter and the Satanic darkness of mind and spirit so dense that whosoever succeeded in killing one of them would profess that his foul deed had been done in God's service. In view of their overwhelming sorrow at the Lord's departure, He sought again to cheer them, saying: "**Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.**"

The assured descent of the Holy Ghost, through whom they should be made strong to meet every need and emergency, was the inspiring theme of this part of the Lord's discourse. Many things which Christ yet had to say to His apostles, but which they were at that time unable to understand, the Holy Ghost would teach them. "**Howbeit,**" said Jesus, "**when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.**"[1222]

Turning again to the matter of His departure, then so near as to be reckoned by hours, the Lord said, in amplified form of what He had before affirmed: "**A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.**"[1223] The apostles pondered and some questioned among themselves as to the Lord's meaning, yet so deep was the solemnity of the occasion that they ventured no open inquiry. Jesus knew of their perplexity and graciously explained that they would soon weep and lament while the world rejoiced; this had reference to His death; but He

promised that their sorrow should be turned into joy; and this was based on His resurrection to which they should be witnesses. He compared their then present and prospective state to that of a woman in travail, who in the after joy of blessed motherhood forgets her anguish. The happiness that awaited them would be beyond the power of man to take away; and thenceforth they should ask not of Christ alone, but of the Father in Christ's name; "**And,**" said the Lord, "**in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you. Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.**"[1224] They were to be advanced to such honor and exalted recognition that they should approach the Father in prayer direct, but in the name of the Son; for they were beloved of the Father because they had loved Jesus, the Son, and had accepted Him as One sent by the Father.

The Lord again solemnly averred: "**I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.**" The disciples were gratified at this plain avouchment, and exclaimed: "Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb. Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God." Their satisfaction threatened danger through over-confidence; and the Lord cautioned them, saying, that in an hour then close they should all be scattered, every man to his own, leaving Jesus alone, except for the Father's presence. In the same connection He told them that before the night had passed every one of them would be offended because of Him, even as it had been written: "**I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.**"[1225] Peter, the most vehement of all in his protestations, had been told, as we have seen, that by cock-crow that night he would have thrice denied his Lord; but all of them had declared they would be faithful whatever the trial.[1226] In further affirmation of the material actuality of His resurrection, Jesus promised the apostles that after He had risen from the grave He would go before them into Galilee.[1227]

In conclusion of this last and most solemn of the discourses delivered by Christ in the flesh, the Lord said: "**These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.**"[1228]

THE CONCLUDING PRAYER

The impressive discourse to the apostles was followed by a prayer such as could be addressed to none but the Eternal Father, and such as none but the Son of that Father could offer.[1229] It has been called, and not inappropriately, the Lord's High-Priestly Prayer. In it Jesus acknowledged the Father as the source of His power and authority, which authority extends even to the giving of eternal life to all who are worthy: "**And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ,**

whom thou hast sent." By way of reverent report as to the work assigned Him, the Son said: **"I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."** With unfathomable love the Lord pleaded for those whom the Father had given Him, the apostles then present, who had been called out from the world, and who had been true to their testimony of Himself as the Son of God. Of them but one, the son of perdition, had been lost. In the fervor of devoted supplication, the Lord pleaded:

"I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee: but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me. And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them."

When they had sung a hymn, Jesus and the Eleven went out to the Mount of Olives.[1230]

THE LORD'S AGONY IN GETHSEMANE [1231]

Jesus and the eleven apostles went forth from the house in which they had eaten, passed through the city gate, which was usually left open at night during a public festival, crossed the ravine of the Cedron, or more accurately Kidron, brook, and entered an olive orchard known as Gethsemane,[1232] on the slope of Mount Olivet. Eight of the apostles He left at or near the entrance, with the instruction: **"Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder"**; and with the earnest injunction: **"Pray that ye enter not into temptation."** Accompanied by Peter, James and John, He went farther; and was soon enveloped by deep sorrow, which appears to have been, in a measure, surprising to Himself, for we read that He **"began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy."** He was impelled to deny Himself the companionship of even the chosen three; and, "Saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and

watch with me. And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, **O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.**" Mark's version of the prayer is: "**Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt.**"[1233]

This part of His impassioned supplication was heard by at least one of the waiting three; but all of them soon yielded to weariness and ceased to watch. As on the Mount of Transfiguration, when the Lord appeared in glory, so now in the hour of His deepest humiliation, these three slumbered. Returning to them in an agony of soul Jesus found them sleeping; and addressing Peter, who so short a time before had loudly proclaimed his readiness to follow the Lord even to prison and death, Jesus exclaimed: "What, could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation"; but in tenderness added, "**the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.**" The admonition to the apostles to pray at that time lest they be led into temptation may have been prompted by the exigencies of the hour, under which, if left to themselves, they would be tempted to prematurely desert their Lord.

Aroused from slumber the three apostles saw the Lord again retire, and heard Him pleading in agony: "O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." Returning a second time He found those whom He had so sorrowfully requested to watch with Him sleeping again, "for their eyes were heavy"; and when awakened they were embarrassed or ashamed so that they wist not what to say. A third time He went to His lonely vigil and individual struggle, and was heard to implore the Father with the same words of yearning entreaty. Luke tells us that "**there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him**"; but not even the presence of this super-earthly visitant could dispel the awful anguish of His soul. "And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground."[1234]

Peter had had a glimpse of the darksome road which he had professed himself so ready to tread; and the brothers James and John knew now better than before how unprepared they were to drink of the cup which the Lord would drain to its dregs.[1235]

When for the last time Jesus came back to the disciples left on guard, He said: "Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners." There was no use of further watching; already the torches of the approaching band conducted by Judas were observable in the distance. Jesus exclaimed: "**Rise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that doth betray me.**" Standing with the Eleven, the Lord calmly awaited the traitor's coming.

Christ's agony in the garden is unfathomable by the finite mind, both as to intensity and cause. The thought that He suffered through fear of death is untenable. Death to Him was preliminary to resurrection and triumphal return to the Father from whom He had come, and to a state of glory even beyond what He had before possessed; and, moreover, it was within His power to lay down His life voluntarily.[1236] He struggled and groaned under a burden such as no other being who has lived on earth might even conceive as possible. It was not physical pain, nor mental anguish alone, that caused Him to suffer such torture as to produce an extrusion of blood from every pore; but a spiritual agony of soul such as only God was capable of experiencing. No other man, however great his powers of physical or mental endurance, could have suffered so; for his human organism would have succumbed, and syncope would have produced unconsciousness and welcome oblivion. In that hour of anguish Christ met and overcame all the horrors that Satan, "the prince of this world"[1237] could inflict. The frightful struggle incident to the temptations immediately following the Lord's baptism[1238] was surpassed and overshadowed by this supreme contest with the powers of evil.

In some manner, actual and terribly real though to man incomprehensible, the Savior took upon Himself the burden of the sins of mankind from Adam to the end of the world. Modern revelation assists us to a partial understanding of the awful experience. In March 1830, the glorified Lord, Jesus Christ, thus spake: **"For behold, I, God, have suffered these things for all, that they might not suffer if they would repent, but if they would not repent, they must suffer even as I, which suffering caused myself, even God, the greatest of all, to tremble because of pain, and to bleed at every pore, and to suffer both body and spirit: and would that I might not drink the bitter cup and shrink – nevertheless, glory be to the Father, and I partook and finished my preparations unto the children of men."**[1239]

From the terrible conflict in Gethsemane, Christ emerged a victor. Though in the dark tribulation of that fearful hour He had pleaded that the bitter cup be removed from His lips, the request, however oft repeated, was always conditional; the accomplishment of the Father's will was never lost sight of as the object of the Son's supreme desire. The further tragedy of the night, and the cruel inflictions that awaited Him on the morrow, to culminate in the frightful tortures of the cross, could not exceed the bitter anguish through which He had successfully passed.

THE BETRAYAL AND THE ARREST [1240]

During the period of the Lord's last and most loving communion with the Eleven, Judas had been busy in his treacherous conspiracy with the priestly authorities. It is probable that the determination to make the arrest that night was reached when Judas reported that Jesus was within the city walls and might easily be apprehended. The Jewish rulers assembled a body of temple guardsmen or police, and obtained a band of Roman

soldiers under command of a tribune; this band or cohort was probably a detachment from the garrison of Antonia commissioned for the work of the night on requisition of the chief priests.[1241] This company of men and officers representing a combination of ecclesiastical and military authority, set forth in the night with Judas at their head, intent on the arrest of Jesus. They were equipped with lanterns, torches, and weapons. It is probable that they were first conducted to the house in which Judas had left his fellow apostles and the Lord, when the traitor had been dismissed; and that finding the little company had gone out, Judas led the multitude to Gethsemane, for he knew the place, and knew also that "Jesus oftentimes resorted thither with his disciples."

While Jesus was yet speaking to the Eleven whom He had roused from slumber with the announcement that the betrayer was at hand, Judas and the multitude approached. As a preconcerted sign of identification the recreant Iscariot, with treacherous duplicity, came up with a hypocritical show of affection, saying, "Hail, master," and profaned his Lord's sacred face with a kiss.[1242] That Jesus understood the treacherous significance of the act appears in His pathetic, yet piercing and condemning reproach: "**Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?**" Then, applying the title with which the other apostles had been honored, the Lord said: Friend, do that for which thou art come.[1243] It was a reiteration of the behest given at the supper table, "That thou doest, do quickly."

Judas was a friend – have we not all felt the betrayal of a so-called friend? And when we did, did we not feel as Jesus felt? By this experience we can also walk in the shoes of our Lord; we can all understand the hurt in the heart of our Saviour.

The armed band hesitated, though their guide had given the signal agreed upon. Jesus walked toward the officers, with whom stood Judas, and asked, "**Whom seek ye?**" To their reply, "**Jesus of Nazareth,**" the Lord rejoined: "**I am he.**" Instead of advancing to take Him, the crowd pressed backward, and many of them fell to the ground in fright. The simple dignity and gentle yet compelling force of Christ's presence proved more potent than strong arms and weapons of violence. Again He put the question, "Whom seek ye?" and again they answered, "**Jesus of Nazareth.**" Then said Jesus: "**I have told you that I am he; if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way.**" The last remark had reference to the apostles, who were in danger of arrest; and in this evidence of Christ's solicitude for their personal safety, John saw a fulfillment of the Lord's then recent utterance in prayer, "Of them which thou gavest me have I lost none." [1244] It is possible that had any of the Eleven been apprehended with Jesus and made to share the cruel abuse and torturing humiliation of the next few hours, their faith might have failed them, relatively immature and untried as it then was; even as in succeeding years many who took upon themselves the name of Christ yielded to persecution and went into apostasy.[1245]

When the officers approached and seized Jesus, some of the apostles, ready to fight and die for their beloved Master, asked, "Lord, shall we smite with the sword?" Peter, waiting not for a reply, drew his sword and delivered a poorly aimed stroke at the head of one of the nearest of the crowd, whose ear was severed by the blade. The man thus wounded was Malchus, a servant of the high priest. Jesus, asking liberty of His captors by the simple request, "Suffer ye thus far,"[1246] stepped forward and healed the injured man by a touch. Turning to Peter the Lord rebuked his rashness, and commanded him to return the sword to its scabbard, with the reminder that "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Then, to show the needlessness of armed resistance, and to emphasize the fact that He was submitting voluntarily and in accordance with foreseen and predicted developments, the Lord continued: "**Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?**"[1247] And further, "**the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?**"[1248]

A friend may be brave and loyal friend, but then they may lose courage as a serious situation begins to dawn on them. Peter was brave at first and took up a sword to protect his friend, Jesus, but at a later time, denied Jesus three times – a time of human weakness that he immediately regretted when the “cock crowed” as prophesied by the Saviour – “Peter went out into the night, weeping bitterly.”

But, though surrendering Himself unresistingly, Jesus was not unmindful of His rights; and to the priestly officials, chief priests, captain of the temple guard, and elders of the people who were present, He voiced this interrogative protest against the illegal night seizure: "**Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to take me? I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me. But all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled.**" Luke records the Lord's concluding words thus: "**but this is your hour, and the power of darkness.**" Unheeding His question, and without deference to His submissive demeanor, the captain and the officers of the Jews bound Jesus with cords and led Him away, a Prisoner at the mercy of His deadliest enemies.

The eleven apostles, seeing that resistance was useless, not only on account of disparity of numbers and supply of weapons but chiefly because of Christ's determination to submit, turned and fled. Every one of them forsook Him, even as He had foretold. That they were really in jeopardy is shown by an incident preserved by Mark alone. An unnamed young man, aroused from sleep by the tumult of the marching band, had sallied forth with no outer covering but a linen sheet. His interest in the arrest of Jesus and his close approach caused some of the guardsmen or soldiers to seize him; but he broke loose and escaped leaving the sheet in their hands.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 33

1. The Day of the Passover Feast—Controversy has been rife for many centuries as to the day of the passover feast in the week of our Lord's death. That He was crucified on Friday, the day before the Jewish Sabbath, and that He rose a resurrected Being on Sunday, the day following the Sabbath of the Jews, are facts attested by the four Gospel-writers. From the three synoptists we infer that the last supper occurred on the evening of the first day of unleavened bread, and therefore at the beginning of the Jewish Friday. That the Lord's last supper was regarded by Himself and the apostles as a passover meal appears from Matt. 26:2, 17, 18, 19 and parallel passages, Mark 14:14-16; Luke 22:11-13; as also from Luke 22:7, 15. John, however, who wrote after the synoptists and who probably had their writings before him, as is indicated by the supplementary character of his testimony or "Gospel", intimates that the last supper of which Jesus and the Twelve partook together occurred before the Feast of the Passover (John 13:1, 2); and the same writer informs us that on the following day, Friday, the Jews refrained from entering the Roman hall of judgment, lest they be defiled and so become unfit to eat the Passover (18:28). It should be remembered that by common usage the term "Passover" was applied not only to the day or season of the observance, but to the meal itself, and particularly to the slain lamb (Matt. 26:17; Mark 14:12, 14, 16; Luke 22:8, 11, 13, 15; John 18:28; compare 1 Cor. 5:7). John also specifies that the day of the crucifixion was "the preparation of the passover" (19:14), and that the next day, which was Saturday, the Sabbath, "was an high day" (verse 31), that is a Sabbath rendered doubly sacred because of its being also a feast day.

Much has been written by way of attempt to explain this seeming discrepancy. No analysis of the divergent views of Biblical scholars on this subject will be attempted here; the matter is of incidental importance in connection with the fundamental facts of our Lord's betrayal and crucifixion; for brief summaries of opinions and concise arguments the student may be referred to Smith's *Comprehensive Bible Dictionary*, article "Passover"; Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, pp. 480-2, and 566-8; Farrar's *Life of Christ*, Appendix, Excursus 10; Andrews' *Life of our Lord*, and Gresswell's *Dissertations*. Suffice it here to say that the apparent inconsistency may be explained by any of several assumptions. Thus, first, and very probably, the Passover referred to by John, for the eating of which the priests were desirous of keeping themselves free from Levitical defilement, may not have been the supper at which the paschal lamb was eaten, but the supplementary meal, the Chagigah. This later meal, the flesh part of which was designated as a sacrifice, had come to be regarded with veneration equal to that attaching to the paschal supper. Secondly; it is held by many authorities on Jewish antiquities that before, at, and after the time of Christ, two nights were devoted yearly to the paschal observance, during either of which the lamb might be eaten, and that this extension of time had been made in consideration of the increased population, which necessitated the ceremonial slaughtering of more lambs than could be slain on a single day; and in this connection it is interesting to note that Josephus (Wars, vi, ch. 9:3)

records the number of lambs slain at a single Passover as 256,500. In the same paragraph, Josephus states that the lambs had to be slain between the ninth and the eleventh hour (3 to 5 p.m.). According to this explanation, Jesus and the Twelve may have partaken of the passover meal on the first of the two evenings, and the Jews who next day feared defilement may have deferred their observance until the second. Thirdly; the Lord's last paschal supper may have been eaten earlier than the time of general observance, He knowing that night to be His last in mortality. Supporters of this view explain the message to the man who provided the chamber for the last supper, "**My time is at hand**" (Matt. 26:18) as indicating a special urgency for the passover observance by Christ and the apostles, before the regularly appointed day. Some authorities assert that an error of one day had crept into the Jewish reckoning of time, and that Jesus ate the passover on the true date, while the Jews were a day behind. If "the preparation of the passover" (John 19:14) on Friday, the day of Christ's crucifixion, means the slaughtering of the paschal lambs, our Lord, the real sacrifice of which all earlier altar victims had been but prototypes, died on the cross while the passover lambs were being slain at the temple.

2. Did Judas Iscariot Partake of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? – This question cannot be definitely answered from the brief accounts we have of the proceedings at the last supper. At best, only inference, not conclusion, is possible. According to the records made by Matthew and Mark, the Lord's announcement that there was a traitor among the Twelve was made early in the course of the meal; and the institution of the Sacrament occurred later. Luke records the prediction of treachery as following the administering of the sacramental bread and wine. All the synoptists agree that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered before the sitting at the ordinary meal had broken up; though the Sacrament was plainly made a separate and distinct feature. John (13:2-5) states that the washing of feet occurred when supper was ended, and gives us good reason for inferring that Judas was washed with the rest (verses 10, 11), and that he later (verses 26-30) went out into the night for the purpose of betraying Jesus. The giving of a "sop" to Judas (verses 26, 27) even though supper was practically over, is not inconsistent with John's statement that the supper proper was ended before the washing of feet was performed; the act does not appear to have been so unusual as to cause surprise. To many it has appeared plausible, that because of his utter baseness Judas would not be permitted to participate with the other apostles in the holy ordinance of the Sacrament; others infer that he was allowed to partake, as a possible means of moving him to abandon his evil purpose even at that late hour, or of filling his cup of iniquity to overflowing. The writer's personal opinion is based on the last conception.

3. Washing of Feet – The ordinance of the washing of feet was reestablished through revelation December 27, 1832. It was made a feature of admission to the school of the prophets, and detailed instructions relating to its administration were given (see Doc.

and Cov. 88:140, 141). Further direction as to the ordinances involving washing were revealed January 19, 1841 (see Doc. and Cov. 124:37-39).

4. Discontinuity of the Lord's Last Discourse to the Apostles – It is certain that part of the discourse following the last supper was delivered in the upper room where Christ and the Twelve had eaten; it is possible that the latter portion was spoken and the prayer offered (John 15, 16, 17) outdoors as Jesus and the Eleven wended their way toward the Mount of Olives. The 14th chapter of John ends with "Arise, let us go hence"; the next chapter opens with another section of the discourse. From Matt 26:30-35, and Mark 14:26-31 we may infer that the prediction of Peter's denial of his Lord was made as the little company walked from the city to the mount. On the other hand, John (18:1) states that "**When Jesus had spoken these words**", namely, the whole discourse, and the concluding prayer, "**he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron.**" Not one of our Lord's sublime utterances on that night of solemn converse with His own, and of communion between Himself and the Father, is affected by the circumstance of place.

5. Gethsemane – The name means "oil-press" and probably has reference to a mill maintained at the place for the extraction of oil from the olives there cultivated. John refers to the spot as a garden, from which designation we may regard it as an enclosed space of private ownership. That it was a place frequented by Jesus when He sought retirement for prayer, or opportunity for confidential converse with the disciples, is indicated by the same writer (John 18:1, 2).

This is why Judas knew where to find Him.

6. The Bloody Sweat – Luke, the only Gospel-writer who mentions sweat and blood in connection with our Lord's agony in Gethsemane, states that "**his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground**" (22:44). Many critical expositors deny that there was an actual extrusion of blood, on the grounds that the evangelist does not positively affirm it, and that the three apostles, who were the only human witnesses, could not have distinguished blood from sweat falling in drops, as they watched from a distance in the night, even if the moon, which at the passover season was full, had been unobscured. Modern scripture removes all doubt. See Doc. and Cov. 19:16-19, also 18:11. See further a specific prediction of the bloody sweat, B. of M., Mosiah 3:7.

7. "Suffer Ye thus Far" – Many understand these words, uttered by Jesus as He raised His hand to heal the wounded Malchus, to have been addressed to the disciples, forbidding their further interference. Trench (*Miracles*, 355) considers the meaning to be as follows: 'Hold now; thus far ye have gone in resistance, but let it be no further; no more of this.' The disputed interpretation is of little importance as to the bearing of the incident on the events that followed.

8. The Cup as a Symbol—Our Lord's frequent mention of His foreseen sufferings as the cup of which the Father would have Him drink (Matt. 26:39, 42; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42; John 18:11; compare Matt. 20:22; Mark 10:38; 1 Cor. 10:21) is in line with Old Testament usage of the term "cup" as a symbolic expression for a bitter or poisonous potion typifying experiences of suffering. See Psa. 11:6; 75:8; Isa. 51:17, 22; Jer. 25:15, 17; 49:12. In contrast, the opposite meaning is attached to the use of the term in some passages, e.g. Psa. 16:5; 23:5; 116:13; Jer. 16:7.

FOOTNOTES

[1179] Matt. 26:3-5; see also Mark 14:1; Luke 22:1, 2.

[1180] Revised version of Matt. 26:5 reads: "Not during the feast, lest there be a tumult among the people."

[1181] John 7:30, 44, 45-53; 11:47-57.

[1182] Matt. 26:14-16; Mark 14:10, 11; Luke 22:3-6.

[1183] Matt. 26:15. The revised version reads: "And they weighed unto him thirty pieces of silver." Compare Zech. 11:12.

[1184] Exo. 21:32; Zech. 11:12, 13.

[1185] Matt. 27:3-10.

[1186] Matt. 26:17.

[1187] Note 1, end of chapter.

[1188] Matt. 26:17-19; Mark 14:12-16; Luke 22:7-13.

[1189] **It should be remembered that the Jews counted their days as beginning at sunset, not, as with us, at midnight.**

[1190] Note 2, end of chapter.

[1191] Luke 22:24-30.

[1192] Luke 14:7-11; see notes to chapter 26 herein.

[1193] Luke 22:28; see chapter 10 herein.

[1194] John 13:1-20.

[1195] Note 3, end of chapter.

[1196] The Lord's expression "neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him" (John 13:16) is more correctly rendered "neither the apostle than he that sent him" (revised version, margin); see chapter 16 herein.

[1197] Matt. 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:19, 20.

[1198] In the revised version we read "covenant" instead of "testament" in Matt. 26:28, and in parallel passages.

[1199] 1 Cor. 11:23-34.

[1200] B. of M., 3 Nephi 18:6-11; Doc. and Cov. 20:75; see also the "Articles of Faith," ix.

[1201] See "The Great Apostasy" 8:15-19.

[1202] John 13:18-30.

[1203] Compare Psalm 41:9.

[1204] John 13:31-34.

[1205] Lev. 19:18.

[1206] So reads the revised version of Luke 22:32.

[1207] Isa. 53:12; compare Mark 15:28.

[1208] Read John 13:36-38; Luke 22:31-38; compare Matt. 26:31-35; Mark 14: 27-31.

[1209] John, chaps. 14, 15, 16.

[1210] John 14:1-4.

[1211] See "The Articles of Faith," iv:28, 29; and xxii:16-27.

[1212] John 14:13, 14; compare 16:24.

- [1213] John 14:15-20; compare verse 26; and 15:26.
- [1214] Matt. 10:3, and Luke 6:16; also see chapter 16 herein.
- [1215] See "Articles of Faith," ii:20-24; see chapter 10 herein.
- [1216] John 14:22-31.
- [1217] John 15:1-8.
- [1218] Revised version, "cleanseth it."
- [1219] John 15:9-17.
- [1220] John 15:18-27.
- [1221] Verse 25; compare Psalms 35:19; 69:4; 109:3.
- [1222] John 16:13-15; read verses 1-15.
- [1223] John 16:16; compare 7:33; 13:33; 14:19.
- [1224] John 16:17, 23, 24; read verses 17-28.
- [1225] Matt. 26:31; Mark 14:27; compare Zech. 13:7; see also Matt. 11:6.
- [1226] Matt. 26:31-35; Mark 14:29-31.
- [1227] Matt. 26:32; Mark 14:28; compare 16:7.
- [1228] John 16:33.
- [1229] John 17.
- [1230] Note 4, end of chapter.
- [1231] Matt. 26:36-46; Mark 14:32-42; Luke 22:39-46.
- [1232] Note 5, end of chapter.
- [1233] **"Abba" is expressive of combined affection and honor, and signifies "Father."** It is applied to the Eternal Father by Jesus in the passage above, and by Paul (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6).
- [1234] Note 6, end of chapter.
- [1235] John 13:37; Matt. 20:22; Mark 10:38, 39.
- [1236] John 5:26, 27; and 10:17, 18; also see chapter 25 herein.
- [1237] John 14:30.
- [1238] Page 127.
- [1239] Doc. and Cov. 19:16-19; compare 18:11. See also B. of M., 2 Nephi 9:5, 7, 21; Mosiah 3:7-14; 15:12; Alma 7:11-13; 11:40; 22:14; 34:8-15; 3 Nephi 11:11; 27:14, 15; and chapter 4 herein.
- [1240] Matt. 26:47-56; Mark 14:43-52; Luke 22:47-53; John 18:1-12.
- [1241] "Cohort," a term descriptive of a Roman body, and "military tribune" are more literal renderings of the Greek original than "band" and "captain" in John 18:3, 12. See revised version, margin.
- [1242] The Greek text of Matt. 26:49, and Mark 14:45 clearly implies that Judas "kissed him much," that is many times, or effusively. See margin of revised version.
- [1243] This is a more nearly correct translation than "wherefore art thou come?" in the common version. See revised version. Matt. 26:50.
- [1244] John 18:9; compare 17:12.
- [1245] See "The Great Apostasy," chaps. 4 and 5.
- [1246] Note 7, end of chapter.
- [1247] Compare Isa. 53:8.
- [1248] Note 8, end of chapter.

34

THE TRIAL AND CONDEMNATION

THE JEWISH TRIAL

From Gethsemane the bound and captive Christ was haled before the Jewish rulers. John alone informs us that the Lord was taken first to Annas, who sent Him, still bound, to Caiaphas, the high priest;[1249] the synoptists record the arraignment before Caiaphas only.[1250] No details of the interview with Annas are of record; and the bringing of Jesus before him at all was as truly irregular and illegal, according to Hebrew law, as were all the subsequent proceedings of that night. Annas, who was father-in-law to Caiaphas, had been deposed from the high-priestly office over twenty years before; but throughout this period he had exerted a potent influence in all the affairs of the hierarchy.[1251] Caiaphas, as John is careful to remind us, "was he, which gave counsel to the Jews, that it was expedient that one man should die for the people." [1252]

Note: The first place Jesus was led was to Caiaphas.

At the palace of Caiaphas, the chief priests, scribes, and elders of the people were assembled, in a meeting of the Sanhedrin, informal or otherwise, all eagerly awaiting the result of the expedition led by Judas. When Jesus, the object of their bitter hatred and their predetermined victim, was brought in, a bound Prisoner, He was immediately put upon trial in contravention of the law, both written and traditional, of which those congregated rulers of the Jews professed to be such zealous supporters. No legal hearing on a capital charge could lawfully be held except in the appointed and official courtroom of the Sanhedrin. From the account given in the fourth Gospel we infer that the Prisoner was first subjected to an interrogative examination by the high priest in person.[1253] That functionary, whether Annas or Caiaphas is a matter of inference, inquired of Jesus concerning His disciples and His doctrines. Such a preliminary inquiry was utterly unlawful; for the Hebrew code provided that the accusing witnesses in any cause before the court should define their charge against the accused, and that the latter should be protected from any effort to make him testify against himself. The Lord's reply should have been a sufficient protest to the high priest against further illegal procedure. **"Jesus answered him, I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? – ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said."** This was a lawful objection against denying to a

prisoner on trial his right to be confronted by his accusers. It was received with open disdain; and one of the officers who stood by, hoping perhaps to curry favor with his superiors, actually struck Jesus a vicious blow,[1254] accompanied by the question, **"Answerest thou the high priest so?"** To this cowardly assault the Lord replied with almost superhuman gentleness:[1255] **"If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?"** Combined with submissiveness, however, this constituted another appeal to the principles of justice; if what Jesus had said was evil, why did not the assailant accuse Him; and if He had spoken well, what right had a police officer to judge, condemn, and punish, and that too in the presence of the high priest? Law and justice had been dethroned that night.

"Now the chief priests, and elders, and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death."[1256] Whether "all the council" means a legal quorum, which would be twenty-three or more, or a full attendance of the seventy-two Sanhedrists, is of small importance. Any sitting of the Sanhedrin at night, and more particularly for the consideration of a capital charge, was directly in violation of Jewish law. Likewise was it unlawful for the council to consider such a charge on a Sabbath, a feast day, or on the eve of any such day. In the Sanhedrin, every member was a judge; the judicial body was to hear the testimony, and, according to that testimony and nought else, render a decision on every case duly presented. The accusers were required to appear in person; and they were to receive a preliminary warning against bearing false witness. Every defendant was to be regarded and treated as innocent until convicted in due course. But in the so-called trial of Jesus, the judges not only sought witnesses, but specifically tried to find false witnesses. Though many false witnesses came, yet there was no "witness" or testimony against the Prisoner, for the suborned perjurers failed to agree among themselves; and even the lawless Sanhedrists hesitated to openly violate the fundamental requirement that at least two concordant witnesses must testify against an accused person, for, otherwise, the case had to be dismissed.

False Witness: Some of us have had lies told about us, and some have even had some injustice done because of that false witness? And if we suffered because of that false witness, did we not feel a little as Jesus may have felt? If we experienced a false witness, then we will have walked in the shoes of our Lord and we can all understand the injustice perpetrated upon our Saviour.

That Jesus was to be convicted on some charge or other, and be put to death, had been already determined by the priestly judges; their failure to find witnesses against Him threatened to delay the carrying out of their nefarious scheme. Haste and precipitancy characterized their procedure throughout; they had unlawfully caused Jesus to be arrested at night; they were illegally going through the semblance of a trial at night; their purpose was to convict the Prisoner in time to have Him brought before the Roman authorities as early as possible in the morning – as a criminal duly tried and adjudged worthy of death. The lack of two hostile witnesses who would tell the same

falsehoods was a serious hindrance. But, "**at the last came two false witnesses**, and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days." Others, however, testified: "We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands." [1257] And so, as Mark observes, even in this particular their "witness" or testimony did not agree. Surely in a case at bar, such discrepancy as appears between "I am able to" and "I will," as alleged utterances of the accused, is of vital importance. Yet this semblance of formal accusation was the sole basis of a charge against Christ up to this stage of the trial. It will be remembered that in connection with the first clearing of the temple, near the commencement of Christ's ministry, He had answered the clamorous demand of the Jews for a sign of His authority by saying "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." He spoke not at all of Himself as the one who would destroy; the Jews were to be the destroyers, He the restorer. But the inspired writer is particular to explain that Jesus "spoke of the temple of his body," and not at all of those buildings reared by man. [1258]

One may reasonably inquire as to what serious import could be attached to even such a declaration as the perjured witnesses claimed to have heard from the lips of Christ. The veneration with which the Jews professed to regard the Holy House, however wantonly they profaned its precincts, offers a partial but insufficient answer. The plan of the conspiring rulers appears to have been that of convicting Christ on a charge of sedition, making Him out to be a dangerous disturber of the nation's peace, an assailant of established institutions, and consequently an inciter of opposition against the vassal autonomy of the Jewish nation, and the supreme dominion of Rome. [1259]

The vaguely defined shadow of legal accusation produced by the dark and inconsistent testimony of the false witnesses was enough to embolden the iniquitous court. Caiaphas, rising from his seat to give dramatic emphasis to his question, demanding of Jesus: "**Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee?**" There was nothing to answer. No consistent or valid testimony had been presented against Him; therefore He stood in dignified silence. Then Caiaphas, in violation of the legal proscription against requiring any person to testify in his own case except voluntarily and on his own initiative, not only demanded an answer from the Prisoner, but exercised the potent prerogative of the high-priestly office, to put the accused under oath, as a witness before the sacerdotal court. "**And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.**" [1260] The fact of a distinct specification of "the Christ" and "the Son of God" is significant, in that it implies the Jewish expectation of a Messiah, but does not acknowledge that He was to be distinctively of divine origin. Nothing that had gone before can be construed as a proper foundation for this inquiry. The charge of sedition was about to be superseded by one of greater enormity – that of blasphemy. [1261]

To the utterly unjust yet official adjuration of the high priest, Jesus answered: "Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you: Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." This expression "Thou hast said" was equivalent to—I am what thou hast said.[1262] It was an unqualified avowal of divine parentage, and inherent Godship. **"Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death."**[1263]

Thus the judges in Israel, comprising the high priest, the chief priests, the scribes and elders of the people, the Great Sanhedrin, unlawfully assembled, decreed that the Son of God was deserving of death, on no evidence save that of His own acknowledgment. By express provision the Jewish code forbade the conviction, specifically on a capital charge, of any person on his own confession, unless that was amply supported by the testimony of trustworthy witnesses. As in the Garden of Gethsemane Jesus had voluntarily surrendered Himself, so before the judges did He personally and voluntarily furnish the evidence upon which they unrighteously declared Him deserving of death. There could be no crime in the claim of Messiahship or divine Sonship, except that claim was false. We vainly search the record for even an intimation that inquiry was made or suggested as to the grounds upon which Jesus based His exalted claims. The action of the high priest in rending his garments was a dramatic affectation of pious horror at the blasphemy with which his ears had been assailed. It was expressly forbidden in the law that the high priest rend his clothes;[1264] but from extra-scriptural writings we learn that the rending of garments as an attestation of most grievous guilt, such as that of blasphemy, was allowable under traditional rule.[1265] There is no indication that the vote of the judges was taken and recorded in the precise and orderly manner required by the law.

Jesus stood convicted of the most heinous offense known in Jewry. However unjustly, He had been pronounced guilty of blasphemy by the supreme tribunal of the nation. In strict accuracy we cannot say that the Sanhedrists sentenced Christ to death, inasmuch as the power to authoritatively pronounce capital sentences had been taken from the Jewish council by Roman decree. The high-priestly court, however, decided that Jesus was worthy of death, and so certified when they handed Him over to Pilate. In their excess of malignant hate, Israel's judges abandoned their Lord to the wanton will of the attendant varlets, who heaped upon Him every indignity their brutish instincts could suggest. They spurted their foul spittle into His face;[1266] and then, having blindfolded Him, amused themselves by smiting Him again and again, saying the while: "Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee?" The miscreant crowd mocked Him, and railed upon Him with jeers and taunts, and branded themselves as blasphemers in fact.[1267]

Note: the "attendant varlets" were the Romans. When the Saviour was being crucified, Jesus said, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." Jesus was talking about the Romans who knew no better than to do a gruesome job. The "high-priestly court" knew exactly what they were doing however, and the Saviour was not forgiving their actions as they would have to earn their own forgiveness.

The law and the practice of the time required that any person found guilty of a capital offense, after due trial before a Jewish tribunal, should be given a second trial on the following day; and at this later hearing any or all of the judges who had before voted for conviction could reverse themselves; but no one who had once voted for acquittal could change his ballot. A bare majority was sufficient for acquittal, but more than a majority was required for conviction. By a provision that must appear to us most unusual, if all the judges voted for conviction on a capital charge the verdict was not to stand and the accused had to be set at liberty; for, it was argued, a unanimous vote against a prisoner indicated that he had had no friend or defender in court, and that the judges might have been in conspiracy against Him. Under this rule in Hebrew jurisprudence the verdict against Jesus, rendered at the illegal night session of the Sanhedrists, was void, for we are specifically told that **"they all condemned him to be guilty of death."**[1268]

Apparently for the purpose of establishing a shadowy pretext of legality in their procedure, the Sanhedrists adjourned to meet again in early daylight. Thus they technically complied with the requirement – that on every case in which the death sentence had been decreed the court should hear and judge a second time in a later session – but they completely ignored the equally mandatory provision that the second trial must be conducted on the day following that of the first hearing. Between the two sittings on consecutive days the judges were required to fast and pray, and to give the case on trial calm and earnest consideration.

Luke, who records no details of the night trial of Jesus, is the only Gospel-writer to give place to a circumstantial report of the morning session. He says: **"And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the chief priests and the scribes came together, and led him into their council."**[1269] Some Biblical scholars have construed the expression, "led him into their council," as signifying that Jesus was condemned by the Sanhedrin in the appointed meeting-place of the court, viz. Gazith or the Hall of Hewn Stones, as the law of the time required; but against this we have the statement of John that they led Jesus directly from Caiaphas to the Roman hall of judgment.[1270]

Note: The second place Jesus was taken was to the Roman hall of judgment.

It is probable, that at this early daylight session, the irregular proceedings of the dark hours were approved, and the details of further procedure decided upon. They "took counsel against Jesus to put him to death"; nevertheless they went through the form of a

second trial, the issue of which was greatly facilitated by the Prisoner's voluntary affirmations. The judges stand without semblance of justification for calling upon the Accused to testify; they should have examined anew the witnesses against Him. The first question put to Him was, "Art thou the Christ? tell us." The Lord made dignified reply: "If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God." Neither did the question imply nor the answer furnish cause for condemnation. The whole nation was looking for the Messiah; and if Jesus claimed to be He, the only proper judicial action would be that of inquiring into the merit of the claim. The crucial question followed immediately: "Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth."[1271]

Jehovah was convicted of blasphemy against Jehovah. The only mortal Being to whom the awful crime of blasphemy, in claiming divine attributes and powers, was impossible, stood before the judges of Israel condemned as a blasphemer. The "whole council," by which expression we may possibly understand a legal quorum, was concerned in the final action. Thus ended the miscalled "trial" of Jesus before the high-priest and elders[1272] of His people. "And straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him to Pilate." [1273] During the few hours that remained to Him in mortality, He would be in the hands of the Gentiles, betrayed and delivered up by His own.[1274]

PETER'S DENIAL OF HIS LORD [1275]

When Jesus was taken into custody in the Garden of Gethsemane, all the Eleven forsook Him and fled. This is not to be accounted as certain evidence of cowardice, for the Lord had indicated that they should go.[1276] Peter and at least one other disciple followed afar off; and, after the armed guard had entered the palace of the high priest with their Prisoner, Peter "went in, and sat with the servants to see the end." He was assisted in securing admittance by the unnamed disciple, who was on terms of acquaintanceship with the high priest. That other disciple was in all probability John, as may be inferred from the fact that he is mentioned only in the fourth Gospel, the author of which characteristically refers to himself anonymously.[1277]

While Jesus was before the Sanhedrists, Peter remained below with the servants. The attendant at the door was a young woman; her feminine suspicions had been aroused when she admitted Peter, and as he sat with a crowd in the palace court she came up, and having intently observed him, said: "**Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee.**" But Peter denied, averring he did not know Jesus. Peter was restless; his conscience and the fear of identification as one of the Lord's disciples troubled him. He left the crowd and sought partial seclusion in the porch; but there another maid spied him out, and said to

those nearby: "**This fellow was also with Jesus of Nazareth**"; to which accusation Peter replied with an oath: "**I do not know the man.**"

The April night was chilly, and an open fire had been made in the hall or court of the palace. Peter sat with others at the fire, thinking, perhaps, that brazen openness was better than skulking caution as a possible safeguard against detection. About an hour after his former denials, some of the men around the fire charged him with being a disciple of Jesus, and referred to his Galilean dialect as evidence that he was at least a fellow countryman with the high priest's Prisoner; but, most threatening of all, a kinsman of Malchus, whose ear Peter had slashed with the sword, asked peremptorily: "Did not I see thee in the garden with him?" Then Peter went so far in the course of falsehood upon which he had entered as to curse and swear, and to vehemently declare for the third time, "**I know not the man.**" As the last profane falsehood left his lips, the clear notes of a crowing cock broke upon his ears,[1278] and the remembrance of his Lord's prediction welled up in his mind. Trembling in wretched realization of his perfidious cowardice, he turned from the crowd and met the gaze of the suffering Christ, who from the midst of the insolent mob looked into the face of His boastful, yet loving but weak apostle. Hastening from the palace, Peter went out into the night, weeping bitterly. As his later life attests, his tears were those of real contrition and true repentance.

CHRIST'S FIRST APPEARANCE BEFORE PILATE

As we have already learned, no Jewish tribunal had authority to inflict the death penalty; imperial Rome had reserved this prerogative as her own. The united acclaim of the Sanhedrists, that Jesus was deserving of death, would be ineffective until sanctioned by the emperor's deputy, who at that time was Pontius Pilate, the governor, or more properly, procurator, of Judea, Samaria, and Idumea. Pilate maintained his official residence at Cæsarea,[1279] on the Mediterranean shore; but it was his custom to be present in Jerusalem at the times of the great Hebrew feasts, probably in the interest of preserving order, or of promptly quelling any disturbance amongst the vast and heterogeneous multitudes by which the city was thronged on these festive occasions. The governor with his attendants was in Jerusalem at this momentous Passover season. Early on Friday morning, the "whole council," that is to say, the Sanhedrin, led Jesus, bound, to the judgment hall of Pontius Pilate; but with strict scrupulosity they refrained from entering the hall lest they become defiled; for the judgment chamber was part of the house of a Gentile, and somewhere therein might be leavened bread, even to be near which would render them ceremonially unclean. Let everyone designate for himself the character of men afraid of the mere proximity of leaven, while thirsting for innocent blood!

In deference to their scruples Pilate came out from the palace; and, as they delivered up to him their Prisoner, asked: "**What accusation bring ye against this man?**" The

question, though strictly proper and judicially necessary, surprised and disappointed the priestly rulers, who evidently had expected that the governor would simply approve their verdict as a matter of form and give sentence accordingly; but instead of doing so, Pilate was apparently about to exercise his authority of original jurisdiction. With poorly concealed chagrin, their spokesman, probably Caiaphas, answered: "**If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee.**" It was now Pilate's turn to feel or at least to feign umbrage, and he replied in effect: Oh, very well; if you don't care to present the charge in proper order, take ye him, and judge him according to your law; don't trouble me with the matter. But the Jews rejoined: "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death."

John the apostle intimates in this last remark a determination on the part of the Jews to have Jesus put to death not only by Roman sanction but by Roman executioners;[1280] for, as we readily may see, had Pilate approved the death sentence and handed the Prisoner over to the Jews for its infliction, Jesus would have been stoned, in accordance with the Hebrew penalty for blasphemy; whereas the Lord had plainly foretold that His death would be by crucifixion, which was a Roman method of execution, but one never practiced by the Jews. Furthermore, if Jesus had been put to death by the Jewish rulers, even with governmental sanction, an insurrection among the people might have resulted, for there were many who believed on Him. The crafty hierarchs were determined to bring about His death under Roman condemnation.

"And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a King."[1281] It is important to note that no accusation of blasphemy was made to Pilate; had such been presented, the governor, thoroughly pagan in heart and mind, would probably have dismissed the charge as utterly unworthy of a hearing; for Rome with her many gods, whose number was being steadily increased by current heathen deification of mortals, knew no such offense as blasphemy in the Jewish sense. The accusing Sanhedrists hesitated not to substitute for blasphemy, which was the greatest crime known to the Hebrew code, the charge of high treason, which was the gravest offense listed in the Roman category of crimes. To the vociferous accusations of the chief priests and elders, the calm and dignified Christ deigned no reply. To them He had spoken for the last time – until the appointed season of another trial, in which He shall be the Judge, and they the prisoners at the bar.

Pilate was surprised at the submissive yet majestic demeanor of Jesus; there was certainly much that was kingly about the Man; never before had such a One stood before him. The charge, however, was a serious one; men who claimed title to kingship might prove dangerous to Rome; yet to the charge the Accused answered nothing. Entering the judgment hall, Pilate had Jesus called.[1282] That some of the disciples, and among them almost certainly John, also went in, is apparent from the detailed

accounts of the proceedings preserved in the fourth Gospel. Anyone was at liberty to enter, for publicity was an actual and a widely proclaimed feature of Roman trials.

Pilate, plainly without animosity or prejudice against Jesus, asked: "Art thou the King of the Jews? Jesus answered him, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?" The Lord's counter-question, as Pilate's rejoinder shows, meant, and was understood to mean, as we might state it: Do you ask this in the Roman and literal sense – as to whether I am a king of an earthly kingdom – or with the Jewish and more spiritual meaning? A direct answer "Yes" would have been true in the Messianic sense, but untrue in the worldly signification; and "No" could have been inversely construed as true or untrue. **"Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done? Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence. Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice."**

It was clear to the Roman governor that this wonderful Man, with His exalted views of a kingdom not of this world, and an empire of truth in which He was to reign, was no political insurrectionist; and that to consider Him a menace to Roman institutions would be absurd. Those last words – about truth – were of all the most puzzling; Pilate was restive, and perhaps a little frightened under their import. "What is truth?" he rather exclaimed in apprehension than inquired in expectation of an answer, as he started to leave the hall. To the Jews without he announced officially the acquittal of the Prisoner. "I find in him no fault at all" was the verdict.

But the chief priests and scribes and elders of the people were undeterred. Their thirst for the blood of the Holy One had developed into mania. Wildly and fiercely they shrieked: **"He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this place."** The mention of Galilee suggested to Pilate a new course of procedure. Having confirmed by inquiry that Jesus was a Galilean, he determined to send the Prisoner to Herod, the vassal ruler of that province, who was in Jerusalem at the time.[1283] By this action Pilate hoped to rid himself of further responsibility in the case, and moreover, Herod, with whom he had been at enmity, might be placated thereby.

Pilate cannot find any guilt in Jesus and doesn't want to take further responsibility. Pilate decides to send Jesus to Herod because Jesus is a Galilean. The third place Jesus is taken, to see Herod Antipas, the son of the infamous baby killer.

CHRIST BEFORE HEROD [1284]

Herod Antipas, the degenerate son of his infamous sire, Herod the Great,[1285] was at this time tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, and by popular usage, though without imperial sanction, was flatteringly called king. He it was who, in fulfillment of an unholy vow inspired by a woman's voluptuous blandishments, had ordered the murder of John the Baptist. He ruled as a Roman vassal, and professed to be orthodox in the observances of Judaism. He had come up to Jerusalem, in state, to keep the feast of the Passover. Herod was pleased to have Jesus sent to him by Pilate; for, not only was the action a gracious one on the part of the procurator, constituting as after events proved a preliminary to reconciliation between the two rulers,[1286] but it was a means of gratifying Herod's curiosity to see Jesus, of whom he had heard so much, whose fame had terrified him, and by whom he now hoped to see some interesting miracle wrought.[1287]

Whatever fear Herod had once felt regarding Jesus, whom he had superstitiously thought to be the reincarnation of his murdered victim, John the Baptist, was replaced by amused interest when he saw the far-famed Prophet of Galilee in bonds before him, attended by a Roman guard, and accompanied by ecclesiastical officials. Herod began to question the Prisoner; but Jesus remained silent. The chief priests and scribes vehemently voiced their accusations; but not a word was uttered by the Lord. Herod is the only character in history to whom Jesus is known to have applied a personal epithet of contempt. "Go ye and tell that fox" He once said to certain Pharisees who had come to Him with the story that Herod intended to kill Him.[1288] As far as we know, Herod is further distinguished as the only being who saw Christ face to face and spoke to Him, yet never heard His voice. For penitent sinners, weeping women, prattling children, for the scribes, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the rabbis, for the perjured high priest and his obsequious and insolent underling, and for Pilate the pagan, Christ had words – of comfort or instruction, of warning or rebuke, of protest or denunciation – yet for Herod the fox He had but disdainful and kingly silence. Thoroughly piqued, Herod turned from insulting questions to acts of malignant derision. He and his men-at-arms made sport of the suffering Christ, "set him at nought and mocked him"; then in travesty they "arrayed him in a gorgeous robe and sent him again to Pilate."[1289] Herod had found nothing in Jesus to warrant condemnation.

The fourth time Jesus is moved – Now Jesus is taken back to Pilate. The Saviour never said a word to Herod and he could find nothing wrong with Jesus to warrant a death sentence.

CHRIST AGAIN BEFORE PILATE [1290]

The Roman procurator, finding that he could not evade further consideration of the case, "called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people," and "said unto them, Ye have brought this man unto me, as one that perverteth the people: and,

behold, I, having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him; No, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him; and, lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him. I will therefore chastise him, and release him." Pilate's desire to save Jesus from death was just and genuine; his intention of scourging the Prisoner, whose innocence he had affirmed and reaffirmed, was an infamous concession to Jewish prejudice. He knew that the charge of sedition and treason was without foundation; and that even the framing of such an accusation by the Jewish hierarchy, whose simulated loyalty to Cæsar was but a cloak for inherent and undying hatred, was ridiculous in the extreme; and he fully realized that the priestly rulers had delivered Jesus into his hands because of envy and malice.[1291]

It was the custom for the governor at the Passover season to pardon and release any one condemned prisoner whom the people might name. On that day there lay in durance, awaiting execution, "a notable prisoner, called Barabbas," who had been found guilty of sedition, in that he had incited the people to insurrection, and had committed murder. This man stood convicted of the very charge on which Pilate specifically and Herod by implication had pronounced Jesus innocent, and Barabbas was a murderer in addition. Pilate thought to pacify the priests and people by releasing Jesus as the subject of Passover leniency; this would be a tacit recognition of Christ's conviction before the ecclesiastical court, and practically an endorsement of the death sentence, superseded by official pardon. Therefore he asked of them: "**Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?**" There appears to have been a brief interval between Pilate's question and the people's answer, during which the chief priests and elders busied themselves amongst the multitude, urging them to demand the release of the insurrectionist and murderer. So, when Pilate reiterated the question: "Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you?" assembled Israel cried "Barabbas." Pilate, surprised, disappointed, and angered, then asked: "**What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ? They all say unto him, Let him be crucified. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified.**"

The Roman governor was sorely troubled and inwardly afraid. To add to his perplexity he received a warning message from his wife, even as he sat on the judgment seat: "Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him." Those who know not God are characteristically superstitious. Pilate feared to think what dread portent his wife's dream might presage. But, finding that he could not prevail, and foreseeing a tumult among the people if he persisted in the defense of Christ, he called for water and washed his hands before the multitude — a symbolic act of disclaiming responsibility, which they all understood — proclaiming the while: "I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it." Then rose that awful self-condemnatory cry of the covenant people: "**His blood be on us and on our children.**" History bears an appalling testimony to the literal fulfillment

of that dread invocation.[1292] Pilate released Barabbas, and gave Jesus into the custody of the soldiers to be scourged.

Scourging was a frightful preliminary to death on the cross. The instrument of punishment was a whip of many thongs, loaded with metal and edged with jagged pieces of bone. Instances are of record in which the condemned died under the lash and so escaped the horrors of living crucifixion. In accordance with the brutal customs of the time, Jesus, weak and bleeding from the fearful scourging He had undergone, was given over to the half-savage soldiers for their amusement. He was no ordinary victim, so the whole band came together in the Pretorium, or great hall of the palace, to take part in the diabolical sport. They stripped Jesus of His outer raiment, and placed upon Him a purple robe.[1293] Then with a sense of fiendish realism they platted a crown of thorns, and placed it about the Sufferer's brows; a reed was put into His right hand as a royal scepter; and, as they bowed in a mockery of homage, they saluted Him with: "Hail, King of the Jews!" Snatching away the reed or rod, they brutally smote Him with it upon the head, driving the cruel thorns into His quivering flesh; they slapped Him with their hands, and spat upon Him in vile and vicious abandonment.[1294]

Pilate had probably been a silent observer of this barbarous scene. He stopped it, and determined to make another attempt to touch the springs of Jewish pity, if such existed. He went outside, and to the multitude said: "Behold, I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in him." This was the governor's third definite proclamation of the Prisoner's innocence. "Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the man!"[1295] Pilate seems to have counted on the pitiful sight of the scourged and bleeding Christ to soften the hearts of the maddened Jews. But the effect failed. Think of the awful fact – a heathen, a pagan, who knew not God, pleading with the priests and people of Israel for the life of their Lord and King! When, unmoved by the sight, the chief priests and officers cried with increasing vindictiveness, "crucify him, crucify him," Pilate pronounced the fatal sentence, "Take ye him and crucify him," but added with bitter emphasis: "I find no fault in him."

Three times Pilate tried to save Jesus, but the "maddened Jews" would not be appeased.

It will be remembered that the only charge preferred against Christ before the Roman governor was that of sedition; the Jewish persecutors had carefully avoided even the mention of blasphemy, which was the offense for which they had adjudged Jesus worthy of death. Now that sentence of crucifixion had been extorted from Pilate, they brazenly attempted to make it appear that the governor's mandate was but a ratification of their own decree of death; therefore they said: "**We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.**" What did it mean? That awe-inspiring title, Son of God, struck yet deeper into Pilate's troubled conscience. Once more he took Jesus into the judgment hall, and in trepidation asked, "Whence art thou?"

The inquiry was as to whether Jesus was human or superhuman. A direct avowal of the Lord's divinity would have frightened but could not have enlightened the heathen ruler; therefore Jesus gave no answer. Pilate was further surprised, and perhaps somewhat offended at this seeming disregard of his authority. He demanded an explanation, saying: "**Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?**" Then Jesus replied: "**Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.**" The positions were reversed; Christ was the Judge, and Pilate the subject of His decision. Though not found guiltless, the Roman was pronounced less culpable than he or those who had forced Jesus into his power, and who had demanded of him an unrighteous committal.

Poor Pilate, he is beside himself. He doesn't understand why the Jews want Jesus dead, and in fact, he finds "no fault in Him". He is curious about the "Son of God" title the Jews have mocked the Saviour over and he wants an explanation from Jesus about why he can't save himself if he is "divine". But Jesus replied to Pilate, "you have no power over me, except what is given from above, but (don't worry), the people who brought me here have the greater sin." Wow, that must have felt awful to Pilate. He knew Jesus was innocent but he is placed in a corner by the wicked Jewish Priests and their followers. Not to say that Pilate was a good man, as mentioned below, but he was very bewildered by the dilemma he was placed in.

The governor, though having pronounced sentence, yet sought means of releasing the submissive Sufferer. His first evidence of wavering was greeted by the Jews with the cry, "**If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar.**" Pilate took his place in the judgment seat, which was set up in the place of the Pavement, or Gabbatha, outside the hall. He was resentful against those Jews who had dared to intimate that he was no friend of Cæsar, and whose intimation might lead to an embassy of complaint being sent to Rome to misrepresent him in exaggerated accusation. Pointing to Jesus, he exclaimed with unveiled sarcasm: "Behold your King!" But the Jews answered in threatening and ominous shouts: "Away with him, away with him, crucify him." In stinging reminder of their national subjugation, Pilate asked with yet more cutting irony, "**Shall I crucify your King?**" And the chief priests cried aloud: "**We have no king but Cæsar.**"

Pilate is tenacious about trying to save the Saviour – I have no doubt that Pilate is one of the people the Saviour speaks about when he says, "Father, Forgive them for they know not what they do."

Even so was it and was to be. The people, who had by covenant accepted Jehovah as their King, now rejected Him in Person, and acknowledged no sovereign but Cæsar. Cæsar's subjects and serfs have they been through all the centuries since. Pitiably is the state of man or nation who in heart and spirit will have no king but Cæsar![1296]

Wherein lay the cause of Pilate's weakness? He was the emperor's representative, the imperial procurator with power to crucify or to save; officially he was an autocrat. His conviction of Christ's blamelessness and his desire to save Him from the cross are beyond question. Why did Pilate waver, hesitate, vacillate, and at length yield contrary to his conscience and his will? Because, after all, he was more slave than freeman. He was in servitude to his past. He knew that should complaint be made of him at Rome, his corruption and cruelties, his extortions and the unjustifiable slaughter he had caused would all be brought against him. He was the Roman ruler, but the people over whom he exercised official dominion delighted in seeing him cringe, when they cracked, with vicious snap above his head, the whip of a threatened report about him to his imperial master, Tiberius.[1297]

JUDAS ISCARIOT [1298]

When Judas Iscariot saw how terribly effective had been the outcome of his treachery, he became wildly remorseful. During Christ's trial before the Jewish authorities, with its associated humiliation and cruelty, the traitor had seen the seriousness of his action; and when the unresisting Sufferer had been delivered up to the Romans, and the fatal consummation had become a certainty, the enormity of his crime filled Judas with nameless horror. Rushing into the presence of the chief priests and elders, while the final preparations for the crucifixion of the Lord were in progress, he implored the priestly rulers to take back the accursed wage they had paid him, crying in an agony of despair: "I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." He may have vaguely expected a word of sympathy from the conspirators in whose wickedly skilful hands he had been so ready and serviceable a tool; possibly he hoped that his avowal might stem the current of their malignancy, and that they would ask for a reversal of the sentence. But the rulers in Israel repulsed him with disgust. "What is that to us?" they sneered, "see thou to that." He had served their purpose; they had paid him his price; they wished never to look upon his face again; and pitilessly they flung him back into the haunted blackness of his maddened conscience. Still clutching the bag of silver, the all too real remembrancer of his frightful sin, he rushed into the temple, penetrating even to the precincts of priestly reservation, and dashed the silver pieces upon the floor of the sanctuary.[1299] Then, under the goading impulse of his master, the devil, to whom he had become a bond-slave, body and soul, he went out and hanged himself.

The chief priests gathered up the pieces of silver, and in sacrilegious scrupulosity, held a solemn council to determine what they should do with the "price of blood." As they deemed it unlawful to add the attainted coin to the sacred treasury, they bought with it a certain clay-yard, once the property of a potter, and the very place in which Judas had made of himself a suicide; this tract of ground they set apart as a burial place for aliens, strangers, and pagans. The body of Judas, the betrayer of the Christ, was probably the

first to be there interred. And that field was called "Aceldama, that is to say, The field of blood."[1300]

NOTES TO CHAPTER 34

1. Annas, and His Interview with Jesus – "No figure is better known in contemporary Jewish history than that of Annas; no person deemed more fortunate or successful, but also none more generally execrated than the late high priest. He had held the pontificate for only six or seven years; but it was filled by not fewer than five of his sons, by his son-in-law Caiaphas, and by a grandson. And in those days it was, at least for one of Annas' disposition, much better to have been than to be high priest. He enjoyed all the dignity of the office, and all its influence also, since he was able to promote to it those most closely connected with him. And while they acted publicly, he really directed affairs, without either the responsibility or the restraints which the office imposed. His influence with the Romans he owed to the religious views which he professed, to his open partisanship of the foreigner, and to his enormous wealth.... We have seen what immense revenues the family of Annas must have derived from the Temple booths, and how nefarious and unpopular was the traffic. The names of those bold, licentious, unscrupulous, degenerate sons of Aaron were spoken with whispered curses. Without referring to Christ's interference with that Temple-traffic, which, if His authority had prevailed, would of course have been fatal to it, we can understand how antithetic in every respect a Messiah, and such a Messiah as Jesus, must have been to Annas.... No account is given of what passed before Annas. Even the fact of Christ's being first brought to him is only mentioned in the fourth Gospel. As the disciples had all forsaken Him and fled, we can understand that they were in ignorance of what actually passed, till they had again rallied, at least so far, that Peter and 'another disciple', evidently John, 'followed Him into the palace of the high priest' – that is, into the palace of Caiaphas, not of Annas. For as, according to the three synoptic Gospels, the palace of the high priest Caiaphas was the scene of Peter's denial, the account of it in the fourth Gospel must refer to the same locality, and not to the palace of Annas." – Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; vol. 2, pp. 547-8.

2. Christ's Forbearance when Smitten – That Jesus maintained His equanimity and submissiveness even under the provocation of a blow dealt by a brutish underling in the presence of the high priest, is confirmatory of our Lord's affirmation that He had "overcome the world" (John 16:33). One cannot read the passage without comparing, perhaps involuntarily, the divine submissiveness of Jesus on this occasion, with the wholly natural and human indignation of Paul under somewhat similar conditions at a later time (Acts 23:1-5). The high priest Ananias, displeased at Paul's remarks, ordered someone who stood by to smite him on the mouth. Paul broke forth in angry protest: "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" Afterward he apologized,

saying that he knew not that it was the high priest who had given the command that he be smitten. See *Articles of Faith*, xxiii, II, and Note 1 following the same lecture; and Farrar's *Life and Works of St. Paul*, pp. 539-540.

3. High Priests and Elders— These titles as held by officials of the Jewish hierarchy in the time of Christ must not be confused with the same designations as applied to holders of the Higher or Melchizedek Priesthood. The high priest of the Jews was the presiding priest; he had to be of Aaronic descent to be a priest at all; he became high priest by Roman appointment. The elders, as the name indicates, were men of mature years and experience, who were appointed to act as magistrates in the towns, and as judges in the ecclesiastical tribunals, either in the Lesser Sanhedrins of the provinces, or in the Great Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. The term "elder" as commonly used among the Jews in the days of Jesus had no closer relation to eldership in the Melchizedek Priesthood than had the title "scribe". The duties of Jewish high priests and elders combined both ecclesiastical and secular functions; indeed both offices had come to be in large measure political perquisites. See "Elder" in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*. From the departure of Moses to the coming of Christ, the organized theocracy of Israel was that of the Lesser or Aaronic Priesthood, comprising the office of priest, which was confined to the lineage of Aaron, and the lesser offices of teacher and deacon, which were combined in the Levitical order. See "Orders and Offices in the Priesthood" by the author in *The Articles of Faith*, xi:13-24.

4. Illegalities of the Jewish Trial of Jesus— Many volumes have been written on the so-called trial of Jesus. Only a brief summary of the principal items of fact and law can be incorporated here. For further consideration reference may be made to the following treatments: Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; Andrews, *Life of Our Lord*; Dupin, *Jesus before Caiaphas and Pilate*; Mendelsohn, *Criminal Jurisprudence of the Ancient Hebrews*; Salvador, *Institutions of Moses*; Innes, *The Trial of Jesus Christ*; Maimonides, *Sanhedrin*; MM. Lemann, *Jesus before the Sanhedrin*; Benny, *Criminal Code of the Jews*; and Walter M. Chandler, of the New York Bar, *The Trial of Jesus from a Lawyer's Standpoint*. The last named is a two volume work treating respectively, "The Hebrew Trial" and "The Roman Trial", and contains citations from the foregoing and other works.

Edersheim (vol. 2, pp. 556-8) contends that the night arraignment of Jesus in the house of Caiaphas was not a trial before the Sanhedrin, and notes the irregularities and illegalities of the procedure as proof that the Sanhedrin could not have done what was done that night. With ample citations in corroboration of the legal requirements specified, the author says: "But besides, the trial and sentence of Jesus in the palace of Caiaphas would have outraged every principle of Jewish criminal law and procedure. Such causes could only be tried, and capital sentence pronounced, in the regular meeting-place of the Sanhedrin, not, as here, in the high priest's palace; no process, least of all such an one, might be begun in the night, nor even in the afternoon, although if the discussion had gone on all day, sentence might be pronounced at night. Again, no

process could take place on Sabbaths or feast-days, or even on the eves of them, although this would not have nullified proceedings; and it might be argued on the other side, that a process against one who had seduced the people should preferably be carried on, and sentence executed, on public feast-days, for the warning of all. Lastly, in capital causes there was a very elaborate system of warning, and cautioning witnesses; while it may safely be affirmed that at a regular trial Jewish judges, however prejudiced, would not have acted as the Sanhedrists and Caiaphas did on this occasion.... But although Christ was not tried and sentenced in a formal meeting of the Sanhedrin, there can, alas! be no question that His condemnation and death were the work, if not of the Sanhedrin, yet of the Sanhedrists – of the whole body of them ('all the council') in the sense of expressing what was the judgment and purpose of all the supreme council and leaders of Israel, with only very few exceptions. We bear in mind that the resolution to sacrifice Christ had for some time been taken."

The purpose in quoting the foregoing is to show on acknowledged and eminent authority, some of the illegalities of the night trial of Jesus, which, as shown by the above, and by the scriptural record, was conducted by the high priest and "the council" or Sanhedrin, in admittedly irregular and unlawful manner. If the Sanhedrists tried and condemned, yet were not in session as the Sanhedrin, the enormity of the proceeding is, if possible, deeper and blacker than ever.

In Chandler's excellent work (vol. I, "The Hebrew Trial"), the record of fact in the case, and the Hebrew criminal law bearing thereon are exhaustively considered. Then follows an elaborate "Brief", in which the following points are set forth in order.

"*Point 1: The Arrest of Jesus was illegal*", since it was effected by night, and through the treachery of Judas, an accomplice, both of which features were expressly forbidden in the Jewish law of that day.

"*Point 2: The private examination of Jesus before Annas or Caiaphas was illegal*"; for (1) it was made by night; (2) the hearing of any cause by a 'sole judge' was expressly forbidden; (3) as quoted from Salvador, 'A principle perpetually reproduced in the Hebrew scriptures relates to the two conditions of publicity and liberty.'

"*Point 3: The indictment against Jesus was, in form, illegal*. 'The entire criminal procedure of the Mosaic code rests upon four rules: certainty in the indictment; publicity in the discussion; full freedom granted to the accused; and assurance against all dangers or errors of testimony' – Salvador, p. 365. 'The Sanhedrin did not and could not originate charges; it only investigated those brought before it' – Edersheim, vol. I, p. 309. 'The evidence of the leading witnesses constituted the charge. There was no other charge; no more formal indictment. Until they spoke and spoke in the public assembly, the prisoner was scarcely an accused man,' – Innes, p. 41. 'The only prosecutors known to Talmudic criminal jurisprudence are the witnesses to the crime. Their duty is to bring

the matter to the cognizance of the court, and to bear witness against the criminal. In capital cases they are the legal executioners also. Of an official accuser or prosecutor there is nowhere any trace in the laws of the ancient Hebrews.' – Mendelsohn, p. 110.

"Point 4: The proceedings of the Sanhedrin against Jesus were illegal because they were conducted at night. 'Let a capital offense be tried during the day, but suspend it at night,' – Mishna, Sanhedrin 4:1. 'Criminal cases can be acted upon by the various courts during daytime only, by the Lesser Sanhedrions from the close of the morning service till noon, and by the Great Sanhedrion till evening.' – Mendelsohn, p. 112.

"Point 5: The proceedings of the Sanhedrin against Jesus were illegal because the court convened before the offering of the morning sacrifice. 'The Sanhedrin sat from the close of the morning sacrifice to the time of the evening sacrifice,' – Talmud, Jer. San. 1:19. 'No session of the court could take place before the offering of the morning sacrifice'. – MM. Lemann, p. 109. 'Since the morning sacrifice was offered at the dawn of day, it was hardly possible for the Sanhedrin to assemble until the hour after that time,' – Mishna, Tamid, ch. 3.

"Point 6: The proceedings against Jesus were illegal because they were conducted on the day preceding a Jewish Sabbath; also on the first day of unleavened bread and the eve of the Passover. 'They shall not judge on the eve of the Sabbath nor on that of any festival.' – Mishna, San. 4:1. 'No court of justice in Israel was permitted to hold sessions on the Sabbath or any of the seven Biblical holidays. In cases of capital crime, no trial could be commenced on Friday or the day previous to any holiday, because it was not lawful either to adjourn such cases longer than over night, or to continue them on the Sabbath or holiday.' – Rabbi Wise, 'Martyrdom of Jesus', p. 67.

"Point 7: The trial of Jesus was illegal because it was concluded within one day. 'A criminal case resulting in the acquittal of the accused may terminate the same day on which the trial began. But if a sentence of death is to be pronounced, it cannot be concluded before the following day.' – Mishna, San. 4:1.

"Point 8: The sentence of condemnation pronounced against Jesus by the Sanhedrin was illegal because it was founded upon His uncorroborated confession. 'We have it as a fundamental principle of our jurisprudence that no one can bring an accusation against himself. Should a man make confession of guilt before a legally constituted tribunal, such confession is not to be used against him unless properly attested by two other witnesses,' – Maimonides, 4:2. 'Not only is self-condemnation never extorted from the defendant by means of torture, but no attempt is ever made to lead him on to self-incrimination. Moreover, a voluntary confession on his part is not admitted in evidence, and therefore not competent to convict him, unless a legal number of witnesses minutely corroborate his self-accusation.' – Mendelsohn, p. 133.

"Point 9: The condemnation of Jesus was illegal because the verdict of the Sanhedrin was unanimous. 'A simultaneous and unanimous verdict of guilt rendered on the day of the trial has the effect of an acquittal.' – Mendelsohn, p. 141. 'If none of the judges defend the culprit, i.e., all pronounce him guilty, having no defender in the court, the verdict of guilty was invalid and the sentence of death could not be executed.' – Rabbi Wise, 'Martyrdom of Jesus', p. 74.

"Point 10: The proceedings against Jesus were illegal in that: (1) The sentence of condemnation was pronounced in a place forbidden by law; (2) The high priest rent his clothes; (3) The balloting was irregular. 'After leaving the hall Gazith no sentence of death can be passed upon any one soever,' – Talmud, Bab. 'Of Idolatry' 1:8. 'A sentence of death can be pronounced only so long as the Sanhedrin holds its sessions in the appointed place.' – Maimonides, 14. See further Levit. 21:10; compare 10:6. 'Let the judges each in his turn absolve or condemn.' – Mishna, San. 15:5. 'The members of the Sanhedrin were seated in the form of a semicircle, at the extremity of which a secretary was placed, whose business it was to record the votes. One of these secretaries recorded the votes in favor of the accused, the other those against him.' – Mishna, San. 4:3. 'In ordinary cases the judges voted according to seniority, the oldest commencing; in a capital case the reverse order was followed.' – Benny, p. 73.

"Point 11: The members of the Great Sanhedrin were legally disqualified to try Jesus. 'Nor must there be on the judicial bench either a relation or a particular friend, or an enemy of either the accused or of the accuser.' – Mendelsohn, p. 108. 'Nor under any circumstances was a man known to be at enmity with the accused person permitted to occupy a position among the judges.' – Benny, p. 37.

"Point 12: The condemnation of Jesus was illegal because the merits of the defense were not considered. 'Then shalt thou enquire, and make search, and ask diligently.' – Deut. 13:14. 'The judges shall weigh the matter in the sincerity of their conscience.' – Mishna, San. 4:5. The primary object of the Hebrew judicial system was to render the conviction of an innocent person impossible. All the ingenuity of the Jewish legists was directed to the attainment of this end. – Benny, p. 56."

Chandler's masterly statements of fact and his arguments on each of the foregoing points are commended to the investigator. The author tersely avers: "The pages of human history present no stronger case of judicial murder than the trial and crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth, for the simple reason that all forms of law were outraged and trampled under foot in the proceedings instituted against Him." (p. 216.)

5. **"His Blood be on us, and on Our Children"** – Edersheim (vol. 2, p. 578) thus forcefully comments on the acknowledgment of responsibility for the death of Christ: "The Mishna tells us that, after the solemn washing of hands of the elders and their disclaimer of guilt, priests responded with this prayer: **'Forgive it to thy people Israel,**

whom thou hast redeemed, O Lord, and lay not innocent blood upon thy people Israel.' But here, in answer to Pilate's words, came back that deep, hoarse cry: 'His blood be upon us,' and – God help us! – 'on our children.' Some thirty years later, and on that very spot, was judgment pronounced against some of the best in Jerusalem; and among the 3,600 victims of the governor's fury, of whom not a few were scourged and crucified right over against the Pretorium, were many of the noblest of the citizens of Jerusalem. (Josephus, Wars, xiv, chap. 8:9). A few years more, and hundreds of crosses bore Jewish mangled bodies within sight of Jerusalem. And still have these wanderers seemed to bear, from century to century, and from land to land, that burden of blood; and still does it seem to weigh 'on us and on our children'."

6. "We Have no King but Cæsar" – "With this cry Judaism was, in the person of its representatives, guilty of denial of God, of blasphemy, of apostasy. It committed suicide; and ever since has its dead body been carried in show from land to land, and from century to century, – to be dead and to remain dead, till He come a second time, who is the resurrection and the life." – Edersheim, vol. 2, p. 581.

7. The Underlying Cause of Pilate's Surrender to the Jewish Demands – Pilate knew what was right but lacked the moral courage to do it. He was afraid of the Jews, and more afraid of hostile influence at Rome. He was afraid of his conscience, but more afraid of losing his official position. It was the policy of Rome to be gracious and conciliatory in dealing with the religions and social customs of conquered nations. Pontius Pilate had violated this liberal policy from the early days of his procuratorship. In utter disregard of the Hebrew antipathy against images and heathen insignia, he had the legionaries enter Jerusalem at night, carrying their eagles and standards decorated with the effigy of the emperor. To the Jews this act was a defilement of the Holy City. In vast multitudes they gathered at Cæsarea, and petitioned the procurator that the standards and other images be removed from Jerusalem. For five days the people demanded and Pilate refused. He threatened a general slaughter, and was amazed to see the people offer themselves as victims of the sword rather than relinquish their demands. Pilate had to yield (Josephus, Ant. xviii, chap. 3:1; also Wars, ii, chap. 9:2, 3). Again he gave offense in forcibly appropriating the Corban, or sacred funds of the temple, to the construction of an aqueduct for supplying Jerusalem with water from the pools of Solomon. Anticipating the public protest of the people, he had caused Roman soldiers to disguise themselves as Jews; and with weapons concealed to mingle with the crowds. At a given signal these assassins plied their weapons and great numbers of defenseless Jews were killed or wounded (Josephus, Ant. xviii, chap. 3:2; and Wars, ii, chap. 9:3, 4). On another occasion, Pilate had grossly offended the people by setting up in his official residence at Jerusalem, shields that had been dedicated to Tiberius, and this "less for the honor of Tiberius than for the annoyance of the Jewish people." A petition signed by the ecclesiastical officials of the nation, and by others of influence, including four Herodian princes, was sent to the emperor, who reprimanded Pilate and

directed that the shields be removed from Jerusalem to Cæsarea (Philo. De Legatione ad Caium; sec. 38).

These outrages on national feeling, and many minor acts of violence, extortion and cruelty, the Jews held against the procurator. He realized that his tenure was insecure, and he dreaded exposure. Such wrongs had he wrought that when he would have done good, he was deterred through cowardly fear of the accusing past.

8. Judas Iscariot— Today we speak of a traitor as a "Judas" or an "Iscariot". The man who made the combined name infamous has been for ages a subject of discussion among theologians and philosophers, and in later times the light of psychological analysis has been turned upon him. German philosophers were among the earliest to assert that the man had been judged in unrighteousness, and that his real character was of brighter tint than that in which it had been painted. Indeed some critics hold that of all the Twelve Judas was the one most thoroughly convinced of our Lord's divinity in the flesh; and these apologists attempt to explain the betrayal as a deliberate and well-intended move to force Jesus into a position of difficulty from which He could escape only by the exercise of His powers of Godship, which, up to that time, He had never used in His own behalf.

We are not the invested judges of Judas nor of any other; but we are competent to frame and hold opinions as to the actions of any. In the light of the revealed word it appears that Judas Iscariot had given himself up to the cause of Satan while ostensibly serving the Christ in an exalted capacity. Such a surrender to evil powers could be accomplished only through sin. The nature and extent of the man's transgressions through the years are not told us. He had received the testimony that Jesus was the Son of God; and in the full light of that conviction he turned against his Lord, and betrayed Him to death. Modern revelation is no less explicit than ancient in declaring that the path of sin is that of spiritual darkness leading to certain destruction. If the man who is guilty of adultery, even in his heart only, shall, unless he repents, surely forfeit the companionship of the Spirit of God, and "shall deny the faith", and so the voice of God hath affirmed (see Doc. and Cov. 63:16), we cannot doubt that any and all forms of deadly sin shall poison the soul and, if not forsaken through true repentance, shall bring that soul to condemnation. For his trained and skilful servants, Satan will provide opportunities of service commensurate with their evil ability. Whatever the opinion of modern critics as to the good character of Judas, we have the testimony of John, who for nearly three years had been in close companionship with him, that the man was a thief (12:6); and Jesus referred to him as a devil (6:70), and as "the son of perdition" (17:12). See in this connection Doc. and Cov. 76:41-48.

That the evil proclivities of Judas Iscariot were known to Christ is evidenced by the Lord's direct statement that among the Twelve was one who was a devil; (John 6:70; compare 13:27; Luke 22:3); and furthermore that this knowledge was His when the

Twelve were selected is suggested by the words of Jesus: "I know whom I have chosen", coupled with the explanation that in the choice He had made would the scriptures be fulfilled. As the sacrificial death of the Lamb of God was foreknown and foretold so the circumstances of the betrayal were foreseen. It would be contrary to both the letter and spirit of the revealed word to say that the wretched Iscariot was in the least degree deprived of freedom or agency in the course he followed to so execrable an end. His was the opportunity and privilege common to the Twelve, to live in the light of the Lord's immediate presence, and to receive from the source divine the revelation of God's purposes. Judas Iscariot was no victim of circumstances, no insensate tool guided by a superhuman power, except as he by personal volition gave himself up to Satan, and accepted a wage in the devil's employ. Had Judas been true to the right, other means than his perfidy would have operated to bring the Lamb to the slaughter. His ordination to the apostleship placed him in possession of opportunity and privilege above that of the uncalled and unordained; and with such blessed possibility of achievement in the service of God came corresponding capability to fall. A trusted and exalted officer of the government can commit acts of treachery and treason such as are impossible to the citizen who has never learned the secrets of State. Advancement implies increased accountability, even more literally so in the affairs of God's kingdom than in the institutions of men.

There is an apparent discrepancy between the account of Judas Iscariot's death given by Matthew (27:3-10) and that in Acts (1:16-20). According to the first, Judas hanged himself; the second states that he fell headlong, "and all his bowels gushed out." If both records be accurate, the wretched man probably hanged himself, and afterward fell, possibly through the breaking of the cord or the branch to which it was attached. Matthew says the Jewish rulers purchased the "field of blood"; the writer of the Acts quotes Peter as saying that Judas bought the field with the money he had received from the priests. As the ground was bought with the money that had belonged to Iscariot, and as this money had never been formally taken back by the temple officials, the field bought therewith belonged technically to the estate of Judas. The variations are of importance mainly as showing independence of authorship. The accounts agree in the essential feature, that Judas died a miserable suicide.

...A suicide not caused by depression or a mind not culpable, but by a full awakened knowledge of the 'miserable' deeds that were done.

Concerning the fate of the "**sons of perdition**," the Lord has given a partial but awful account through a revelation dated February 16, 1832: "Thus saith the Lord, concerning all those who know my power, and have been made partakers thereof, and suffered themselves, through the power of the devil, to be overcome, and to deny the truth and defy my power – They are they who are the sons of perdition, of whom I say that it had been better for them never to have been born. For they are vessels of wrath, doomed to suffer the wrath of God, with the devil and his angels in eternity; Concerning whom I

have said there is no forgiveness in this world nor in the world to come, Having denied the Holy Spirit after having received it, and having denied the Only Begotten Son of the Father—having crucified him unto themselves and put him to an open shame. These are they who shall go away into the lake of fire and brimstone, with the devil and his angels, And the only ones on whom the second death shall have any power....

Wherefore, he saves all except them: they shall go away into everlasting punishment, which is endless punishment, which is eternal punishment, to reign with the devil and his angels in eternity, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched, which is their torment; And the end thereof, neither the place thereof, nor their torment, no man knows. Neither was it revealed, neither is, neither will be revealed unto man, except to them who are made partakers thereof: Nevertheless I, the Lord, show it by vision unto many, but straightway shut it up again: Wherefore the end, the width, the height, the depth, and the misery thereof, they understand not, neither any man except them who are ordained unto this condemnation." – Doc. and Cov. 76:31-37, 44-48.

FOOTNOTES

[1249] John 18:13, 24.

[1250] Matt. 26:57; Mark 14:53; Luke 22:54.

[1251] Note 1, end of chapter.

[1252] John 18:14; compare 11:49, 50.

[1253] John 18:19-23.

[1254] The common text of John 18:22, says that the man "struck Jesus with the palm of his hand," that is to say slapped Him; such an act added humiliating insult to violence; the marginal reading of the revised version is "with a rod." There is lack of agreement on this point in the early Mss.

[1255] Note 2, end of chapter.

[1256] Matt. 26:59-61; Mark 14:55-59.

[1257] Matt. 26:61 and Mark 14:58.

[1258] John 2:18-22; see Chapter 12 herein.

[1259] Note the accusation reported to Pilate that Jesus was guilty of "perverting the nation," Luke 23:2.

[1260] Matt. 26:63-66; compare Mark 14:61-64.

[1261] See Chapter 14 herein.

[1262] Compare Mark 14:62.

[1263] Matt. 26:65, 66. Revised version reads: "He is worthy of death," and gives in margin a yet more literal rendering: "liable to" death.

[1264] Lev. 21:10.

[1265] Josephus, Wars, ii, 15:2, 4; also 1 Maccabees 11:71.

[1266] Matt. 26:67; Mark 14:65; compare Luke 18:32; see also Isa. 50:6.

[1267] Matt. 26:68; Luke 22:62-65.

[1268] Mark 14:64.

[1269] Luke 22:66.

[1270] John 18:28.

[1271] Luke 22:66-71.

[1272] Note 3, end of chapter.

[1273] Mark 15:1; compare Matt. 27:1, 2; John 18:28.

[1274] Note 4, end of chapter, gives further details of the unlawful irregularities of the Jewish trial of Jesus.

[1275] Matt. 26:58, 69-75; Mark 14:54, 66-72; Luke 22:54-62; John 18:15-18, 25-27.

- [1276] John 18:8, 9; See Chapter 13 herein.
- [1277] John 1:35, 40; 13:23; 19:26; 20:2; 21:7, 20, 24.
- [1278] Observe that Mark, who alone states that the Lord said to Peter "before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice," (14:30) records a first crowing of the cock after Peter's first denial (v. 68) and a second crowing after the third denial (v. 72).
- [1279] Cæsarea Palestina, not Cæsarea Philippi.
- [1280] John 18:28-32.
- [1281] Luke 23:2.
- [1282] John 18:33-38; compare Matt. 27:11; Mark 15:2; Luke 23:3, 4.
- [1283] Luke 23:5-7.
- [1284] Luke 23:8-12.
- [1285] See Chapter 9 herein.
- [1286] Luke 23:12.
- [1287] Matt. 14:1; Mark 6:14; Luke 9:7, 9.
- [1288] Luke 13:31, 32; See Chapter 26 herein.
- [1289] Luke 23:11. Revised version reads, "arraying him in gorgeous apparel." Clarke ("Commentaries") and many other writers assume that the robe was white, that being the usual color of dress amongst the Jewish nobility.
- [1290] Luke 23:13-25; Matt. 27:15-31; Mark 15:6-20; John 18:39, 40; 19:1-16.
- [1291] Matt. 27:18; Mark 15:10.
- [1292] Note 5, end of chapter.
- [1293] Matthew says "scarlet," Mark and John say "purple."
- [1294] Compare Luke 18:32.
- [1295] "Ecce Homo."
- [1296] Note 6, end of chapter.
- [1297] Note 7, end of chapter.
- [1298] Matt. 27:3-10; compare Acts 1:16-20.
- [1299] Revised version of Matt. 27:5 reads, "And he cast down the pieces of silver into the sanctuary" instead of "in the temple," signifying that he flung the money into the Porch of the Holy House, as distinguished from the outer and public courts.
- [1300] Acts 1:19; Matt. 27:8. Note 8, end of chapter.