

## SECTION 72

## JESUS' BETRAYER COMMITS SUICIDE

TEXT: 27:3-10

3 Then Judas, who betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, 4 saying, I have sinned in that I betrayed innocent blood. But they said, What is that to us? see thou *to it*. 5 And he cast down the pieces of silver into the sanctuary, and departed; and he sent away and hanged himself. 6 And the chief priests took the pieces of silver, and said, it is not lawful to put them into the treasury, since it is the price of blood. 7 And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in. 8 Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day. 9 Then was fulfilled that which was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was priced, whom *certain* of the children of Israel did price; 10 and they gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.

## THOUGHT QUESTIONS

- a. Do you think Judas expected Jesus to be condemned to death?
- b. How would you differentiate between the repentance of Peter and that of Judas? Of what value to the modern Christian is a detailed study of Judas Iscariot?
- c. Do you see any value in the testimony Judas gave to Jesus' innocence? If so, what value is there? If not, why not?
- d. Do you think that in testifying to Jesus' innocence, Judas shows any love for Him?
- e. What was it that so completely crushed Judas and drove him to suicide?
- f. What does the priests' scruple about the proper use of the blood money indicate about them?
- g. When the priests' called it "blood money," do you think they unconsciously admitted Jesus' innocence? If not, what would this expression mean to them?
- h. Why do you think they selected a potter's field? Did God direct their choice or was this simply the only land available or what?
- i. Why do you think Matthew attributed the prophecy quoted to

Jeremiah instead of to Zechariah whose words more nearly resemble it? Did Matthew forget who wrote the prophecy?

j. Why do you think Matthew recorded the death of Judas?

### PARAPHRASE

When Judas, Jesus' betrayer, realized that He was really condemned, he was seized with remorse and returned the thirty pieces of silver money to the chief priests and elders. "I have sinned in betraying an innocent man to his death," he said.

"What has that got to do with us?" they retorted. "That is your problem!"

He then hurled the money into the sanctuary and left. Then he went off and hanged himself.

The chief priests, however, picked up the coins, arguing, "It is not legal to put this money into the temple fund, because it is tainted with blood." So, after discussing the matter, they used this sum to purchase the "Potter's Field," as a cemetery for foreigners. This is why that field has been called "The Field of Blood" ever since. In this way the words of the prophet Jeremiah came true:

They took the thirty pieces of silver, the amount some Israelites had established to pay for him, and they gave them for the Potter's Field, as the Lord had ordered me.

### SUMMARY

Incredibly for Judas, Jesus was condemned. Shocked, the betrayer attempted to make amends but was rudely rebuffed by heartless hypocrites. After hurling the money into the Temple's Holy Place, Judas committed suicide. On a scruple, the priests did not put the money into the treasury but purchased a piece of land as a burial ground for foreigners. Unintentionally on the part of the Jewish authorities, they hereby enacted the ancient prophecy.

### NOTES

#### A SHATTERED LIFE: FUTILE REPENTANCE AND RESTITUTION

27:3 Then Judas, who betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself. *Then (tôte)* synchronizes Judas' awakening

with Jesus' consignment to Pilate immediately following the condemnation by the Sanhedrin (27:2). For the first time he grasped the horrible result of his betrayal: they were dragging the Lord off to His death! It is unclear just where or how Judas learned of the sentence. Unlike Peter, however, Judas would have had no public motive to distrust Jesus' foes. So, he could have witnessed the entire morning trial, hence did not need to wait until after Pilate's condemnation to hurry to the Temple to plead with the returning priests alone. Instead, Judas returned the money to the *chief priests and elders*, i.e., to the Sanhedrin, since Matthew's expression contextually refers to that body (26:3, 47, 57; cf. 26:59; 27:1 = Mark 15:1; Luke 22:66). Therefore, he stood before members of the supreme council, because, if Judas considered the Jewish sentence definitive, it being only a matter of time until Pilate carried it out, it is conceivable that, to halt this avalanche, he interrupted them even as they were preparing to go to Pilate.

Edersheim (*Life*, II,573) notes that during the trials before Pilate a definite break occurred when Pilate sent Jesus to Herod, after which the governor had to reconvene Jesus' accusers (27:17; Mark 15:8; Luke 23:13). So, it is alternatively possible that Judas' intervened with the individual *chief priests and elders* on Jesus' behalf during this recess.

*Judas . . . repented himself (metameletheis)*. He felt profound regret (21:30; II Cor. 7:8; Heb. 7:21). He was driven by circumstances to renounce the view that, we believe, stood at the base of his plot to betray Him, i.e. that Jesus *must* defend Himself. The unexpected consequences of his crime throw him into deep remorse, but do not save him. True repentance takes the sinner to the Lord, *not away* from Him to an improvised gallows. He found his fearful responsibility unbearable. (Cf. Cain's reaction, Gen. 4:13f.)

However, some say this verse is not proof that he had not planned for Jesus to suffer, because a person can regret the consequences of his act, even if he clearly foresaw them. Accordingly, Judas could have intended Jesus' death, but now regrets it. While study of his motives is a matter of considerable conjecture on our part, nevertheless, his confession (v. 4) need not militate against the view that the condemnation took him by surprise. In fact, what one plans for what he conceives of as good may smash back with terrific force, convincingly revealing itself as evil. To betray an innocent man to

*death* was not necessarily his purpose, but simply to betray an innocent man *to get Him to act on His own behalf to escape death*, although high-risk planning, is also compatible with Judas' shock.

*Judas . . . brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders.* Because his deed burdened him with intolerable guilt, he wanted desperately to reverse his disastrous bargain. Naturally, he would return the money, but he could not hope to redeem Jesus from his enemies with this miserable sum, but by courageous, public testimony to Jesus' innocence. Did he hope that, if he offered new testimony after sentencing, they must hear Jesus' case again? Even if they took him for a necessary but despised tool in their plans and an unwelcome intrusion, they must hear him out.

### The betrayer's testimony

**27:4 saying, I have sinned in that I betrayed innocent blood. But they said, What is that to us? See thou to it. I have sinned** is the shocked reaction of a man unnerved at seeing the totally unexpected enormity of his blunder. Whatever the glamor of his former ambition, the enticement of what he imagined has now vanished. Only grim reality holds him in its grip, leaving him broken by remorse. His is the anguish of a man who would turn back the clock to rid his soul of this haunting hour. (Cf. Esau's grief, Heb. 12:16f.) Admirably, Judas took personal responsibility for his actions. He blames no one but himself. Yet this is not the repentance of a man who would fling himself at the foot of the cross to beg forgiveness of his Victim. Turning to Him is just not Judas' way.

Is it true that in testifying to Jesus' innocence, Judas shows no love for Him? His had always been that kind of self-interested friendship that manipulated his true Friend. Unquestionably, his shock is deep and genuine. Was he revolted only by the *consequences* of his act and not also at the heinous sinfulness of it? Yet, stark awareness of the abominableness of our sins, alone, does not break our hearts and lead us, repentant, to Jesus. Only undiminished confidence in God's gracious forgiveness can convince us to do that. Despite his long discipleship under Jesus, Judas did not believe this.

*I betrayed innocent blood* is the soul-cry of a tormented conscience seeking elementary justice for Another. However, *innocent blood*, as a Mosaic legal term (Exod. 23:7; cf. Deut. 27:25), would not have halted those heartless judges or procured a stay of execution for

Jesus. They refused to reopen the case, because Jesus was sentenced for blasphemy and Judas' defense did not refute the accusations on which it was founded. However, Judas' anguished pleas disprove the later Talmudical claim that for 40 days a herald went through Israel inviting anyone to come forward to defend the Nazarene, but none came. (Cf. Bab. Talmud, *Seder Nezikin*.)

Sadly, these anguished cries do not mitigate Judas' guilt, because, however innocent of all wrong-doing he considered Jesus, he never personally surrendered to the practical ramifications of Jesus' self-understanding, never bowed to His Lordship, never accepted the doctrine of the cross. (See notes on 26:14, 25, 49f.) Rather than confess his sin to these calloused priests, had he thrown himself upon the mercy of Jesus, he could have been forgiven. For pardon this frenzied soul turned to the wrong people.

*But they said, What is that to us?* They treat his belated testimony as immaterial, because they condemned Jesus for a claim they themselves heard and rejected as false, whereas Judas' generic defense seems to concern only Jesus' general good character against which they had no specific complaint. *See thou to it* translates two words, *sū òpsei* (future indicative of *horðo*), capable of two meanings:

1. If they intended a simple future tense, then they say: "What is your testimony of Jesus' innocence to us? He is guilty and you yourself (*sū*) shall see it."
2. Because in the Hebrew a future indicative can communicate an imperative sense, many render it as the ASV: *See thou to it*, "You will take care of the problem yourself!" (Cf. Acts 18:15, *òpsesthe autoi*.)

They had achieved the only goal that mattered. Rather than point this pitiful man they had used back to God as his hope from despair, they heartlessly tossed aside their despised, now useless tool.

### The appalling power of unresolved guilt

**27:5 And he cast down the pieces of silver into the sanctuary, and departed; and he went away and hanged himself.** So, if Jesus were taken from Caiaphas' palace (see on 27:2) somewhere on the *south* side of the Temple, to Pilate's quarters in the Antonia castle on the *north* side, Judas, failing to stop them, took a short-cut through the Temple and disposed of the money, while the others took Jesus to Pilate.

Shattered, the friendless traitor entered the Temple. The "reward of his iniquity" burned his hands and his agonized soul. Attempting to obtain relief, he entered the Temple and in an insane gesture of spite against the priests who rejected his attempt to save Jesus, hurled away this concrete reminder of his guilt. Two views of his act are possible:

1. He simply cast the money down at the priests' feet in any part of the Temple. (Some manuscripts have *en tō naō*.) Plummer (*Matthew*, 385) affirms that Josephus uses *naōs* "of the collective Temple-buildings," so our author could have too. However, Matthew does not affirm that Judas did this in the presence of priests. Yet, if he senselessly hurled it into the "treasury," his vindictiveness at being repulsed by the authorities is clearer: if they would not listen to his claim to justice for Jesus, now they must take back the money, wanted or not.
2. Judas could have hurled (*hripsas*) the coins with violent force through the open doors of *the sanctuary* into the Holy Place. (Better manuscripts have *eis tōn naōn*.) The arrangement of the Temple which makes this act possible demands that he stand in the Court of the Women at the Nicanor Gate at the top of the fifteen steps leading to the Court of the Priests. (Cf. *Wars*, V,5,4.)

*He . . . departed (anechōresen)* but apparently did not seek the understanding fellowship of other disciples. In the solitude of his self-counsel, did he believe them incompetent to help him?

*He went away and hanged himself.* No man commits suicide casually. There is a strange consistency in Judas' final act. Because his root-motivation seems to have been selfish ambition that clamored for instant solutions, he would not hesitate to eliminate anyone or anything that hindered his happiness.

Was Judas' final act of self-oblivion the attempt to escape the curse for betraying the innocent for a bribe (Deut. 27:25)? Or did he even think of this? Did he remember Jesus' fearful prophecy 26:24)? Was it not the frenzied desperation of a man so tortured by his own conscience that he would rather become his own executioner than tolerate its accusations? Even so, did he not curse himself by hanging himself (Deut. 21:22f.)? The sad irony is that salvation for Judas was as close as Jesus, had he but believed it—and Him!

Judas, according to Matthew, hanged himself. Luke says, however, "he fell headlong, his body burst open and all his intestines spilled

out" (Acts 1:18). The alleged contradiction is resolved by noting that, whereas Luke describes the result of Judas' suicide, our author documents the way he died, i.e. by hanging. Whether Judas' decaying body remained suspended several days and either the limb or rope would not support his weight, or whether these broke when he fell headlong and his body was grotesquely impaled on a sharp rock from which he could not extricate himself, the conditions are supplied to harmonize both testimonies. Thus, the Acts account incidentally supplements Matthew's.

**LAUNDERING CRIMINAL MONEY:  
CALLOUSNESS ABOUT JUSTICE BUT  
SANCTIMONIOUS SCRUPULOUSNESS ABOUT TRIVIA**

**27:6 And the chief priests took the pieces of silver, and said, it is not lawful to put them into the treasury, since it is the price of blood.** Judas' unanticipated move left these legalists a dilemma. Possibly founded on Deuteronomy 23:18, their argument may have concluded that nothing abominable to God be considered acceptable as a proper offering (*eis tôn korbanân*: "given to God"; cf. Mark 7:11). *The treasury*, cf. Mark 12:41; Luke 21:1; John 8:20; Josephus, *Wars*, II,9,4.

Is calling this money *the price of blood* the unwitting admission that they purchased the death of an objectively *innocent* man? From their point of view, no, because these sophists could call it *the price of blood* merely from its connection with a person's death which they completely justify. Their scruple is morally frivolous, because they had been ready to withdraw it perhaps from the holy treasury itself to secure the death of Jesus, but were unwilling to accept it back when it has been used for its intended purpose!

**27:7 And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in.** This purchase may have occurred after the crucifixion, in which case, Matthew recorded it ahead of time, to avoid breaking into the story following. Because the land in question is described as *the potter's field*, some deduce that its value was too clayey for agriculture, hence suitable only for stripping its clay for pottery. Because the priests buy it for a cemetery, its clay may already have been depleted, leaving only an abandoned excavation good for nothing. Hence *the potter* would sell the worn-out land for such a low sum.

*To bury strangers in* seems to express a warmly humanitarian, religious purpose: non-Jews would not now have to be buried together

with the Hebrews. However, rather than to Gentiles, *strangers (xénois)* may refer merely to Jewish pilgrims whom death overtook at Jerusalem, hence would not have a proper burial place. Either way, the unscrupulousness of these priests is nicely buried under the guise of long-neglected civic responsibility. The blood money has now been laundered by this act of charity.

The supposed contradiction between Matthew and Acts relative to the reason for renaming the field, *the field of blood*, is without foundation. (Cf. Matt. 27:6-9; Acts 1:18f.) In both accounts the same money, "the reward of [Judas'] iniquity," purchased the field. In both cases it was Judas who furnished both the situation and the means whereby this purchase took place, even if others legally acted in his name and with money that remained his even though he were dead. (Cf. other examples of deeds by representative agents, John 19:1; Acts 2:23.) Nowhere did Luke state that Judas kept the money and with it personally bought the field. Even if reading Acts alone seems to suggest this view, Luke's original readers could have compared it with Matthew's account and harmonize them to get all the facts, if they wished, just as we today.

**27:8 Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day.** This verse explains the source of a traditional place-name. However, does this make its facts *untrue*, as alleged by some? Matthew and Acts furnish two valid, not irreconcilable reasons for calling the field "Akeldama," *the field of blood*: in both the *blood* in question is primarily that of Christ, for whose betrayal by Judas the *blood* money ("the reward of his iniquity") has been spent. Luke however furnished an additional gory reason to call the terrible place "Akeldama." He revealed a fact Matthew omitted: that the field in question was, by an ironic twist of history, the very one where Judas himself came to a violent end (Acts 1:18f.). Luke's parenthetical remark merely summarizes for his reader's what was already well-known, without disputing Matthew's narrative.

The priests denominated this area "a field to bury strangers in," but popular sentiment, aware of the life-blood which that field represented, gave it a truer name, *The field of blood*, a perpetual reminder that the authorities had not buried their injustice after all.

*Unto this day* dates the writing of Matthew's Gospel as quite some time after the resurrection, time enough for this new local tradition ("Akeldama") to take root in the popular language. However, if the siege and destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. may be thought to have



obscured place names as the sites themselves were obliterated under debris, *unto this day* whispers that the Gospel was not penned after that event.

## HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF—ONLY MUCH LOUDER

27:9 Then was fulfilled that which was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was priced, whom certain of the children of Israel did price. No such text can be found in *Jeremiah* and the evident source of the concept is Zechariah 11:12f. as a comparison of Matthew with Zechariah will show:

### *Matthew:*

They took the silver coins, the price set on him by the people of Israel, and they used them to buy the potter's field, as the Lord commanded me.

### *Zechariah:*

And the Lord said to me, "Throw it to the potter"—the handsome price at which they priced me! So I took the thirty pieces of silver and threw them into the house of the Lord to the potter.

That the genuineness of Matthew's quotation cannot be questioned is proven by the surprising observation that its apparent clumsiness vouches for its historicity. A clever forger would have been more careful not to include such palpable blunders as attributing to *Jeremiah* what Zechariah wrote. He would have smoothed out the wrinkles. Attempts to explain why Matthew attributes the prophecy to *Jeremiah the prophet* are various.

### 1. A TEXTUAL EMENDATION IS INVOLVED

- a. Matthew always omitted the name of Zechariah when citing his writings (21:5; 24:31; 26:31). Why not also here? Some ancient translations do not name any prophet at this point. So, perhaps some extremely early, ill-informed scribe, remembering "the potter-passages" of Jeremiah (18:2; 19:2, etc.) inserted *Jeremiah the prophet* by mistake, and this reading became common among the majority of manuscripts. However, see b.
- b. Similarly, some suggest an extremely early scribal error accomplished by a misreading and consequent substitution of only two Greek letters: an "I" for a "Z" and an "M" for an "R." Compare: *ZRIOY* and *IMIOY*, the abbreviated

forms of "Zechariah" and "Jeremiah" respectively. However, the reading, *Jeremiah*, is believed to be firmly established (*Textual Commentary*, 66).

2. A QUESTION OF JEWISH TRADITION IS INVOLVED

- a. Circulating in Matthew's time was a genuine quotation of a now lost writing of Jeremiah himself or perhaps an unwritten, traditional statement attributed to him, i.e. Zechariah recorded oral tradition of Jeremiah's preaching. Accordingly, Matthew finally documents this, pointing not to the man who recorded it, but to him who first pronounced the prophecy. Jewish tradition said, "The spirit of Jeremiah is in Zechariah." Or, vice versa it represents a Jewish deletion of this passage from the canonical Jeremiah (Eusebius, *Dem. Ev.* X,4).
- b. The scroll on which Zechariah was copied bore the name of *Jeremiah*, its leading book. The Talmud calls this roll "Jeremiah," even though it contains Zechariah among the other books. Thus Matthew quotes not an author but a *section* of the Old Testament. (See critical introductions to the Old Testament.) This is a less likely solution, because Matthew wrote, *Jeremiah the prophet*, an expression that would seem not to refer to the organization of the Old Testament on numerous scrolls, but to the man himself.

Whatever the final solution to this problem, despite our present uncertainty as to which is the true explanation, nevertheless, since a number of alternative hypotheses are available, *not charge of contradiction or lapse of memory can be proven against Matthew*. Until a more clearly definitive solution arises, we can simply confess our limitations and await further information.

Perhaps the most satisfactory solution is to see this quotation as a Targum or free paraphrase by Matthew who utilized ideas drawn from both prophets, because of a common key word or subject matter, to summarize both, but attributed the whole to the more important (or better known?) of the two. Rightly Hendriksen (*Matthew*, 948) asked, "Where in Zechariah is there mention of a plot of ground, used for burial purposes, which became known as 'the Field of Blood,' because innocent blood had been shed?" He notes the following parallels from *Jeremiah* 19:

- a. Judah and Jerusalem have shed innocent blood (Jer. 19:4; Matt. 27:4).
- b. Chief priests and elders are mentioned prominently (Jer. 19:1; Matt. 27:3, 6, 7).
- c. A potter is mentioned (Jer. 19:1, 11; Matt. 27:7, 10).
- d. Topheth, that is, the valley of Hinnom—the very valley where, according to tradition, the Potter's Field was located—has its name changed to “the Valley of Slaughter,” which is about the same as “the Field of Blood” (Jer. 19:6; Matt. 27:8; cf. Acts 1:19).
- e. And this valley becomes a well-known “burial place” (Jer. 19:11; Jer. 7:32; Matt. 27:7).

Also possibly parallel to Israel's repudiation of Jesus is Israel's rejection of God's prophet's troublesome preaching of repentance and their attempt to eliminate him on false charges (Jer. 18:15-17).

Perhaps, by writing *Jeremiah*, Matthew intended to draw the reader's attention to concepts in the major prophet which are resumed in Zechariah and succinctly expressed in this latter prophet's words. Matthew even boiled these down to an apt, interpretative statement that appropriately expressed Israel's memorializing its shameful rejection of Christ. In this case Matthew is not so much interested in finding a direct prophecy in Jeremiah 18, 19 and 32 as in pointing out how *both prophets spoke of Israel's contempt for God shown by the nation's ungratefulness for God's blessings, sins which are even more significantly repeated in Israel's repudiation of God's greatest Prophet, the Messiah.*

So, what is Matthew teaching us? From one point of view, the enacted prophecy of the prophet's hurling the miserable sum to the potter is possibly a symbolic forepicturing of the priests' hurling Judas' miserable wages to the potter to buy his field. However, only an amazing correspondence is pointed out between the prophetic words in Jeremiah and Zechariah and the historic event in Jesus' time, without intending a literal fulfillment. (See notes on 2:17.) Accordingly, Matthew finds in this event a *situation* which tragically resembles and culminates the earlier *situation* of God's prophets.

Honing this concept even further, we see that Matthew gives an *interpretative paraphrase* of the prophecy. Rather than quote it verbatim, he explains its meaning, i.e. that Jesus' contemporaries repeated substantially the same rejection of God's prophets as had any previous generation. (Cf. 21:33-39; 22:1-6; 23:29-37.) In Zechariah,

specifically, Israel paid no more than thirty pieces of silver for God's Shepherd. When Israel's authorized representatives similarly valued Jesus at the price of a slave, they merely repeated Israel's chronic shameful contempt for God. The pitiful sum given for the Good Shepherd stands in dramatic contrast with His true value and the high estimation that Israel should have set on Him. They characteristically undervalued God's guidance, hence this insulting wage was once again paid for the services of God's Shepherd, but, in this case, it was God's Son. Nevertheless, it was returned with disdain to the Lord's House. And, by another ironic twist of history this lordly sum went again to pay the potter!

*Thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was priced, whom certain of the children of Israel did price.* Not insignificantly, in Israel it was a priestly function to decide what people were worth (Lev. 27:8). The value the nation, in the person of its authorized representatives, the priests, placed on the services of God's prophet was the ancient, legal price of an injured slave or a woman (Exod. 21:32; Lev. 27:4). So Israel's contempt for the Lord is again repeated in their crass devaluation of His Son. They hated Jesus because they hated the Father who sent Him (10:40; Luke 10:16; John 15:23; 16:3). The treatment of the prophet-shepherd was not accidental, but a true, moral preview of Israel's treatment of the prophet's Lord, Jesus.

**27:10 and they gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.** Both in the prophecy as well as in the fulfillment God disposed of the money through agents. Because this money was found in the house of the Lord, it was as if God Himself had received it, and the priests, by purchasing the field, unconsciously were throwing His 30 shekels to the potter whose field it was. Their disposition of the money produced an astonishing evocation of the ancient words all in accordance with the will of the Lord. Rather than disappear into the oblivion of the treasury, that blood money was memorialized in the purchase of "the field of Blood," until unbelieving Israel should be destroyed in a City of Blood.

Matthew does not chronicle Judas' death to establish him as a classic example of evil, a monster of wickedness or a man apart. Rather, Judas' is the tragic story of a double-minded disciple who followed Jesus for the wrong motives, whose discipleship was blocked by his refusal to let Jesus be Lord in everything.

## FACT QUESTIONS

1. In what sense did Judas "repent"? Contrast the repentance of Peter and that of Judas, showing why one led to life and the other to death.
2. What was it that convinced Judas to repent?
3. By whom had Jesus been condemned when Judas saw it and repented?
4. Where and how did Judas return the betrayal money? Where were the priests when he approached them? Defend your answer.
5. On what Scriptural basis could the priests have established their decision to refuse to accept the blood money into the temple treasury?
6. Who were the "strangers" for whom the potter's field was bought as a cemetery? Why should a special cemetery for them be needed?
7. Indicate the source of the prediction Matthew cites as fulfilled here. Who wrote the prophecy? Deal with the supposed contradictions connected with this question.
8. How does the book of Acts report this account? What differences distinguish the two accounts? How harmonize these divergencies?
9. Why was the field called "the field of blood"?

## SECTION 73

JESUS IS TRIED BY PILATE,  
CONDEMNED AND SCOURGED

(Parallels: Mark 15:2-20; Luke 23:1-25; John 18:28—19:16)

TEXT: 27:2, 11-31

2 and they bound him, and led him away, and delivered him up to Pilate the governor.

.....

11 Now Jesus stood before the governor; and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest. 12 And when he was accused by the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing. 13 Then saith Pilate unto him, Hearst thou now how many things they witness against thee? 14 And he gave him no answer, not even to one word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly. 15 Now at the feast the governor was