

OpenTheo

Mark 10:32 - 11:11



Gospel of Mark - Steve Gregg

Steve Gregg provides a comprehensive analysis of Mark 10:32 - 11:11. Jesus predicts His death, rebukes James and John's request for positions of power, and emphasizes the importance of serving others. Blind Bartimaeus is healed, and Jesus' entry into Jerusalem on a donkey is a politically charged act. Despite the spectacle of His arrival, Roman authorities did not consider Jesus to be a threat to their rule.

Transcript

So let's turn to Mark chapter 10 once more. Mark chapter 10, beginning at verse 32. Now they were on the road going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them, and they were amazed.

And as they followed, they were afraid. Then He took the twelve aside again and began to tell them the things that would happen to Him. Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be delivered to the chief priests and to the scribes, and they will condemn Him to death and deliver Him to the Gentiles.

And they will mock Him and scourge Him and spit on Him and kill Him. And the third day He will rise again. Now this is actually the third time that Jesus has said this very plainly to the disciples.

The first time was at Caesarea Philippi. The second time was, I think, when He was coming down. This is in chapter 9, I believe.

Yeah, chapter 9, after He had cast the demon out of that boy. And now this is the third time. What I find interesting is Mark's frequent references to the people's emotional responses.

For example, back when Jesus spoke about the difficulty of a rich man entering the kingdom, it says in verse 24 of this chapter, His disciples were astonished. And then Jesus said essentially a similar thing, and it says in verse 26, They were astonished beyond measure. And now they're just walking and they're amazed.

I don't know what they're amazed at while they're walking. And they're also afraid. We have all these emotions mentioned of theirs, but we are not told what was inspiring these emotions.

In verse 32, it says, As He was walking ahead and they were amazed and as they followed, they were afraid. And yet we're not told of any particular stimulus, any particular thing Jesus was doing or saying at that time that caused them to be amazed or afraid. However, it is very possible that we are to understand there was a conversation going on as they walk.

We are not given anything like a complete record of the things Jesus and His disciples talked about. We read about them going from this town to this town. We have to realize we cover that transition in a single verse.

They covered it in several days of walking together. And the amount of talking and conversing they did must have been a great amount. And so it may be that we're simply supposed to understand that the things that Jesus was talking to them about were things that astounded them, that amazed them and scared them.

And it may even be that His statements in verse 33 and 34 are maybe to be a summary of the subject matter they were talking about. It may have been that which was amazing them. Perhaps Mark is suggesting that this was his topic, that he was going to Jerusalem, he's going to be crucified and rise again the third day.

And so they were amazed and they were frightened. If it is not the matters about which they were conversing, then we're left without any kind of hints as to why they were having these reactions. But since they were walking from town to town, obviously they weren't being silent.

Maybe some of the time they were, but I'm sure that a lot of conversation was going on and probably Jesus was conversing with them. And since it's on His mind, His crucifixion and His resurrection that are coming up as they come to Jerusalem, that may well be the things He was talking about to them that caused those reactions. In verse 35, it says, Then James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came to Him, saying, Teacher, we want you to do for us whatever we ask.

That seems like a strange way to open the subject. We'd like you to do anything we ask you to do. Will you? Like the genie in the bottle, right? Our wish is your command.

But this is perhaps not their actual words. It's just Mark's way of representing what their attitude was. The reason I say it wasn't their actual words in all likelihood is because it wasn't even they that came to Jesus.

So we know from reading Matthew is their mother that came to Jesus. Mark and Luke tell us about the disciples, James and John, making this request. But Matthew gives us more

details as well.

The request was actually made, not directly by them, but by their mother on their behalf. They were, in fact, the ones making the request, but they sent their mother. Why? Why their mother? Because in all likelihood, their mother was Jesus' aunt.

There are reasons to believe if you can compare the different lists and the different gospels of the women at the cross, that the woman who's called Salome was also the one who is in another place referred to as the mother of Zebedee's children. And in another place in the Gospel of John, she's referred to as the sister of Jesus' mother. You kind of have to compare the different gospels and the parallels to make this out.

But it would appear that the mother of Zebedee's children, that's James and John's mother, was the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus. That means James and John were first cousins of Jesus. And perhaps they thought that their mother could get through to him on their behalf.

If you look at Matthew, chapter 20, verse 20, it says the mother of Zebedee's sons came to him with her sons, kneeling down and asking something from him. And he said to her, what do you wish? And she said to him, Grant that these two sons of mine may sit one on your right hand and the other on your left in your kingdom. And Jesus answered and said, you do not know what you ask.

Are you able to drink the cup? Now, the statement of Jesus is obviously addressed to the boys, to the men. The mother comes with the request. She's with the boys.

The sons and their mom come to Jesus. She makes the request, bowing down to Jesus. Perhaps she thinks that she'll have some standing because she is his mother's sister, but also because perhaps these two decided were the only ones in the company that were blood relations of Jesus.

And therefore, it might be that there'd be some reason that Jesus would be inclined to allow them to have the positions of honor when he comes to power. This would not be too strange, this idea of the nepotism of it all, because Moses, for example, when he's called the leader, his brother became the high priest and his nephews became the priests. And for apparently no other reason than that they were related to Moses.

We don't find that they were particularly qualified more than others. In fact, Aaron did act that would have been punishable by death if almost anyone else had done them. But Moses interceded and Aaron was spared.

It seems like, you know, it was not unheard of for the leader of a movement to have his relatives involved in other positions of power with them. And so maybe Salome felt and the brothers felt that this was a good chance that Jesus would offer them these positions. But he hadn't offered them without being asked.

And so they come and ask. And in Mark, chapter 10, verse 36, he said to them, what do you want me to do for you? They said to him, and yet this was spoken through their mother, according to Matthew, grant us that we may sit one on your right hand and the other on your left hand in your glory. Now, in Matthew's version said in your kingdom, it's obvious here it means when your kingdom is glorified.

Jesus kingdom already existed. And that he was he was the king and the kingdom had come in the person of Christ. But his kingdom had not yet come in glory and not yet come in power.

He was not yet universally recognized, in other words, as the king. And therefore, they anticipated a time when he would be recognized. Of course, their idea was probably a very political kind of one of Jesus becoming a political ruler.

But in any case, they knew that he had not yet come to the zenith of his power and they thought they'd better get their petitions in early. Because once he comes to power, everyone's going to want to be at his right hand, left hand when you're despised and unpopular. There's not that many people looking for the second position in your movement.

But when you're on the top, then everybody wants that position. So they thought they'd get their foot in the door early, put the request in early. Before he comes into his glory.

But Jesus said to them, you do not know what you ask. Can you drink the cup that I drink and be baptized with the baptism that I'm baptized with? And they said to him, we can not having any clue what he was talking about. And Jesus said to them, you will indeed drink the cup that I am to drink.

And with the baptism that I am baptized with, you will be baptized. But to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give. But it is for those for whom it is prepared.

That is, it's prepared not by Jesus. He says, not mine to give that it's prepared by somebody above me, obviously referring to the father. In fact, it's stated that way in Matthew's parallel in Matthew 20 and verse 23.

Jesus said that to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give. But it is for those for whom it is prepared by my father. Mark's version doesn't have that last two words, three words, but obviously it's implied.

So the father has in mind some people to sit at Jesus right hand and left hand in his glory. If such positions really do exist. All he's saying is that I'm not the one dishing out the honors here.

My father has his own ideas. My father is one who appoints me to my position and he is the one who has reserved the positions for others that he that may receive positions in

the kingdom. It's interesting to think about that, that there could be, as it were, when Jesus comes to people who've lived on Earth who actually are second to him in command, actually at his right hand and his left hand.

There no doubt will be some kind of government that he sets up and there will be delegated authorities because Jesus talk about people being given a rule over five cities and people being given a rule over 10 cities. Of course, all of these may simply be accommodationist images because the nature of the new creation may be so different from anything we're familiar with that it might be that he's using mere illustrations from the present age that don't really bear an immediate resemblance to what things will be like. But accommodating their own thinking on this, he says, listen, you want the positions of authority.

You want the positions of glory. You want to have power. You want recognition.

Well, you're going to have to do the same thing I'm doing. You're going to have to drink the cup I drink and you're going to be baptized with the baptism I'm baptized with. And you're going to be like me.

Just let the father decide what's going to happen to you. Remember, he said something like that to Peter in John, chapter 21, when he was telling Peter about how eventually when Peter's older things are going to happen that are not what Peter would prefer. And in fact, he predicted Peter's death and Peter seeing John actually on this occasion behind him, said, Lord, what about him? Is he going to, you know, my institution, is he going to have to do things he doesn't want to do also? Is he going to die too? And he said, if it's my will that he tarries until I come.

What is that to you? You just go preach the gospel. You just do what you're assigned to do. Don't worry about whether someone else is going to have a better position than you, a better lot in life than you.

The way things turn out that way is really not up to you to worry about. You see, the very act of being a Christian means you give up your agendas, you deny yourself, you take up a cross, you leave your fate in God's hands. And so Jesus said, you're going to have to be like me and leave your fate in God's hands.

The father has prepared the proper position for each person. And if there are positions at the right and left hand of Christ, the father has decided who's going to be there. Jesus was not the one making those decisions.

And so he said they have to be baptized with the baptism that he's baptized with and drink the cup. Now, this reference to the baptism that he's to be baptized with is actually unique because there's no other place in the Bible that speaks of baptism in this particular meaning that he's using here. The word baptism, of course, means immersion.

It means to be immersed. And we're more familiar in the Bible with the idea of being baptized in water or immersed in water. John baptized with water and even Jesus or his disciples baptized in water.

And then we also have reference in the Bible to being baptized in the Holy Spirit, which is to be immersed in the Holy Spirit rather than in water. We also have in 1 Corinthians 12 reference to being immersed in the body of Christ. The Holy Spirit has baptized us into the body of Christ, immersed in and incorporated in the body of Christ.

Jesus also talks about being baptized in fire, which apparently is judgment. It's an image of judgment, people being immersed in the judgment of God, overwhelmed, in other words. And here he's got another baptism that's not like any of the others, and he doesn't say what the baptism is in.

He doesn't say what it is he's going to be immersed in, though one could fairly deduce it from the immediate context. The fact that the disciples would come to him and say, can we sit at your right hand and your left hand in your kingdom at the very time he's talking about his own crucifixion, his own rejection, it seems, you know, exceptionally inappropriate for them to be, you know, hearing him talk about how he's going to die and suffer and so forth and then saying, yeah, but can we sit on your right hand and your left hand when you come into your power? He says, well, you've got to go through what I got to go through. Now, one could easily deduce just by itself that baptism here refers to being immersed in suffering, Jesus has got to go through suffering, we wouldn't necessarily have to say death because that is martyrdom, because although Jesus is going to be killed for his for his loyalty to God in this story, and so will James, the brother of John.

John, as far as you know, did not die that way. John died a natural death as an old man, so he didn't drink that specific cup of martyrdom, but he did have to go through suffering. And so I believe the baptism is a baptism of suffering, and it seems confirmed by it being compared with the cup.

There's two images. Christ has to drink a certain cup. He has to be baptized with a certain baptism.

And so would they. Now, we have much more to go on on what the cup is, because when Jesus was in the garden of Gethsemane praying, he said, Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me. And when that cup was given to him nonetheless, and Peter tried to defend Jesus from the arrest.

Jesus said, Peter, put away your sword, the cup that the father has given me, shall I not drink it now? In this case, Jesus cup was the cup of being crucified. But maybe not only that, the whole of his sufferings, the whole of his passion was the cup that he had to drink and the whole of whatever sufferings the father has in mind for each Christian is

the cup that they have to drink and the baptism with which they must be baptized. And Jesus said to his disciples, yeah, you will, you will be baptized and drink the cup.

But as far as the outcome, as far as the rewards and the positions and so forth that will come to you as a result, that's not mine to give. That's the father. So I'm afraid I can't grant your request or deny it.

I simply can't address it. But I can tell you that between now and whatever happens to you, you're going to suffer like me. And verse 41, and when the 10 heard it, they began to be greatly displeased with James and John.

Are you guys trying to muscle in here behind our backs? I mean, you can imagine these guys are all on the same level, essentially. Well, not exactly, because Peter, James and John had been given more access than others. But the idea that they would try to get in there and be in his right and left hand.

What hadn't they heard Jesus say to Peter, you are Peter upon this rock. I built my church. They must not have understood that Peter's the guy.

They must not have been Roman Catholics. So they thought they could get in those positions. But the other disciples, what are you guys trying to pull here? He tried to get in behind our backs, send your mom in to get you guys some positions above the rest of us.

So the other disciples were greatly displeased. You see, again, Mark always making emphasis on the emotions. They weren't just displeased.

They were greatly displeased. With James and John, but Jesus called them to himself and said to them, you know that those who are considered rulers over the Gentiles lorded over them and their great ones exercise authority over them. Yet it shall not be so among you.

But whoever desires to become great among you shall be your servant and whoever of you desires to be first shall be the slave of all. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life a ransom for many. Now, he's making application of what he had told them earlier in verse 33 and 34, that the Son of Man is going to be delivered to chief priests, scribes.

He's going to be condemned and delivered over to be mocked and scourged and spit on and killed and he'll rise again. But the Son of Man didn't come to take an easy road. He came to be abused.

He came to be to suffer. He came to give his life a ransom. For many now, this makes it very clear that whereas in verses 33 and 34, one might have gotten the impression that Jesus was going to be at the mercy of the Jews and of the Gentiles and those that were

doing these things to him.

But in verse 45, it's clear he's not in anybody's mercy. He's giving his life. He's making a payment, he's ransoming.

Sinners by his death, and that's an act that he is doing. He's not just at the mercy of people more powerful than himself. He has come to lay his life down and his disciples have to be of the same spirit.

Jesus didn't come to serve to be served, but to serve. Now, this doesn't mean that we aren't supposed to serve the Lord because he's talking about in his earthly life. He didn't come as the one to command people to serve him.

He came to be a servant and to die. After that, however, he's raised from the dead. God commands all men everywhere to serve him, to submit to him, to recognize his leadership.

But he's talking about during his earthly sojourn. He's here to show us what the path is to glory. You want to sit at my right hand and left hand in my glory.

Well, here's the path to glory. You serve and you die if necessary. You give your life up for other people.

That's the ultimate in service. And what God is looking for is not people who have ambition to be at the top, but people who have a heart to serve, the heart of Christ, the servant's heart. And that is what makes somebody a chief.

Now, some of I think, well, then I put in my years of service, can I be the chief now? You know, like being a chief is a reward for being a servant. But I don't think he's saying that do your service and then you get your position of chiefness. I think he's saying in serving, you are chief, you are the best if you serve the best.

Your stature with God is not a reward for having earlier been a servant. It is being a servant, being a servant is the stature, being most like Christ, most surrendering of your life and your prerogatives for other people. That is the highest position one can be.

And it's at the bottom of what the world would consider to be the ladder or the totem pole or whatever. And this is why Paul said in first Corinthians seven that if a Christian is a servant or a slave, they shouldn't really care. That shouldn't be a shouldn't bother them.

So in first Corinthians seven, twenty four, he said, brethren, let each one remain with God in that calling in which he was called. And a little earlier in verse 20 says, let everyone remain in the same calling in which he was called. Were you called while a slave? Do not be concerned about it.

But if you can be made free, use it, use that opportunity. Go ahead and be made free. But don't worry about it.

For he who is called in the Lord while a slave is the Lord's freed man. Likewise, he who is called while free is Christ's slave. So we're all slaves anyway, in a sense, and we're all free in another sense.

Our social status is not something for us to be concerned about. We have as much freedom in Christ as anyone has, regardless of our social status. And we have as much duty to lay down our rights as any slave has because we are Christ's slaves.

And to be great in the kingdom is to make oneself small and to give up hope of greatness. You see, Jesus said it's the rulers of the Gentiles who lord over them and who exercise authority over them. But it says it shall not be so among you.

Now, this statement is a very important statement for Christians in defining relationships and defining even church leadership. Because Jesus said that those who lead the Gentiles, that means the pagan, those who are considered rulers, he says, over the Gentiles, they lord it over them. They exercise authority over them.

In other words, they say, OK, you do what I say. And they expect obedience to themselves. And Jesus said, well, that's not how it should be among you.

So if a person is considered a ruler in the church, Jesus said it should not be such that you are exercising authority over people. Now, this is just the opposite of what many people assume, because churches are set up just like secular organizations are. They have corporations, they have presidents, they have, or at least CEOs or boards of directors or whatever.

And those persons in a nonprofit organization have the same kind of authority in their organization that they'd have if it was a secular organization. Pastors, the CEO, the elders or the board of directors or whatever. And they exercise authority and they expect the people to obey them.

Some do, not all do. But it's like many pastors are offended if they tell you to do something, you say, I don't think so. I don't think I'll do that.

They feel like, wait a minute, I'm the authority here. Submit to those who are in authority. Well, Jesus said that's how the rulers, the Gentiles exercise their leadership.

It shall not be done that way by you. You want to be considered an authority, you want to be considered chief, then just serve people. Servants don't require people to obey them.

Servants serve. That's what it means to be great in the kingdom, he said, so that the

person who's seeking position in the church and wants others to do things his way and submit to his authority is a person who's got the very attitude that Jesus said should not be existing among among Christians. So how does the church get led? It gets led by example, by a servant example.

Well, what about those who don't want to follow the example? What about those who are rebellious? Well, they get kicked out of the church by the church. The church itself disciplines them. Not some leader gets peeved because someone didn't obey him and kicks him out of church.

The church itself of true Christians maintains its own standards. Now, that might sound very idealistic because churches don't really do that mostly, but that's how Jesus set it up. That's how it was supposed to be.

If you look over at Matthew chapter 23. Jesus is talking to his disciples about similar matters, and he said about the Pharisees, he said in verse six, Matthew 23, six, they love the best places at the feast and the best seats in the synagogues, greetings in the marketplaces, and they love to be called by men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But you do not be called Rabbi, for one is your teacher, the Christ, and you are all brothers.

Do not call anyone on earth your father. He means in terms of a religious reverential title. Obviously, you call your own dad, father.

For one is your father, he who is in heaven and do not be called teachers, for one is your teacher, the Christ, but he who is the greatest among you shall be your servant. Says whoever exalts himself will be abased, and he who humbles himself will be exalted. This same teaching actually comes up also in Mark, but the point here is Jesus is saying that if you want to be, you guys obviously want positions, you guys obviously want to be respected.

You want to be at the right hand and the left hand in the kingdom. Well, if you want to be respected, seek to be respected by God and he respects a servant's heart. He respects Jesus.

Jesus did not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life. And so that's the path to pleasing God and being great in his sight. Now, verse 46, then they came to Jericho and as he went out of Jericho with his disciples and a great multitude, blind Bartimaeus, the son of Timaeus, sat out by the road begging.

And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out and say, Jesus, son of David, have mercy on me. Then many warned him to be quiet, but he cried out all the more. Son of David, have mercy on me.

So Jesus stood still and commanded him to be called. Then they called the blind man, saying to him, be of good cheer. Rise, he's calling for you and throwing aside his

garment.

He arose and came to Jesus. And Jesus answered and said to him, what do you want me to do for you? And the blind man said to him, Rabboni, that I may receive my sight. Rabboni means my great one or my rabbi.

Rabbi means great, my great one, actually, and Rabboni is sort of a longer term of that. That I might receive my sight. Then Jesus said to him, go your way, your faith has made you well.

And immediately he received his sight and followed Jesus on the road. Now, there's a slight difficulty in harmonizing the way that Mark tells the story with the way that Matthew and Luke tell it. And Matthew and Luke don't tell it exactly the same as each other, either.

For one thing, and this is not a problem, but Mark is the only gospel that tells us this blind man's name, Bartimaeus. It even tells us he's the son of Timaeus. Now, the blind man was not a man of stature in society.

He was a beggar. So why would even his name and his father's name be a matter of note? It seems obvious that Mark wrote this at a time when Bartimaeus was a member of the church. And he's telling the story about one of the guys he knows and one of the brothers in the fellowship.

And then calls him by name. Now, Matthew and Luke do not mention him by name, but they have their own differences that have occasion problems from time to time. For example, in Mark, chapter 10, at the very beginning of the story, it says, as they came to Jericho, it says, then they came to Jericho and as they went out of Jericho with his disciples.

He ran into this blind man, but it says in Luke chapter 18 and verse 35, then it happened that as he was coming near Jericho, that a certain blind man sat at the road begging. Now, the difference here is that both Matthew and Mark say that this miracle occurred as he was leaving Jericho. Luke tells us it happened as he was nearing Jericho, as he was going in.

So the question is, did he encounter Bartimaeus as he went into Jericho or as he went out of Jericho? Because Matthew and Mark tell us it was as he was leaving Jericho and Luke says it was as he was going into Jericho. So there's a slight difference there. Now, it's not super problematic to someone who's not obsessed with, you know, making everything harmonized perfectly in detail.

If persons have a certain a certain view of the inspiration of Scripture, it bothers them that there's any details different. But then they're going to be bothered by lots of details because the sayings of Jesus are recorded in different words, in different ways and in

different order and so forth in the different Gospels. But this one, one of these statements seems like it cannot be true.

Was it as he's going into Jericho or as he's going out of Jericho, they ran into Bartimaeus. Whichever one is right makes the other one wrong. So it seems like something is wrong here.

On the other hand, maybe not. There's been some solutions proposed. Some of them don't seem as convincing as others to me.

Some say that there have been the ruins of two different Jericho's found near each other. Maybe Jesus was going out of one of the Jericho's and nearing the other one as he is on his road to Jerusalem. So it could be correct that he was going out of Jericho, one of the Jericho's, but approaching the other Jericho going in.

And this man was in between them. So he was both on the way out and on the way into Jericho, depending on which Jericho you're talking about. But that seems to me not most likely to be the correct way of looking at it.

The question I would have is, did Jesus go into Jericho and out of Jericho through the same gate? Or did he go in one gate at one end and go out another gate at the other end? I don't know how the city was constructed. In many cases, a city would have one primary entrance and you'd go in that entrance and out that entrance. I guess I sometimes picture Jesus going in one end of Jericho and out the other end as he's on his way to Jerusalem.

But is it possible he encountered Bartimaeus on the way in and on the way out? It doesn't strike me as impossible. Now, even if Jesus went in one end of the city and out the other end, it's not impossible that he encountered him going in. And the man cried out to Jesus and Jesus didn't hear him and Jesus went on in the city.

And so the man found his way around the city or through the city and was waiting for Jesus at the other end when he came out. So that Jesus did encounter him going in and going out. Or especially if Jesus went in and out the same gate, he went into Jericho one day and came out the same gate.

He would have perhaps met the blind man there, both coming in and going out. See, what Luke says, and Luke's the one who differs from Matthew and Mark on this, Luke says in verse 35 of chapter 18, Luke 18, 35. It happened as he was coming near Jericho that a certain blind man sat by the road begging.

Well, that may have been true, and that may be simply the first time Jesus saw the man. And it may be that the next verses describe things that happened after Jesus was then leaving the city and passed that blind man again. And and hearing the multitude passing by, he asked what it meant.

And, you know, he cried out to Jesus and had this healing as Jesus was leaving Jericho. We really don't know for sure how this is to be resolved, but it's not impossible that Jesus could have encountered the man both going in and coming out and healed him, of course, in the second instance as he was going out. And that would be a solution.

I don't know what the right solution is. It might be the right one or might be some other one. To me, it's not an overly large concern.

The fact that Jesus did the miracle and he did it outside Jericho seems to be infinitely more important than whether Jesus is going in or coming out at the time. The other problem that exists in this story is that both Mark and Luke tell us about a blind man. But Matthew tells us there were two blind men.

On this occasion, that's in Matthew, chapter. Twenty. And verse twenty nine, Matthew is parallel to this story, says Matthew, twenty, twenty nine.

Now, as they departed from Jericho, a great multitude followed him and behold, two blind men sitting by the road when they heard that Jesus was passing by, cried out, saying, have mercy on us. So, Lord, son of David, then the multitude warned them that they should be quiet. But they cried all the more saying, have mercy on us, O Lord, son of David.

Now, this is just like the story in Mark. Only it's they instead of he, it's two instead of a blind man named Bartimaeus. So Jesus stood still and called them and said, what do you want me to do for you? They said, Lord, that our eyes may be open.

So Jesus had compassion and touched their eyes and immediately their eyes received sight and they followed him. So Matthew tells us about two blind men and Mark and Luke only mentioned the one in Mark alone tells us the man's name, Bartimaeus. Now, this kind of problem is not overwhelmingly destructive to our view of the inspiration of Scripture either, however, because it's first of all, it's not the only instance of its type that we already have encountered the story of the man of the tombs where Mark and Luke tell us that this demon possessed man possessed with a legion of demons met Jesus over in the other side of the Sea of Galilee.

And Jesus cast this this legion out into the herd of pigs. Mark and Luke tell us that story, but Matthew does, too, but Matthew says there were two demon possessed men on that occasion. Apparently they were both delivered.

Matthew mentions to Mark and Luke mention only one. It's the same story in all cases. And then when you come to the account of Jesus empty tomb, when the women came to the empty tomb of Jesus after it risen, all four Gospels tell us of the women arriving there, but two of them mentioned that they saw an angel there and two Gospels mentioned they saw two angels there.

Same kind of problem. One gospel mentioning one individual where another gospel mentions two. This is what some people call a contradiction.

I don't call it a contradiction because a contradiction by definition requires that the statements that are said to be contradictory to each other cannot both be true. If they can both be true, then they don't contradict each other. They may contain different information from each other, but that different information isn't the same thing as contradictory information.

The only time a contradiction is present is if you have two statements that cannot both be true. Now, if Mark tells us there was a man, a blind man named Bartimaeus, they got healed on this occasion and Matthew tells us there were actually two men who got healed on this occasion. Is it impossible for both statements to be true? Of course, it's not impossible.

Assuming Matthew is correct that there were two men, then it would also be correct that there was a man and another one too. Besides, it's not necessary that all the details we give it in every account. And it may be that Mark and Luke only mentioned the one man because Bartimaeus perhaps became a permanent member of the church.

The other man may have fallen away. Eventually, they both followed Jesus immediately, it says in Matthew. But but who knows what became of the other one? Jesus did have a certain attrition rate in his following, and many people who had been who had received benefits from Jesus often did not remain loyal to him long term.

It's possible that Bartimaeus was the only one of the two of them that really stuck with Jesus long term and to be actually a known individual known by name. Even it was known who his father was by the members of the church at a later date. The other man remains nameless and may have not continued.

And therefore, both Mark and Luke wanting to tell the story of their friend Bartimaeus told the story about Bartimaeus without mentioning his his companion, Matthew, who happened to be there. And see the story, remember, there were two and mentions that there were two. It's not contradictory, it's just different.

One story gives the more detail than the other one account. Anyway, this is another instance of Jesus healing the blind. It's significant that the man cried out to Jesus and said in verse 47, Mark 10, 47, Jesus, son of David, have mercy on me.

Now, calling him son of David wasn't simply referring to him as, you know, in terms of who his dad was. Bartimaeus is referred to as Bartimaeus, the son of Timaeus, and Timaeus would have been his father. David was not Jesus's father.

One would expect someone to say, Jesus, son of Joseph. Because if a man was usually referred to as the son of his immediate male ancestors father. But in calling Jesus the

son of David, this was a title.

Son of David was the term for the Messiah, and the man was crying out that he recognized Jesus as the Messiah. Now, this was at a time when not many did. Remember, Jesus had not very long before this said, who do men say I am? And the opinions were all over the map.

Some say Elijah, some say John the Baptist, some say Jeremiah or one of the prophets. Well, who do you say? Well, I say you're the Christ, Peter says. And Jesus is relieved.

Someone knows the father has revealed it to you. Well, apparently the father revealed to this man, too, this man was a man of faith in in Christ's messiahship. He called Christ the son of David, a messianic title at a time when there were few people thinking of Jesus in those terms anymore.

Earlier, when Jesus had been doing much more popular ministry, there had been many people speculating that he might be the Messiah. But apparently at the time of the collapse of the Galilean campaign, when he gave his talk about the bread of life and lost most of his followers in Galilee at that point, it became less common for people to see him as the as a candidate for the Messiah. But this man had not given up.

This man believed that Jesus was the Messiah, he also had very strong faith that he could be healed. I take that from the fact that when Jesus called him to come, Mark specifically says in verse 50, throwing aside his garment. He rose and came to Jesus.

Now, you and I have never been blind, but I can imagine that a blind person has to keep close track of his possessions because he can't see them. He's got to know where they are. I left it right here.

That's where I can find it when I need it again. You know, a garment is an important thing, especially to a beggar, because it was all that he owned and it's what he wrapped up in at night. He'd be cold at night if he didn't have his cloak.

He wouldn't be throwing his stuff off randomly where he might have a hard time finding it as a blind man in the future. It's clear that he considered when Jesus called, that's the end of my being a beggar. That's the end of my being blind.

I don't need to keep track of this anymore. I might need it again, but I'll be able to find it because after I face Jesus, I'll be able to see. But I'm sure that a blind person doesn't just throw his things around.

You know, he's got to know where he left everything. So he can find it again. Might be good for me to be blind, so I might be able to find my car keys or my glasses.

I might be able to remember where I put them. Sometimes when we can see, we were

more careless about such things, you know, and because he expected to see, he became careless about keeping track of it. He threw it aside and ran in the direction that he knew Jesus was.

If he had ended up not getting healed, he'd have to go look into that garment again, you know, and all over the place. Probably could find it, but he was expecting not to need it. And so he threw it aside.

And Jesus, what do you want me to do? He said, my great one, that I may receive my sight. And there were two men making this request were told in Matthew. And Jesus said to him, go your way.

Your faith has made you well. Immediately he received his sight and followed Jesus on the road. And, you know, it's a wonderful story, except it's become rather ordinary in reading the story of Jesus healing blind men, you know, blind people being healed are like a dime a dozen in Jesus story.

He's always doing this kind of thing. So it's almost almost takes away from the amazing, the amazing character of it. Hey, this man was blind and now he's not blind.

I mean, you know, it might be ordinary for those who are following the story of Jesus. Oh, yeah. Yeah.

He's healed several blind people before. This is not new. But when you think of it as the impact on an individual man, that man himself was blind.

That made all the difference in the world for him. It was it was a unique case for him. And every time Jesus does something remarkable, it's even if he does it a lot of times, you might get used to him answering your prayers.

You might get used to him providing for you. You might get used to things that he does. Eventually it might seem so ordinary.

And yet it's always a unique act of God that he might otherwise have not done. And life would have been very different for you or for someone if he hadn't done it. You know.

So many things that we come to count on, we count on the sun rising in the morning. If it wasn't predictable, if we weren't sure it was going to happen, it'd be an amazing thing every time it happened. Or, you know, a garden growing, you plant seeds and you you're accustomed to the fact that they're going to grow.

But if it wasn't something you could predict with certainty, the growing of a seed would be an amazing thing. The reproduction of a plant. Everything that God does on a regular basis is amazing in itself.

It just becomes less amazing to us because it becomes commonplace. Even healing blind

people can almost become commonplace to us as we read more and more stories. Whenever you read in the Gospels about a blind man, you know it's going to happen.

Now, there are a lot of blind people Jesus didn't heal, but we don't read about them. Whatever you're in the Gospels, there was a certain blind man, he said, oh, I already know how this story's going to end. It's predictable.

Even even Jesus of contemporaries knew how the story ended. Remember, it says that he was in a synagogue and there was a man with a withered hand in the synagogue. And so the Pharisees were there watching him to see if he was going to heal him on the Sabbath.

You know, when you go to church, you see someone in a wheelchair, you don't say, I wonder if this person is going to get healed because he's not. You know, unfortunately, he's not. But when Jesus was there and there was a cripple there, he said, I'll bet something's going to happen.

I'll bet this guy's going to get healed. And so we we we lose our sense of surprise. You know, I think that would be astonishing if we really saw them happen just one time.

It's when he does it a lot of times it becomes ordinary in our eyes and it becomes almost like there's hardly anything to say about this story. We've already seen Jesus heal so many blind people. There's just another case.

But when you think about it, our our lack of amazement is really unjustified. Because miracles are amazing things, no matter how commonly God does them. Of course, we live in an age where he doesn't commonly do them.

Miracles are not very commonly seen. He does do miracles. But they're not very common.

But in the Gospels, of course, they're very common. The disciples, apparently, they became very common to the disciples, too, because although they were often amazed in the beginning when Jesus did things, eventually they just, you know, Jesus was just a guy that they felt comfortable around. I'm sure the first time they saw him do a few miracles was like they were, you know, it's like being around an alien or something, you know, from outer space.

Remember when he stilled the storm? They said, what kind of person is this? I mean, that was just an amazing thing to them. But as time goes on, oh, yeah, Jesus healed that guy, too. Oh, he raised that dead person, too.

It's predictable, you know, so much so that they could be so casual around that they didn't even feel embarrassed to be talking to one of them. Who's the greatest? As they walk down the road, you know, I mean, that would have been they'd lost all sense of

awe, apparently, by that time. Anyway, it is a remarkable story, and to Bartimaeus himself, it was life changing.

And so it is Mark's giving the testimony of one of his friends in the church, no doubt. You see, Bartimaeus would have become part would have become part of the Jerusalem church. And that's where Mark came from.

Mark was now writing in Rome when he wrote this. And of course, Mark and Peter, the source, Mark's source was Peter for this. Both of them would have known this guy by name.

That's why they give it. And that means that he was someone they had associated with. And it was an amazing it's amazing thing.

If you knew somebody who had been, you know, blind, nerve blind. Your optic nerve didn't work and then they'd gotten healed and you fellowship with them on a regular basis, you'd be telling that story, too. And it'd be something that you'd find amazing, I think.

I would. Now, in Chapter 11, we finally come to the Passion Week, I say finally, actually, the Passion Week is introduced rather early in all the gospels, if you consider them as biographies. The Gospel of John, almost half the book is dedicated to the Passion Week.

All the gospels give a disproportionate length of treatment to the Passion Week, disproportionate to the length of time, the rest of Jesus' ministry that they record. We're about two thirds of the way through Mark here right now. A little more than two thirds, let me think here about two thirds, and now we come to the last week of Jesus life.

So it's like three years, three and a half years are covered in two thirds of the book. The last third is one week, which and that's how the other gospels are, too, very much. They give a disproportionate length of treatment to the final week, partly because it was the climax.

Certainly a lot happened of significance even prior to Jesus being crucified. But it's obvious that his death, which has now become even the focus of his conversations with his disciples prior to this, is the principal thing of importance in the life of Jesus. According to the gospel writers, the reason is they're writing the gospel, they're not really writing a biography.

If you write a biography, you usually tell something about a person's childhood, for example, an upbringing, their education. All the gospels leave all of that out, except for Matthew and Luke give just some infancy narratives. Mark and John don't even give those.

They're not writing a complete biography, they're writing a presentation of the gospel

and the gospel is, yes, the life of Jesus, but but also most particularly his death and resurrection. And so they're going to give much larger concern to those things that are in the proximate area of his death and resurrection because of their disproportionate significance. And so we begin at chapter 11 with the with Palm Sunday, really, which is one week before the resurrection.

And I think I think we're going to go ahead and start this, we only have a few minutes, but I want to take the first part of this. Chapter 11, verse one says, Now, when they came near Jerusalem to Bethphagia and Bethany at the Mount of Olives, he sent out two of his disciples and he said to them, go into the village opposite you. And as soon as you have entered it, you will find a colt tied on which no one has sat, loose it and bring it.

And if anyone says to you, why are you doing this? Say the Lord has need of it and immediately he will send it here. So they went their way and found the colt tied by the door outside the street and then loosed it. And some of those who stood there said to him, what are you doing, loosing the colt? And they spoke to them just as Jesus had commanded and they let them go.

Now, this little exchange that took place raises an interesting question, I think most people would find it interesting, and that is that was Jesus just prophesying that they would find things in this way? Was this like a supernatural thing that it was unplanned, but Jesus just knew you go to such and such place, there's going to be a colt there. I can kind of see it in my head. There's a colt there.

And if you take it, someone's going to ask you why you're doing that. And if you say certain things, they'll let you go. And so Jesus just kind of supernaturally foresaw this and predicted it.

Or had Jesus made these arrangements with the owner of the colt previously? I've known Christians who are very resistant to the second suggestion because they feel like it takes away from the miraculous element. Well, believe me, we've still got plenty of miraculous elements in the Gospels, even if we allow that in this particular case, Jesus had made a prior arrangement with the owner of the colt. It would be no desire, it would reflect or demonstrate no desire to diminish the supernaturalness of the life of Jesus and his miracles to say that on some occasions he did things that weren't miraculous on things.

On some occasions he did what an ordinary man might do, like eat food, sleep, walk. I mean, not everything Jesus did was miraculous and not everything that's recorded of him is miraculous. There's plenty of miracles he did, but this might not be one of them.

It seems very possible that what we find here is that Jesus had connections. In town that even the disciples were not aware of, there's another story kind of like this later on, where two of the disciples are sent to prepare for the Passover feast and they say to the Lord, where do you want us to prepare the Passover? He said, well, you go to town and

by the well, you'll see a man with a pitcher of water in his head, follow him and wherever he goes, go into that house and say, where do you want the master to prepare the Passover? Well, obviously, that the owner of the house had already been notified by Jesus, and this was the signal Jesus was giving a countersign, more or less, sort of like the secret agents, you know, that don't know who each other are, but they're supposed to meet someone here. And you say this word and you'll say this word back and they'll say that one back.

And then that's called the countersign. That's how you identify your contact when you can't just come right out. Actually, the early Christians had a countersign, you know, in the early days of persecution.

And that's that was the origin of that fish symbol that that has become the symbol of Christianity. Many people have wondered why would a fish become the symbol of Christianity? Well, the reason apparently was that the word Icthus, which means in Greek a little fish, is an acronym. As you take the first letters of five words in Greek, Jesus Christ, God, Son, Savior, you take the first letters of those five words, Jesus Christ, God, Son, Savior, and you put those first letters together.

It makes a Greek word fish, Icthus. Now, the Christians, as I'm told, when they would want to know if somebody else was a Christian, but they wouldn't they wouldn't dare to ask because it was too dangerous because of the persecution, they couldn't just come around and say, I'm a Christian. Are you a Christian? But if they met a traveler and wanted to know if that was a fellow Christian or not, as they would stop and talk along the way, one of them would just doodle in the sand with his walking stick.

He'd make sort of an arch in a rather subtle manner in the dirt. The other person, if he was not a Christian, would pay no attention to it at all. If he was a Christian, he'd, in the course of conversation, take his stick and make the second arch that made the fish sign.

And that would be their countersign. That would be their secret way of identifying themselves to each other. This was practiced apparently by Jesus too.

Jesus was at this point not, you know, not sure who he could trust. There were people plotting against him. And so he had made arrangements, I think.

Now, I can't guarantee that this is true. I mean, all this thing with the donkey might just happen providentially. And Jesus was able to predict it would happen.

But it's entirely likely that Jesus had some friends in town who had a donkey and unbeknown to the disciples, Jesus had made some private arrangements that on a certain day, I'm going to want to use your donkey. I'll send two guys for it. Now, of course, if they if you see two guys taking your donkey and you want to know if they're my guys or not, just ask them, what do you do with that donkey? And if they're my guys,

they'll say the Lord has need of it.

And then, you know, it was me that sent them. You know, I'm I'm fairly confident that's probably what had happened. Just like when he said, when you see a man walking with a picture on his head, follow him to the house and ask the people who live there, where do you want the Lord to make the Passover? Obviously, the people in the house have to know they have to kind of already have preplanned that the Lord's going to make the Passover in their house.

So these are signals. These are connections that are being made in a subtle way. And so I think this was probably a prearrangement Jesus had made, not that I have any doubts that he could have prophesied it in a non prearranged situation.

I just don't see any reason that we would have to insist on that, because if he hadn't made the arrangement, then why would people react that way? Two strangers come up and start taking your donkey. They say, where are you going with my donkey? Oh, the Lord has needed it. That'd be the Lord who? You know, they say the Lord has need of it.

They say, oh, OK, you're the right people. Take it. You know, we were expecting you.

And so that's what I think happened. But it does mean that Jesus had friends that even his disciples didn't know about. Jesus had a network of people who were loyal to him, but weren't following him around.

We know people like Mary and Martha and Lazarus. They didn't follow Jesus around. They lived in Bethlehem.

They, as far as we know, stayed home, but they were definitely on his side. They were definitely loyal to him. Mark's mother probably was one of those.

Her house was in Jerusalem. In fact, that's probably where he had the last supper. We don't know for sure who or whoever the owner of this donkey was.

We don't know. But I think Jesus did. I think Jesus knew the person.

And so, verse seven says, they brought the colt to Jesus and threw their garments on it and he sat on it and many spread their garments on the road and others cut down leafy branches from the trees and spread them on the road. Then those who went before and those who followed cried out saying, Hosanna, blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Blessed is the kingdom of our father, David, that comes in the name of the Lord.

Hosanna in the highest. Now, we won't read any further than that in this session, but I want to just say we're very familiar with this scene. If you say, you know, dramatic depictions of the story of Jesus, we know they always include the triumphal entry.

When people throwing palm branches down their clothes down, big crowds of people lining the streets as Jesus writes to Jerusalem. One thing that's never explained is where these people come from and why did they show this excitement about him on this occasion? He was coming into Jerusalem. It's true.

But he came into Jerusalem many times in his ministry. They didn't do this kind of thing. He was riding a donkey, but riding donkeys was a fairly common thing to do.

You know, it's not like this is the first time Jesus came to Jerusalem or the first guy who rode a donkey into Jerusalem. What was it that alerted these people that this was a significant arrival? Jesus probably went to Jerusalem three times a year with his disciples and not not obscurely. But people didn't always line the streets.

There was something that made these people at this time sense that this time was going to be his important time coming to Jerusalem. They were declaring that the kingdom of their father, David, was now coming as Jesus was coming to Jerusalem. Now, most of these people, probably including the disciples, had in mind that he was coming to Jerusalem to take over.

That he's coming to Jerusalem to drive out the oppressive Romans. And to set up the throne of David there where David had had his throne. That would be the apparent meaning of their words.

Blessed is the kingdom of our father, David, that is coming in the name of the Lord. Now, they were not wrong in what they said. The kingdom of David was, in fact, coming in the person of Christ.

Probably not the way they expected. But it would be a mistake to say that the kingdom of David was postponed at this point. And that's what, of course, this sensationalism teaches, that Jesus actually would have established the kingdom of David.

But he was not able to do so because the Jews rejected him. And therefore, it was postponed until the millennium. Then he'll set up the kingdom of David.

That's the dispensational position. But the people weren't rejecting him. The people were accepting him.

And they were not making a mistake when they said that the kingdom of our father, David, is coming in the name of the Lord, although it's not brought out in Mark in the other Gospels, some of them. It says the Pharisees, when they heard the people saying these things, said to Jesus, Rebuke your disciples. Don't let them say those things.

And Jesus said, you know, if they don't stand, the rocks are going to cry it out. You know, this message, what these people are saying, it's got to be said that they don't say it. God makes the rocks say it because this is a true saying.

The kingdom of David is, in fact, coming right now. This is the arrival. Now, how these people knew it, I don't know.

There were a lot of things going on that aren't recorded behind the scenes. For example, Jesus probably having made the arrangements with the owner of this donkey. We don't read of him making those arrangements, but he did things every day that we don't read about him doing.

He may well have sent his disciples around to announce to people that he was going to come in to Jerusalem. As the king. Now, he had never announced himself to be the Messiah ever previous to this.

He didn't really announce it here, either. He just wrote in and they recognized him as the Messiah. But how did they recognize him on this occasion when the other times he'd come to Jerusalem, they didn't? We don't know.

We don't know. We don't know how the word got around. We don't know why people seen Jesus riding a donkey in Jerusalem on this occasion realize, oh, this is it.

Maybe the disciples themselves were the first to begin to throw palm branches down and others got in on the action. Oh, there's this is significant, you know, and, you know, people were volatile in those days and they're always looking for the Messiah. So it may be that a whole bunch of people got involved who who were just kind of sparked by a seed crowd of disciples who were doing it first.

We're not told, but we do know that somehow this became a visible known thing so that many people would gather around and proclaim him the king as he wrote into Jerusalem. Now, when he got into Jerusalem, he didn't do anything particular that day. In verse 11, it says he went into Jerusalem and into the temple.

And when he looked around at all the things. As the hour is already late, he went to Bethany with the twelve, apparently spend the night with Mary, Martha and Lazarus in their house in Bethany. So he wrote in on a donkey, triumphantly proclaimed to be the king.

Once he got to town, he is kind of anticlimactic. He didn't say, OK, here I am. Everyone follow me.

He just looked around, checked things out, looked at the temple, went down to Bethany, spent the night there. But the next day he came back and cleaned up the temple. So apparently his surveillance of the temple on this occasion was the time when he began to formulate the plan of what he's going to do the next day when he comes to the temple.

Probably seeing the things that were offensive at the temple on this Sunday evening

probably gave him. Probably helped him formulate his plan about cleansing the temple the next day. Anyway, I we do have to stop at this point, but I'm trying to think of it seems like there's something else I want to say with reference to his triumphal entry.

And it's skipped my mind, so maybe during the break it would come back. I can tell you when to come back. If not, we'll just move forward.

Oh, there is one thing. The thing I wanted to mention is for Jesus to be riding a donkey into Jerusalem with people proclaiming him to be the Messiah would seemingly be a very provocative thing politically. Because the Romans were very touchy about Jews who had popular movements and who were regarded to be the Messiah, because Jesus was by no means the first.

There were numerous Jews prior to Jesus who had risen up, proclaimed themselves to be the Messiah. And started popular movements, and those movements are always revolutionary movements to try to overthrow the Romans, because that's what they expected the Messiah to do. So the false messiahs would come to power promising to overthrow the Romans and would lead a guerrilla movement or a popular movement of some kind like the zealots and try to overthrow the Romans.

And they'd be crushed. The Romans would crush them. But the Romans were always on the lookout for this kind of volatile situation.

Certainly, with Jesus riding into Jerusalem and being proclaimed the Messiah by crowds of people, this would be the kind of thing the Romans would take note of and be concerned about, you would think. And he was coming into Jerusalem, that's where Pilate's palace was, the Roman procurator. What's interesting about this fact is that less than a week later, Jesus stood before Pilate on trial, and Pilate said, I can't find anything wrong with him.

Pilate found Jesus entirely unthreatening to Rome. And yet, only a few days earlier, this scene had been caused. It's just the kind of scene that the Romans had had to put down violently on many occasions before with other characters who were viewed as the Messiah before Jesus.

And yet Pilate found Jesus to be completely innocent, completely not a problem to Rome. My assumption is that when Jesus rode into Jerusalem on this occasion, the Romans had their eyes and ears there, too. It was that's what was their business to do, to keep track of these kinds of things, make sure there's no uprisings against Rome.

And I'm sure that with as many Roman soldiers marching around the streets and stuff, that this did not go unnoticed by them. And I'm sure that Jesus became an object of their scrutiny from this point on for the next few days. But their scrutiny led them to believe he was not a threat.

And so that when he actually stood before Pilate, Pilate wasn't the least bit interested in even handling the case. He didn't want to condemn Jesus. He just wasn't interested in the case.

I'm going to have to assume that Pilate knew about the triumphal entry. Unless he was just an incompetent ruler and didn't pay any attention to what's going on right under his nose. Things that could be thought dangerous to his regime.

But I think Pilate must have just done the research. Who is this guy that they're talking this way about? What's he doing? What's he teaching? What's he trying to get people to do? And I think that he recognized that Jesus was not an insurgent. He was not there to overthrow the Romans.

And it's interesting that when the Jews actually brought Jesus to Pilate with accusations, they formulated the false accusation against Jesus that Jesus was an insurrectionist and that he was stirring up people and telling them not to pay taxes to Caesar. If that were true, Pilate should have been very upset, but Pilate didn't believe them. Pilate still said, I don't find anything wrong with him.

I don't think he's done anything wrong. What? He's just been told that he's telling people not to pay taxes to Caesar. Pilate apparently didn't believe the accusation.

Why? Well, maybe because Pilate had eyes and ears around when the people actually came to Jesus that is it lawful to pay tribute to Caesar or not, which happened within days of this afterwards. And Jesus said, give Caesar what's Caesar's and give God what's God's. In other words, Pilate may have known more about Jesus than he was being told by the Jews.

If he knew only what they were telling him, he'd be worried about Jesus. But I think Pilate knew that Jesus was teaching something entirely different than what the Jews were accusing him of and that he was not the kind of threat that the Jews were trying to make Pilate think he was. And that in spite of the fact that he was at this point on the triumphal entry acting very much like some of those guys who had been a threat or seemed to be having a popular movement such as those that had threatened Rome's presence there before.

But I think Jesus was so harmless and Jesus was so upfront with his agendas and so non-threatening on the political level that Pilate just thought, I'm not worried about this guy. You know, he's got popularity. He could be a problem if he wants me, but I just don't think he wants to be.

I think Pilate recognized that Jesus agenda was not anything to do with the Roman government and the political liberation of Palestine from the Romans. But Pilate would have had to have some real information about Jesus and what Jesus really taught and so

forth in order to know that he was a threat because the thing like this would look like a threat to Rome. But anyway, those are just some some thoughts I've had about this.

We'll talk now when we come back about some of the other things that happen between the triumphal entry and the crucifixion. Some of Jesus most interesting encounters and teachings will be found there.