

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. VII

AUGUST, 1845.

ARTICLE I.

THE ALLEGED DISCREPANCY BETWEEN JOHN AND THE OTHER EVANGELISTS RESPECTING OUR LORD'S LAST PASSOVER.

By E. Robinson, Prof. in Union Theol. Seminary, New York.

EVER since the earliest centuries of the Christian era, a difference of opinion has existed in the church, as to the point, whether our Lord's last meal with his disciples, on the evening before his crucifixion, was the ordinary paschal supper of the Jews. The question may be stated in other forms; as for example: Did the crucifixion of our Lord follow or precede the Jewish paschal supper? Was the Friday on which Jesus suffered, the fourteenth or the fifteenth day of the month Nisan? But it is obvious, that in all these forms the point at issue is the same; and the solution must in all depend upon the same evidence and arguments.

In the following Article I propose briefly to survey this field of controversy; partly because of the intrinsic importance and difficulties of the subject itself; and partly because, in late years, these difficulties have been brought forward very prominently by some of the commentators of Germany; and have been made the ground, sometimes, of fierce assault upon a single Gospel, and at other times, of systematic efforts against the credibility and authority of all the Evangelists. It will, I trust, be made to appear, that these efforts are all in vain; and that the truth of God stands forever sure. We shall be led to see, I think, that here, as well as elsewhere, the longer such efforts are continued, and the greater the learning and skill with which they are conducted, the more clearly will the grand result be brought out to view, and the strik-

ing truth be more and more developed, that a fundamental characteristic everywhere manifest in the testimony of the four evangelists, is UNITY IN DIVERSITY.

As the events of our Lord's Passion were so intimately connected with the celebration of the Passover, it seems proper here to bring together in one view those circumstances relating to that festival, which may serve to illustrate the sacred history, and thus prepare the way for a better understanding of the main point to be discussed.

I. *Time of killing the Paschal Lamb.*

The paschal lamb (or kid, Ex. 12: 5) was to be selected on the tenth day of the first month, Ex. 12: 3. On the fourteenth day of the same month, (called Abib in the Pentateuch, and later Nisan, Deut. 16: 1. Esth. 3: 7,) the lamb thus selected was to be killed, at a point of time designated by the expression בֵּין הָעֶרְבָיִם *between the two evenings*, Ex. 12: 6. Lev. 23: 5. Num. 9: 3, 6; or, as is elsewhere said, שָׁקֵב עַבְרָא דְּבֵרָא דְּהַשְׁמַרְתָּ, *at evening about the going down of the sun*, Deut. 16: 6. The same phrase, בֵּין הָעֶרְבָיִם, *between the two evenings*, is put for the time of the daily evening sacrifice; Ex. 29: 39, 41. Num. 28: 4. The time thus marked was regarded by the Samaritans and Karaites, as being the interval between sunset and deep twilight; and so too Aben Ezra.¹ But the Pharisees and Rabbinitists, according to the Mishnah, Pesach. 5. 3, held the first evening to commence with the declining sun (Greek δειλη πρωία); and the second evening with the setting sun (Greek δειλη ὀψία). Hence, according to them, the paschal lamb was to be killed in the interval between the ninth and eleventh hour, equivalent to our three and five o'clock, P. M. That this was in fact the practice among the Jews in the time of our Lord, appears from the testimony of Josephus: Πάσχα καλοῖται, καθ' ἣν θύουσι μὲν ἀπὸ ἐνάτης ὥρας μέχρι ἐνδεκάτης.² The daily evening sacrifice in the temple was also offered at the ninth hour or three o'clock, P. M. as the same historian testifies.³ Similar was the Greek δειλη.⁴

The true time then of killing the Passover in our Lord's day,

¹ See Reland de Samar. § 21, in Diss. Miscell. T. II. Trigland. de Karais c. 4. Aben Ezra ad Ex. 12: 6.

² Jos. B. J. 6. 9. 3.

³ Jos. Antiq. 14. 4. 3. Comp. Pesach. 6. 1; also Acts 3: 1 et Wetstein in loc.

⁴ Hesych. δειλη πρωία, ἣ μετ' ἄριστον ὦρα · δειλη ὀψία, ἣ περὶ θύουσι ἡλίου. Eustath. ad Od. 17. p. 285, ἣ ὀψία δειλη, τὸ περὶ ἡλίου θυομένης · δειλη πρωία, τὸ εὐδὲς ἐν μωσημβρίαις.

was between the ninth and eleventh hour, or towards sunset, near the close of the fourteenth day of Nisan.

II. Time of eating the Passover.

This was to be done the same evening, "And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread, and with bitter herbs shall they eat it;" Ex. 12: 9. The Hebrews in Egypt ate the first Passover, and struck the blood of the victims on their door-posts, on the evening before the last great plague; at midnight the Lord smote all the first-born; and in the morning the people broke up from Rameses on their march towards the Red Sea; viz. "on the fifteenth day of the first month, on the morrow after the passover;" Num. 33: 3.

It hence appears, very definitely, that the paschal lamb was to be slain in the afternoon of the fourteenth day of the month; and was eaten the same evening; that is, on the evening which was reckoned to and began the fifteenth day.

III. Festival of unleavened Bread.

"In the first month, on the *fourteenth* day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even. Seven days there shall be no leaven found in your houses;" Ex. 12: 17, 18. comp. Deut. 16: 3, 4. "And on the *fifteenth* day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord; seven days ye must eat unleavened bread;" Lev. 23: 6. comp. Num. 28: 17. From these passages it appears, that the festival of unleavened bread began strictly with the pass-over meal at or after sunset following the fourteenth day, and continued until the end of the twenty-first day.¹

In accordance with these precepts, and with an anxiety to go beyond rather than to fall short of them, the Jews were accustomed, at or before noon on the *fourteenth* day of Nisan, to cease from labor and put away all leaven out of their houses.² On that day, too, towards sunset, the paschal lamb was killed; and was eaten in the evening. Hence in popular usage, this fourteenth day itself, being thus a day of preparation for the festival which properly began at evening, very naturally came to be regarded as belonging to the festival; and is therefore sometimes spoken of in

¹ Comp. Jos. Antiq. 3. 10. 5.

² Lightfoot Opp. ed. Leusd. I. p. 728 sq. Hor. Heb. in Marc. 14: 12.

the New Testament as the "first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover;" Mark 14: 12. Luke 22: 7. comp. Matt. 26: 7. That such an usage was common appears also from Josephus; who, having in one place expressly fixed the commencement of this festival on the fifteenth of Nisan, speaks nevertheless in another passage of the fourteenth as the day of that festival, in exact accordance with the Evangelists.¹ In still another place, the same historian mentions the festival of unleavened bread as being celebrated for *eight* days.²

It is hardly necessary to remark, that in consequence of the close mutual relation between the Passover and the festival of unleavened bread, these terms are often used interchangeably (especially in Greek) for the whole festival, including both the paschal-supper and the seven days of unleavened bread.³

IV. *Other Paschal Sacrifices.* ●

1. "In the first day [fifteenth of Nisan] shall be a holy convocation; ye shall do no manner of servile work. But ye shall offer a sacrifice made by fire, a burnt-offering unto the Lord; two young bullocks, and one ram, and seven lambs of the first year;" also a meat offering, and "one goat for a sin-offering;" "after this manner shall ye offer daily throughout the seven days;" Num. 28: 18—24. All this was in addition to the ordinary daily sacrifices of the temple. "And on the seventh day ye shall have a holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work," v. 25. The first and last days of the festival, therefore, were each a day of rest or a *sabbath*; distinct from the weekly sabbath, except when one of these happened to fall upon this latter.

2. On the morrow after this first day of rest or sabbath, that is, on the sixteenth day of Nisan, the first-fruits of the harvest were offered, together with a lamb as a burnt-offering; Lev. 23: 10—12. This rite is expressly assigned by Josephus, in like manner, to the second day of the festival, the sixteenth of Nisan.⁴ The grain offered was barley; this being the earliest ripe, and its harvest occurring a week or two earlier than that of wheat.⁵ Until this of-

¹ Jos. Antiq. 3. 10. 5.—B. J. 5. 3. 1. comp. Antt. 11. 4. 8.

² Jos. Antt. 2. 15. 1.

³ See Luke 22: 1. John 6: 4. Acts 12: 3, 4, etc. Jos. Antt. 2. 1. 3. comp. B. J. 5. 3. 1.

⁴ Jos. Antt. 3. 10. 5.

⁵ Joseph. l. c. Bibl. Res. in Palest. II. p. 99.

fering was made, no husbandman could begin his harvest; nor might any one eat of the new grain; Lev. 23: 14. It was therefore a rite of great importance; and, in the time of our Lord and later, was performed with various formalities. Some of these were the following, according to the Mishnah; Menach. c. 10. Towards the end of the fifteenth of Nisan, some members of the Sanhedrim, appointed for the purpose, went with much ceremony out of Jerusalem over the brook Kidron, and there, in some field not far from the city, selected the portion of barley. During the evening or night following, i. e. early on the sixteenth of Nisan it was cut and brought into the court of the temple; even though that day might be the Sabbath.¹ Here the grain was separated from the ears, ground in a hand-mill, and sifted thirteen times. Of the flour, the tenth part of an ephah was mixed with oil and frankincense for a wave-offering; one handful of which was burnt upon the altar, and the rest eaten by the priests.²

3. There was also another sacrifice connected with the Passover, known among the later Hebrews as the *Khagigah* (חֲגִיגָה); of which there would seem to be traces likewise in the Old Testament. It was a festive thank-offering (תּוֹבֵחַת חֲגִיגָה, Engl. Vers. peace-offering), made by private individuals or families, in connection with the Passover, but distinct from the appointed public offerings of the temple. Such voluntary sacrifices or free-will offerings (חֲבִירָה), differing from those offered in fulfilment of a vow (נֶדָוָה), were provided for in the Mosaic law. After the fat was burned upon the altar (Lev. 3: 3, 9, 14), and the priest had taken the breast and right shoulder as his portion (Lev. 7: 29—34. 10: 14), the remainder was eaten by the bringer with his family and friends in a festive manner, on the same or the next day; beyond which time none of it might be kept; Lev. 7: 16—18. 22: 29, 30. Dent. 12: 17, 18, 27. 27: 7. These private sacrifices, or free-will offerings, were often connected with the public festivals, both in honour of the same, and as a matter of convenience; Num. 10: 10. Dent. 14: 26. 16: 11, 14. comp. 1 Sam. 1: 3—5, 24, 25. 2: 12—16, 19. They might be eaten in any clean place within the city (Lev. 10: 14. Dent. 16: 11, 14); but those only might partake of them, as likewise of the Passover, who were themselves ceremonially clean; Num. 18: 11, 13. John 11: 55. comp. Num. 9: 10—13. 2 Chr. 30: 18. Joseph. B. J. 6. 9. 3.

¹ Lightfoot Hor. Heb. in John 19: 31. Reland Antt. Sac. 4. 2. 4. p. 227.

² See Lev. 2: 14—16. Jos. Antt. 3. 10. 5. Lightfoot Hor. Heb. in Joh. 19: 31. Reland Antiqq. Sac. 4. 3. 8.

Such a voluntary private sacrifice in connection with the Passover, would seem to be implied in Deut. 16: 2; "Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the Passover unto the Lord thy God, even flock and herd (רֶבֶקֶת וְצֹאן), Sept. *θύσεις τὸ πάσχα κυρίου τῷ θεῷ σου πρόβατα καὶ βόας*. It might indeed be said, that while the "flock" here stands for the paschal lambs, the "herd" is mentioned in allusion to the extraordinary public sacrifices on each of the seven days; Num. 28: 19. Yet other passages in the later Jewish history show that such a limitation is unnecessary and improbable. Thus in 2 Chr. 35: 7—9, Josiah and his princes are said to have given to the people not only nearly forty thousand lambs, but also three thousand eight hundred oxen; which latter especially could not of course have all been for the daily public sacrifices. Indeed, it is expressly said, that when these were offered in sacrifice they "sod them in pots and in caldrons and in pans, and divided them speedily among all the people;" vs. 12, 13. So too thank (peace) offerings are enumerated in connection with Hezekiah's great passover; for which likewise he and his princes gave to the people two thousand bullocks and seventeen thousand sheep; 2 Chr. 30: 22, 24. It was, moreover, the general law, that on this and other great festivals, none should appear before the Lord empty; Ex. 23: 15. Deut. 16: 16. Hence, as being a sacrifice connected with a festival, these voluntary offerings were themselves called, at least by the later Hebrews, חַגְגִּית, *a festival*; a word strictly synonymous with the earlier חַג.¹

Such apparently was the origin and character of the festive *Khagigah* of the later times of the Jewish people, derived in this manner from the festival sacrifices of the Old Testament. Indeed the earlier Rabbins, in commenting on Deut. 16: 2, directly refer the "flock" (רֶבֶקֶת) to the paschal victims, and the "herd" (צֹאן) to the *Khagigah*.² There existed, however, some difference of opinion as to the particular day of the passover festival, on which the *Khagigah* ought to be offered, whether on the fourteenth or fifteenth of Nisan; but the weight of authority was greatly in favour of the fifteenth day. Still, in certain cases, it was permitted to be offered on the fourteenth day; as, for instance, when the paschal lamb was too small for the number of the family or company, and then the *Khagigah* furnished a fuller meal.³ Yet the later accounts of the mode of celebrating the paschal supper, seem to

¹ See Buxtorf's *Lex.* sub voc.

² Pesach. fol. 70. 2. Lightfoot *Hor.* Heb. ad Job. 18: 28.

³ Aruch, in חַג. Pesach. fol. 89. 2. Lightfoot l. c.

imply, that a Khagigah was ordinarily connected with that meal. Indeed, mention is made of a "Khagigah of the fourteenth day," so called in distinction from the more important and formal ceremonial Khagigah of the passover festival; which latter was not regularly offered until the fifteenth day, when the paschal supper had already been eaten. The former was then a mere voluntary oblation of thanksgiving, made for the very purpose of enlarging and diversifying the passover meal.¹

V. *The Paschal Supper.*

In the original institution of the Passover (Ex. c. 12), the lamb, as we have seen, was to be selected on the tenth of Nisan, killed late in the afternoon of the fourteenth, and eaten the same evening after the fifteenth day had begun; the blood having been struck upon the door-posts; vs. 3—7, 22. The flesh was to be eaten roasted, not raw nor sodden, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs; vs. 8, 9. None of it was to remain until the morning, or to be carried out of the house; and not a bone was to be broken; vs. 10, 46. It was to be eaten in haste, apparently standing, with the loins girded as for a journey, the shoes on the feet, and staff in hand; and no one was to go out of the door of the house until the morning; vs. 11, 22.

Some of these particulars would seem to have been intended only for the first Passover in Egypt; and could not well have had place afterwards. Thus when, in later times, crowds went up to Jerusalem to keep this festival, arriving there a day, or two days perhaps, before the fourteenth, and purchasing their lambs of the traders in and around the temple, a previous selection on the tenth was out of question. As too they were strangers in the city, and the lamb was slain in the court of the temple, the smiting of the blood upon the door-posts of other men's houses could hardly have been a matter of custom. Instead also of eating in haste, prepared as for a journey, the Jews in our Saviour's time, and our Lord with his disciples, ate at their leisure, reclining at table in the Roman manner.² So, further, instead of not going out of the house before morning, which the Hebrews in Egypt were forbidden to do for fear of the destroying angel, the later Jews, inas-

¹ See Lightfoot *Ministerium Templi* 13. 4. *ibid.* c. 14. *Reland Antiqu. Sac.* 4. 2. 2.

² *Pesach.* 10. 1. Wetstein in *Matt.* 26: 20. *comp.* *Mark* 14: 18. *Luke* 22: 14. *John* 13: 12.

much as no such reason existed afterwards, disregarded the prohibition; and our Lord and his disciples went out the same evening over the brook Kidron.

That the Jews, in the course of many centuries, had introduced various additional ceremonies along with the eating of the paschal supper, is evident from the manner in which our Lord celebrated it, as narrated by the Evangelists. What all these rites were, we have no specific historical account from any contemporary writer. Yet the precept as to the manner of holding the meal, preserved in the Mishnah and Talmud of Jerusalem,—which were compiled in the third century in the school at Tiberias from the traditional teaching of earlier Rabbins, and have been illustrated and explained by successive Jewish commentators,—although they cannot be depended upon as contemporaneous testimony, do nevertheless serve to throw light upon some of the circumstances connected with the institution of the Lord's supper; and may therefore properly find a place here.¹

According to these authorities, four cups of red wine, usually mingled with one fourth part of water, were drunk during the meal, and served to mark its progress. The first cup being prepared, the master of the family opened the meal with a blessing upon the day and upon the wine, and so the first cup was drunk; apparently the same mentioned in Luke 22: 17. All now washed their heads, the master at the same time giving thanks. Then bitter herbs were brought in, dipped in vinegar or salt water; of which they tasted meanwhile, until the proper paschal dishes were served, viz. the unleavened bread and roasted lamb, and further the Kha-gigah of the fourteenth day, and a broth or sauce (רביב) made with spices; Pesach 2. 8. The master of the house now pronounced a blessing over the bitter herbs, and ate of them dipped in the sauce; as did also the rest. After this the second cup was filled; the son inquired of the father the meaning of this celebration; and the latter instructed him as to its significancy, pointing out and explaining in their order the lamb, the bitter herbs, and the unleavened bread, etc. Then was repeated the first part of the Hallel or song of praise, Ps. 113, 114. The second cup was now drunk. The master of the family next took two cakes of the unleavened bread; broke one of them in two and laid it upon the other yet unbroken; and pronounced a blessing upon the bread.

¹ See the tract Pessachin c. 10. Lightfoot Minist. Templi c. 13. Hor. Heb. in Matt. 26: 26, 27. Othon. Lex. Rabb. p. 504 sq. Werner de Poculo Benedictionis, in Ugolini Thesaur. T. XXX. Wetstein in Matt. 1. c.

He then took a piece of the broken bread, wrapped it in bitter herbs, dipped it in the sauce, gave thanks, and ate it. Then followed the blessing upon the Khagigah, of which he ate a morsel; and finally the blessing upon the paschal lamb, of which he ate in like manner. Thereupon began the actual meal, in which they ate this or that as they pleased and at their leisure; partaking of the herbs, of the bread dipped in the sauce, of the flesh of the Khagigah, and lastly of the paschal lamb; after which last they ate nothing more. The eating being thus finished, the master of the family washed his hands and gave thanks for the meal. Next followed the giving of thanks over the *third* cup, called *קוס ברכה*, the cup of blessing, which was now drunk; compare the cup in the Eucharist, and also *τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας*, 1 Cor. 10: 16. Upon this, the fourth cup having been filled, the remainder of the Hallel, Ps. 115—118, was repeated; and the *fourth* cup was drunk. This was ordinarily the end of the celebration. But the Jews have a tradition, that when the guests were disposed to repeat further the great Hallel, Ps. 120—137, a *fifth* cup might thereupon be added.¹

It is obvious that the first cup spoken of above, corresponds to that mentioned in Luke 22: 17; and that the institution of the Lord's supper probably took place at the close of the proper meal, immediately before the third cup or "cup of blessing," which would seem to have made part of it; comp. 1 Cor. 10: 16.

VI. *Did our Lord, the night in which he was betrayed, eat the Passover with his Disciples?*

If we were to regard only the testimony of the first three Evangelists, not a doubt upon this question could ever arise. Their language upon this point is full, explicit and decisive, to the effect that our Lord's last meal with his disciples, as recorded by them all, was the regular and ordinary paschal supper of the Jews, introducing the festival of unleavened bread, on the evening after the fourteenth day of Nisan. Matthew and Mark narrate first, that the Passover was approaching after two days; then, that the first day of unleavened bread was come, when Jesus sent two of his disciples into the city to make ready the Passover, of which he and his disciples partook the same evening; Matt. 26: 2, 17—20. Mark 14: 1, 12—17. All this points directly and only to the regular lawful passover-meal, as

¹ See Lightfoot *Minist. Templi XIII.* 9. Buxtorf *Synagog. Jud.* c. 18.

celebrated by all the Jews the same evening. Mark's words are : *ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυσον*, when THEY killed the passover, v. 12 ; which, whether the subject of *ἔθυσον* be the Jews, or be indefinite, implies at least the regular and ordinary time of killing the paschal lamb. Luke's language is, if possible, still stronger and more definite : " Then came the day of unleavened bread, *ἡ ἡμέρα θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα*, when the passover must be killed," i. e. according to law and custom, Luke 22: 7. It was the first day of unleavened bread, the day on which the passover must be killed, of course the fourteenth day of Nisan ;¹ and on that same evening our Lord and his disciples sat down to that same passover-meal, which had thus by his own appointment been prepared for them, and of which Jesus speaks expressly of the passover, v. 16. Philologically considered, there cannot be—and I presume is not and has not been in the minds of the great body of commentators—a shadow of doubt, but that Matthew, Mark, and Luke intended to express, and do express, in the plainest terms, their testimony to the fact, that Jesus regularly partook of the ordinary and legal passover-meal on the evening after the fourteenth of Nisan, at the same time with all the Jews.

If, however, we turn to the Gospel of John, we seek in vain in this Evangelist for any trace of the paschal supper in connection with our Lord. John narrates indeed (c. 13) our Lord's last meal with his disciples ; which the attendant circumstances show to have been the same with that which the other Evangelists describe as the Passover. But on that point John is silent. Does this silence of itself imply, that it was *not* the Passover, and thus contradict the other Evangelists ? To admit this would prove far too much ; for John in like manner says not a word respecting the Lord's supper ; and yet no one doubts the testimony of the other Evangelists as to its institution during this meal. John, as is admitted by all, obviously wrote his Gospel as a supplement to the others. Hence, in speaking of this last meal, he does not mention the previous contention among the disciples, because Luke had sufficiently described it, Luke 22: 24—30 ; but he does narrate in addition the touching act of our Lord in washing his disciples' feet, which evidently arose out of that same contention. John narrates, indeed, like the rest, the pointing out of Judas as the traitor ; but he does it in order to add the further circumstance of his own particular agency in the matter. He omits, it is true, all mention of the Lord's supper, because the other Evangelists had fully described it ; but he gives in full, what they had not preserved, the

¹ See pp. 406, 407 above.

affecting discourses of our Lord held in connection with it, and his pathetic final prayer with his disciples, c. 17. The *silence* of John, therefore, does not in the case before us, imply even the slightest contradiction of the other Evangelists; while all the above circumstances, and the subsequent going out to the Mount of Olives, related also by John, where Jesus was betrayed, serve incontestably to mark this supper in John as identical with the passover-meal of the other Evangelists. They also sufficiently account for the difference between the two reports of the same occasion.

But there are a few expressions in John's Gospel, in connection with this meal and especially with our Lord's Passion, which taken together might, at first view and if we had only John, seem to imply, that on Friday, the day of our Lord's crucifixion, the regular and legal passover had not yet been eaten, but was still to be celebrated on the evening after that day. The following are the passages.

a) John 13: 1 *μετὶ δὲ τῆς ἄρατος τοῦ πάσχα.* This phrase introduces the account of our Lord's last meal; and the form of expression, it is said, shows that this meal took place *before* the passover, and could not therefore itself have been the paschal supper.

b) John 18: 28 "and they themselves [the Jews] went not into the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled, *ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα* but that they might eat the passover." Taking this last phrase in its ordinary acceptation of the paschal lamb, as in Matt. 26: 17, etc. it hence follows, as is averred, that the Jews were expecting to partake of the paschal supper the ensuing evening; and of course had not eaten it already.

c) John 19: 14 *ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα.* This "preparation of the passover," being the day on which Christ suffered, necessarily implies, it is alleged, the day before the passover-meal; which of course was to be eaten that evening.

d) John 19: 31 *ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου.* The next day after the crucifixion being the Jewish sabbath, and that sabbath being a "great day," we must infer, it is argued, that the reason of its being thus called "great" was the fact, that it coincided with the first day of the festival or fifteenth of Nisan, and was thus doubly consecrated.

These four are the passages mainly urged. Some other considerations are brought forward as auxiliary.

e) In John 13: 27—30, Jesus says to Judas, after giving him the sop, "that thou doest, do quickly." These words the other dis-

ciples did not comprehend; but supposed, among other things that Jesus had said to him, "Buy that we have need of for the feast." Now as this was spoken apparently near the close of this meal, it follows, as some think, that the passover-meal was yet to come, and could not have been that at which these words were uttered.

f) The same conclusion, it is affirmed, is greatly strengthened by the circumstance, that on the day of the crucifixion the Sanhedrim was convened, sat in judgment upon Jesus, condemned him, and delivered him over to death,—a public judicial act, which according to the Talmudists was unlawful upon the sabbath and upon all great festival days.¹

To all these different considerations we shall again recur in the sequel. It is only from the first four passages of John above cited, that any important difficulty has arisen, or can well arise, as to the question before us. The whole inquiry relates simply to the time of the Passover. According to all the four Evangelists, our Lord was crucified on Friday, the day before the Jewish sabbath; and his last meal with his disciples took place on the preceding evening, the same night in which he was betrayed. The simple question, therefore, at issue is, Did this Friday fall upon the fifteenth day of Nisan, or upon the fourteenth day? Or, in other words, did our Lord on the evening before his crucifixion eat the passover, as is testified by the first three Evangelists; or was the passover still to be eaten on the evening after that day, as John might seem to imply?

It cannot be denied, that if we had only the Gospel of John, we should naturally be led to adopt the latter view; for then there would be no opposing evidence whatever. In like manner, if we had only the Gospel of John, we should know nothing as to the institution of the Lord's supper. But since the testimony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, as we have already seen,² shows conclusively, that these inspired writers held to the first view, and intended so to record their testimony; we are compelled, either to seek out some mode of reconciling this apparent diversity of statement between John and them; or, to admit, that the discrepancy is irreconcilable. To this last point it has, of late years, been the effort of German neological commentators to bring the discussion of this subject. But the sincere inquirer, who holds the Gospel

¹ See Lightfoot *Hor. Heb. in Matt.* 27: 1. *Jahn Bibl. Archaeol.* III. ii. p. 309. *De Wette Archaeol.* § 218.

² See above, p. 413.

to be the inspired Word of God, will be slow to arrive at or admit any such conclusion, except upon irrefutable evidence. In this case no such evidence exists.

The question before us has been more or less a subject of discussion in the church ever since the earliest centuries; chiefly with a view to harmonize the difficulties. It is only in recent years, that the apparent difference between John and the other Evangelists has been urged to the extreme of attempting to make it irreconcilable.

VII. *Examination of passages in John's Gospel, etc.*

Admitting, as we must, and as we have already seen, that the testimony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, is too definite and explicit to be in any way set aside or modified, let us examine more closely the passages in John, and thus see whether they may, or may not, without violence and without any strained interpretation, be so understood, as to remove all appearance of discrepancy.

John obviously wrote his Gospel as supplementary to the other three. He had them then before him, and was aware that the other three Evangelists had testified to the fact, that Jesus partook of the passover with his disciples. Did John believe, that their testimony on this point was wrong; and did he mean to correct it? If so, we should naturally expect to find some notice of such a correction along with the mention of the meal itself, which John describes, as well as they. But is this the case? John narrates additional circumstances, which took place at the meal; and he does not indeed say it was the passover. But does he say or imply, that it was *not* the passover? Not at all; although this is what we should naturally expect, if it was his purpose to correct the testimony of the other Evangelists. As, therefore, on the one hand, we have already seen,¹ that there was a sufficient reason why he did not speak of that meal as the paschal supper; so here, on the other hand, no good reason can be assigned, why, if the testimony of the other Evangelists was wrong, John should not in the same connection have corrected it; as he might have done by a word. Indeed, that was the appropriate and only fitting place for such a correction. And as none is there found, we are authorized, to maintain, that it was not John's purpose thus and there to correct, or contradict the testimony of the other Evangelists; and if not

¹ Page 414 above.

there, much less by mere implication in other places and connections.

Let us now examine the passages adduced from John, in the same order as before.

A) John 13: 1 *πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα*, see p. 415, a. Here something may depend upon the import of *ἑορτή*. The proper and only signification of this word, as of the Hebrew *מִן*, is *festival*, not *feast*; that is, it implies both in classic and scriptural usage a yearly day or days of festive commemoration, never a single meal or entertainment. So in Num. 28: 16, 17, where the *paschal supper*, prepared on the fourteenth of Nisan and eaten at evening, is distinguished from the *festival*, Heb. *מִן*, Sept. *ἑορτή*, which began on the fifteenth and continued for seven days. See further Luke 2: 41. 22: 1; also the Lexicons and Concordances of the New Testament and Septuagint.

Interpreters differ as to the construction of John 13: 1. Griesbach and Knapp connect it with the following verses; and make the full sentence close at the end of v. 4. So too De Wette and others, who would thus make *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς* qualify the action in v. 4.¹ In favour of this view it is urged, that *εἰδώς* in v. 3 is nothing more than a resumption of *εἰδώς* in v. 1; while the phrase *εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς* in v. 1, does not express an action, but only a state of feeling, and therefore logically the mind does not rest upon it, but remains suspended until the action in v. 4. But the sentence thus formed is exceedingly involved and intricate, wholly unlike John's usual manner; and that without any necessity. A glance at the second *εἰδώς* shows that it has no relation to the first, but stands in a connection altogether different; and this De Wette admits. He further admits, that strict grammatical construction requires v. 1 to be made independent; against which he urges only the logical objection above stated. Yet *ἀγαπᾶω* in classic usage signifies not only *to love* as an emotion, but also *to manifest love* in action, to receive or treat with affection.² Hence the words in v. 1, *εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς*, imply not merely an emotion, but that Jesus *manifested his love* towards his disciples unto the end, in the touching manner which the Evangelist proceeds to relate. True logic, therefore, as well as strict grammar, requires us to regard v. 1 as an independent sentence, forming a fitting preface to the narrative which follows. As such it has been re-

¹ Exeget. Handb. Joh. 13: 1.

² See Passow Lex. s. voc. Hom. Od. 23. 214; also in N. T. Matt. 19: 19. Luke 6: 32. 2 Cor. 12: 15.

garded by Mill, Wetstein, Bengel, Hahn, Lachmann, Tholuck, and a host of others; and particularly by Lücke and Meyer, who in other respects press the alleged testimony of John as to the Passover.

It follows that the qualifying power of *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς* is restricted to v. 1; and in that verse it may be referred to different clauses.

1. It may qualify *εἰδώς κ. τ. λ.* and then the sense is: "Jesus, knowing before the festival of the Passover that his hour was come," etc. comp. John 12: 23. Matt. 17: 9, 22 sq. 20: 17—19. al. In this way the passage has no bearing whatever upon the present question as to the passover. This view is maintained by Meyer with emphasis.

2. It may qualify the words *εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς*. In this case the phrase *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς* is equivalent to *ἐν τῷ προεορτίῳ*, i. e. the time immediately before the festival; which again is viewed in different aspects. (a) It is said, that as *πρόλογος* signifies a part of the discourse itself, *πρόδομος* part of the house, *πρόγλωσσις* part of the tongue, *προκόμιον* part of the hair, *προτειχίσμα* part of the wall, etc. etc., so *προεορτίον* is the *forepart* or beginning of the festival itself. Hence the equivalent phrase, *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς*, here marks the time of the paschal-meal, with which the festival was introduced. So Bochart.¹ (b) Others regard *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς* as here referring particularly to the commencement (at evening) of the fifteenth day of Nisan, as the first or opening day of the festival of unleavened bread, distinct from the mere paschal supper; see Num. 28: 16, 17, cited above. The phrase *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς* is in that case equivalent to the Engl. *festival-even*, and here marks the evening immediately before the *ἑορτή* or festival proper; on which eve, during the supper, our Lord "manifested his love for his disciples unto the end," by the touching symbolical act of washing their feet. So in Philo *προεορτίον* is i. q. *παρασκευή*.² The following remarks of Lücke are to the point: "As John wrote for Greeks and other readers unacquainted with the Jewish mode of reckoning time, and is here directly speaking only of the preparation of the meal and what preceded it,—while the preparation of the passover-meal did actually take place on the fourteenth of Nisan, the true *προεορτίον*,—he therefore could very properly use the expression *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα* without intending to say that the meal itself was eaten on the fourteenth day. At any rate the word *πρό* is here too indefinite and relative,

¹ Hieroz. lib. II. c. 50. p. 564.

² Philo de Vita contempl. p. 616.

to draw from it the inference, that the meal described was eaten on the evening which followed the thirteenth and began the fourteenth of Nisan.¹

In any case, therefore, this passage does not require us to admit the inference which some have drawn from it.

B) John 18: 28 ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα, see p. 415 b. This passage is perhaps the strongest of all. To bring out from it, however, the inference that on the day of the crucifixion the paschal supper had not yet been eaten, the expression φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα must be taken in the limited sense: *to eat the paschal supper*; and this, it is affirmed, is the true and only usage of the phrase in the New Testament or elsewhere. This last assertion is correct; for, besides the present instance, the expression φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα occurs only five times in the New Testament, viz. Matt 26: 17. Mark 14: 12, 14. Luke 22: 11, 15; and but once in the Greek version of the Old Testament, 2 Chron. 30: 18; in all which passages the context limits it necessarily to the paschal-supper. But it by no means hence follows, where the phrase is used generally and without the mention of any restrictive circumstances, that there also it must be taken in a like limited sense. The word πάσχα at least, is not always so taken.

The primary signification of the Hebrew פֶּסַח (Sept. πάσχα, in Chron. πασέx) is a *passing over*, a *sparing* from punishment or calamity; as Ex. 12: 27 יָבִיחַ פֶּסַח הוּא לַיהוָה a *sacrifice of passing over (sparing) is this to Jehovah*. Hence it came naturally to denote *the paschal lamb*, slain as a victim in this sacrifice of sparing; Ex. 12: 21. 2 Chr. 30: 15, 17. 35: 1, 5; in N. T. Mark 14: 12. Luke 22: 7. metaph. 1 Cor. 5: 7.—From this it was an easy transition to employ it for *the paschal meal*, at which the lamb was eaten with various accompaniments and rites on the evening after the fourteenth of Nisan; Ex. 12: 48. Num. 9: 4, 5. Josh. 5: 10; and so in N. T. Matt. 26: 18, 19. Mark 14: 16. Luke 22: 8, 13. Heb. 11: 28. Here too belongs the phrase אָכַל הַפֶּסַח, Sept. φαγεῖν τὸ πασέx, which occurs but once, 2 Chron. 30: 18; and in N. T. φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα, found five times elsewhere, as already cited. — Hence again τὸ πάσχα came to signify *the paschal day*, or fourteenth of Nisan, on which the passover was killed, Lev. 23: 5; and we once find the expression אָכַל הַפֶּסַח, Sept. ἐσθῆν τὸν πάσχα, Ex. 34: 25; comp. further Josh. 5: 11. Num. 33: 3. This sense of πάσχα is not found in the New Testament.—As however the seven days of unleavened bread were intimately connected with the פֶּסַח, the

¹ Lücke Comm. zu John 13: 1.

word came to stand, at least in the later Hebrew usage, for the whole festival of seven days; see Ez. 45: 21. 2 Chron. 35: 18, 19 coll. 17. Indeed, it would seem to have been so used as early as the time of the Pentateuch; see Deut. 16: 2, where the people are commanded to sacrifice the קורבן even *stock and herd* (בצאן ובעֶבְרֵי); which mode of expression can well refer only to the extraordinary sacrifices of the seven festival days.¹ In the times of the New Testament this usage had become the prevailing one; as indeed is expressly intimated in Luke 22: 1, *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἢ λεγομένη πάσχα*. So too in all the remaining passages where the word is found, Luke 2: 41 coll. 43. Matt 26: 2. Mark 14: 1. John 2: 13, 23. 6: 11, 55 bis. 12: 1. 13: 1. 18: 39. 19: 14. Acts 12: 4. Among the still later Jews also, the קורבן is spoken of as continuing seven days; Pesach. 9. 5. — From all this it appears, that the word *τὸ πάσχα*, *passover*, is employed in the New Testament in three different and specific acceptations, viz. 1. *The paschal lamb*. 2. *The paschal meal*. 3. *The paschal festival*, comprising the seven days of unleavened bread.

As now there is nothing in the circumstances nor in the context of John 18: 28, to limit the meaning of *τὸ πάσχα* in itself either to the paschal lamb or paschal meal, we certainly are not bound by any intrinsic necessity so to understand it here in the phrase *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα*. If, on the other hand, we adopt for it in this place the wider sense of *paschal festival*, two modes of interpretation are admissible.

1. The first mode takes *τὸ πάσχα* in its literal and widest sense of *passover-festival*; but modifies the force of *φαγεῖν*. In this way the phrase *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* may be understood as put in a loose popular usage instead of the common *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα*, *to keep or celebrate the passover*. The Hebrew exhibits a like phraseology in respect to this very festival; 2 Chr. 30: 22 $\text{וַיֵּאָכְלוּ אֶת-לֶחֶם הַפֶּסַח שִׁבְעַת יָמִים וַיִּשְׂבְּרוּ אֶת-הַכֶּבֶד בְּיָמֵינוּ$ and *they did eat the festival seven days*. So the Seventy at least understood it; as is manifest from their version: *καὶ συντέλεσαν τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν ἀζύμων ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας*, and *they fulfilled (kept) the festival of unleavened bread seven days*.

2. The second mode retains *φαγεῖν* in its literal acceptation; takes *πάσχα* still in its widest signification; but assigns to the latter by metonymy the sense of *paschal sacrifices*, that is, the voluntary peace-offerings and thank-offerings made in the temple during the paschal festival, and more especially on the fifteenth day

¹ See above, p. 410.

of Nisan. These sacrifices, called in later times *Khagigah* (חגיגה), have already been particularly described.¹ That the word *πάσχα*, in the general sense of *festival*, is susceptible of such a metonymy, is apparent from Hebrew analogies. So, according to modern interpreters, in the same passage 2 Chr. 30: 22, חגיגה *festival*, by meton. *festive offerings*; where the next clause specifies the kind of sacrifices, viz. peace offerings.² So too חג, the common word for festival; e. g. Ps. 118: 27 אָסְרֵינוּ גְבָרִים וְעַבְדֵינוּ *bind the sacrifice (festive offering) with cords*, etc. Ex. 23: 18. Mal. 2: 3. The same metonymy is found likewise in the Talmud, where it is asked: מָה טַא' טַסַח *what is the passover?* and the reply is: שְׁלַמֵי טַסַח *the peace-offerings of the passover*, that is, the *Khagigah*.³

It is manifest, that both the above methods of interpretation are founded upon fair analogies; and that either of them relieves us from the necessity of referring the phrase in question to the paschal supper, and thus removes the alleged difficulty. The chief priests and other members of the Sanhedrim, on the morning of the first day of the festival, were unwilling to defile themselves by entering beneath the roof of the Gentile procurator; since in this way they would have been debarred from partaking of the sacrificial offerings and banquets, which were customary on that day in the temple and elsewhere; and in which they from their station were entitled and expected to participate.

This view receives some further confirmation from the circumstance, that the defilement which the Jews would thus have contracted by entering the dwelling of a heathen, could only have belonged to that class of impurities from which a person might be cleansed the same day by ablution; the טְבִילַת יוֹם *ablution of a day*, so called by the Talmudists.⁴ If now the *πάσχα* in John 18: 28 was truly the paschal supper, and was not to take place until the evening after the day of the crucifixion, then this defilement of a day could have been no bar to their partaking of it; for at evening they were clean. Their scruple, therefore, in order to be well founded, could have had reference only to the *Khagigah* or paschal sacrifices offered during the same day before evening.⁵

C) John 19: 14 ἡ δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, see p. 415. c. The force of this passage depends upon the answer given to the following question, viz. Does this *παρασκευὴ* refer, as usual, only to

¹ See above, p. 410.

² See Simonis, Gesenius, and others.

³ Rosh Hashana 5. 1. See Reland Antiqq. Sac. 4. 3. 11.

⁴ See Lev. 15: 5 seq. 17: 15. 22: 6. Num. 19: 7 sq. Maimonid. Pesach. 6. 1. Lightfoot Hor. Heb. in John 18: 28. Winer Realw. II. p. 377.

⁵ See Bynæus de Morte J. C. 3. 1. p. 13.

the Jewish sabbath, which actually occurred the next day? or does it here refer to the festival of the Passover *per se*, as distinct from the sabbath? It is only on the latter supposition, that the language can be made in any way to conflict with the testimony of the other Evangelists.

The Greek word *παρασκευή*, *preparation*, is elsewhere found five times in the New Testament, viz. Matt. 27: 62. Mark 15: 42. Luke 23: 64. John 19: 31, 42. Mark defines it to be the *προσάββατον*, *fore-sabbath*, the day or hours immediately preceding the weekly sabbath and devoted to preparation for that sacred day. No trace of any such observance is found in the Old Testament. Yet the strictness of the law respecting the sabbath, which forbade the kindling of fire and of course the preparation of food on that day (Ex. 35: 2, 3. comp. 16: 22—27), would very naturally lead to the introduction of such a custom. After the exile the *προσάββατον* is once mentioned in the Apocrypha, Judith 8: 6. In later times, *ἡ παρασκευή* would seem to have become the usual Greek term for this observance, as in the New Testament and in Josephus.¹ Philo calls it *προόρτιον*.² In the still later Hebrew it bore the specific appellation of *קַרְפָּיִי*, *eve*, as being the *קַרְפָּיִי* *עֵבֶר*, *eve of the sabbath*.³ Primarily and strictly this *παρασκευή* or *eve* would seem to have commenced not earlier than the ninth hour of the preceding day; as is perhaps implied in the decree of Augustus in favour of the Jews, preserved by Josephus: *ἔγγυας τε μὴ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν σάββασις ἢ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης παρασκευῇ ἀπὸ ὥρας ἐνάτης*. But in process of time, the same Hebrew word came in popular usage to be the distinctive name for the *day* before the Jewish sabbath, that is, for the sixth day of the week or Friday.⁴ Nor was the use of this Hebrew word for the Greek *παρασκευή* confined to the Jews; for the like Syriac form *ܩܪܦܝܝܢܐ*, is found for *παρασκευή* in the Syriac version of the New Testament; and, in like manner, the corresponding Arabic word, *العربية*, is given in the Camoos as an ancient name for Friday.⁵ We are therefore entitled to infer, that *ἡ παρασκευή*, that is, the *παρασκευή* of the weekly sabbath, became at an early date among Jews, Syrians, and Arabs, a current appellation for the sixth day of the week. This inference is also strengthened by the very peculiar phrase-

¹ Jos. Antt. 16. 6. 2.

² Philo de Vita contempl. p. 616.

³ Buxtorf Lex. p. 1659.

⁴ Jos. Antt. 16. 6. 2.

⁵ Bereshith Rabba, § 11. Buxtorf Lex. p. 1659. Compare the German *Sonabend* for Saturday.

⁶ See Golius p. 1551. Freytag III. p. 130.

ology of Matt. 27: 62; where the Evangelist speaks of the Jewish sabbath as *ἡ ἀπαύριον, ἣτις ἐστὶ μετὰ τῆς παρασκευῆς*, the *morrow after the preparation*, that is, the next day after Friday. It is not easy to account for this mode of expression, except upon the supposition, that *ἡ παρασκευή* was already in common use as a specific name for the sixth day; as much so, indeed, as the sabbath for the seventh day.

The reasons which operated to introduce a *προσάββατον*, or preparation for the sabbath, did not exist in the case of the other festivals, on which the preparation of food was not forbidden; Ex. 12: 16. Nevertheless, what had become customary in respect to the sabbath, would naturally be imitated in other cases; and accordingly after the exile we find mention of the *προουμηνία*, *eve of the new moon*, Judith 8: 6. In the Talmudists a *passover-eve*, *עֶרֶב פֶּסַח*, is likewise spoken of.¹ But what this could well have been, so long as the passover (paschal supper) was regularly celebrated at Jerusalem, it is difficult to perceive. The *eve* (עֶרֶב) before the passover festival could have included, at most, only the evening and the few hours before sunset at the close of the fourteenth of Nisan; like the primary usage in respect to the *προσάββατον*, as we have just seen. But according to all usage of language both in the Old and New Testament, those hours and that evening were the *Passover itself*, and not its preparation; unless indeed the paschal meal and its accompaniments be called the preparation of the subsequent festival of seven days; which again is contrary to all usage. It would seem most probable, therefore, that this mode of expression did not arise until after the destruction of the temple and the consequent cessation of the regular and legal passover-meal; subsequently to which event the seven days of unleavened bread became of course the main festival, and were introduced by a symbolical paschal supper (*πάσχα μενημοσεντικόν*) on the preceding evening. This latter might then easily come to be spoken of as the *eve* of the passover-festival.

But even admitting that a *passover-eve* (עֶרֶב פֶּסַח) did exist in the time of our Lord; still, the expression could in no legitimate way be so far extended as to include more than a few hours before sunset. It could not have commenced apparently before the ninth hour, when they began to kill the paschal lambs; see p. 406. On the other hand, the Hebrew term *עֶרֶב פֶּסַח*, for which the Greek *παρασκευή* stands in the New Testament, was employed, as we have seen, as a specific name in popular usage for

¹ Buxtorf. *Lex.* p. 1765.

the whole sixth day of the week or Friday, not only by the Jews, but also by the Syrians and Arabs. Hence, when John here says: ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ἕρᾳ δὲ ὥσει ἔκρη, there is a two-fold difficulty in referring his language to a preparation or eve of the regular passover; *first*, because apparently no such eve or preparation did or could well then exist; and *secondly*, because, it being then the sixth hour or midday, the eve or time of preparation (supposing it to exist) had not yet come, and the language was therefore inapplicable. But if John be understood as here speaking of the weekly παρασκευὴ or προσάββατον, which was a common name for the whole of Friday, then the mention of the sixth hour was natural and appropriate.

We come then to the conclusion, that if John, like Mark in c. 15: 42, had here defined the phrase in question, he would probably have written on this wise: ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ὃ ἐστιν προσάββατον τοῦ πάσχα, that is, the paschal Friday, the day of preparation or fore-sabbath which occurred during the paschal festival. In a similar manner Ignatius writes σάββατον τοῦ πάσχα, and Socrates σάββατον τῆς ἑορτῆς.¹ This interpretation is further supported by the fact, that John, when speaking, in vs. 31, 42, of the self-same day of our Lord's crucifixion, employs παρασκευὴ in this its current acceptation, of the weekly preparation. Especially is the mode of expression to be noted in v. 42, διὰ τῆν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, implying of itself that the weekly παρασκευὴ or προσάββατον, and no other, was an ordinary and well known public institution of the Jews.

D) John 19: 31 ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου, see p. 416. d. Here we may ask, Was such a paschal sabbath called "great" solely because the first day of the paschal festival fell upon it? or might it be so called for other reasons? The former part of this question is affirmed by those who maintain the alleged discrepancy between John and the other Evangelists; while of course they do not, because they cannot deny the latter part. The coincidence of the first festival day with the sabbath, would certainly make the latter a great day; but the sabbath of the passover, even when it fell upon the second day of the festival, would still be a great day. The last day of the festival of Tabernacles is called "that great day;" though in itself not more sacred than the first day; John 7: 37. comp. Lev. 23: 34—36. So κληρὸ κληρ, the calling of assemblies, Is. 1: 13, is rendered ἡμέρα μεγάλη by the Seventy, implying that in their estimation any day

¹ Ignat. Ep. ad Phil. c. 13. Socrat. Hist. Ecc. V. 22.

of solemn convocation was a great day. The sabbath then, upon which the sixteenth of Nisan or second day of the festival fell, might be called "great" for various reasons. *First*, as the sabbath of the great national festival, when all Israel was gathered before the Lord. *Secondly*, as the day when the first-fruits were presented with solemn rites in the temple; a ceremony paramount in its obligations even to the sabbath.¹ *Thirdly*, because on that day they began to reckon the fifty days before the festival of Pentecost, Lev. 23: 15 sq. In all these circumstances there is certainly enough to warrant the epithet "great," as applied to the sabbath on which the sixteenth of Nisan might fall, as compared with other sabbaths.—There exists, therefore, no necessity for supposing, that John by this language meant to describe the sabbath in question as coincident with the fifteenth of Nisan or first paschal day.

The investigation thus far, as it seems to me, presents a fair and natural interpretation of the four main passages adduced from John's Gospel. Nothing has been assumed, and nothing brought forward, except as founded on just inference and safe analogy. The strongest of all these passages is doubtless John 18: 28; and had this not existed, the others probably would never have been relied upon as affording ground for an attempt to overthrow the credibility and authority of one Gospel or of three.—The other considerations above presented have still less force.

E) John 13: 27—30; see p. 415. e. When Jesus said to Judas: "That thou doest, do quickly," some of the disciples thought he meant to say: "Buy what we have need of *εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν* for the festival." Here no discrepancy with the other Evangelists could ever have been alleged, except by referring *ἑορτή* to the paschal meal, which it never signifies.² The disciples thought Judas was to buy the things necessary for the festival on the fifteenth and following days. If now our Lord's words were spoken on the evening preceding and introducing the fifteenth of Nisan, they were appropriate; for it was already quite late to make purchases for the following day. But if they were uttered on the evening preceding and introducing the fourteenth of Nisan, they were not thus appropriate; for then no haste was necessary, since a whole day was yet to intervene before the festival. This passage, therefore, so far as it bears at all upon the question, instead of contra-

¹ See above, p. 408. Lightfoot Hor. Heb. in Job. 10: 31. Reland Antiqq. Sec. 4. 2. 4. p. 227.

² See above, p. 418. A.

vening the testimony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, goes rather to support it.

F) There remains the objection, that a public judicial act, like that by which Jesus was condemned and executed, was unlawful upon the sabbath and on all great festival days.¹ This consideration has at first view some weight, and has been often and strenuously urged; yet it is counterbalanced by several circumstances which very greatly weaken its force. The execution itself took place under Roman authority; and therefore does not here come into account. And as to the action of the Sanhedrim, even admitting that the prohibitory precepts cited above from the Talmud were already extant and binding in the times of the New Testament,—a position in itself very doubtful,—yet the chief priests and Pharisees and Scribes, who composed the Sanhedrim, are everywhere denounced by our Lord as hypocrites, “who say, and do not; who bind heavy burdens upon others, but themselves touch them not with one of their fingers;” *Matt.* 23: 1 sq. Such men, in their rage against Jesus, would hardly have been restrained even by their own precepts. They professed likewise, and perhaps some of them believed, that they were doing God service; and regarded the condemnation of Jesus as a work of religious duty, paramount to the obligations of any festival. Yet in fact, the first and holy day of the festival did not demand the same strict observance that was due to the sabbath. On this day they might prepare food; which might not be done upon the sabbath; *Ex.* 12: 16. comp. *Ex.* 35: 2, 3. 16: 22 sq. On this day too, the morning after the paschal supper, the Jews might return home from Jerusalem, whatever the distance; an extent of travel not permitted on the weekly sabbath; *Deut.* 16: 6, 7. Further, in the time of our Lord, the practice of the Jews at least, if not their precepts, would seem to have interposed no obstacle to such a judicial transaction. We learn from *John* 10: 22, 31, that on the festival of Dedication, as Jesus was teaching in the temple, “the Jews took up stones to stone him.” On the day after the crucifixion, which, as all agree, was the sabbath and a “great day,” the Sanhedrim applied to Pilate for a watch; and themselves caused the sepulchre to be sealed, and the watch to be set; *Matt.* 27: 62 sq. A stronger instance still is recorded in *John* 7: 32, 37, 44, 45. It there appears, that on the last GREAT DAY of the festival of Tabernacles, the Sanhedrim having sent

¹ See above, p. 416. f.

out officers to seize Jesus, "some of them would have taken him, but no man laid hands on him;" so that the officers returned without him to the Sanhedrim, and were in consequence censured by that body. The circumstances show conclusively, that on this last great day of that festival the Sanhedrim were in session and waiting for Jesus to be brought before them as a prisoner. Nor was it merely a casual or packed meeting, but one regularly convened; for Nicodemus was present with them; v. 50. And finally, according to Matt. 26: 3—5, the Sanhedrim, when afterwards consulting to take Jesus and put him to death, decided not to do it on the festival; why? Because it would be unlawful? Not at all; but simply "lest there should be an uproar among the people." Through the treachery of Judas they were enabled to execute their long cherished purpose without danger of a tumult; and the occasion was too opportune not to be gladly seized upon, even on a great festival day.—These considerations seem to me to sweep away the whole force of this objection; on which Scaliger and Casaubon, as also Beza and Calov, laid great stress; and which Lücke has again brought forward and urged with no little parade.

Some other minor considerations, formerly advanced by those who hold that Jesus was crucified before the passover, are examined and refuted by earlier writers; particularly by Bochart.¹ As however these are no longer brought forward by the more recent advocates of that view, it is not necessary to dwell upon them here.

Such then is a general review of the passages and arguments, on the strength of which the alleged discrepancy between John and the other Evangelists in respect to this passover has usually been maintained. After repeated and calm consideration, there rests upon my own mind a clear conviction, that there is nothing in the language of John, nor in the attendant circumstances, which upon fair interpretation requires or permits us to believe, that the beloved disciple either intended to correct, or has in fact corrected or contradicted, the explicit and unquestionable testimony of Matthew, Mark and Luke.

VIII. *Early Historical Testimony.*

On the other hand, some circumstances in the early history of the Christian church seem to favour the idea, that among the

¹ See Bochart, Hieroz. lib. II. c. 50. p. 569 sq.

primitive teachers, those who were most familiar with the writings and views of the apostle John, held to the belief that our Lord did celebrate the regular passover with his disciples on the evening before his crucifixion. The question which we have been discussing, seems to have first arisen in connection with the great passover controversy of the second and following centuries. In those churches which had been mostly gathered from Jewish converts, as in Asia Minor, it would seem to have been a rule to lay aside only so much of Jewish observances as was matter of necessity. They therefore continued to keep the passover on the evening after the fourteenth of Nisan, simultaneously with the Jews; and made this the central point of their celebration of our Lord's passion and resurrection, on whatever day of the week it might occur. But in the churches formed mostly from Gentile converts, like those of the West, a contrary rule apparently prevailed; and they retained only so much of Jewish observances as was absolutely essential. They therefore kept no passover; but celebrated annually the resurrection of our Lord on a Sunday, and observed the preceding Friday as a day of penitence and fasting.

This diversity of Christian practice seems to have been first brought into friendly discussion, when Polycarp of Smyrna, the disciple of John, paid a visit to Anicetus bishop of Rome, in A. D. 162. Polycarp testified, that he had once celebrated the regular Jewish passover with the apostle John; while Anicetus appealed to the fact, that his predecessors had introduced nothing of the kind.¹ Later, about A. D. 170, the subject again came up in Asia Minor. Melito of Sardis wrote apparently in favour of the Jewish-Christian usage; and Apollinaris of Hierapolis in Phrygia, against it.² Yet no interruption of fellowship took place between the churches of the East and West; and Christians from Asia Minor found in Rome a fraternal reception and were welcome to the communion.

But under the Roman bishop Victor, the controversy broke out anew in A. D. 190, between the Romish church on the one side, with which the churches of Alexandria, Tyre, Cesarea, and Jerusalem took part, and the churches of Asia Minor on the other side, of which Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, was now the leader. Among several other points in the controversy, the main inquiry now was, Whether the yearly passover was to be retained, and the Jewish law followed in respect to the time? The opponents,

¹ See Euseb. H. E. V. 24.

² Euseb. H. E. IV. 26.

or at least Apollinaris, Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus, according to the fragments preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*,¹ affirmed, that "the last meal of Jesus with his disciples was not the passover; since according to John's Gospel Christ partook of it on the thirteenth of Nisan; while on the following day, which was the appointed time for the Jewish passover, he offered up himself as the true sacrifice for mankind, of which the passover was the type." The title or argument of the tract of Apollinaris, was: "Ὅτι ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ὁ κύριος ἔπαθεν, οὐκ ἔφαγεν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσχα. On the other side, Polycrates wrote an epistle to Victor, preserved by Eusebius,² in which he asserts that the Asiatics celebrated the true and genuine day: and appeals to the testimony and practice of apostles and others, viz. the apostle Philip who died at Hierapolis; the apostle John who taught in Asia Minor and died at Ephesus; the martyr Polycarp and other bishops and teachers; of whom he says:³ "These all kept the day of the passover on the fourteenth, according to the Gospel; deviating in nothing, but following according to the rule of faith." Of his own seven relatives, who also had been bishops, Polycrates says:⁴ "And these my relatives always celebrated the day, when the [Jewish] people put away the leaven." The result of the controversy at this time was, that Victor attempted to break off communion with the Asiatic churches. For this step he was strongly censured by Ignatius bishop of Lyons, in a letter preserved by Eusebius;⁵ and other bishops likewise raised their voices against the rash measure. Through their efforts peace was at length restored; and both parties remained undisturbed in their own modes of observance, until the great council of Nicea in A. D. 325, where this question was finally decided in favour of the West. The few scattering churches, which afterwards continued to keep the passover according to the Jewish time, were accounted heretics, and are known in history as *Quatuordecimani*, or "Fourteenth-day men."⁶

From the preceding narrative it is manifest, that the passages of

¹ Chron. Pasch. I. p. 13. ed Dindorf.

² Euseb. H. E. V. 24.

³ Euseb. l. c. Οὗτοι πάντες ἐπέφυγον τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης τοῦ πάσχα κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· μηδὲν παρεμβαίνοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ἀκολουθοῦντες.

⁴ Euseb. l. c. Καὶ πάντοτε τὴν ἡμέραν ἔγαγον οἱ συγγενεῖς μου ὅταν ὁ κύριος ἔφαγε τὸ πάσχα.

⁵ Euseb. H. E. V. 24.

⁶ See Neander K. G. I. ii. p. 518—524. II. ii. p. 643—645. Gieseler K. G. I. pp. 198, 235.

John's Gospel which we have reviewed above, were already regarded and urged by Apollinaris and the western churches, in the latter part of the second century, as conflicting with the testimony of the first three Evangelists; that is, as implying that our Lord's last meal with his disciples was not the regular paschal supper. On the other hand, it is no less manifest from the language of Polycrates, that the teachers and churches of Asia Minor, among whom John had lived and taught, celebrated the passover on the evening after the fourteenth of Nisan, in agreement, as they held, with the example of John himself and *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, "according to the Gospel." Now whether the writer here meant a single Gospel; or, as is more probable, the whole Gospel history; he evidently alludes to that celebration of the passover, which, according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, our Lord held with his disciples; for nowhere else does the Gospel history speak of the time or manner of keeping the passover. We are therefore entitled to draw from the language of Polycrates this inference, viz. that he and those before him in Asia Minor, who had been familiar with John and other apostles, had no belief that John's Gospel contained anything respecting the passover, at variance with the testimony of the other Evangelists.

That the contrary opinion should have sprung up and have been urged in the West, among churches composed mainly of Gentile Christians, is not surprising. It went to sustain their favourite view, that the passover was no longer to be observed; and it also accorded generally with their feeling of opposition and hatred against the Jewish people. As a result of the latter feeling, which became more and more intense as time rolled on, it was held to be a shame for the Christian church to regulate itself after the pattern of the unbelieving Jews, who had crucified the Lord; and this suggestion had weight in the Council of Nicea. Even the emperor did not disdain to urge it in his epistle to the churches: *μηδὲν ἴστω ἡμῖν κοινὸν μετὰ τοῦ ἐχθίστου τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὄχλου*.¹ While therefore the western churches had strong motives to adopt and press the argument to be derived thus speciously from John's Gospel, the Asiatic churches had no like motives for adhering to the testimony of the other Evangelists. The belief and practice of these latter churches could have rested only on tradition; a tradition, too, derived from John himself and his immediate disciples and companions.

On all grounds, then, both of philology and history, the conclu-

¹ Euseb. de Vit. Constantini III. 18

sion remains firm, that the testimony of John in respect to the passover need not be, and is not to be, understood as conflicting with that of the first three Evangelists.

IX. *Other Methods of Conciliation reviewed.*

Among all those who have in every age held the view, that our Lord was crucified before the Jewish passover, the idea seems never to have been entertained; that the apparent diversity of testimony between John and the other Evangelists afforded any ground for questioning the authority or inspiration of either. On the contrary, the endeavour has ever been, until recent times, so to interpret the language of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, or else that of John, as to bring their statements into harmony with each other.

1. The earliest and perhaps most current mode of explanation in the Greek and Latin churches, was that indicated in the extract from the *Chronicon Paschale* above given,¹ viz. that Jesus on the evening after the thirteenth of Nisan celebrated, not the Jewish passover, but a special paschal supper, a *πάσχα ἀληθινόν καὶ ἀρίστου*, the antitype of the Jewish passover, in order to institute the Lord's supper in connection with it; and that he himself on the fourteenth of Nisan was offered up for mankind as the true paschal victim. This view is likewise found in the fragments of Peter of Alexandria preserved in the preface of the *Chronicon Paschale*, and in other Greek writers; and has been adopted in modern times by B. Lamy and Toinard, by Calmet and Deyling, and especially by Gude.² The insuperable objection to this view is the clear and decisive testimony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; which has been already stated and considered.³

2. Another mode of explanation assumes that Jesus did indeed eat the Jewish passover; although not at the same time with the other Jews. To account for this supposed difference of time, several hypotheses have been brought forward; none of which are tenable even *per se*, and much less in opposition to the clear language of the first three Evangelists. They follow here in the order of time.

a) The Jews, it is said, following the calculations of their calen-

¹ Page 430 above.

² See the Harmonies of Lamy and Toinard. Deyling Obs. Sac. l. p. 273. Gude Demonstr. quod Christus in coena sua *σταυρωσήμερον* agnum paschalem non comedit. Lips. 1733, 1742.

³ See above, p. 413 sq.

dar, had deferred the beginning of the passover for one day; while our Lord, according to the letter of the Law, ate the paschal supper on the evening after the true fourteenth day of Nisan. In support of this theory, or rather conjecture, the *ἔδει θύσθαι* of Luke 22: 7 is particularly urged. So Scaliger and Casaubon.¹

b) The modern Karaites, who are thought by some to be descended from the Sadducees, determine the time of the new-moon by its first appearance; the other Jews, by astronomical calculation. Now this same diversity, it is said, may have prevailed in the time of our Lord; and thus the Sadducees, and Jesus with them, have celebrated the passover that year a day earlier than the rest of the nation. So L. Cappell, and especially Iken.² But here too the whole hypothesis is gathered from the air. The Karaites are not known to have had any connection whatever with the Sadducees; the new-moon was never determined by astronomical calculation so long as the temple stood; and had such been the rule of the Pharisees, then, as the conjunction of the sun and moon necessarily precedes the appearance of the new-moon by a day, the celebration of the Pharisees must have taken place a day first; and not a day later. And why, moreover, should Jesus have kept the passover with the Sadducees rather than with the great majority of his nation?³

c) Jesus may have celebrated such a passover as is kept by the Jews of the present day, a *πάσχα μνημοσυνητικόν*, not a *πάσχα θύσιμον*, that is, consisting of merely a lamb killed in the ordinary manner, with unleavened bread; a voluntary passover, not one prescribed by law. So Grotius, Hammond, and Le Clerc.⁴ But such a mode of celebrating the passover could not exist, and would have been unlawful, especially in Jerusalem itself, so long as the temple was standing; where the victims were always to be killed.

d) Our Lord, it is said by some, foreseeing that the vengeance of his enemies would overtake him before the close of the fourteenth of Nisan, when the regular paschal supper was to be eaten, celebrated it one day earlier in his character of Messiah, as thus

¹ Scaliger, *Emendat. Temporum* 6. p. 531. Casaubon, *Exercit. Antibar.* 16. 13. p. 496 sq.

² Ikenii in *Dissertt. philol. theol.* II. p. 337—471. See also this view stated in Bochart *Hieroz.* II. 50. p. 564. Kaunoel in *Matt.* 26: 17. C.

³ See Bochart l. c. Winer *Bibl. Realw.* II. p. 240.

⁴ Grotius in *Matt.* 26: 18. Hammond and Le Clerc in *Mark* 14: 12.

having power over the law.¹ But of all this there is no trace in the New Testament.

Indeed, this whole theory of an *anticipative* passover, in whatever way explained, is totally irreconcilable with the exact and definite specifications of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, that the day on which our Lord sent his disciples to prepare the passover, was the first day of unleavened bread, the day when it was necessary (*ἐθελ*) that the passover should be killed; Matt. 27: 16. Mark 14: 12. Luke 22: 7.²

3. A later hypothesis attempts to remove the difficulty, by assuming that the paschal lamb was legally to be killed and eaten, not at the close of the fourteenth of Nisan, but at its commencement; that is, at the close of the thirteenth day and in the subsequent evening; so that the whole fourteenth day would intervene between the paschal supper and the festival of unleavened bread, which legally began on the fifteenth day. So first Frisch, and after him Rauch.³ But this hypothesis is in direct contradiction to Num. 33: 3, as also to Ex. 12: 6. Lev. 23: 5. Num. 9: 3, 5.⁴ Nor does it even remove the main difficulty; for it does not touch the question respecting John 18: 28; but leaves that passage, the most important of all, to be explained as we have done above.

It is painful thus to dwell upon these shifts of great and learned and often pious minds to escape from a supposed difficulty which in fact does not exist. Still more painful is it, to find professed teachers of the Bible, pressing the alleged difficulty to an extreme, in order to overthrow the authority of that Holy Book; and venturing sometimes upon assertions like that of De Wette, when he affirms that "the important contradiction between John and the other Evangelists remains firm; and all attempts to remove it are false!"⁵ We hold, on the contrary, that the four Evangelists all testify to one and the same simple truth; and that there exists among them no contradiction. The more we have examined, the more has our conviction been strengthened, that the testimony of John, fairly interpreted, here as well as elsewhere, is not only supplementary to, but confirmatory of, that of Matthew, Mark and Luke.

¹ So J. H. Maius de Tempore Pasch. Chr. ultimo, 1712. Seb. Schmid de Paschate p. 398. Kühnol ad Matt. 26: 17. F. Comp. Ideler Chronol. I. p. 521.

² See above, p. 413.

³ Frisch Abhandl. von Osterlamm. Lips. 1758. Rauch in Studien u. Kritiken, 1832. III. p. 537 sq. translated in Bibl. Repos. for 1834. Vol. IV. p. 108 sq. *Contra*, Gabler im Neuesten Theol. Journ. III. p. 433 sq.

⁴ See above, p. 406 sq. Bochart Hieroz. II. 50. p. 560.

⁵ Handb. zu Joh. 13: 1.

X. Literature.

The following are among the more important works, which treat in some detail of the subject of this article. The list, however, is by no means complete; neither is that given by Hase in his *Leben Jesu*, † 124.

J. J. SCALIGER, *Opus de Emendatione Temporum*. fol. Genev. 1609. etc. p. 531.

I. CASAUBON, *De rebus sacris et ecclesiast.* Exercitt. XVI ad Baron. Prolegom. etc. fol. Lond. 1614. etc. p. 426 sq.

J. CLOPPENBURG, *Ep. de controversia inter Baron. et Casaub. de Agno paschali*; in his *Opp. Theol.* Tom. I. Amst. 1684.

L. CAPELLI, *Enquiries ad amicam se inter et Cloppenb. epist. collationem de ultimo Chr. paschate*, etc. Amst. 1644. Also in Cloppenb. *Opp. Theol.* T. I.

S. BOCHART, *Hieroicoicon*, lib. II. c. 50. p. 560 sq. ed. Leusden. —Comparatively little that is new, has been brought out on either side, since Bochart.

J. FRISCHMUTH, *Diss. utrum agnum paschale Salvator eodem die cum Judæis comederit*, etc. Jena 1673. Also in *Thezaur. Theol. philol.* T. II. Amst. 1701—2.

D. PETAVIUS, *De anno et die dominicæ Passionis*. In his *Annot. ad Epiph.* Col. 1682.

A. BYNÆUS, *De Morte Jesu Christi, libri III* 4to. Amst. 1691—98.

B. LAMY, *Harmonia seu Concord. quatuor Evangg.* Par. 1689. Also, *Commentarius in Harmon.* 2 Tom. Par. 1699.

— — —, *Traité hist. de l'ancienne Pâque des Juifs, où l'on examine à fond la question: si J. C. fit cette Pâque la veille de sa mort.* Par. 1693.

S. LE NAIN TILLEMONT, *Lettre au Lamy sur la dernière Pâque de notre Seigneur*. In his *Mémoires pour servir à l'hist. Ecclesiast.* Tom. II. App.

Also, *Harmonie ou Concorde Evangel. . . suivant la methode et avec les notes de feu M. Toinard*. Par. 1716.

H. WITSIUS, *Diss. an Christus eodem quidem cum Judæis die, sed non eadem, diei parte pascha manducaverit*. In his *Melett.* Leidens. p. 421 sq. Herb. 1717.

J. H. MAIUS, *De tempore Pasch. Chr. ultimo*. Giessen 1712.

A. CALMET, *Diss. de la dernière Pâque J. C.*

S. DEYLING, *De J. C. die emortuali*. In his *Observatt. Sacrae* P. I. Lips. 1735.

G. F. GUDE, *Demonstr. quod Chr. in coena sua σταρασίμωσ αγνυμ πασχαλε non comederit*, 4to. Lips. 1733. Also: *Ed. 2, ab objectionibus Ikenii vindicata*. Lips. 1742.

C. IKEN, *Diss. de tempore celebratae a Serv. ultimae coenae paschalis*. Brem. 1735. — *Diss. II. qua difficultates contra sententiam ds. adstructam moveri solitae dibuuntur*, P. I. II. Brem. 1739. — All these are found also in Iken's *Dissertt. Phil. Theol. Tom. II. ed. Schacht, Traj. Bat. 1749, 1770. Diss. 9—11.*—Also, *Diss. qua contra Gudium demonstratur, quod Chr. σταρασίμωσ vere paschalem fuisse*. Brem. 1742. Also in *Dissertt. Phil. Theol. Tom. II. Diss. 12.*

J. FR. FRISCH, *Abhandlung von Osterlamm und dem letzten Osterlammstage Christi*. Lips. 1768.

J. P. GÄBLER, *Ueber den Anfang des Passahfestes bei den alten Juden*, in his *Nat. Theol. Journ. B. III*; also in his *Kleinere Schriften B. I.—Ueber die Anordnung des letzten Passahmahls Jesu*, in *Nat. Theol. Journ. B. II. Kl. Schr. B. I.—Ob Jesus wirklich das Osterlamm gegessen habe?* *Ibid.*

C. G. BRETSCHNEIDER, *Probabilia de Evangelio Joannis*. Lips. 1820. p. 102 sq.

L. USTERI, *Comm. crit. in qua Evang. Joannis genuinum esse ex comparatis IV Evv. narrationibus de coena ultima et passione Chr. ostenditur*. Turici 1823.

K. G. W. THEILE, *Ueber die letzte mahlzeit Jesu*. In *Winer's Krit. Journ. B. II. p. 153 sq.*—*Noch etwas über d. letzte Mahlz. Jesu*. *Ibid. B. V. p. 129 sq.*

H. E. GUERIKE, *Versuch einer Vereinigung der evang. Relationen über d. letzte Mahlz. Jesu*. In *Winer's Krit. Journ. B. III. p. 257 sq.*

J. H. RAUCH, *Ueber d. letzte Passahmahl u. s. v.* In *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1832. Heft. 3. p. 537 sq.—*English: On the time of our Lord's last Passover and Crucifixion*. In the *Biblical Repository*, 1834. Vol. IV. p. 108 sq.

M. SCHNECKENBURGER, *Chronologie der Leidenswoche*, in his *Beitrag zur Einleit. in N. T.* Stuttgart. 1832.

W. L. DE WETTE, *Bemerkungen zu Stellen des Evang. Johannis*. In *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1834. Heft 4. p. 939 sq.

See also the *Commentaries on John*, by CALVIN, LAMPE, KUINOEL, PAULUS, LÜCKE, THOLUCK, H. A. W. MEYER, DE WETTE, etc. etc.