is the only Evangelist who mentions the  
sum. De Wette and others have supposed  
that the accurate mention of the *thirty  
pieces of silver* has arisen from the prophecy of Zechariah (xi. 12), which St. Matthew clearly has in view. The others have  
simply “*money*.” It is just possible that  
the thirty pieces may have merely  
*earnest-money*: but a difficulty attends  
the supposition; if so, Judas would have  
been entitled to the *whole* on our Lord  
being delivered up to the Sanhedrim (for  
this was all he undertook to do); whereas  
we find (ch. xxvii. 8) that, after our Lord’s  
condemnation, Judas brought only the  
thirty pieces back, and nothing more. See  
note there.

**17–19.]** PREPARATION FOR CELEBRATING THE PASSOVER. Mark xiv. 12–16. Luke xxii. 7–18. The whole narrative which follows is extremely difficult to  
arrange and account for chronologically.  
Our Evangelist is the least circumstantial,  
and, as will I think appear, the least exact  
in detail of the three. St. Mark partially  
fills up the outline;—but the account of  
St. Luke is the most detailed, and I believe the most exact. It is to be noticed  
that the narrative which St. Paul gives,  
1 Cor. xi. 23–25, of the institution of the  
Lord’s Supper, and which he states he  
‘*received from the Lord,*’ coincides almost  
verbatim with that given by St. Luke. But  
while we say this, it must not be forgotten  
that over all three narratives extends the  
great difficulty of explaining the **first day  
of unleavened bread** (Matt., Mark), or  
“*the day of unleavened bread*” (Luke),  
and of reconciling the impression undeniably conveyed by them, that the Lord  
and his disciples *ate the usual Passover*,  
with the narrative of St. John, which not  
only does not sanction, but I believe absolutely excludes such a supposition. I  
shall give, in as short a compass as I can,  
the various solutions which have been  
attempted, and the objections to them;  
fairly confessing that none of them satisfy  
me, and that at present I have none of  
my own. I will (1) state the *grounds  
of the difficulty itself*. The day alluded  
to in all four histories as that of the  
supper, which is unquestionably one and  
identical, is Thursday, the 13th of Nisan.  
Now the day of the Passover being slain  
and eaten was the 14th of Nisan (Exod.  
xii. 6, 18: Lev. xxiii. 5: Numb. ix. 8;  
xxviii. 16: Ezek. xlv. 21), *between the  
evenings* (so literally in Heb.), which was  
interpreted by the generality of the Jews  
to mean the interval between the first  
westering of the sun (3 p.m.) and his setting,—but by the Karaites and Samaritans  
that between sunset and darkness:—in  
either case, however, *the day* was the  
same. The feast of unleavened bread began at *the very time of eating the Passover*(Exod. xii. 18), so that the *first day of the  
feast of unleavened bread was the 15th*(Numb. xxviii. 17). All this with  
the narrative of St. John, where (xiii. 1)  
the last supper takes place *before the feast  
the Passover*—where the disciples think  
(ib. ver. 29) that Judas had been directed  
to buy the things *which they had need of  
against the feast*—where the Jews (xviii.  
28) would not enter into the judgment-hall,  
lest they should be defiled, *but that they  
might eat the Passover* (see note on John  
xviii. 28)—where at the exhibition of our  
Lord by Pilate (on the Friday at noon) it  
was (xix. 14) *the preparation of the Passover*—and where it could be said (xix. 31)  
*for that Sabbath day was an high day,*—being, as it was, a *double Sabbath*,—the  
coincidence of the first day of unleavened  
bread, which was sabbatically hallowed  
(Exod. xii. 16), with an actual sabbath.  
But as plainly, it *does not agree* with the  
view of the three other Evangelists, who  
not only relate the meal on the evening of  
the 13th of Nisan to have been *a* Passover,  
but manifestly regard it as the *ordinary  
legal* time of eating it: “*on the first day  
of unleavened bread*, **when they killed the  
passover**” (Mark xiv. 12), “*when the Passover* **must be killed**” (Luke xxii. 7), and  
in our Gospel by implication, in the use of  
**the Passover**, &c., without any qualifying  
remark.

The solutions which have been proposed  
are the following: (1) that the Passover  
which our Lord and his disciples ate, was  
not the ordinary, but an *anticipatory* one,  
seeing that He himself was about to be  
sacrificed as the true Passover at the legal  
time. To this it may be objected, that  
such an anticipation would have been  
wholly unprecedented and irregular, in a  
matter most strictly laid down by the  
law; and that in the three Gospels there  
is no allusion to it, but rather every thing  
(see above) to render it improbable. (2)  
That our Lord and his disciples ate the  
Passover, but at the time observed by *a  
certain portion of the Jews*, while He  
himself was sacrificed at the time *generally* observed. This solution is objectionable, as wanting any historical testimony whereon to ground it, being in fact  
a pure assumption. Besides, it is clearly  
inconsistent with Mark xiv. 12: Luke