xxii. 7, cited above. A similar objection  
lies against (3) the notion that *our Lord*ate the Passover at the strictly legal, *the  
Jews* at an inaccurate and illegal time.  
(4) Our Lord ate only a *commemorative*Passover, such as the Jews now celebrate,  
and not a sacrificial Passover (Grotius).  
But this is refuted by the absence of any  
mention of a commemorative Passover *before the destruction of Jerusalem*; besides  
its inconsistency with the above-cited passages. (5) Our Lord *did not eat the  
Passover at all*. But this is plainly not  
a *solution* of the difficulty, but a setting  
aside of one of the differing accounts:  
for the three Gospels manifestly give the  
impression that He *did* eat it. (6) The  
solution offered by Chrysostom, on our  
ver. 58, is at least ingenious. The Council,  
he says, did not eat their Passover at the  
proper time, but “*on another day, and  
broke the law, because of their eagerness  
about this execution… they chose even  
to neglect the Passover, that they might  
fulfil their murderous desire.*” This had  
been suggested before in a scholium of  
Eusebius. But St. John’s habit of noticing  
and explaining all such exceptional circumstances, makes it very improbable. I  
may state, as some solutions have been  
sent me by correspondents, that I have  
seen nothing besides the above, which justifies any extended notice.

I will conclude this note by offering a  
few hints which, though not pointing to  
any particular solution, ought I think to  
enter into the consideration of the question. (*a*) That, on the evening of the  
13th (i.e. the beginning of the 14th) of  
Nisan, the Lord *ate a meal with his disciples*, at which the announcement that  
one of them should betray Him was made:  
after which He went into the garden  
of Gethsemane, and was betrayed (Matt.,  
Mark, Luke, John):—(*b*) That, in *some  
sense or other*, this meal *was regarded as  
the eating of the Passover* (Matt., Mark,  
Luke). (The same may be inferred even  
from John; for some of the disciples  
must have gone into the praetorium, and  
have heard the conversation between our  
Lord and Pilate [John xviii. 33–38]:  
and as they were equally bound with the  
other Jews to eat the Passover, would  
equally with them have been incapacitated from so doing by having incurred  
defilement, *had they not eaten theirs previously*. It would appear too, from Joseph  
of Arimathea *going to Pilate* during the  
*preparation* [Mark xv. 42, 43], that *he also  
had eaten his passover*.) (*c*) That it was  
*not the ordinary passover of the Jews*:  
for (Exod. xii. 22) when at was eaten,  
none might go out of the house until morning; whereas, not only did Judas go out  
during the meal (John xiii. 29), but our  
Lord and the disciples went out when the  
meal was finished. Also when Judas went  
out, it was understood that he was gone  
to *buy*, which could not have been the  
case, had it been the night of eating the  
Passover, which in all years was sabbatically hallowed. (*d*) St. John, who omits  
all mention of the Paschal nature of this  
meal, also omits all mention of the distribution of the symbolic bread and wine.  
The latter act was, strictly speaking, anticipatory: the Body was not yet broken,  
nor the Blood shed (but see note on ver.  
26, end). Is it possible that the words  
in Luke xxii. 15, 16 may have been meant  
by our Lord as an express declaration of  
the anticipatory nature of that Passover  
meal likewise? May they mean, ‘I have  
been most anxious to eat this Paschal meal  
with you to-night (before I suffer), for I  
shall not eat it to-morrow,—I shall not eat  
of it any more with you?’ May a hint  
to the same effect be intended in ‘my time  
is at hand’ (ver. 18), as accounting for the  
time of making ready—may the present  
tense itself (*I will keep* is literally *I keep*)  
have the same reference?

I may remark that the whole of the  
narrative of St. John, as compared with the  
others, satisfies me that *he can never have  
seen their accounts*. It is inconceivable,  
that one writing for the purpose avowed  
in John xx. 31, could have found the three  
accounts as we have them, and have made  
no more allusion to the discrepancy than  
the faint (and to all appearance undesigned)  
ones in ib. ch. xii. 1; xiii. 1, 29; xviii. 28.

**17. the first day of… unleavened  
bread]** If this night had been the ordinary  
time of sacrificing the Passover, the day  
preceding would not indeed have been  
strictly the first day of unleavened bread;  
but there is reason to suppose that it was  
accounted so. The putting away leaven  
from the houses was of the work of  
the day, and the eating of the unleavened  
bread actually commenced in the evening.  
Thus Josephus mentions eight days as constituting the feast,—including this day in  
it.

**Where wilt thou]** The ‘making  
ready’ would include the following particulars; the ration of the guest-chamber itself (which however in this case  
was already done, see Mark xiv. 15 and