understand these words (which are peculiar  
to our Gospel) otherwise than as an imperfect report of what really happened, viz.  
that the Lord *dipped the sop, and gave it  
to Judas*, thereby answering the general  
doubt, in which the traitor had impudently  
presumed to feign a share. If the question  
**Is it I?** before, represented **looked on one  
another doubting**, and was our narrator’s  
impression of what was in reality not a  
*spoken* but a *signified* question,—why now  
also should not this question and answer  
represent that Judas took part in that  
doubt, and was, *not by word of mouth, but  
by a decisive sign*, of which our author  
was not aware, declared to be the traitor?  
*Both* cannot have happened;—for John  
xiii. 28) *no one knew* (not even John, see  
note there) *why Judas went out*; whereas  
if he had been openly (and it is out of the  
question to suppose a *private* communication between our Lord and him) declared  
to be the traitor, reason enough would  
have been furnished for his immediately  
leaving the chamber. (Still, consult the  
note on Luke, vv. 24–30, where I have  
left room for modifying this view.) I am  
aware that this explanation will give offence  
to those who believe that every part of each  
account may be tessellated into one consistent and complete whole. Stier handles  
the above supposition very roughly, and  
speaks of its upholders in no measured  
terms. Valuable as are the researches of  
this Commentator into the inner sense of  
the Lord’s words, and ready as I am to  
acknowledge continual obligation to him, I  
cannot but think that in the whole interpretation of this part of the Gospel-history,  
he and his school have fallen into the error  
of a too minute and letter-serving exposition. In their anxiety to retain *every portion* of *every account* in its strict literal  
sense, they are obliged to commit many inconsistencies. A striking instance of this  
is also furnished in Mr. Birk’s Horse Evangelicae, p. 411: where in treating of this  
difficulty he says, “If we suppose St. Matthew to express the *substantial meaning* of  
our Lord’s reply, *rather than its precise  
words*, the two accounts are easily reconciled. The question of Judas might concur  
with St. John’s private enquiry, and *the  
same sign which revealed the traitor to  
the beloved disciple, would be an affirmative reply to himself, equivalent to the  
words in the Gospel*—‘Thou hast said.’”  
Very true, and nearly what I have maintained above: but the literal harmonizers  
seem to be quite blind to the fact, that this  
principle of interpretation, which *they use  
when it suits them*, is the very one against  
which they so vehemently protest when  
others use it, and for the use of which they  
call them such hard names. On **Thou hast  
said**, see below, ver 64, note.

**26–29.]** INSTITUTION OF THE LORD’S SUPPER. Mark xiv. 22–25. Luke xxii.  
19, 20. 1 Cor. xi. 23–25. We may remark on this important point of our narrative, (1) That it was demonstrably our  
Lord's intention to *found an ordinance* for  
those who should believe on Him; (2)  
that this ordinance had some *analogy with  
that which He and the Apostles were then  
celebrating*. The *first* of these assertions  
depends on the express word of the Apostle  
Paul; who in giving directions for the  
due celebration of the rite of the Lord’s  
Supper, states in relation to it that he had  
*received from the Lord* the account of its  
institution, which he then gives. He who  
can set this aside, must set aside with it  
all apostolic testimony whatever. The  
*second* is shewn by the fact, that what  
now took place was *during the celebration  
of the Passover:* that the same Paul  
states that *Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us*; thus identifying the Body  
broken, and Blood shed, of which the  
bread and wine here are symbolic, with  
the Paschal feast. (3) That the *key to  
the right understanding of what took  
place must be found in our Lord’s discourse after the feeding of the five thousand* in John vi., since He *there*, and  
*there only* besides at this place, *speaks of  
His flesh and blood, in the connexion found  
here*. (4) *It is impossible to assign to  
this event its precise place in the meal*. St.  
Luke inserts it *before* the announcement  
of the treason of Judas: St. Matt. and  
St. Mark *after* it. It is doubtful whether  
the accounts found in the Talmud and  
elsewhere of the ceremonies in the Paschal  
feast are to be depended on:—they are exceedingly