



# Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.









2



202

# LETTER to a FRIEND.

Endeavouring to give a general notion of the Rev  
Mr KENNEDY's late *System of Chronology.*

*rector of Dringley, Derbyshire.*

REV. SIR,

I Have now gone over the Rev. Mr Kennedy's Chronology with some care and attention; and am more and more convinced of what I at first thought, *viz.* that his scheme will be equally true, though he should be found (with Dr Wall, Dr Hammond, and many others of eminent learning and piety) to have been mistaken, in saying, our blessed Saviour did not keep the legal passover the night before he suffered. For the question is not, Whether he was crucified on Friday the 3d of April, in the 19th year of Tiberius, on a full-moon day? all which Mr Ferguson, as well as the Rev. Mr Kennedy, seems to have fully proved; nor yet, Whether this happened in the 4040th solar tropical year of the world, answering to A. D. 33, so many days from the creation, at the end of just so many revolutions of the sun and moon? but the question is, Whether that full-moon day was the 14th or 15th of the Jewish month Nisan? If we reckon from the evening next after the mean new moon, which Mr Kennedy owns, p. 223. is the manner in which the Jews reckon to this day; then Thursday, the 2d of April, was the 14th of Nisan, the day on which the passover must be killed; as the three evangelists witness: but if, with Mr Kennedy, we reckon from the evening after the moon's being visible, then Friday, the 3d of April, was the 14th of Nisan; and, as St John is supposed to say, it was the preparation only, and the passover was not yet eaten, when our Saviour died.—The Rev. Mr Kennedy places the commencement of time on Thursday, the 4th day of creation, the sun being in Libra, the moon at the last point of the full. His

e-authority for this is Lev. xxiii. 16, where Moses commands

A

2031.e.1

22031.e.1



commands the feast of tabernacles to be kept on the 15th of the 7th month, in the end of the year. From the manner of expression, he very justly concludes, that this was an original feast in memory of the creation; and therefore that the 15th day was the very day on which the moon was full at the autumnal equinox, and on which time commenced. From thence, by an exact calculation of days and years, he brings us down to the present time; shewing, by the way, how, in the year 1656, at the end of Noah's 599th year, the solar and lunar years ended together; how, consequently, the year of the deluge began with the sun in Libra, and a new moon, Wednesday being the day of the week; how, consequently, the solar year being 365 days, and the lunar but 354, the lunar epact was 11, and the 601st year began on Thursday the 12th of the 1st month, the sun being again in Libra. From thence he passes on to the Exodus, which he places in the year of the world 2512, one year sooner than our Bible chronology; which is owing to his reckoning the 430 years from Abraham's call out of Ur, which he places one year and an half only before his coming into Canaan. The first passover he places on Saturday the 14th of the 7th month, thenceforth to be reckoned the first, from the vernal instead of the autumnal equinox; and, lastly, he comes to the year of crucifixion, A. M. 4040, when Friday, April the 3d, was the full-moon day nearest the vernal equinox. Now, if the full moon, at the commencement of time, was the 15th of the 1st month, and the feast of tabernacles was kept on the 15th, the full-moon day, in memory of it; one would naturally conclude, that this latter full moon, *anno* 4040, should be the 15th of the 7th month, or Nisan; and nothing but a strong conviction, that our blessed Saviour must have suffered on the 14th, could, I think, have made Mr Kennedy take so much pains to prove it otherwise. I could, I believe, fully make out, how he brings it about; but, as I have said, it is not necessary as to the question now in hand. I wish I could tell where he introduces the four years which he gives to the age of the world, more than the Bible chronology does. It is not by giving three seconds more to the length of the year than Sir Isaac Newton, Keill, and others: for that, in the course of 5756 years, makes only a difference of 4 hours and 48 minutes. Nor are the four years added till after the death of Joseph: for he places that as our Bible does. I imagine, therefore, that as he has no scripture *data* for the distribution

distribution of intermediate facts, he has, as all chronologers must, adjusted these in the most probable manner to the sum-total of years, and that the four years difference will be found between the death of Joseph and the 1st of Cyrus

As my leisure is very small, and I see Mr Kennedy differs widely from our Bible chronology in some places; as, for example, as to the beginning of Othniel, and the death of Uzziah; I imagine, to find the four years, might require going through all the Judges and Kings; a labour which I cannot engage in. But you may say, Why do I then meddle with the subject? The truth is, I do not write to instruct others, but myself: though in conversation I may seem to support my own notions as eagerly as any body, yet, in fact, I am never satisfied with them, till they have the sanction of other people's judgments. When I converse with my superiors, (which all men *are* in some respect or other), I have an awe upon me, which hinders me from doing justice to my arguments: I am therefore glad to lay my sentiments before you, (and, if you please, before the public), that if Mr Kennedy himself, or any one else, think them worth notice, I may be told where I am wrong.

Though Mr Kennedy's system seems at first sight difficult, on account of the number of figures used in his calculations; yet, when understood, there is, I think, a simplicity and a certainty in it which must in time recommend it: I say, in time; for I don't wonder when people prefer a difficult method which they are used to, even unto an easier one with which they are unacquainted; for use makes every thing easy. But perhaps an ordinary reader, unaccustomed to such kind of studies, may better understand what is to be said, after considering the following example. If we take the numbers 3, 5, and 7, and set them down in three columns, thus, they can never return in the same order till after 105 changes, which is the product of those 3 numbers multiplied into each other. If therefore 105 years were connected with these rows of figures, each year would be distinguished from every other by a distinct character. Thus, likewise, the Julian period is composed of the cycle of the sun of 28 years, the cycle of the moon of 19 years, and the Roman indiction of 15 years. This period, produced by the multiplication of these 9 numbers, carried back from the time of Scaliger, who invented it, and who flourished in 1580, precedes the

1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	1
5	5	2
6	1	3
7	2	1
1	3	2



creation of the world, according to our Bible chronology, 710, and, according to Mr Kennedy's, 706 years. If the sun and moon did, at the end of these cycles, return exactly to the same point; these, with the day of the week, connected to the cycle of the sun, would be distinct characters whereby to distinguish every real or supposed year since the creation. But this is not the case. There is a difference, though but a small one; so that the sun at the end of 28 years, and the moon at the end of 19, do not return exactly to the same point at the same hour of the day; and therefore the Julian years require to be rectified by calculation. We must not therefore seek for the characters of a distinct year, according to Mr Kennedy, in any such multiplication of one number by another; such a period, to be exact, would be immense; but he has taken another method. The characters by which, he says, every year may infallibly be distinguished, are, the return of the sun to the equinoctial point at noon, the situation of the moon at the same moment, and the day of the week. Thus, says he, p. 150. "Every solar tropical year of the world has its appropriated characters respecting the sun, the moon, and the day of the week;"—they cannot possibly in nature return identically the same in a much greater number of years than have passed since the creation, take which of the four chronologies you please. These mutual aspects, relations, and distances, of the two luminaries, cannot happen alike two years together. The precession of the equinoxes, which we were once mentioning, has here nothing to do; the sun will return to the equinoctial point, whether the constellation by which it is named, be there or not; and the moon will likewise come to its conjunction or opposition at a limited distance from it; and that distance be certainly known, if the quantity of the solar year, and that of a mean lunation, be really fixed according to truth. But though no two years can be exactly the same, through a space of more than 600,000 years, because the moon will not return to the same point, on the same day and hour, in a shorter space; yet Mr Kennedy sets down what he calls a *commensurating year*, in which, after 1440 revolutions, (*i. e.* as many years as there are minutes in 24 hours), the sun returns again to the original cardinal point of the day, in the same place, but not on the same day of the week, as at the creation, p. 196. These years of commensuration are, 1440, 2880, 3420, 5760. We must not confound with these what he calls a *similar year*, of which he gives an example

example in 1656, the year of the deluge, and 1760, the last of George II. In these the situation of the sun and moon were the same; but different not only as to the day of the week, as in a year of commensuration, but also as to the hour and minute of the day in the given meridian. As to Mr Kennedy's method of proceeding, it seems to be this; Having set down, from scriptural *data*, the situation of the luminaries at the creation, at a first meridian, at a precise day, hour, and minute, he calculates the number of years, of months, or mean lunations, of weeks, days, hours, and minutes, which have passed from the year of the Julian period 706 to A. M. 5757; and shews, by the agreement of his calculation with itself, with observations both in that year and in former years, with calculations of eclipses in several different years, with other astronomical observations, where coincidences are found, which could not happen in any year but one, that his principles must be right. His principles are as follow.

I. That the quantity of a solar day, or the time between one mid-day and the next following, is precisely 24 hours; — the siderial 4 minutes less, p. 130.

II. That the length of a solar year is just 365 days 5 hours 49 minutes, which is less than a Julian year just 11 minutes; *i. e.* eleven days in 1440 years,

and 3 <sup>h</sup>	}	less than	{	Keil and Sir I. Newton.
p. 120. 5				Dr Halley.
15				Dr Bradly.

III. That a mean lunation is precisely 29 days 12 hours 44 minutes 1 second 45 thirds, *i. e.* 1'' 8''' 25'''' less than Mr Mayer's tables, p. 219.

IV. That time commenced at noon from a meridian 156 degrees west of Greenwich, lying in the vast Pacific ocean, p. 169. on the 25th Octob. A. J. p. 706. on the 4th day of the patriarchal week, *i. e.* Thursday, (which day he does not include in his calculations), the sun in the first degree of Libra, the moon in the last point of the full-moon day, p. 158.

And now, having given the reader a general notion of Mr Kennedy's system, it will be easily made appear, that, however useful it may be to fix the year and day of our Saviour's crucifixion, it cannot determine the question as to its being kept that year as the Jewish passover; that being a question purely historical, and to be decided only by the authority of historians.

historians. Mr Kennedy, p. 223. sets down the Caotic new moon, A. J. p. 706. on October 9th day, 5 hours 38 minutes P. M.; add to this, says he, for  $\frac{1}{2}$  lunation, 14 days 18 hours 22 minutes, it will give for the full moon October 24th at noon.— He then proceeds to give an account of three different ways of beginning a lunar month.

“ 1st, If we compute the beginning of the month from October 9th day, 5 hours 38 minutes, *i. e.* from the first point of the mean new-moon day, half a lunation will bring it down to October 24th at noon. *i. e.* to the first point of the mean full-moon day. This we call *the astronomical epoch* of the first month of the lunar year.”

“ 2dly, If we compute from October 9th day, 6 hours P. M. *i. e.* from the evening next after the moon’s mean conjunction, the 15th day of the month will terminate in October 24th, 6 hours P. M. *i. e.* on the evening next after the mean full moon; and on the 15th day of the month thus computed, the Jews observe to this day their feast of tabernacles. This we call *the Jewish epoch*.”

“ 3dly, If we compute from October 10th day, 6 hours P. M. *i. e.* from the evening the next but one after the conjunction, on which the moon is generally visible at its setting, (which, by the way, at the equinoxes, must be after six o’clock, and therefore after the 11th of October was begun), the 15th day of the month will terminate October 25th, 6 hours P. M. or in that evening, which either follows after the completion of the full-moon day, as at the creation, or after a great part of it is completed; and on the 15th day of the month thus computed, the primitive patriarchs, the ancient Hebrews and Israelites, observed their feast of ingathering, and their feast of tabernacles. This we call *the patriarchal epoch*.”

Let us now apply these three reckonings to the year of the crucifixion, *i. e.* 4040, according to Mr Kennedy, 19th of Tiberius, A. D. 33, the last year of the 202d Olympiad. In this very year Phlegon informs us, says Mr Ferguson, that an extraordinary eclipse of the sun happened. His words (Phlegon’s) are, “ In the 4th year of the 202d Olympiad there was the greatest eclipse of the sun that ever was known: it was night at the 6th hour of the day, so that the stars of heaven were seen.” This time of the day, says Mr Ferguson, agrees exactly with the time that the darkness began according to St Matth. xxvii. 25.; but whoever calculates, says he, will find, that a total eclipse of the sun  
could

could not possibly happen at Jerusalem any time that year in the natural way;" *Ferg. Astr.* p. 195. In this memorable year (the only year out of 20 in succession on which Mr Ferguson could find a full moon on a Friday), the true time of the new moon was March 19th, 1 hour 12 minutes P. M. *i. e.* 4 hours 26 minutes sooner in the day than the Caotic new moon on October 9th, to March the 19th, 11 hours 12 minutes P. M. Add 14 — 18 — 22 for a half lunation, it will bring it to Friday, April 3d, at 34 minutes past 7 in the morning, for the first point of the full moon; just 4 hours 26 minutes earlier in the day than the full moon on October 24th — at the creation. This then is the astronomical epoch mentioned above; and by it this full-moon day is proved, by Kennedy, to be just so many weeks, days, &c. from the full moon at the creation. But this does not determine as to which day is to be called the 14th of the month.

Next, therefore, for the 2d or Jewish epoch: If reckoning by it from the evening of Tuesday October 9th, the 15th will terminate on October 24th at evening on Wednesday; then, by the same rule, if we reckon from Thursday March 19th at evening, the 15th will terminate on Friday April 3d at evening; which is the Jewish epocha, and that for which I am pleading. But,

3dly, If we reckon by the patriarchal epocha, then Friday, April the 3d, will be found to be only the 14th of the moon, and the day on which the passover was killed. Did the Jews at this time reckon as the patriarchs did, there would be no doubt of their always having done the same; but since Mr Kennedy allows there has been a change, the question is purely historical: Was this change before our Saviour's death, or since? Mr Kennedy places the changes as to their months, length of year, &c. upon their becoming subject to the Greeks; and why may we not suppose their different way of reckoning the 14th of the month, to have commenced at the same time? Mr Kennedy, p. 365. gives us the testimony of Josephus, from *Antiq. l. 3. chap. 10.* thus. "In the Macedonian month *Xanticus*, which by the Jews is called *Nisan*, and is the beginning of the year, on the 14th day of the month, according to the moon, the sun being in Aries, we annually kill the passover." To explain this, he gives us the words of Philo, p. 366. "The first day of the month begins on the evening next after the synod, or the moon's (mean) conjunction with the sun:" And again, "In the end of the first day of the month, the sun begins to enlighten



enlighten the moon with a perceptible light." And so Mr Ferguson, p. 194. says, "In the latitude of Jerusalem the moon may be seen just setting about an hour after the sun, when she is not above 24 hours old." Can any thing be plainer therefore than these testimonies, to shew that Josephus and Philo reckoned the passover-day to be the 14th from the evening next after the mean conjunction? And consequently the Jews, in our Saviour's time, as three evangelists witness, did the same; and other testimonies we have none. I have not left unconsidered what Mr Kennedy says in this very place of his work, as to the circumstance of the moon's visibility: but I say nothing to it; because I think, if he compares, as above, his new and full moon at the creation, with the parallel circumstances of the new and full moon 4040, he will see that he has already answered himself; and I can take no pleasure in finding fault with one *for* whose valuable work I have so great a regard, and whose appearance of piety claims a still higher degree of respect.

I shall now enter on the question as to our blessed Saviour's eating or not eating the paschal lamb; and, without confining myself to him alone, put together what appears to me the strongest arguments on either side.—To begin with scripture, we have, on one hand, the three Evangelists, St Matthew, St Mark, and St Luke; on the other, St John.—I will set them down in columns.

S. Matthew, chap. xxvi.

ψ 2. Ye know that after two days is the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified. ψ 17. Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, the disciples came unto Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? ψ 18. And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand, I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. ψ 19. And the disciples

S. John, chap. xiii.

ψ 1. Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come, that he should depart out of this world, unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. ψ 2. And supper being ended, (the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him) ψ 3. Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God, ψ 4.





he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house where he entereth in.  $\psi$  11. And ye shall say unto the good-man of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest-chamber where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?  $\psi$  12. And he shall shew you a large upper room furnished: there make ready.  $\psi$  13. And they went and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.  $\psi$  14. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him.  $\psi$  15. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer.  $\psi$  16. For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.  $\psi$  17. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves.  $\psi$  18. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.  $\psi$  19. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.  $\psi$  20. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.

From the account here given by the three evangelists, the following propositions seem evident.

- I. That the day on which the passover was to be killed, which was the 14th of Nisan, was called, though improperly, *the first of unleavened bread*.—Exod. xii. 6.—“ And ye shall keep it up until the 14th day of the same month: and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening,”—*compared with* Lev. xxiii. 5, 6. “ In the 14th of the first month at even is the Lord’s passover. “ And

“ And on the 15th day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord : seven days ye must eat unleavened bread.”—And Numb. xxviii. 16, 17. “ And in the 14th day of the first month is the passover of the Lord. “ And in the 15th day of this month is the feast : seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten.” So Josephus says, the passover was said to last seven days, if reckoned from the day of the feast ; or eight days, if reckoned from the day it was killed.

II. That what the disciples were desirous to prepare was the legal passover : S. Mark xiv. 12. “ Where thou mayst eat the passover.”

III. That our Saviour himself expressly ordered them to prepare the passover ; and said he would eat it : “ He sent ;” — “ Go and say ;” — “ The Master saith — I shall eat the passover.”

IV. They made ready as Jesus appointed ; and that was the passover.

V. All this was done on the day the passover must be killed ; that is, on the 14th of Nisan.

VI. There is a plain distinction of two days in this account, according to the Jewish way of reckoning, whereby the day began at six in the evening ; for the disciples came to Jesus on the same day on which the passover was to be killed, between the two evenings : they had their directions, went, found the man bearing the pitcher, and made ready the passover ; all which would take up some time ; and then — “ When even was come,” — “ In the evening he cometh,” — “ When the hour was come, he sat” (or lay) “ down ;” which plainly shows, that the evening was not come when the disciples were sent, that was on the 14th ; but the even was come when he sat down, that was the 15th.

VII. The supper, this passover, Jesus now eat with his disciples, was what he had earnestly desired to eat of ; therefore not a common meal.

VIII. It was what he would no more eat of, till it was fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

IX. and *lastly*, The cup he now drank of was the fruit of the vine, a name appropriated to the paschal cup, as has been often proved ; and of this likewise he says, he will drink no more until the kingdom of God shall come.

On the other hand, it seems to be positively affirmed by St John, I. That supper was ended before our Saviour wash-

ed his disciples feet ; and yet it was still before the feast of the passover.

II. That Judas was thought to be commanded to buy somewhat against the feast ; the feast therefore was not yet come.

III. That it was night, when, immediately after receiving the sop, (which could not be long after this), Judas went out.

IV. That all this passed the very night before our Saviour suffered ; for as soon as Jesus had spoken these words, *i. e.* the discourses and prayers contained in this chapter, and the four following, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron ; *St John* xiii. &c.

V. That the Jews had not eaten the passover when Jesus was led to the hall of judgment ; for they went not in, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover : whence it is concluded, that the time of eating the passover was not yet come ; and therefore that the blessed Jesus had not eat the lamb, but only a vicarious passover, unleavened bread, with bitter herbs, &c.

VI. That after our Saviour was crucified, it was still the preparation, and called a few hours before, *the preparation of the passover* ; therefore the passover was not yet come.

VII. and lastly, The day following was the Sabbath, as all allow, and that Sabbath-day, that particular Sabbath, was an high day ; which seems to point it out as the 15th of Nisan, the first of the feast of unleavened bread, strictly so called ; of which Josephus says, *Antiq. l. 3.* “ On the 15th day the feast of unleavened bread follows the passover, and lasts seven days.” As also, *l. 2.* he says, “ We keep that feast eight days, beginning from the 14th day of the month.”

As both these accounts are from inspired writers, the authority of the one cannot be set against that of the other ; both are certainly true, and which ever appears to any one most clear and express, he must show, how the other can be fairly reconciled to it. As the joint testimony of the three seems to me unanswerable, I shall therefore beg leave to begin, by showing how *St John* may be reconciled to them.

And, I. As to supper being ended, *Dr Hammond*, who is with *Mr Kennedy* in the main, explains, in the margin of his paraphrase on this chapter, the expression, “ supper being ended,” — by, “ supper being come,” or, “ at supper-time,” and refers to *ψ 12.* In the paraphrase itself, he renders

renders the words thus : " When he was at supper." Now,  $\psi$  12. mentions our Saviour's sitting down again, and entering into a discourse with his disciples, after washing their feet, to shew the reason of what he had been doing ; after which he said, " Verily verily one of you shall betray me ;" which St Matthew tells us was said as they did eat : therefore supper was not ended when he washed the disciples feet, since they were yet eating when those things were said, as says St Matthew ; and they were said after the washing, as says St John. Our Saviour therefore might wash his disciples feet before the feast of passover, and yet eat it immediately after. But besides, the feast of passover is taken in a double sense, as will appear by the answer to the difficulty raised from chap. xviii. 28. which I pass to directly, both because it is the most considerable of any, and because explaining it will help to explain the rest. Thus it stands :

They went not into the judgment-hall lest they should be defiled ; because, being defiled, they could not eat the passover : therefore the passover was yet to be eaten.

Now, in answer to this, it will appear, *1<sup>st</sup>*, That defiling themselves by commerce with the Gentiles on the day the passover was to be killed, could not prevent their eating the paschal lamb ; for that was to be eaten at soonest the beginning of the next day. *2<sup>dly</sup>*, That what was here spoken of was not the paschal lamb ; but the sacrifices to be offered on the 15th day of the month, the first, strictly speaking, of the feast of unleavened bread.

*1<sup>st</sup>*, The defilement could not make them unfit to eat the lamb, for it continued only till the evening, Lev. xi. 24. " And for these ye shall be unclean ; whosoever toucheth " the carcase of them, shall be unclean until the even," &c.

But the lamb was to be eaten on the night following the 14th, on which it was killed ; therefore, in the beginning of the 15th day, according to the Jews method of beginning the day at six o' clock in the evening,—" Ye shall keep it up until " the 14th day of the same month : and the whole assembly " of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening," **בין הערבִים** (between the two evenings, as in the margin) " And they shall eat the flesh in that night, rost with " fire, and unleavened bread, and with bitter herbs they shall " eat it ;" Exod. xii. 6. 8.—" And at midnight" (*i. e.* probably when they had just finished what was commanded them  $\psi$  11. &c. and were standing ready with their staff in hand, &c.)



etc.) "the Lord smote all the first-born," v. 29. — This circumstance, therefore, of their fearing to be defiled, instead of proving it to be the 14th day, proves the direct contrary; for nothing relating to the passover was to be eaten on that day; and therefore no defilement to be feared on that account.

2dly, Therefore, what is here called *the passover*, was not the lamb, but the other sacrifices. And for calling them by this name, we have express scripture-authority: for, Deut. xvi. 2. it is said,—"Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock, and of the herd." Now, by the mention of the *herd* here, which means bullocks or calves, it is plain the sacrifices on the feast-day and days following were called *the passover*; and of these, as well as of the lamb, no unclean person could eat; and as these were offered at the usual solemn hours in the day-time, entering the judgment-hall must have disabled *them* (the scribes, &c.) from eating of them.

This chief difficulty thus removed, the others will seem trifling.—Our Saviour's command to Judas, to buy things needful against the feast, will naturally now be understood of those other sacrifices to be offered on the 15th day, and the days following. For as to the passover, the three evangelists tell us expressly the disciples had made ready for it: and hence will appear how needless the conjecture of those, who, supposing our Saviour to have eaten the lamb, to avoid the seeming force of this text against it, have endeavoured to distinguish this supper, at which our Saviour washed his disciples feet, from the paschal supper; though they appear to be one and the same from innumerable circumstances, and have ever been looked upon as such, even by those who differ from each other as to the eating the paschal lamb.

With regard to the texts mentioning Friday as the preparation of the passover, they explain one another. The Jews uneasiness was, lest the bodies should remain on the cross on the Sabbath-day; and St Mark says, it was the day before the Sabbath, by way of explanation. St Luke says, it was the preparation; to what? why, to the Sabbath: "And the Sabbath drew on," Luke xxiii. 54.; and that Sabbath day, that particular Sabbath, was an high day. The preparation to the passover, meaning thereby the day on which the passover was to be slain, it could not well be called, considering the hour at which the chief priests came to Pilate; for the lamb by that time was slain, according to Mr Kennedy,

℥c. But it was still the preparation of the Sabbath; and called the preparation of the passover, only because it was the preparation of the paschal Sabbath, that Sabbath which fell within the limits of the feast; and therefore called, by way of eminence, *the Sabbath*, (Lev. xxiii. 11. “ And “ he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted “ for you : on the morrow after the Sabbath the priest shall “ wave it. ψ 15. And ye shall count unto you from the “ morrow after *the Sabbath*,” ℥c.), and here said to be an high day.

Having now done with the objections properly scriptural, let us consider those taken from the supposed difference, as to the manner of eating this passover, and that in which the lamb is commanded to be eaten. The lamb was to be eaten with the loins girded, the staff in hand, Exod. xii. 11. But Jesus sat (or lay) down, ℥c.; therefore, says Mr Kennedy, “ unless we suppose that Jesus eat the passover contrary to the law,— we must conclude that he did not eat that passover at all,” p. 657. So, on the other side, it may be said, there is no such thing mentioned in scripture as a vicarious passover of bitter herbs, ℥c.; nay, even where provision is made for such as could not be present on the 14th of the first month. It is plain that they were to kill and eat the lamb on the 14th and 15th of the second month; but not to supply its place by any other feast, (Numb. ix. 11. 12. “ The four- “ tenth day of the second month at even they shall keep it, “ and eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.— They “ shall leave none of it unto the morning, nor break any “ bone of it : according to all the ordinances of the passover, “ they shall keep it);” and therefore our Saviour, who came to fulfill the law, would not keep such a feast. It might also be said, that whereas it is expressly said, Numb. ix. 13. “ The man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and for- “ beareth to keep the passover; that soul shall be cut off.” It is therefore unlikely, that our Saviour, who came to fulfill the law, should invite his disciples to a vicarious passover, when they were to keep the real one on the next day; unlikely that they should do it without any question, and, as far as appears, should neglect the observing the true passover the next day. But this way of arguing is, I think, rash. Our duty is to inquire into matters of fact, what our Lord did, for that was certainly right; and not to make our own supposals, and say, this or that he could not do; nor again, he had power to change his own laws, and therefore he did  
so



so in this or that instance, unless we are very sure of the fact. But let us consider the orders given for keeping the first passover, set down Exod. xii. from  $\psi$  3. to  $\psi$  14. The orders here are very full; and yet, it is plain, they do not contain the whole of what was said to Moses; for when he rehearses the command to the elders,  $\psi$  21. ("Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them, Draw out and take you a lamb, according to your families, and kill the passover"); he adds these circumstances immediately following in the 22d verse. "And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the bason, and strike the lintel and the two side-posts with the blood that is in the bason: and none of you shall go out at the door of his house until the morning;" which he certainly did not add of his own head; and the other circumstances he does not repeat; that is, it is not said in that place that he did repeat them. It is said by our blessed Saviour, St Mark vii. 13. that the Jews had made the word of God of none effect by their traditions, and we with justice complain of the church of Rome for setting up mere *oral* tradition, in opposition to scripture, or at least making it equal with it. But we are, I think, too hasty when we therefore reject all traditions whatever; when we represent to ourselves, as some do, the whole Jewish nation at the time Moses was sent to them as totally ignorant of revelation, and as receiving from him a written law, containing the whole revealed will of God to man. It is this which makes the law of Moses be reflected on as imperfect, as insisting only on outward ceremonies; as being harsh in its precepts, and as setting forth only temporal rewards and punishments. But this was not the case; God had revealed himself from the beginning, both as to moral duties and religious ceremonies; such as sacrifices, &c. See Gen. iv. 3. 4. 5. "And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord; and Abel he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering; but unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect." Chap. viii. 20. 21. "And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar.—And the Lord smelled a sweet favour, &c."—This religion had been preserved by tradition, (Gen. xviii. 19. "For I know him, [Abraham],

"braham], that he will command his children, and his  
 "household after him, and they shall keep the way of the  
 "Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may  
 "bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him,"  
 to the death of the patriarchs; one of whom, *i. e.* Levi,  
 had been dead but sixty-three or sixty-four years when the  
 Israelites came out of Egypt; in which space of time,  
 though they were persecuted, and denied the outward exer-  
 cise of their religion, it would be strange to think they had  
 quite forgotten it: besides that there appears no traces of  
 such ignorance. "Moses," it is plain, "feared God, and  
 "preferred the reproach of Christ to the being called the  
 "son of Pharaoh's daughter;" Heb. xi. 24.—26. Aaron  
 his brother, Caleb and Joshua, and, doubtless, many o-  
 thers, had preserved the true worship of God by tradition.  
 What God saw fit should be committed to writing, was  
 written by Moses, and it was chiefly the new laws given to  
 Israel as his peculiar people, and with an intent to separate  
 them from other nations. As for other parts of religion,  
 both moral and ceremonious, which were known before,  
 they needed not to be repeated, or were at least but slightly  
 mentioned, except that summary of moral duties given  
 from Mount Sinai: and, doubtless, many things also con-  
 cerning the Jewish law were likewise committed to the care  
 of the priests, and preserved by tradition; for our Saviour  
 himself sends the people to them for instruction, (S. Matth.  
 xxiii. 2. 3. "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat:  
 "all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that ob-  
 "serve and do; but do not ye after their works, for they  
 "say, and do not," &c.), though he blames the priests  
 themselves for their corruptions. The author to the He-  
 brews has preserved one tradition, which is mentioned no  
 where else in scripture; and that is, the ceremony of mixing  
 water with the blood which was sprinkled at the establishing  
 of the covenant at Mount Sinai; the same was probably  
 done at the first passover, for blood cannot well be sprinkled  
 without it. In imitation of this significant ceremony, the  
 primitive church always mixed water with the wine in the  
 holy eucharist; and thought they followed the example of  
 Christ in so doing; and many other things they likewise  
 practised as apostolical traditions. We are not therefore to  
 go to the letter of the law, and suppose the Jews could  
 practise nothing but what we see there written; since the

passage above from Exodus, and this from the epistle to the Hebrews, shew the contrary: and many other passages might be brought to the same effect.

Mr Kennedy grants, and others have shewed, from 2 Chron. xxx. 15. 16. and xxxv. 11. 13. that, after the Israelites were come into the promised land, the lambs for the passover were not killed in each one's house, but in the temple by the priests; nor was the blood put upon the door, but offered at the altar; and the same appears from Josephus: yet we find no mention in scripture of any command for this change, nor are told when it was introduced; and who can say the change, as to the manner of eating the passover, was not made at the same time, and all by divine command? As eating in haste with their loins girt, and their staff in hand, was expressive of their condition when waiting every moment for a command to leave Egypt; so, sitting, or lying down in a posture of rest, may be thought as expressive of their state when delivered from bondage, and settled in the land of Canaan: and it is to be observed, that these ceremonies, the standing with loins girded, &c. are never mentioned after the first command; though the law for keeping the passover, the day, and other circumstances, are frequently repeated. Some have observed, and that with good grounds, a conformity in this very respect, between the sacrifice of the passover in Egypt, and the death of Christ on the cross; and between the commemorations of that passover, in all succeeding years, and the commemorative sacrifice of the holy eucharist. As the blood of the first lambs was sprinkled on the wood, the door-posts and lintel, not on any altar; so the blood of Christ was poured out on the cross; but the blood in the subsequent passovers, and the cup which it represented, are offered with the commemorative lamb, and the representative body, on the altar of God. As the first sacrifice of the lamb was properly propitiatory, since by it the Israelites were saved from the destroying angels, and the paschal sacrifice was only a commemoration of that deliverance though itself a sacrifice; so the sacrifice of Christ once offered, was the only propitiation for the sins of mankind; and the sacrifice of the holy eucharist is a memorial of it, and no otherwise propitiatory than by virtue of the same.

Mr Kennedy seems to infer somewhat from the circumstance of the sop, as if inconsistent with a roasted lamb; and mentions the command, "That it should not be eaten

" law,

“ raw, nor sodden with water.” Now, though it does not appear why a sop might not be dipped in the dish with the roasted lamb, yet it may be worth while here to observe, from Dr Hammond, (S. John xiii. 26. “ Jesus answered, “ He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it,”) that what is called a sop, does not necessarily imply a piece of bread moistened, but was one of those pieces distributed after the passover, according to a custom among the Jews, in token of charity or brotherly affection ; and that the dipping expresses no more than putting the hand into the dish for to take it.

These are the chief objections I have met with as to our Saviour’s eating the passover, and completely fulfilling the law, before he suffered : but perhaps these arguments themselves have had less weight with many people, than the supposed propriety they think they find in our blessed Saviour’s dying at the very moment the lamb was slain in the temple. That he died about the time the continual burnt offering was offered in the temple, is certain ; that he died at the time when, according to what Mr Kennedy reckons the patriarchal computation, the passover should have been killed, may likewise be granted ; but that the Jews did kill the passover on that day is another question : besides, as to the hour and minute, it is impossible ; for, when so many thousand lambs were to be killed in the temple, it could not be done at any precise moment. Nay, the offering of the one lamb for the continual burnt-offering seems not to have been so confined. Josephus, as quoted by Mr Kennedy, p. 664. says, “ They killed the paschal lamb, from the ninth to the eleventh hour, *i. e.* “ from three in the afternoon till five ; in the remaining “ hour of the day they roasted it ; at the setting of the sun “ they were to eat it :” that is to say, in the beginning of the next day, the 15th of Nisan ; for all the hours of the 14th day are expressly said by Josephus to be passed before they began to eat : and, besides, the command, Exodus xii. 8. is, “ Ye shall eat it in that night,” *i. e.* after sunset and before midnight, which was the time the first-born were killed. Mr Kennedy, p. 652. seems to insist much upon the Hebrew word *בין הערבים* rendered *between the two evenings* ; as if it meant an individual point, between the decline of the day from noon, and the end of it at six o’ clock ; that is to say, as if three was the precise time for killing the passover. I should rather have understood *between the two evenings* to mean the whole time from three



o'clock on the 14th day, properly called the evening or last part of that day, and six o'clock, when that evening began, which was to be the first part of the 15th day. The word is used only in a few places of the Bible; but the meaning of it may, I think, be gathered with certainty from the 1st of Kings xviii. 29. 36. "And it came to pass, when mid day was passed, and they prophesied until the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice." — "At the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice," compared with Numb. xxviii. 4. "The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer at even; "בין הערבִים." In the last of these texts, the time for offering the evening-lamb for the continual burnt offering, is expressed by the same Hebrew word, and rendered in the margin in the same manner, *i. e.* between the two evenings. But when we turn to the account of Elijah's sacrifice in the former texts, we find that the prophets of Baal prophesied until the offering of the מנחה, that is, as in our translation, till the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice; then Elijah, ψ 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. and 35. called the people to him; he repaired the altar; dug the trench, and filled it with water; all which must take up some time; and yet at last began his prayer at the time of the offering of the evening-sacrifice. — So likewise the Israelites, however distant, offered their prayers to God about the time of the evening or morning oblation. All which shews, that the word used for the time of offering the evening-oblation, and for killing the passover, does not imply a precise moment of time; as indeed, from the nature of the things, it could not. — The same may be said as to the prophecies of Daniel, with regard to the time when the Messiah was to be cut off; which Mr Kennedy makes to be accomplished even to a moment. I shall not say much on the subject; for it would carry us too far. I shall only observe, that the truth of the prophecy would not be affected by the difference of an hour, a day, or even of a month, since the time mentioned expresses nothing further than so many weeks of years, or a half week; that is, three years and a half at most. But besides, the prophecy may be completed at the death of the Messiah, so many solar or lunar years being revolved: but this again will no wise affect the question, Whether the day on which it was completed was the 14th or 15th of Nisan; the passover-day, or the day of the feast? for these circumstances are not mentioned in the prophecy at all.

Having

Having now, I think, taken notice of all the material objections to the notion I am defending, I beg the reader to turn back once more to the collection of texts from scripture, and observe with me a few things. *1st*, The chief stress of the argument lies upon a trifling circumstance, *viz.* Whether our Saviour came to Jerusalem about six o'clock, at which time it was sun-set, or some time after? If he came about six, then the orders were given before six, *i. e.* on the 14th day, and the supper was eat on the 15th: but if the supper was eat on the 14th, then the whole of what is mentioned, must have passed after six o'clock; for it was on the day the passover must be killed, that the orders were given. Now, is it probable that our Saviour, being yet at a distance, should send his disciples to find out the guest-chamber; that they should go and prepare; that he should come and sit down; and all this to be done after sun-set: especially when all the three evangelists distinguish the day on which the passover must be killed, from the evening when they came and sat down? *2dly*, Our blessed Saviour saith, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer." If we consider this supper as the legal passover, we see in it the complete fulfilling of the law, which Jesus came not to destroy, but to fulfill; we see in it a conclusion of the shadow, in order to make way for the truth; an end put to the Mosaic dispensation by the most solemn ceremony of it: And can we be then at a loss for the reason, why the blessed Jesus should so earnestly desire to eat this passover, and establish the new one, since this was the very purpose for which he came into the world? But if this was no more but an ordinary supper, it does not appear, why he so much desired to eat it. *3dly*, He says, "I will not any more eat thereof till it be fulfilled." Till what be fulfilled? The things typified by the passover certainly; for there could be nothing in an ordinary supper to be fulfilled: and therefore the passover must be the supper he was going to eat of, and which he had desired; for the same expressions cannot be understood to mean two different things. Again, the cup after supper, the fruit of the vine, is plainly distinguished by St Luke from the eucharistic cup, and our Lord declares he will drink no more of it. — If this was the paschal cup, and the supper the lamb, then the words were verified; for he never kept another passover with his disciples: but if it was an ordinary supper, how was it fulfilled? for the Apostles witness, that they did eat and drink  
with



with him after he rose from the dead, Acts x. 41.—“ And he took it,” (the broiled fish), “ and did eat before them,” St Luke xxiv. 43.—And now, as a conclusion, which may be agreeable to some readers, I will endeavour, as well as I am able, to set in one view all the circumstances of this great transaction, and point out those peculiar beauties which have struck me in it, and which I have not met with in those authors I have read. Should I say any thing that may appear new, I am so far from being vain of the discovery, that I own it needs an apology; and what I shall say for myself is only this, that the doctrines upon which these notions are grounded, are far from being novel doctrines, but are, on the contrary, such as were believed by the primitive church, and acknowledged by the best divines both in Scotland and England, not to mention those of other countries.

On the 14th day of the month, the first of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed, Jesus sendeth two of his disciples, Peter and John, to prepare for him to eat the passover; and for a sign whereby to find a fit place, directs them to follow a man bearing a pitcher of water; which sign has been supposed to represent baptism, the first necessary requisite for such as are to partake of the true passover. The disciples did as Jesus commanded, and in a large upper room (probably one of those commonly called so, and made use of by the Jews for religious purposes) they made ready the passover. When even was come, the hour appointed by the law, that is, the beginning of the 15th day, Jesus came with his disciples, and lay down, according to the usual manner, the beloved disciple lying in his bosom, *i. e.* being on his right hand, or, as it were before him; for the manner was, to lean on the left elbow. Here passed the discourse, in which Christ foretold his sufferings, and declared aloud, that one of them should betray him; that Peter should deny him: with other things mentioned by St Luke only; which however that evangelist does not place in the exact order in which they were said; a circumstance not peculiar to this part of his gospel.—After these discourses, during which the disciples fell into a dispute concerning precedence, Jesus riseth from supper, supper being yet present, and Judas still of the company, and began to wash his disciples feet, &c. The lesson of humility here set us, our blessed Saviour himself pointed out afterwards; but I don't recollect to have met with any comment on these words of our Lord, “ He that is washed, needeth not save  
“ to

“ to wash his feet.” I take them to be an allusion to the custom, both of Jews and Gentiles, to bathe their whole body in water; and I would thus paraphrase them: “ He that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, for they may be soiled in his journey home from the bath; so he that would partake of the passover which I am going to institute, must be cleansed by baptism: and ye are clean, (though not all); yet have need to be washed by me from sins of infirmity and ignorance, which will too often surprize you in your pilgrimage through this world.” Being set down, and having explained to them what he had done; and having again mentioned that he should be betrayed; Simon Peter gave a sign to John, who, being near his master, privately asked him who it should be? and was answered by the token of the sop, or piece of bread, which seems to have been given to Judas before the other disciples, (the *post-cænium* not being yet), as the last trial of his hard heart; for, *immediately* after, he went out, though it is plain the rest sat yet some time. After that he was gone out, passed all the discourse mentioned in the end of the 13th and the whole of the 14th chapter of St John; in which are many things peculiarly suited to the occasion; as, the command to love each other, which was to be the symbol by which his disciples should be known; the foretelling more solemnly than ever that he was now to leave them, and comforting them with hopes of his return; encouraging them to ask in his name, which is particularly understood of those petitions offered up with his sacrifice, to which sense it seems appropriated in this place, they never having had the opportunity of so asking before; and, lastly, the promise of the Holy Ghost. He finishes with these words, “ Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me. But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence.” The first of these verses at first sight conveys, I think, no very distinct idea: “ I will not talk much with you.” He could not, being so soon to depart. “ The prince of this world cometh.”—Who is here meant? If understood of the death he was to suffer from the Roman governor, what mean the following words, “ He hath nothing in me?” If we compare the past discourse with the following chapters, xv. and xvi. we find the disciples in the former eagerly asking questions; in the latter we find them silently attending, till towards the conclusion, hearing their  
 master

master say, " Yet a little while," &c. they begin to whisper among themselves, yet privately ; but he, knowing they were desirous to ask him, encourages them to it ; and after a few words they are silent again ; and he goes on till he concludes his discourse with the heavenly prayer contained in the 17th chapter. From this difference of behaviour in the apostles, therefore, I would conclude, that they understood the words of our blessed Saviour somewhat to the following purpose : " I have indulged you hitherto in familiar discourse, asking me questions freely ; but now that time is past. I have promised you a comforter, who shall teach you all things ; but as for me, I will not henceforth talk with you in this manner ; for I am now going to perform that great action for which I came into this world, and to offer myself up a victim to suffer the whole wrath of God for man ; in consequence of which the prince of this world cometh : but though he shall be allowed to try me a second time by a most dreadful agony, yet shall he find nothing in me : but that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father has given me commandment, even so I do, offering myself a free and willing sacrifice. — Arise, hear now my last dying words : and after concluding the paschal solemnity, and finishing the work given me to do, let us go hence." — The expression *arise*, shews certainly, that till then they were still at the table : but I don't see that it necessarily follows they immediately went out, or that the discourse and prayer, chapters xv. xvi. xvii. was spoken in the way to Gethsemane : for St John expressly says after that prayer, " When Jesus had spoken these words," (consequently not before), " he went forth with his disciples over the brook " Cedron." Saying, " He then went forth," implies, that till then he had remained in the house. Besides, the other three evangelists mention the hymn as the last thing before they went out ; that therefore must come between their rising from table, and their going forth ; for the Jews knew too well the reverence due to God in his worship, to sing the hymn, or join in the solemn blessing which accompanied the last paschal cup, lying on beds at the table. Add to all this, that the words, " I am the true vine," &c. stand quite unconnected, if spoken after they were gone out, and seem therefore abrupt ; but, connected with what passed in the house, they have a peculiar beauty and energy. It may be objected, That we suppose the paschal lamb to be eat lying along ; and why not the hymn sung in the same posture, since  
it

it was a religious feast? It was so indeed; but so were all their feasts, being all feasts upon sacrifice: but though they were doubtless eat in a reverent manner, yet they were not considered as acts to be performed in a posture of devotion; for then must they have been ever in a posture of prayer. Saul sat at the feast of the new moon, and so would David had he been present; 1 Sam. xx. 24. 25. "So David hid himself in the field: and when the new moon was come, the king sat him down to eat meat. And the king sat up on his seat as at other times, even upon a seat by the wall: and Jonathan arose, and Abner sat by Saul's side, and David's place was empty." The devotional part had been performed in the temple, and then the feasts were celebrated in a posture of rest; but the prayers that accompanied them, were doubtless said in the posture of prayer, *i. e.* standing. As St John relates scarce any thing but what the others omit, he leaves us at liberty to fix the time of the institution of the holy eucharist to that part of his relation which shall appear best to suit it; and none seems to suit so well as this we are now arrived at.—It has been learnedly proved by several authors, that our Saviour did not begin to offer himself when on the cross; but that his oblation, like those by which it was typified, particularly the sacrifice of the goat on the day of expiation, was not a momentary action, but a continued act; not fully concluded till he entered at his ascension into the holy places not made with hands, by his own blood, there to be an high priest for ever: Heb. ix. 11. 12. "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us.*" To say he did not offer himself on the cross, is, I think, too bold an expression; what passed in that dreadful moment we are not told; and the words, "*Into thy hands I commend my spirit,*" are a kind of oblation; but they were spoken when our Saviour was expiring on the cross as the victim, not officiating as a living high priest. As such he could not offer himself when dead; as a voluntary oblation he could scarcely be said to offer himself when in the hands of his persecutors, and by them, not himself, laid on the cross. The time, the witnesses, of that great sacrifice, seem not so proper; it is therefore rightly concluded, that the solemn oblation of the



Son of God, as a propitiation for the sins of the world, was made by himself, at the institution of the holy eucharist, in a place, probably a place of worship, in the midst of his apostles, who were to witness to the world how freely and cheerfully he devoted himself to death before any appearance of violence; which they could not do when he was on the cross, for they were then dispersed. Our blessed Lord says, speaking to the Father, St John xvii. 4. "I have finished the work thou gavest me to do." How strictly true was this expression, if our Saviour had now offered the great sacrifice for which he came into the world? The rest was the work of his crucifiers; even as it was the priest's office to offer before the Lord both the goats on the day of atonement, to confess over the one the sins of the people, and to carry the blood of the other into the holy of holies, both jointly representing the one oblation of Christ; but the flesh was to be carried out by any one, and burnt without the camp, as Jesus also suffered without the gate: Lev. xvi. 27. "And the bullock for the sin-offering, and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp, and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung." Heb. xiii. 12. "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." How literally therefore did he say, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do?" St John xvii. 4.; but with what propriety could it be said, if that action to which all others tended, was yet left undone?

We are accustomed, from our childhood, to see our Saviour represented in pictures sitting at a table, and there blessing the elements, or distributing them to the disciples; our imaginations are prejudiced by these false images, contrived in the ages of the darkest ignorance, and by persons commonly but little versed in history or divinity, however skilful in painting. Since then the imagination has been made use of to teach wrong notions, I shall perhaps be indulged in setting before it, what seems to me a truer picture. Let us, therefore, imagine the blessed Jesus standing before that table, which was now to become an altar, with the symbols of his body and blood placed before him, his disciples, risen at his command, attending in awful silence, till the solemn blessing and hymn, which accompanied the *post-cœnium*, (or distribution of bread and wine), should be pronounced by their master. When the blessed Jesus, with a majesty in his  
countenance

countenance suitable to the great occasion, begins that noble discourse,—“ I am the true vine,” &c. The practice of the bishops of the primitive church is the best comment on the six first verses of this chapter; they considered the holy eucharist, not only as the symbol of unity with Christ, and with each other, but as the instituted means whereby we are made one with Christ, and Christ with us; without whom we can do nothing; separated from whom we are but dead branches: they cut off, by the authority committed to them, every branch not bearing fruit, after the example of the great husbandman; they purged, by salutary penance, such branches as, though not dead, had need of purging; and they had this very passage in view, the meaning of which can never be so evident, as when connected with the institution of the sacrament. Verse 7. repeats the promise of granting what is asked in Christ’s name, *i. e.* in virtue of his oblation; even as the Jews had a regard to the time and place of the daily burnt-offering, where-ever absent. The following verses to the 13th, are an exhortation to love: “ For greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.”  $\psi$  18. begins an exhortation to the disciples to devote themselves to sufferings; to offer themselves, their souls and bodies, for him, as he now offered himself for them. He then revives their drooping spirits, by repeating the promise of the Holy Ghost, and shewing the advantage of changing a corporal presence for a spiritual one; and yet adds, that they should even see him corporally present with them again for a little while. Upon this, they (who were still intent upon his coming to reign on earth) began to whisper; and he, knowing they were desirous to ask, explains himself more fully; whereupon they begin with more confidence to assert the steadiness of their faith; but Jesus checks their confidence, with this lesson of humility,—“ Do ye now believe? Behold, the hour cometh; —“ I have overcome the world.” These words spake Jesus,—and having performed the actions recorded by the other evangelists, lift up his eyes to heaven, and said, “ Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son.—“ I have glorified thee,” *i. e.* by the oblation of myself. “ I have finished the work,” *i. e.* “ I am no longer to be active, but passive in all which is to follow. “ I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me.— I pray for them.—Keep those thou hast given me. “ —For their sakes I sanctify myself.—Neither pray I for these alone.— That they all may be one,” &c. Can one



read this prayer, and not compare it with those in the ancient liturgies? Can one, especially, consider that expression, "For their sakes I sanctify myself," and not consider it as the very oblatory prayer, accompanying our blessed Lord's sacrifice? In what sense could he be sanctified, now, or at any other time, but in the sense in which it is said, "Sanctify to me the first-born?" They, or their substitutes, were devoted to death, and Christ did now devote himself to death for the sins of mankind. We are not told, whether our Lord used any other prayer during this action; neither are we told what prayers were used by the Jewish church at their sacrifices: but we are told, St Luke i. 12. that Zacharias used some prayer when he offered incense; for his prayer was heard\*. And therefore we must not, from the silence of scripture, infer that sacrifice was a silent worship by actions only, though in many cases it might be so.

If to all these considerations, we add the difficulties that attend the common notion, that this prayer and discourse were uttered in the short way to the brook Cedron, and that in a dark and cold night, (for they had fire within and lanthorns and torches without, notwithstanding the full moon), walking on the way, when *eleven* persons can scarce attend to the speech of one; especially not to a speech the most solemn and the longest, (except the sermon on the mount, when he was sitting), the longest, I say, of any recorded in scripture; when other discourses are also said to have passed, particularly the second foretelling of Peter's denial. S. Mark xiv. 27.; will not all this incline us (since nothing is said to the contrary) to suppose the whole to have passed in the house, at the institution of the new testament? After which, ending with an hymn, they went out. I can think but of two objections that can be made to what is here said: the first, That S. Matthew and S. Mark say, the holy eucharist was instituted as they were eating; whence it is supposed they were yet at table. But it is allowed on all hands, that what they were eating was the *post-*

\* I cannot help observing here, that what is said of Zacharias shews his prayer was the petition of the church for the coming of the promised Messiah; for the answer is, Thou shalt have a son, who shall go before the Lord. His prayer was not for a son; but his prayer was heard and granted; therefore it was for the latter part of the promise, *i. e.* the coming of Christ, that he had been praying.

*cœnium*; and S. Luke, by mentioning the paschal cup, puts it out of doubt. And why, when not one word is said to prove it, must we suppose them sitting to eat this last morsel, especially when it was accompanied by the solemn benediction? The second is, That Judas has been by many supposed to have partook of the holy sacrament; whereas this account places the institution after he was gone out. But, without entering into the inquiry, what authorities are for either opinion, I shall only say, I should rather suppose Judas to have gone out and returned, (for the other evangelists say nothing of his going out), than separate the discourse and prayer from the institution. As for S. Luke's adding, *ψ* 21. chap. xxii. "The hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table," which he inserts after the institution; that is certainly part of the same discourse mentioned by S. Matthew and S. Mark, as having passed before. And accordingly it is followed in S. Luke by the account of the dispute concerning who should be greatest, which is allowed on all hands to have passed before. What therefore is said by S. Luke of the institution, from *ψ* 17. to *ψ* 21. should probably be in a parenthesis; for then S. Luke's account stands like that of the others.

And now I will beg leave to return to chronology, and ask the favour of Mr Kennedy, or any other calculator, to consider one text of scripture, which I was surpris'd to find wanting in the collection of texts of that kind in the *Complete System*, p. 87. I mean, the account of the passage of Jordan, from Joshua, the 4th to the 10th, 11th, and 13th verses of the 5th chapter. They passed Jordan on the 10th day of the first month, *i. e.* at the vernal equinox; they kept the passover on the 14th day in the plains of Jericho: "And they did eat of the old corn of the land on the morrow after the passover, unleavened cakes and parched corn in the self-same day. And the manna ceased on the morrow after they had eaten of the old corn of the land, &c." They had been in the promised land four complete days, yet the manna continued. The reason of this will be found Lev. xxiii. 10. to *ψ* 16. They might not eat of the corn of the land till the wave-sheaf, that is, the first-fruits of the harvest, had been offered to the Lord; and this was to be done on the morrow after the Sabbath, that Sabbath-day which was an high day, because it fell within the paschal week. For that this was the very Sabbath, is plain; for it is said, they

They eat unleavened bread of the old corn. This day of offering the first fruits is very remarkable: it was the regulator of the feast of Pentecost; for they were to number seven Sabbaths from this day, and on the morrow after the seventh Sabbath the feast of weeks or Pentecost was to be observed: so that both these feasts, and the octave of the last, were to be kept always on a Sunday; thereby preserving (as Mr Kennedy rightly observes) the memory of the patriarchal Sabbath, and typifying Christ, who was on that day to rise from the dead. On the first of these days the first-fruits of the early harvest were to be offered; that is, the wave-sheaf; and on that day our Saviour rose from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep. On the last of these days, I mean the day of Pentecost, the two loaves were offered as the first-fruits of the latter harvest; on the same day the law was given from Mount Sinai, and on the same day also the new law was given by the descent of the Holy Ghost, and 3000 converts were offered up to God as the first-fruits of the preaching of the apostles.—Mr Kennedy observes, when fixing the commencement of time, that the command of keeping the 15th day of the seventh month, at the revolution or end of the year, shews plainly the year was twofold; for the year could not end at the seventh month: and he hence likewise concludes, that it was an original feast in memory of the creation, as well as a thanksgiving for the ingathering of vines and olive-yards. It was also, at the Exodus, ordained to be kept as the feast of tabernacles, in memory of the dwelling in tents in the wilderness: but had that alone been the design of it, it should have been fixed to the vernal equinox; for that, and not the autumnal, was the time they came out of Egypt\*; but it was also typical of Christ, who, as St John tells us, was to pitch his tabernacle among men, and is thought by many, as well as Mr Kennedy, to have been born at that very feast. On the first of this same seventh month was the feast of trumpets at the new moon, perhaps in remembrance of the new creation after the deluge, when the position of the luminaries, Mr Kennedy says, were inverted, and the new moon coincided with the equinox, as the full moon did at the creation; perhaps it was also typical of the revolution

\* It is remarkable, that the command of keeping the 15th day is twice repeated at large Lev. xxiii.; first from  $\psi$  34. to  $\psi$  36.—then  $\psi$  39. to  $\psi$  44. and each time also the keeping the 8th day is mentioned; which seems to imply a double reason for its observation.

of all things. So likewise the feast of the passover was in remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt, and typical of the deliverance of mankind from the slavery of sin; but inseparably connected with it was this feast on the morrow after the passover, originally a thanksgiving for the blessings bestowed by the great giver of all things, an acknowledgment of his supreme dominion, and a typical representation of him who was to rise from the dead that day, which very day it seems to have been the intention of the Christian church to celebrate through all generations. Lastly, The feast of Pentecost was a thanksgiving for the harvest, a memorial of the giving of the law, as being fifty days after the paschal Sabbath, a memorial of the patriarchal Sabbath, as being always on a Sunday, and a type of the new law, which was to be given on that same day. But, all this while, I have not mentioned what I would infer from Joshua iv. &c. as to chronology. It is in short this: It is mentioned there, that they did not eat of the old corn till such a day; from Lev. xxiii. I have shewed, that the reason why they began to eat of it only on that day was, that the first fruits were then offered; for they were expressly forbid to taste of it before: but the day on which they began to eat, is by Joshua called *the morrow after the passover*; therefore I think we may with certainty conclude, that the passover was that year on a Sabbath-day, since the morrow after the Sabbath was the morrow after the passover. Hence, therefore, is the day of the week, Sunday, connected with the 16th day of the first month at the vernal equinox. This, therefore, seems to be a test whereby to try the Rev. Mr Kennedy's system, at least with regard to the year of Exodus. If these characters shall be found to agree with A. M. 2552, then it is easy to know on what days of the week the first passover, the passage of the red sea, the giving of the law, &c. fell in the year of the Exodus; if not, with what other year will they agree? But if they agree with none near about that time, will they suit better with the Jewish manner of reckoning the 16th day of the month? I have not myself so much as attempted a calculation; so that I am totally ignorant, whether this text will witness for or against the Rev. Mr Kennedy: but I think the text of importance enough to deserve his consideration; and it is plain he had not considered it when he wrote. If therefore he will give the public his thoughts upon it, he will very much oblige one, who honours his piety, learning, and unwearied industry,



industry, and who is a wellwisher to his system, as to the chief part. I am,

REV. SIR,

Your ever obliged humble Servant.

P. S. Should the Rev. Mr Kennedy think it worth while to take notice of the above, I wish he would explain what he says, p. 175. "If a line were drawn from that point of the heavens where the ecliptic intersects the celestial equinoctial, it would fall on this very point of the equator; therefore this in nature must be the first meridian." How is this reconcileable with the situation of his first meridian, 156 degrees west of Greenwich? or that again with what is said in his first book on chronology, That the first meridian is the same as that of ~~Edinburgh~~? Something is certainly wanting as to clearness of expression in some of these places.

Eden?

The above, said to be  
written, by the Rev. Mr —  
Guthrie, Ep. minister at  
Preston. A. M. Ep.  
F I N I S.

(C. 1762.)





















































































