"What You are going to do, do quickly": A Close Reading of Judas' Betrayal of Jesus and Jesus' Self-Knowledge as "Lamb of God" in John 13:21-32

Joseph Don Zaldivar

In 2011, the Catholic Bishops Conference of Philippines (CBCP) website featured a series of videos that were meant to help Filipinos in their observance of the Holy Week. One of the videos that were uploaded was that of reflection points being given by Pablo Virgilio David, then an auxiliary bishop of San Fernando in Pampanga. His video-reflection was intended for Holy Thursday. The following are transcriptions of pertinent parts of what he said:

> On Holy Thursday, we celebrate the Mass of the Lord's Supper, and of course the ritual of the Washing of the Feet. I remember when I was a child…, I wondered why our people would usually celebrate the *pahatid ng pagkain ng apostol.* There was a ritual procession, and somebody was holding a platter of the *kordero*, roasted lamb.
>
> According to the Synoptic Gospels, especially the Gospel of Mark, that evening they were supposed to be celebrating the Passover meal. We know that the usual Passover meal included unleavened bread, wine, bitter herbs, and of course, the main course—the roasted lamb.
>
> I asked, 'Why is it that during the mass, we only have bread and wine, and there is no lamb? And why is it only during Holy Thursday that the people bring the lamb on a platter?'

I remember asking my mother these questions. And my mother answered, 'But the Lamb is Jesus Christ because Jesus Christ is the Lamb of God.' So I said, 'Oh does that mean they did not really celebrate the Passover meal?'

The Jewish people celebrate the Passover meal in the same way that Americans celebrate Thanksgiving with roasted turkey; the difference is that the Jewish people had lamb. What we call the 'Last Supper of the Lord' is really in memory of another 'last supper,' that of the last supper of the Jewish people before their freedom from being slaves in Egypt; this is what Jesus and his disciples were commemorating.

But there is a serious issue about the fact that there was no lamb that showed up on table. One time I was meditating on the Gospel of John, and I realized the clue right in this Gospel. Remember Jesus said, 'One of you will betray me.' Then one of the disciples asked Jesus, 'Who is it?' Jesus said, 'I will dip the bread in the dish, and the one I will give it to, that's him.' And he dipped the bread in the dish, and sure enough, he gave it to Judas.

After Judas had eaten the bread, Jesus said, "What you are going to do, do quickly." What was he supposed to do? The disciples were also wondering what Jesus was instructing him to do.

Well, I would like to believe that Judas was supposed to procure the lamb because he was the treasurer of the group. Unfortunately, he did not come back. And when he was not coming back, it became clear to Jesus that he had been betrayed. It became clear to Jesus that no roasted lamb was going to show up at table. That is because, he was going to be the lamb.

> I can imagine the disciples already hungry and asking, 'Where is the lamb?' Remember that the same question was asked by Isaac to his father, Abraham. Abraham answered, 'God will provide.' And now, the disciples were asking the same question to Jesus. Maybe Jesus humored them and said, 'I am the Lamb!'
>
> That was the beginning of our Eucharist, which is Jesus giving himself, body and blood, to us. Jesus gave us an entirely new meaning to the Passover meal of the Jewish people. It is no longer about a lamb by which the Jewish people are saved. Now it is about Jesus, by whose passion and death, we are all saved; not just the Jewish people, but everyone's salvation is guaranteed by the death of Jesus.[1]

The passage from the Fourth Gospel that the good bishop might have read is 13:21-30, which I will call the Betrayal Announcement Narrative:

> When Jesus had thus spoken, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, 'Truly, truly, I say to you, one of you will betray me.' The disciples looked at one another, uncertain of whom he spoke. One of his disciples, whom Jesus loved, was lying close to the breast of Jesus; so Simon Peter beckoned to him and said, "Tell us who it is of whom he speaks." So lying thus, close to the breast of Jesus, he said to him, "Lord, who is it?" Jesus answered, "It is he to whom I shall give this morsel when I have dipped it." So when he had dipped the morsel, he gave it to Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot. Then after the morsel, Satan entered into him. Jesus said to him, "What you are going to do, do quickly." Now no one at the table knew why he said this to him. Some thought that, because Judas had the money box, Jesus was telling him, "Buy what we need for the

1 Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines, "Holy Thursday Reflections." *Visita Iglesia* 2011. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VBG8Qic1gjI (accessed February 12, 2013).

> feast;" or, that he should give something to the poor. So, after receiving the morsel, he immediately went out; and it was night.

The conclusion the bishop has arrived at with this passage is that the Johannine Jesus came to understand himself as the Lamb of God when Judas left and did not return with a lamb procured from the temple. However, several questions arise from this interpretation. This research seeks to make a review of his reflections in light of the Fourth Gospel through a close reading of the Betrayal Announcement Narrative in order to understand how Jesus might have been thinking and feeling regarding the attitudes and actuations of Judas, of Satan, and Judas' betrayal of him.

However, before looking into the Betrayal Announcement Narrative itself, I shall try to discover how the Johannine author seeks to determine how the read is to perceive Judas (and Satan) and his relationship toward Jesus. I shall therefore undertake a close reading of the character of Judas (and Satan) in parts of the Gospel preceding the Betrayal Announcement Narrative, with particular focus on his character development during the foot-washing scene.

Reader Knowledge about Judas (and Satan) until John 13

By the time the reader has reached chapter 13, one must have already encountered references to the figure of Judas twice: at the conclusion of the Bread of Life discourse (6:60-71), and at the scene of the anointing of Jesus' feet at Bethany (12:1-8). Likewise, one must have been confronted also with the figure of "the devil" being referred to once: at the confrontation of Jesus with "the Jews" (8:44).

Judas: The Devil among the Twelve (6:60-71)

In 6:31-59, Jesus is portrayed to be delivering his "Bread of Life Discourse" during a dialogue with "the Jews" at the synagogue in Capernaum. Jesus spoke of himself as the "bread of life" (6:48) which must be partaken of in order to gain life (6:57). In 6:60, the narrator reveals that Jesus's own disciples found his words to be very difficult to receive.

Then, for the first time, in 6:64, the narrator makes his very first reference to Jesus' betrayer. For now, the narrator withholds from the reader the identity of the betrayer, but states that Jesus knew who his betrayer would be. It would be seven verses later, in 6:71, that the narrator gives the reader a share in the knowledge of Jesus by explicitly stating that it is Judas who is about to betray Jesus.

We also know from 6:64 that "the Twelve" are not perfect disciples; they are "half-hearted" about believing in Jesus and following him. Apparently, however, one of them is most imperfect; and him we find Jesus referring to as his betrayer, the "devil" among "the Twelve" whom he has chosen (6:70). The reader here would find a "tragic irony in the making."[2] Judas keeps being considered and treated as one of "the Twelve," someone whom Jesus himself has chosen, yet he acts contrary and is called "devil."

"Devil," here may be understood as "the enemy" or "the adversary," i.e. someone who will oppose the words and deeds of Jesus.[3] The Johannine community would have easily understood the Bread of Life Discourse as an allusion to the

2 Margaret Beirne, *Women and Men in the Fourth Gospel: A Genuine Discipleship of Equals* (London: Continuum, 2004), 147. Cf., André Gagné, "Caractérisation des Figures de Satan et Judas dans le Quatriéme Evangile," *Science et Esprit* 55 (2003): 268.

3 Gagne, "Caractérisation des Figures de Satan et Judas," 269-70.

Eucharist i.e. the *memoria passionis* communion meal of the early Christian community. At the foot washing scene, some allusion to the Eucharist will also be made and Judas shall respond in a remarkably opposite manner.

The Devil: Father, Murderer, and Liar (8:44)

A clearer Johannine characterization of "the devil" appears in 8:44 where the evangelist identifies "the devil" to be the "father" of "the Jews".[4] This occurs within the 8:32-47 pericope which narrates another discussion of Jesus with "the Jews."

Upon reaching this pericope, the reader has already encountered several times the Johannine portrayal of "the Jews" to be having murderous intentions against Jesus (cf. 5:18; 7:1, 19-20, 25; 8:37, 40). Moreover, in 7:19-20, "the Jews" have also been portrayed to be lying because they deny their desire to kill Jesus, and thus they are devoid of truth (cf. 8:47).

Alas, in 8:44, the evangelist exposes the reason for their homicidal intents and dishonesty. According to the Fourth Gospel, "the Jews" are engendered by their "father," the devil who is a murderer and a liar (8:44b). And so it is that their wills are servile to the desires of the devil (8:44a).[5]

4 The very negative depiction of "the Jews" by the Johannine author does not warrant a judgment of anti-semitism against the Fourth Evangelist. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in the Fourth Gospel does not refer to modern-day "Jews", i.e. a particular group of people belonging to a particular race or religion, nor to their ancestors *in toto.* Rather, most probably, he uses the term οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι to identify a group of persons encountered by the Johannine community to be unbelieving or apostatic. Cf. Amy Jill Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew* (New York: Harper Collins, 2006), 102-16. A more detailed discussion of scholarly opinions are outlined in Urban C. von Wahlde, "'The Jews' in the Gospel of John: Fifteen Years of Research (1983-1998)," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis* 76 (2000): 30-55.

5 Juan Barreto and Juan Mateos, *El Evangelio de Juan: Analisis Linguistico y Comentario Exegetico* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad,

https://publications.lst.edu/

Judas: A Hypocrite, i.e. A Thief and an Uncaring One (12:1-8)

The second time that the reader will encounter Judas is in chapter 12. By this time, one has knowledge of Judas as the devil (6:70-71) and that the devil is murderer and liar (8:44).

One then finds Jesus in Bethany, having just finished the spectacular raising of Lazarus from the dead (11:1ff). At the house, Mary, the sister of Lazarus, anoints the feet of Jesus with a pound of very expensive perfume (12:3). Then Judas figures in the scene, very indignant at what Mary did. He points out the financial wastefulness of the act, asserting that resources could have been used for the poor (12:4-5). However, the narrator exposes his hypocrisy (12:6). Judas was actually lying about his intentions for the poor. Furthermore, he was embezzling from the treasury of the believing community.

Judas, the betrayer, not only stands here in contradistinction against Mary, the loyal and loving friend of Jesus.[6] Rather, the reader will also sense a lot of diametric opposition of Judas against Jesus the "good shepherd" (cf. 10:11). Not only was Judas uncaring towards the poor and little ones, unlike the "good shepherd" who cared for the weak sheep (10:13). Judas was also a thief, i.e. the very adversary of the "good shepherd" (10:1, 8, 10). The reader could now have the sense that Judas, the symbolic representation of the unbelievers and apostates in the Johannine community, is the referent for "thief" in 10:1-18. Indeed, apart from the Good Shepherd discourse, the only other mention of "thief" (κλεπτης) in the Fourth Gospel is in 12:6. Furthermore, 10:10 makes a link

1979), 589.

6 Beirne, *Women and Men in the Fourth Gospel*, 140-69 and Michael Crosby, *'Do You Love Me?' Jesus Questions the Church* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000), 139-41.

between thief and murderer, hinting for the reader to think that Judas also has murderous intents against the sheep he preys upon.

Thus, by his thievery and hypocrisy, Judas stands not only in contrast with Mary and the Good Shepherd, but also parallel to the devil, who is murderer and liar.[7] This now definitely confirms the direct description given to him by Jesus in 6:70-71: Judas is the "devil" among "the Twelve."

Reader Knowledge about Jesus until John 13

Upon reaching chapter 13, the reader is already fully aware that Judas is set to betray Jesus, and that Jesus is aware of the betrayal that is to happen to him as well as who his betrayer is (6:70-71). In addition to this, as Moloney observes, the reader must have also appropriated a good amount of the Fourth Evangelist's image of Jesus.[8]

First, the reader has by now repeatedly heard Jesus speak about the "hour" which is yet to come (2:4; 7:30; 8:20). It is the "hour" of the passion of Jesus and the glorification of himself and of the Father. Several times, this "hour" is associated with the Passover feast (11:55-57; 12:20-24, 27-33). Indeed, in chapter 13, the readers find that the two themes coalesce (13:1). The reader has also heard Jesus speaking several times about his departure (7:32-36; 8:14, 21-27). This, too, is now made clear in chapter 13.

It is also clear to the readers that, in the course of his ministry, Jesus has gathered a group of disciples that are called "his own" (οἱ ἴδιοι) i.e. "his own people" (1:11-12), "his own flock"

7 Gagné, "Caractérisation des Figures de Satan et Judas," 271.
8 Francis Moloney, *Glory Not Dishonor: Reading John 13-21* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1998), 12.

https://publications.lst.edu/

(10:3,4,12) and in chapters 13-17, he tells that his departure towards the Father is for the sake of "his own."

But most importantly, by reading the Prologue itself (1:1-18), the readers know *who* Jesus is. He is the Word of God, the one from the Father, and is destined to return to the Father. And so now, at the opening of chapter 13, they will learn of *what* he did (loved his own to the end) and the rest of the Passion narrative will explicate *how* he will fulfill his identity.

The Foot Washing as the Preceding Literary Context (13:1-30)

In John 13:1-30, the figure of Judas/the betrayer is three times referred to: at the beginning of the foot washing (13:2), during the dialogue with Peter (13:10b-11), and at the explanation of the foot washing gesture (13:18). Satan is referred to once, at the beginning (13:2). While Judas (with Satan) is not the main theme of the foot washing narrative, the relatively frequent reference to "the betrayer" means that the Fourth Evangelist intends to emphasize the role of the betrayer in the thematic development of the narrative.[9]

The characterization of Judas in the Foot Washing narrative may thus be done at three moments within the narrative: the "prologue" (13:1-3), the actual foot washing and dialogue with Peter (13:4-11), and the explanation discourse (13:12-20). In analysis, one may easily notice the tendency of the Fourth Evangelist to insert allusions to Judas/the betrayer to create an irony that would further highlight the themes present in the foot washing narrative.

9 Blaise Arminjon, *Nous Voudrions Voir Jesus : Avec Saint Jean Decouvrir Son Visage* (Paris: Desclee de Brouwer, 1996), 43-44.

Loving to the End (13:1-3)

Verses 1-3 of chapter 13 provide a "second prologue" within the Fourth Gospel[10], i.e. a sort of *introduction solennelle* to the whole passion narrative.[11] It stands parallel to 1:1-18 in that it explains in more concrete terms how Jesus is Word of God (1:1) and revealer of the glory of the Father (1:18); it is Jesus who "loved his own to the end."

What is crucial here is Jesus's knowledge of the arrival of his Paschal "hour," of which he was aware "with plain conscience and full lucidity."[12] Jesus knew of his Passion and he actively consented to it.[13] More importantly, he also knew that his hour of Passion is also the hour of his glorification and victory (13:3). And this "double knowledge and power" of Jesus climaxes in absolute love—loving till the end (εἰς τέλος, cf. 19:28, 30).[14]

It is against the themes of love, glorification, community, and light in 13:1-3 that the "parenthetic insertion" of 13:2 stands. Almost immediately, at the mention of "Judas" and the "devil," the bells in the mind of the reader peal with alarm. There is a "break in the rhythm!"[15] Betrayal, perdition, discord, and darkness are about to happen. Through the use of irony, the insertion of Judas here highlights at best the loving act that Jesus is about to do.

Closer reading may further highlight this irony; four noteworthy details may be mentioned: (1) the use of the nominative

10 Arminjon, *Nous Voudrions Voir Jesus*, 35.
11 G.M. Behler, *Les Paroles d'Adieux du Seigneur* (Paris: Cerf, 1960), 2.
12 Arminjon, *Nous Voudrions Voir Jesus*, 35.
13 Xavier Leon-Dufour, *Lecture de l'Evangile selon Jean* (Paris: Seuil, 1988), 39.
14 Ibid, 36.
15 Ibid.

Ἰούδας, (2) the meal setting, (3) linking with death, and (4) the double yet ironic use of the verb βάλλω (put into). First, one may observe that in the original Greek, "Judas" is in the nominative Ἰούδας rather than the genitive Ἰούδα ("of Judas" as in RSV). It is thus better translated as "…when the devil had put it into *the heart that Judas, son of Simon Iscariot*…."[16] It may seem therefore that the devil was seeking entrance into every heart in the room, i.e. of all the disciples, not just that of Judas.[17] This further highlights the link between the foot-washing and the issue of group solidarity.[18] The devil, in this sense, fulfills his identity as the "sower of discord,"[19] over which Jesus will triumph through his Passion that will gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad (11:27).

Second, equally worth noting is the mention of the setting of a meal. Meals take a communitarian function in the context of Semitic cultures and the testimonies of the Hebrew scriptures, e.g. Isaac and Abimelech (Gen 26:30), Jacob and Laban (Gen 31:54), Moses and the elders of Israel (Ex 24:9-11) It is also a mark of hospitality and intimacy (Ruth 2:14). The treason of Judas and the "divisiveness" of the devil are therefore very unacceptable and stand in irony against the whole theme of 13:1-3.[20]

Third, from a narrative perspective, the inserted mention of the betrayal of Judas also signals the reader about the

16 D.A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1996), 462. This version is apparently more attested in the ancient sources and Raymond Brown, *The Gospel according to John : Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, vol. 2 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 550.

17 Thomas Brodie, *The Gospel according to John : A Literary and Theological Commentary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 447.

18 Bruce Malina and Richard Rohrbaugh, *Social-science Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1998), 219.

19 The word διαβόλος may also mean "sower of discord", i.e. destroyer of unity, cf. Arminjon, *Nous Voudrions Voir Jesus*, 37.

20 Leon-Dufour, *Lecture de l'Evangile selon Jean*, 25.

imminence of the death of Jesus. In this way, the Fourth Evangelist links the act of foot washing to the death of Jesus, further emphasizing the notion of love-to-the-end.[21]

And fourth, as soon as the reader reaches 13:5, the love-betrayal irony would be further sharpened by the relatively frequent use (twice) of the relatively rare word, βάλλω (put into), within one pericope or chapter.[22] In 13:2, it is used for describing the action of the devil putting (βεβληκότος) betrayal into the heart; while in 13:5, it is used to denote the action of Jesus pouring (βάλλει) water in the basin for an act of love. The two contradictory uses imply the experience in the disciples of two opposing forces. The first is an infection of darkness and betrayal of the heart, and the second, a loving purification of wrong.[23]

Indeed, 13:1-3 encapsulates for the reader what is to be expected in the next chapters: the paradoxes of love-hatred, loyalty-betrayal, passion-glorification, solidarity-discord. Even this early in the narrative, the reader can now feel with anticipation the drama of conflict that is to unfold in the Passion narrative between Judas (with Satan) and Jesus.

Washed yet Unclean (13:10-11)

In 13:4-5, Jesus has washed the feet of his disciples, which is the *semēion* of his love-till-the-end (13:1) and of his "hour" of Passion and glorification.[24] Then in 13:6-10a, the reader

21 Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 563-64.
22 Brodie, *The Gospel according to John*, 448.
23 Ibid.
24 Fernando Segovia, "John 12:1-20, The Footwashing in the Johannine Tradition" *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1982): 31-51. Also cf. James Dunn, "The Washing of the Disciples' Feet in John 13:1-20," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 61 (1970): 247-52.

https://publications.lst.edu/

encounters the terribly poor understanding of Peter (who likewise represents the rest of the disciples). This stands in irony against the full knowledge of Jesus which the reader has just seen in 13:1-3. In the subsequent verses 13:10-11, Jesus chooses to respond to the confrontations of Peter (i.e. with the rest of the disciples). Probably fed up with Peter's weak comprehension, Jesus had to do some explaining, even if futile, so that somehow, the disciples might understand his gesture.

In his explanation, Jesus initially suggests linking the act of foot washing to its cleansing effects (13:10). Earlier in the Gospel, the reader has read a little mention about the Jewish rite of purification (2:6, the water jars at Cana) and may also know the purity rules of the Jewish religion. However, one will later find Jesus, in 15:3, redefining the meaning of cleanliness from ritual purity to cleanliness brought about by the word spoken by Jesus to them.

Thus, on the one hand, 13:10a might be an attempt of the Fourth Evangelist to contradistinguish faith in Jesus (washing of the feet) against Jewish ritualism (purification).[25] On the other hand, it may also signify spiritual cleanliness, which the disciples received through the word spoken to them by Jesus (15:3).[26] It is therefore not really the washing that purified the disciples, but the long time they have spent with Jesus listening to his word[27] and believing in it.[28]

It may be noted further that foot washing may be symbolic of forgiveness. With the feet as a symbol of action, washing becomes a symbol of cleansing away the errant actions of a

25 Bareto and Mateos, *El Evangelio de Juan*, 585.
26 Behler, *Les Paroles d'Adieux*, 37.
27 Bareto and Mateos, *El Evangelio de Juan*,596.
28 Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, 466.

person (similar to how cutting away one's hand is to cease acting in a certain way, cf. Mk 9:43).[29] The shift from the second person singular in addressing Peter to the second person plural (ὑμεῖς) to address all the disciples may signify Jesus concern for solidarity and community among his disciples through mutual forgiveness, mercy, and love.

Again, using irony, it is against these themes of faith in the word of Jesus and solidarity with the community of disciples that the Fourth Evangelist makes mention of Judas. Appraised as unclean, Judas stands in irony against the disciples who are already clean. Aware of the traitorous intents of Judas, Jesus knew (13:11) that Judas refused to believe in Jesus' word (6:64) and to be one with the believing community. The foot washing had no effect on Judas; he remained unclean.[30]

It is not that Judas only refused to be cleansed in this moment. He has always refused to believe Jesus (6:64). Moreover, the use of the present participle παραδιδόντα (been betraying) rather than the future tense shows that Judas has always been scheming to betray his master.[31] Judas has always been unclean and intends to remain so.

The stubbornness of Judas to be an outsider while remaining an insider makes this "insertion" stand out again in the narrative[32], just as it did in 13:2 and 6:60-71. The Fourth Evangelist heightens the irony by a mere mention of Judas or betrayer.

29 Rohrbaugh and Malina, *Social-science Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 220-221.
30 Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 568.
31 Ibid., 552.
32 Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John : A Commentary*, ed. by R. W. N. Hoare, & J. K. Riches, trans. by G. R. Beasley-Murray. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 473

https://publications.lst.edu/

Intimacy yet Disloyalty (13:18)

As Jesus continues his discourse in explaining his symbolic act of washing the feet of his disciples (13:12-17), he introduces not simply a revelation of a truth but a *mandatum* to some action. "Knowing" and "acting" go hand-in-hand in Jesus (cf. 13:1-5), and so it must also be with the disciples (13:17).

The action to which Jesus exhorts his disciples becomes clear in the use of the rare word ὑπόδειγμα (example) in 13:15. This word is a *hapax legomenon* in the Fourth Gospel, but elsewhere in the Bible, it is used to signify exemplary death (2 Macc 6:28; Sir 44:16; cf. 4 Macc 17:22-23).[33] In being told to do as "Jesus did," the disciples are also being exhorted to take Jesus' death, symbolized in foot washing, to be the norm of life and conduct for the believing community. Thus, it does not only mean "just as *I have done*, so you must do;" rather, it may also mean, "just as I *will do* (i.e. to love until death), so you must do." The disciples are expected to take part in the death of Jesus and are invited by Jesus to the loving gift of self.

Here now, the Fourth Evangelist inserts a reference to the betrayer in order to hint at the concrete manner by which he will show his example of love-till-the-end (13:1). The evangelist makes Jesus quote the Hebrew scriptures:

> The one who ate my food has raised his heel against me. (John 13:18 RSV)

> Even my bosom friend in whom I trusted, who ate of my bread, has lifted his heel against me. (Psalm 41:9 RSV)

33 R. Alan Culpepper, "The Johannine Hypodeigma: A Reading of John 13," *Semeia* 53 (1991): 133-52; cf. Moloney, *Glory Not Dishonor*, 16.

This passage from the Psalms seems to be also alluded to in Mark 14:18 (cf. Mt 26:21ff, Lk 22:22ff). Indeed, the use of the quotation may have originally been from the Synoptics.[34] However, it was used by the Fourth Evangelist using a different scheme that contains three purposes.[35]

First, it intends to prepare the reader for the betrayal. In this passage from a Psalm, the theme of intimacy-betrayal irony is emphasized. Betrayal is more tragic if done by an intimate friend rather than just anyone.[36] Jesus knew who among "his own" was not disposed to follow his message of equality and love; and that it is he who is not clean (13:11). This quotation is Jesus' ultimate invitation for Judas towards reconciliation and friendship with him (cf. 15:13, 15),[37] an offer that later he would still refuse.

Second, the reader is informed that Jesus had the exact foreknowledge of his betrayal. In Semitic cultures, pointing one's sole at someone was an extreme discourtesy. Worse therefore was the gesture of the lifting of a heel which can signify contempt, animosity, or even treachery. By quoting this verse, Jesus is expressing his awareness that Judas is not just betraying his master for profit or self-interest but because he has actually hated his master from the very beginning (6:64).[38]

Third, the citation serves to provide a scriptural proof that such betrayal has been prophesied in scripture and is thus contained in God's salvific plan. Since the psalms are usually

34 Günter Reim, *Studien Zum Alttestamentlichen Hintergrund Des Johannesevangeliums* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 41-2.
35 Ernst Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, trans. by R. Funk (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 109.
36 Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, 470.
37 Baretto and Mateos, *El Evangelio de Juan*, 559.
38 Eric F.F. Bishop, "'He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his

https://publications.lst.edu/

alluded to David, the quotation may also mean that the citation attempts to show David as made a "type" or "model" of "great David's greater Son," the promised Messiah (cf. 2 Sam 7:12-16, Ps 16:8-11).[39] Just as David in his Psalm experienced betrayal, so too will the promised Messiah. In citing the Scriptures, Jesus shows full knowledge and consent for the design of God.[40]

Now, the irony of love-till-the-end is at its full sharpness with the hints at and explicit mentions of the betrayal-of-the-intimate-friend. This time, it is not just the will of Judas or Satan that is at work but more so the design of God.

Initial Conclusions

With the foregoing, we can make the following conclusions about the Jesus (and God/Father)—Judas (and the devil/Satan) relationship. First, Judas is fully intent on handing Jesus over to the authorities who will bring him to his death. The Fourth Evangelist has made him a foil to the characters whose faith in Jesus are portrayed to be developing. Judas' contempt and hatred at Jesus only impinges, hardens, and overwhelms his heart. He is a figure of discord, deceit, and thievery. The fact that he remains one of Jesus' "own" makes him the "consummate hypocrite, the epitome of those who reject the truth."[41] Second, Judas here is the corporal manifestation (if not the identification, cf. 6:70) of the devil. His will is to manifest the design of the devil.[42]

heel against me.'--Jn xiii.18 (Ps xli.9)," *Expository Times* 70 (1958): 331-33.

39 Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, 470.

40 Leon-Dufour, *Lecture de l'Evangile selon Jean*, 41.

41 Tom Thatcher, "Jesus, Judas, and Peter: Character by Contrast in the Fourth Gospel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153 (1996): 435-48.

42 Craig Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2003), 75.

Third, in contrast to Judas, Jesus is very intent on manifesting love to "his own," establishing solidarity and community among his disciples, inviting friends to intimacy, and encouraging faith in them. Fourth, Jesus here is the revealer or concrete manifestation of the glory of the Father, a glory that is concretized in love-till-the-end (13:1). Fifth and most importantly, Jesus is fully aware that betrayal forms a constitutive and integral dimension of the will of the Father. It is instrumental to making love-till-the-end happen. The schemes of Judas could do no harm to Jesus. Jesus knew and controlled everything Judas did and used Judas as a "tool" for his own glorification.[43] With this much information provided by the Fourth Evangelist, it is as if the Gospel-writer is intent on making the reader have the same full knowledge as Jesus has. At the same time, the reader is made to feel that with the knowledge is the burden (or beatitude) of action (13:17). The awareness brings the reader to motion.

With verse 20, the reader comes to the close of the foot washing narrative and discourse. By this time, one already has knowledge of Judas (with the devil/Satan) and his relationship with Jesus (with God/the Father) which is enough to predict what is to occur—betrayal towards love-till-the-end (13:1). But how exactly this betrayal shall occur is the *quaestio disputatae* of this essay.

Spotlight on Judas (13:21-30)

In order to analyze the Betrayal Announcement Narrative, it may broken down as follows:

43 Thatcher, "Jesus, Judas, and Peter," 448.

13:21-26a: Announcement and Questions

13:26b-30: Jesus' gesture and the exit of Judas

13:31-32: Interpretation of Jesus

Knowledge and Ignorance (13:21-26a)

There are many things that are known to the reader but remain unknown to the disciples. Jesus's "own" do not fully understand the meaning of the foot washing given that the death of Jesus is outside their purview. Despite two hints (13:10b-11; 13:18), the disciples do not sense the imminence of the betrayal, passion, and death of Jesus. Thus, when, in 13:21, Jesus announced that he was to be betrayed, his disciples were dumbfounded in ignorance; but the reader is not surprised.

However, even though the disciples have become aware of the betrayal that is to come, they did not know who among them was the betrayer (13:22). Aside from Jesus, the only other person now who knows about the identity of the betrayer is the reader. This knowledge of Jesus and of the reader is counterposed to the ignorance shown by the disciples (cf. 13:6-11). This ignorance will persist until the end of the Betrayal Announcement Narrative (13:28-29), even if Jesus has already given some sort of clue (13:26a).

While the disciples here are filled with curiosity (or possibly indignation, or even fear, in the case of Peter) and are busy asking questions (13:22-25), the reader who shares the knowledge of Jesus cannot help but also share in his emotions. Unlike the betrayal announcement narratives in the Synoptics (Mk 14:18; Mt 26:21; Lk 22:21), the Fourth Gospel reports in 13:21 that Jesus was deeply "troubled in the spirit" (ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι; notable is the use of the aorist passive

of ταράσσω)[44]. The reader has already twice encountered this disposition of inner unease earlier in the text. The first was when Jesus saw Mary weeping for his brother Lazarus (11:33). The second was during the coming of the Greeks, when he learned of the nearness of "the hour" (12:27). More and more, the knowledge of the reader is geared towards evoking emotions, and eventually actions, in the reader.

A Final Offer and a Definite Refusal (13:26b-30)

In 13:26a-30, the word "morsel" (ψωμίον) is mentioned four times (13:26bis, 27, 30). This word therefore is an important key to the interpretation of this passage.

Given the insights and discussions above, it would be unreasonable to say that the morsel here is some sort of a "magical thing" with which "Satan entered the heart of Judas" in order to show that Fourth Evangelist did not desire Jesus to be betrayed, to become a deceived sacrifice.[45] The discussions above demonstrate that the evangelist does not exclude a freely-willed betrayal by Judas in the narrative of Jesus's mission of fulfilling the will of the Father. The morsel did not take away the freedom of Judas, as if Judas was a puppet in the plan of salvation.[46]

The more reasonable argument would be that ψωμίον evokes notions of the Eucharist in the early community.[47] The giving of bread is a normative gesture of love in the community of disciples. One may therefore sense that Jesus hid the identity of Judas and avoided denouncing him in the presence

44 Leon-Dufour, *Lecture de l'Evangile selon Jean*, 43
45 Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 111-15 and Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 482.
46 Brodie, *The Gospel according to John*, 454.
47 Moloney, *Glory Not Dishonor*, 20.

https://publications.lst.edu/

of everyone. In doing this, he fulfills his mission, which is "not to judge but to save" (12:47; cf. 3:16-17).[48]

Furthermore, in dipping (βάψω, βάψας) the morsel, the Fourth Evangelist insinuates for the reader the idea of body soaked in blood. Jesus offered Judas his own body and blood, his own self.[49] Jesus continues to invite Judas to be one with him (6:56) and to have eternal life (6:54). In offering the dipped morsel, Jesus reaches out in love for Judas, his betrayer. In so doing, he reveals love-till-the-end (13:1), thereby also revealing God (1:18).[50] It was an effort of Jesus to recall Judas from his act of betrayal.[51]

At the same time, by Jesus' offer of dipped morsel to Judas, he maintains the host-commensal relationship with his "fake guest." In so doing, Jesus embodies, accomplishes, and consents to the scriptures (13:19, cf. Ps 41:10).[52]

Judas embodied irony *par excellence*! He used the occasion to turn good into evil.[53] He accepted the symbol of Jesus' offer of himself, but he received only the sop; Judas kept himself from the love-till-the-end, intimacy, abiding, solidarity, and reconciliation.[54] Instead, he succumbed to the desire of Satan (13:27) and chose to "go into the night" (13:30) where he now belongs.[55] He went on to hand over the body and blood, i.e. the person, of Jesus to those who intend to kill his master. He took the "morsel" but chose to bring it to death.[56]

48 Baretto and Mateos, *El Evangelio de Juan*, 608-609.
49 Ibid.
50 Moloney, *Glory Not Dishonor*, 23.
51 Brodie, *The Gospel according to John*, 454.
52 Leon-Dufour, *Lecture de l'Evangile selon Jean*, 46-47.
53 Brodie, *The Gospel according to John*, 454.
54 Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, 475.
55 Charles Kingsley Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1978), 449.
56 Baretto and Mateos, *El Evangelio de Juan*, 609.

Now, the reader comes to a definitive picture of Judas: he is not anymore a disciple, but the one to hand over—a betrayer. "Night," here, does not only serve as a time indication. Judas himself embodied the night;[57] he is the darkness where the evildoers hide (3:20).

Jesus Understanding the Situation (13:31-32)

Seeing Judas off to finally carry out the plans of Satan, Jesus knew that it was also time for him to accomplish the designs of his Father. Thus, Jesus says:

> Now is the Son of man glorified,
> and in him God is glorified;
> if God is glorified in him,
> God will also glorify him in himself,
> and glorify him at once.
> (John 13:31-32 RSV)

Indeed, the "hour" of the full revelation of the glory of the Father, of love-till-the-end, is about to happen. Jesus will enter his Passion. What was symbolized in the washing of the feet will now be realized. Jesus knew it was time for him to say his farewell to those who are "his own." (13:31-17:26). Yet the good reader, who continues to be deeply immersed in the trepidation of Jesus, does not despair because one is assured that "the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it" (1:5).

Jesus, "Lamb of God"

It was Jesus himself who bade Judas off to "do quickly" what Judas "had to do" (13:27b). In the video mentioned

57 Arminjon, *Nous Voudrions Voir Jesus*, 45.

https://publications.lst.edu/

above, David seems to understand this passage as an order by Jesus for Judas to procure the lamb for the Feast. However, a reader who has gone through the entire drama of the Jesus-Judas relationship might highly doubt this interpretation.

Given the discussion above, it would seem more reasonable that the bidding, "what you are going to do, do quickly," was more of an "imploration than an order."[58] The traditional interpretations somehow coincide with this. For John Chrysostom, the bidding for Judas to act quickly seems to be neither an order nor a counsel but a reproach and a now-resigned desire for Judas' repentance that seems to say, "since you have decided to betray me, then do it quickly."[59] For Augustine, it denotes the participation of Christ in the act of being handed over in that while Judas, concerned with the details of the sale, delivered Christ to the Jews, Christ delivered himself being concerned with the work of redemption.[60] With this bidding, Jesus puts his fate in his hands. He holds by his own capacity the power to lay down his life. Neither Judas nor Satan, but Jesus and the Father, will bring about the final glorification.[61]

The time indication in 13:1-2 and the guesses of the disciples as to the purpose of Jesus for bidding Judas (13:29) provide an essential tension of data in the argumentation.

In the Synoptics, especially in the Gospel of Mark, it is clear that the "Last Supper" indeed happened during the Passover Feast (Mk 14:12-16; Mt 26:19; Lk 22:13). However, the time indication of 13:1-2 does not seem to agree with this. The meal during which the foot washing occurred could

58 Ibid.
59 John Chrysostom, *Homilia in Ioannem* 72:2 (PG 59:391); Behler. *Les Paroles d'Adieux*, 53.
60 Augustine of Hippo, *In Evangelium Ioannis Tractus* 62:4 (PL 35:1802-03); Behler, *Les Paroles d'Adieux*, 54.
61 Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 111-14.

not have been a Passover meal.[62] "Before the feast of the Passover" (13:1) means that the day is at the latest the night of 13th Nisan (already 14th Nisan), not the night of 14th Nisan (already 15th Nisan, when the lamb was slaughtered in the afternoon and then feasted upon at night). Moreover, there is no mention of the Passover meal; rather, it was simply an ordinary meal, and foot washing has no place in a Passover meal.[63] In other words, the traditional lamb is not yet needed during that particular meal.

The guesses of the disciples, in 13:29 do seem to support the theory that the "Last Supper" in the fourth Gospel was on Passover night. First, they intuited that Judas is being sent by Jesus to buy "what is needed for the Feast" (and David believes that Jesus actually intends this). Perhaps, the disciples thought that Judas was sent by Jesus to purchase the "food for the feast" because shops would close for Passover and Sabbath. But why shop at night, when there is a full day to do this the next day without violating Jewish customs? [64]

The disciples' second intuition was that Judas was off to give alms to the poor. This may also point to the Jewish custom of giving to the poor, especially during the feast of Passover. But then again, why on Passover night, when there is a full day to do this the next day, and many other days of the year? [65]

At any rate, it seems that by inserting 13:29, the Fourth Evangelist merely intends to highlight the ignorance of the disciples as against the knowledge of Jesus and of the reader. Jesus is clearly aware of the betrayal that is to happen, and the reader knows about the absence of concern in Judas for the

62 Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, 460-61.
63 Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 461-62.
64 Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 576
65 Ibid., 556

https://publications.lst.edu/

poor (12:6) or for the communal meal, as well as his avarice and his thievery.[66] Therefore, the guesses of the disciples only serves to affirm their cluelessness about the real reasons for Judas' departure. Indeed, they did not know at all what was going on, and what was to unfold (13:28).

It is very unlikely that David follows Loisy and Jeremias in being determined to squeeze the Synoptic timing of the "Last Supper" into that of the Fourth Gospel. However, even if the calendric debate remains inconclusive[67], the hypothesis of harmonization is most likely untenable. Nevertheless, the close linkage that the Fourth Evangelist has given between the "hour" and the Passover of the Jews, leaves the reader helpless, except to surmise that the identity of Jesus has something to do about some Passover icon. Undeniably, the supper had some Passover characteristics.

And yes, early on in the Gospel, the reader gets a sense of this (and this might be the clearest support for the interpretation of David). Before even reaching any mention of "the hour," the "betrayer," the "devil," the "Passover of the Jews," the reader has already met John giving an unequivocal witness about Jesus. Having informed the reader that John is from God (1:6) and his witness is believable (1:7) and that he is about the light and the truth (1:8-9)[68], the Fourth Evangelist then makes the reader believe that Jesus was indeed the "Lamb of God" (1:29, 36). The reader then knows that the witness of John is fulfilled when the gospel reaches the actual Passion Narrative, where the reader finds Jesus condemned to death at noon on the eve of Passover (19:14), which is the same time that the paschal lambs are prepared for the Passover meal.[69]

66 John Meier, *A Marginal Jew.* vol. 3 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 209.
67 Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, 475.
68 Meier, *A Marginal Jew,* 21-22.
69 Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 556

But did Jesus come to know this only when Judas did not return to the meal (as David supposes)? The discussions above have shown that the Fourth Evangelist intended to make the reader's awareness about "the hour," "the betrayer," and the betrayal gradually approximate to what Jesus knows as the narrative progresses. Certainly, Jesus, the true light (1:5-9), knew more than what the reader knew. Jesus is both knowledgeable predicter and conscientious fulfiller of his own fate.[70] Thus, Jesus must have known himself as the "lamb of God" at the moment (or even before) the reader knew about this upon encountering the witness of John, and not later in 13:29.

The traditional interpretations hold water. Jesus has already known himself as the "Lamb of God" and in 13:29, Jesus instructed Judas to do as the devil designed—to hand his master over—not to purchase the paschal lamb, as the disciples mistook it to be.

Conclusion: Theological-Pastoral Implications

This close reading of John 13:21-32, and its related texts, did shed some light in the murky issues on the identity and role of Judas. Nevertheless, this issue remains cloudy to this day[71] (especially with the now hypermedia-popularized appearance of some gnostic Gospel).

Yet, more than any elucidation on the character of Judas, this close reading of the text shall have made a more concrete

70 Adele Reinhartz, "Jesus as Prophet: Predictive Prolepses in the Fourth Gospel," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 36 (1989): 3-16.

71 Alice Camille, "Fall Guy: Judas might seem like the quintessential enemy, but was he misunderstood?" *US Catholic* 73/3 (March 2008): 39-41. Cf. also Curti, Elena. "Judas the Obscure: An Interview with Fr Francis Moloney and Jeffrey Archer," *Tablet* (March 2007): 8-9.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Christology and understanding of the Paschal mystery from the perspective of the Fourth Gospel. The reader discovers a Jesus who, in the face of imminent betrayal, loved his own till the end (13:1), and in so doing made his Father known (1:18).

The ancient hymn "Agnus Dei" has long held an important place in the liturgy of the Church. In the current liturgy, it is sung to accompany the gesture of the *fractio*, i.e. the ritual breaking of the consecrated bread. More often than not, this part of the liturgy is neglected and obscured by noisy and rowdy exchanges of signs of peace (especially in the Philippine context). Most mass-goers (and chances are, even the priest) are incognizant of the sacramental re-presentation unfolding right before them at the *fractio* and the *Agnus Dei*.

However, one who has gone through a close reading of the Fourth Gospel shall have a fuller, more active, and more conscious participation in the liturgy. When the minister says, "This is the Lamb of God…" while raising the broken bread above the chalice, the well-read Mass-celebrators shall have assumed Johannine readership and will feel evocations of the "hour," the tragic betrayal by an intimate friend of the Lord, the glorification of the Father through "love-till-the-end" on the cross. The gesture and the hymn are re-presentations of the great drama (and glorious scandal) found in John chapters 13-19. One shall have felt both the "Beloved" and the "Betrayer" revolt in tension within and cannot help but resonate with the words "happy are we, who are invited to partake" and "Lord, I am not worthy…"

BACCALAUREATE IN SACRED THEOLOGY

SYNTHESIS PAPERS



https://publications.lst.edu/