

For the Catholic Church, God's Revelation is found in Sacred Tradition, understood as God's Revealed Word handed down by the Living Teaching Authority established by Christ in the Church. That includes both Written Tradition (Scripture) and Unwritten Tradition received from Christ and handed down Orally by the Apostles and their Successors. The Church founded by Christ on Peter, and only that Church, has been Empowered by Christ to 'Interpret' His Teaching Authoritatively in His Name.

Scripture is *Inspired*; *Inspiration* really means that God Himself is the Chief Author of the Scriptures. He uses a Human Agent, in so marvelous a way that the Human writes what the Holy Spirit wants him to write, does so without Error, yet the Human Writer is Free, and keeps his own Style of Language. It is only because God is *Transcendent* that He can do this - insure Freedom from Error, while leaving the Human Free. To say He is Transcendent means that He is above and beyond all our Human Classifications and Categories.

John was writing his eye-witness account of Jesus some thirty years later than the other three accounts, possibly around 95AD. There had been time for growth, reflection and observation. Many thousands of Christians had by then lost their lives for their faith in the Lord Jesus, both in Rome and in Jerusalem. John himself had been in prison and was now in exile, the last of Jesus' twelve apostles to remain alive.

Considered one of the most important Catholic theologians and Bible commentators, Cornelius à Lapide's, S.J. writings on the Bible, created a Scripture Commentary so complete and scholarly that it was practically the universal commentary in use by Catholics for over 400 years. Fr. Lapide's most excellent commentaries have been widely known for successfully combining piety and practicality. Written during the time of the Counter Reformation, it includes plenty of apologetics. His vast knowledge is only equaled by his piety and holiness.

Continuation of John 13: 19-38

Ver. 19.—*I say to you at once, before it come to pass, that when it come to pass ye may believe that I am. Now, in the Greek, απ άζει, which may be translated from now or from this time, as in the Syriac Version, or, as here, straightway, forthwith, indicating the treachery of Judas to be near at hand. A few hours hence Judas shall betray Me, and therefore I foretell it to you, that when you see Me betrayed, seized, and killed, you may not be disturbed, but may believe—persevere in My Faith, that I am—the Messiah, the Son of God, freely offering Myself to death for the redemption of mankind. I foretell all these things to you that you may believe that I know them all beforehand and could withdraw Myself from danger, but that I will not, but wish to suffer for the salvation of the world. Then, too, shall you see that I said truly, “Ye are not all clean”—that Judas is unclean and wicked, and therefore to be reprobated and condemned, when you see him for the enormity of his crime strangle himself with a cord. Let, therefore, this prediction of Mine, coupled with the occurrence of the thing predicted, make you firm and strong in My faith when you are on the point of*

grace of Christ. Wherefore Christ repeatedly made this prediction to Peter. Hear S. Chrysostom (*Hom. 72*), “Thou shalt know by experience that thy love is nothing without Divine grace. And hence it appears that Jesus permitted this fall for his benefit.”

The words, “*as I have loved you,*” are but taken as relating to those which follow—“*that ye love one another.*” Toletus, and others, place a colon before the former. The former part of the verse gives the substance of the precept, the latter signifies the mode of its proper execution. Moreover, this latter part supplies a sharp incentive to this mutual love, as if to say: The love of Christ to you, O Christians, should stir you up to love one another. For those whom Christ so loved you also, His followers, must love. And again Christ in His love asks that you love one another.

Ver. 35.—*In this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love towards one another.* My school is the discipline of love. If, then, you desire to follow Me as your Teacher, to be My disciples, and to be recognised as such by all men, love one another. This privilege is granted, therefore, only to charity. For it is not miracles that constitute us disciples of Christ, nor intellect, nor eloquence, nor strength, nor anything else but only love, says S. Chrysostom. For He is the Master, Leader, Prince, and Chief of love. Hence Paul says, Rom. xiii. 8, “He that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the law.” Such were the early Christians of whom Luke, Acts iv. 32, says, “And the multitude of them that believed had one heart and one soul, and had all things in common.”

Simon Peter says to Him: Lord, whither goest Thou? Peter, says Chrysostom, asked this not for information, but that he might follow Christ, whom he loved supremely. But Cyril says that he was presuming too far; for he thought that he could follow Christ through all, and he could not yet. Wherefore Christ repressed him, adding, “Thou canst not follow Me now, but thou shalt hereafter.” At Rome, before the gate of S. Sebastian, there is a spot where stands a chapel, and there Christ appeared to S. Peter, who, at the entreaty of the Christians, was fleeing from the Mamertine Prison. And when Peter then asked Him, *Lord, whither goest Thou?* He answered, “*I go to Rome, to be once more crucified.*” So S. Peter, understanding that Christ was speaking of him, went back to his prison at Rome, and was soon after crucified by Nero. And for this reason that chapel is called to this day the “*Domine quo vadis?*”

Jesus saith to him: Whither I go thou canst not follow Me now. Because thou hast not yet received the Holy Ghost, by whose strength thou mayest overcome death, says Cyril. For Christ must needs go first and conquer death. Thou hast not now that constancy of soul and strength to die for Me; but the Holy Ghost will come upon thee, and then shalt thou be able. Moreover, Christ had destined Peter to be Head of the apostles, Prince and Ruler of the Church after Himself, and Founder of the Roman Pontificate.

But thou shalt follow Me hereafter, on the cross, and, by the cross, to heaven. The love and zeal of Peter at this time merited for him the privilege of being the first to follow Christ on the cross.

Ver. 37.—*Peter says to Him, Why can I not follow Thee now? I will lay down my life for Thee.* Peter says this with his wonted fervour and zeal, but a zeal not according to knowledge. For, suspecting that Christ was going to death, as He had foretold, he offers himself as a comrade to share all dangers with Him. I am ready with Thee to take every chance of danger; I offer myself to Thee as a companion for all that may befall; with Thee and for Thee I will gladly welcome death. The affectionate feeling of Peter for Christ, though without effect, is worthy of praise; he had not yet received the wings of love from the Holy Ghost to fly to so lofty a cross.

Ver. 38.—*Jesus answered him: Layest thou thy life down for Me? Verily I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow before thou deny Me thrice.* Christ humbles Peter, who trusts too much in himself, and suffers him to fall, that he may learn to confide not in his own strength but in the

tottering. So Cyril.

Ver. 20.—*Verily, verily I say to you, that He that receives him whom I have sent, receives Me; and he that receives Me receives Him that sent Me.* It is not clear how these words are connected with those which precede. First Chrysostom (*Hom.* 21), and Theophylact after him, refer them to the passion and cross of Christ, as though He were encouraging the apostles to imitate it. In other words: Fear not the persecutions, death, and crosses which you shall suffer in preaching My faith, for in this you will be following Me,—suffering as My ambassadors, sent by Me and therefore by God the Father. Wherefore this suffering shall not bring ignominy on you, but glory. There is, however, no reference here to the sufferings of the apostles, but to their reception by the world.

Then again Cyril (bk. ix. ch. 12) thinks that Christ is showing the heinousness of Judas’ treachery by means of an argument from its contrary, thus—Just as he who receives and honours one sent by Me receives and honours Me, so, too, he who rejects him that I send offers a grievous insult not only to Me, but also to God who sent Me. Here, however, we must supply a great many things which Christ did not say.

Gaetano, Jansenius, and Ribera, with more probability, hold that Christ wished, at the close of His discourse on the washing of feet, to make some additional remarks by way of exhorting all the faithful to receive and treat with kindness the apostles sent to them, just as He had previously exhorted the apostles to be kind to the faithful. In this way He consoles the apostles too, whom He had bidden labour in offices of charity for the good of all. (Chrysostom, *Homily* 71.)

Lastly, Toletus thinks that this is connected with the example given in the washing of feet by Christ, in order that the apostles and the faithful may not excuse themselves from following it on the score that such an act lowers a man. For Christ Himself practised it, and in so doing rendered it honourable and noble. The meaning then is: He who entertains guests who are of the faith, especially apostles, and washes their feet, as it were receives Me who sent them, but he that receives Me receives also the Father who sent Me.

Christ, then, here teaches that offices of humility, such as the washing of feet, must be undertaken even by apostles and prelates, and not refused by them on the score of the dignity of their station, for by these works they shall become honourable as true imitators of Christ and His genuinely accredited agents. It was for this that St. Francis Xavier when, on his voyage to India, he used to make the beds of the sick people, cook their food, and give them their medicine, hearing the complaint made that such degrading occupations were not becoming to an Apostolic Legate as he was, answered that they were becoming to a disciple and -apostle of Christ,

since Christ Himself underwent, and, as it were, ennobled them. For in the school of Christ humility alone ennobles and exalts, because it makes us like Christ our God and Lord. So says Tursellinus in his life of this Saint.

S. Charles Borromeo would, on an occasion of public supplication, go with his feet bare, a halter tied round his neck, carrying a cross. He used to discharge servile functions towards the poor, minister to those who were stricken with the plague, and fulfil every menial office; yet did he not by so doing derogate from his dignity as an Archbishop and a Cardinal, but rather enhanced it, and earned the name of “the Holy Cardinal.” For as a carbuncle set in a gold ring increases its beauty, so does humility shed a lustre upon the insignia of high station.

Ver. 21.—*When He had said these things, Jesus was troubled in spirit, and testified* (openly and plainly), *saying, Verily, I say unto you, that one of you will betray Me.* In the Syriac, “These things said Jeschua, and groaned in spirit, and testified and said, Amin, amin, I say to you,” κ.τ.λ. In the Arabic Version “was moved in spirit.” This emotion, then, was an immense grief and indignation at the crime of Judas. Christ was pained in the innermost feelings of His soul, and groaned in spirit for the enormity of this crime as well as for the perdition of Judas. And this sorrow he did not suffer involuntarily, but admitted it of His free will, and took it upon Him at this point of His own accord, as He did at the death of Lazarus. See commentary on ch. xi. ver. 33.

The question arises here, Did this prediction of Christ take place before or after the institution of the Eucharist? John omits all mention of that event, it having been narrated fully by the other Evangelists. Matthew and Mark put the prediction before the institution of the Eucharist in order of time, but Luke puts it after.

There are three probable opinions on this point. The first is that of Jansenius and Francis Lucas, who think that Christ predicted the treason of Judas after the Eucharist, as Luke has it, and that Matthew and Mark, in making it come before, anticipate intentionally. The reason for this view is that if Christ had predicted the treason of Judas before the institution of the Eucharist, He would have disturbed the minds of the apostles, moved them to anger, and rendered their dispositions for its reception less collected than would have been fitting. But this is not conclusive. For Christ before the Eucharist foretold His passion and death, and this disturbed the apostles far more: and soon after the Eucharist—as these interpreters themselves admit—He foretold the treason of Judas, and this disturbed them then, so that they did not duly dispose themselves for that recollection which is proper after Communion. Then again this prediction would, before the Eucharist, have had the force of deterring Judas from his crime, as well as producing compunction in the hearts of the apostles and making them all careful to examine each one his own conscience, lest Christ should there find anything to bring to light and complain of, as He did the crime of Judas.

The second opinion is that of Baronius (Anno Dni. 34, ch. 58). He thinks that Christ made this prediction before the institution of the Eucharist, as Matthew and Mark

you shall follow Me when perfected in strength and merits, and following Me dying in your own death, you shall earn by faith in Me the laurel of Martyrdom in the kingdom of Heaven. Hence Christ, clearly explaining to Peter, says at ver. 36; *Thou canst not follow Me now, but thou shalt hereafter.*

Ver. 34.—*A new commandment I give to you; that you love one another. Why new?* Various reasons are given. S. Augustine says, because the faithful, by love put off the old man and put on the new. “New,” says Jansenius, “that is renewed by Christ, having grown out of date in the minds of men.” Maldonatus says that “new” means *excellent, surpassing*. As in Rev. vii., the virgins are said to sing “a new song,” that is a remarkable one.

But I say that the command of love is called new, because it is the chief characteristic of the New Testament, and specially commended by the words and example of Christ; just as, on the other hand, the command of fear was the old command and the chief one among the Jews. The new law is that of love, as the old was of fear.

Secondly, because Christ here taught us this precept of love more explicitly, and more forcibly than it had been taught before; and for this cause He sent forth the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, that we might fulfil this new commandment of love with a new spirit of love.

Thirdly, and more appropriately to the actual circumstances, new in respect of the new object and cause of love. For when Christ the Head of the Church was incarnate, there was brought about a peculiar community and union among the members of the Church, both among themselves and with Christ their Head, now made of like nature with themselves. A union both through the human nature assumed by Christ, and by the grace whose influence He, as Head, brought to bear upon us as members, and chiefly by that Sacrament of the Eucharist here instituted by Him. And this union is the foundation of that especial and more intimate love between Christ and Christians, and of that greater obligation to love one another. For by this union we are closely bound not only to the humanity of Christ, but also to His Godhead and to the Blessed Trinity, and by and through it to one another.

This sense is implied by Christ when He adds: *that you love one another, as I have loved you*—because I have loved you in a new and especial manner, taking upon Me your flesh and giving it to you by means of the Eucharist which I have just instituted as the food of your soul, that in this Sacrament I might unite you all to Me, and to one another in Me; for this cause I likewise demand of you, O Christians, that you love one another with a new and peculiar love, not merely as man loves man, because of their common nature, but as a Christian ought to love one who is united to himself in Christ, a fellow-member of the same Church of Christ and participator of the same Eucharist. For Toletus rightly observes that this command is given not to all men, but only to Christians.

As I have loved you, that ye love one another; that as I, when I was in the form of God, for love of you took the form of a slave to teach you, save you, and make you blessed, so you too descend to any humiliation or hardship whatsoever in order to help one another. This is what John says in his first Epistle, iii 16—“In this have we known the love of God, that He laid down His life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.”

latter in His resurrection, by which He was glorified in the sublimity of His immortality.

Secondly, S. Hilary (*De Trinitate*, bk. v.), and Toletus following him, think that God is said to be *glorified in Christ*, because He showed His own Divinity in His death and resurrection; proving Himself God and the Son of God by raising Himself from death, ascending into heaven by His own power, and thence sending down the Holy Spirit and working many wonders through the apostles. This interpretation is called for by the expressions—*in Him, in Himself*. The Godhead was veiled in Christ until His death, but it then shone out and thrust itself forth, showing Christ to be not only man, but also the Son of God, inasmuch as He raised Himself from death by virtue of His own Divinity. Origen says, “The Son is as Paul says, the brightness of the Divine glory, from whence come its splendours upon every rational creature; for only the Son is capable of comprehending all the brightness of the Divine glory.” The words “*in Himself*” may be referred, first, to “the Son of Man.” God glorified the Man Christ, by showing that He, as man, had God indwelling in Him, and the Godhead of the Word; and secondly, to “God”—God showing that the Man Christ subsists in the Divine Person of the Word, that is, *in God*.

Ver. 33.—*My little children*. Notice the tenderness of Christ’s feeling of love towards His apostles and the faithful. He says not “*my sons*,” but “*my little children*,” showing in our regard the heart, as it were, of a mother towards her newly born infants. Again, *little children*, because the apostles were as yet little in the faith and love of Christ, for they received its fullness and, as it were, their manhood from the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. Symbolically Cyril says that all the Saints are *little ones* in relation to Christ.

Yet a little (a little time) *I am with you*—because an hour hence I shall be betrayed by Judas and given up to the Jews. Christ is here taking His last farewell of His own.

Farewell, He says, My well-beloved children, for I am going away from you to death, and after that I shall not converse with you as we have been wont, but shall return to heaven.

Ye shall seek Me, and, as I said to the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come. I by My death return to heaven; you, O apostles, bereft of My presence, shall seek Me in the tribulations and persecutions that await you, and shall wish that I were with you that you might consult Me in your doubts and receive comfort and consolation from Me in your troubles; but *whither I go you cannot come*, both because you cannot by your own strength—with your own feet and your own natural powers—follow Me when I ascend into heaven, and you have not yet the supernatural strength of grace. For you are not yet strong enough to be able to accompany Me to the Cross and the martyr’s death,—not yet so perfect in grace, strength, and love as to be fit for and worthy of the kingdom of heaven. Lastly, you cannot come there yet, because My Heavenly Father has determined to send you after My death to preach the gospel throughout the world, and bring all nations to My faith and salvation.

As I said to the Jews. This, says Chrysostom, He adds to show that it is nothing new or fresh, but foreseen and predicted long before, and decreed by the Father. Moreover, it was to reveal to them that they should suffer persecution and death at the hands of the Jews as He was ill-used and slain. Thirdly, to indicate that they, like the Jews, were to suffer many tribulations and, at length, death, though for a different reason and a different end. For the Jews, cut off by reason of their crimes, went into hell, but the Apostles, slain for the sake of the Gospel, took flight to heaven.

And I say to you now—both in order to protect and arm you against all the tribulations that threaten you, and also that you may know at this time that you cannot yet follow Me, but that

have it. Baronius, then, is of opinion that the events took place in the order given by John, namely, that after the washing of the feet, Jesus spoke of His betrayal, that it was then that He gave John the sign of the morsel dipped in the dish, but that, as for Judas having gone out *immediately* after he had taken the morsel, we are not to take the phrase as meaning *without any delay* in point of time, but that, driven on by a kind of madness, he did not wait for the lengthy discourse which our Lord made after the Supper. For S. Luke clearly bears witness that Judas stayed with the others until the end of the Communion; and after this, according to the Jewish ceremonial, it would seem that nothing was left on the table in which the morsel of bread could have been dipped, so, too, it seems impossible to say that this morsel of bread was the Eucharist. But then Judas, after taking the morsel, *did go out immediately*, nay, that very moment according to the Syriac. He did not, then, wait for the lengthy Communion of the apostles, if that took place after the incident of the morsel. Hence it is with greater likelihood that other upholders of this view maintain that the morsel given to Judas by Christ was itself the Eucharist; and he, driven, as it were, to madness by the devil when he had received it, unworthily, straightway went forth to carry out the crime he was meditating. Moreover, during and after the institution of the Eucharist Christ reclined at the table, and there, as Luke has it, foretold the treason of Judas. It is, therefore, altogether probable that the table had not yet been removed, but that on it there remained bread and fragments of food out of which Christ could take the bread which He dipped and gave to Judas.

The third opinion, therefore, holding a middle place between the two former, seems to be the more correct—namely, that Christ both foretold His betrayal by Judas before the Eucharist, and repeated the prediction after it; and this both because He felt the atrocity of the crime, and was, as John here says, disturbed in spirit by it, again, that He might place his own wickedness before Judas, show him that He knew of it, and deter him from carrying it out, and also to prepare and fortify the minds of the Apostles, that when they should soon after see the actual betrayal and the capture of Jesus they might not be shocked, but might persevere with constancy in His faith. In this way we best reconcile Matthew and Mark with Luke. This is the expressed view of S. Augustine (*De Consensu Evang.*, bk. iii. ch. 1), of Euthymius, and of Toletus, who say that the order of events was as follows. The Supper of the Paschal Lamb having been finished, and the ordinary Supper begun, Christ, while they were supping, arose and washed the feet of His disciples; then, reclining once more, He said all these things which John narrates; being troubled in spirit He speaks of His betrayer, and they all ask, one by one, “Is it I?” Judas receiving the answer, “Thou hast said.”

Next He institutes the Eucharist, and this being done, and the Mystery having been celebrated, He again speaks of His betrayer, as Luke relates, ch. xxii. “Nevertheless,” He says, “behold, the hand of him that betrayeth Me is with Me at table,” &c. Then Peter asks John, “Who is it of whom He

speaks?” and John asking Jesus, receives the answer, “He to whom I shall offer the bread when I have dipped it.” And after this morsel Satan entered into Judas, and he went away; and when he went away, and the Supper was quite finished, Christ made to His disciples the wonderful discourse shortly after recorded by John.

Ver. 22.—*Therefore the disciples began to look at one another, doubting of whom He was speaking*, and asking, too, one by one, “Lord, is it I?” For, as Chrysostom says, “Because He did not speak of His betrayer by name, He brought fear upon all, and, though conscious to themselves of nothing evil, they yet believed Christ more than their own thoughts.” And, as Origen says, “They, as being men, remembered that the feelings even of enthusiasts are liable to change.”

Ver. 23.—*There was then reclining on the bosom of Jesus one of His disciples, whom Jesus loved*, namely, John himself. The Apostles, desiring to know by name who was to be the traitor, Peter, more eager and fervent than the rest, hints to John, who is reclining on the bosom of Jesus, to inquire of Jesus, as John here relates, and this is the force of the “then.” John being dearer to Jesus and closer to Him, inasmuch as he was reclining on His bosom, *therefore*, for this reason, Peter hints to him to inquire of Jesus his beloved the name of the traitor. Moreover, John is said to have reclined on the bosom of Jesus because the ancients used not to sit at table, but reclined by twos or threes on the several couches placed before the tables, so that, leaning on the lower part of the right arm, they lay rather than sat at table; and so it came to pass that the second person coming next to the first on his left hand would seem as it were to lie upon his bosom.

Whom Jesus loved—not only with the love of human friendship, but also with the love of charity, for the sake of virginity and purity, his modesty and meekness, and the sweet and holy disposition by which he excelled all the others. So say Cyril, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius, and St. Jerome in his letter to Heliodorus. Still it does not follow from this that John was absolutely holier than all the other apostles; Peter may have been more ardent in charity than he, and therefore holier than John. For sanctity consists chiefly in the love of God, which is its measure. Moreover, that John was reclining on the bosom of Jesus was not only a mark of His love for him at the time, but also a sign of what was to be, “That he might take from thence,” says Bede, “that voice unheard through all ages which he was afterwards to send forth to the world.”

Ver. 24.—*Simon Peter, therefore, gave him a sign, and said to him, Who is it of whom He speaks?*—Hence it is plain that Peter not only gave a sign to John by winking and nodding, as S. Augustine would have it, but also spoke to him quietly, as John here relates. Such is the opinion of Origen, Chrysostom, and Cyril. Peter asks this not as Prince of the Apostles (though Cyril takes this view), nor as though fearing, for himself lest he should be the traitor, as Chrysostom thinks, but out of his zeal, that he might avert so enormous a crime and prevent the betrayal of Christ, just as in the garden he wished to prevent His capture by cutting of the right ear of Malchus.

Verses 25, 26.—*So when he had reclined upon the breast of Jesus, κ.τ.λ.* John seems

appreciate the rashness of Judas whom the unreasonableness of the hour did not restrain.”

Symbolically, the Gloss says that the night-time is in keeping with the mystery, for he that went out was a son of darkness and did the works of darkness. *The night* indicates the darkness of mind in which Judas was, says S. Ambrose (*De Cain*, bk. ii. ch. 4), also the impenitence and condemnation to the darkness of hell, to which Judas was on his way. S. Gregory (“*Morals*,” ii. 2), “By the nature of the time the end of the action is expressed, and Judas, who was never to come back to pardon, is recorded to have gone forth by night. . . . For this cause it is said to the wicked rich man: This *night* shall thy soul be required of thee. His soul which is being carried away into darkness, is mentioned as being required of him not by day but *by night*.”

Ver. 31.—*When, therefore, he had gone forth, Jesus said, Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him—“is glorified,”* equivalent to “*is soon to be glorified*,” the perfect put for the immediate future; Judas is now gone forth to betray Me, therefore is my cross and death nigh at hand, and so far is it from bringing ignominy on Me that, on the contrary, by it I am to be supremely glorified. For in it shall I be recognised as not only man and the Son of man, but also the Son of God and God; for the Divinity that lieth veiled in My humanity shall be recognised by the darkening of the sun, the cleaving asunder of rocks, the opening of sepulchres, the rising up of the dead, and the quaking of all the earth,—all these things shall show forth that God suffereth and dieth upon the cross. And again by its effects, for by the cross will I subjugate to Myself the whole world, all the devils, and sin, death and hell, as the God and Lord of all things. So S. Chrysostom, Cyril, and others. And here, note that by these signs God and the Godhead of Christ not only glorified the humanity of Christ but Itself also; for in them was made manifest the infinite goodness, power, wisdom, majesty, and glory of Christ’s Godhead.

Ver. 32.—*If God is glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall glorify Him straightway. If, that is because—*because Christ, made obedient unto the death of the cross, hath by this His obedience, reverence, and sacrifice, glorified God the Father, therefore shall God the Father in turn glorify the Son *in Himself*, by demonstrating and making manifest the Divinity that is hidden in Him. And this straightway—quickly, for on the third day He shall raise Him up revived, and glorious in His death; on the fortieth day He shall cause Him to ascend in triumph into Heaven; and on the fiftieth to send down His Holy Spirit upon the apostles. By all these things He made known to the world that Jesus is not only man but God, and the Son of God. So Cyril and Chrysostom. Origen, in his 6th Homily, says that the glorification of Christ was twofold,—the former in His death, by which He was glorified in the lowliness of His mortality; and the

But from what we have said it is clear that this was said to Judas and not to Satan, as the Fathers and interpreters generally hold.

Ver. 28.—*But of this, none of those at table knew why He said it, κ.τ.λ.* For though they knew from the words of Christ that Judas was to be His betrayer, yet they did not know that he would betray Him that very night; and therefore they did not understand that Christ, when He said, *What thou doest, do quickly*, was speaking of His betrayal, but interpreted it with reference to the purchase of things needful for the celebration of the Passover, Judas being the steward of Christ and the apostles.

Ver. 30.—*When, therefore, he had received the morsel, he straightway went out.* Both because he then became possessed by the devil, and also because Christ by the foregoing words had expelled him from His household. The word “*therefore*” refers to both these reasons. S. Augustine remarks that, the unclean one going forth, all they that were clean remained with Him that cleanseth them, like the wheat when the tares have been separated from it. S. Cyril observes that the devil impelled Judas to go forth *immediately* to betray Christ, lest, by the virtue of the Eucharist which, though unworthily received, was pricking his conscience, he might repent and think better of his crime. Origen adds further, that the teaching of Christ was so efficacious as to move His betrayer afterwards to say: *I have sinned in betraying the innocent blood*, nay, even to such sorrow, that unable to tolerate life he hanged himself, “showing” he says, “how great was the power of the teaching of Jesus even in a sinner, a thief, and a traitor, seeing that he even could not altogether set at nought the things he had learnt from Jesus.” Hence we may gather that it is good to bring about delays in the way of those who are suffering a strong temptation from the devil to commit some sin forthwith; for through this very delay, the matter being more maturely considered, the vileness, the evil results, and penalties of the sin come to be seen, and deter the man from its commission; and at last the heat of the temptation abates and slackens by reason of the mere delay.

On the other hand, when we are following after good and virtuous intentions, as, for instance, a resolution to enter the Priesthood or the Religious State, there is need of haste, lest our relatives, our companions, or the devil, by interposing delays, succeed in frittering away the whole scheme. Hear what S. Chrysostom says (Hom. 57), “While this love is burning in thee, betake thee straightway to the angels themselves and inflame it yet more exceedingly. Say not, I will first speak to my relations, and set my affairs in order; for such delay is the beginning of torpor. The disciple would bury his father, and Christ suffered him not. Why so? Because the devil is eager and watchful to creep into the soul, and if he can seize but a brief delay brings thee to lukewarmness.”

S. Anselm and S. Bernard speak in the same sense.

And it was night. John adds this, first, for the sake of historical completeness, to mark the time when Christ was betrayed and seized by the Jews; secondly,—to indicate the haste of the devil, who drove on Judas late at night to go and look for the guards who were perhaps asleep; and, thirdly, says S. Chrysostom (Hom. 71), “that we may

to have moved towards Peter, who was making signs to him, and so to have moved away a little from the bosom of Jesus in order to hear what Peter had to say; and having heard, he seems to have reoccupied his former position to ask of Jesus what Peter had suggested to him.

The bread I have dipped.—Observe that Judas was present at the celebration of the Passover, and also of the Eucharist; and received the latter together with the other Apostles, as SS. Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyril, and others show. Indeed some have thought that this bread which He had dipped was the Eucharist, but erroneously; for Christ did not consecrate bread which He had dipped, but dry bread, and likewise pure wine and unmixed (with bread). Christ, after the Holy Communion, took from the table a morsel of the bread that remained, dipped it into some little dainty sauce that remained on the table, for it is not fitting that at a banquet dry bread should be given to a guest by the host, and gave it to Judas, that by this sign He might indicate him to John as the traitor. The other apostles did not hear the words of Christ to John about this way of pointing out the traitor, He having spoken quietly to John in his ear.

Moreover, Christ pointed him out by this sign with peculiar fitness, bread which we eat at table being a sign of peace and friendship, so that Christ showed by it, not only who the traitor was, but also the nature and mode of his treachery, for Judas was to betray Him by a similar sign of friendship, a kiss.

Mystically this dipping of the bread denoted the falseness and fraud that was in the soul of Judas, says St. Augustine. Again St. Cyril and Augustine say that Judas was pointed out by Christ by the morsel of bread that the words of Ps. xli. might be fulfilled—“He that eateth bread with me hath lifted his heel against me.” Indeed Chrysostom says that by this very act Christ here upbraided Judas with this, as if He had said, How is it, Judas, that thou, a companion of My table, art not ashamed to betray Me? Judas, then, having received the morsel from Christ, feeling by his own evil conscience, and by this sign, that he was a marked man, persisted shamelessly and obstinately in his intention of betraying Christ. For seeing himself found, out and disgraced, as it were beside himself and infuriated, he went forth at the devil’s prompting to finish his crime, going to the chief priests to ask them for guards who, with him for their leader and guide, should seize Jesus.

Though Matthew puts these words and Christ’s answer before the Eucharist, so that S. Augustine (*De Consensu, Evang.* bk. iii. ch. 1) thinks that they were spoken before it, yet from the words of Luke and John it is plain that they were spoken after the Eucharist. For it is altogether likely that Judas, when he heard Christ’s answer, *Thou hast said*, straightway went out embarrassed and indignant. Immediately, then, after receiving

the morsel he asked, *Master, is it I?* received the answer, *Thou hast said*, and then went out at once, covered with shame and indignation.

Ver. 27.—*And after the morsel Satan entered into him*, urging and impelling him to avenge this his disgrace,—to betray to the Jews Christ who had betrayed his villainy. Satan, who had before entered into Judas for the plotting of the betrayal, as was said in verse 2, here again entered into him for its accomplishment; both because Judas, being already called by Christ and the apostles a traitor, dared remain among them no longer lest he should be ill-treated by them, and also because the hour proper for the betrayal, and appointed first by Judas, was near at hand—that hour, namely, when he knew that Christ would, after His wont, go out to pray on Mount Olivet, where He could easily be seized. Wherefore there was no need for John to point out Judas to Peter when Christ pointed out the traitor to him, for Judas soon betrayed himself both by his question and by his departure.

So Satan entered into Judas to take complete possession of him, and that with certainty and with a strong hold, so that he brought him soon to the halter. Not that the morsel given him by Christ put the devil into him, for this was a sign of Christ's love by which He wanted to win the heart of Judas to love Him in return, but that Judas, ungrateful for this love of Christ, took it in bad part, thinking that Christ was giving him the morsel out of hatred and a desire to injure him and make his crime known to the apostles.

Wherefore, bidding farewell to the apostolate of Christ, he went away to the household and the bondage of Satan and of the Jews as a deserter and apostate. So S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, and Cyril, who observes that a kindness hurts those who are ungrateful not of itself, but through their fault and ingratitude. S. Ambrose (*De Cain et Abel*, bk. ii. ch. 4) says—“When Satan put himself into the heart of Judas, Christ went away from him, and in that moment when he received the former he lost the latter.”

The devil entered into Judas for three reasons. First, for his ingratitude, says S. Augustine; for Christ having discharged all the offices of love towards him, and he not being moved even by these, was left to be fully possessed by the devil. Then again, because the devil knew from the words of the Lord and from outward signs that he was stubborn in his evil will, and given over by the Lord, says Chrysostom (Homily 71). Thirdly, because Judas himself understood that he was now found out, and, as it were, separated from the disciples and from their Master; so he became hardened in evil, and, as if in desperation, gave himself over entirely to the devil; and so it was that he went out, unable to bear the looks of his Lord and of the disciples, or, says Euthymius, following S. Chrysostom, fearing lest he should be torn to pieces by them. So Ribera.

Notice here in the case of Judas how a man who deserts Christ is palpably deserted by Christ, and when deserted is attacked by Satan—possessed by him, and, when possessed, hurried into every crime, and then into the abyss. Just as Judas from an apostle became a devil, so Lucifer from the fairest of angels became the darkest of

evil spirits,—as the sourest vinegar is made from the sweetest wine, and the heretic—Luther, for instance—nay, the heresiarch, is made from the monk.

And Jesus said to him: What thou doest, do more quickly—more quickly, that is *quickly*, as the Syriac translates it; the comparative is put for the positive. Christ is not precipitating the treason of Judas, but He permits it. He says as it were: Think not that thy doings are hidden from Me; I know that thou art meditating treason. He did not tell him to commit the crime, says S. Augustine, but He foretold it, not so much in wrathful desire for the destruction of the villain, as in haste for the safety of the faithful. He *permitted* it, saying, as it were: Do what thou hast begun, finish what thou didst intend; in a thousand ways could I hinder thee, but I will not; rather do I leave thee to thy free will. Do what thou hast planned in thy heart.

Thirdly, S. Chrysostom says they are words of reproach. I know that thou art working great evil against Me, from whom thou hast received so many gifts; are these the injuries thou repayest Me for so many kindnesses? But do what thou hast to do. For even though I have made known thy crime, yet have I not done so as fearing it, nor would I wish to hinder it; for if I wished I could do so; but in order to cast before thine eyes thy malice and thy shamelessness, and to reprove thee.

Fourthly, they are the words of a lofty mind that despises all the machinations of Judas. St. Leo (Serm. 1, On the Passion) says, “It is the voice of one who commands not but permits, of one not fearing but prepared, who, holding all time in His power, showed that He allowed no delay to the traitor, and that He so followed out the will of the Father for the redemption of the world, as neither to prompt nor fear the crime that was being matured.”

Fifthly, they are the words of one excluding Judas, as incorrigible, from His family and the fellowship of the apostles. Since thou wilt sever thyself from us, I exclude thee from My table, from My house, My apostolate, and My companionship; get thee gone, then, to thine own Jews and to Satan, to whom thou hast sold thyself. So S. Ambrose (*De Cain et Abel*, bk. ii. ch. 4). Cyril (bk. ix. ch. 17), following Origen, interprets in a novel fashion, taking these things as said by Christ not to Judas but to Satan, who was entering into Judas. He says that, “Just as if a mighty man against whom some one advances with hostile intent, trusting in his own might, doubts not but that his adversary shall fall, and, with loud and threatening noise, speaks: *What thou doest do quickly, that thou mayest know the strength of my right hand*. Such words we would not call so much the words of one in haste to die, as of one who knew before that his adversary must fall. So our Lord bids the devil run quickly to the things he has made ready, that being conquered and bound he may the sooner relieve the world of his tyranny.”