

Translation:

² and dinner was taking place, by this time the devil had already been put in the heart so that Judas, [son] of Simon Iscariot, would betray him (Jesus)

³ [Jesus] having seen that the father gave all unto his hands, and he came from God and leads towards God,

⁴ arose from the meal and having taken the towel and placing the robe he wrapped it [around] himself

⁵ he then threw water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples feet and [began] to wipe [with] the towel which had been tied

⁶ then Jesus coming to Simon Peter: who says to him, 'Lord, are you washing my feet?'

⁷ Jesus answered and said to him, 'you do not know what I am doing now, but you will know after this'

⁸ Peter says to him: 'you should never wash my feet.' Jesus answered him, 'if I might not wash you, you do not have part among me'

⁹ Simon Peter says to him, 'Lord, and not only my feet, but also my hands and my head'

¹⁰ Jesus says to him, 'he who has been bathed does not need to wash, except the feet, yet the whole [body] is clean, And you are clean, but not everyone is'

¹¹ for he knew who betrayed him, because of this he said that not all are clean

¹² when he had completely washed their feet and removed his robe and fell back, again he said to them, 'do you all know what I have done for you?'

¹³ 'You call me Teacher and the Lord and speak well, for that is what I am

¹⁴ truly if I the Lord and the Teacher washed your feet, you should also wash others feet

¹⁵ for I gave you an example, so that you might also do just as I did to you'

English Comparison:

I compared the Common English Bible (CEB), the Contemporary English Version (CEV), the New King James Version (NKJV), and the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV). There were a few differences between the translations that really stood out. The first thing was how Judas was described in verse 2. The CEB, CEV, and NRSV all pair 'Simon' and 'Iscaiot,' while the NKJV pairs 'Judas' and 'Iscaiot.' I found it interesting that the NKJV paired 'Judas' and 'Iscaiot,' because 'Judas' is in the nominative, and 'Simon' and 'Iscaiot' are in the genitive. Because 'Simon' and 'Iscaiot' are in the same case, they should be paired. All four translations also had a different way of describing the relationship between the Devil and the meal. The translations all agree that the Devil was in the heart of Judas before the meal, they just show that in slightly different ways. The NKJV is less clear about the Devil being put in the heart of Judas before or during the meal, but the Devil is in his heart by the time the meal ends. All the translations, with the exception of NRSV, mention the meal prior to the Devil, which mentions the meal after explaining the Devil's place in Judas' heart.

Significant Comments:

1. In verse 3 the verb for 'to lead,' is in the present active indicative. However, the verb for 'to come,' is in the aorist active indicative. The change of tense is significant because it shows that Jesus has already come from the Father (God). Jesus has already completely come from the Father, showing it happened in the past. Though with the use of the present active indicative for 'to lead,' it shows that Jesus is currently leading towards God. Jesus did not finish leading to God when this story was taking place, Jesus continues to lead to God in today's time.
2. In verse 11 there is an interesting use of the present active participle. The word for 'betray' is in the present. In many English translations, is translated in what sounds to be a future tense. With the use of the pluperfect verb before it, the translation is a little tricky, but the present active participle shows us something about the betrayal. Because present active participles show that the action is happening at the same time as the main verb, it shows that Jesus was actively being betrayed. Judas hadn't done the actual outward betrayal yet, but when we refer back to verse 2, we already know that it was in Judas' heart to betray

Jesus, and by the verb in verse 11, we know the betrayal was taking place in the moment, even if others were unable to outwardly see that.

3. In verse 15 the use of the aorist indicative verb, describing Jesus' action, and the aorist subjunctive verb used to describe other actions, shows us something important. This shows that Jesus did the action and now he expects us to do the same. The use of the subjunctive to describe other people shows that Jesus wants others to do the same action, but the others might not. There is a chance they will do the same act as Jesus, which is what Jesus wants, but there is also a chance, they won't do the same act as Jesus.
4. In verse 10, there is a perfect middle/passive participle for 'to wash/bathe.' Because the form for a perfect middle and a perfect passive are the same, the reader does not know if the intention of the verb is to be middle or passive. Depending on if the participle is middle or passive can change the meaning. If the participle is middle, it would mean that whoever was being washed would have part in that. In the context of the passage, it would mean that they helped wash their own feet. However, if this participle is in the passive form, it would mean that the washing was happening to them. In the context of the passage, this would mean that the person who is getting their feet washed, has no part in the act of washing. Both ways could make sense in the passage.
5. In verse 2 there is an interesting order to the Greek. The mention of the meal comes before the mention of Judas betraying Jesus. However, because of the Greek form, we know that the betrayal was put in Judas' heart before the meal took place. The mention of the betrayal also has the word 'already' attached to it, but even without that we know the betrayal was put in his heart first. The word for 'betrayal' is in the perfect active participle, meaning it happened in the past and is completed. The word describing the meal 'taking place' is a present middle/passive participle which shows that it is happening in the moment. In addition to showing that the betrayal was already in Judas' heart, it shows that the meal was happening before the act of washing feet. Obviously, the meal is not currently taking place, but this is an example of the historical present. In addition, with the use of the middle/passive form for 'to take place,' it could change the meaning. If it were in the passive form, it would mean the meal was happening to those who were eating there. However, it makes more sense for it to be in the middle form, meaning the people were taking part in the meal, because a meal could not take place without people there for it.

6. In verse 12, there is a dative 'ὐμῖν' which could bring up some different translations. There are so many ways to translate the dative, which means more ways this verse and even passage could be interpreted. Some common ways to translate a dative, would be to put 'to' or 'for' in front of the dative word. However, this could really change the meaning. In the context of this verse, if it is 'to' in front of the dative 'you,' this is something Jesus is doing to them. It implies they have no say, and they are possibly not benefiting positively from this. It is just an action happening to them. If it were to be translated as 'for' it implies this is something they are benefiting from and the Jesus is doing this to help someone out of his wants to help others. Not to read too much into what we like to know and think of this verse as, however, I think the best translation for this is 'for,' because this is something Jesus was doing to help others and show them his love and how the disciples should act towards others.
7. The use of the present active 'to wash' in verse 6 is interesting. Peter is asking if Jesus is washing his feet. This seems a little weird, and with the present nature of the verb, it seems as though Jesus is already in the act of washing. So, while Jesus is washing Peter's feet, Peter is asking Jesus about washing his feet. It would seem a little redundant to ask if someone is washing your feet as they wash your feet. It would seem Peter is almost asking why Jesus is washing his feet and if he deserves to have his feet washed. Peter seems shocked at Jesus washing his feet.

Essay:

In this passage, it is not explicitly said if 'clean' refers to being spiritually clean or being physically clean. Through doing my word study, I noticed that in John's other writings he refers to clean as being either just spiritually clean, or both physically and spiritually clean. Clean is only used as an adjective in the book of John and used 27 times throughout the New Testament. While it is not used to represent spiritual cleanliness every time in the New Testament, in most of John's writings it could be argued to represent spiritual cleanliness. Even the verbal form of 'clean,' is used twice in 1 John to represent spiritual cleanliness. From looking at other verses and passages where John uses 'clean,' and seeing that he uses clean to represent being spiritually clean, the conclusion can be made that in this passage from John 13, spiritual cleanliness is being used.

The context of the time also helps us to understand if clean is used to show spiritual cleanliness or physical cleanliness. Guests who came to a dinner, were accustomed to bathe before coming.¹ So all the disciples would have been physically clean before coming to the meal. However, their feet would have been dirty since they had to walk to the meal. While they were at the meal, everyone had their feet washed, which means they all were completely physically clean, but Jesus still says not everyone is clean. Since it is already established that everyone was physically clean, it only makes sense for Jesus to be referring to someone being spiritually unclean. Having read the passage and knowing what happens, we also know that Jesus is referring to Judas as the spiritually unclean one because Judas goes and betrays Jesus later.

Relating to Judas being the unclean one, it is not clear in verse 2, who's heart is being talked about. Going back to the Greek, we see that the heart is not directly attached to any person. That creates some debate as to who the heart is talking about. The options are the Devil's heart and Judas' heart. If we take the original translation where 'heart' is unattached to any person, we do not know what heart is being talked about. Some assume that the heart should be attached to the Devil, but with the active nature of the verb it is hard to connect 'heart' and 'Devil.'² However, from knowing there was an unclean person in the room in verse 10 and 11, and that person is Judas, the Devil has to be in the heart of Judas, because that is what makes someone unclean. While it seems ambiguous in verse 2 as to where the Devil is, after looking further into the word 'clean' in this passage, its meaning in other places in Scripture, and how Judas is referenced in later verses, the Devil must be in the heart of Judas.

Dynamic Equivalent Translation:

I am aiming my translation towards younger kids around the ages of 4-6.

One night, Jesus and 12 of his closest friends were sitting around a table enjoying a meal together. Now before the meal, the Devil had told Judas to tell the officials Jesus should be arrested and

¹ Bernard, J. H., and A. H. McNeile. 1928. A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to St. John. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 462-463.

² Brown, Raymond E. 1966. The Gospel according to John. 550.

killed. Jesus knew he was the son of God and he brought others to God, so he got up from the meal so he could serve others. He took off his robe and tied a towel around his waist. Then he filled a bucket with water and began to go to each disciple washing their feet and drying their feet with the towel around his waist.

Jesus got to the one disciple, Peter.

Peter asked Jesus, 'Are you going to wash my feet?'

Jesus replied to Peter, 'right now you don't know why I am washing your feet, but later you will know.'

Peter said, 'don't wash my feet!'

Jesus answered, 'if I do not wash your feet, you will not be with me.'

Peter said, 'then please wash my hands and my head too.'

Jesus said to Peter, 'you only need to wash your feet, and your whole body is clean. Peter, you are clean, but not everyone is.'

Jesus knew Judas was going to betray him and hurt him, and because of this, he said not everyone was clean. When he finished washing all their feet, he went back to his place at the table.

Jesus asked everyone, 'do you know what I did for you? You say I am Lord and a teacher and you are right. I am your Lord and teacher. Because I washed your feet, I want you to go wash others feet. I gave you an example and showed you what I want you to do, so you can go do the same thing to others.'

Word Study:

Clean (John 13:10-11) adj, 27x in NT

John 13:10, John 13:11, John 15:3, Revelation 15:6, Revelation 19:8, Revelation 19:14, Revelation 21:18, Revelation 21:21, Matthew 5:8, Matthew 23:26, Matthew 27:59, Luke 11:41

To Clean verb, 31x in NT

1 John 1:7, 1 John 1:9, Matthew 8:2, Matthew 8:3, Matthew 10:8, Matthew 11:5, Matthew 23:25, Matthew 23:26, Mark 1:40, Mark 1:41, Mark 1:42, Mark 7:19, Luke 4:27, Luke 5:12, Luke 5:13, Luke 7:22, Luke 11:39, Luke 17:14, Luke 17:17

- John only writes using the adjectival form in John and Revelation, never the verbal form; does John only refer to things being clean and not the act of cleaning?
 - Physically clean: Revelation 15:6, Revelation 19:14, Revelation 21:18, Revelation 21:21, Matthew 27:59
 - Spiritually clean: John 13:11, John 15:3, Matthew 5:8,
 - Both physically and spiritually clean: John 13:10, Revelation 19:8, Matthew 23:26, Luke 11:41
- The verbal form of clean is only used twice in John's writing, both times found in 1 John
 - Both times it is used in 1 John it is referring to being spiritually clean