

## FACT QUESTIONS

1. Who was Simon the leper? Where was his house? According to John, who else was present at his house?
2. When, exactly, was Jesus in Bethany for the event described here? Which Gospel writer positively dates this event chronologically? Where? On the basis of what facts can this date be known?
3. Name the woman who anointed Jesus' head and feet.
4. List the differences between this anointing and the one that is recorded by Luke 7:36-50.
5. Of what was the perfume container made? How does this detail add to the cost of the ointment? How much ointment did it hold, according to John?
6. What kind of ointment was used? On what basis could its value be estimated? According to John, how much was it worth? How much would it be worth today?
7. Describe the disciples' reaction to the anointing: what was their judgment and on what principle was it based?
8. According to John, who led in the criticism? Reconcile this with the other Gospel statements about who complained.
9. Show how Jesus used the disciples' own argument against them and, at the same time, defended the woman.
10. In what two ways was this anointing a "good work"?
11. What did Jesus mean by "You will not always have me"?
12. What motive did Jesus say was in the woman's mind when she anointed Him? In what sense was this anointing for that specific purpose?
13. Where else had Jesus spoken before of the world-wide proclamation of the Gospel? (book and chapter)

## SECTION 64

JUDAS AGREES WITH JESUS' ENEMIES  
TO BETRAY HIM

(Parallels: Mark 14:10, 11; Luke 22:3-6)

TEXT: 26:14-16

14 Then one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, 15 and said, What are ye willing to give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they weighed unto him thirty pieces of silver. 16 And from that time he sought opportunity to deliver him *unto them*.

## THOUGHT QUESTIONS

- a. "What do you think of Judas? Whose son is he?" are two important questions in this section. Collect all of the facts revealed in the New Testament about this man. Trace the development of sin in his life as it leads up to the sins of betrayal and suicide.
- b. If Matthew already mentioned him before (10:4), why does he now present him here as "one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot"? Is he copying from a document that has this fixed, traditional expression, or does he have some better reason for expressing himself this way? If so, what is it?
- c. Why do you think Matthew inserted Judas' secret agreement with Jesus' enemies right in this place after the anointing in Bethany? Why not include it before it, even omitting the anointing? What connection is there between the two facts, if any?
- d. Do you think the authorities welcomed Judas' offer or treated him with diffidence? Would they be two-faced with him, their own confederate?
- e. Judas was greedy (John 12:6). Do you think that he dickered with the authorities over the price for betraying Jesus? Or did he even question the price? On what basis could he accept it as is?
- f. Do you see any significance in the final price settled upon of thirty pieces of silver? If so, what is the significance? If not, why not?
- g. Why should the priests be so glad to pay Judas in advance? What is the psychological advantage for them to do it this way?

## PARAPHRASE AND HARMONY

Judas Iscariot, one of the Twelve Apostles, conceived a diabolic plan. He went away and, with the Jewish clergy and officers of the Temple police, discussed a scheme for handing Jesus over to them. His offer was: "What are you willing to give me, if I hand him over to you?"

Upon hearing his proposal, they were delighted and promised to give him money. So he agreed. At this they counted out to him thirty silver coins. So, from that moment on he began watching for a good chance to betray Jesus when no crowd was present.

## SUMMARY

His decision fixed by Jesus' undimmed "defeatism," Judas went right to the authorities to work out a mutually agreeable plan for

Jesus' capture. His incredibly timely offer was immediately welcomed by the rulers who awarded Judas the purchase price of a slave for his efforts. Thereupon he began plotting a course which would lead to his plan's realization.

## NOTES

### 1. THE TRAITOR'S TRADE-OFF

26:14 **Then one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests.** When did he go? Matthew, having concluded the historical flashback, now returns to his narration of events that occurred "two days before the Passover" (26:2-5; cf. Mark 14:1f.; Luke 22:1-6). However, *then*, points to the anointing in Bethany as the psychological, if not the immediately chronological, background in which Judas' determination to betray Jesus finally crystallized. The element common to Matthew's two paragraphs (26:1, 2 and 26:6-13) is Jesus' repeated allusion to His death. His "disgusting negativism" apparently proved too much for his ambitious disciple. But the betrayer did not arise from the Bethany supper to hurry over to Jerusalem in hopes of concluding a midnight deal with the powers-that-be. The likelihood is very slim that he would have found them assembled on that Sabbath evening. That he did not see the priests for several days is clearly implied in the council's desperation as late as "two days before the Passover" (26:3-5). Further, the Triumphal Entry on the day after the Bethany anointing, as also the furious purification of the Temple on the following day, would have seemed to Judas to cancel all of Jesus' negativism, pointing to the immediate realization of his own nationalistic hopes. But, when ensuing events did not confirm this prognosis and Jesus continued to arouse the bitter enmity of every segment of Jewish political life into a white-hot-rage, Judas grew more frustrated with Jesus' political inaction. Then, Jesus' latest prediction of His own death tipped Judas over the brink (26:2, 14). Two days before Passover, inspired by a diabolical plan, he sought out the priests and found them ready to talk. (See below on *priests*.)

*Then one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot.* That Matthew should resort to this rather elaborate introduction of someone already introduced and described (10:4) has been thought to verify the theory that he merely follows stereotyped tradition. But, as we have seen, to establish his own credibility, Matthew needs no copy-book similarity

to the other Evangelists. To assume categorically that he unimaginatively copied other work is to fail to take him seriously. Rather, Matthew remained shocked that the ultimate betrayer of the Messiah of Israel should turn out to be *one of the twelve*! Nevertheless, he does not draw back from recording this sordid picture of one of his brother-apostles, because, as has been his approach throughout this Gospel, he must show the disciples' slow growth in faith through their many falls. Thus, even in this horrible contradiction of discipleship, he objectively displays the options that confront every potential disciple. In the life of *Judas Iscariot*, Matthew warns, are to be found the same alternatives and components of betrayal which tempt *every disciple*. Not merely *one of the twelve*, but all of them faced the scandal of the cross. Matthew's message is that *one of the twelve* cracked, because of the flaws in his own personal faith. By examining this negative example, we may learn what flaws of our own would, in the end, make us turn against Jesus.

### WHAT MADE JUDAS DO THIS?

Many tend to judge Judas in the light of the grandeur and divinity of the One whom he betrayed, but not according to his own motives. Hence, in the highly-colored, negative language used to describe the heinousness of his crime, they obscure Judas the real man. He becomes the model of all hatred and infamy with not one scruple left to cause him to shudder at the baseness of his treachery. He is pictured as wilfully forgetting everything he knew about Jesus: His compassionate love, His matchlessly holy life, His unequalled teaching and His supernatural deeds.

While the view is credible, it fails to take into account another route that alienation from Christ can take, a route which, ironically, still permits the disciple to believe himself a loyal follower of the Lord. It is the road more commonly taken by those who believe themselves wiser than He, more practical, more versed in worldly know-how, who simply know how God's Kingdom should be run better than the King Himself. They retain their own right to rule, their own worldly ambitions, their private, "unimportant" sins. But this too is no less a betrayal of Jesus Christ. In fact, it is essentially more diabolical, because perpetrated by those who, in the name of loyalty; to Him, actually prove false to (= betray) everything He stands for. The result is the same and he who does it is no less a "betrayer" or "traitor"

(10:4; 27:3; Mark 3:19; Luke 6:16; John 6:71) or a "devil" (John 6:70). It is from this standpoint, therefore, that Judas Iscariot is the more valuable case study in discipleship destroyed. So, what made Judas betray the Lord? We must see him as . . .

### JUDAS ISCARIOT, THE COMMON SINNER

GOD did not predetermine his choices, because, aside from His determinate counsel and foreknowledge which decided *that* the Christ would be betrayed, by *whom* or *how* were items neither foreordained nor the subject of prophecy. (See on 26:24.) Here we see most clearly the interplay between divine sovereignty and human freedom. The Sanhedrin, following its own political fears, defined Jesus a wanted man (John 11:57). Here was opportunity for *anyone* to betray Him. Judas, moved by his own ambitious desires, took the bait.

SATAN? Luke (22:3) attributes this diabolical plan directly to the devil who entered into Judas. And why not? Judas had left too many doors open in his life. (See below.) This, however, was no literal possession, hence presents no problem fatal to the moral freedom of Judas who remained fully free in his conscious choices. As will be seen, Satan already owned much territory in Judas' thinking. (Contrast John 14:30b.) Judas did not offer Satan any resistance. (Contrast James 4:7.) Why should he? Judas thought Satan's ideas sound, because they were already so identical with his own concepts! There is no overwhelming demoniacal power in Judas' case any more than in our own (I Cor. 10:13). Rather, Judas found the temptation to betray Jesus irresistible, because he found his own concepts irresistible.

AVARICE? His stealing from Jesus' common fund revealed His love of money (John 12:6). His proposal to Jesus' enemies, "What are you willing to give me?" (26:15) seems to confirm his greed. That covetousness is not an altogether insufficient motive was ably defended by Farrar (*Life*, 551f.).

How little insight can they have into the fatal bondage and diffusiveness of a besetting sin, in the dense spiritual blindness and awful infatuation with which it confounds the guilty, who cannot believe in so apparently inadequate a motive! Yet the commonest observance of daily facts which come before our notice in the moral world, might serve to show that the commission of crime results as frequently from a motive that seems miserably small and inadequate, as from some vast and abnormal temptation.

And covetousness is simply "civilized" idolatry (Eph. 5:5; Col. 3:5).

However, while avarice can drive a man to be cold and unscrupulous, crushing conscience to gain more, this does not explain how such a man could have ever become the disciple of that poor Man who had no place to lay His head (8:20). Surely, in first-century Palestine there were faster routes to sheer financial success!

VINDICTIVENESS? Was the rage of hatred now boiling in Judas because of the gentle rebuke he received at the anointing in Bethany? Had he not taken a public stand for righteousness ("given to the poor"), but was rejected? No matter how kind were Jesus' words, did he feel humiliated publicly? Did Jesus' defense of Mary's "sentimentalism and lavish waste" wound and provoke the betrayer to the limit? This hypothesis does not explain the time Judas had to cool down, his apparent inactivity for four days from the anointing until his going to the priests. Further, raging hatred, burning to get even, does not explain Judas' surprise, as great as anyone's, that his bargain actually resulted in Jesus' death sentence (27:3ff.). Contrary to his own expectations, his ill-conceived plan had produced precisely the opposite result from what he intended. Then, as he had never accepted Jesus' own self-understanding of Messiahship, he was left no alternative but to imagine Jesus' total failure. Shattered and hopeless, Judas took revenge on himself.

Again, vindictiveness finds satisfaction, not in silver, but in blood. Were Judas merely vengeful, he would have despised pay offered for his deed, since revenge itself would have been pay enough.

THWARTED POLITICAL AMBITION. Much of Judas' motivation is bound up in his reason for being Jesus' disciple in the first place. Contrary to popular belief, *Judas Iscariot* may well have been a Galilean. (See note on 10:4 my Vol. II, 272f.) He would have been exposed to the nationalistic fervor for which the Galileans were noted. Further, *Iscariot*, family name of both Judas and his father, has been interpreted by some as an Aramaic transcription of the Greek *sicarios*, meaning "assassin" from the Latin *sica*, a "dagger." This label covered "the most fanatical group among the Jewish nationalists quite hostile to Rome; they did not hesitate to assassinate their political opponents" (Arndt-Gingrich, 381,757). If so, Judas stood farther to the political right than Simon the Zealot. So, if Judas followed Jesus in the hope of fulfilling the extremist political ambitions of this misguided nationalistic spirit, the fierce radicalism of Judas would be decidedly frustrated by many elements:

1. Jesus inexplicably refused to preach the standard Messianic doctrine generally held by "right-minded" patriots. He steadfastly declined to inaugurate a materialistic Kingdom of God (John 6:14f., 66-71). Because the Lord so emphatically opted for a spiritual messiahship and refused Israel's crown (John 6:15), perhaps Judas discerned the beginning of the end of his own materialistic dreams of personal wealth and power. His political disenchantment may have become a bitter, vindictive drive that impelled him to formulate—even if ever so slowly—which move to make.
2. Then Jesus constantly warned of heartaches, set-backs, even martyrdom ahead for His most intimate followers (24:9ff.). Utopian dreams of wealth and glory for anyone were conspicuous for their absence.
3. Jesus' apparent failure to meet the public challenges of the Pharisees (12:38ff.; 16:1ff.) in smashing ways that would command belief, shook all the Apostles, not merely Judas (15:12; 16:6). And the enemy kept attacking.
4. Jesus' doctrine of the cross (16:21-28; 17:22f.), for the disciple that neither understood nor believed it, would be deeply discouraging and liable to be labelled "morbid defeatism." Exasperatingly, Jesus continued to use this language (26:2, 12).
5. Perhaps most disgusting for Judas was Jesus' obvious inability to seize the political advantage. After feeding the 5000, He turned down Israel's crown during a moment of high revolutionary spirit among His most ardent followers! Now He did not follow up the Triumphal Entry by declaring the Kingdom. Rather, He continued inciting the authorities to implacably bitter antagonism (Matt. 21-23).

In short, Jesus' gradualism, His emphasis on spiritual power and intangible riches and His repudiation of power politics all add up to the disenchantment of ANYONE thoroughly enamored with instant political solutions and tangible spoils. Even John the Baptist seemed staggered by the direction and slowness of Jesus' program (11:2ff.). Sadly, evaluation of Judas' motivation is not difficult, because there are so many political activists like him! The kind of person that would betray Jesus in light of these elements is fundamentally selfish, impatient, ambitious and demanding. This volatile mixture adds up to one clear controlling passion in Judas: INSTANT UTOPIA. Judas' thievery is of a piece with his disappointment at Jesus' political impotence. Avarice and desire for security from the pain, grief and sufferings of the world will lead a person not only to steal, but impatiently

demand the immediate, permanent solution that instantaneously eliminates intolerable people and problems. Immediate solutions is Judas' operating procedure. The long, hard road of patient teaching, self-giving service and suffering to transform man's present ills he considers absolutely intolerable. Such a man is fundamentally a person without faith. He cannot allow God time to transform into things of beauty and eternal worth all that he finds disgusting and imperfect.

Therefore, in his disgust with Jesus' astounding lack of progress, he may have resolved to force the issue by precipitating a supreme crisis that would force Jesus to declare the formation of the Kingdom, accept the Crown so long refused, and issue a call to liberate Israel from the oppressor, and initiate a program that would elevate and enrich His loyal supporters.

It is even conceivable that Iscariot, honestly felt that this betrayal could promote the success of God's plan for Israel. He was enough of a believer in Jesus to foresee that his Master could prove Himself invincible in the ensuing clash, consequently would never even risk death. Perhaps Judas imagined that the end of the affair would find Israel's enemies outwitted, frustrated and finally beaten, as on so many other occasions when Jesus had shown Himself the master of every situation. Not incidentally, Judas richer by far more than thirty pieces of silver, could chuckle smugly at their discomfiture.

Thus, Judas could expect himself to be forgiven this momentary "sin," because, by personally masterminding what he may have considered Jesus too impractical and other-worldly to put together, he would actually become Christ's benefactor. Not incidentally, too, Christ's consequent political indebtedness to Judas the king-maker promised enormous financial benefits for his daring foresight and brilliant execution. Thus, even in this betrayal Judas could consider himself quite loyal to Jesus. He could not only keep up the appearance of friendliness, but actually feel it. Was he not acting in the best interest of Jesus and of the other disciples, indeed of all Israel? From this point of view, the intention to have Jesus killed is the furthest from Judas' mind.

So, in reality, Judas is not a man apart, the archtype of monstrous wickedness. This traditional image is as unrealistic as it is popular. It is but a caricature that blurs our own spiritual kinship with so much of Judas' own failures as a disciple. So, what was his fatal flaw? Barclay (*Matthew*, II,367) well concluded:



However we look at it, the tragedy of Judas is that he refused to accept Jesus as He was, and tried to make Jesus what he wanted Him to be. It is not Jesus who can be changed by us, but we who must be changed by Jesus. We can never use Jesus for our purposes; we must submit to Him to be used for His. The tragedy of Judas is the tragedy of the man who thought that he knew better than God.

To see Judas as a misguided, worldly-wise king-maker is neither to excuse his crime nor detract anything from the real awfulness of his sin (26:24) or from the certainty of his condemnation (Acts 1:25). Rather, to picture him as a common disciple who followed ordinary temptations that lie before any of us has the intensity practical value of showing how desperately real is our own vulnerability to the temptation to be false to the Lord, while contemporaneously believing ourselves upright citizens of the Kingdom of God in good standing.

*Judas Iscariot went to the chief priests.* Even though the Pharisees also shared the determination to put Jesus to death, that Judas approached *the chief priests* and "captains" (Luke 22:4) points to an encounter different from the Sanhedrin's earlier informal meeting (26:3ff.). Perhaps he went first to the Temple police requesting permission to make an interesting offer *to the chief priests*. These "captains" (*strategoís*) are probably not Roman soldiers, since this military term could also apply to the Levitical Temple guards who maintained order at all times in the Temple. (Cf. Num. 8:5-26; II Chron. 23:1-19; Acts 4:1; 5:24; see also Josephus, *Wars* VI, 5,3; Edersheim, *Temple*, 147ff.; cf. 2 Macc. 3:4.) Eventually, these Levitical officers would need to be brought into the picture, because, being under the authority of the chief priests, they could be counted on to participate in Jesus' arrest (Luke 22:52). Approaching one of these who could take him directly to Caiaphas, Judas could present himself as ready to obey the official order to turn Jesus in to the authorities.

There is no evidence that Judas appeared before the entire Sanhedrin to bargain with its members, unless it be assumed that the aforementioned council were still in session (26:3ff.). That all three Synoptics mention only priests and Levites, points not to the Sanhedrin, but to the clergy alone. Judas' approach, therefore, was not the cause of a convocation of the Sanhedrin, but an unexpected element that radically catalyzed the ecclesiastical authorities' decision to act.

## 2. THE TAWDRY TRANSACTION

26:15 and said, What are ye willing to give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they weighed unto him thirty pieces of silver. Jesus had not formed a clandestine movement, but operated openly. But the chief priests' dilemma lay in their fear to arrest Jesus publicly and in their ignorance about His whereabouts in private during the constant movement of people during the feast. So, Judas' entire usefulness and offer hinged on his valuable particular knowledge of Jesus' habits. (Cf. John 18:2.) Being a member of the most intimate group of disciples, he could conduct the Lord's foes directly to Him during the private, evening hours in the absence of cheering crowds to protect Him from arrest. Further, to avoid capturing the wrong person, Judas could correctly identify Jesus during a night raid.

*And they weighed unto him thirty pieces of silver.* Mark and Luke state that "they promised (engaged) to give him money," to which Luke adds, "He agreed." Was this merely the early stage of the negotiation between Judas and the leaders, and they later actually gave him the full amount after consigning Jesus to them? Both Hendriksen (*Matthew*, 902) and Lenski (*Matthew*, 1012) argue that the priests paid right away. The testimony of Mark and Luke only means to record the priests' instant reaction to Judas' offer, to which he declared agreement, then, according to Matthew, they paid him outright. The psychology of the situation would demand that the priests seize this unparalleled chance by morally binding Judas to go through with the betrayal.

That Matthew reports, *They weighed unto him*, rather than "They paid him," alludes to the use of a scale to determine monetary value by weight (*étesan*, "they placed [on the scales] - "they weighed"). Because coins were then in common use (cf. 5:26; 10:9, 29; 17:24, 27; 22:19; 25:15ff.; Luke 10:35; 15:8), three things may have been true:

1. *Weighed* might just be a linguistic holdover among Palestinian Jews, meaning simply "paid."
2. Either they actually weighed out the silver in the ancient manner, sanctimoniously showing religious precision in doing their wickedness.
3. Or they simply handed him the coins, but Matthew utilized the ancient expression to point to the prophecy of Zech. 11:12 (*étesan tòn mishthòn mou triàkonta arguroùs*, LXX; Matthew has *argùria*).

Taken in shekels, *thirty pieces of silver* equals 120 denarii, the equivalent of four month's wages of a common day-laborer. Nonetheless,

that so little should be awarded him by the Jewish authorities for the life of a MAN seems unrealistic and out of proportion to the value of their Prey.

1. Some see this low evaluation as the priests' contempt for Jesus. Perhaps the priests belittled the assistance Judas offered, and finally conceded a small compensation for his offer which would be but a minimal convenience to them. The brevity of our account, however, neither affirms nor denies such haggling. In fact, if Judas sought merely to push Jesus to act, *any* price that appeared to cover his true motive would be right.
2. Did this sum represent only the down-payment of more? This is highly doubtful because,
  - a. The non-coincidental allusion to Zech. 11:12 suggests that this amount was the total price. (See on 27:9, 10.)
  - b. When Judas had been paid in full for betraying Christ and he discovered that his plan had backfired, he returned only *the thirty pieces of silver* (27:3ff.). There is no indication of more.

So, the priests haughtily judged that the value of a slave (Exod. 21:32; cf. Gen. 37:28) was quite adequate for the Nazarene! Edersheim (*Life*, II,477) sensed the high symbolic significance, unappreciated, of course, by the Temple bosses:

The Lord was, so to speak, paid for out of the Temple—money which was destined for the purchase of sacrifices; and that He, Who took upon Him the form of a servant, was sold and bought at the legal price of a slave (Phil. 2:7; Exod. 21:32).

Ironically, *thirty pieces of silver* is the "handsome" price paid the Lord for His service in caring for Israel. (Zech. 11:12; see only on Matt. 27:9.)

If Judas' petty bargain for the going price of a male slave seems paltry, this petty cash embezzler's love of money would not stick at turning his private plans to profit. On the other hand, if he dreamed that by pushing Jesus into a crisis which He could escape only by inaugurating the long-awaited Davidic Kingdom, then Judas stood to gain far more materially in the ensuing glory and inflowing wealth that must come. So, *thirty pieces of silver* would not be the last income realized at the expense of the Galilean Prophet. This small bargain would thus have been but a minor incident on the way to bigger things.

## The task targeted

**26:16 And from that time he sought opportunity to deliver him unto them.** *From that time* means from two days before the Passover (26:1; Mark 14:1). Thus, on Tuesday night (the beginning of Wednesday) he made his contact and on Thursday night (the beginning of Friday) he fulfilled it. But this interval is also his last moment to repent and revoke his evil agreement and return the blood money, confessing his sin. (Cf. 27:3ff.) But, from his point of view, why should he want to fail to help Christ do what He apparently cannot bring Himself to begin? Such is the blindness of error!

The *opportunity he sought* must be one in which the crowds favorable to Jesus could not impede His arrest. In harmony with the Sanhedrin's fear that people would riot, should the police attempt a public arrest, Judas agreed to the priest's strongly recommended directive "to betray him to them in the absence of the multitude" (Luke 22:6; cf. Matt. 26:5). Despite the leaders' enthusiasm prompted by Judas' unexpected offer, their basic solution arrived at earlier has not fundamentally changed. Postponement until after the feast is still a fundamental part of their strategy, because, although they sense their ability to move more freely than they could have without the guidance of an insider like Judas, a risky collision with the people still spelled political suicide for them.

But something imperceptible has changed. Unbeknownst to them, by their accepting Judas' proposal, they surrendered absolute control of the situation back to Jesus, because he could now control the events by guiding Judas to their disadvantage. (See on 26:21-25; cf. John 13:27.)

Undoubtedly, the priests and Judas imagined themselves in control of the situation, unconscious of the overruling providence of a God who can make even the wrath of men to praise Him (Ps. 76:10). Those who would not willingly serve Him as instruments of righteousness, can, without violation of their human will, be made to serve the purposes of God. Even while they are bent on gratifying their selfish desires, God's program moves irresistibly forward. While they will not consciously cooperate with Him, He shall still be glorified in their reactions to His providence through the elements He brings into their lives and in the choices He places before them. Because He has the right to decide their options, He rules, while leaving completely unshackled their human freedom to decide.

## FACT QUESTIONS

1. When did this consultation between Judas and the authorities occur?
2. Explain Matthew's elaborate introduction of Judas as "one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot."
3. List facts in Judas' life with Jesus that conspired to tempt him to betray Him.
4. What circumstances in Jerusalem facilitated Judas' going to the chief priests to offer to turn Jesus over to them?
5. State the probable terms of the agreement.
6. What is today's value of thirty pieces of silver?
7. List other Biblical allusions to thirty pieces of silver.
8. In what way did Judas' offer create the mechanism whereby the Sanhedrin's decision not to capture Jesus during the feast was completely reversed so as to make Jesus' earlier prediction come true?
9. Describe the type of opportunity the authorities wanted Judas to find that would be ideal for capturing Jesus. Why did not Judas betray Jesus immediately?
10. How much time did Judas think He had to deliver Jesus into their hands? How much did he actually have, according to the actual history of the events?

## SECTION 65

JESUS CELEBRATES HIS LAST PASSOVER AND  
INSTITUTES THE LORD'S SUPPER

(Parallels: Mark 14:12-26; Luke 22:7-39a; John 13:1—18:1)

TEXT: 26:17-30

17 Now on the first *day* of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying, Where wilt thou that we make ready for thee to eat the passover? 18 And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Teacher saith, My time is at hand; I keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. 19 And the disciples did as Jesus appointed them; and they made ready the passover.

20 Now when even was come, he was sitting at meat with the twelve disciples; 21 and as they were eating, he said, Verily I say unto you,