

Matthew 26:20-25

<https://thebiblesays.com/commentary/matt/matt-26/matthew-2620-25/>

Jesus identifies Judas as His betrayer.

The Passover meal begins. During the meal with His disciples Jesus makes the startling announcement that that one of the twelve will betray Him. This troubles the disciples. Jesus quietly but clearly identifies Judas as His betrayer.

The parallel gospel accounts of this event are found in Mark 14:17-21, Luke 22:14, 22-23, and John 13:21-30.

See [“The Bible Says Timeline of Jesus’s Final 24 Hours”](#) to learn more about the timing and sequencing of this event.

After *Jesus’s* plans for where to keep the Passover were carried out by the *disciples* (Matthew 26:17-19), Matthew continued his narrative of the Passover meal itself. He skips some events—like *Jesus* washing the *disciples’* feet (John 13:3-17). Instead, Matthew summarizes and recounts the most impressionable things to him and/or the readers of his gospel narrative that happened at the Messiah’s final Passover meal.

Five key moments that Matthew recorded from *Jesus’s* final Passover meal were:

1. *Jesus’s* announcement that *one of the twelve* would *betray Him* (Matthew 26:21).
2. The manner in which *Jesus* identified *Judas* as His betrayer (Matthew 26:22-25).
3. *Jesus’s* Messianic revelation identifying His broken body as the Unleavened Bread of Passover (Matthew 26:26).
4. *Jesus’s* Messianic revelation identifying His spilled blood as the Cup of Passover Wine (Matthew 26:27-28).
5. *Jesus’s* statement that He would not drink of the cup until He shared it with them after His Father’s kingdom was established on earth (Matthew 26:29).

At the bottom of this page is a sequence of all the events from *Jesus’s* last Passover. The events in this sequence were taken from all four gospels. It attempts to depict how *Jesus’s* last Passover meal may have unfolded.

Matthew began his account of these events with a simple but significant phrase: *Now when evening came.*

The expression *when evening came* indicates a change of days on the Jewish calendar. This is because Jewish days end and begin at sunset. This may have been Matthew's way of saying it was now the fifteenth of Nisan. Passover lambs were to be slaughtered at twilight (the afternoon) of Nisan 14 (Exodus 12:6). The Passover lamb was to be eaten for dinner that evening—the evening of Nisan 14-15 (Exodus 12:6-8). The day *Jesus* would be killed as our Passover lamb (1 Corinthians 5:7b) had begun.

After noting that *evening* had come, Matthew wrote *Jesus was reclining at the table with the twelve disciples*. This was his summarizing remark that the Passover meal had begun.

JESUS ANNOUNCES HE WILL BE BETRAYED

The first moment Matthew described of *Jesus's* “Last Supper” was Christ's startling announcement that *one of the twelve disciples will betray Him*. Matthew tells us *Jesus* made this proclamation while *He was reclining at the table with the twelve disciples*. *Jesus* and His *disciples* are said to be *reclining* because the custom of that day was to lay on one's side and eat from a short table ([See Image](#)). It was also customary to recline while eating a *Passover Seder*.

John's gospel seems to record two instances of *Jesus* stating that *one of the twelve will betray Him*. Once before the meal (John 13:18-20) and once during it (John 13:21-30). Because Matthew wrote that *Jesus* declared this *as they were eating*, his account likely describes the second mentioning of this grievous announcement. *Jesus* probably said this soon after *He* had broken bread and *they* were dipping it in one of *the Seder* bowls. This seems likely since *Jesus* specified: *He who dipped his hand with Me in the bowl is the one who will betray Me*.

Matthew recounted *Jesus's* announcement of *Judas's* betrayal separately from his narration of the Seder itself. He did not seem to retell these moments from *Jesus's* last Passover in the exact order that they happened. Matthew likely separated them so that the significance of each moment would not muddle or overshadow the significance of the other.

It is difficult to imagine the level of disturbance the disciples felt upon hearing this when *Jesus* announced *truly I say to you that one of you will betray Me* during the Passover meal.

Jesus had specially chosen *the twelve disciples* (Matthew 10:1-4; Luke 6:12-16). Each one of *the twelve* had left everything to follow *Jesus*. They had believed that He was the Messiah. They served together alongside one another for *Jesus's* sake for some time. A betrayal of *Jesus* was a personal betrayal against all of them. It was a betrayal of Israel. And it was a betrayal against the Messiah. This news was deeply upsetting. Matthew and Mark observe how *the disciples* were *deeply grieved* (Mark 14:19). John describes how the disciples were speechless and dumbfounded by the shock of what *Jesus* told them (John 13:22).

As this troubling thought began to register, *the disciples* began to try to figure out who among them would do this awful thing. *Each one began to say to Him, “Surely not I, Lord?”* According to John's gospel, Peter eventually gestured to John to ask *Jesus* who the betrayer was, and John asked Him, “Lord who is it?” (John 13:24-25).

It was at this point that *Jesus* told *the disciples*: *He who dipped his hand with Me in the bowl is the one who will betray Me*. This cryptic response had several meanings.

First, it was a metaphor underscoring how *Jesus* and His betrayer had shared life together. The Seder has a bowl of bitter herbs and a bowl with a mixture of sweet crushed fruit and nuts. *Jesus*'s response metaphorically showed how *He* and His betrayer had experienced bitter and sweet times together.

Second, because all *twelve disciples* had partaken of the Passover with *Jesus* to this point, it reiterated how *Jesus*'s betrayer was both present and *one of the twelve*.

Third, this was *Jesus*'s way of vocalizing how a Messianic prophecy from Psalm 41 was fulfilled.

“Even my close friend in whom I trusted,
Who ate my bread,
Has lifted up his heel against me.”
(Psalm 41:9)

And fourth, it also seems to have subtly narrowed the suspects to *the disciples* who were sitting in close proximity to *Jesus* during the Passover meal. They were close enough to dip their matzah (unleavened bread) *in the bowl* that they shared. John was sitting next to *Jesus* during this meal (John 13:23-25). So, it appears, was *Judas*.

JESUS WARNS HIS BETRAYER

Before *Jesus* identified *Judas* as His betrayer, *He* warned: *The Son of Man is to go, just as it is written of Him; but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It would have been good for that man if he had not been born.*

The expression: *The Son of Man is to go, just as it is written of Him* referred to the fact that the scriptures foretold that the Messiah would be betrayed and delivered over to the authorities to be executed. The term, *Son of Man* referred to the Messiah, and *Jesus* frequently used it to speak of Himself as the Messiah.

Jesus may have had Psalm 41:9 among other prophecies in mind when He said this. One of these other prophecies may have been the “Suffering Servant” prophecy of Isaiah 53.

It was foreordained that *the Son of Man* would go—that *He* would suffer and die for the sins of the world.

After Adam and Eve's disobedience in the Garden of Eden, God said to the serpent:

“And I will put enmity
Between you and the woman,
And between your seed and her seed;

He shall bruise you on the head,
And you shall bruise him on the heel.”
(Genesis 3:15)

And John’s apocalyptic vision described Jesus as “the Lamb” who was “slain from the foundation of the world” (Revelation 13:8).

But even though it was predestined that *the Son of Man* would suffer and die, this did not absolve His betrayer. *Jesus said: “but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed!* His betrayer would be held responsible for his sin, and the penalty for his sin would be terrible. Even though God sovereignly ordained this even, it was still *Judas’s* choice to *betray* God. This is a paradox, but all things extend from God, and God is paradoxical from our perspective (link to TT article Founding Paradox).

Jesus described the devastation of the betrayer’s penalty with the exclamation—*Woe*. A *woe* is an interjection that conveys sorrow or despair or both. It is a prophetic warning. *Jesus* was warning His betrayer to not go through with his treachery, because the consequence would be ruinous for him.

What *Jesus* said next was serious and sobering.

It would have been good for that man if he had not been born.

Grammatically, this remark can be interpreted one of two ways, each with different meanings.

The difference concerns **who** *it would have been good for if the betrayer had never been born*

- *Judas*, the betrayer
- *Jesus, the Son of Man* if the betrayer *had never been born*.

The first way this statement could be grammatically interpreted is: *It would have been good for **that man [Judas/the betrayer]** if he [Judas/the betrayer] had not been born.*

The second way this statement could be grammatically interpreted is: *It would have been good for **Him [Jesus/the Son of Man]** if that man [Judas/the betrayer] had not been born.*

Perhaps the reason for this grammatical ambiguity is that *Jesus* could have meant both interpretations.

The first way is how most translators have chosen to interpret this statement. But the Greek texts, which are the authoritative version of the New Testament, are ambiguous concerning whether *Jesus* is referring to *Judas* or Himself.

To see this ambiguity, we have to dive into the nitty gritty of the Greek text itself. If this is of interest, the following section attempts to demonstrate the grammatical ambiguity. If this is not

of interest, feel free to skip it and scroll to the next section where we consider the various implications of these substantially different interpretations.

A Granular Look at the Greek Text of Matthew 26:24

Here are the Greek text and English translations of Matthew 26:24 side by side. The main terms and phrases in question are boldfaced.

ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος

*The Son of Man is to go, just as it is written of Him; but woe to **that man** by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It would have been good for **that man** if **he** had not been born.*

The grammatical ambiguity stems from the warning Jesus issued: *woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed!* The Greek phrase translated as *that man* in this warning is ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ.

The word ἀνθρώπῳ is pronounced “anthrōpō.” It literally means “man” and is a form of the Greek noun “anthrōpos.” Here it is in what is called the “dative” case.

The word ἐκείνῳ is pronounced “ekeinō.” It literally means “that” and is from the Greek demonstrative pronoun “ekeinos.” It is also in the “dative” case.

In Jesus’s warning, ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ (*that man*) clearly refers to *Judas*.

These same words (ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος) are used in their “nominative” form at the end of Jesus’s statement translated as *It would have been good for that man if he had not been born.*

Here ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος (*that man*) is translated as *he*. The phrase clearly refers to *Judas*/the betrayer.

But the term in question from *Jesus’s* statement: *It would have been good for that man if he had not been born* rests upon the Greek pronoun αὐτῷ (pronounced “au-tō”). The word αὐτῷ is in the “dative” case. This word is normally translated as “he.” But in this instance the translators choose to translate it as *that man*.

In other words, the translators switched the normal translations for both αὐτῷ (he) and ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος (*that man*) in *Jesus’s* statement: *It would have been good for that man if he had not been born*. Had they not switched the normal translations of these words in *Jesus’s* statement, it would read:

It would have been good for him/Him if that man had not been born.

Had the translators not switched their normal meanings of these two terms, then the statement could equally indicate that *it would have been good for Jesus/the Son of Man* or *Judas/His betrayer if Judas/His betrayer had not been born*.

We will discuss the implications of both interpretations in a moment. But before we do, we need to consider the grammatical reasons our translators had for interpreting this verse as they did, in order to sway the reader to interpret the verse as referring to *Judas* as the one *who it would have been good for* had he never been born.

First, their translation of *Jesus's* remark provides teeth to His *woe*. Their interpretation describes the terribleness of this *woe* as being so awful that *Judas* would have *been* better off *if had he never been born*. In the opinion of the translators this grammatical context warrants the departure from the normal grammatical translation for each term.

Second, their translation connects the “dative” case forms of *Jesus's* use of *ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ* (*that man*) in His *woe* statement with the pronoun *αὐτῷ* (he) in His follow-up remark (*It would have been good...*). The fact that these terms are in the same case possibly link them together.

These reasons provide some grammatical merit to the translators' interpretation and reason for switching the normal meanings of each term. But at the same time, we have seen that there is some grammatical validity to interpreting *Jesus's* remark the opposite way, in which it would have been good *for Jesus* had *Judas never been born*.

Sometimes the very limits of human language and the nature of translating a text from one language into another forces the translator to choose one meaning over another. And this handicaps the possibility of an alternative interpretation(s) that is/are equally valid. Such is the case with this particular text.

For what it's worth, the Greek text for Mark 14:21 (which is the parallel passage of Matthew 26:24) is entirely identical. (Neither Luke's nor John's gospels contain this remark).

A Consideration of what Jesus meant by His Remark: “It would have been good for that man if he had not been born.”

As mentioned above, there are two ways in which *Jesus's* remark—*It would have been good for that man if he had not been born*—can be grammatically understood. Both interpretations have substantially different meanings from one another. And as discussed above, there are sound reasons for both interpretations. Both interpretations may be true separately or simultaneously.

The difference is who *it would have been good for*—*Judas*, the betrayer; or *Jesus, the Son of Man*—*if the betrayer had never been born*.

The first way this statement can be taken is that *Jesus* was referring to *Judas/the betrayer* as the *man it would have been good for had Judas not been born*.

This is how most translators have chosen to interpret this statement.

According to this interpretation, *Jesus* was first and foremost warning *Judas* not to follow through on the betrayal. And *He* is also describing the severity of the woe *He* just issued to His betrayer.

Jesus's main point in saying *it would have been good for that man if he had not been born* was to warn *Judas*, His disciple.

He was telling *Judas*: “Don’t do this! If you *betray Me*, you will regret it more than you can possibly imagine.” *Jesus's* warning was both stern and loving toward His traitorous disciple. It was in *Judas's* best interest not to hand *Jesus* over to the religious leaders.

Betraying *Jesus* would be crushing for *Judas*. When he finally realized the weight of his sin, *Judas* (after the fact) felt intense guilt. He tried to undo his betrayal by returning the blood money. But it was too late. Overcome by sorrow and guilt, *Judas* killed himself in despair (Matthew 27:3-5).

Judas's actions after-the-fact demonstrated that he felt remorse. But in his despair, he did not seek forgiveness. Perhaps because *Jesus* was killed around the same time that *Judas* hung himself, *Judas* felt there was no one he could turn to for help—for he had betrayed the disciples also. *Judas* hung himself (Matthew 27:5). When his body fell, his guts gushed out (Acts 1:16-18).

Judas's remorse showed he had a change of heart (perspective) which is the definition of repentance (change one’s mind). But *Judas* did not repent in a healthy way. He did not change his perspective from bad to good. He changed it from bad to worse. He did not exchange his earthly perspective for God’s. Instead of asking God for forgiveness and trusting Him, *Judas* made a terrible situation worse when he killed himself. Suicide is self-murder. And murder is a violation of the Ten Commandments (Exodus 20:13). Had *Judas* turned to God’s wisdom, he would not have hung himself. And it is possible that he may even have been restored, as Peter was restored by *Jesus* after his denials (John 21:15-22). *Judas's* suicidal act tragically eliminated this possibility (that he could be restored in this life).

There may be times in your life where you feel hopelessly lost and crushed by the weight of your guilt. You may see no way out. The shame may feel overwhelming. But we do not have to give into despair. God loves you. He knows what you have done. And He sees what you can still become if you will trust Him. He has great things in store for you. He can redeem you. And He will if you trust Him. There is no sin He cannot forgive. All sins were nailed to the cross (Colossians 2:14). There is no situation He cannot redeem. There is nothing you can do to make Him love you any more or less than He already does—for God is love (1 John 4:16). If you have believed in *Jesus* as God’s son for eternal life, you are His child, and He has already paid the penalty for all your sins. If you have not done this, trust Him now and receive His gifts of forgiveness and eternal life (John 3:16).

If you are a believer and are currently struggling with guilt—remember and apply this blessed truth from 1 John and act upon it and you will begin the path of having your friendship and partnership with Christ restored.

“If we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.”

(1 John 1:9)

Jesus loved *Judas*. This was why *He* warned *Judas* not to *betray Him*. But even as *Jesus* warned His friend, *He* also described how bad it would for *Him* if *he* betrayed *Him*. We now must consider the possible implications of this warning.

Jesus said of *Judas*: *It would have been good for that man if he had not been born.*

Many understand *Jesus*'s warning to imply that *Judas* would be sent to the eternal fire, prepared for the devil and his angels (Matthew 25:41). This very well could be correct.

If this is what *Jesus* meant, then this would also imply that *Judas* never believed in *Jesus* as God's Son and had never received the gift of eternal life.

But it is also possible that *Jesus* was simply describing *Judas*'s desperate perspective once the betrayal was final. *Jesus* may only have been predicting His friend's tragic suicide and was not making a declaration upon *Judas*'s eternal condition. Or *He* may have been doing both.

The second way *Jesus*'s remark can be taken is that *He* was speaking of Himself when *He* said: *It would have been good for that man if he had not been born.*

It would have been good for Him—the Son of Man—had Judas/His betrayer not been born.

If this was what *Jesus* meant, then *He* was referring to the physical pain; the emotional trauma; and spiritual anguish that *Judas* caused *Him* to suffer by betraying *Him*.

The physical pain *Jesus* suffered was excruciating. It included: the corporal beatings from the priests (Matthew 26:67; Mark 14:65); the bloody scourging from the Romans (Matthew 27:26; Mark 15:15-19; John 19:1-5); and of course the physical torture of being nailed to and hanging for hours on the cross (Matthew 27:33; Mark 15:24; Luke 23:33; John 19:19).

The emotional trauma *Jesus* suffered was extreme. It included: having His close friend betray Him (Matthew 26:48-50; Luke 22:47-48); the rest of His friends desert Him in His hour of need (Matthew 26:56b; Mark 14:50); His countrymen's insults and rejection of Him (Matthew 27:21-26; Mark 15:9-15; Luke 22:18-22; John 18:39-40); the shame of being branded a criminal; and the humiliation of being publicly executed while hanging (most likely naked) on a cross.

The spiritual anguish *Jesus* suffered was unimaginable. A sense of its horror may be felt in *Jesus*'s disturbing cry, “My God, My God why have you forsaken Me?” (Matthew 27:46).

This interpretation would be compatible with the request *Jesus* will soon make of His Father, that another way be found if possible (Matthew 26:39). In each case, another way was not provided. *Judas* was in fact born, and *Jesus* was in fact betrayed by *Judas*, which led to both men suffering. It directly led to *Jesus*'s death on the cross. And it indirectly led to *Judas*'s suicide.

JESUS IDENTIFIES JUDAS AS HIS BETRAYER

Jesus had announced that “*one of you will betray Me,*” and *the disciples* began to say “*Surely it is not I, Lord.*” *Jesus* then answered them, “*He who dipped his hand with Me in the bowl is the one who will betray Me*”, before He warned His betrayer.

Then *Judas, who was betraying Him*, responded, “*Surely it is not I, Rabbi?*” By pointing out that *Judas was betraying Jesus* as he said this, Matthew informs us that *Judas’s* response was not only full of deceit but was itself an act of betrayal. *Judas’s* use of *Rabbi* was especially personal. A *rabbi* was a personal mentor or teacher to his *disciples*.

Jesus’s response to *Judas* was probably clear to *Judas* but cryptic to the other disciples: “*You have said it yourself.*” By this, *Judas* knew that *Jesus* was aware that he was *betraying Him*. And at the same time, what *the disciples* heard, was *Jesus* affirming *Judas’s* statement, that he was *not* the *one* who was *betraying Him*. It was likely only after the fact that *they* made this connection.

After all *the disciples* had spoken, John seems to have asked *Jesus* for clarification about who the betrayer was (John 13:24-25).

“*Jesus* then answered, “That is the one for whom I shall dip the morsel and give it to him.” So when He had dipped the morsel, He took and gave it to *Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot.*” (John 13:26)

Jesus then dismissed *Judas*, telling him: “What you do, do quickly” (John 13:27), but the disciples misunderstood *Jesus’s* meaning (John 13:28-30). This may have been because they did not suspect *Judas* at all. Or it may have been because their discussion of who the betrayer might have been devolved into arguing amongst themselves (again) of which of them was the greatest (Luke 22:23-24).

POSSIBLE MOTIVES FOR JUDAS’S BETRAYAL

The Bible does not specify *Judas’s* motive(s) for betraying *Jesus*. It is not particularly important **why** he betrayed his *Lord*. What is most significant is **that** he betrayed Christ. Nevertheless, here are four potential motives *Judas* may have had that Christians have speculated concerning:

1. **Greed**—*Judas* was a thief, who used his position as *the disciples’* treasurer to steal from *Jesus’s* ministry (John 12:6). *Judas* also agreed to *betray Jesus* for money (Matthew 26:14-16). However, the amount that he was to be paid appears to have been very little. If money was his chief motivator, *Judas* could have easily been compensated much more than the token fee received.
2. **Ambition/Hubris**—Some have speculated that *Judas* may have grown impatient with the slowness of *Jesus’s* mission, and that by betraying *Jesus* into the clutches of His enemies, he may have been attempting to somehow force *Jesus’s* hand to reveal Himself as the Messiah and institute His kingdom. If this was *Judas’s* motive, it would stem from the

basic thought that “I know best,” which is consistent with the notion of Satan entering him, as Satan’s influence leads to following the things of man rather than God (Matthew 16:23). If this was *Judas*’s motivation, then *he* was deeply seeped in self-deceit, which seems likely. *He* would have had to believe that he would be able to execute this betrayal, then either keep it hidden or spin the story such that it would seem like loyalty. Since *Judas* thought he had successfully pilfered from the treasury of Team *Jesus*, and had the illusion that no one knew he was a thief, we can imagine that *he* might have rationalized his ability to live a double life, and benefit either way. This sort of thinking seems to be common throughout history among prominent political figures. This position would be supported by *Judas* becoming distraught when his plan did not go as *he* expected (Matthew 27:4).

3. **Fear/Self-Preservation**—Others have speculated that *Judas* may betrayed *Jesus* out of fear. *Judas* would have been aware that *Jesus* had powerful enemies. *Jesus*, Himself, had said *He* would be crucified and killed (Matthew 26:1). When this happened, *the disciples* would also be in danger (Matthew 10:22, 24). *Judas* may have been trying to reposition and protect himself from suffering once this happened. If this was his calculation, then it seems to have unwound, for by returning the money, *Judas* would have put himself back in danger and undone this potential benefit. However, since *he* was so distraught as to take his own life, perhaps this did not matter.
4. **Bitterness**—Still others contend that *Judas* became disillusioned about *Jesus* as the Messiah. Perhaps this took place as *Judas* began to realize the present and demanding sacrifice to deny oneself the earthly treasures and ambitions in exchange for what may have felt like immaterial benefits. If so, *Judas* counted the cost, and decided it was not worth it. Perhaps, *Judas* became embittered that *he* had personally sacrificed so much already for what seemed *to him* as a “passive” or “wimpy” Messiah and not one who was outwardly determined to overthrow Rome or in a hurry to claim power. Or perhaps, *Judas* became embittered by *Jesus*’s rebuke of the disciples at the Anointing at Bethany (Matthew 26:6-13), when *Judas* complained about Mary extravagantly pouring out the expensive oil upon *Jesus*’s head. If this was all or part of his internal rationalization, it unwound after *Jesus* was arrested (Matthew 27:4).

Judas may have betrayed *Jesus* for any one or combination of the reasons above, or he may have betrayed *Jesus* for another reason. The Bible sometimes tells us the inner thoughts of others, but in this case it does not. What *Judas* did was evil. And the more evil something is the less rational and sane are its reasons to the point where logical threads begin to disappear. This is because the nature of evil is to distort the reality of God’s design in creation.

Perhaps this is why the Bible is silent as to *Judas*’s motive. It was evil. The *betrayal* was totally illogical and the fruit of moral insanity. There was and is no valid or sane reason that could even partially justify *Judas*’s betrayal of Christ. It was separate from reality itself, and completely disastrous for *Judas*. Such is always the case with evil. It always inflicts self-harm, but is offered by Satan and the world as the path to the greatest self-benefit. Just as it was in the Garden of Eden, so it is always: sin (acting apart from God’s design) leads to death, and obedience (acting within God’s design) leads to life.

What scripture does tell us is that Satan entered *Judas* (Luke 12:3; John 6:70; 12:26-27). And the Bible clearly implies that *Judas* was morally responsible for the choice he made. Both *Jesus's* warning: *woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed*, and *the disciples' statement* in Acts about how “*Judas turned aside to go to his own place*” (or according to the idiom: “*the place where he belonged*”) (Acts 1:25) make abundantly clear that *Judas* was responsible for his choice.

A POSSIBLE SEQUENCE OF EVENTS DURING THE LAST SUPPER

1. Jesus and the Disciples arrive at the Upper Room (Mark 14:17).
2. Jesus washes the Disciples' feet (John 13:3-17).
3. Jesus announces that one of the disciples will betray Him (John 13:18-20).
4. The Seder officially begins (Matthew 26:20; Luke 22:14).
5. Jesus announces that He has longed to eat this Passover with them (Luke 22:15-16).
6. Jesus blesses the first cup of wine (Luke 22:17-18).
7. Jesus breaks bread and identifies Himself as the Unleavened Bread (Matthew 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19).
8. Jesus announces a second time that one of the twelve will betray Him. This troubles the disciples. Jesus identifies Judas as His betrayer, but the disciples do not pick up on this fact until afterward. Judas then leaves to betray Jesus (Matthew 26:21-25; Mark 14:17-21; Luke 22:21-23; John 13:21-30).
9. Jesus pours a second (or more) cup of wine and identifies Himself as the Passover Lamb (Matthew 26:27-28; Mark 14:23-24; Luke 22:20).
10. Jesus pours a third (or more) cup of wine and says that He will not drink it until He is with the disciples again in the Kingdom (Matthew 26:29; Mark 14:25).
11. The Disciples Argue about who is the Greatest (Luke 22:24).
12. Jesus Reminds them about True Greatness (Luke 22:25-29) and Discusses His Kingdom (Luke 22:25-29).
13. Jesus tells them about His command to Love one another (John 13:31-35).
14. Jesus Informs Peter that he will Deny Him (Luke 22:31-34; John 13:36-38).

15. Jesus informs the Disciples that He is going on a Journey. They Question Him and He answers them (John 14, Luke 22:35:38).
16. Jesus and the Disciples sing a Hymn and Depart for the Mount of Olives (Matthew 22:30; Mark 14:26; Luke 22:39; John 14:31).

Biblical Text

²⁰ Now when evening came, Jesus was reclining at the table with the twelve disciples. ²¹ As they were eating, He said, "Truly I say to you that one of you will betray Me." ²² Being deeply grieved, they each one began to say to Him, "Surely not I, Lord?" ²³ And He answered, "He who dipped his hand with Me in the bowl is the one who will betray Me. ²⁴ The Son of Man is to go, just as it is written of Him; but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It would have been good for that man if he had not been born." ²⁵ And Judas, who was betraying Him, said, "Surely it is not I, Rabbi?" Jesus said to him, "You have said it yourself."