

auf die Suffizienz der Hl. Schrift; und auch der zwischen »Älterem« und »Kindern« eingeleitete ›Austausch‹ (genauer die gegenseitige geistliche Ermunterung und Zurüstung) wird – durch Anlehnung an ein Pauluswort – im Reflexionsbereich der Hl. Schrift aufgenommen. Athanasius hat damit auf charakteristische Weise die rhetorische Wendung in die entsprechende Relation gestellt und zurechtgerückt. Der Antonius, dem das Recherchieren und die Darstellung der Vita Antonii gelten sollen, weist nun ›selber‹ zuerst einmal von sich weg auf die Hl. Schrift. Von ihr her wird die Kommunikation mit den Schülern aufgenommen. In solcher Kommunikation soll jeder sagen, was er weiß; Antonius/Athanasius teilt außerdem auch seine Erfahrungen mit. Sie sind dann in der Rede hauptsächlich als die Erfahrungen der evidenten Unterlegenheit der immer noch allerlei Spuk veranstaltenden Dämonen und als die Erfahrungen des siegreichen Kreuzes Christi mitgeteilt. Damit ist ›das Wort vom Kreuz als Kraft Gottes‹ für Athanasius Zentrum der Glaubenserfahrung und des Glaubenslebens. Von dieser Glaubenserfahrung des Athanasius ist sein »Sorgetragen für die Wahrheit« geleitet. Es mag bei der Aufnahme dessen, was sein Gewährsmann und evtl. noch andere wissen, als eine auffallende Sorglosigkeit erscheinen. Es ist bei ihm aber eine Sorglosigkeit, die aus der Glaubensgewißheit hervorgeht, daß die Wahrheit siegt, vielmehr schon gesiegt hat. Dem Licht dieser siegreichen Wahrheit weiß Athanasius das, was Christen über den Christen Antonius zu erzählen wissen<sup>114</sup>, anheimzugeben und anheimgegeben. Diese siegreiche Wahrheit, von der christliches Leben als Zeit der ›Bewährung‹ abhängt, ist von den Christen für ihr Glaubensleben und in ihrer Glaubenserfahrung entsprechend wahrzunehmen. Der Beitrag des Athanasius zum ›Antoniusleben‹ hätte somit die Aufgabe, – was an ihm ist – Sorge dafür zu tragen, daß die Wahrheit, daß das Licht, daß Christus den christlichen und nichtchristlichen Lesern der Vita Antonii nicht verstellt werde und daß sich die Wahrnehmungsfähigkeit dieser Leser schärfe.

<sup>114</sup> S. dazu die den Historiker angehenden Bemerkungen von Rolf Hochhuth, Eine Liebe in Deutschland, 1978: »Wer eine Geschichte erzählt« (S. 55–62). – Im übrigen zeigt Athanasius – unter der entscheidenden Voraussetzung des gemeinsamen Glaubens – eine größere Weite im Akzeptieren unterschiedlicher Verhaltensweisen, namentlich auch menschlicher Schwächen, als es sich mitunter neuzeitliche Kirchenhistoriker bei anderer Auffassung des Verhältnisses von Glauben und Ethik vorzustellen vermögen.

## “John 13 1–20, The Footwashing in the Johannine Tradition”

by Fernando F. Segovia

(Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wi. 53233, USA)

One of the narratives of the Fourth Gospel that has always received and continues to receive considerable exegetical attention is that of Jesus' washing of the disciples' feet in John 13 1–20. In this century alone, the body of literature, either in the way of commentary or of scholarly article, that has sought to explicate the meaning of Jesus' action toward his disciples is incredibly vast.

Yet, a review of that literature shows without any doubt that a consensus has yet to emerge among Johannine scholars with respect to the fundamental meaning of the passage and its role in the Gospel. Indeed, such a review also shows that just about every logically possible explanation of the text has been propounded and defended by Johannine scholars in the course of the century.<sup>1</sup> In what follows, I should like to begin this study with an overview of these different lines of interpretation that have been advanced and then proceed to locate and justify my own approach within this exegetical taxonomy.

### I. Exegetical Taxonomy

The most overarching logical division that may be made in the ranks of the interpreters of this passage is based on opposing views concerning its literary unity, i. e., either the text as it now stands constitutes a literary unity or it does not. Both positions are indeed frequently encountered.

It has long been observed that the basic action of Jesus described in vv. 4–5 seems to be followed by two different explanations: the first is generally associated with vv. 6–11; the second, with vv. 12–20. However, the evaluation of the degree of “difference” involved has given rise to the

<sup>1</sup> For an exhaustive chronological study of the different interpretations of this passage from the early Church to the present century, see G. Richter, Die Fusswaschung im Johannesevangelium. Geschichte ihrer Deutung, Biblische Untersuchungen 1, Regensburg 1967. My own brief presentation of the exegetical history of this passage will differ from Richter's in three respects: a. it will be limited to studies appearing in this century; b. it does not seek to be numerically exhaustive, but rather logically exhaustive; c. it includes Richter within the taxonomy itself, since his own distinctive approach has now been adopted by other commentators as well.

two opposing views on literary unity mentioned above: some argue that the two explanations are perfectly unified or at least complementary and that the text is correspondingly smooth as it stands, while others see the two as conflicting or even contradictory and the text impossible as it stands. I shall call the first approach the "harmonizing" approach and the second the "redactional" approach. I turn to the former first.

A. *The Harmonizing Approach.* As mentioned above, all the interpreters within this approach have as their common denominator the belief that John 13 1-20 does constitute a smooth and intelligible literary unity. Within this basic framework, however, several subordinate lines of interpretation may be found. The logical possibilities are four: an emphasis on the first explanation within the text itself; an emphasis on the second explanation within the text itself; an emphasis on both of these explanations; an emphasis on a more complex symbolism which includes both of these explanations. All of these options are encountered in the literature. In addition, I proceed to separate a very definite exegetical interpretation which may be classified under two of these types into a fifth category because of its importance and frequency in the history of the interpretation of this passage.

1. A well represented and frequently recurring line of interpretation within this approach proposes to read all of 13 1-20 in terms of the second explanation provided by the text itself, i. e., vv. 12-20. Correspondingly, the contents of vv. 6-11 are in effect entirely bypassed. Thus, the washing of the feet is seen exclusively as an act and an example of humility on the part of Jesus which the disciples must imitate, but not literally, after his death.<sup>2</sup>

2. The opposite and much less frequently encountered extreme is to read the entire narrative in the light of the first explanation provided by the text itself, i. e., vv. 6-11. In this approach, the contents of vv. 12-20 are completely subordinated to those of vv. 6-11, so that the washing emerges exclusively as a symbol of Christ's death on the cross with which the disciples must somehow identify.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> See, e. g., M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean*, Paris 1925; J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, ICC, Edinburgh 1928; P. Fiebig, *Die Fusswaschung*, *Angelos* 3, 1930, 121-128; F.-M. Braun, *Le lavement des pieds et la réponse de Jésus à saint Pierre*, *RB* 44, 1935, 22-33; A. Durand, *Évangile selon Saint Jean*, Paris 1938; R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel. A Commentary*, ed. C. F. Evans, London 1956; H. van den Bussche, *Le discours d'adieux de Jésus*, *Tournai* 1959; J. Michl, *Der Sinn der Fusswaschung*, *Biblica* 40, 1959, 697-708.

<sup>3</sup> See, e. g., J. A. T. Robinson, *The Significance of the Footwashing*, in: *Neotestamentica et Patristica. Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht*, *NovTSup* 6, Leiden 1962, 138-141; H. Weiss, *Foot Washing*

3. A third subordinate line of interpretation represents in effect a compromise between the two extremes delineated above: the passage should be read *both* as a symbol of Christ's death on the cross *and* as an example of humility to be imitated by the disciples. The precise relationship of these two basic thrusts within the passage varies from author to author.<sup>4</sup>

4. A fourth option within this approach is basically a logical extension of the previous one: the passage is indeed a symbol of Christ's death and an example of humility; however, other important themes and concerns must be recognized as well, e. g., baptismal references, a eucharistic setting, a symbol of the incarnation of Jesus, a symbol of the incorporation of the disciples into Jesus, a symbol of the appropriation of the benefits of Jesus' death by his disciples. Again, the number of such themes that must be taken into account varies from author to author.<sup>5</sup>

5. Finally, I should like to consider the sacramental interpretation of the passage as a fifth and separate option. Some of its proponents argue along the lines of option (2) above: the passage should be read solely in terms of vv. 6-11, and these verses should be interpreted only in terms of a sacramental cleansing. Others argue more along the lines of option (3): the washing is both an example of humility and a sacramental cleansing of the disciples.

The main task for all the proponents of a sacramental interpretation has been to identify the sacrament being symbolized in the washing of the feet. The proposed suggestions have been varied indeed: a. many have seen in the participle *λελουμένος* of v. 10 a reference to baptism and have then proceeded to identify the further washing as a reference to the eucharist;<sup>6</sup> b. a few have argued on behalf of baptism, claiming that

in the Johannine Community, *NovT* 21, 1979, 298-325. Robinson speaks of the washing as representing a bid for solidarity with Jesus as he goes to his death. Weiss interprets this "bid" literally, i. e., the washing was a ceremony carried out in the Johannine community for the purpose of preparing the elect for martyrdom and entrance into the presence of God.

<sup>4</sup> See, e. g., A. C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. F. N. Davey, London 1947; W. K. Groussow, *A Note on John xiii 1-3*, *NovT* 8, 1966, 124-131; James D. G. Dunn, *The Washing of the Disciples' Feet in John 13 1-20*, *ZNW* 61, 1970, 247-252; B. Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, New Century Bible, London 1972.

<sup>5</sup> See, e. g., C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John. An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, London 1962; J. Marsh, *Saint John, The Pelican New Testament Commentaries*, Baltimore 1968; J. N. Sanders, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, ed. B. A. Mastin, HNTC, New York 1968; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge 1970.

<sup>6</sup> See, e. g., W. Bauer, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, in: *Die Evangelien*, HNT 2, Tübingen 1912; A. Loisy, *Le quatrième Évangile*, Paris 1921; M. Goguel, *Jésus et les origines du Christianisme*, vol. 3: *L'Église primitive*, Paris 1947; O. Cullmann, *Urchristentum und*

λελουμένος refers to a more general type of purification, e. g., by the word of Jesus;<sup>7</sup> c. fewer still argue on behalf of the sacrament of penance;<sup>8</sup> d. E. Lohmeyer sees it as an act of ordination whereby the disciples become priests of the eschatological community;<sup>9</sup> e. R. Eisler proposes to read it in terms of marriage, viz., the heavenly bridegroom prepares his mystical bride for the marital union;<sup>10</sup> f. finally, some opt for a more general type of sacramental cleansing, e. g., a purification brought about by the word of Jesus.<sup>11</sup>

*B. The Redactional Approach.* The basic point of departure for interpreters within this approach is the opinion that the present text of Jn 13 1-20 (and some adherents would extend this judgment to vv. 21-30 as well) shows such literary difficulties that it becomes impossible to speak of a unified and intelligible narrative or even of complimentary explanations. Indeed, these literary difficulties are seen as reflecting and pointing to irreconcilable theological tensions between the two explanations provided by the text itself.

The inevitable conclusion, therefore, is to argue that an original written version of Jesus' action has been rather badly integrated with a later written version of that same action. Once such a position has been adopted, two explanations of this process of integration are possible: either the original version was an independent source or a part of a much larger *Grundschrift* that was then taken over and revised by the evangelist or the original version was that of the evangelist which was then revised by a later hand. In other words, either the integration was carried out at the stage of the evangelist or at a time later than that of the evangelist. In the former case, one can speak of a "source" theory; in the latter, of an "addition" theory. Both positions are again found in the literature.

1. The beginnings of the source theory can be traced to the early decades of the century, when the search for a *Grundschrift* underlying the entire Fourth Gospel was in vogue in certain quarters of Johannine scholarship. The literary difficulties within 13 1-20 led these scholars to look

Gottesdienst, ATANT 3, Zürich 1950; G. H. C. MacGregor, The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel, NTS 9, 1962-63, 111-119.

<sup>7</sup> See, e. g., H. von Campenhausen, Zur Auslegung von Joh 13 6-10, ZNW 33, 1934, 259-271; C. T. Craig, Sacramental Interest in the Fourth Gospel, JBL 58, 1939, 31-41; A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. W. Montgomery, New York 1968.

<sup>8</sup> See, e. g., W. Koch, Zur Entstehung des Bußsakraments, TQ 130, 1950, 296-310.

<sup>9</sup> Die Fusswaschung, ZNW 38, 1939, 79-94.

<sup>10</sup> Zur Fusswaschung am Tage vor dem Passah, ZNW 14, 1913, 268-271.

<sup>11</sup> See, e. g., A. Fridrichsen, Bemerkungen zur Fusswaschung Joh 13, ZNW 38, 1939, 94-96.

for and reconstruct the *Grundschrift* behind this narrative as well. Since then, a source theory regarding this passage, where the source is seen as either an independent document or a part of a much larger *Grundschrift*, has been occasionally revived. Two options are possible, and both are encountered in the literature: either the source contained the first explanation within the text (all or most of vv. 6-11)<sup>12</sup> or the second (all or most of vv. 12-20).<sup>13</sup>

2. The beginnings of the addition theory can be traced to the work of the French exegete, M.-É. Boismard,<sup>14</sup> which was subsequently developed by G. Richter.<sup>15</sup> Since Richter's work, this line of interpretation has been adopted and espoused by a growing number of Johannine exegetes. The basic position of these scholars may be summarized as follows: in the first edition of the Gospel, there was only one explanation of the washing of the feet; in a subsequent edition, a second explanation was added. As in the case of the source theory, two options are possible, and, again, both are found in the literature: either the Gospel originally contained only the first explanation within the text (all or most of vv. 6-11)<sup>16</sup> or the second (all or most of vv. 12-20).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>12</sup> F. Spitta, Das Johannesevangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu, Göttingen 1910. The *Grundschrift*, Spitta argues, consists roughly of vv. 1a.1b (minus the final pronoun). 2 (only the reference to the meal). 4-5.6-10.21-30.

<sup>13</sup> J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Johannis, Berlin 1908. The *Grundschrift* consists basically of vv. 4-5 and 12-15. R. Bultmann, The Gospel of John. A Commentary, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray et al., Philadelphia 1971. The source consists of vv. 4-5.12-15.17 and, possibly, 16 and 20. R. Fortna, The Gospel of Signs. A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel, SNTSM 11, Cambridge 1970. A "tentative" reconstruction assigns vv. 2a.4-5.12-14.18b.21b.26-27 to the narrative source.

<sup>14</sup> Le lavement des pieds, RB 71, 1964, 5-24.

<sup>15</sup> Three works are important: Die Fusswaschung Joh 13 1-20, MTZ 16, 1965, 13-26; Die Fusswaschung im Johannesevangelium; Die Deutung des Kreuzestodes Jesu in der Leidensgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums (Joh 13-19), BibLeb 9, 1968, 21-36. For a very brief attempt at a refutation of Richter's line of interpretation from a harmonizing perspective, see A. Weiser, Joh 13 12-20 - Zufügung eines späteren Herausgebers?, BZ 12, 1968, 252-257.

<sup>16</sup> Richter (Die Fusswaschung) sees the original version as comprising vv. 3.4-5.6-11. R. Brown, The Gospel according to John xiii-xxi, AB 29a, Garden City, N. Y. 1970. Brown opts for vv. 2-3.4-5. and 6-10. H. Thyen, Johannes 13 und die »kirchliche Redaktion« des vierten Evangeliums, in: Tradition und Glaube. Festgabe für K. G. Kuhn, Göttingen 1971, 343-356. For Thyen the source consists of vv. 1a.2a.3.4-5.6-10a.18-19.28. R. Schnackenburg, Das Johannesevangelium. III. Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 13-21, HThKNT 4, Freiburg 1975. Vv. 2a.4-5.6-10b.(11).12a.18b-19.21-27.30 constituted the original version.

<sup>17</sup> Boismard («Le lavement») is alone in this regard. The earlier explanation is seen as encompassing vv. 1-2.4-5.12-15 and 17-18.

C. *Critical Evaluation of the Taxonomy.* Given such numerous and widely divergent interpretations of Jn 13 1-20, any further explication of this text must come to terms with what I believe to be a solidly established principle and, in the light of that principle, begin with a very specific task. First of all, a new line of interpretation regarding this text seems to be logically out of the question; every conceivable approach has already been proposed somewhere along the line (in this century alone!). Thus, the most such an explication could hope to accomplish would be to strengthen or develop a particular line of interpretation. Consequently, any further explication must begin necessarily with a justification of its own exegetical point of departure, i. e., why this approach and not the other or others?

The first immediate decision that the interpreter must make is to choose between the harmonizing and the redactional approaches, i. e., either the text is an intelligible unity or it is not. Such a decision can only be made on literary-critical grounds. I am of the opinion that the text as it now stands presents insurmountable literary difficulties that can only be explained by means of the redactional approach. Indeed, I believe that the basic weakness of the harmonizing approach has been the failure to begin the exegetical task with a thorough literary-critical analysis of the text. These difficulties have been repeatedly pointed out by all proponents of the redactional approach, and I should like to summarize them here:

1. In terms of Johannine style, vv. 1-4 are grammatically overloaded: the main verbs support too many participial clauses and genitive absolutes.

2. The information concerning Judas given in v. 2b does not quite agree with that given in v. 27.

3. Vv. 1-3 also contain an unnecessary doublet: the theme of Jesus' return introduced in the first participial clause of v. 1 is repeated in the participial clause of v. 3.

4. Vv. 4-5 can be followed by either vv. 6-11 or 12-20. In either case, the result would be a complete and intelligible narrative.

5. Vv. 7 and 12 do not agree. V. 7 clearly refers to the "hour" of Jesus' death, resurrection, and ascension; it can hardly refer to the following explanation of vv. 12-20.

6. Whereas vv. 6-11 present the washing of the feet as a sign which points to Jesus' death, thus performed once and for all time, vv. 12-20 present the same act as a humble service on the part of Jesus, thus to be repeated forever by his disciples after his death. The juxtaposition of the two explanations is thus hardly comprehensible.

7. Vv. 10b-11 and 18-19 constitute another unnecessary doublet.

8. Vv. 18 and 26 represent yet a third doublet.

No harmonizing interpretation can reconcile and resolve all or even most of these difficulties successfully. The problems are simply too numerous, involving every section of the narrative, and too far-reaching, as shown by points (4), (5) and (6) above. Therefore, the interpreter has to turn to the redactional approach for a solution. However, an initial decision on behalf of the redactional approach leads immediately to a second fundamental choice: has the redaction taken place at the stage of the Gospel or at a later stage?

In his own methodological reflections on this passage, R. Schnackenburg suggests that the appropriate point of departure for a proponent of the redactional approach, before any decision is made concerning authorship, should be the careful delineation of the literary layers present in the passage and a close examination of their respective *Tendenzen*.<sup>18</sup> I fully agree with the proposed procedure. A decision on authorship will ultimately depend on the reasonableness of the explanation that the interpreter can provide for the proposed redaction, whether source or addition. I am of the opinion that the addition theory is to be preferred, since a reasonable and appropriate *Sitz im Leben* can be advanced on behalf of the proposed addition to the Gospel.

Indeed, it will be the thesis of this study that part of vv. 1-3 and all of vv. 12-20 were added to the Gospel by someone whose situation parallels that of I John — perhaps even the author of the Letter himself — as a part of a larger revision of an earlier edition of the Gospel. The presentation of the thesis will be developed as follows: 1. a delineation of the immediate context of Jn 13 1-20 in the Gospel narrative; 2. an exegetical analysis of the passage; 3. a summary and conclusions.

## II. The Context of Jn 13 1-20

Before undertaking the exegetical analysis of 13 1-20, I should like to turn briefly to a consideration of its present context in the Gospel narrative. A delineation of this context will, I believe, be of considerable help in the proposed separation of the different literary layers, the subsequent examination of their respective *Tendenzen*, and the final decision to be made concerning authorship. Four main elements of that context should be taken into consideration:

a) First of all, the geographical and chronological indications are clear: Jesus now comes to Jerusalem for the last time (12 12-19) and the Passover is at hand (11 55-57). Thus, the washing takes place in Jerusalem before the feast of the Passover.

<sup>18</sup> R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 10.

b) With the coming of the Greeks to see Jesus in 12 20, that time toward which the entire narrative has been pointing and moving (2 4 4 21.23 5 25.28 7 30 8 20) finally arrives (12 23), viz., the "hour" of Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension; the time for his departure from this world and his return to the Father. Thus, the washing becomes an integral part of the "hour" and must be read from that perspective as well.

c) With 12 36b-43 Jesus' public ministry comes to a close, and he now turns exclusively toward his disciples. Thus, the washing must be read from the perspective of this relationship as well. There are two foci in this relationship: on the one hand, it is clear that the disciples possess correct belief in Jesus; however, at the same time, it is also clear that such belief cannot be complete or perfect until after the resurrection of Jesus.<sup>19</sup>

d) Finally, the washing is followed by a series of long and private instructions on the part of Jesus to his disciples (13 31-14 31 15-17). Since the instructions are given on the eve of his departure, they constitute in effect "farewell" addresses. Thus, the washing should also be seen as Jesus' last act before he bids farewell to his own.

### III. Exegetical Analysis of Jn 13 1-20

In outlining the literary difficulties of the text above, it became clear that, with the exception of the brief description of the act itself in v. 5, these difficulties were to be found in every section of 13 1-20.<sup>20</sup> Thus, in the exegetical analysis that follows, I should like to proceed section by section, using these difficulties as exegetical clues: a) introduction to the washing, vv. 1-4); b) explanations of the washing, vv. 6-10a

<sup>19</sup> First of all, the disciples believe in Jesus from the beginning (1 35-51), see his glory in his signs (2 1-11), accept his words and refuse to abandon him (6 66-71), declare their willingness to die with him (11 16) are promised the Spirit (14 15-27), and receive it (20 19-23). At the same time, however, they repeatedly misunderstand his declarations (4 32-33 11 7-16 14 4-14) and are said to understand certain events only at a later time, i. e., after the resurrection of Jesus (2 13-22 12 12-19).

<sup>20</sup> Although 13 1-14 31 do constitute a literary unit — centered around events that took place between Jesus and his disciples during a meal in Jerusalem — the unit may be divided into three largely self-contained sub-units, viz., 13 1-20 13 21-30 13 31-14 31. The first focuses on the washing of the disciples' feet by Jesus and the explanation of this action; the second, on the identification and departure of the betrayer; the third, on Jesus' first farewell discourse. Each of these sub-units may be separated from the other two for the purpose of exegetical analysis. Thus, for example, vv. 21-30 do develop the theme of the betrayer introduced in vv. 1-20, they do so quite independently of the washing itself. Thus, I believe that the literary difficulties of vv. 1-20 may be resolved without any major consideration of or appeal to vv. 21-30.

and 12-17; c) conclusions to these explanations by way of comments on Judas Iscariot, vv. 10b-11 and 18-20.

*A. Introduction to the Washing, vv. 1-4.* Of the eight literary difficulties mentioned above, the first three are to be found within the introduction to the narrative, vv. 1-4. The most fundamental of these, I believe, is the first one: vv. 1-4 are indeed grammatically overloaded. The verses contain in effect two sentences: the first sentence (v. 1) includes a prepositional phrase and two participial clauses before the main verb; the second sentence (vv. 2-4) includes two genitive absolutes and a long participial clause prior to the main verbs. Such a succession of prepositional phrases, participial clauses and genitive absolutes not only constitutes in effect a rather clumsy arrangement of material, but also reveals an uncharacteristically Johannine style of composition.<sup>21</sup>

The other two difficulties are immediately related to this first one, since they do contribute in part to the overloaded character of these verses. First of all, the theme of the first participial clause of v. 1 is unnecessarily repeated — although with somewhat different terminology, to be sure — in the participial clause of vv. 2-4: the time of Jesus' departure is at hand. Secondly, it is difficult to reconcile the statement concerning Judas in the second genitive absolute of vv. 2-4 with that of v. 27: either Satan has already entered into Judas prior to this gathering or he does so at this point.<sup>22</sup>

Three different ways of resolving these difficulties have been advanced by proponents of the redactional approach. The first solution proposes a distinction between v. 1 and vv. 2-4: the former verse is said to act as an introduction to the entire Book of Glory (chaps. 13-21), while the latter verses perform a similar function for the washing narrative of chap.

<sup>21</sup> This point concerning the uncharacteristic style of vv. 1-4 may be found outside the redactional approach as well. See, e. g., J. H. Bernard, *The Gospel*, 2. 454.

<sup>22</sup> The text of this clause is problematic. I believe that the reading of  $\rho^{66}$   $\text{SBLWX}$  — the question of the correct form of the name is unimportant for our purposes — is to be preferred, because it is the lectio difficilior and is better attested: τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη βεβληκός εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν Ἰούδας Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου.

On the contradictory nature of the two statements, see, e. g., J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium*, 59; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 8; G. Richter, *Die Fusswaschung*, 21. Boismard (*Le lavement*, 24, n. 27) speaks of a doublet rather than a contradiction and assigns the two statements to different literary layers. Brown (*The Gospel*, 563) hesitates between the adoption of the customary harmonizing position, viz., v. 2 represents an earlier stage of the process than v. 27, and Boismard's solution, but leans toward the first alternative, since both vv. 2 and 27 are assigned to the same literary layer. In the end, however, I do not think that the two different times of possession given in vv. 2 and 27 can be called a doublet or be said to represent a gradual process of possession; the statements are too conflicting to support either of these solutions.

13.<sup>23</sup> A much more frequent approach has been to argue that there are different literary layers within vv. 1-4.<sup>24</sup> The third and final solution integrates elements from each of these two solutions: v. 1 is seen as the introduction to the Book of Glory, but different literary layers are also said to be found within vv. 2-4.<sup>25</sup> I believe that the second approach is to be preferred.

Perhaps the most fundamental objection that may be brought to bear against the first and third solutions concerns the presence of two themes in v. 1 that closely unite this verse to its immediate context. The first theme is that of the approaching Passover: it is introduced in 11 55-57 and is then found in the introductions to three narratives in chap. 12, viz., vv. 1-8 (v. 1), vv. 12-19 (v. 12), and vv. 20-36 (v. 20). The second is that of the "hour" of Jesus: it is found in the introductions to both 12 20-36 (v. 23) and 13 31-14 31 (vv. 31-32) and is then developed extensively in both units. In the light of the clear introductory character and usage of these two themes in the immediate context, I believe that their combined presence in 13 1 establishes this verse as a definite part of the introduction to the specific narrative of the washing of the feet.

Therefore, it is only through the separation of literary layers that the difficulties within vv. 1-4 can be resolved. The key to this separation lies, in my opinion, in the doublet of vv. 1b and 3. It is not uncommon for a redactor, after his additions are complete, to repeat the last theme of the source prior to the beginning of the additions; this is, I believe, the

<sup>23</sup> R. Brown, *The Gospel*, 560-561. First of all, Brown argues that the act of love to which v. 1 alludes is the act of the passion, death, resurrection, and ascension, i. e., all of chaps. 13-21. Secondly, he proceeds to argue that 1 1-18 and 13 1 were added to the Gospel by the final redactor in order to serve as introductions to both major sections of the work, i. e., chaps. 1-12 and 13-21 respectively. It is not clear, however, whether the redactor composed 13 1 or took it from earlier material written by the evangelist.

<sup>24</sup> Much variation may be found in the reconstructions of these literary layers. Some argue, for example, that two complete introductions may be outlined. Thus, for example, Boismard (*Le lavement*, 22-24) separates vv. 1-2 from v. 3. Similarly, G. Richter, *Die Fusswaschung*, 21. (While Boismard assigns vv. 1-2 to the original introduction, Richter opts for v. 3.) Others argue in favor of one basic introduction to which additions were made at a later time. Thus, for example, Bultmann (*The Gospel*, 461-464) reconstructs the original introduction as follows: vv. 1a and 2a (the time references), 3 and 4. The remainder was added later. Similarly, H. Thyen, *Johannes 13*, 346-347. Spitta (*Das Johannesevangelium*, 285-288) proposes a somewhat different original introduction: v 1 (minus the participle ἀγαπήσας and the pronoun αὐτούς), v. 2a, and v. 4 (minus ἐκ τοῦ δεῖπνου). The remainder was added later.

<sup>25</sup> R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 10-11. Both the composition and the present position of v. 1 are assigned to the evangelist. Then, an original introduction is reconstructed as follows: v. 2a and v. 4 (minus ἐκ τοῦ δεῖπνου).

most satisfactory way of explaining the doublet in question.<sup>26</sup> Thus, I see the original introduction as having included both the prepositional phrase and the first participial clause of v. 1 as well as all of v. 4. On the other hand, I see the redactor as having added the remainder of v. 1, the two genitive absolutes of v. 2, and the participial clause of v. 3 (with which the sequence of the source is resumed).<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, given the connections between v. 1a.b and its immediate context, I see the original introduction as coming from the evangelist and the redaction as a later addition to the Gospel.

On the one hand, this proposed separation eliminates and accounts for all three literary difficulties mentioned above. First of all, the original introduction can in no way be said to be grammatically overloaded; this problem arises only when the additions are incorporated. Secondly, the doublet of vv. 1b and 3 disappears, since v. 1b is thereby assigned to the source and v. 3 to the redaction. Finally, the disagreement between v. 2 and v. 27 is traced, once again, to the stage of the redaction, so that the original introduction did not conflict in any way with the following subunit.

Yet, at the same time, through this proposed separation all the elements assigned to both the source and the redaction can be satisfactorily explained (although a full explanation must await the completion of the exegetical analysis of the passage). With regard to the original introduction, the two themes of v. 1a.b serve to connect the action that follows very closely with its immediate context in the Gospel narrative.<sup>28</sup> With regard to the redaction, I see the addition of the remainder of v. 1 as the main reason for it: the action that follows is deliberately presented as an act of love on the part of Jesus toward his disciples.<sup>29</sup> Then, the

<sup>26</sup> G. Richter on the one hand and R. Bultmann and H. Thyen on the other (see above, n. 24) take v. 3 to have been a part of the source and v. 1b an addition of the redactor. However, in such a reading of the situation the addition of v. 1b can never be satisfactorily explained, i. e., why repeat the theme at an earlier point? From a literary point of view, it is much easier to explain the addition of v. 3 to a source already containing v. 1b. Similarly, although they recognize v. 1b as part of the original introduction, both M.-É. Boismard and F. Spitta proceed to include in that original introduction material that follows v. 1b, thus in effect ignoring the redactional clue provided by the doublet.

<sup>27</sup> The redactor, in effect, makes two sentences out of one. The text of the source was thus not altered at all, but rather expanded.

<sup>28</sup> This is a further argument against G. Richter's reconstruction, since he assigns all of v. 1 to the redaction as well (see above, n. 24 and 26).

<sup>29</sup> In the Gospel of John, the love of Jesus for his disciples is mentioned only in this verse and in 13 31-14 31 (13 34-35 14 15-27) and 15 1-17. In both 13 34-35 and 15 1-17 such love is interpreted in terms of Jesus' death and presented as the ground for the disciples' own love toward one another; however, on both literary and theological grounds I have argued elsewhere (F. F. Segovia, *Love Relationships in the Fourth Gospel: Agapē/Agapan in*

redactor proceeded to provide a new introduction for the actions of v. 4; in v. 2 he included two themes that appear elsewhere in the narrative,<sup>30</sup> while in v. 3 he resumed the theme of v. 1b as a lead into v. 4.

*B. Explanations of the Washing, vv. 6-10a and 12-17.* As in the case of vv. 1-4, the introduction to the washing, three of the literary difficulties mentioned above — points (4), (5) and (6) — are also to be found within the explanations of that washing, vv. 6-10a and 12-17. Two of these — points (5) and (6) — are quite fundamental.

First of all, it is clear from v. 7 that the disciples will not be able to understand the full meaning of the washing until a later time. Yet, immediately afterwards, in vv. 12-20, the disciples are given a rather full and explicit explanation of that act. Thus, vv. 12-20 go directly against the situation envisioned by vv. 6-10a. Secondly, whereas vv. 6-10a speak of Jesus' washing as a unique act (v. 8), vv. 12-20 present it as an example to be imitated and repeated by all of Jesus' disciples (vv. 14-15). Once again, therefore, vv. 12-20 directly contradict the situation presupposed by the earlier verses.

The third difficulty in question — point (4) — is immediately related to these two. The description of the act in v. 5 can be followed quite smoothly by either vv. 6-10a or vv. 12-20: not only do both vv. 6 and 12 connect quite well with v. 5, but also the omission of either section does no damage whatever to the intelligibility of the story.

The evidence points, therefore, to the presence of only one of these explanations in the original version of the narrative. At this point, I should like to examine closely the *Tendenzen* of the two explanations.

1. *Vv. 6-10a.* The structure of this first explanation is as follows: an introduction (v. 6a) is followed by a dialogue between Peter and Jesus

I John and the Fourth Gospel, SBLDS, Chico, Cal. forthcoming; Jn 15 1-17 — Theology and Provenance, JBL, forthcoming) that both of these units were added to the Gospel at a later time by either the author of I John or someone from the same *Sitz im Leben*. In 14 15-27, the love of Jesus is presented as a post-resurrection relationship and interpreted as Jesus' return to his own in the figure of the Paraclete. It will be the thesis of this study that the interpretation of Jesus' love given in 13 1c,d — along with vv. 12-20 — matches that of 13 34-35 and 15 1-17 and should be assigned to the same redaction.

<sup>30</sup> The first theme is meant to clarify somewhat the original indication of v. 4, i. e., the action takes place during a supper (see also, v. 26). (The present tense reading, *γινόμενου*, is to be preferred because of superior attestation:  $\aleph^*$  BLWX al.) Nevertheless, the introduction of the setting continues to be rather abrupt and unexpected after chap. 12. The second theme is meant to anticipate and reinforce — in an admittedly conflicting manner — the association between Satan and the betrayer that was already present in the Gospel. Ultimately, I believe that the grammatical overloading and all the problems that that causes can be traced to the refusal on the part of the redactor to alter his source directly; he may expand it, but he never alters it.

consisting of three exchanges (vv. 6b-7/8/9-10a). The basic element in the progression of the dialogue is the theme of misunderstanding: Peter is at first quite taken aback by Jesus' action, thus misunderstanding the fundamental meaning of the washing (v. 6b); this misunderstanding is confirmed and sharpened by his subsequent refusal to submit to the washing (v. 8a); finally, faced with Jesus' severe threat of v. 8b, Peter proceeds to ask for a complete washing, again misunderstanding, though from a different perspective, the character of the washing (v. 9). The basic meaning of the act is thus to be sought in Jesus' three responses to Peter.

One gathers, first of all, from the second response (v. 8b) that the washing can be correctly understood only if regarded as a symbol, so that it is the refusal to accept that which the washing represents — rather than the washing itself — that dissolves the disciple's relationship with Jesus. The referent of the symbol can be identified with the help of the other two responses of Jesus.

The first response (v. 7) makes it quite clear that the washing can be fully understood, i. e., that its true symbolic character can be grasped, only at a later time (*μετὰ ταῦτα*). Such a response constitutes in effect another example of the frequent Johannine theme of Jesus' "hour", a theme which presents two basic connotations: it refers to Jesus' glorification, i. e., his death, resurrection, and return to the Father, as well as to the concomitant bestowal of the Spirit that grants full understanding to the believers (e. g., 2 22 7 37-39 12 16 14 26).<sup>31</sup>

Thus, the symbolic character of the washing can only be understood at the time of Jesus' glorification: only then will the disciples possess the Spirit and only then will the referent of the symbol become clear. Since an acceptance of that which the washing symbolizes grants the disciple continued union with Jesus — *μέρος μετ' ἐμοῦ* — the referent of the symbol can only be the death of Jesus on the cross, i. e., the washing is a *sêmeion* of Jesus' glorification, and it cannot be understood as *sêmeion* until that glorification has taken place and the Spirit has been given.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>31</sup> The failure to see or to accept this ultimate reference in Jesus' response and to interpret instead that response in terms of vv. 12-17 is, I believe, the fundamental weakness of those who see the washing as a simple act of humility. See, e. g., M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile*, 349.

<sup>32</sup> I quite agree, therefore, with all those who see in this explanation a symbol of Jesus' death. Indeed, the term, *sêmeion*, has been used by some of these exegetes to describe the symbolic character of this action. See, e. g., J. D. G. Dunn, *The Washing*, 247. Among the proponents of the addition theory, all but Boismard follow this line of interpretation: G. Richter, *Die Fusswaschung*, 13; H. Thyen, *Johannes 13*, 347, n. 13; R. Brown, *The Gospel*, 562; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 7. Boismard opts for a sacramental interpretation, calling it a "préfiguration" of baptism (Le lavement, 13-18). Invariably, however, the washing as *sêmeion* is not interpreted in terms of its present context in the Gospel narrative as a whole.

This identification of the washing as a *sēmeion* of Jesus' glorification is also reflected in and confirmed by an examination of Jesus' third response to Peter (v. 10a). In this last response, Peter is declared to be "clean all over" (καθαρός ὅλος), because he "has bathed" (ὁ λελουμένος); nevertheless, a further washing of the feet is also said to be absolutely necessary.<sup>33</sup>

I believe that this distinction can be best understood if one places it within the context of Jesus' relationship with the disciples in the Gospel narrative: the "bathing" that has taken place would refer to the fact that the disciples have already expressed correct belief in Jesus,<sup>34</sup> while the further "washing" that remains would indicate that such a belief is not yet perfect, i. e., it does not yet include the still outstanding and impending glorification of Jesus.<sup>35</sup> In other words, belief in the Son of God must

<sup>33</sup> The text of this first response is problematic. In recent times, a number of exegetes have chosen the shorter reading, οὐκ ἔχει χροίαν νίψασθαι, supported by  $\aleph$  it<sup>aur,c</sup> vg<sup>ww</sup> Tertullian Origen, solely on the basis of internal evidence. Two main reasons are usually adduced: a. the inner logic of the passage is said to demand the shorter reading; b. the following "but" (ἀλλά) is said to follow ill upon the preceding qualification, εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας. See, e. g., J. Michl, *Der Sinn*, 703; J. D. G. Dunn, *The Washing*, 250; G. Richter, *Die Fusswaschung*, 15, n. 6; M.-É. Boismard, *Le lavement*, 8-13.

However, I believe that the longer reading (and I favor that of B C \* W Ψ arm Origen Augustine) is to be preferred on the following grounds: a. the external attestation is much superior; b. the reading can be satisfactorily explained in the context of the Gospel narrative; c. the shorter reading can be readily explained as an attempt to smooth out what could be construed as an irreconcilable clash with the following ἀλλά.

<sup>34</sup> This would be the case even if the shorter reading were to be adopted (see above, n. 33). The distinction can be avoided only if the "bathing" of v. 10a is taken to refer to the washing of the feet; however, such an identification is highly problematical, since the term used for "bathing" (λούω) is not the same as that used consistently to describe the "washing" (νίπτω). I believe that a distinction is intended (explicitly, with the longer reading) and is to be understood symbolically in terms of the disciples' relationship with Jesus. Up to this point in the narrative, the disciples have been among the few who have believed in him (e. g., 1 35-51 2 1-11 6 66-71). To that extent, they may be said to be "clean all over" (see, e. g., Jn 15 3).

<sup>35</sup> Although they have believed in his word, the disciples have not yet received the Spirit (20 19-23) and, as such, not only fail to grasp the true meaning of some of Jesus' actions (e. g., 2 22 12 16), but actually misunderstand some of his declarations as well (e. g., 4 32-33 11 7-16).

Some commentators have seen in this last exchange a polemic against repeated ritual washings. The object of the polemic has been variously identified, e. g., the Jews or the disciples of the Baptist (e. g., G. Richter, *Die Fußwaschung*, 16; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 25); fellow Christians (e. g., H. von Campenhausen, *Zur Auslegung*, 263). However, I do not think a polemic is intended here at all. Peter's request for a more complete "washing" is meant to show his continued misunderstanding of the *sēmeion*: from the one extreme of refusing the washing he now proceeds to the other of asking for a complete washing.

include an acceptance of his death as the goal and culmination of his mission. At the same time, this narrative also makes it quite clear that such an inclusion, i. e., perfect belief, is impossible prior to the "hour" itself: Peter completely misunderstands the action and sayings of Jesus at this point.<sup>36</sup>

In conclusion, therefore, one may say that the explanation of the washing given in vv. 6-10a is very closely related not only to the Gospel narrative as a whole, but also to its present, immediate context in that narrative. Thus, on the one hand, strong Johannine features can be immediately discerned: the presentation of Jesus' act as a *sēmeion* of Jesus' glorification; the use of the theme of misunderstanding as a literary and theological technique; the theme of Jesus' "hour" and of the full understanding that can take place only at the "hour". On the other, then, the explanation is also firmly tied to its present context: Peter's attitude matches that of the disciples at this point in the narrative, i. e., they are among those few who have accepted Jesus' claims, but their belief is not yet complete; the failure to grasp Jesus' approaching death and departure is strongly continued in 13 31-14 31. There can be no question, therefore, that this explanation forms an integral part of the Gospel narrative.<sup>37</sup>

2. *Vv. 12-17.* The structure of this second explanation is as follows: an introduction (v. 12a), which explicitly concludes the washing, is followed by a discourse of Jesus (vv. 12b-17). This discourse, in turn, presents the following structure: a beginning question concerning the correct meaning of the washing (v. 12b); the elaboration of this meaning (vv. 13-16); a conclusion (v. 17). This second explanation, unlike the first, is quite explicit and readily comprehensible.

The washing of the feet is therein presented as an "example" (ὑπόδειγμα) given by Jesus to his disciples: since the Lord (ὁ κύριος) and teacher (ὁ διδάσκαλος) himself washes the feet of his disciples or "servants" (δοῦλοι), the latter must also wash one another's feet, since they are in no way "greater" than (μεῖζων) their Master. Thus, the washing itself emerges as a symbol of humble service that must be reproduced

<sup>36</sup> This misunderstanding comes to the fore once again in the following Farewell discourse of 13 31-14 31: the disciples, including Peter, have no idea what Jesus means when he announces that he is about to "depart" (13 31-14 14).

I believe that the failure to place this distinction between "bathing" and "washing" in the full context of the Gospel narrative constitutes the fundamental weakness of the sacramental approach, opening the way to all sorts of unnecessary sacramental speculations.

<sup>37</sup> I have already argued that vv. 1a,b and 4 form the original introduction to the washing in the Gospel narrative. The connection between this introduction and the first explanation of vv. 6-10a is clear: in v. 1b the theme of Jesus' "hour" is introduced; vv. 6-10a then proceed to explain the washing as a *sēmeion* of that "hour". Thus, in effect, v. 1b introduces the main line of interpretation expanded in vv. 6-10a.



by the disciples in their dealings with one another.<sup>38</sup> Indeed, the conclusion (v. 17) clearly states that only through the imitation of this act can the disciples retain their status, i. e., no disciple can shirk this duty and remain a disciple (μακάριοι ἔστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά).

The *Tendenz* of these verses is, therefore, quite different from that of vv. 6-10a. The emphasis here is on the washing as an example of humble service, not as a *sēmeion*;<sup>39</sup> on present understanding, not future (v. 7); on the need on the part of the disciples to reproduce Jesus' act (v. 15), not on the uniqueness of that act (v. 8b); on the continued discipleship that results from its imitation (v. 17), not from its acceptance (v. 8b). In short, the emphasis of this second explanation is on the ecclesiological implications of Jesus' act.<sup>40</sup>

From the point of view of the Gospel narrative, this *Tendenz* is quite unusual. It is in fact limited to 13 34-35 and 15 1-17, texts whose present positions in the Gospel narrative have often been called into question on both literary and theological grounds.<sup>41</sup> Thus, unlike the first explanation, this second one is only very loosely related not only to the Gospel narrative as a whole but to its immediate context as well. However, before deciding in favor of either the source or the addition theory, it is necessary to examine the respective conclusions of both explanations.

*C. Conclusions to the Explanations, vv. 10b-11.18-20.* The two remaining literary difficulties mentioned above – points (7) and (8) – have to do with the comments on Judas Iscariot that follow the two explanations of the washing, i. e., vv. 10b-11 and 18-20 respectively. Both difficulties involve unnecessary doublets.

The first one concerns what is in effect a double announcement of Judas' betrayal within 13 1-20. First of all, after the dialogue of vv. 6-10a, the judgment passed on Peter is extended in v. 10b to all the disciples: you are "clean". However, this declaration is immediately qualified in v. 10c, and the qualification is explained in the aside of v. 11 in terms of Judas'

<sup>38</sup> The aspect of service is obvious, while the aspect of humility is, as has often been recognized, an essential part of the symbol, i. e., the washing of the feet is a menial task performed only by the lowest segments of society. See J. Michl, *Der Sinn*, 699-700; W. K. Groussow, *A Note*, 130.

<sup>39</sup> Indeed, this aspect of humble service on the part of Jesus was immediately perceived by Peter in vv. 6-10a (vv. 6b. 8a); however, that interpretation was completely bypassed, if not thoroughly revised, in the ensuing first explanation.

<sup>40</sup> The failure to grasp the primary ecclesiological concerns of the washing in vv. 12-17 is, in my opinion, the fundamental weakness of those who interpret these verses primarily in terms of vv. 6-10a. See, e. g., J. A. T. Robinson, *The Significance*, 139.

<sup>41</sup> See above, n. 29. See also, G. Richter, *Die Deutung*, 29-30; H. Thyen, *Johannes 13*, 355-356; J. Becker, *Die Abschiedsreden Jesu im Johannesevangelium*, ZNW 61, 1970, 215-246; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 101-106. 140-143.

betrayal.<sup>42</sup> Then, after the discourse of vv. 12-17, the judgment passed in v. 17 on the disciples who imitate Jesus' example is also immediately qualified in the following verse (v. 18a.b). Furthermore, that qualification is explained once again in v. 18c in terms of Judas' betrayal.<sup>43</sup>

The second difficulty has to do with what is in effect a double identification of the betrayer within 13 1-30. First of all, the qualification of v. 18c provides a sign – a scriptural quotation from Ps 41 9 – whereby the identity of the betrayer may be ascertained: it is the one who "eats my bread". Then, in vv. 21-30, when the disciples ask Jesus who the betrayer will be, the same sign is once again provided (vv. 25-26).

I believe that both difficulties may be satisfactorily resolved if one recalls that it is not uncommon for a redactor, having completed his additions to the source, to repeat the last theme from that source prior to the additions. Thus, the second announcement of the betrayal in vv. 18-20 may be explained as a deliberate resumption of that same theme in the source, vv. 10b-11. In other words, the redactor broke off the source at v. 11, added the second explanation of vv. 12-17, and concluded it by repeating the theme of betrayal from vv. 10b-11 in vv. 18-20 prior to the resumption of the source (vv. 21-30).<sup>44</sup> Given such a framework, furthermore, there was only one identification of the betrayer in the original narrative (vv. 25-26).<sup>45</sup>

From a purely literary point of view, therefore, I believe that the additions theory is to be preferred in accounting for the presence of

<sup>42</sup> Given the distinction of v. 10a between "bathing" and "washing", it is clear that in vv. 10b-11 the betrayer is specifically regarded as not being "clean", i. e., as not having "bathed". In other words, Judas Iscariot, unlike the other disciples, never accepted Jesus' claim or expressed correct belief in him. Such a portrayal of Judas is strongly reflected elsewhere in the Gospel narrative, e. g., 6 60-65. 66-71 12 1-8. Yet another connection between vv. 10b-11 and the rest of the Gospel may be observed in the aside of v. 11, a technique that is commonly employed in the Gospel, e. g., 12 6. 16.

<sup>43</sup> In v. 19 the theme of Judas concludes with an instruction to the disciples not to be shaken by the coming betrayal. Then, v. 20, resuming key concepts from v. 16, concludes the entire addition by declaring that in imitating Jesus' action, the disciples are in fact accepting each other as disciples, and, as such, accepting Jesus and the Father as well.

<sup>44</sup> This is exactly the same procedure observed in vv. 1-4. Thus, in effect, the entire addition to the Gospel narrative may be seen as having consisted of vv. 1c-3 and 12-20. Furthermore, just as v. 1a.b introduces the main line of interpretation later expanded in vv. 6-10a (see above, n. 37), so do vv. 1c-3 also introduce a new line of interpretation that is then expanded in vv. 12-17, viz., the washing as an act of love on Jesus' part becomes, when reproduced, an act of love on the part of the disciples as well.

<sup>45</sup> The doublet was created when the redactor, resuming the theme of vv. 10b-11, also decided to anticipate, somewhat obtrusively, the identification of the betrayer in the following unit of his source, 13 21-30. A parallel, though much more obtrusive, anticipation has already been detected above in v. 2 (see n. 30). It is clear, once again, that the redactor will expand, but not alter, his source.

vv. 12-20 in the Gospel narrative. Not only does such a theory resolve the difficulties occasioned by the two conclusions of vv. 10b-11 and 18-20, but also those that arise from the juxtaposition of two conflicting interpretations, vv. 6-10a and 12-17, of the same act. In the original narrative, then, v. 5 was explained solely in terms of vv. 6-10a; a qualification concerning the betrayer followed in vv. 10b-11; and, finally, the betrayer was identified in vv. 21-30.

#### IV. Summary and Conclusions

The result of the preceding exegetical analysis has been the separation of two distinct literary layers within Jn 13 1-20. Such a separation, I have argued, accounts for and satisfactorily resolves all eight literary difficulties mentioned at the beginning of this study. I have also argued, on the basis of redactional clues as well as literary and theological affinities with the remainder of the Gospel narrative, that the earlier layer - comprising vv. 1a.5.6-10a.10b-11 - constitutes the original version of the washing in the Gospel narrative and, consequently, that the latter layer - comprising vv. 1b-4,12-17 and 18-20 - represents an addition to this original version.<sup>46</sup>

With regard to the original version, first of all, I have argued that the washing is therein presented as a *sēmeion* of Jesus' departure and glorification and, furthermore, placed directly within the context of Jesus' relationship with the Twelve in the Gospel narrative, i. e., perfect belief on their part is not possible until the "hour" itself. Secondly, I have also argued that the redaction of this original version presents that same washing as an act of love and an example of humble service on Jesus' part which is to be reproduced by the disciples in their dealings with one another: just as he washed the feet of the disciples (= loved them), so must they also wash one another's feet (= love one another).

However, at this point in the inquiry, a proponent of an addition theory, such as the one delineated above, must still reckon with the further question concerning the *Sitz im Leben* of the proposed addition, i. e., what situation in the Johannine community is reflected in and presupposed by that addition? It is my opinion that the *Tendenz* of the proposed addition parallels quite closely that of I John on two fundamental counts and that the addition can thus be reasonably assigned to and

<sup>46</sup> In the light of these literary and theological affinities between the first explanation and the rest of the Gospel narrative and the absence thereof with respect to the second explanation, I find Boismard's position untenable (see above, n. 17). The second explanation may indeed be an older tradition, but not at the literary level.

satisfactorily explained in terms of the same *Sitz im Leben* as that of the letter.

First of all, the emphasis noted above within vv. 12-17 on the proper behavior, viz., humble service or love for one another, that the disciples are to exhibit in their dealings with one another as well as the definition of true and abiding discipleship in terms of this proper behavior immediately remove these verses from the generally accepted theological concerns and *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel, i. e., a bitter struggle and debate between a Christian community and its parent synagogue, where discipleship is defined solely in terms of acceptance of Jesus' origin and identity.<sup>47</sup> Aside from the very problematic 13 34-35 and 15 1-17, such intra-church concerns are not to be found in the Gospel at all.

Such concerns, however, do appear quite prominently in I John. Thus, one finds therein a similar, very strong emphasis on the kind of behavior that is proper to a member of the community, viz., love for the brethren (1 5-2 11 2 15-17 4 7-12.16b-21) as well as the inclusion of such proper behavior within the definition of a true and abiding discipleship (2 10-11 3 10 4 7-8.12b 5 1-5).

Secondly, this emphasis on humble service or love for one another as the proper criterion for a true and abiding discipleship is also explicitly grounded by the redaction on Jesus' own washing as an act of love and humble service (vv. 1b-4.12-17). I argued above that this latter interpretation of the washing represented a shift in "emphasis" from that of vv. 6-10a; however, I believe that this shift should not be construed as an abandonment of the earlier interpretation of the washing, but rather as a development of it by incorporation. Such an incorporation may be seen above all in the addition of v. 1b.

Thus, according to v. 1b, in washing the feet of the disciples, Jesus showed that he loved them "to the end" (εἰς τέλος), i. e., the washing itself represents love "to the end." In the light of 19 28-30, this prepositional phrase can only be taken as a reference to the hour of Jesus' death and glorification. Thus, the redactor accepted the earlier interpretation of the washing as a *sēmeion* of Jesus' hour. However, he proceeded to develop that interpretation in two basic ways: that washing as *sēmeion*, as symbolic of Jesus' death, was described in terms of love "to the end"; that washing as *sēmeion* was further interpreted as an act of humble service upon which the proper behavior of the disciples toward one another is grounded, i. e., just as Jesus loved them "to the end," so must they also love one another.

<sup>47</sup> On this depiction of the *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel, see the very influential work of J.L. Martyn (*History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, Nashville 1979). See also, F. F. Segovia, *The Love and Hatred of Jesus and Johannine Sectarianism*, CBQ 43, 1981, 258-272.

Aside once again from the very problematic 13 34-35 and 15 1-17, the description of Jesus' death, as represented in the washing, as an act of love on his part<sup>48</sup> and the grounding of the proper behavior of the disciples on that very precise act of love are theological concerns that are not found elsewhere in the Gospel narrative. However, such concerns do appear jointly and quite prominently in I John (3 11-18 4 7-11 4 14-16a, 16b-21).

I have argued elsewhere that these fundamental theological concerns from I John – love for one another as the proper behavior of a disciple; the inclusion of this proper behavior within the definition of true discipleship; the understanding of Jesus' death as an act of love for his disciples; the grounding of the disciples' own love for one another on Jesus' own mode of love for them – presuppose, reflect and confirm the generally accepted *Sitz im Leben* of the Letter, i. e., the emergence of a group *from within* the community of believers with a docetic understanding of Jesus' death as the Christ (2 18-27 4 1-6 5 1-12) and a disregard, in the eyes of the author of I John, for the command of mutual love (1 5-2 11 2 15-17 4 7-12. 16b-21).<sup>49</sup>

Furthermore, in the Letter itself these concerns serve to combat directly the positions of this "deviant" group: against docetism, the author argues that Jesus did die on the cross as the Christ and that his death was an act of love; against perceived moral laxity, the author argues on behalf of love for one another. Finally, the author grounded this latter love on the former as yet another argument against his opponents.<sup>50</sup>

Given the parallel theological concerns found in the additions within Jn 13 1-20, I believe that the redaction also presupposes and reflects the *Sitz im Leben* of the Letter delineated above.<sup>51</sup> As such, its incorporation

<sup>48</sup> See above, n. 29.

<sup>49</sup> See above, n. 29. For a recent and rather complete description of this *Sitz im Leben*, see J. Bogart, *Orthodox and Heretical Perfectionism in the Johannine Community as Evident in the First Epistle of John*, SBLDS 33, Missoula, MT 1977, 123-41.

<sup>50</sup> Given the complete absence of any mention of persecution or the possibility of death in I John, I have also argued (Love Relationships) that the grounding itself is to be understood symbolically, i. e., in order to love one another as Jesus loved them, the disciples must accept Jesus' mode of love through his death; indeed, this acceptance then becomes the highest example – as well as the basis for – of mutual love. Thus, the love command emerges as a double weapon against the interrelated docetic and ethical positions of the opponents.

<sup>51</sup> R. Brown (*The Gospel*, 562) argues that the addition was added by someone other than the evangelist; however, it is not clear exactly who wrote it, i. e., the evangelist or the redactor. In either case, the redactor is not associated with I John. H. Thyen (*Johannes* 13, 350) does connect the addition with the Letters; however, I disagree entirely with the proposed framework, viz., the Gospel (which included vv. 6-10a) was an originally Gnostic

into the original Gospel narrative parallels those of 15 1-17 and 13 34-35 and should, like these two, be construed as a part of a further attack on the "deviant" group of believers, an attack which was carried out through a redaction of the community's *Grundschrift*.

Thus, in that part of the Gospel narrative wherein Jesus declares that his "hour" has come and proceeds to explain what this "hour" entails (12 20ff.), additions coming from a later stage of the community, that of I John, have, in the light of the new situation in the community, been incorporated into the narrative with the purpose of having Jesus himself argue against the positions taken by the "deviant" believers, i. e., characterizing his coming death as an act of love for his disciples, emphasizing the corresponding duty of the disciples to love one another, and grounding the latter love on the former.

For the redactor, the original version of the washing in the *Grundschrift* was eminently suitable for his purposes, since the washing was already intimately connected therein with Jesus' death as a *sēmeion* of that death. Thus, he proceeded to reinterpret the washing in such a way that it could serve as a further weapon against the "deviant" group: he characterized it as an act of love and, most appropriately in the light of the docetic claim, of love "to the end"; he described it further in terms of humble service; and he grounded the proper behavior of the disciples toward one another on this act of love. In doing so, however, the redactor did not alter the text of the *Grundschrift*, but simply added on to it, thus creating – as in the case of 15 1-17 and 13 34-35 – numerous literary difficulties.

document which was subsequently edited (including the addition of vv. 12-17) against the background of the controversy outlined in III John.

R. Schnackenburg (*Das Johannesevangelium*, 28) and, much more explicitly, G. Richter (*Die Deutung*, 34-36) do associate the addition specifically with I John, but they do so solely in terms of the ethical or parenetical parallels, thus bypassing completely the christological aspect of the controversy behind I John, a controversy which is strongly reflected in and presupposed by the addition to the washing.