

as symbolical of the impure state of his heart, and thus have pointed him out to the little band as one who was unworthy of their confidence and regard. *Peter* objected to such humiliating work on the part of *Jesus*. "Lord, thou shalt never wash my feet." But no objection was urged by *Judas*. He submitted uncomplainingly to have his feet washed by him who was Lord of all. This conduct on the part of *Jesus* might have melted the traitor's heart. It might have broken up the fountain of his emotions had his heart not been sealed by a dread infatuation. *Christ* had said to *Peter*, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." That feet washing was intended to teach the disciples two things. First to wash one another's feet—that they might be prepared to be the servants of one another. And, secondly, to teach them that their purity must come from *Christ*, and that there was in him the means of purity for them. It taught the same lesson to all, to *Judas* as well as the rest. Or must we come to the conclusion, that there was insincerity in the act towards the one, and sincerity towards the eleven? Must we take this feet washing to be a Janus-faced exercise, looking one thing to the eleven, and another and different thing to the one? Was it an act of love to *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, and the rest, and a mere judicial act to *Judas*? Away with the thought! The act looked lovingly to *Judas* as well as to the others; and as lovingly to the one as to the many. There was no ambiguity in any of the acts of the Redeemer. He was earnest and sincere in all that he did.

2. The Saviour's intimation, "Ye are clean, but not all," was calculated to carry conviction to the heart of *Judas*. *Jesus* knew who would betray him, therefore he said, "Ye are not all clean." The intention of *Judas* was known to the Saviour. The statement would not be so plain to the rest of the disciples; but to *Judas* it was calculated to be a startling revelation. The traitor might confess his guilt. It was not yet too late. The foul deed existed but in purpose. The master loved the erring disciple still. He had manifested his love in washing the feet of *Judas*. The Saviour would receive his confession and forgive his sin. Then will not the traitor's heart give way? "The Lord has no need of any testimony concerning man. I may confess my sin to this loving one. He is able to bring up every secret thought." *Judas* might have been led to reason thus. But no, the traitor remains unmoved. There is no apparent relenting. The statement was intended to lodge conviction in the mind of *Judas*, and