*Galilæan* miracle (see ch. iii. 2, and ver. 45).  
But (1) how is that expressed in the words?  
The miracles which He did at Jerusalem  
in the feast being omitted, the words naturally carry the thoughts back to a former one related; and the clause added (“*when  
He was come out of Judea into Galilee”*)  
shews, not that a miracle prior to this,  
during this return visit, has been passed  
over,—but that as the scene of this second  
was in Galilee, so that former one, to which  
“*second*” refers, must be sought in Galilee also. And then (2) *why* should this so particularly be stated? Certainly, it seems  
to me, on account of the part which this  
miracle bore in the calling ont and assuring of faith by the manifestation of  
His glory, as that first one had done before. By that (ch. ii. 11), His disciples  
had been convinced: by this, one (himself a type of the weak and unworthy in  
faith) outside the circle of His own. By  
both, half-belief was strengthened into  
faith in Him: but in each case it is of a  
different kind.

It is an interesting  
question, whether or not this miracle be  
the same as the healing of the centurion’s  
servant (or *son*, Matthew?) in Matt. viii.  
5: Luke vii. 1. Ireneus *appears* to hold  
the two narratives to be the same history  
(appears only; for his words are, “He  
healed the centurion’s servant when absent, saying, ‘Go thy way, thy son liveth:’”  
which remark may be simply explained by  
his having cited from memory, and thus  
either made this *nobleman* a centurion,—  
or, which is more probable, having understood the word in Matt. viii. to signify a  
*son*, and made our Lord there speak very  
similar words to those really uttered by  
Him, but which are in reality found here) :  
so Eusebius also in his canons. Chrysostom  
notices, but opposes the view :—and it has  
never in modern times gained many advocates, being chiefly held by the interpreters  
of the Straussian school. Indeed, the internal evidence is all against it : not only  
(Chrys) “in station, but also in the nature.  
of his faith,” does the man in one case differ from the man in the other. The inner kernel of the history is, in our case here,—  
*the elevation of a weak and mere wonder-seeking faith into a deep conviction of the personal power and love of our Lord*; in  
the other, the commendation of a noble  
confession of our Lord’s divine power, indicating great strength and grasp of faith,and inducing the greatest personal humility. And the external point brought out  
in the commendation there, “*I have not  
seen such faith, no, not in Israel*,” is not  
only different from, but stands in absolute  
contrast with, the depreciating charge  
here, “*Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe*.”

Olshausen well remarks, that this narrative may be  
regarded as a sequel to the foregoing one.

**CHAP. V.—XII.]** *Second great division  
of the Gospel.* JESUS IN CONFLICT WITH THE   
Jews. V., VI. JESUS THE LIFE.  
*Beginning of the conflict.*

**V. 1—47.]** *Healing of a cripple at the  
pool of Bethesda, during a feast ; and the  
discourse of Jesus occasioned by the persecution of the Jews arising thereupon.*

**1. After these things]** Lücke remarks that  
when John wishes to indicate immediate  
succession, he uses “*after this*” (or  
“*that*”), ch. ii. 12; xi. 7, 11; xix. 28;  
when mediate, after an interval, “*after  
these things*,” ch. iii. 22; v.14; vi.1; vii.  
1; xix. 38. So that apart from other considerations which would lead us to the same conclusion, we may infer that some  
interval has elapsed since the last verse of  
ch. iv.

**a feast of the Jews]** Few  
points have been more controverted, than  
the question, *what this feast was*. I will  
give the principal views, and then state  
my own conclusion. (1) Irenæeus understands it to be the *second Passover of our  
Lord’s ministry*. Origen (whose commentary on this chapter is lost) mentions this  
view, but apparently does not approve it.  
This is the view of Luther, Grotius, Lightfoot, and others. (2) Cyril of Alexandria,  
Chrysostom, and others think it to be *the  
Pentecost*. This opinion prevailed in the  
Greek Church; and has found many defenders in modern times. (3) Kepler first  
suggested the idea that it might be *the  
feast of Purim*, (Esth. ix. 21, 26,) almost  
immediately preceding the Passover (the  
14th and 15th of Adar). This has been  
the general view of the modern chronologists. (4) The *feast of Tabernacles* has  
been suggested by Cocceius, and is supported by one of our MSS., but of late date.  
(5) Kepler and Petavius thought it also  
possible that the *feast of Dedication* (see ch.  
x. 22) might be meant.

So that almost every Jewish feast finds some supporters.  
I believe, with Lücke, De Wette, and  
Tholuck, *that we cannot with any probability gather what feast it was*. Seeing  
as I do no distinct datum given in ch. iv.  
35, nor again in ch. vi. 1, and finding