of their limbs by stiffness or paralysis.  
Of this kind was the man on whom the  
miracle was wrought.

“*waiting for  
the moving of the water*,’ and the whole  
of ver. 4.] The spuriousness of this controverted passage can hardly be questioned. See the critical considerations  
dwelt on in my Greek Test, I may mention that the Vatican, Paris, Cambridge,  
and Sinaitic MSS. omit it: while at the  
same time the Alexandrine MS. contains  
it, but with the important variation  
of “*an angel* **washed in**” instead of  
“*went down into*.”

**5.]** Observe, he  
had *been lame* thirty-eight years, not *at  
Bethesda* all that time.

**6.] knew**,  
namely, *within Himself*, as on other similar occasions. Our Lord singled him out,  
being conscious of the circumstances under  
which he lay there, by that superhuman  
knowledge of which we had so striking an  
example in the case of the woman of Samaria.

**Wilt thou be made whole ?]**Some would supply, “*notwithstanding that  
it is the sabbath*.’ But this is very improbable, see ver.17. Our Lord did not  
thus appeal to his hearers’ prejudices, and  
make His grace dependent on them. Besides, the “*being made whole*” had in the  
mind of the man no reference to a healing  
such as there would be any objection to  
on the Sabbath; but to the cure *by means  
of the water*, which he was there to seek.

The question is one of those by  
which He so frequently testified his compassion, and established (so to speak) a  
point of connexion between the spirit of  
the person addressed, and His own gracious  
purposes. Possibly it may have conveyed  
to the mind of the poor cripple the idea  
that at length a compassionate person had  
come, who might put him in at the next  
troubling of the water. It certainly is  
possible that the man’s long and apparently  
hopeless infirmity may have given him a  
look of lethargy and despondency, and the  
question may have arisen from this: but  
there is no ground for supposing *blame*  
conveyed by it, still less that he was an  
impostor labouring under some trifling  
complaint, and wishing to represent it  
more important than it was.

**7.]**The  
man’s answer implies the popular belief  
that whoever stepped in immediately after  
the bubbling up of the water was made  
whole: no more than this. Bauer asks  
why the person who *brought him there  
every day*, could not have put him in?  
But no such person is implied. The same  
slow motion which he describes here, would  
suffice for his daily coming and going.

**8.]** The command, **Take up thy bed**, has  
been treated as making a difference between  
the man lame from his birth in Acts iii. 8,  
who *walked* and *leaped* and *praised God*;  
and this man, who, since sin had been the  
cause of his disease (ver. 14), is ordered to  
carry his bed, ‘a present memento of his  
past sin.’ Possibly; but our Lord must  
have had in his view what was to follow,  
and have ordered it also to bring about  
this his first open controversy with the  
Jews.

**10.]** The Jews, never the *multitude*, but always those in authority of  
some kind, whom John ever puts forward  
as the representatives of the whole people