

# Taking up your Bed on the Sabbath

*John 5:1-16*

**John 5:1** After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

<sup>2</sup> Now there is in Jerusalem by the Sheep Gate a pool, in Aramaic called Bethesda, which has five roofed colonnades.

<sup>3</sup> In these lay a multitude of invalids--blind, lame, and paralyzed, *waiting for the moving of the waters (NAS)*

<sup>4</sup> *for an angel of the Lord went down at certain seasons into the pool, and stirred up the water; whoever then first, after the stirring up of the water, stepped in was made well from whatever disease with which he was afflicted. (NAS)*

<sup>5</sup> One man was there who had been an invalid for thirty-eight years.

<sup>6</sup> When Jesus saw him lying there and knew that he had already been there a long time, he said to him, "Do you want to be healed?"

<sup>7</sup> The sick man answered him, "Sir, I have no one to put me into the pool when the water is stirred up, and while I am going another steps down before me."

<sup>8</sup> Jesus said to him, "Get up, take up your bed, and walk."

<sup>9</sup> And at once the man was healed, and he took up his bed and walked. Now that day was the Sabbath.

<sup>10</sup> So the Jews said to the man who had been healed, "It is the Sabbath, and **it is not lawful for you to take up your bed.**"

<sup>11</sup> But he answered them, "The man who healed me, that man said to me, 'Take up your bed, and walk.'"

<sup>12</sup> They asked him, "Who is the man who said to you, 'Take up your bed and walk'?"

<sup>13</sup> Now the man who had been healed did not know who it was, for Jesus had withdrawn, as there was a crowd in the place.

<sup>14</sup> Afterward Jesus found him in the temple and said to him, "See, you are well! Sin no more, that nothing worse may happen to you."

<sup>15</sup> The man went away and told the Jews that it was Jesus who had healed him.

<sup>16</sup> And this was why the Jews were persecuting Jesus, because he was doing these things on the Sabbath. (Joh 5:1-16 ESV)

## **Doc Holliday and the Hot Pool**

May 1887. He had heard much of Colorado's newest health resort in Glenwood. The hot springs were boasted as a sure cure for consumption, the vapors being heavily charged with healing chemicals. So he had his trunk taken down to Carson's stage and express line, paid twelve dollars for his ticket and got on top of the big four-horse Concord for his last ride. He checked into the Glenwood Hotel and began to take the cure. When not breathing the hot, steamy air he hung out in the sheriff's office talking over old times or did his serious drinking in one of four local saloons. He attempted to support himself by doing dental work, but his violent cough made that effort unsuccessful. The town had some 400 permanent residents, but as summer came on, the population increased enormously. Everyone seemed benefited by the hot mineral waters. Everyone but Doc. His chronic pulmonary tuberculosis suddenly developed into miliary tuberculosis in which the germ attacks not only the lungs but every part of the

body, and with vicious force and speed. Doc felt worse and worse. By October, Doc became delirious. By Monday November 7, he was unable to speak. About ten o'clock on the morning of November 7, 1887, Doctor John Henry Holliday (aka Doc Holliday) died at the Hotel Glenwood. He was buried near Palmer Avenue and Twelfth Street in Linwood Cemetery that afternoon.<sup>1</sup>

It was not just the settlers of Colorado that viewed the Glenwood hot springs this way. The Ute Indians revered them for centuries because of their curative powers. And it is not just the Glenwood hot springs. Places around the world where natural water bubbles out of the ground have been revered forever. Time and technology do not seem to change our views. Whether you live by a secular naturalistic creed like we do in the west and attribute the healing to chemicals, or you live by a supernatural creed and attribute it to angels, humanity can't seem to "grow out of" such thinking.

## **The Angel Pool at Bethesda**

Our story today is **John 5:1-16**. It is a story similar in some ways to that of Doc Holliday. Jesus, who has been home in Galilee, is now taking a return trip down to Jerusalem. He was in Jerusalem in Chs. 2-3. He went there the first time because the feast of Passover was near (**2:13**). He returns again because another feast was approaching (**John 5:1**). Unlike the

---

<sup>1</sup> Taken from Patricia Jahns, *The Frontier World of Doc Holliday* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 282; and Karen Holliday Tanner, *Doc Holliday: A Family Portrait* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001), 216, 220.

other feasts in this book, we are not told which feast it was. We know that it would have been one of the three pilgrim feasts (Passover or Pentecost or Tabernacles) and it was probably in the year 28 A.D.<sup>2</sup>

The setting of the miracle is a pool by “the Sheep Gate” which has five roofed colonnades. Nehemiah mentions the Sheep Gate (**Neh 3:1, 32; 12:39**), and it is probably a small opening in the north wall of the temple where sheep may have been washed in the pool before being taken to the sanctuary for slaughter. In Aramaic this place was probably called **Bethesda**, meaning “House of Divine Mercy” (there are several variations on the spelling in the manuscripts and ancient writings). Near the church of St. Anne, in the northeast quarter of the old city, there exist the remains of two pools surrounded by four columns with a fifth dividing the two pools. This is probably the spot where our story takes place.

The beginning of **verse three** tells us that a multitude of invalids used to come to this spot. Later on (**vs. 6-7**) we learn why. **Vs. 7** tells us that there was a belief that the pool was occasionally stirred up and when this occurred, people would rush down the steps to be healed by the waters. The verse also seems to imply that the first person in the water would be healed, while all the rest were out of luck.

## Missing Verses

---

<sup>2</sup> William Hendriksen and Simon J. Kistemaker, vol. 1-2, *New Testament Commentary : Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953-2001), Jn 5:1.

Now, you ask, why do you go to vs. 7 to tell me this? If you have the ESV, you will notice that someone took **vs. 4** out of your Bible. It isn't there. However, if you have something like the NIV or NAS or KJV you will see that vs. 4 is there as well as an addition at the end of vs. 3. This needs a comment (we are going to see the same problem arise again in chapter 8 when we come to the woman caught in the act of adultery).

Why would some Bibles have these words while others would not? Is the Bible unreliable, untrustworthy? Are people just picking and choosing what they want to be in the Bible? Are we no better than the Jehovah's Witnesses?

You have to remember that the NT was copied by hand by scribes for the first 1,500 years of its existence. We owe a great debt of gratitude to the hundreds of monks that spent their lives doing nothing but copying book. Without them, we have no Bible. But sometimes, scribes felt the need to insert something into the text, perhaps to make it clearer. This may be the case with **John 5:3b-4**. For whatever reason, someone felt the need to add these words. It is probable that he was adding what was known oral tradition about the place. So, some translations like the ESV do not translate the additions because they feel very confident that they were not in the original text. Others do add the additions, because they add a bit of historical background that is probably accurate to the story.

There is something to think about here when you are dealing with non-Christians. Many people today will say that

you can't trust the Bible. They may even point to this very passage as proof. But they know nothing of textual criticism. In actuality, these Bible translations are trying to be faithful to the original text as best they can ascertain. The Bible is a very old book. Some have argued that these were in fact the original words (though I'm doubtful),<sup>3</sup> and even if they were not, they were of such an early tradition that Tertullian, writing a mere 130 or so after the Gospel of John was written, seems unaware of manuscript traditions that do not have this text (Tertullian, *On Baptism* 5). The fact that there are difficulties like this does nothing to harm our faith, for there is no contradiction in any of them in the essential doctrines that we must believe to be saved.<sup>4</sup> All this one does is add some filler to the story, though it is pretty interesting filler.

At any rate, what does our **variant** say? First, it says that the people used to “wait for the moving/stirring of the waters.” It then explains that “an angel of the Lord went down at certain seasons into the pool, and stirred up the water; whoever then first, after the stirring up of the water, stepped in was made well from whatever disease with which he was afflicted.” This sounds extremely strange to modern sensibilities. It does not sound exactly like the view of the waters at Glenwood, where everyone but Doc was seeing some benefit.

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, Zane Hodges, “Problem Passages in the Gospel of John Part V: The Angel at Bethesda—John 5:4,” *BibSac* 136:541 (Jan 1979): 25-39.

<sup>4</sup> In spite of the claims of people like Bart Ehrman who erect a kind of all or nothing test for biblical authority: If there is a single mistake of any kind, you cannot trust the entire thing. This is an absurd position.

Furthermore, the kinds of infirmities being healed were quite extraordinary: blindness, lameness, paralysis. Why would they all go there if no one was ever being healed?

Tertullian and many others explain that the pagans had similar kinds of beliefs. There were similar shrines in the ancient Greek world, for instance, to the god **Asclepius**. Some have said that the Jewish leaders probably did not believe such superstition, but tolerated it anyway. If the words are an addition, we are not compelled to believe that an angel really did these things. They may still be true, however. Yet, *if* they are Scripture's words, we are obligated to believe them. In the third century, Origen reports that even in his time these waters were said to have healing powers (*Commentary on John*, Fragment 61). Pilgrims travelling to the Holy Land in the fourth century told legends about the place. It may be strange that God would send an angel to do this, but then again, we really know next to nothing about their powers or interaction with our material world, other than that they do interact with it.

But either way, it is clear that there was obviously something very strange about this place. **Vs. 5** says, "One man was there who had been an invalid for thirty-eight years." **Vs. 6** adds that "he had been there a long time." **Chromatius of Aquileia** (ca. 400 A.D.) said that the waters were only stirred once a year, so he had to get there early.

## **OT Symbolism of a NT Miracle**

The man's belief in the healing waters was great, for when Jesus asks if he wants to be healed, he says, "I have no one to put me into the pool when the water is stirred up, and while I am going another steps down before me." Clearly, he had come here in order to be healed by these waters, just like doc. At this point I want to make you aware of how the early church often interpreted this passage. It was quite different from anything we hear today.

Many commented on the length of the man's infirmity, the number of colonnades, the meaning of the pool and water, etc. These include Augustine, Chrysostom, Tertullian, Irenaeus and others. In their estimation, these things point back to the Jews and the OT. **Thirty eight years** just happens to be the amount of time that Israel spent in the wilderness (**Deut 2:14**). Some believe that Herod created the **five pillars** to represent the Torah. Many compare these waters to the **waters of baptism**, which I have argued many times, is deeply rooted in the OT, including the parting of the Red Sea. Augustine even says that the waters and the pool represent **the Jews**, because elsewhere, in John's Apocalypse, people are identified through the symbol of water (**Rev 17:15**). If John's intent is to use symbolism in such a way, he would be making a theological point. Jesus could be performing this miracle to show that **the age of wilderness wandering is finally over**. It was time to enter into *his* rest. If that is John's intent, this is not spiritualizing the text, it would be intentional on John's part, and for anyone who has ever read John's other book



Revelation, this is certainly not unknown to John. The problem is, we don't know for sure if that is his intent or not. But it is curious that the focus shifts now from the miracle to the day upon which it takes place. It is at least worth keeping in your mind, because clearly, now, the focus shifts from the miracle to the attitude of the Jews in the midst of it.

## Healing the Man

First, the miracle itself. The ESV says the man was an **invalid**. In fact, we don't know what his disease was. The word used is simply the word for sick, weak, frail, or infirmed. And invalid is just as good as any other disease in which a person could not even walk down to the water to be healed. The ESV also seems to imply that Jesus knew that this man had been there a long time simply by looking at him. This is quite possible, though some think he inquired about it. Whether it was supernatural knowledge or not, it doesn't really matter, because Jesus has already proven a couple of times in this book that he has that.

“**Do you want to be healed?**” (vs. 6), Jesus asks. The man has no inkling that Jesus is the Great Physician and is offering to heal the man himself. Jesus, not this pool at Bethesda, is the **Living Water**, we have learned in the last chapter. Whereas, at best, this pool could only heal one person once a year because of the sending of an angel, Jesus can heal whenever and whomever he wishes. The man's answer is that he does want to be healed, but he doesn't ask Jesus to heal him.

But **Jesus heals him anyway**. Such is the compassion of our Savior. How often does Christ do good things for us when we do not even ask? We are often told by preachers that we won't get anything from God until we ask for it. I understand the sentiment and the importance of prayer, but that is to put God in a box. But God is sovereign and can do whatever he wants whenever he wants. He doesn't need this man's permission to heal him, and in fact this man is blind to Jesus' anyway. That is the greatness of our savior, who takes people running from him, throwing their fist in his face, laying as dead on the side of the road, and saves them, gives them life, heals their sin, and all without their permission. Never think that God can't do a thing until you ask him to do it. Don't let that be a reason not to pray, but simply keep in mind who it is that you are praying to. This is the Sovereign God.

Jesus searches out a man, one particular man among a host of sick people there at Bethesda, and he heals him because he wants to. This demonstrates the selecting love of God upon whichever unsuspecting sinner he sees fit to bestow it. It is a kind of **election**, a kind that certainly emulates the electing love that he has for his church, and that he has shown many of you here today. Take delight in the compassion of Jesus and his desire to heal those he sets out to heal, for if you are in Christ, you are one of them.

As he showed in the previous story, Jesus speaks a word, and the healing occurs. "**Get up, take up your bed, and walk.**" Jesus does not touch the man. Jesus does not perform some

ritual. He just speaks and his wish occurs. He speaks and whatever he desires comes to pass. He says take up your bed and walk, and the man “was healed, and he took up his bed and walked” (vs. 9). This is the power of God once more displayed for the world to see. But how does the world tend to react to the power of Christ? That is really the focus of the story from here on out.

This focus begins with those seemingly incidental words, “Now that day was the Sabbath” (vs. 9). Our story really isn’t all that concerned with the miracle, as much as it is with when it occurred. Jesus did this healing on the Sabbath day. Jesus did lots of things on the Sabbath day that made the Pharisees not a little angry. Here, then, is where I want to focus the rest of our time today. We want to look at the Sabbath and the reaction of people to it.

## **Sabbath**

A few weeks ago in [Sunday School](#), the class got into a rather lengthy discussion on the Sabbath. The Sabbath day is technically the [day of rest](#). “Sabbath” means “rest.” Sabbath does not mean “seven,” as if it has to occur on the seventh day, even though in those days the Sabbath day was the seventh day of the week. For the seventh day anticipated the eighth day, and thus, Christians now worship God on the first day of the week. This is the NT Sabbath.

What was the function of the Sabbath day? What was its purpose? Why did it exist? The fourth commandment is pretty clear, “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy” ([Ex](#)

20:8). The day exists **to be kept holy**. It is not a common day, but a sanctified day. Holiness is the word *qadash*. It means to be set apart or sanctified. It means, basically, that it is a day unlike other days. It is special to God. You may not think it is, but he says it is. Do you believe him?

The **positive command** is to keep the day holy, while the **negative command** is not to work. “Six days you shall labor, and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, you or your son, or your daughter, your male servant, or your female servant, or your livestock, or the sojourner who is within your gates” (vs. 9-10). The commandment **forbids work**. The reason given for the commandment is two-fold, depending upon if you are reading Exodus or Deuteronomy. In Deuteronomy, the reason is that God has redeemed Israel out of slavery by bringing them out with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm (**Deut 5:15**). Thus, Sabbath “rest” involves some form of **remembrance** of our redemption.

In Exodus, the reason given is that God did his work of creation on the first six days, but rested on the seventh, whereby he blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy (**Ex 20:11**). This explanation is important, because it roots Sabbath observance, not at Sinai, not with one particular people known as Israel, but in creation, long before there ever was an Israel. For this reason, Reformed Christians have believed that Sabbath is part of **the moral law**, particularly the moral law as it involves our duty to God. It is of the same

essence as not worshiping other gods, not creating idols, and not taking God's name in vain. One person who has a problem with murder has no problem breaking the Sabbath. That is deeply inconsistent. Moral law does not cease. Sin is lawlessness, and it would not be possible to sin if the moral law no longer obtained in this world because of Christ's work.

## **No Work on the Sabbath?**

Our Confession speaks to the issue of Sabbath in [22.7-8](#). Paragraph 8 ends by explaining that there are [some works that are ok on the Sabbath](#). These it calls, "[duties of necessity and mercy](#)." This can be a rather broad category. Does what Jesus is doing fit into that category? Certainly. Jesus' work is a [work of mercy](#). The climax of the story today is how the Pharisees get angry at Jesus for something that takes place on the Sabbath.

But [what were they angry about?](#) Curiously, at least at first, it was *not* that he healed the man. Let me repeat that. They were not angry because Jesus healed on the Sabbath, at least not at first. [Vs. 10](#) elaborates, "[So the Jews said to the man who had been healed, 'It is the Sabbath, and it is not lawful for you to \*take up your bed\*.'](#)" Do you see what they were angry about? The Mishna records the [oral traditions](#) of the Jews, beginning with the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D. Listen to what it says about work on the Sabbath,

[The principal acts of labor \(prohibited on the Sabbath\) are forty less one—viz.: Sowing, ploughing, reaping, binding into sheaves,](#)

threshing, winnowing, fruit-cleaning, grinding, sifting, kneading, baking, wool-shearing, bleaching, combing, dyeing, spinning, warping, making two spindle-trees, weaving two threads, separating two threads (in the warp), tying a knot, untying a knot, sewing on with two stitches, tearing in order to sew together with two stitches, hunting deer, slaughtering the same, skinning them, salting them, preparing the hide, scraping the hair off, cutting it, writing two (single) letters (characters), erasing in order to write two letters, building, demolishing (in order to rebuild), kindling, extinguishing (fire), hammering, transferring from one place into another. These are the principal acts of labor—forty less one (Shabbath 7.2).

Did you catch that last one? “[Transferring from one place into another](#).” In other words, picking up your mat. Now, apparently, it was ok, as an act of mercy, for two people to pick up that mat (*Shabbath* 10.5). This meant that the person who had the mat was disabled, and they wanted to show kindness and leniency to that kind of a person. This is obviously how the man got to the pool in the first place. But our man is no longer ill. Therefore, they get upset at him for “[breaking the Sabbath](#).” This is incredible. It is a splicing of the law into double standards which all starts with “fencing the Day” with the best of intentions. They end up creating laws that go beyond the Scripture and their rigidity to their own good intentions creates hypocrisy at the end of the day. This is the very reason why in the numerous sermons I have preached on this topic, I have refused to make lists and hand them out to you, even though that would make some of you very happy to know what you can and can’t do. But the very moment I do

that, I will be guilty of adding to the law of God, of binding someone's conscience to my inventions rather than Gods, and I don't want that responsibility on my shoulders on judgment day.

Your duty is to realize what is forbidden on this day (work), to understand why God gave us this day (it was made for us, not us for it), to see what your positive duty on it is (to remember redemption and keep it holy and to rest). On these things God must bind your conscience. Jesus does not disregard the Sabbath day here, nor did he ever do that. Jesus did not come to abolish the moral law. Nor has the moral law been abolished since he rose from the dead. Jesus was not a Sabbath breaker!

Beyond what God has commanded, you must come to your own convictions on how this works itself out. That takes study and personal conviction on your part. The intent of this day was never to tie legalistic anchors around people's necks. It was given for our good, not to be a burden. Keep the day holy, don't do your ordinary work on the day under ordinary circumstances, and remember your salvation in the presence of the assembly of the believers.

But also, you do **not have the right to bind another person's conscience** with regard to applications God has not made. Do not try to be wiser than him. Learn to be gracious to other people. Let's see how this **works itself out**, then, with the Pharisees, this man, and Jesus.

Besides keeping the heart of the Sabbath, worshiping God by doing works of mercy, Jesus also **attacks Pharisaical legalism** by commanding the man to break the last of the 39 laws of the Mishnah (I do not mean to be anachronistic here. I know the Mishnah was written later, but assume that it reflects ideas that were common in Jesus' day). This is a statement by our Lord towards those who wish to bind people up with traditions of men, even if those traditions had good intentions. Jesus does not think highly of man-man religion which looks like it is worth some value, but has no ability to restrain the flesh.

Furthermore, this discussion will lead to Jesus making an astounding claim at the end of this chapter about the Sabbath. As is put in other places, he is the Lord of the Sabbath. As John puts it at the end of the chapter, the Father and the Son have been working until this day. Going back to the point made by the early church, it seems to me that indeed, Jesus is making a pretty strong claim in this miracle that the day of rest has its ultimate fulfillment in him. And we are to enter into his "rest." The "work" of the man, to put up his mat and walk, was supposed to be the result of entering into Christ's "rest."

## **The Rest of Christ**

What do I mean by Christ's "rest?" I mean that **his yoke is easy and his burden is light**. I mean that his work alone satisfies God's demands of the law. I mean that you are to lay aside your attempts to merit God's favor, either before or after



salvation, by trusting in the completed, finished work of Christ. The miracle points you to Christ's healing, to Christ's forgiveness, to Christ's compassion, and to Christ's grace. The Day of Christ is the day of Sabbath rest, and it is a day that has existed since Adam and Eve were saved by his grace and has continued to this very day for those who trust in the promise of God in Christ to relieve their distress. The seventh day never ended, and people have always been able to enter into God's rest. I'll have more to say about this when we come to the end of Chapter 5.

## **A Warning**

But just here is the warning, and it comes as a result of the story. As we saw last week, so we see again today, and so we will see it only intensify as we move through this Gospel. Neither this man nor the Pharisees seemed to want any part of that rest. This is pretty easy to see with [the Pharisees](#). After the man finally tells them who it was that healed him we read, [“And this was why the Jews were persecuting Jesus, because he was doing these things on the Sabbath” \(vs. 16\)](#). In other words, their 39 rules were only a pretense. They didn't really think it was OK to do works of mercy on the Sabbath. They were concerned with the power they had over little people. It can be quite an ego-trip for some religious leaders to control the masses with the things they say. Jesus attacked them where it hurt. Their attitude was not one of jaw-dropping amazement that God had come in the flesh. It was one of

rebellion that some hick faith-healer from Galilee had dared to come into the temple and disrupt their order. They refused to enter Christ's rest.

As for **the man**, this is a little more difficult to see. Here is what I suggest is taking place with this man, though, as with Nicodemus, I think this is open to interpretation. John's comments on this man seem vague, and probably intentionally so, because he represents a whole people that end up rejecting and killing our Lord, even though he came to them to heal them of their infirmities. Notice the subtle things in the man's responses.

First, ask who it was that healed him, the man had no idea. **"Now the man who had been healed did not know who it was."** Faith seeks out the object of its desire. This man didn't seem to care much at all. Now, it is true that it says, **"Jesus had withdrawn, as there was a crowd in the place"** (vs. 13). But Jesus came back to the man. He found him in the temple and said to him, **"See, you are well! Sin no more, that nothing worse may happen to you"** (vs. 14).

Now, a lot of people think that Jesus is referring to some sin that this man committed 38 years ago that caused him to be ill in the first place. This is typical of the word-of-faith theology that has existed since the days of Job. There is no doubt that sometimes sin can cause physical illness. The Bible affirms that. But much of the time, this isn't the case at all. We simply live in a fallen world. Jesus does not use the past tense verb here, but a present tense verb when he says sin no

more. As Hendriksen says, “Right now he was in the state of being unreconciled with God. Jesus knew this. Hence, he warns him not to continue in this condition.”<sup>5</sup> Otherwise, something far worse is in store for him on the day of judgment. This is precisely why you must seek out the source that healed you. You must flee to Christ. You must enter into his rest.

What the man did is at best ambiguous. “The man went away and told the Jews that it was Jesus who had healed him.” It is possible that this man became an evangelist, just like the woman at the well and the official whose son Jesus healed. However, we are not told that the man began telling the *people*. Rather, he told the *religious leaders*, and the next verse tells us that this was why the Jews were persecuting Jesus. I think DA Carson is right in his assessment of this reaction. “Guilty of dullness rather than treachery, the man goes away and tells *the Jews* ... It will not do to suppose he is innocently giving credit where credit is due, like the healed man in 9:11. In the latter case, credit is given when it is still a question of establishing the reality and credibility of the miracle; in the present context, the motive can hardly be a desire to assign appropriate praise to Jesus, for the hostile opposition has already manifested

---

<sup>5</sup> William Hendriksen and Simon J. Kistemaker, vol. 1-2, *New Testament Commentary : Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953-2001), Jn 5:14.

itself.”<sup>6</sup> The man should have known that the Jews were not asking who healed him so that they could offer a lamb in worship of the healer. He is dull and senseless. Just like the Jews. Just like us.

Therefore, let us cast off our senseless careless attitudes about Jesus, and give him praise for his healing power, his Lordship and fulfillment of the law, and his resurrection of the dead on this, the Lord’s Day, the Christian Sabbath.

---

<sup>6</sup> D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester, England; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans, 1991), 246.