No rule can be laid down which our Lord  
may seem to have observed, as to using,  
or dispensing with, the ordinary human  
means of healing. He Himself determined,  
by considerations which are hidden from  
us. Whatever the means used, the healing  
was not in *them*, but in Him alone. The  
‘conductor’ of the miraculous power was  
generally the *faith* of the recipient: and if  
such means served to awaken that faith,  
their use would be accounted for.

**7.**] The *reason* of his being sent to Siloam is  
uncertain. It may have been *as part of*  
*the cure,*—or merely to wash off the clay.  
The former is most probable.

A beggar   
blind from his birth would know the  
localities sufficiently to be able to find his  
way; so that there is no necessity to suppose   
a partial restoration of sight before  
his going.

The situation of the fountain   
and pool of Siloam is very doubtful.  
On the subject of a recent suggestion respecting   
the identity of Siloam and Bethesda,   
see note on ch. v. 1.

**which is  
interpreted**] The reason of this derivation  
being stated has been much doubted. Some  
consider the words to have been inserted  
as an early gloss of some allegorical interpreter.   
But there is no external authority  
for this supposition, Euthymius says, “I  
suppose, on account of the blind man being  
then sent thither:” and Meyer takes this  
view. But it would be a violent transfer,  
—of the name of the fountain, to the man  
who was sent thither. I should rather  
regard the healing virtue imparted to the  
water to be denoted, as symbolical of *Him  
who was sent*, and whose mission it was to  
give the healing water of life.

**came,**  
i.e. **came back;**—apparently to his own  
house, by the next verse.

**8.**] **had  
beheld,** rather than “*had seen.*” The  
choice of the word implies attention and  
habit.

**11.**] The word rendered *received  
sight* is literally, **recovered sight.** Sight  
being natural to men, the deprivation of it  
is regarded as a *loss*, and the reception of  
it, though never enjoyed before, as a *recovery.*

13.] The neighbours appear  
to have brought him to the *Pharisees,*  
out of hostility to Jesus (see ver. 12):  
and ver. 14 alleges the reason of this:—  
or perhaps from fear of the sentence  
alluded to in ver. 22. The “*Pharisees*”  
here may have been the court presiding  
over the synagogue, or one of the lesser  
local courts of Sanhedrim. Lücke inclines  
to think they were an assembly of the  
great Sanhedrim, whom St. John sometimes   
names *the Pharisees*:—see ch. vii. 47;  
xi. 46: Meyer regards them as some formal  
section of *the Pharisees,* *as a body:* but  
were there such sections?

**14.**] Lightfoot  
cites from a Rabbinical treatise on the Sabbath,   
that *it was forbidden even to put saliva  
on the eyelids.* But the *making the clay,*  
as a servile work, seems to be here prominently   
mentioned. Meyer notices,—  
and it is interesting, as a minute mark of  
accuracy,—that the man, in verses 11 and  
15, only relates what he himself, as being  
blind, had felt: he says nothing of the