ST. JOHN.   
 IX.   
 2 And his diseiples asked him,   
 was blind from his birth.   
 aver. $4, saying, Master, \*who did sin, this man, or his parents,   
 that he was born blind? 3 Jesus answered, Neither   
 thath this man sinned, nor his parents: »but 4¢T must   
 beh. xi. works of God should be made manifest in him.   
 ech. iv. : work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the   
 v. 3 night cometh, when no man can work.   
 Tam in the world, ‘I am the light of the world.   
 “he had thus spoken, \*he spat on the ground, As and made as   
 \* clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the When   
   
   
   
   
 © render, Should be. f render, did this man sin.   
 & render, When.   
   
 vi. 1, and vii. The blind man was why it was asked. Supply therefore after   
 sitting begging (ver. 8), possibly pro- his parents, “that he should be born blind.”   
 claiming the fact of his having been so Also after but supply “he was born blind.”   
 born; for otherwise the disciples could In the economy of God’s Providence, his   
 hardly have asked the following question. suffering had its place and aim, and this   
 ‘The incident may have been in the neigh- was to bring out the works of God in his   
 bourhood of the temple (Acts iii. 2): but being healed by the Redeemer. De Wette   
 doubtless there were other places where denies this interpretation, and refers the   
 beggars sat, besides the temple entrances. saying merely to the view of our Lord to   
 2.] According to Jewish ideas, every bring out his own practical design, to   
 infirmity was the punishment of sin (see make use of this man to prove His divine   
 ver. 34). From Exod. xx. 5, and the pre- power. But sce ch. xi. 4, which is strictly   
 vailing views on the subject, the disciples parallel, 4.] Connected by the words,   
 may have believed that the man was work the works, to the former verse.   
 visited for the sins of parents: but how There certainly seems to be some reference   
 could he himself have sinned before his to its being the sabhath; see the similar   
 birth ? Beza and Grotius refer the ques- expressions in ch. v.17. From ver. 5, it   
 tion to the doctrine of the transmigration seems evident that the day is the appointed   
 of souls, that he may have sinned in a course of the working of Jesus on earth,   
 former state of existence; this however is and the night the close of it (see the   
 disproved by the consideration adduced parallel, ch. xi. 9, 10). It is true, that,   
 by Lightfoot, that the Pharisces believed according to St. Johu’s universal diction,   
 that the good souls only passed into other the death of Jesus is His glorification   
 bodies, which would exclude this case. but the similitude here regards the effect   
 Lightfoot, Liicke, and Meyer refer it to on the world, see ver. 5; and the language   
 the possibility of sin the womb; Tholuck of Rom. xiii. 12 is in accordance with it,   
 to predestinated sin, punished by anti- as also Luke xxii. 53: John xiv. 30.   
 cipation: De Wette to the general doe- 5.] This partly explains the day and night   
 trine of the prm-existence of souls, which of the former verse, partly alludes to the   
 prevailed both among the Rabbis and nature of the healing about to take place.   
 Alexandrians: see Wisd. viii, 19, 20. As before the raising of Lazarus (ch. xi.   
 The question may have been asked 25), He states that He is the Resurrection   
 vaguely, without any strict application of and the Life; so now, He sets forth Him-   
 it to the circumstances, merely taking for self as the of the archetypal spiritual   
 granted that some sin must have led to the light, of which the natural, now about to   
 blindness, and hardly thinking of the non- be conferred, is only a derivation and sym-   
 applicability of one of the suppositions to bol. 6.] See Mark vii. 33; viii   
 this case. Or perhaps, as Stier inclines to The virtue especially of the fasting saliva,   
 suppose, the question may mean, ‘this in cases of disorders of the eyes, was well   
 man, or, for that is out of the question, known to antiquity. In the accounts of   
 his parents ?” 8.] Our Lord does not the restoring of a blind man to sight at-   
 of course assert the absolute sinlessness of tributed to Vespasian, the use of this   
 the man, or of his parents, but answers remedy occurs. The use of clay also for   
 the question with reference to the reason healing the eyes was not unknown.