

HEALING OF THE MAN BORN BLIND

*Reason
Removal
Resist* *Arguments
Revelation*

Intro. Ryle, Jn ,II,139. (1) It is only related by Jn. (2) Like each of the few miracles in Jn it is told with great detail. (3) It is one of 4 done in Judea and reported by Jn. (4) It was a miracle Jews were taught to expect in Messiah's time, Isa 35:5. (5) X directed Jn Bap's attention to it. (6) It was in so public a place and on a man so well known that Jews couldn't deny it. Not long after events of ch 8 but allow for some interval. Possibly ch 8 in a.m. and 9 in evening of same day. Then in vs 13 move to next day and possibly at vs 8. Location is Jerusalem.

I. DISCUSSION, 1-5.

- A. The Occasion of the Discussion, 1a. See above on time of miracle in relatn to ch 8.
- B. The Object of the Discussion, 2b. Blind man. No record of healing of blind in OT. Jewish law specifies the blind as peculiarly deserving of attention Lev. 19:14; Deut 27:18. In Tobit 11:7ff blind man healed. No record of an apostle doing it in NT (Ananias and P not one). God specially preserved this as an evidence of the Messianic age. Isa 35:5 (physical) and Isa 29:18; 32:3; 42:7 (moral). 5 specific and 3 general ref to X's going it in gospels. When disciples saw him the discussion opened bec question arose from Jews' understanding of the solidarity of the race, Exod 20:5; Heb 7:10. Trench has the other explanations, 227-28. Evidently this man was a well-known person and the disciples knew that he had been born blind. Ezek 18:20. Perhaps disciples also remembered Lord's word in 5:14. Their only conclusion was that someone sinned to bring this thing about.
- C. The Outcome of the Discussion, 3-5. X doesn't deny the solidarity of the race, but simply says that in this case that's not the principle that applies. "His suufering is the occasion and ~~thaxk~~ not the appointed preparation for the miracle, though when we regard things from the divine side we are constrained to see them in their dependence on the will of God." Westcott, II, 32. No more denies solidarity of race than existence of sin; just denies moral connection in this case. Blindness was for glory of God. He must work and this man was occasion for doing a work to glorify God. We (not I in vs 4) must work works of God. While X here He is of the character of light. No personal pronoun in vs 5 as in 8:12--emphasizes character of manifestation of Son rather than character of Son. X is light to the world and now that He is personally present He should give light to the world and to this blind man. So He must work while it is day (that is in X's case before the Passion)--in our cases before the 2nd coming. Emphasis is on X's working and contrast is bet time of labor and of rest. General application to us. But main point of all this discussion is that this man was occasion for demonstration of Grace of God. Miracle was unasked for--X did it.

II. DEMONSTRATION, 6-12.

- A. The Character of the Demonstration. Above. Pure grace. Man nor his parents didn't appeal. Disciples didn't evidently think about healing him. They were just having a theological discussion. Never let theory take your mind off practice. P's theology was forged on the mission field. X did it of pure grace.

- B. The Carrying Out of the Demonstration, 6-7.
Application of spittle was expressly forbidden on Sabbath by tradition and kneading of clay (like rubbing ears of corn) aggravated the offense. But used to remind and assure that the power of healing came from the Person Himself. Going to pool of Siloam tested man's faith and reminded them of His Messianic claims. "Thus . . . God Himself, whose law X was accused of breaking, was seen to cooperate with Him in the miracle. At the same time the charge tried the faith of the blind man." Westcott, 34. Siloam--waters sent from subterranean channel. At Mouth of Tyropoeon Valley, s of temple. Also recd water from Virgins Fountain by means of tunnel. Siloam where water was drawn for feast of ch 7.
- C. The Conclusiveness of the Demonstration, 8-12. Maybe next day or maybe not. Conclusive to the one who was healed. He convinced at least some of those who saw him before (pres ptc) begging. But he only knew Lord as Jesus and neighbors were only interested in the manner, not the fact, of the cure.

III. DISPUTATION, 13-41.

involved in

- A. Reactions ~~whikxksdksk~~ the Dispute, 13-33.
1. Of the Pharisees. 2 smaller courts in Jerus (besides larger Sanhedrin) called Synagogue councils. Man prob brot to 1 of these. "Worldly religion, whatever its profession, is really and always a systematic effort to make God the servant of man's pride and selfishness" Kelly, An Expos of the Gosp of Jn, 195. Breaking of Sabbath gave offence. vs 14, 18 (Jews here means unbel. Pharisees), 22 (had a compact which shows that ques of Jesus as Messiah had been debated publicly. Excomm-unication was exclusion from all rel fellowship), 24 (Give God means tell whole truth) (we know oida, absolute knowledge, we who are guardians of national honor and interpreters of Divine will. He is a sinner bec of violation of Sabbath and therefore couldn't give deliverance), 28-- followers of Moses.
 2. Of the parents. Evidently man removed while parents questioned, 18-23. Parents afraid to admit and testify. These are the compromisers. Squirm out by saying boy of age, ask him since his testimony will be valid.
 3. Of the man. 1st exam, 13-17, he answers them more curtly than vs 11. Getting impatient. 2nd exam, 24-34 "The man chooses the Saviour whom he had experienced before the Moses of the schools" Westcott, II, 40. Looses patience, v 27. and shows great wisdom vs 30. Real issue in vs 28--the great chasm bet Moses and X. Man finally got on right side.
- B. Results of the dispute, 34-41.
1. For the man--conversion. First cast out (not excommunication but prelude to it), vs 34; then conversion, 37 (not 38). Aleph and B have son of man in 35 and A and many others Son of God. Doesn't make too much diff--point is that object of faith now directly related to X. Confession, 38 in word and deed immediately followed.
 2. For the Pharisees--condemnation. Ques of 40 inspired by pride of class. In a sense the Pharisees were not blind, but this very sight was their condemnation. Claim to sight conceded insofar as to leave them without excuse when they failed to profit from it.

Conclusion--schisma in vs 16 (7:43; 10:19) over His power. Where do you stand in relation to power of X. With Pharisees, parents, man. Not only for conversion but also in the Xn life. Is He able to do in your life all He claims to be able to do.