OUTLINE OF CHAPTER 9:

- I. The entirety of this chapter evolves around Jesus' healing of a man born blind from birth.
- II. Vss.1-12 records Jesus' healing the man and the corroborating witness regarding the event.
- III. Vss.13-34 records the questioning of the man, to include his parents, regarding the incident, by the Pharisees.
- IV. Vss.35-41 records a second meeting between the man and Jesus, to include some of the Pharisees being present.

EXEGESIS VERSES 1 - 2:

GNT John 9:1 Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς.

NAS John 9:1 And as He passed by, He saw a man blind from birth. $\kappa\alpha i$ (cc) $\pi\alpha\rho\dot{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu$ $\pi\alpha\rho\dot{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ (circ. ptc./p/a/nm-s; "as He passed by/to go past"; used 10x; the ptc. denotes linear action; John uses it in the passive to denote something "disappearing or passing away in the course of time" -1Joh.2:8 & 2:17; here it has a strong implicit reference of relating back to Jesus' disappearance from the hostile crowd of Joh.8:59b, but explicitly relates to a literal and separate action.) $\epsilon i\delta\epsilon\nu$ $\delta\rho\alpha\omega$ (viaa--3s) $\dot{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\nu$ $\dot{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\zeta$ (n-am-s) $\tau \upsilon\phi\lambda\delta\nu$ $\tau \upsilon\phi\lambda\delta\zeta$ (adj-am-s; "blind"; used 50x; it can refer to both physical and spiritual blindness, exs. Joh.5:3 cp. 9:40-41) $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa$ (pAbl; "from the source of") $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\eta\zeta$. $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\eta$ (n-gf-s; "birth"; hapax; denotes the exact point or time of birth as illustrated in Homer's writings where it is translated "hour of birth"; emphasizes that this man was blind from the womb.)

GNT John 9:2 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες, Ῥαββί, τίς ἡμαρτεν, οὖτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ;

NAS John 9:2 And His disciples asked Him, saying, "Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind?" $\kappa \alpha i (cc) \alpha v \tau o v v t o v t o v \tau o v \tau o v t o v$

άμαρτάνω (viaa--3s; "sinned") οὖτος (near dem. pro./nm-s; "this man/this one") ή (comparative conj.; "or") αὐτοῦ, αὐτός (npgm3s) οἱ ἡ γονεῖς γονεύς (d.a. + n-nm-p; "parents/begetters/progenitor"; used 20x; always in the plural, always translated parents) ἕνα (ch; denotes result; "resulting that") γεννηθῆ; γεννάω (vsap--3s; "he might be born") τυφλός (a--nm-s; "blind")

ANALYSIS VERSES 1 – 2:

- 1. This chapter possesses no certain chronological note, but the context of chapter eight is naturally continued.
- 2. This is the sense of the opening phrase, "And as He passed by".
- 3. It denotes that the scenario at hand occurs during the continuing natural course of events during Jesus' ministry.
- 4. It has further implications grammatically that the present event has a direct tie contextually to chapter 8, specifically Jesus' disappearing act of 8:59.
- 5. This points to a primary purpose of the following context in relating to why it was necessary for Jesus to be hidden in 8:59, i.e., because of His claim of Deity in 8:58.
- 6. It is John's purpose to now provide evidence of His claim in that regard, through the unprecedented miracle about to take place.
- 7. Therefore, John is not emphasizing any particular time frame; rather he is maintaining contextually the emphasis at hand.
- 8. Some have suggested that this took place on the last day of the feast of chapter 7, just as chapter 8 does.
- 9. As the previous analysis has shown, the last day of the feast of Tabernacles, the 8th day, is called a Sabbath (Lev.23:36), and the present miracle occurs on a Sabbath (Joh.9:14).
- 10. While it is possible, John's grammar tends to lean away from this notion, since in 7:37 he refers to the last day as *"the great day of the feast"*, and in 9:14 he simply uses the term *"a Sabbath"* (without the d.a.).
- 11. In other words, if it was John's intent to tie in the Sabbath of 9:14 with the Sabbath of 7:37, he would grammatically in some way denote "a" Sabbath of 9:14 as that definite Sabbath (by using the d.a. or other modification), of the great day of feast in 7:37.
- 12. Chronologically, chapters 9 and 10:1-21 occur surrounding the same event of Jesus' healing of this **blind man**.
- 13. In Joh.10:22, John skips in time to the Feast of the Dedication, which occurs in mid-December, some two months away from the Feast of Tabernacles.
- 14. Therefore, it makes better sense that John is only relating to an event sometime between these two feasts, purposely avoiding any inference chronologically in order to emphasize the validity/proof of Jesus' claim as God, a major theme of the Gospel.
- 15. Therefore, at some undetermined period down the road in the natural course of Jesus' ministry, **He saw a man blind from birth**.
- 16. As the Greek makes clear, this **man** came forth from the womb in this condition.

- 17. He is the subject of this chapter and his healing forms the catalyst for yet another confrontation between light and darkness.
- 18. The OT does not contain any story of documentation of anyone giving sight to someone born **blind**, nor is there any other known documentation medically in this regard to date.
- 19. As the **blind man** will say, "since the beginning of time it has never been heard that anyone opened the eyes of a person born blind". Joh.9:32
- 20. In the OT, it was understood that the giving of sight to the blind is an activity associated with God Himself. Exo.4:11; Psa.146:8
- 21. It is also clearly taught that such activity would be a regular feature of the Messianic kingdom. Isa.29:18; 35:5; 42:7; cp. Luk.7:19-22
- 22. That this is a unique function of the Christ is obvious, and that there were many miracles of the giving of sight is recorded in the NT. Mat.9:27ff; 12:22ff; 15:30ff; 21:14; Mar.8:22ff; 10:46ff; Luk.7:21ff
- 23. One could hardly observe such activity and not have to consider the Divine nature of the One who could do such a thing.
- 24. The **man** whom Jesus observed is seen as somewhat of a colorful character as his exchanges with the Pharisees bear out.
- 25. He is presented contextually as an unbeliever when Jesus healed him, but manifests +V after the fact, coming to saving faith. Joh.9:35-38
- 26. Therefore, he provides for those who are observing him during his discourse with the Pharisees, an example of the mental process of one that manifests they are +V.
- 27. As we will see, he observes his healing by:
 - A. Sticking strictly to the facts of the healing (vs.15).
 - B. Provides answers to questions that he can logically deduce based on his frame of reference and the facts (vss.17, 25, 30-33).
 - C. Is not deterred by any contradicting thinking that opposes the facts (vs.24-25).
 - D. Is not willing to "fold" under pressure in his stand for the truth in this regard.
 - E. And is not afraid to stand toe-to-toe with the opposition and take issue with their illogical repudiation of the facts, calling a "spade a spade/heart a heart" (vs.27).
- 28. In essence, this **man** is a perfect example of the intellectual honesty inherent in the manifestation of +V (vss.35-38).
- 29. That a different/later time frame is in view than that of chpt.8, again has support in that the immediate twelve not mentioned in chpts.7-8 (not saying they weren't there), reappear contextually into the picture in vs.2, showing a distinct division, "And His disciples asked Him, saying, 'Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind?""
- 30. As they saw the man who was begging (vs.8), they inquire of Jesus with regard to why this particular person was in his current physical condition.
- 31. Their question reflects the mentality of Judaistic thinking in that day regarding suffering and why people suffer.
- 32. As previously recorded in John, there is a legitimate place for attributing suffering and physical malady to sin as the case of the paralytic pointed out. Joh.5:1-15 cp. vs.14
- 33. However, to attribute all suffering and illness to sin is a very shallow approach to the problems of mankind.

- 34. How the **disciples** knew that this **man** had been **born blind from birth** is not stated, only that they do have knowledge of this very important fact.
- 35. Their view was that blindness was punishment for sin, and the only question to be resolved in their thinking was that of whose sin was responsible.
- 36. The two alternatives that reflect present Judaistic thinking is that either the **man** himself had sinned or his **parents**.
- 37. Considering the nature of his blindness being from the womb, their first possibility points to a very ludicrous teaching and failure in understanding –V and the STA in interpretations of such passages as Psa.51:5; 58:3 and the events surrounding the birth of Jacob and Esau (Gen.25:23).
- 38. To entertain the idea that infants might sin in the womb goes against all understanding of the process of birth, imputation of the soul, expression of volition and places injustice upon God for punishing someone for a sin or sins that are impossible to commit.
- 39. So this suggestion was human viewpoint of the worst sort.
- 40. The second suggestion is that this **man** was in this state due to some sinning on the part of his **parents**.
- 41. This principle of "cursing by association" has merit based on such passages as Exo.20:5; 34:7; Num.14:18 and Deu.5:9.
- 42. As those passages proclaim, certain sin activity can carry with it future repercussions effecting even the innocent, including infant children.
- 43. That **parents** can and do make sinful decisions that directly and physically effect their newborn is evident even today, in the transmission of such diseases and problems associated with AIDS, venereal disease (herpes), drug addiction and incest.
- 44. Therefore, it is a distinct possibility that a child could **be born** into a family with some congenital defect due to the sins of his/her **parents**.
- 45. But, as we will see, this is not the case for this **man**.
- 46. Observation: As an adjusted believer, it is wise to leave matters of judgment, such as this, in the hands of God, unless there is explicit verifiable facts to substantiate a claim otherwise.

EXEGESIS VERSES 3 - 5:

GNT John 9:3 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Οὔτε οὗτος ἥμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθη τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.

NAS John 9:3 Jesus answered, "It was neither that this man sinned, nor his parents; $i\eta\sigma\sigma\hat{\nu}\zeta$, (n-nm-s) $d\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho(i\theta\eta d\pi\sigma\kappa\rho(i\nu\rho\mu\alpha) (viad--3s)$ "it was" supplied $O \delta t \epsilon$ (cc; " $o \delta t \epsilon$ $o \delta t \epsilon$ " = "neither...nor") "that" supplied $o \delta t \sigma \zeta$ (near dem. pro./nm-s; "this man") $\eta\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\nu d\mu\alpha\rho\tau\alpha\nu\omega$ (viaa--3s; "sinned") $o \delta t \epsilon$ (cc; "nor") $\alpha \delta t \sigma \delta$, $\alpha \delta t \sigma \zeta$ (npgm3s) $o \delta$ $\delta \gamma \sigma\nu\epsilon\hat{\iota}\zeta \gamma \sigma\nu\epsilon\delta\zeta$ (d.a. + n-nm-p; "parents") but it was in order that the works of God might be displayed in him. $d\lambda\lambda' d\lambda\lambda\alpha'$ (strong adver.) "it was" supplied $\delta \nu\alpha$ (conj. of purpose; "in order that") $t \alpha t \delta \epsilon \rho \gamma \alpha \epsilon \rho \gamma \sigma \nu$ (d.a. + n-nn-p; "the works") $t \sigma \delta$ $\delta \theta \epsilon \sigma \delta \theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$ (d.a. + n-subjective gen./m-s; it is God who produces the "works") $\phi \alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\omega\theta \eta \phi \alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\delta\omega$ (vsap--3s; "might be displayed/manifested") $\epsilon \nu$ (pL) $\alpha \delta t \phi \delta$. (npLm3s)

GNT John 9:4 ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν· ἔρχεται νὺξ ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι.

NAS John 9:4 "We must work the works of Him who sent Me, as long as it is day; $\dot{\eta}\mu\hat{\alpha}\zeta \ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ (npa-1p; "We"; accusative of reference. Literally, "With reference to us" or "For us") $\delta\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ (vipa--3s; "it is necessary/a must") $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\dot{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \ \dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\dot{\alpha}\zeta\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ (compl. inf/p/dep-; "to work"; though a deponent, it has the nuance of a passive to denote that God is the agent behind the act of "working") $\tau\dot{\alpha} \ \tau\delta \ \dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha \ \dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\rho\nu$ (d.a. + n-an-p) $\tau\circ\hat{\nu} \ \delta$ $\pi\epsilon\mu\mu\mu\alpha\nu\tau\delta\zeta \ \pi\epsilon\mu\pi\omega$ (d.a. + subs. ptc./a/a/gm-s; "of Him who sent/the One having sent") $\mu\epsilon \ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ (npa-1s) $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\zeta$ (cs; when followed by an indicative = "for a time/as long as") $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \ \epsilon\dot{\iota}\mu\iota$ (vipa--3s) $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$ (n-nf-s) **night is coming**, when no man can work. $\nu\dot{\nu}\xi$ (n-nf-s; "night") $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \ \dot{\epsilon}\rho\chi\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ (vipd--3s; "is coming") $\delta\tau\epsilon$ (adv. of time; "when/while") $o\dot{\nu}\delta\epsilon\iota\zeta$ (card. adj./nm-s; "No man/no one/not even one") $\delta\dot{\nu}\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ $\delta\dot{\nu}\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ (vipd--3s; "is able/can") $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota. \ \dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ (compl. inf./pd-; "to work")

GNT John 9:5 ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῷ ὦ, φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου.

NAS John 9:5 "While I am in the world, I am the light of the world." $\delta \tau \alpha \nu$ (cs; "While/When/Whenever") $\hat{\omega}$, $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \mu \hat{\iota}$ (vspa--1s; "I might be") $\hat{\epsilon} \nu$ (pL) $\tau \hat{\omega}$ δ $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \hat{\omega}$ $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \zeta$ (d.a. + n-Lm-s) $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \mu \hat{\iota}$ (vipa--1s) $\phi \hat{\omega} \zeta$ (n-nn-s; no d.a.; "a light") $\tau \hat{\omega} \delta$ $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \zeta$ (n-objective gen./m-s; receives the action of the illumination)

ANALYSIS VERSES 3 – 5:

- 1. How **Jesus answered** His disciples, does not mitigate for or against the validity of either of their suggestions as He stated, "*It was* neither *that* this man sinned, nor his parents".
- 2. What He does, is offer a third explanation not commonly considered when those with a physical handicap were observed.
- 3. For **Jesus** to dismiss an opportunity to explicitly address their erroneous ideas by design points to:
 - A. The subjective nature of human viewpoint approach to life and the need for objectivity to be employed by individuals to overcome this "spiritual" handicap.
 - B. This subjectivity must first be attacked by employing intellectual honesty that demands a consideration for "all" the facts surrounding any given subject or situation.
 - C. That **Jesus** simply denotes that there is a third alternative to this particular situation, "**but** *it was* **in order that the works of God might be displayed in him**", is sufficient for His disciples to recognize their "narrow-mindedness" of their particular views in this regard.
 - D. That His alternate view indeed provides that stark contrast is seen in Jesus' use of the strong adversative " $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ /but", coupled with the purpose conjunction " $\nu\alpha$ /in order that".
 - E. His approach in this fashion, points to the principle that some erroneous views of God's plan are based on more fundamental/base problem areas in one's thinking and understanding.
 - F. In essence, **Jesus** cuts through the more superficial problem (the "peeling" on the apple) to get to the "core" of the problem in their thinking.
 - G. Therefore, He utilizes an approach that will in the long run not only correct any erroneous views they may have regarding this particular situation, **but** will lay a foundation of thinking in such a way that will help them avoid subjectivity in all areas of their thinking.
 - H. Only by approaching subjects and situations in life in a purely intellectually honest and objective fashion, accumulating all the facts while employing discernment, will the believer find a balanced approach to the extremes in life and as depicted in Scripture.
- 4. **Jesus** response points out that while there is a purpose to all that God does, does not mean necessarily that in all cases it is due to some blame upon the individual in view.
- 5. What it does point out is a higher principle that in the approach to those in need, the first consideration should be is there a purpose for their state of being **that** includes a

contribution on our part so **the works of God might be displayed in him**, not an immediate act of subjective condemnation.

- 6. However, this is not teaching that we should be foolish do-gooders, who rush in to aid every charity case that we find.
- 7. What it does teach is that there are legitimate cases of spiritual need that may be accessed through the physical need.
- 8. The believer then, must approach each individual case in an objective way with some measure of doctrinal discernment and prayer when they come across those in life with severe physical afflictions.
- 9. To foolishly rush in and attempt to alleviate all suffering would be a mistake; to avoid all suffering and place the blame on the sufferer would be equally wrong.
- 10. Only by an objective and openly honest approach, while avoiding overreacting in a subjective manner, can one ascertain what the true will **of God** is for not only the individual, **but** for the applications of others in their periphery towards them.
- 11. In this case, it is God's will that an opportunity for Divine good production to be seized.
- 12. We recognize that Jesus had complete insight into all men and knew that this man would believe if given the chance. Joh.9:38
- 13. We do not have such insight and so must proceed with more caution in such matters.
- 14. We do not accept the premise that the relief of physical suffering that may provide an opportunity to address spiritual needs, is the primary mandate of believers. *Exs.*, *Salvation Army, Feed the World, etc.*
- 15. If this premise were true, why then did not **Jesus** heal all of the afflicted and physically handicapped in Israel at the first advent? *Ex. At the pool of Bethesda of Joh.5:1ff, He only picked one man out of the multitude of sick, lame, etc.*
- 16. We recognize the principle that in some cases, the STA is the cause of suffering and *"if you rescue him, you will only have to do it again"*. Pro.19:10
- 17. We also recognize the reality that God allows certain people to suffer in order to bring them around spiritually. Dan.4:28ff *of King Nebuchadnezzar*
- 18. On the other hand, some people can suffer, and suffer intensely, and no spiritual adjustment is forthcoming. *Ex. Pharaoh of the Exodus*
- 19. We also understand that God has established priorities in our acts of good towards others as Paul so directly puts it in Gal.6:10, "So then, while we have opportunity, let us do good to all men, especially though/δè-"but" (corrected) to those who are of the household of the faith (those a part of the local church)".
- 20. Therefore, what must be determined is the appropriate thinking and application to each individual case at hand.
- 21. And this demands that we avoid narrow-minded or subjective/emotional analysis that may not fully deal with the facts and concern ourselves with walking in FHS and assimilating BD, so we can know how to deal with situations with which we may come into contact.
- 22. That the principle at hand is applicable to all who adjoin themselves to Christ, is observed in vs.4 where **Jesus** uses the plural of the pronoun $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega/We$, to include those who were there with Him as He states, "We must work the works of Him who sent Me".

- 23. This verse constitutes an important observation of Dvgd (Divine good) production for the positive believer.
- 24. He points out that there is a time for activity and there is a time when activity is impossible in the remainder of the verse, "as long as it is day; night is coming, when no man can work".
- 25. He uses a fact regarding **work** that denotes that normal productive hours of labor are accomplished during the **day**, while **night** is provided for rest and sleep.
- 26. "**Day**" contextually corresponds with the time of life; "**night**" refers to the time of physical death, after which **work** is not possible.
- The conjunction of time, "έωσ/as long as" denotes the uncertainty of the length of life allotted by God to each of us. Ecc.3:1-2 cp. 7:17
- 28. The nuance of His declaration is that the time for working is during the **day** and if the **work** is not completed in a timely manner, tomorrow may be too late.
- 29. The Bible categorically denies any time after death when one can make any adjustment or contribution to the POG. Heb.9:27
- 30. When one dies, that is it; they are not given any further opportunity to believe or to excel in the POG.
- 31. The **works of God** refers to those specific **works** that **God** endorses in His directive will of BD, and hence approves.
- 32. Bible class is the place where one first learns of Dvgd production and where one learns what **works** are sanctioned by **God** compared to that which is to be avoided under the principle of hmgd (human good), being a waste of time.
- 33. BD is designed to make the man of **God** "*mature, equipped for every good work*". 2Tim.3:17
- 34. The verb "**must**/ $\delta \epsilon \hat{\iota}$ /it is necessary", underscores the fact that this issue of Dvgd production is not an optional feature of the CWL, but an absolute necessity.
- 35. It is our **works** as believers that will be evaluated for SG_3 at the Bema. 1Cor.3:12-15
- 36. That **Jesus** includes Himself with His disciples in this aspect underscores the principle that the **works** of His disciples under His authority are to be compatible with His own ministry.
- 37. **Jesus**, as God's Divinely sent emissary to these men, is the example given for them to discern what constitutes working "**the works of Him who sent Me**".
- 38. This observation denotes that under the authority of one's right P-T, his teaching and ministry, one is apprised of that which constitutes the **works of God** and that the opportunities will come into your niche that allow you to actually engage in Dvgd production and in compatibility and sync with the ministry of each local church.
- 39. Failure to know or failure to follow through and do the **works of God** is failure in fulfilling God's directive will in your life.
- 40. Much must be overruled in life in order to fully excel in the matters of Dvgd production, to include:
 - A. Lack of knowledge.
 - B. Laziness.
 - C. Wrong priorities.
 - D. Procrastination.
 - E. Rationalization.
 - F. Emotionalism and the STA.

- 41. In vs.5, **Jesus** sets Himself forth as the status quo in this example as He proclaims, "While I am in the world, I am the light of the world".
- 42. He denotes that even His time remaining on the planet was limited and therefore, there is a sense of urgency to His mission.
- 43. For Him, less than six months remains for His departure to Ph_3 and He is totally motivated to continue in producing maximum Dvgd to the end.
- 44. He understands that in that time allotted to Him, He must remain totally focused on His purpose of existence as **the light of the world**.
- 45. While He knew precisely His time remaining, we do not and therefore must seize every opportunity that comes to us in the A/C.
- 46. That **Jesus** once again refers to His Person as "**light**", **but** in this context of Dvgd, illustrates that the illuminating effect of BD is manifested in the very application of it.
- 47. The absence of the d.a. with the word "**light**", is intentional to remove any subjective conclusions that the principle at hand is limited only to His Person and ministry as Messiah.
- 48. Rather, it is equally applicable to any that claim to be a **light of the world**.
- 49. The very nature and effect of +V's existence as "**light**" is dependent upon a discerning ability as to how and when to apply Dvgd in all areas of life.
- 50. This teaching is compatible with what **Jesus** taught concerning spiritual priorities of one's life in Joh.4:32ff, when He informed the disciples that certain applications took precedence even over necessary functions of life, like eating.
- 51. In this case, the emphasis is on the short and unknown duration of the believer's Ph₂.
- 52. In addition, it is teaching that relates exactly to the emphasis in the book of James that knowledge of BD in and of itself is insufficient before **God** to be counted as **light**, but application of it must follow or it is worthless. Jam.2:17,26 cp.1:17
- 53. Therefore, **Jesus** who was perfect **light** understood that inhale faith of BD demanded exhale faith **in order that the works of God might be displayed in** others around Him.
- 54. It points to the reality that it is one's application of BD that opens the door for **God** to reveal/illustrate to others the power of His word as **light**, which encompasses life, truth, Divine love, etc.
- 55. And for those who are ultimately +V, the act of application towards them will be considered with intellectual honesty leading to spiritual illumination.
- 56. Review Doctrine of Divine Good Production.

EXEGESIS VERSES 6 - 7:

GNT John 9:6 ταῦτα εἰπών ἔπτυσεν χαμαὶ καὶ ἐποίησεν πηλὸν ἐκ τοῦ πτύσματος καὶ ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς

NAS John 9:6 When He had said this, He spat on the ground, $\epsilon i \pi \omega \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (circ. ptc./a/a/nm-s; "When or After He had said") ταῦτα οὗτος (near dem. pro./an-p; "this/these things") $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\tau\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$ $\pi\tau\omega\omega$ (viaa--3s; "He spit"; used 3x; The Jews held that saliva was efficacious/effectual for eye-trouble, but its use was forbidden on the Sabbath; in the OT, the act of spitting in one's face denoted a failure of obedience [Deu.25:9] and denoted the shame of one rendered unclean [Num.12:14]. To spit out or to spit at someone also denotes a condescending act of judgment towards one considered to be cursed or unworthy before the one spitting [Job 17:6; Rev.3:16]) $\chi \alpha \mu \alpha i$ (adv.; "on the ground/earth"; here the emphasis is on the "dirt/soil", since the product of "clay" is *produced*) and made clay of the spittle, and applied the clay to his eyes, $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) ϵ ποίησεν ποιέω (viaa--3s; "made/kneaded") πηλόν πηλός (n-am-s; "clay/mud"; used 5x; Used of potter's clay in Rom.9:21, where God is seen as having the right to use His creation as He sees fit.) $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa$ (pAbl.; "from the source of") $\tau o\hat{v} \tau \delta \pi \tau \dot{v} \sigma \mu \alpha \tau o \zeta \pi \tau \dot{v} \sigma \mu \alpha$ (d.a. + n-Abln-s; "that which one spits/saliva/spittle") $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \chi \rho i \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \pi i \chi \rho i \omega$ (viaa--3s; "to apply/spread something on something/ to anoint"; used 2x) $\tau \dot{\rho} \nu \dot{\rho} \pi \eta \lambda \dot{\rho} \nu$ πηλός (d.a. + n-am-s; "the clay") $\epsilon \pi i$ (pa; "to/upon") αὐτοῦ αὐτός (npgm3s) τοὺς δ \dot{o} φθαλμοὺς \dot{o} φθαλμός (d.a. + n-am-p; "eyes")

GNT John 9:7 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ύπαγε νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ (ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται ἀΑπεσταλμένος). ἀπῆλθεν οὖν καὶ ἐνίψατο καὶ ἦλθεν βλέπων.

NAS John 9:7 and said to him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam" (which is translated, Sent). $\kappa\alpha i$ (cc) $\epsilon i\pi\epsilon\nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3s) $\alpha v \tau \phi$, $\alpha v \tau \delta \zeta$ (npdm3s) "Y $\pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ $v \pi \alpha \gamma \omega$ (vImp./pa--2s; "Go") $v i \psi \alpha i v i \pi \tau \omega$ (vImp./am--2s; "wash yourself") $\epsilon i \zeta$ (pa) $\tau \eta \nu \eta$ $\kappa \delta \lambda v \mu \beta \eta \theta \rho \alpha \nu \kappa \delta \lambda v \mu \beta \eta \theta \rho \alpha$ (d.a. + n-af-s; "the pool"; same as Joh.5:2,7) $\tau o v \delta$ $\Sigma i \lambda \omega \alpha \mu$ (d.a. + n-gm-s; "Siloam") ($\delta \delta \zeta$ (rel.pro./nn-s) $\epsilon \rho \mu \eta \nu \epsilon v \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \mu \epsilon \nu \delta \zeta$ (vipp--3s; "being translated/interpreted/explained in words") 'A $\pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \mu \epsilon \nu \delta \zeta$). $\alpha \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$

(adj. ptc./PF/p/nm-s; "having been sent with a commission") And so he went away and washed, and came back seeing. $o\tilde{v}v$ (infer. conj.; "And so/therefore") $\dot{\alpha}\pi\hat{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\rho\chi o\mu\alpha\iota$ (viaa--3s; "he went away") $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (cc) $\dot{\epsilon}v\iota\psi\alpha\tau o \nu\iota\pi\tau\omega$ (viam--3s; "washed himself") $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (ch) $\dot{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\chi o\mu\alpha\iota$ (viaa--3s; "returned/came back") $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\omega\nu$. $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\omega$ (circ. ptc./p/a/nm-s; "seeing")

ANALYSIS VERSES 6 - 7:

- 1. Having made His statement about performing the works of God, as denoted in the phrase, "When/After He had said this", Jesus proceeds to heal the man who was born blind.
- 2. Though **He** does not tell anyone what **He** is doing, His words and now actions may well inferred that there was to be a miracle.
- 3. He begins with a series of actions followed by words of command.
- 4. His actions are in the order of 3 parts as "He spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and applied the clay to his eyes".
- 5. The use of saliva in the miracles of Jesus is recorded on at least two other occasions involving deafness and blindness. Mar.7:31ff; 8:22ff
- 6. Questions have naturally arisen as to why Jesus would employ some physical action when He healed certain people.
- 7. To claim that it was some supernatural formula in order to heal is only mysticism and denies other acts of healing where **He** simply gave a command and it was done. Cp. Joh.5:8-9
- 8. One cannot limit the Son of God by exact procedures and what **He** did, **He** did by His own sovereign hand at the direction of the Father.
- 9. As John has made clear, all of Jesus' miracles are "signs" and therefore the miracle and actions accompanying them point to a greater spiritual revelation. Joh.2:11,23; 6:2; 20:30; et al
- 10. Having **applied** the mud to the man's **eyes**, **He** immediately follows up with instructions to complete the miracle **and said to him**, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam".
- 11. **The pool of Siloam** has been identified as located in Southern Jerusalem called the Lower City, within the city wall.
- 12. This **pool** came into existence at the time of Hezekiah under the threat of Assyrian invasion by King Sennacherib. 2Chr.32:1-4
- 13. During the siege of the city, Hezekiah determined to stop all water supplies outside the city and in the region as deterrence of the invasion.
- 14. He then created secure water supplies within the city by tunneling between Gihon Spring under the wall and into the city.
- 15. The Jews created a tunnel 1200 cubits (approx. 2000 ft.) between the **Siloam** reservoir and the spring.

- 16. They tunneled through shear rock with iron twisting and turning to avoid constructions or rock faults or to follow a fissure, with the tunnel being 6 ft. in height and as narrow in width as 20 inches.
- 17. In 1880, an inscription was found about 15 ft. inside the tunnel that read: "...was being dug out. It was cut in the following manner....axes. each man towards his fellow, and while there were still 3 cubits (4.5 ft.) to be cut through, the voice of one man calling to the other was heard, showing that he was deviating to the right. When the tunnel was driven through, the excavators met man to man, axe to axe, and the water flowed for 1,200 cubits from the spring to the reservoir".
- 18. The tunnel, known as Hezekiah's Tunnel, was engineered by starting at two ends and meeting in the middle, and that apart from tunneling in a straight line.
- 19. This engineering feat is a definite reflection of God's hand and grace applied towards the Jews from impending defeat from the hands of their enemies.
- 20. John in vs.7, provides a parenthetical insert regarding the name of Siloam, "(which is translated, Sent)".
- 21. The verb "**Sent**/ $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$ " literally means "to send with a commission" and denotes that the act of sending carries with it delegated authority to carry out a prescribed mission or certain duties.
- 22. In vs.7b, the commands to the blind man by Jesus are carried out resulting in the actual healing as John records, "And so he went away and washed, and came *back* seeing".
- 23. The spiritual representations behind the healing as a "sign" explained:
 - A. The man born blind represents mankind born into this world under spiritual death that equates to spiritual blindness.
 - B. That there is no guilt of actual sin placed upon this particular man by either himself or his actual parents, points to the reality that all men enter the world under spiritual death apart from any sin(s) accounted against them on their part personally or those responsible for their procreation. Rom.5:12-15
 - C. It reflects the true cause of spiritual death being the sin nature, not actual or personal sinning.
 - D. Though cursing by association remains a viable principle in the case of spiritual death, Jesus omitted further discussion concerning that principle in vs.3, to emphasize that placing blame on another for one's spiritual condition is not the primary issue before men.
 - E. Rather, the real issue is simply that the condition of spiritual death/blindness exists for all men.
 - F. And for some, it is for the purpose of God's works to be manifested in them personally.
 - G. Jesus' actions represent His Person in answer to the spiritual dilemma of men:
 - 1) The act of spitting represents the judgment of His Deity demanded by His absolute righteousness in its evaluation of men under spiritual death.
 - 2) The nuances in this regard can be gleaned from what the use of spitting in the Scriptures reveal, as documented in Deu.25:9; Num.12:14; Job 17:6 and Rev.3:16.

- a. It denotes that under the reality of death due to the nature and volitional propensity of men, men cannot depend upon other like men to secure a heritage of life beyond death. Deu.25:5-9
- b. Mankind in their condition of spiritual blindness reflects shame and is rendered unclean before God. Num.12:14
- c. It demands an act of judgment of separation between men and God. Rev.3:16
- d. His view is that men are under a curse and fail to attain to His standard of +R. Job 17:6
- 3) That the target of His emission is **on the ground** denotes that the earth and those in it are His target destination of manifesting His +R/+J.
- 4) The term ground further relates contextually to dirt/soil, which is used to represent volition. Mat.13:3-9, 18-23 cp. Heb.6:7
- 5) Therefore, it is volition/souls of mankind that God specifically targets under His +R/+J. Psa.34:22; Mat.10:28
- 6) That Jesus makes **clay** from the saliva represents that there is one vessel of honor among men that God's +R/+J is found to be completely pliant/adaptable/compatible with, in order to generate spiritual life to those who are spiritually dead.
- 7) It illustrates His Person as God the Son who condescended into humanity under the Doctrine of the Hypostatic Union, a union that was formed into one entity. Phi.2:6-11
- 8) It denotes volition of such positive character that Deity could unite with it and provide the necessary +R to satisfy God's +J regarding spiritual death.
- 9) Therefore, it is the unique Person of Jesus Christ that is the prescribed anointing by God for men to be healed spiritually.
- 10) That Jesus physically **applied the clay to his eyes** denotes that salvation is the free gift provided to men by God, through His person, and men are helpless otherwise. Rom.6:23; Eph.2:8
- 11) That the application contextually is directed towards a man who is ultimately +V to the SAJG emphasizes that the prescribed anointing provided for men is only beneficial to those who are +V. 1Tim.4:10
- 12) That the man could not see Jesus actions physically points to the spiritual reality of His actions.
- 13) It demonstrates God's love for men in that He gave His Son even while mankind continues to exist under spiritual death and demonstrates unlimited atonement. Rom.5:8; 6:10; 1Pet.3:18
- 14) That He physically touched the man illustrates that it is His Person that evokes hope from men concerning their destitute state.
- H. Jesus commands and Johns parenthetical insertion in vs.7 denotes mans role in the spiritual healing process:
 - 1) The double imperatives to "go", "wash" indicates two necessary acts of obedience by men to be spiritually healed.
 - 2) The command to "**go**" illustrates that man must seek the answer to their spiritual dilemma in their normal course of life. Act.17:26-27

- 3) The term "**wash**" is a middle voice and literally means to "**wash** oneself" and here represents the exercise of faith necessary to be healed from spiritual blindness.
- 4) That washing is accomplished in a **pool** of water represents that the truth of BD (Eph.5:26), here specifically to the gospel presentation Ph₁, is the avenue and source from which one will find the correct object in which to exercise their faith.
- 5) John's parenthetical translation "**Sent** with a commission" identifies the object of faith as Jesus Christ being the Divinely commissioned emissary of God **sent** to absolve the issue of man's spiritual blindness.
- 6) That the blind man was obedient illustrates that +V in their quest of seeking the answer, exercising faith in Christ as stipulated in BD, will result in a spiritual reversal from death/blindness to sight/life.
- 24. It is noted that this is not a miracle of restoration of sight, but a creation of sight in a person who had never seen before.
- 25. It was a miracle of such magnitude that people could readily recognize the supernatural power demanded for its existence.
- 26. As a side note, it is recognized that technically, Jesus violated the current laws of legalistic Judaism regarding the Sabbath in the following ways:
 - A. The making of **clay** violated the prohibition of kneading, one of the 39 classes of work that was forbidden.
 - B. The placing of the mud on they **eyes** was a violation of their laws of anointing on the Sabbath.
 - C. The medical procedure of the actual healing was a violation of the law concerning healing on the Sabbath, unless the life was in danger.

EXEGESIS VERSES 8 - 12:

GNT John 9:8 Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον ὅτι προσαίτης ἦν ἔλεγον, Οὐχ οὖτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος καὶ προσαιτῶν;

NAS John 9:8 The neighbors therefore, and those who previously saw him as a beggar, were saying, $Oi \delta \gamma \epsilon (\tau \circ \nu \epsilon \varsigma \gamma \epsilon (\tau \circ \nu) (d.a. + n-nm-p; originally meant "Those of the same land"; hence, "The neighbors") <math>ov (infer. conj.) \kappa \alpha (cc) oi \delta \theta \epsilon \omega \rho \delta v (d.a. + subs. ptc./p/a/nm-p; "those who saw/to observe as a spectator" +) <math>\tau \delta \delta \pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \varsigma (d.a. + adverbial accusative/n-s; "previously/before/of former time" +) <math>\alpha v \tau \delta \nu \alpha v \tau \delta \varsigma (npam3s) \delta \tau (declar. conj.; "that"; goes with the verb <math>\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \epsilon \omega;$ "previously saw that") $\eta \nu \epsilon \iota \mu i (vilPFa--3s; "he was") \pi \rho \circ \alpha i \tau \eta \varsigma (n-nm-s; "a begger"; used 2x) \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \circ \nu, \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega (vilPFa--3p; "were saying") "Is not this the one who used to sit and beg?" <math>Ov \lambda \circ v \circ (neg. +) \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \epsilon \iota \mu i (vipa-3s; "Is not") ov \tau \delta \varsigma ov \tau \circ \varsigma (near dem. pro./nm-s; "this man") \delta \kappa \alpha \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \iota \sigma \varsigma \kappa \alpha \theta \eta \mu \alpha u (d.a. [governs both ptc's] subs.ptc./p/dep/nm-s; "he who sits/to be seated/to sit down"; used 16x) <math>\kappa \alpha i (cc) \pi \rho \circ \alpha \iota \tau \delta \nu; \pi \rho \circ \alpha \iota \tau \epsilon \omega (subs. ptc./p/a/nm-s; "he who begs/to ask for/to ask for alms or begs"; hapax)$

GNT John 9:9 ἄλλοι ἕλεγον ὅτι Οὖτός ἐστιν, ἄλλοι ἕλεγον, Οὐχί, ἀλλὰ ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ἐστιν. ἐκεῖνος ἕλεγεν ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι.

NAS John 9:9 Others were saying, "This is he," $\mathring{a}\lambda\lambda o\iota \mathring{a}\lambda\lambda o\zeta (ap-nm-p; "Others";$ denotes others of a different kind) $\check{e}\lambda\epsilon\gamma o\nu \lambda \acute{e}\gamma \omega (viIPFa--3p) \check{o}\tau\iota (declarative conj. not translated) <math>O\hat{v}\tau \acute{o}\zeta o\hat{v}\tau o\zeta (near dem. pro./nm-s +) \acute{e}\sigma\tau\iota\nu, \epsilon \acute{e}\mu \acute{\iota} (vipa--3s; "This man is he") still others were saying, "No, but he is like him." still supplied <math>\mathring{a}\lambda\lambda o\iota \mathring{a}\lambda\lambda o\zeta (ap-nm-p) \check{e}\lambda\epsilon\gamma o\nu, \lambda \acute{e}\gamma \omega (viIPFa--3p) O\dot{v}\chi \acute{\iota}, (emphatic neg.; "No/by no means/not so") <math>\mathring{a}\lambda\lambda \acute{a} (strong adver.; "but"; in stark contrast to) \acute{e}\sigma\tau\iota\nu. \epsilon \acute{e}\mu \acute{\iota} (vipa--3s; "he is") \check{o}\mu o\iota o\zeta (adj--nm-s; "like/resembles/is similar to in form or appearance"; same as 8:55) <math>\alpha \acute{v}\tau \acute{\omega}$ $\check{a}\dot{v}\tau \acute{o} (npdm3s; "to him")$ He kept saying, "I am the one." $\acute{e}\kappa\epsilon \widehat{\iota}\nu o\zeta$ (remote dem. pro./nm-s; "That one/He/the begger") $\check{e}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu$ $\lambda \acute{e}\gamma\omega$ (viIPFa--3s; "kept saying/was

saying") $\delta \tau \iota$ (declarative conj.; not translated) $E \gamma \omega$ (npn-1s +) $\epsilon \iota \mu \iota$. (vipa--1s; "I Myself am he")

GNT John 9:10 ἕλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ, Πῶς ἠνεῷχθησάν σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί;

NAS John 9:10 Therefore they were saying to him, "How then were your eyes opened?" $o\dot{v}v$ (infer. conj.; "Therefore"; based on the fact that he convinced them that he was one and the same person) $\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\sigma\nu$ $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega$ (viIPFa--3p) $\alpha\dot{v}\tau\dot{\omega}$, $\alpha\dot{v}\tau\dot{o}\zeta$ (npdm3s) $\Pi\hat{\omega}\zeta$ (interr. adv.; "How then/In what way?") $\sigma\sigma\nu$ $\sigma\dot{v}$ (npg-2s) $o\dot{v}$ $\dot{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu oi$; $\dot{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu o\zeta$ (d.a. + n-nm-p; "the eyes") $\dot{\eta}\nu\epsilon\dot{\omega}\chi\theta\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}\nu$ $\dot{\alpha}\nuoi\gamma\omega$ (viap--3p; "were opened/have been opened/caused to open up"; used 4x)

GNT John 9:11 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος, Ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς πηλὸν ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐπέχρισέν μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ εἶπέν μοι ὅτι Ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν Σιλωὰμ καὶ νίψαι· ἀπελθών οὖν καὶ νιψάμενος ἀνέβλεψα.

NAS John 9:11 He answered, "The man who is called Jesus made clay, and ϵ κείνος, (remote dem. pro./nm-s; "He/that one/the begger") anointed my eyes, άπεκρίθη άποκρίνομαι (viadep--3s) O άνθρωπος (d.a. + n-nm-s) δ λεγόμενος λέγω (adj. ptc./p/p/nm-s; "who is called/the one being called") In $\sigma \delta \zeta$ (n-nm-s) $\epsilon \pi \delta \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ποιέω (viaa--3s; "made") πηλόν πηλός (n-am-s; "clay") καί (cc) $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \chi \rho_i \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \ell \pi_i \chi \rho_i \omega$ (viaa--3s; "anointed/spread on") $\mu o \psi \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ (npg-1s) $\tau o \dot{\nu} \zeta \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu o \dot{\nu} \zeta \dot{\delta} \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \dot{\delta} \zeta$ (d.a. + n-am-p; "eyes") and said to me, 'Go to Siloam, and wash'; so I went away and washed, and I received sight." $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3s) $\mu o i \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (npd-1s) ὅτι (intro. indir. disc.) "Υπαγε ὑπάγω (vImppa--2s; "Go") είς (pa) τον ό Σιλωάμ (d.a. + n-am-s; "Siloam") καί (cc) νίψαι νίπτω (vImpam--2s; "wash οὖν (infer. conj.; "So/therefore") άπελθών άπέρχομαι (circ. vourself") ptc./a/dep/nm1s; "after going away/departing") $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) $\nu i \psi \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu o \zeta \nu i \pi \tau \omega$ (circ. ptc./a/m/nm1s; "after washing myself") $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\psi\alpha$. $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\pi\omega$ (viaa--1s; "I received sight/I looked up able to see"; used 2x)

GNT John 9:12 καὶ ϵἶπαν αὐτῷ, Ποῦ ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος; λέγει, Οὐκ οἶδα.

NAS John 9:12 And they said to him, "Where is He?" He *said, "I do not know." $\kappa \alpha i (cc) \epsilon i \pi \alpha \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega (viaa--3p) \alpha v \tau \hat{\omega}, \alpha v \tau \delta \zeta (npdm3s) \Pi o \hat{v} (interr. adv.; "Where?")$ $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \epsilon i \mu i (vipa--3s) \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu o \zeta; (remote dem. adj./nm-s; "He/that man") \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota, \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ $(vipa--3s; "He was saying") O v o v (neg. +) o \hat{\iota} \delta \alpha. (viPFa--1s; "I do not know")$

ANALYSIS VERSES 8 – 12:

- 1. While it is not specifically stated where the man came after returning from the pool of **Siloam**, it is obvious it was the general area where he **used to sit and beg**. Cp.9:7b
- 2. Two distinct groups of people are mentioned in our verses that were familiar with the blind **begger**, "**The neighbors and those who previously saw him as a beggar**".
- 3. His **neighbors** are those people that lived in his neighborhood and would have seen him regularly and had opportunity for a more intimate relationship with **him**.
- 4. The second group, and undoubtedly the largest, were **those** people that passed by and **saw him** in his regular spot each day as he begged for aid.
- 5. Unlike today, there was little in the ancient world that one who was blind could hope to do; so begging was a regular way of life for those with such serious handicaps (oops, challenges to be politically correct).
- 6. People would recognize such fixtures as this blind beggar as they went about their daily business, and no doubt, some had contributed to this man.
- 7. The sight of this man walking around and seeing would obviously prompt questioning as **therefore**, the **were saying**, **"Is not this the one who used to sit and beg?"**
- 8. Their question is rhetorical in nature and phrased in such a way as to anticipate a "yes" answer.
- 9. It denotes the initial response and amazement of all that had come in some regular contact with the man in now seeing **him** healed.
- 10. However, after some due consideration of what everyone thought they were beholding, John records a conflict of conclusion and difference of opinions rendered by these people.
- 11. Though at first, all perceived that this was possibly the blind beggar, some were thoroughly convinced, while **others** chose to deny the reality.
- 12. This difference of conclusions is brought out by the use of the adjectives "άλλος/**others**", denoting distinct differences of opinions.
- 13. Of the people that initially considered **him** to be that very man, some had to think no further, while retaining their belief, **others** needed further time before being thoroughly convinced as they **were saying**, "**This is he**", and *still* **others** rejected the initial premise and **were saying**, "**No**, **but he is like him**".
- 14. The differing reads on the man point to the nature of men when confronted with an unexpected reality thrown in their face.
- 15. Some will immediately and without further question will accept what they see, **others** will eventually accept it, while **others** will end up denying it.
- 16. Its intriguing to note that some people still did not believe the miracle even after they saw the results with their own **eyes**.

- 17. Apparently the cliche, "Seeing is believing", is not always true.
- 18. The crowd's reactions point to a reality concerning people and that is when it comes to the issue of the truth of reality, not everyone is readily amenable to accept it.
- 19. It in turn points to the stubbornness of some people to reject reality, even when it is in their face.
- 20. While some of these people are standing around the man debating his identity, **He** was consistently interjecting the truth regarding his person and **kept saying**, "**I am the one**".
- 21. After some time of the beggar's insistence that **he** was the one formerly blind, John records the natural question of all concerned as **therefore they were saying to him**, **"How then were your eyes opened?"**
- 22. That John records the question as a generic response by the people as a whole, by design and intent points to the following:
 - A. Those who never questioned his identity would obviously be asking from a pure sense of wanting to know more regarding the reality of the miracle.
 - B. Those who ultimately came to believe their **eyes**, in addition to wanting to know more are also looking for a reaffirmation to their belief.
 - C. Those who *still* didn't want to believe what they were seeing, the question has a nuance of their need for even additional proof, before they would believe.
- 23. As subtle as it might or might not be, John is picturing the reality of people's volitional propensity when confronted with the truth.
- 24. For some, they immediately accept it without further question and honestly desire to know more.
- 25. For **others**, they will come to accept it on their own, but are to some degree insecure in their belief and will look for more confirmation to strengthen their belief.
- 26. For *still* others, while they may ultimately come to believe these things, they will fight even the facts and continue to look for additional proof before their minds are thoroughly made up, one way or the other.
- 27. When it comes to people facing the reality of truth, there are those with absolutely no doubt to its validity, **others** will carry some doubt, but generally just a little that is not detrimental to their faith and **others** that will perpetuate strong doubt.
- 28. That John does not record the ultimate decisions made by those with strong doubt is because he is not seeking to determine ultimately what people will or will not believe, only to point to the nature of people's believing.
- 29. Observation: While we may recognize one or even all of these volitional characteristics in others, or ourselves, it is not grounds to impute ultimately the final outcome of one's faith.
- 30. Observation: However, it would be remiss not to "see" the most desirable of these propensities as being to accept the facts of reality upon the face value of presentation.
- 31. The formerly blind man **answered** their questioning in a straightforward manner, succinct and accurate.
- 32. He makes no attempts to embellish the occasion, emotionally or otherwise as he states, "The man who is called Jesus made clay, and anointed my eyes, and said to me 'Go to Siloam, and wash'; so I went away and washed, and I received sight".

- 33. **He** relates exactly what happened in a matter of fact way and thus leaves any additional questioning regarding the miracle itself upon the shoulders of those around **him** to ascertain as truth or not.
- 34. Too, it is obvious **he** knows little about **Jesus**, save His name, and expects his questioners to investigate on their own if they want more in-depth answers on the miracle.
- 35. Therefore, for whatever motivational reasons each of those around **him** may have had, **they said to him**, **"Where is He?"**
- 36. As honestly and readily the beggar was capable of telling them what **he** did **know**, just as honestly now, **he said**, "I **do not know**".
- 37. Contextually then, the blind man that now sees becomes an example of those too who have experienced the reality of truth in our own lives (though not of such a physically miraculous miracle, spiritually just as miraculous), when confronted by those around us who are inquisitive for whatever reasons.
- 38. And that is, tell the truth, sticking with the facts that you **know**, while not trying to explain what you **do not know**, and let your questioners make their own decisions as to how to proceed for themselves.
- 39. And it is this man's intellectual honesty that provides the framework for a satisfying and amusing scenario for John's readers in vss.13ff, as well as spiritual advancement for himself in vss.35-38.

EXEGESIS VERSES 13 - 17:

GNT John 9:13 "Αγουσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους τόν ποτε τυφλόν.

NAS John 9:13 They *brought to the Pharisees him who was formerly blind. "Ayououv $\ddot{a}y\omega$ (vipa--3p; "They brought/to lead/to bring"; historic present) $\pi\rho\delta\zeta$ (pa; denotes a face-to-face encounter) $\tau o\dot{v}\zeta \delta \Phi \alpha\rho\iota\sigma\alpha iov\zeta \Phi \alpha\rho\iota\sigma\alpha io\zeta$ (d.a. + n-am-p; "the Pharisees") $\alpha\dot{v}\tau\dot{o}\nu \ \alpha\dot{v}\tau\dot{o}\zeta$ (npam3s) $\tau\delta\nu \ \delta \ \tau v\phi\lambda\delta\nu$. $\tau v\phi\lambda\delta\zeta$ (d.a. + adj.-am-s; "the blind man") who was - supplied $\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon$ (adv.; "formerly/at some previous time")

GNT John 9:14 ην δε σάββατον εν ή ήμερα τον πηλον εποίησεν ο Ίησοῦς καὶ ἀνέωξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς.

NAS John 9:14 Now it was a Sabbath on the day when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes. $\delta \epsilon$ (cs; "Now") $\eta \nu \epsilon i \mu i$ (viIPFa--3s) $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \sigma \nu$ (n-nn-s; "a Sabbath") $\epsilon \nu$ (pL of time; "on") $\eta \delta \zeta$ (rel. pro./Lf-s; "that") $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho \alpha$ (n-dL-s) when supplied δ Inoov ζ (d.a. + n-nm-s) $\epsilon \pi \sigma i \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ $\pi \sigma i \epsilon \omega$ (viaa--3s) $\tau \delta \nu \delta$ $\pi \eta \lambda \delta \nu$ $\pi \eta \lambda \delta \zeta$ (d.a. + n-am-s; "the clay") $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) $\alpha \nu \epsilon \omega \xi \epsilon \nu \alpha \nu \sigma i \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3s; "opened") $\alpha v \tau \sigma v$ $\alpha v \tau \delta \zeta$ (npgm3s) $\tau \sigma v \zeta \delta \delta \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \sigma \delta \zeta$.

GNT John 9:15 πάλιν οὖν ἠρώτων αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πῶς ἀνέβλεψεν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πηλὸν ἐπέθηκέν μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, καὶ ἐνιψάμην, καὶ βλέπω.

 $\dot{\epsilon}$ νιψάμην, νίπτω (viam--1s; "I washed myself") καί (ch) βλέπω. βλέπω (vipa--1s; "I am seeing")

GNT John 9:16 «λεγον οὖν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων τινές, Οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι τὸ σάββατον οὐ τηρεῖ. ἄλλοι [δε] «λεγον, Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς τοιαῦτα σημεῖα ποιεῖν; καὶ σχίσμα ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

NAS John 9:16 Therefore some of the Pharisees were saying, "This man is not from God, because He does not keep the Sabbath." $o\hat{v}$ (infer. conj.; "Therefore") $\tau v \epsilon \zeta$, τίς (indef. pro./nm-p; "some") $\epsilon \kappa$ (pAbl; "of/from") των δ Φαρισαίων Φαρισαίος άνθρωπος, (d.a. + n-nm-s; "the man") Οὐκ οὐ (neg. +) ϵστιν ϵἰμί (vipa--3s; "is not") $\pi\alpha\rho\dot{\alpha}$ (pAbl) $\theta\epsilon o\hat{v}$ $\theta\epsilon o\hat{\zeta}$ (n-Ablm-s) $\check{\delta}\tau\iota$ (causal conj.) $o\dot{v}$ (neg. +) $\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}$. $\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\hat{\omega}$ (vipa--3s; "He does not keep/guard/watch over/keep in view") $\tau \dot{o} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \beta \beta \alpha \tau o \nu$ (d.a. + n-But others were saying, "How can a man who is a sinner perform such an-s) signs?'' $\delta \epsilon$ (ch) άλλοι άλλος (adj.-nm-p; "others of a different kind") $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma o \nu$, $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (viIPFa--3p) $\Pi \hat{\omega} \zeta$ (interr. adv.; "How?") $\delta \dot{\upsilon} \nu \alpha \tau \alpha i$ $\delta \dot{\upsilon} \nu \alpha \mu \alpha i$ (vipdep--3s; "can/is it possible") $\ddot{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\varsigma$ (n-nm-s) $\dot{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\dot{\sigma}\varsigma$ (a--nm-s; "who is a sinner"; lit. "a sinful man"; one who engages in evil, loving sin) $\pi ol \in \tilde{\nu}$; $\pi ol \in \omega$ (compl. inf./pa-; "perform"; completes the verb "can/ $\delta \dot{\nu} \alpha \mu \alpha i$ ") $\tau o i \alpha \hat{\nu} \tau \alpha$ $\tau o i o \hat{\nu} \tau o \zeta$ (dem. adj./an-p; "such/of such a kind/of this sort/) $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \alpha \sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} o \nu$ (*n-an-p*; "signs") And there was a division among καί (ch) $\eta \nu$ εἰμί (viIPFa--3s; "there was") σχίσμα (n-nn-s; "division/rift/ them. conflict/dissension") $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ (pL; "among") $\alpha\dot{v}\tau o\hat{i}\zeta$. $\alpha\dot{v}\tau o\hat{\zeta}$ (npdm3p)

GNT John 9:17 λέγουσιν οὖν τῷ τυφλῷ πάλιν, Τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἡνέῳξέν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ὅτι Προφήτης ἐστίν.

NAS John 9:17 They *said therefore to the blind man again, "What do you say about Him, since He opened your eyes?" $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma o \upsilon \sigma \iota \nu \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ (vipa--3p; "They said"; historical present) $o \acute{\upsilon} \nu$ (infer. conj.) $\tau \acute{\omega} \acute{o} \tau \upsilon \phi \lambda \acute{\omega} \tau \upsilon \phi \lambda \acute{o} \zeta$ (d.a. + pro. adj.-dm-s; "to the blind man"; ref. to his former state) $\pi \acute{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu$ (adv.; "again"; indicates this was not their first question as to how he perceived Jesus) $T \acute{\iota} \tau \acute{\iota} \varsigma$ (interr. adj./an-s; "What thing do") $\sigma \acute{\upsilon}$ (npn-2s) $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ (vipa--2s) $\pi \epsilon \rho \acute{\iota}$ (pg; "about/concerning") $\alpha \acute{\upsilon} \tau o \widetilde{\upsilon}$, $\alpha \acute{\upsilon} \tau \acute{\circ} \varsigma$ Chapter 9

GOSPEL OF JOHN

(npgm3s) ὅτι (causal conj.; "since") $\eta \nu \epsilon \omega \xi \epsilon \nu \, \alpha \nu o (\gamma \omega \, (viaa--3s; "He opened") \sigma o v \sigma v (npg-2s) τους δ όφθαλμούς; όφθαλμός (d.a. + n-am-p; "eyes") And he said, "He is a prophet." δε (ch; "And/then") δ (dnms; "he/the man" +) είπεν λεγω (viaa--3s) ὅτι (ind. disc.) εστίν. είμί (vipa--3s) Προφήτης (n-nm-s; "a prophet")$

ANALYSIS VERSES 13 – 17:

- 1. It becomes obvious that the conflict at hand in deciding the man's veracity and claim is of such a nature that a decision was made to let the religious experts investigate the case as **they brought to the Pharisees him who was formerly blind**.
- 2. John provides a key note that at least in part would motivate a feeling of necessity for these people to proceed in this fashion in vs.14, "Now it was a Sabbath on the day when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes".
- 3. Therefore, no matter what opinions **they** may have held regarding the man's claims, these people concluded that there were religious issues involved that should be addressed by their spiritual guides and authorities.
- 4. No doubt, many if not most of these people had at least heard about **Jesus** and the fact that **He** liked to spend His Saturday's healing would be no secret at this time in His ministry. Joh.5:16
- 5. That Jesus' name is mentioned in connection with the miracle implicates Him as a collaborator to the act.
- 6. The people knowing that His actions of this sort put **Him** at odds with Jewish leadership would naturally turn the situation over to them, if nothing more than to absolve themselves personally from any incrimination.
- 7. The irony is that those, to whom they would turn to, to resolve this matter, are spiritually blind from birth.
- 8. **The Pharisees** in view are not random **Pharisees**, but are official Sanhedrin authorities of one of the minor synagogue courts established in Jerusalem at the time.
- 9. This gives leverage to the fear of the parents in their questioning in vss.22-23.
- 10. That these local courts did not normally meet on festival days and Sabbaths would indicate that a special meeting convened to address this issue.
- 11. After enduring the bombardment of questioning from the previous crowd, the man now finds himself in front of these religious leaders **again** explaining himself, as **therefore, the Pharisees also were asking him how he received his sight**.
- 12. It further denotes that **the Pharisees** had already heard the account by others and now were seeking his personal testimony regarding the matter.
- 13. And again, the man is seen to "tell it like it is" as he said to them, "He applied clay to my eyes, and I washed, and now I see".
- 14. As previously noted, these actions coupled with the resultant healing constituted a violation of working on the **Sabbath** under the legalistic laws of Judaism.
- 15. The man's reply causes dissension among those who were investigating the matter as recorded in vs.16.
- 16. Two opposing views are expressed, and no doubt some lively discussion ensued.

- 17. And as will be noted, there are two differing approaches to the analysis of the matter by those involved.
- 18. The first group adheres to a subjective approach of interpretation and therefore some of the Pharisees were saying, "This man is not from God, because He does not keep the Sabbath".
- 19. It is this group that reveals the most legalist and religious doctrinaire of Judaism as they seize an opportunity to condemn a breach of **Sabbath** law as they saw it.
- 20. Their condescending attitude and preconceived conclusion that **God** was no way possibly behind this act is seen in their perception of **Jesus** as they refer to **Him** as "οὖτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος/this one, the man". (*ex. of eyes on man, not on God/reality*)
- 21. Their reasoning was simple and straightforward; if a man violated the laws of **the Sabbath**, which **God** established, then he could not be considered a representative of **God**.
- 22. However, while their conclusion was correct, their initial assumption was incorrect.
- 23. Though **God** did establish the principle of the **Sabbath** observance, He <u>did not</u> establish their multitude of rules and regulations about the **Sabbath**.
- 24. This group represents the establishment of mainline religiosity and that their compromise of clear principles of Scripture and their intent produces a distortion of even the principles that would otherwise be true.
- 25. They fail here to consider the one other possibility and that is that their established and accepted interpretations and laws were flawed.
- 26. The second group represents those in total contrast to the first group, who was willing to look beyond their laws to the facts in an objective manner, as John notes, "But others were saying, 'How can a man who is a sinner perform such signs?""
- 27. The term "**sinner**" indicates someone who is devoted to sin as opposed to **God**, a wicked **man** with his own agenda.
- 28. It denotes the predominate view of **the Pharisees** in their attitude towards Christ.
- 29. It was a label they placed on those who were in disagreement with mainline Judaistic beliefs in contradiction to their interpretations. Cp.8:34
- 30. A label of this sort was tantamount to referring to individuals as "unbelievers", who fail to attain to the legalistic standard of righteousness set forth in Judaism.
- 31. Though these Nicodemus-like **Pharisees** too adhered to Judaistic laws, what is illogical to labeling **Jesus** in this way is how anyone could not be of **God** and consistently **perform** such miracles.
- 32. In other words, the overt evidence of His works was incongruous/irreconcilable to the depiction of His character as **a sinner**.
- 33. It denotes that this group looked at the overall picture of Jesus' performing of miracles as noted in the plural use of "**signs**".
- 34. As John later records, **Jesus performed** more miracles than one could "shake a stick at" (Joh.20:30; 21:25), and it is obvious that their impact stimulated at least some degree of intellectual honesty and logic, even among **the Pharisees**.
- 35. The word "τοιοῦτος/such" signs, qualifies the miracle concept and says that His miracles were of such a character so as to stand out as obviously done by God and not a mere man.

- 36. Though the opposition could point out that Deu.13:1-5 warns against false prophets that might arise and deceive people with miracles, these men could as easily argue that that is not the case here due to the magnitude and nature of Jesus' miracles.
- 37. In fact, His miracles are of mercy, and considering the nature of the present miracle that no one had ever performed in history, of healing a congenital blindness, would indeed indicate that Divine power was involved.
- 38. And, as Jesus Himself so aptly put it that He did not come to bring peace, but a sword (Mat.10:34), there was a division among them.
- 39. As will become apparent, even though intellectual honesty may be employed and no matter how many times **they** hear the truth of the matter, those totally engrained in their –V, will not be satisfied.
- 40. The nature of -V is **such** that when the issues of the truth are clearly and cogently explained, and even with the evidence right before their eyes, they will continue to reject the obvious facts (vs.18).
- 41. Though a **division among the Pharisees** does occur, it is obvious that any continuous attempt to defend Jesus' actions overtly weakens and those who might adhere to this premise succumb to pressure of the mainline approach to Judaism.
- 42. This is not to say that any or all of the 2nd group inwardly changed their minds, only that they obviously are of the minority and do not have the spiritual backbone to fight on.
- 43. Since they are reaching an impasse among themselves, and apparently no minds are readily being changed, another irony is revealed as **they** now turn **to the blind man again** and **said therefore**, "What do you say about Him, since He opened your eyes?"
- 44. Their frustration is evident, since this **man** was of no authority on law or religion and his opinion would have mattered little to them.
- 45. However, **he** has had some direct dealing with **Jesus** and so they invite his opinion.
- 46. He does not hesitate and said, "He is a prophet".
- 47. Recognizing his ignorance regarding **Jesus** and frame of reference, this was the highest thing **he** could **say about Him**, at this point.
- 48. It may be that after listening to the arguments and views of **Pharisees**, **he** too has concluded that if **Jesus** was **not from God**, then **He** could not have such power.
- 49. We will observe the progress of the man's perception of **Jesus** in this chapter:
 - A. A man named Jesus. vs.11
 - B. A prophet. vs.17
 - C. He is God-fearing and does God's will. vss.31-33
 - D. Jesus is Messiah. vss.36,38
 - E. **Jesus** is worthy of worship. vs.38
- 50. In turn we can contrast **the Pharisees**, who begin with the belief that **Jesus** is **not from God**, question the veracity of the miracles, are willing to consider **Him** a **sinner**, and are declared to be **blind** sinners themselves.
- 51. Further, it is interesting to note that human viewpoint would conclude that the best course of action, when opportunity is given to apply Divine good to unbelievers (or others), is to immediately present the gospel or opportunity is lost and the individuals may fall into the wrong hands and be lead astray.

- 52. This is tantamount to the fundie philosophy that people are dying and going to hell or people are missing the "boat" spiritually because believers are not evangelizing with the gospel Ph₁ or Ph₂ at every given opportunity.
- 53. Under this thinking, one would conclude then that in this case, **Jesus** failed miserably. (*Of course I speak as if insane.*)
- 54. Does **Jesus** not, in this case, after taking the opportunity to apply Divine good towards the **blind man**, disappear and seemingly abandoned him to face a bunch of negative religious idiots who now have opportunity to "sway" him spiritually?
- 55. The fact that **Jesus** handles the situation in the recorded manner, points to the following:
 - A. The number one responsibility for adjusted +V is to determine God's will in each situation of applying towards others.
 - B. Not in all cases, is it God's will for the believer to immediately "shove" the truth down people's throats just because an opportunity seemingly arises.
 - C. In fact, the first opportunity believers should be sensitive to, is the availability to apply Divine good towards others. Joh.9:4; Gal.6:10; 1Pet.3:1 (*Obviously*, *1Pet.3:1 is qualified by Col.3:18, "....as is fitting in the Lord."*)
 - D. The principle is that actions/modus operandi and vivendi of believers speak louder than words.
 - E. Those who employ intellectual honesty will evaluate the applications made into any overall character assessment of individuals.
 - F. This in no way diminishes the importance of the intake of BD or its articulation to others.
 - G. The purpose of acquiring the knowledge of BD is in order to provide the impact of witnessing through Dvgd, which level of application comes with increased knowledge. Col.1:9-10 (One's spiritual level is manifested and measured in their level of application of Dvgd.)
 - H. The present scenario of **the blind man**, who is potentially +V, denotes that all +V will be given an opportunity to hear the truth in God's own timing. Joh.9:35
 - I. For this particular **man**, it is God's will that after the application of Dvgd towards **him**, **he** first is confronted with false views before **he** is given the gospel.
 - J. This points to the principle that **God** knows exactly what each individual needs in order for their +V to surface.
 - K. **He** is given opportunity to weigh the evidence of the application towards **him** in light of alternative views.
 - L. This in turn gives the intellectual honesty of +V an opportunity to be exercised.
 - M. Via God's perfect timing and when **Jesus** does present the gospel to **him**, his +V is primed and immediately surfaces.
 - N. This points to the principle that +V sees through all the human viewpoint garbage and will ultimately come to a correct understanding of the truth, which is provided at God's perfect timing.
 - O. Therefore, Jesus' act of Dvgd set the groundwork for consideration by the **man**, even in the face of railing opposition, that when **Jesus** did speak, **He** spoke the truth.

- P. Just as the consistent acts of Dvgd production of believers establishes a basis for consideration by those around them, when the timing is appropriate for the believer to evangelize, that what they have to say is not words only, but words of truth supported by their actions.
- Q. It is our application of BD that provides the "weight" to the validity of that which we speak.
- R. All cases are not the same, and each individual believer must discern the appropriate time for applications apart from evangelizing vs. a time to simply evangelize.
- S. For the adjusted believer that is truly focused on producing maximum Divine good production, **God** will use that believer's applications to further open the doors for evangelizing according to the recipient's volition and per His perfect Divine timing.
- T. Because **God** truly knows all men, all the believer has to do is keep his/her nose to the "grindstone" of BD in their niche, and **God** will provide the opportunities to evangelize accordingly.

EXEGESIS VERSES 18 - 23:

GNT John 9:18 Οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἦν τυφλὸς καὶ ἀνέβλεψεν ἕως ὅτου ἐφώνησαν τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναβλέψαντος

GNT John 9:19 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτοὺς λέγοντες, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμῶν, ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη; πῶς οὖν βλέπει ἄρτι;

NAS John 9:19 and questioned them, saying, "Is this your son, who you say was born blind? $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) $\eta \rho \omega \tau \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \alpha \omega$ (viaa--3p; "questioned/inquired/asked") $\alpha v \tau \delta c \alpha v \tau \delta c (npam3p) \lambda \epsilon \gamma \rho \nu \tau \epsilon c \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (circ.ptc./p/a/nm-p) $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \epsilon v \epsilon \mu i$ (vipa--3s) $Ov v \tau \delta c (near dem. pro./nm-s; Lit. "this man") v \mu \omega \nu, \sigma v (npg-2p) \delta v \delta \delta c (d.a. + n Pred.nm-s) <math>\delta \nu \delta c$ (rel. pro./am-s; "who") v $\mu \epsilon \hat{\iota} c \sigma v (npn-2p) \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (vipa--2p) $\delta \tau \iota (cc; intro. ind. disc.; not translated) \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \eta; \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \alpha \omega$ (viap--3s; "was born") $\tau v \phi \lambda \delta c (a-nm-s; "blind/a blind man")$ Then how does he now see?" $ov \nu v (infer. conj.; "then/therefore") \pi \omega c (inter. adv.; "how?") <math>\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega$ (vipa--3s; "does he see/is he seeing") $\delta \rho \tau \iota; (adv.; "now"; as opposed to when you say he was blind)$

GNT John 9:20 ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπαν, Οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ὅτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη.

NAS John 9:20 His parents answered them and said, "We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind; $o\tilde{v}v$ (infer. conj.; not translated) $\alpha v \tau o v \alpha v \tau o (npgm3s)$ $oi of voreic voreic (d.a. + n-nm-p; "parents") <math>d\pi \epsilon \kappa \rho i \theta \eta \sigma \alpha v d\pi \sigma \kappa \rho i vo \mu \alpha i$ (viad--3p) $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) $\epsilon i \pi \alpha v$, $\lambda \epsilon v \omega$ (viaa--3p) $Oi \delta \alpha \mu \epsilon v oi \delta \alpha$ (viPFa--1p; "We know"; PF tense denotes knowledge with absolute certainty) $\delta \tau i$ (ch; intro. indi. disc.; "that") $ov \tau \sigma c v \epsilon i \mu i$ (near dem. pro./nm-s) $\epsilon \sigma \tau i v \epsilon i \mu i$ (vipa--3s) $\eta \mu \omega v \epsilon v \omega i$ (npg-1p) $\delta v i \delta c (d.a. + n-$ Pred.nm-s) $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) $\delta \tau i$ (ch; continues indir. disc.) $\epsilon v \epsilon v \nu \eta \theta \eta$. $\gamma \epsilon v \nu \alpha \omega$ (viap--3s; "he was born") $\tau v \phi \lambda \delta c (a--nm-s)$

GNT John 9:21 πῶς δὲ νῦν βλέπει οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἢ τίς ἤνοιξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡμεῖς οὐκ οἴδαμεν· αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε, ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσει.

NAS John 9:21 but how he now sees, we do not know; or who opened his eyes, we **do not know.** $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ (cc) $\pi \hat{\omega} \zeta$ (inter. adv.; "how?") $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ (adv.; "now/right not") $\beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota$ $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\omega$ (vipa--3s; "he is seeing") our our our (neg. +) on $\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$, olda (viPFa--1p; "we do not know"; again, the PF denotes a statement of absolute certainty) η' (cc; "or") $\tau i \zeta$ (interr. pro./nm-s; "who?") $\eta'\nu ol \xi \epsilon \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu o (\gamma \omega)$ (viaa--3s; "opened/caused to open") $\alpha \dot{\nu} \tau o \hat{\nu}$ αὐτός (npgm3s) τοὺς ὁ ὀφθαλμοὺς ὀφθαλμός (d.a. + n-am-p; "eyes") ἡμεῖς έγώ (npn-1p) \vec{o} of (neg. +) \vec{o} ($\delta \alpha \mu \in \nu$ · \vec{o} ($\delta \alpha$ (viPFa--1p; "we at no time have known") Ask him; he is of age, he shall speak for himself. " έρωτήσατε, έρωτάω (vImpaa--2p; "Ask/question/inquire") αὐτόν αὐτός (npam3s; "actually is before the verb "ask", "Him, Ask"; it begins their comment for emphasis and refocuses the leaders attention on the son again) $\xi_{\chi\epsilon\iota}$, $\xi_{\chi\omega}$ (vipa--3s; "he has") $\eta_{\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\nu}$ $\eta_{\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\alpha}$ (n-af-s; "time of life/maturity/adulthood/is of legal age") αὐτός αὐτός (npnm3s; "He"; again places emphasis on the son) $\lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$. $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon \omega$ (vifa--3s; "will speak") $\pi\epsilon\rho i$ (pg: "concerning/for" +) $\dot{\epsilon}\alpha \upsilon \tau o \hat{\upsilon}$ (reflex. pro./gm3s; "himself"; "he will speak on his own *behalf"*)

GNT John 9:22 ταῦτα ϵἶπαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐφοβοῦντο τοὺς Ἰουδαίους· ἤδη γὰρ συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα ἐάν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστόν, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται.

Chapter 9

GOSPEL OF JOHN

NAS John 9:22 His parents said this because they were afraid of the Jews; αὐτοῦ $\alpha \dot{v} \tau \dot{o} \zeta$ (npgm3s) of $\dot{o} \gamma o \nu \epsilon \hat{i} \zeta \gamma o \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \zeta$ (d.a. + n-nm-p; "parents") $\epsilon \tilde{i} \pi \alpha \nu \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3p) ταῦτα οὗτος (near dem. pro./an-p; "this - Lit. these things") ὅτι (causal conj.) έφοβοῦντο φοβέομαι (viIPFpass--3p; "were afraid/have been made afraid") τούς δ *Τουδαίους Τουδαίος* (d.a. + ap-am-p)for the Jews had already agreed, that if anyone should confess Him to be Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. $\gamma \alpha \rho$ (explan. conj.; gives reason for their fear) of δ Ioubaioi Ioubaioi (d.a. + ap-nmp) $\eta \delta \eta$ (adv; "already/by this time") $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \sigma \sigma \nu \tau \iota \theta \eta \mu \iota$ (viPluPFm--3p; "had agreed/came to a mutual understanding amongst themselves/resolved/ determined"; used *ίνα* (purpose conj.; "in order that") $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\nu$ (part. intro. 3rd class cond.; "if") $\tau i \zeta$ 3x δ μολογήση δ μολογέω (vsaa--3s; "should or might (ind. pro./nm-s; "anyone") confess/acknowledge/agree with"; same as 1:20) $\alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \dot{\upsilon} \nu \alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \dot{\upsilon} \zeta$ (npam3s) to be - supplied Χριστόν, Χριστός (n-am-s; "a Christ") γένηται. γίνομαι (vsad--3s; "he should become") $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\sigma\nu\nu\dot{\alpha}\gamma\omega\gamma\sigma\zeta$ (a--nm-s; compound adj. " $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\sigma}$ - away from" and " $\sigma\nu\nu\alpha\gamma\sigma\gamma\eta$ synagogue"; "put out of the synagogue/to be excluded/excommunicated"; to be separated from the religious life of Israel; used 3x, all in John, cp. 12:42; 16:2; there were 3 kinds of excommunication, 30 days, for 30 more and indefinitely)

GNT John 9:23 διὰ τοῦτο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπαν ὅτι ἡΗλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσατε.

NAS John 9:23 For this reason his parents said, "He is of age; ask him." $\delta\iota\dot{\alpha}$ (pa +) $\tau o\hat{\upsilon} \tau o$ $o\dot{\upsilon} \tau o \zeta$ (near dem. pro./an-s; "For this reason/because of this") $\alpha\dot{\upsilon} \tau o\hat{\upsilon} \alpha\dot{\upsilon} \tau \dot{\sigma} \zeta$ (npgm3s) où $\dot{\delta}$ $\gamma o \nu \epsilon \hat{\iota} \zeta$ (d.a. + n-nm-p; "parents") $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \pi \alpha \nu \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3p) $\check{\delta} \tau \iota$ (intro. ind. disc.; not translated) $\check{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota$, $\check{\epsilon} \chi \omega$ (vipa--3s; "he has") H $\lambda \iota \kappa \iota \alpha \upsilon \eta \lambda \iota \kappa \iota \alpha$ (n-af-s; "adulthood" - "he is of age") $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \eta \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon$. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \dot{\alpha} \omega$ (vImpaa--2p; "ask") $\alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \dot{\delta} \nu \alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \dot{\delta} \zeta$ (npam3s)

ANALYSIS VERSES 18 - 23:

- 1. As John continues the narrative, the shift from identity of the Pharisees to now simply "**The Jews**", cannot be dismissed.
- 2. John uses this term 61x in his gospel and of the majority of uses, it emphasizes Israel corporately under the religious system of Judaism.
- 3. It emphasizes those who at least overtly are the most hostile and antagonistic to Jesus.
- 4. Therefore, it is representative of the predominate legalistic sect of Judaism that Israel corporately adhered too.
- 5. It ties in all of Judaism and its followers as the responsible party corporately leading to the demise of their Messiah.
- 6. This does not mean that of those, some were not +V to the SAJG (Joh.11:45; 12:11).
- 7. But, as a people corporately because of their religious reversionism and failure to separate from it, their religious system under their –V was the underwriter to all that occurred in opposition to **Christ**.
- 8. **The Jews therefore** of vs.18 maintains the division of the Pharisees mentioned in vs.16, while emphasizing the first group, who persist in supporting the current legalistic view of Judaism in antagonism to the truth.
- 9. The presupposition of that group was that Jesus was not from God, because of their legalistic stand on what constituted works on the Sabbath.
- 10. That being the case logically then, they conclude that He could not have performed a miracle by the power of God.
- 11. That they are unwilling to consider the objective reasoning of the second group of Pharisees and obviously have no real argument against them, they take the next course of defense for themselves and declare there was no miracle.
- 12. Their first attempt in promoting their premise is to discredit the testimony of the blind **man** that they **did not believe** *it* **of him, that he had been blind, and had received sight**.
- 13. They reach for a "loophole" flaw in the opposing arguments that they can present as a viable option in this "alleged" miracle.
- 14. Their move smacks of legal wrangling of a defense technique to avoid an inevitable in order to find other avenues to rebuild their case.
- 15. Their "slick Willie" approach is seen in that if some had accused them of prejudice and lack of intellectual honesty, they would have stated that they were merely seeking to get to the truth of the matter.
- 16. However, this move is not one of seeking the truth; rather of seeking to discredit the truth.
- 17. So much for the principle of innocent until proven guilty. Deu.19:15
- 18. The time bought is indeed temporary, as the next order of events would demand to call in the appropriate witnesses in this regard.
- 19. But either way, it was time bought to regroup **until they called the parents of the very one who had received his sight**.
- 20. The inquisitors propose two questions to the man's **parents**, **and questioned them**, **saying**:

A. "Is this your son, who you say was born blind?"

- B. "Then how does he now see?"
- 21. While it is subtle, their questioning betrays their legal methodology.
- 22. Though the first part of their first question may be legitimate, "**Is this your son**", they reveal that it is not a question to really get at the facts as they admittedly proclaim, "**who you say was born blind?**"
- 23. Their question reveals that this is information they have concluded as true and are ready to accept.
- 24. It is the second question that reveals their true intent and motive of questioning as they ask, "**then how does he now see?**"
- 25. It is a question that seeks to transfer the burden of proof of the miracle from the **son**, a hostile witness to the prosecution, to **the parents**.
- 26. Again, it points to the fact that they are not trying to really get at the truth, but are only looking for any avenue possible to put holes in the truth.
- 27. Their intent of questioning **then**, is to find a way of being able to admit the truth that **he** can **now see** without loosing face.
- 28. In addition, they propose a question that if answered in any way agreeing with their **son**, will open them up to all kinds of possible scenarios of continued interrogation and who knows what avenues might open up for these **Jews** then.
- 29. Again, in either case, distraction from their fallacies and the real issue at hand would be effective.
- 30. His parents answered their first question straightforward and honestly and said to them, "We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind".
- 31. They testify that their relationship with the **man** and **his** congenital blindness is indeed who and what the first question inferred.
- 32. The perfect tenses of the verbs "to **know**/οἶδα" in all of the parent's answers has the force of what they are saying is with absolute certainty and nothing but the truth.
- 33. However, the answer to the second question, "**but how he now sees, we do not know**" is less than completely honest.
- 34. They tell on themselves by continuing to answer a question never asked, "or who opened his eyes, we do not know".
- 35. That they volunteer this answer completely without coercion reveals the fact that they do **know** that another person was involved.
- 36. It they would have stuck with the question as to **how** the miracle happened, any further judgments of their words would be withheld.
- 37. However, since they reveal that a "**who**" was involved, then they are not telling all that they do **know**.
- 38. After denial of any knowledge concerning the miracle itself, they immediately shift the focus back in this regard to their **son**, as they insist that **the Jews ask him; he is of age, he shall speak for himself**.
- 39. By Jewish law, a witness had to be at least 13 years old, and this man was obviously beyond those years.
- 40. And before anyone might rationalize the parent's response of "**who opened his eyes**" as being merely information they just heard in passing and therefore questionable as factual, John makes it clear why they lied in vs.22.

- 41. He notes that their act of cowardice and deception was due to sin **fear**, as he records, "**His parents said this because they were afraid of the Jews**".
- 42. And that **the parents** were privy to knowing that Jesus was indeed involved in the miracle is revealed as to why the **fear** existed, "**for the Jews had already agreed**, **that if anyone should confess Him to be Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue**".
- 43. **The Jews had** previously conspired together to kill Jesus and part of their thinking was to place pressure on all **Jews** to conform to their view by renouncing Jesus.
- 44. To **be put out of the synagogue** was to be excommunicated from all religious life of Israel.
- 45. The ramifications were not merely religious, but had political, social, financial, familial, etc., impacts as well.
- 46. In short, one risked everything if they admitted any belief that Jesus was the Messiah.
- 47. It is doubtful that this was binding in all Israel at this point, but was more likely restricted to Jerusalem due to the impact that Jesus' ministry was having there.
- 48. The fact that Jesus is the focal point as reason for excommunication reveals that **the parents** knew beyond a doubt that it was **Him who** performed the miracle.
- 49. Therefore, their denial in this regard in vs.21, was a blatant lie in order to avoid any possible incrimination upon themselves.
- 50. To what degree if any, **the parents** personally had in believing that Jesus was indeed Messiah is unknown, however they were sufficiently intimidated that they wanted no part of discussing His Person in front of these religious zealots.
- 51. Therefore, they took the first opportunity they could to get out of the hot seat and put that monkey back on their son's shoulders as John states in vs.23, "For this reason his parents said, 'He is of age; ask him'".
- 52. It is clear that they are of very weak character and do not rise to any level of integrity and ethical grit portrayed in their **son**, as it will be revealed.
- 53. They represent those in life who have their eyes on men and not on God and therefore are easily intimidated by others and have no real courage to present the truth, when opportunity is provided.
- 54. These **parents** would not risk the ostracism **of the synagogue**, even to defend their own **son**.
- 55. They were predetermined not to get involved in the controversy and so left their **son** alone to fend for himself.
- 56. They are of the ilk of this world whose only concerns are for themselves and will let even the closest to them "hang out to dry" for their own protection.
- 57. Obviously, the Jew's strategy backfires, since all that **the parents** have confirmed is that this **is** their **son** and that **he was born blind**.

EXEGESIS VERSES 24 - 27:

GNT John 9:24 Ἐφώνησαν οὖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ δευτέρου ὃς ἦν τυφλὸς καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Δὸς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ· ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὖτος ἑ ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν.

NAS John 9:24 So a second time they called the man who had been blind, and said to him, $o\dot{v}v$ (infer. conj.; "So/therefore") $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa$ (pAbl +) $\delta\epsilon v \tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho o v$ $\delta\epsilon \dot{v} \tau \epsilon \rho o \zeta$ (ord. adj./gn-s; used adverbially; "from a second time/from a succession of times that the blind man formally took the stand") $E\phi \omega v \eta \sigma a v \phi \omega v \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ (viaa--3p; "they called") $\tau \dot{o}v$ \dot{o} $\ddot{a}v \theta \rho \omega \pi o v ~\ddot{a}v \theta \rho \omega \pi o \zeta$ (d.a. + n-am-s) $\delta\zeta$ (rel. pro./nm-s; "who") $\eta v \epsilon \dot{\iota} \mu \dot{\iota}$ (viIPFa--3s; "had been/was continually in the past") $\tau v \phi \lambda \dot{o} \zeta$ (a--nm-s) $\kappa \alpha \dot{\iota}$ (cc) $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \pi \alpha v \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3p) $\alpha \dot{v} \tau \dot{\phi}$, $\alpha \dot{v} \tau \dot{o} \zeta$ (npdm3s) "Give glory to God; we know that this man is a sinner." $\Delta \dot{o} \zeta ~\delta \dot{\iota} \omega \mu \iota$ (vImp/aa--2s; "You give") $\delta \dot{o} \xi \alpha v ~\delta \dot{\delta} \xi \alpha$ (n-af-s; "glory/praise") $\tau \dot{\omega} \dot{o} ~\theta \epsilon \dot{\phi} \cdot ~\theta \epsilon \dot{o} \zeta$ (n-dm-s) $\eta \mu \epsilon \hat{\iota} \zeta ~\epsilon \gamma \omega$ (npn-1p; "we ourselves") $o \dot{\iota} \delta \alpha \mu \epsilon v ~o \dot{\iota} \delta \alpha$ (viPFa--1p; "know without a doubt") $\delta \tau \iota$ (conj. intro. ind. disc.) $o \dot{v} \tau o \zeta$ (near dem. pro./nm-s; "this one") $\dot{o} ~\ddot{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o \zeta$ (d.a. + n-nm-s; "the man") $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota v$. $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \mu \dot{\iota}$ (vipa--3s) $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda \dot{o} \zeta$ $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda \dot{o} \zeta$ (a--nm-s)

GNT John 9:25 ἀπεκρίθη οὖν ἐκεῖνος, Εἰ ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν οὐκ οἶδα· ε̈ν οἶδα ὅτι τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω.

NAS John 9:25 He therefore answered, "Whether He is a sinner, I do not know; $o\tilde{v}v$ (infer. conj.) $d\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho(\theta\eta \ d\pi\sigma\kappa\rho(\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota)$ (viad--3s) $E\ell \ \epsilon\ell$ (part.; intro. 1st class cond.; "Whether/If"; assuming the statement as true) $\ell\kappa\epsilon\ell\nu\sigma\zeta$, (remote dem. pro./nm-s; "He/that One") $\ell\sigma\tau\iota\nu \ \epsilon\ell\mu\ell$ (vipa--3s) $d\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\delta\zeta$ (a--nm-s) $o\ell\kappa \ o\ell$ (neg. +) $o\ell\delta\alpha$. (viPFa--1s; "I do not know") **one thing I do know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see.**" $\ell\nu \ \epsilon\ell\zeta$ (card. adj./an-s; "one thing") $o\ell\delta\alpha$ (viPFa--1s) $\delta\tau\iota$ (conj. intro. ind. disc.) $d\nu \ \epsilon\ell\mu\ell$ (circ. ptc./p/a/nm1s; its action is concessive to or antecedent to the main verb; "while being previously/whereas I was") $\tau\nu\phi\lambda\delta\zeta$ (a--nm-s) $d\rho\tau\iota$ (adv.; "now/at this moment") $\beta\lambda\ell\pi\omega$. (vipa--1s; "I see")

GNT John 9:26 εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, Τί ἐποίησέν σοι; πῶς ἤνοιξέν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;

NAS John 9:26 They said therefore to him, "What did He do to you? How did He open your eyes?" $\epsilon i \pi \sigma \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3p) $o v \dot{\nu}$ (infer. conj.) $\alpha v \tau \dot{\omega}$, $\alpha v \tau \dot{\sigma}$ (npdm3s) Tí $\tau i \zeta$ (interr. pro./an-s; "What?") $\epsilon \pi \sigma i \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \pi \sigma i \epsilon \omega$ (viaa--3s) $\sigma \sigma i$; σv (npd-2s) $\pi \omega \zeta$ (interr. adv.; "How?") $\eta \nu \sigma i \xi \epsilon \nu \alpha \nu \sigma i \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3s; "cause to open") $\sigma \sigma v \sigma v$ (npg-2s) $\tau \sigma v \zeta \delta \delta \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \delta \zeta$; $\delta \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \delta \zeta$ (d.a. + n-am-p; "the eyes")

GNT John 9:27 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, Εἶπον ὑμῖν ἤδη καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσατε· τί πάλιν θέλετε ἀκούειν; μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ γενέσθαι;

NAS John 9:27 He answered them, "I told you already, and you did not listen; $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho(i\theta\eta\ \dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\kappa\rho(i\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota\ (viad--3s)\ \alpha\dot{v}\tauo\hat{c},\ \alpha\dot{v}\tauo\hat{c}\ (npdm3p)\ E^{i}\pi\sigma\nu\ \lambda\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ (viaa--1s; "I told")\ \dot{\nu}\mu\hat{\nu}\ \sigma\dot{\nu}\ (npd-2p)\ \ddot{\eta}\delta\eta\ (adv.; "already")\ \kappa\alphai\ (ch)\ o\dot{\nu}\kappa\ o\dot{\nu}\ (neg. +)\ \dot{\eta}\kappao\dot{\nu}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ $\dot{\alpha}\kappao\dot{\nu}\omega\ (viaa--2p; "did not listen/did not hear") why do you want to hear it again?$ $You do not want to become His disciples too, do you?" <math>\tau i\ \tau i \varsigma\ (interr.;\ "Why?)$ $\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omega\ (vipa--2p;\ "do\ you\ want/wish/desire")\ \dot{\alpha}\kappao\dot{\nu}\epsilon\iota\nu;\ \dot{\alpha}\kappao\dot{\nu}\omega\ (comp.\ inf./pa-;\ "to\ hear")\ it\ -\ supplied\ \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu\ (adv.;\ "again")\ \dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\hat{\iota}\varsigma\ \sigma\dot{\nu}\ (npn-2p;\ "You\ yourselves")$ $\mu\dot{\eta}\ (neg.\ +)\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omega\ (vipa--2p\ +)\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota;\ \gamma\iota\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota\ (compl.\ inf./ad-;\ "do\ not\ want\ to\ become")\ \alpha\dot{\nu}\tauo\hat{\nu}\ \alpha\dot{\nu}\tauo\varsigma\ (npgm3s)\ \mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\dot{\alpha}\ \mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\eta\varsigma\ (n-nm-p;\ "disciples/students")\ \kappa\alphai\ (adjunct.;\ "also/too")\ do\ you? -\ supplied$

ANALYSIS VERSES 24 – 27:

- 1. As previously noted, the tactic of the Pharisees in their call of a "foul" regarding the veracity of the **blind** man's claim of an actual miracle occurring fails, and they find themselves back to square one.
- 2. While the testimony of the parents may have lacked in certain ways, it did establish beyond question that this **man had been** born **blind**.
- 3. This placed them into a position of accepting non-disputable physical evidence indicating that a bona fide miracle had occurred, since **the man** could now see.
- 4. All of the facts also indicated that Jesus was the one who had performed this miracle, and the power of **God** was manifested in His life exceedingly.
- 5. The natural conclusion then would be that Jesus was some sort of representative of **God** that should be acknowledged.
- 6. However, this conclusion was totally unacceptable to these religious reversionists.

- 7. Though clearly beaten at their game, these legalistic rulers continue to pursue their agenda and **so a second time they called the man who had been blind**, to the witness stand.
- 8. That they cannot refute the evidence, their interrogation now takes on intimidation tactics under abuse of their authority, "and they said to him, 'Give glory to God; we know that this man is a sinner'".
- 9. The force of their command to give glory to God takes on a dual emphasis:
 - A. Like the command of Joshua 7:19 that has the force of "to tell the complete truth".
 - B. A command to disassociate this miracle from **this man** Jesus, and only attribute it **to God**.
- 10. The first meaning insinuates that they feel there is still some fact that is being hidden from them and if they can just find it, the entire affair will be cleared up.
- 11. The second suggests that Jesus' role in the miracle is really bogus and in spite of His role, **God** apart from Him healed **the man** for whatever reason.
- 12. The force of intimidation and concluding reasoning is seen in the perfect tense of "**we know**" and that what they knew was there was no way anyone could be of **God** and engage in the breaking of their Sabbath laws.
- 13. Their statement is tantamount to saying, "Certainly, we of all people, the religious leadership of Israel, **know** the law and have insight into such matters as this, and will not be taken in by a subordinate.
- 14. They knew that Jesus was **a sinner** and therefore the man's explanation of the miracle isn't for real and thus, "What are you hiding?"
- 15. However, again their strategy fails and far from intimidating **the man**, the pressures only cause him to further clarify what he indeed does **know**.
- 16. He refrains from moving into the realm of what they profess to **know** and merely confines himself to the facts as **He therefore answered**, "Whether He is a sinner, I do not know; one thing I do know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see".
- 17. Via intellectual honesty, he is unwilling to pass judgment of Jesus, as they are doing, and sticks to the real issue at hand that **whereas I was blind, now I see**.
- 18. His physical testimony has become the spiritual testimony of many throughout the ages.
- 19. And, like **the blind man** and his detractors, the same situation spiritually has played itself out innumerable times.
- 20. Observation: No matter at what stage of growth you are at spiritually, by maintaining intellectual honesty and sticking with the facts of BD, you too will have a clear read when confronted by those seeking to disparage your witness.
- 21. Obviously his answer leads the Pharisees to nowhere and **they said therefore to him**, **"What did He do to you? How did He open your eyes?"**
- 22. The force of the man's honesty is such that the Pharisees are again "backpedaling" and really are back to square one, asking him the same questions as during the initial questioning.
- 23. It is another "legal" effort by them to cast doubt upon the veracity of his initial answers, while seeking to find any discrepancies with the man's statements in order to save face.

- 24. The questioning now is not acceptable to **the man**, who now demonstrates that he has little fear of these men, if any, as **he answered them**, "I told you already, and you did not listen".
- 25. He knows that they have heard the facts of this case and readily understand the issues involved.
- 26. There is nothing to be gained by going over the same old ground again.
- 27. He knows that they have no intention on investigating the incident in an honest way.
- 28. They are simple intent on discrediting the truth and proving their preconceived ideas.
- 29. Again, the Pharisees point to the nature of -V in religious reversionism and that is even though they hear the truth, they will not listen openly and objectively to it.
- 30. It is the mindset of religious reversionists to promote their religious agendas come "hell or high water" and seek to discredit any contradicting views with extreme prejudice.
- 31. This is in contrast to intellectually honest adjusted believers that are always open to objective criticism that is based on factual evidence of BD.
- 32. In vs.27b, the man engages in a little sarcasm as he asks his own questions, "why do you want to hear *it* again? You do not want to become His disciples too, do you?"
- 33. He twits them by submitting his own hypothesis that he knows will surely get under their skin, maybe because they were beginning to irritate him with their incessant stupidity and stubbornness.
- 34. And before we judge him as being disrespectful to his authorities, it must be made clear that his authorities have already set the ground rules of interchange and questioning, which he is now following suit.
- 35. Some observations to be gleaned from this scenario:
 - A. As an authority, how you deal with people must project clear guidelines and boundaries of objectiveness and fairness.
 - B. To do otherwise, you open yourself to rebuttals projecting a like judgment upon yourself for your own refraction's/STA twists or bends.
 - C. For an authority to insist that all must adhere to their point of views, no matter whether the authority refuses to accept the facts and deal with others in less than an objective and honest/righteous way (Joh.7:27), in essence is tantamount to a dictatorial rule and gross abuse of authority.
 - D. This does not mean that those under these types of authority are not obligated to continue to submit to their authority, only that they have a right to appeal to a higher authority (here, an appeal to the truth of the facts), in their own defense.
 - E. This points to the principle that truth should always stand as the final authority in all aspects of life and for the adjusted believer that truth is the entire realm of BD.
 - F. If as an authority, you are arrogant, condescending, subjective, or abusive in other areas in dealing with others, then you set precedence to those under your authority as to their response.
 - G. Righteous authorities deal with others strictly within the boundaries and guidelines of BD, while applying objectiveness in their discerning of the facts.
- 36. And the return judgment to the Pharisees is seen in that the man's hypothetical opinionated questions are in reality, just as ludicrous as the Pharisee's have been in their approach to him.

- 37. Truly the universal principle is accurate in what goes around comes around and what one sows, so shall one reap in their applications or misapplications. Cp. Pro.22:8; Gal.6:7
- 38. The force of his questions is rhetorical and expects a "no" answer.
- 39. His first question denotes that he understands the motive of their questioning is not really because they **want to hear** *it* **again**, but for ulterior reasons.
- 40. His second question, in addition, denotes that he knows they are not interested in attaching themselves to Jesus' cause, either.
- 41. He basically uses "fire" to fight "fire" in such a way that when combined, his questions relate to the Pharisees that he clearly sees through their agenda of discrediting the facts and will not be "taken in" by their tactics.
- 42. He reads their intellectually dishonest approach like a book.
- 43. In addition, it has a nuance that he has chosen which side of the case he stands for.
- 44. That **the man** has determined himself to be on Jesus' side is brought out by the word "**too**/also".
- 45. He has in essence declared that he will not be intimidated and back down from the truth just because the Pharisees are who and what they are.
- 46. In contrast to his parents who view these authorities under fear, he represents those that under authority are truly innocent and have no reason to fear. Rom.13:3-4
- 47. This **man** represents the fact that though we may all be under authorities, we are not obligated to submit to their demands or imperatives that in effect will compromise the truth.
- 48. Obviously, the man's approach of shoveling the same "σκύβαλα/skubala/dung" down their throats as they have been attempting to do to him, does not set well with them, giving them terrible STA gas, which will erupt into immediate spiritual flatulence in vs.28.

EXEGESIS VERSES 28 - 29:

GNT John 9:28 καὶ ἐλοιδόρησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπον, Σὺ μαθητὴς εἶ ἐκείνου, ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐσμὲν μαθηταί·

NAS John 9:28 And they reviled him, and said, "You are His disciple, but we are disciples of Moses. $\kappa\alpha i$ (ch) $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda o\iota\delta o\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ $\lambda o\iota\delta o\rho\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ (viaa--3p; "they reviled/reproached/hurled abusive and derogatory insults/railed upon"; used 4x) $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\dot{\upsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\dot{\upsilon}\zeta$ (npam3s) $\kappa\alpha i$ (cc) $\epsilon i\pi\sigma\nu$, $\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ (viaa--3p) $\Sigma\dot{\upsilon}$ $\sigma\dot{\upsilon}$ (npn-2s) $\epsilon i\epsilon i\mu i$ (vipa--2s) $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon i\nu\sigma\upsilon$, $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon i\nu\sigma\varsigma$ (apdgm-s; "His/that man's") $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ (n-nm-s; "disciple"; actually the subject of the verb for emphasis) $\delta\epsilon$ (ch) $\eta\mu\epsilon i\zeta \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ (npn-1p) $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu \epsilon i\mu i$ (vipa--1p) $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha i\cdot \mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ (n-nm-p) $\tau\sigma\hat{\upsilon}$ δ $M\omega\ddot{\upsilon}\sigma\dot{\epsilon}\omega\zeta$ $M\omega\ddot{\upsilon}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ (d.a. + n-gm-s)

GNT John 9:29 ήμεις οἴδαμεν ὅτι Μωϋσει λελάληκεν ὁ θεός, τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἴδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν.

NAS John 9:29 "We know that God has spoken to Moses; but as for this man, we do not know where He is from." $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\hat{\iota}\zeta \ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ (npn-1p) $o\'\ell\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu \ o\'\ell\delta\alpha$ (viPFa--1p; PF indicates fact still on record in the OT) $\delta\tau\iota(cc; indir. disc.)$ $\delta \ \theta\epsilon\delta\zeta$, (d.a. + n-nm-s) $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\dot{\alpha}\lambda\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu \ \lambda\alpha\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ (viPFa--3s; "has spoken/communicated to") $M\omega\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\hat{\iota} \ M\omega\upsilon\sigma\hat{\eta}\zeta$ (ndm-s) $\delta\epsilon$ (cc/ch) $\tau o\upsilon\tau o\nu \ o\upsilon\tau o\zeta$ (near dem. pro./am-s; emphatic position; "as for this fellow/man") $o\'\kappa \ o\'$ (neg. +) $o\'\ell\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu \ o\'\ell\delta\alpha$ (viPFa--1p) $\pi\delta\theta\epsilon\nu$ (adv. of origin/used adjectivally; "from where or what place/what condition or origin") $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\ell\nu. \ \epsilon\dot{\iota}\mu\ell$ (vipa--3s)

ANALYSIS VERSES 28 - 29:

- 1. As graphic and inevitable as "Scotty" would picture the situation, "I can't hold it any longer Captain, she's goin' a blow", the certain frustration and anger of the Pharisees now expresses itself, "And they reviled him".
- 2. The term, "**reviled**" has the nuance of casting a barrage/salvo of verbal abuses that are totally derogatory, insulting and defaming in nature.
- 3. It would be commensurate of slamming the character of individuals through the use of idiomatic language designed to express a repugnant or vile quality seen as inherent in the person or thing.
- 4. It has the force of verbal retribution in a most demeaning and hostile way.

- 5. It appears that the man's comment in vs.27, definitely had gotten under their skin and as the Jews saw that **they** could not effectively advance their tactics, resort to outright verbal anger in release of their frustrations.
- 6. **They know** at this point that **they** were not going to resolve this in a manner that would make them happy and discredit Jesus, which is what **they** are seeking to do.
- 7. That they cannot discredit the man's testimony nor the parents forces all concerned to come to the conclusion that a bonafide miracle has taken place in the hands of Jesus.
- 8. And that the blind man has seen through their agenda and verbally has challenged them to acknowledge Jesus in this fashion has totally kicked their "skunk".
- 9. However, even with the truth forced upon them, it does not produce any acknowledgment on their part and **they** continue to reject and fight against its very premise.
- 10. It is clear also that the man's challenge came across that he was divided from them as to which side of the case he would stand as the Jews said, "You are His disciple, but we are disciples of Moses".
- 11. That **they** continue to reject any Divine expression on Jesus' part is noted as **they** contemptuously refer to Him as "that man/one", with the demonstrative pronoun, "ἐκεἶνος/**His**", in vs.28.
- 12. Their tone reflects that only an idiot would attached himself to someone that mainline religion rejects as an emissary from **God**, giving the readers a taste of the focus of their reviling.
- 13. And as is the habit of the Jews when forced to account for their reasoning and logic theologically, **they** claim allegiance to their racial human predecessors considered great by all, this time **Moses**.
- 14. Their sense of being Moses' **disciples** contextually has emphasis as it pertains to his giving of the Law to Israel.
- 15. **They** view their current positions of being Pharisees as a direct authoritative inheritance of the Mosaic Law through the lines as established by **Moses**.
- 16. **God** imparted the Law to **Moses**, who in turn imparted to Joshua, who in turn to the elders and judges, in turn to the prophets and ultimately delivered to the great men of the synagogue, according to Jewish writings. Deu.34:9-10; Jos.1:7-9, 23:2,6; 24:1,25-28; 2Kgs.17:13
- 17. Therefore, **they** view themselves as not only descendants of **Moses**, but spokesmen and experts on the Law given by **God to Moses**.
- 18. This is the force of vs.29a, "We know that God has spoken to Moses", while implying "and therefore us".
- 19. The perfect tense of "**has spoken**" denotes that the certainty of their stand in this regard lies in the very Scriptures that have recorded this fact.
- 20. While this premise is indeed correct, their fallacy lies in the fact that simply because **they** are custodians of the Law, in and of itself does not mean they have GAP'd the Law.
- 21. But via their subjective arrogance, **they** consider their approach and interpretations of the Law as perfect as **God** and **Moses** speaking themselves.
- 22. Hence, **they** ought to know if the Sabbath law has been broken and that Jesus is a heretic.

- 23. The irony is that **they** place their confidence in themselves and their authoritative positions, not on **God** and what He actually was communicating to **Moses**.
- 24. Their tone is one of complete certainty and they lack no confidence in their position as Moses' **disciples**.
- 25. And in contrast as to how **they** truly view themselves as such experts of the Law and their "bestowed" religious authoritative positions, it is no wonder **they** reject anyone, who contradicts their beliefs as **they** continue, "**but as for this man, we do not know** where He is from".
- 26. Because Jesus did not fit within their legalistic clique and was constantly opposing their religious and authoritative views, **they** consider Him as a complete spiritual reprobate from an unknown origin.
- 27. This statement by implication is a slam against Jesus that questions His racial and spiritual heritage regarding Him as less than a true Jew. Cp. Joh.8:48
- 28. However, another irony is seen in that **they** have unwittingly again spoken truth because Jesus had already informed them that **they** were ignorant of His true origin and destiny. Joh.8:14
- 29. Because of their –V in unbelief, **they** not only have arrogantly subverted the Law, **they** are blind to the fact that Jesus was given by **God** to fulfill the Law, an irony not lost on our author that recognized that *the Law was given through Moses; grace and truth were realized through Jesus Christ.* Joh.1:17
- 30. Vs.29 is a feeble attempt to arrogantly exalt their authoritative positions and views before the man while claiming that via their expertise in understanding of Scripture, **they** are ignorant of any like authority being bestowed upon Jesus.
- 31. But the reality is, and again another irony, the true ignorance is of themselves, not on the Scriptures or Jesus.
- 32. And again, the perfect tenses of the verbs "**know**" states that they are confident in their ignorance.
- 33. And in their arrogant admission of ignorance in their appeal to the Scripture is their "Achilles heel" the blind man cuts, as he proceeds to win the debate in vs.30ff.

EXEGESIS VERSES 30 - 34:

GNT John 9:30 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐν τούτῷ γὰρ τὸ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε πόθεν ἐστίν, καὶ ἤνοιξέν μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς.

GNT John 9:31 οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει, ἀλλ' ἐάν τις θεοσεβὴς ἢ καὶ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιῇ τούτου ἀκούει.

NAS John 9:31 "We know that God does not hear sinners; $\delta \delta \delta \alpha (viPFa-1p)$ $\delta \tau \iota$ (ch; explains what is known) $\delta \theta \epsilon \delta \varsigma$ (d.a. + n-nm-s) $\delta \delta \kappa$ od (neg. +) $\delta \kappa \delta \delta \epsilon \iota$, $\delta \kappa \delta \delta \omega$ (vipa--3s) $\delta \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda \delta \nu$ $\delta \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda \delta \varsigma$ (adj.-gm-p; "sinners") but if anyone is God-fearing, and does His will, He hears him. $\delta \lambda \lambda' \delta \lambda \delta \delta$ (strong adversative) $\delta \delta \omega \nu$ (cs; intro. 3rd class cond.) $\tau \delta \varsigma$ (indef. pro./nm-s; "anyone) $\eta \delta \epsilon \delta \rho \omega \delta \varsigma$; "might be") $\theta \epsilon \delta \sigma \epsilon \beta \eta \varsigma$ (a--nm-s; "God-fearing/God worshipping"; compound from $\theta \epsilon \delta \varsigma \varsigma$ - God and $\sigma \epsilon \beta \delta \mu \alpha \iota$ - to worship/revere; hapax) $\kappa \alpha \iota$ (cc) $\pi \delta \iota \eta \tau \delta \omega$ (vspa--3s; "does/might do") $\alpha \delta \tau \delta \varsigma$ (npgm3s; ref. God) $\tau \delta \delta \delta \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ (d.a. + n-an-s; "will") $\delta \kappa \delta \delta \epsilon \iota$. $\delta \kappa \delta \delta \omega$ (vipa--3s) $\tau \delta \delta \tau \delta \varsigma$ (near dem. pro./gm-s; "him/this one")

GNT John 9:32 ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσθη ὅτι ἠνέωξέν τις ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλοῦ γεγεννημένου.

NAS John 9:32 "Since the beginning of time it has never been heard that anyone opened the eyes of a person born blind. $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa$ (pAbl) $\tau o\hat{v}$ δ $\alpha i\hat{\omega}\nu o\zeta \alpha i\dot{\omega}\nu$ (d.a. + ngm-s; "From the age/Since the beginning of time") $o\dot{v}\kappa$ $o\dot{v}$ (neg. +) $\eta\kappa o\dot{v}\sigma\theta\eta$ $\dot{\alpha}\kappa o\dot{v}\omega$ (viap--3s; "it has not been heard") $\delta\tau\iota$ (cc. intro. indir. disc.) $\tau i\zeta$ (indef. pro./nm-s; "anyone") $\eta\nu\dot{\epsilon}\omega\xi\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\dot{\alpha}\nu oi\gamma\omega$ (viaa--3s; "opened") $\dot{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu o\dot{v}\zeta$ $\dot{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu o\dot{\zeta}$ (n-am-p; "eyes") $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nuov$ · $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\dot{\alpha}\omega$ (circ. ptc./PF/p/gm-s; "of one having been born/having been brought forth") $\tau v\phi\lambda o\hat{v}$ $\tau v\phi\lambda \dot{\zeta}$ (adj.-gm-s; "blind")

GNT John 9:33 εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν.

NAS John 9:33 "If this man were not from God, He could do nothing." ϵi (part. intro. 2nd class condition) $o \hat{v} \tau o \zeta$ (near dem. pro./nm-s) $\mu \eta'$ (neg. +) $\eta' \nu \epsilon i \mu i$ (viIPFa--3s; "were not"; 2nd class assumes this is not true, hence He is) $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha'$ (pg) $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$ (n-gm-s) $o \dot{v} \kappa o \dot{v}$ (neg. +) $\eta' \delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \tau o \delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \mu \alpha i$ (viIPFd--3s; "he would not be able") $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu \pi o \iota \epsilon \omega$ (compl. inf./pa-; "to do") $o \dot{v} \delta \epsilon \dot{\iota} \zeta$ (card. adj./an-s; "nothing/not one thing")

GNT John 9:34 ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Ἐν ἁμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὅλος καὶ σὺ διδάσκεις ἡμᾶς; καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω.

NAS John 9:34 They answered and said to him, "You were born entirely in sins, $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho(\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\kappa\rho(\nu\sigma\mu\alpha\iota\ (viad--3p; ref. the Pharisees)\ \kappa\alphai\ (cc)\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\alpha\nu\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\ (viaa--3p)\ \alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\dot{\phi},\ \alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\dot{\phi}(\ (npdm3s)\ \sigma\dot{\upsilon}\ (npn-2s; "You\ yourself")\ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\theta\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\dot{\alpha}\omega\ (viap--2s;$ $"were born")\ \check{\sigma}\lambda\sigma\varsigma\ (adj.--nm-s; "entirely/wholly")\ Ev\ \dot{\epsilon}\nu\ (pL)\ \dot{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau(\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \dot{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau(\alpha\ (n-Lf-p)\ and\ are\ you\ teaching\ us?" And\ they\ put\ him\ out.\ \kappa\alphai\ (cc;\ adversative\ sense;\ "yet/and")\ \sigma\dot{\upsilon}\ (npn-2s)\ \delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\omega\ (vipa--2s;\ "are\ teaching")\ \dot{\eta}\mu\hat{\alpha}\varsigma;$ $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ (npa-1p)\ \kappa\alphai\ (ch)\ \dot{\epsilon}\xi\dot{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\lambda\sigma\nu\ \dot{\epsilon}\kappa\beta\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\ (viaa--3p;\ "to\ cast\ out/put\ out/throw\ out/expelled")\ \alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\dot{\circ}\gamma\ (npam3s)\ \check{\epsilon}\xi\omega.\ (adv.;\ "outside/without")$

ANALYSIS VERSES 30 - 34:

- 1. For the reader to have a full appreciation of vss.30-33, a recap of the scenario at hand must be kept in focus:
 - A. **The man** in view is still an unbeliever at this point.
 - B. He is the recipient of "the works of **God**", to reveal the impact those works can have in a person who is potentially +V. Joh.9:4 cp. vs.35-38
 - C. Therefore, the entire scenario is designed to show the process of thinking involved in +V through the exercise of intellectual honesty, objectivity and logic in their evaluation of circumstances in life.
 - D. He is left to defend for himself in the face of those who will not accept the facts of the miracle, to include the highest religious authorities of Israel.
 - E. He has not allowed himself to stray from the facts at hand.
 - F. He has had opportunity to hear arguments concerning himself, the miracle and Jesus from those who reject the facts as opposed to those who accept the facts.
 - G. Of those who continued to reject the facts, he has had opportunity to observe their approach to the situation to include:
 - 1) Their premise of belief as grounds for their denial. 9:16a
 - 2) Their attack upon his own integrity. 9:18a
 - 3) His integrity vindicated. 9:18b-20
 - 4) How they utilized the opportunity of his abandonment by his parents to engage in intimidation tactics in his isolation. 9:22-24
 - 5) The necessity for them to "backpedal" in the pursuit of maintaining their initial premise. 9:26
 - 6) Their unbridled verbal abuse in reaction to his unveiling their dishonest approach to the facts. 9:28a
 - 7) Their demanding attitudes for him to comply with their way of thinking simply based on their positions of authority implying that they are right even in light of contradictory evidence. 9:28b
 - 8) Their final point of argument that by omission of facts, the truth is really revealed.
- 2. It now becomes totally apparent, if not before, that **the man** has come to completely opposite conclusions than his inquisitors.
- 3. Though he is still an unbeliever, his intellectual honesty and common sense reasoning has not been shut down.
- 4. By being confronted with those who oppose the truth, he has been given opportunity to evaluate the truth of light, to the darkness they have promoted.
- 5. Because he has approached what has happened to him in an unbiased and unprejudiced way, he is able to see clearly all of the discrepancies and contradictions inherent in the opposition.
- 6. He now succinctly puts together the facts as presented in the preceding interchanges into a perfect logical conclusion.
- 7. He begins by cutting down the opposition to their knees in addressing the very core problem inherent in their argument.

- 8. And that is their admission of ignorance in their appeal to their authoritative positions as he **answered and said to them**, "Well, here is an amazing thing, that you do not know where He is from".
- 9. The force of the phrase, "**Well, here is an amazing thing**" denotes that what he has to say is a line of thinking based on a logical deduction of what has been previously presented.
- 10. The sarcasm of his statement is laced with innuendoes to include:
 - A. His statement is in light of the Jew's claim as experts and authorities of the facts of Scripture and the religious life of Israel.
 - B. Just as they have set themselves up to be extraordinary/**amazing** before **God** and men as religious leaders and experts in evaluating things, isn't it extraordinarily remarkable that they have done no further investigating into the origin of Jesus, who they claim is a fraud.
 - C. For someone who has created so much controversy between even the religious leaders of Judaism, isn't it unbelievable that no one knows **from where He** hails.
 - D. It is in light of their insistence that he is ignorant, yet so are they, as they too are lacking in knowledge.
 - E. Their claim smacks of trying to hide something and not really reporting all that they do **know**; the same accusations they implied of him. Cp. Joh.7:52 (*Reflects the inconsistency/deceit in the arguments of reversionists.*)
 - F. It implies that their ignorance is due to simply rejection/dismissing or omission of facts, not that the facts are not readily available.
 - G. It has the force of intimidation returned upon them, based on the very authority of which they stood as religious experts that they tried to use to intimidate him. (*He uses their positions as Pharisees and hence religious leaders against them, as they are ignorant to Jesus origin and thus failures as "shepherds" of Israel.*)
- 11. Needless to say, **the man** finds their ignorance regarding Jesus to be something totally remarkable.
- 12. However, the real satisfaction to the readers comes in vss.31-33, where **the man** whom they claim as ignorant, abases totally all of the high and mighty appearances and forces that these Jews have tried to pass off as being.
- 13. He does so by recapping the very basis of opposing arguments as presented by the two groups of Pharisees themselves in vs.16:
 - A. "We know that God does not hear sinners".
 - B. In stark contrast to that fact, "but if anyone is God-fearing, and does His will, He hears him".
- 14. He effectively articulates and summarizes the very "intent" of what the arguments were meant to present.
- 15. He has correctly ascertained as an astute observer of the debate that **God** does not aid anyone opposed to Him, **but** does respond to all that pay Him His due respect.
- 16. **The man** changes the second person of "**you do not know**" in vs.30 to the first person of "**We know**" in vs.31 to emphasize that no matter who of the crowd may reject any truth based on its omission of or ignorance, none present (including himself) can disregard the premise of opposing arguments as clearly presented earlier.

- 17. Therefore, the simple fact is that on the negative side, anyone opposed to **God**, any request placed before Him falls on deaf ears and on the positive side, those who are **God-fearing and does His will**, He hears their prayers.
- 18. These two principles are true and are confirmed by both the Old and New Testaments. Psa.4:3; 17:1; 34:17; Pro.15:8,29; 1Joh.5:14-15
- 19. With these two facts stipulated and clearly defined, it clears the air regarding any superfluous or complicating speculations regarding the miracle and Jesus and puts it all under a clear and straightforward form of evaluation.
- 20. As all would have to agree, not only on the basic premise of argument, but that **God** is ultimately behind the miracle (including the opposition, vs.24b; *Give glory to God*), the one and only fact needing consideration is Jesus' participation.
- 21. In other words, apart from everything else, since **God** must provide the power to heal him, logically and according to their theology, Jesus would have to make request.
- 22. Therefore, on what side of the coin Jesus falls on, sinner or **God-fearing**, would be determined by God's answer.
- 23. And it is vs.32 that reveals the magnitude of God's answer as **the man** states, "Since **the beginning of time it has never been heard that anyone opened the eyes of a person born blind**".
- 24. The proof is "in the pudding", as the very nature of this miracle rules out human means and must have only been accomplished by **God** Himself.
- 25. The Jews would have been very well aware that there was no recorded history on anyone born congenitally blind having ever been given the gift of sight.
- 26. And since it is accepted that Jesus initiated the acts and indeed is involved in the miracle, only one logical and rational conclusion can be ascertained and that is, "If this man were not from God, He could do nothing".
- 27. The second class condition of "**If this man were not from God**" automatically assumes this premise as false, otherwise, **He** literally could **not** initiate with success all of the miracles of His ministry, let alone especially this one.
- 28. His statement is of the full realization and logical deduction that ipso facto, God obviously hears Jesus' request and therefore must of necessity fall under the category of God-fearing and doing His will.
- 29. There is no other logical and honest explanation.
- 30. With all of the sophisticated rhetoric and tactics employed by the Pharisees, it is the simple logic of an openly honest poor ex-blind beggar that slices through the garbage of debate and reveals the true analysis and answer to the situation.
- 31. And he does so by weighing the evidence of the very theology the Pharisees are espousing.
- 32. Though he may not yet recognize Jesus as **God**, (prep. para along side vs. ek from the source of), there is no doubt in His mind that **God** is behind all that Jesus **does**.
- 33. **The man** represents the methodology of all potential +V that when confronted with the truth and facts, though that exposure may be countered by others false views, they will see through it and come to the correct conclusions.
- 34. Contextually, he serves to represent the minority of Israel, unlike the subjective Pharisees in view and hostile and subjective Jews of chapter 8, who were intellectually honest and objective in their thinking making the correct decisions regarding Christ.

- 35. John uses this **man** as a compliment to the apologetic intent of Chapter 9 that Christ was indeed **God** as He claimed in 8:58.
- 36. He serves to prove that in stark contrast to those such as pictured in 8:59, the evidence of the veracity of Jesus' claims and ministry was extremely obvious, and he is a premier example that those who were –V, were totally without excuse.
- 37. He points to the reality that +V in their seeking will truthfully and honestly evaluate the things they hear and experience and the truth against the backdrop of cosmic views will stand out as the only logically correct conclusions to adhere to.
- 38. It points to the fact that a correct understanding of God's Divine revelation of His Person and works to men stands upon the foundation of veracity/honesty and objective reasoning.
- 39. And all +V have these qualities inherent at least to some degree, in them.
- 40. The more the individual applies these qualities, the more they will "see" the truth of **God**.
- 41. And the more they will "see" through all of the discrepancies, contradictions and intellectual dishonesty inherent in those who are –V and reject the truth.
- 42. The man's reasoning is incontestable.
- 43. Jesus indeed must be some very special representative of **God** and this miracle proves it so.
- 44. He has advanced his thinking thus far from a man named Jesus (vs.11), to at least a prophet (vs.17) to with no shadow of doubt **from God** (vs.33).
- 45. And again ironically, it has been the intense desire of the Pharisees to discredit Jesus and the truth and laughable attempts to force this **man** into their line of thinking that has caused him to reason through the facts and come to these conclusions.
- 46. Oh, to be a mouse in the pocket of the minds of the second group of Pharisees who are reasoning like him, as in their cowardly silence are still probably going "right on brother". (*Speculative point, but not without reasonable merit.*)
- 47. And the man's reasoning ability and honest conclusions of the very theology the –V Jews have espoused further infuriates them.
- 48. That his arguments are airtight gives them no grounds for further debate and again **they** fall back on abusing their authoritative positions to deal with him.
- 49. In so doing, they again expose their condescending and subjectively judgmental natures as they answered and said to him, "You were born entirely in sins, and are you teaching us?"
- 50. Their judgment that he **was born entirely in sins** harks back to the subjective presuppositions of the disciples in vs.2.
- 51. It points to their persons as the religious leaders of Israel, as the responsible parties in **teaching** this ideology.
- 52. The adjective "**entirely**/wholly" infers a "doubly whammy" of guilt upon **the man** indicating that both he and his parents are cursed with sin and therefore he is nothing but sin. (*Funny, the irony is they have just proclaimed a true doctrine, but their application is completely evil.*)
- 53. It is an inference that he is an unbeliever of the worst sort and is not therefore qualified to impart any explanations or reasoning involving spiritual matters.
- 54. This is the force of the remainder of the response literally translated; "Yet, **you** yourself **are teaching us?**"

- 55. **They** reflect the narrow-mindedness of religious reversionists not willing to accept the errors of their way and with misplaced loyalty to their agenda resort to condemning all aspects of the individual's character. (*The attitude/inference that those who oppose them are completely screwed up in every facet of their thinking.*)
- 56. These being supposedly the keenest religious minds in Israel at the time, will exercise no tolerance to someone who may come in challenging their doctrinaire stand and prove them wrong.
- 57. **They** reflect a total lack of intellectual honesty.
- 58. And **they** can't swallow the fact that some rank unbeliever has just come in and put them to shame.
- 59. Observation: Certain types of –V religious reversionists would not admit their wrong even if their life depended upon it, which unfortunately it does.
- 60. John then records a natural reaction those of this ilk would take in dealing with anyone that might threaten the validity of their "circle", "**And they put him out**".
- 61. Some have interpreted this to mean that the Jews formally excommunicated him.
- 62. However, John does not use the same word "to be **put out**/ἀποσὐάγωγος/ excommunicated" as in vs.22, but literally says "**they** cast out/threw **out**/ἐκβάλλω **him** outside/ἕξω".
- 63. Literally, the Jews physically forced **the man** to completely leave the premises.
- 64. The Jews functioned as "bouncers" and physically escorted **him** outside the synagogue.
- 65. Whether or not excommunication formally took place after the fact, their actions were sufficient to relay the message that he was not welcome back there again.
- 66. And while many might look at **him** and say, "Poor **man**!"; the reality is that it was God's way of effectuating the necessary logistical separation for **him** to now be free to be introduced to the truth of the gospel. Vss.35ff
- 67. His being cast **out** represents that **God** will provide all of the logistics for those potentially +V, to be delivered from the clutches of religious reversionism/hmvwpt into the hands of the truth.
- 68. Observation: +V will find that they just don't fit in with mainline churches that "lack" in providing the truth.
- 69. God knew exactly what this **man** needed to go through to cause his +V to be "primed" and ready to "jump" on the truth like a "frog on a june-bug".

EXEGESIS VERSES 35 - 38:

GNT John 9:35 "Ηκουσεν Ίησοῦς ὅτι ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω καὶ εὑρών αὐτὸν εἶπεν, Σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;

NAS John 9:35 Jesus heard that they had put him out; $i\eta\sigma\sigma\hat{\nu}\zeta$ (*n*-*nm*-*s*) *"H*κουσεν *ἀκούω* (*viaa*--3*s*) *ὅτι* (*cc*; *indir. disc.*) *ἐξέβαλον ἐκβάλλω* (*viaa*--3*p*; "*they cast out/put out/ejected*") *αὐτὸν αὐτός* (*npam3s*) *ἕξω* (*adv.*; "*outside*") **and finding him, He said, "Do you believe in the Son of Man? "** *καί* (*cc*) εύρών εύρίσκω (*circ. ptc./a/a/nm*-s; "*after finding/having found*") *αὐτὸν αὐτός* (*npam3s*) *εἶπεν, λέγω* (*viaa*--3*s*) Σὐ σύ (*npn*-2*s*) *πιστεύεις πιστεύω* (*vipa*--2*s*) *εἰς* (*pa*; "*into*") *τὸν* ὁ υἱὸν υἱός (*d.a.* + *n*-am*s*) τοῦ ὁ *ἀνθρώπου; ἄνθρωπος* (*d.a.* + *n*-gm-s)

GNT John 9:36 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν, Καὶ τίς ἐστιν, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν;

NAS John 9:36 He answered and said, "And who is He, Lord, that I may believe in Him?" $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu\rho\varsigma$ (remote dem. pro./pnm-s; "That one") $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho\ell\theta\eta \ \dot{\alpha}\pi\rho\kappa\rho\ell\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ (viad--3s) $\kappa\alpha\ell$ (cc) $\epsilon\hat{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$, $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega$ (viaa--3s) $K\alpha\ell$ $\kappa\alpha\ell$ (cc) $\tau\ell\varsigma$ (interr. pro./nm-s; "who?") $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\mu\ell$ (vipa--3s; "is He") $\kappa\ell\rho\iota\epsilon$, $\kappa\ell\rho\iota\rho\varsigma$ (n-vm-s; vocative of address; "Lord/Sir") $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ (conj. purpose) $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\ell\sigma\omega \ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\ell\omega$ (vsaa--1s; "I may believe") $\epsilon\ell\varsigma$ (pa) $\alpha\ell\tau\rho\nu;$ $\alpha\ell\tau\delta\varsigma$ (npam3s)

GNT John 9:37 εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Καὶ ἑώρακας αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σοῦ ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν.

NAS John 9:37 Jesus said to him, "You have both seen Him, and He is the one who is talking with you." δ In $\sigma \delta v c$, $(n-nm-s) \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3s) $\alpha v t \phi \alpha v t \delta c$ (npdm3s) Kai $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc + cc = "both...and") $\epsilon \omega \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha c$ $\delta \rho \alpha \omega$ (viPFa--2s; "You have seen") $\alpha v t \delta \nu \alpha v t \delta c$ (npam3s) $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \delta c$ (remote dem. pro./nm-s; "that One") $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$. $\epsilon i \mu i$ (vipa--3s) δ $\lambda \alpha \lambda \omega \nu \lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon \omega$ (adj. ptc./p/a/Prednm-s; "talking/speaking") $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha$ (pg) $\sigma \delta v v$ (npg-2s)

GNT John 9:38 ὁ δὲ ἔφη, Πιστεύω, κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ.

NAS John 9:38 And he said, "Lord, I believe." And he worshiped Him. $\delta \epsilon$ (ch) δ (dnms; "he/the man") $\epsilon \phi \eta$, $\phi \eta \mu i$ (viaa--3s; "said/to declare/make known one's mind/affirmed/asserted"; same as 1:23) $\kappa i \rho \iota \epsilon \cdot \kappa i \rho \iota o \rho c$ (n-vm-s) $\Pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon i \omega$, $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon i \omega$ (vipa--1s) $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \kappa i \nu \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \pi \rho \sigma \kappa \nu \nu \epsilon \omega$ (viaa--3s; "worshiped/to fall down in reverence/to pay homage to"; In John it is always used to express Divine worship) $\alpha i \tau \phi$. $\alpha i \tau \delta \epsilon$ (npdm3s)

ANALYSIS VERSES 35 - 38:

- 1. News concerning the man circulates quickly getting back to **Jesus** as **He heard that they had put him out** of the synagogue.
- 2. An occurrence of this nature would obviously be a "news flash" for all of Jerusalem.
- 3. To be physically expelled from the synagogue would be reason enough in everyone's minds to conclude that the Pharisee's were serious regarding anyone who supported the cause of Christ.
- 4. However, his expulsion was not that **he** so much espoused Jesus' claim as the Christ, but had merely made the appropriate and logical observations of discussion and observations of the miracle.
- 5. Jesus upon hearing seeks the man out and finding him, He then proceeds to present the gospel as He said, "Do you believe in the Son of Man?"
- 6. The scenario in view now becomes a perfect example of the doctrine that Christ does not abandon those who are ultimately +V and have been ostracized for the sake of truth.
- 7. Rather, God knows exactly the perfect timing to intercede on behalf of potentially +V in order to advance the manifestation of their intellectual honesty and +V.
- 8. Jesus uses a common title of Himself, "the Son of Man" as the object of the faith the man needs to believe literally, "into/ ϵ i ζ ".
- 9. It points to the reality that Messiah is literally God in likeness of flesh. Dan.7:13
- 10. Jesus' does not use the title "**Son of** God" with this man to emphasize that via the man's intellectual honesty and +V, **he** will continue to put two and two together, understanding that indeed Messiah is God in the flesh.
- 11. In other words, it is not necessary for **Jesus** to verbally claim His Deity, as the miracle in and of itself will directly commend that reality to the man.
- 12. The only issue for the man is to identify **Jesus** as the Christ and in doing so, the man, because of the nature of the miracle and his objective reasoning, will conclude that **He** is God.
- 13. Obviously, only **Jesus** who knew all men could present Himself in this way and know that the man would put this all together.
- 14. We as believers don't know the minds of men and therefore must usually be more direct in our gospel presentations.

- 15. Furthermore, the man is proof positive that there were Jews in Israel at the time that could come to the correct conclusion regarding Christ, even without direct and explicit verbal claims on His part regarding His hypostatic nature.
- 16. It is a validation that Jesus' works were a sufficient witness for one to ascertain that **He** was the Promised One. Joh.5:36
- 17. He is in stark contrast to the Jews who were -V and rejected His direct claims of Deity. Joh.8:58-59
- 18. It points to the necessity for those at the 1st advent to identify the historical Person of **Jesus** as the Messiah, and realize that as Messiah, **He** is God and **believe**.
- 19. That the man is thoroughly convinced that **Jesus** is a representative of God has been recorded and it is obvious that he places complete trust into whatever **Jesus** now says.
- 20. **He** understands by Jesus' question that faith is an issue before God and that that faith must be placed into the appropriate Person.
- 21. That he fully understands the intent of the question and fully relies on Jesus giving him an honest answer is reflected in his polite and respectful response as he answered and said, "And who is He, Lord/Sir, that I may believe in Him?"
- 22. The aorist subjunctive of "**may believe**" indicates the man's desire to express his volition in this regard.
- 23. He exudes a complete willingness to obedience in following Jesus' directive.
- 24. With the man's +V completely primed, **Jesus** identifies Himself as the very object of faith as **He said to him**, **"You have both seen Him, and He is the one who is talking with you."**
- 25. The evidence Jesus presents is two fold as denoted by the conjunction "and".
- 26. The perfect tense of "**have seen**" emphasizes the experiential results of the miracle having continuous impact as evidence in the man's perception of being able to specifically identifying whom **the Son of Man** is.
- 27. In other words, it is a statement to reinforce the logic of reasoning in the man (his perception) that the evidence of the miracle itself is validation to the truth of what **Jesus** is now claiming.
- 28. The fact that the man can now physically see **Jesus** in front of **him** (after being blind his whole life), is all the evidence this man needs to believe and perceive the evidence of the truth in the final clause, "**and He is the one who is talking with you**".
- 29. The real force of this clause can only be gleaned from the Greek.
- 30. The pronoun of choice by **Jesus** in directly pointing to Himself is the remote demonstrative pronoun "ἐκεῖνος/that One/**He**".
- 31. Obviously, **Jesus** physically standing near the man in conversation is referring, though very subtly to the less astute, to His Person as Deity.
- 32. The fact the **He** refers to His Person as being distant in nature while yet physically standing in close proximity most definitely points to His hypostatic union.
- 33. In essence, His final clause states that it is his Person as "God" who is talking with you.
- 34. Therefore, taking **Jesus** complete identifying of Himself in vs.37 as a whole, makes the statement that it is the evidence of the miracle that provides the evidence that God is the One presently speaking **with him**.
- 35. And therefore, it was the work of God that displayed in this man the necessary evidence for **him** to spiritually perceive that God exists in the very Person that **he**

now is seeing. (The very force of the verb "have seen/δράω/to perceive accompanied with an experiential participation.)

- 36. And that this very principle of perception is not missed by the man is made clear in vs.38, "And he said, 'Lord, I believe.' And he worshiped Him".
- 37. The present tense of the verb "**I believe**" openly declares that at the very present moment that the man spiritually saw God in the Person of Christ **he** was now physically standing in front of, salvation Ph₁ resulted.
- 38. And there can be no question that based on his physical experience of "seeing" **Jesus**, **he** spiritually saw **Him** as God, since **he worshiped Him**.
- 39. The verb **worship** means literally to acknowledge with humility or revere one considered worthy of highest praise or deserving of utmost adoration.
- 40. Its function is often accompanied by showing overt obeisance such as bowing, kneeling, falling prostrate on the ground and/or to offer some sort of kiss to the hand or garment of the one who is the object of **worship**.
- 41. However, overt genuflecting is not a necessary requirement for one to engage in **worship**.
- 42. In fact, **Jesus** proclaimed that true worshipers of the Church Age dispensation would be those who **worship** in Spirit and truth. Joh.4:23-*true worship is a spiritual reality*
- 43. While genuflecting may occur, it is a separate function from the true force of worshiping, which is to acknowledge the truth. 1Cor.14:24-25
- 44. One may engage in an overt **worship** that is pseudo-**worship** because they fail to align their thinking in total obedience to the object of **worship**. Cp. Luk.4:7-8 where in Satan's demand that Jesus worship him, Jesus' response is worship is reserved only for God and that serving Him accompanies the worship.
- 45. Our verse is the only time in John where someone is said to **worship** Jesus, although worship is ascribed to **Him** from the time of His birth. Mat.2:11
- 46. Jesus' disciples worshiped Him on at least one recorded occasion. Mat.14:33
- 47. In none of the instances these people offered **worship** to **Him** did **Jesus** chide or rebuke them but merely passively accepted their obeisance.
- 48. It is common knowledge that those who were to be worshiped in all realms of religions belonged to the realm of the supernatural and thus were gods.
- 49. For Jewish theology to include heretical Judaism, it can be readily demonstrated that all **worship** was to be reserved for Deity. Exo.3:12; 4:31; 12:31; 34:14; et al.
- 50. That the **Son of** God is to be likewise revered is explicitly taught in Heb.1:6.
- 51. However this man overtly may have display his **worship** of **Jesus**, the real force contextually denotes that it was his act of faith in believing **Jesus** as the God-man that was the basis of his **worship**.

EXEGESIS VERSE 39:

GNT John 9:39 καὶ ϵἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰς κρίμα ἐγώ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον, ἴνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται.

NAS John 9:39 And Jesus said, "For judgment I came into this world, $\kappa\alpha i$ (ch) δ $I\eta\sigma o\hat{v}\varsigma$, (d.a. + n-nm-s) $\epsilon i\pi\epsilon\nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3s) $Ei\varsigma$ (pa; "For/into") $\kappa\rho i\mu\alpha$ (n-an-s; "judgment/act of judging/to sentence/to pass a verdict"; used 27x) $\epsilon \gamma \omega$ (npn-1s) $\eta \lambda \theta \sigma \nu$, $\epsilon \rho \chi \sigma \mu \alpha i$ (viaa--1s) $\epsilon i\varsigma$ (pa) $\tau o\hat{v}\tau \sigma \nu$ $\sigma v \tau o \sigma v \sigma v \sigma v \sigma v \sigma v \delta$ $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \sigma \nu$ $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \sigma \varsigma$ (d.a. + n-am-s) that those who do not see may see; $i\nu\alpha$ (ch; purpose) δi δ (d.a./nmp +) $\mu \eta$ (neg. +) $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \sigma \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega$ (subs. ptc./p/a/nm-p; "those not seeing/those who do not see") $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega \sigma \nu \rho \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega$ (vspa--3p; "may see") and that those who see may become blind." $\kappa \alpha i$ (cc) "that" supplied to indicate the continued purpose $\delta i \delta \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \sigma \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega$ (subs. ptc./p/a/nm-p; "those who see") $\gamma \epsilon \nu \omega \nu \tau \alpha i$. $\gamma i \nu \sigma \mu \alpha i$ (vsad--3p; "may become") $\tau \nu \phi \lambda \delta i \tau \nu \phi \lambda \delta \varsigma$ (adj--nm-p; "blind")

ANALYSIS VERSE 39:

- 1. Based on the man's newly found spiritual insight, **Jesus** now follows up with teaching concerning this very principle.
- 2. That Pharisees were present during His teaching at this point (cp. vs.40), would indicate that some time lapse has occurred since the man's original inquisition and the religious leaders are again dogging Jesus' tracks, if nothing else out of curiosity.
- 3. That both sympathizers and antagonizers of the Pharisaic circles regarding **Jesus** are at hand is made clear, as 10:19-21 denotes another division arose among them surrounding this miracle.
- 4. Though John does not record the "why" and "wherefore" of the Pharisees once again being present, it is safe to conclude they saw <u>no act</u> of the man worshiping Him, or else all hell would have broke loose among them.
- 5. This would reinforce the premise that the man's worship of **Jesus** in vs.38 was simply an acknowledgment of His Person as God-man.
- 6. Furthermore it points to the premise that John is not seeking to emphasize any chronology in this section, rather he is seeking to maintain a contextual flow of doctrinal principles and ideology.
- 7. That the miracle of the blind man being made able to **see** is so fresh in everyone's minds is a perfect time for **Jesus** to once again analogize the physical to teach the spiritual. Joh.3:12

- 8. The miracle itself as a sign deals with the spiritual realities of light and darkness and sight and blindness.
- 9. It is the backdrop of physical sight and the light that is necessary to have such sight that is the basis for the concept of spiritual sight and the illumination necessary to have such sight.
- 10. He begins by first stating that their is a primary purpose for His Person being in existence and said, "For judgment I came into this world".
- 11. The act of **judgment** denotes a separation or differentiating between the **world** of light in which He lived in the pre-incarnate state and the **world** of darkness into which He entered.
- 12. He Himself is the light. Joh.1:5,9; 8:12
- 13. His coming refers to the period of the incarnation when the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. Joh.1:14
- 14. His act of judging is not in contradiction to His previous statement about not coming into the **world** to judge the **world** in Joh.3:17.
- 15. In Joh.3:17, it is clear that the judging in view He is <u>not</u> engaged in at the 1st advent is the actual judicial judging of men sentencing them to eternal condemnation.
- 16. His judging in our verse is in line with the effect of the reality of His existence effectuating a division among men <u>volitionally</u>, as He described in Joh.3:19-21.
- 17. In other words, the very coming of Christ divides men into two camps, +V or -V.
- 18. Contextually the volition in view is interpreted to be +V and -V as seen in believers versus unbelievers. Cp. vss.40-41
- 19. While Joh.3:19-21 placed emphasis on the works that differentiate –V from +V, in vs.39 the emphasis is on their spiritual vision or perception.
- 20. This is brought out by the two remaining purpose clauses, "that those who do not see may see; and that those who see may become blind".
- 21. The verb "to see/ $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\omega$ " can be used either for physical sight or spiritual/mental sight/perception, but is never used to represent both at the same time.
- 22. **Jesus** uses its divisive nuances to teach the difference between sight physically and spiritually with a play on words elsewhere in the gospels. Mat.13:13-14; Mar.4:12; Luk.8:10
- 23. That two distinct camps are indeed in view is seen in **that** there are **those** who were blind but **may see and that** there are **those** who profess they **see** but are proved to be blind in reality.
- 24. The term **see** in the first group denotes strictly a spiritual perception while the term for the second group strictly denotes only a physical perception.
- 25. **Those who do not see** refer to those who are +V and come to the God-man for sight, i.e., salvation.
- 26. The fact that they **may see** refers to the necessity of volition in terms of the salvation adjustment.
- 27. **Those** of the second group **who see** refers to **those who** profess to have salvation and a proper relationship with God, like the Pharisees.
- 28. However, their sight is based only on what they physically conclude based on the afferent impulses of the flesh and not a spiritual reality.

- 29. **That** they **may become blind** denotes that volitionally they choose to reject the fact of Jesus' appearance, Person and message, ultimately proving that such do not have a relationship with God.
- 30. **Those who** claim to have spiritual sight apart from the light of the **world** are ultimately shown to be the **blind** men spiritually that they are.
- 31. They represent all –V in the **world** that seek and claim salvation for themselves apart from accepting the light of **Jesus** Christ.
- 32. **Jesus** is teaching the principle that all men are born in **this world** in spiritual darkness and only those who come to an understanding of this reality and choose to accept the free gift of light will acquire spiritual sight.
- 33. In other words, men that realize their need for salvation and deliverance from the condemnation of sin and see the light of Christ as God sent to provide that salvation, go from spiritual blindness to having spiritual sight.
- 34. On the other side of the coin, all men who think they can acquire salvation by any other means are deluded and volitionally are **blind** to the reality of salvation.
- 35. This is because they have their eyes only on the physical in life, not the spiritual.
- 36. And as long as they maintain a status quo of -V, the potential outcome will ultimately produce a state of permanent spiritual blindness.
- 37. What they have concluded to be light is what the cosmos and STA has to offer, which in reality is darkness (Joh.3:19; 12:46; Eph.6:12) that perpetuated ultimately renders them intolerable/unreceptive to the light of truth effectuating their blindness.
- 38. This principle harks back to the very procedure of -V at God consciousness that "sees" the light of reality and yet exchanges it for foolish and speculative darkness. Rom.1:20-32
- 39. And all this occurs simply due to the presence of the light, **Jesus** Christ, which exposes the "real you/souls" of men for what they are.
- 40. Since it is His very Person that salvation hinges on, He most certainly functions as **judgment** upon all volition of men.
- 41. It is the attitude of men towards Christ and all that He is that makes true His teaching that He did not come **into this world** to grant peace, but division. Luk.12:51 cp. Mat.10:34

EXEGESIS VERSES 40 - 41:

GNT John 9:40 "Ηκουσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ταῦτα οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄντες καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοί ἐσμεν;

NAS John 9:40 Those of the Pharisees who were with Him heard these things, $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa$ (pAbl; "From") $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\delta}$ (d.a. Ablmp; translated "Those") $\Phi \alpha \rho_{1} \sigma \alpha \hat{\omega} \nu \Phi \alpha \rho_{1} \sigma \alpha \hat{\omega} \varsigma (n-Ablm-p)$ où $\dot{\delta} \ \delta' \nu \tau \epsilon_{\zeta} \epsilon \dot{\iota} \mu \dot{\iota}$ (subs. ptc./p/a/nm-p; "who were/the ones being") $\mu \epsilon \tau' \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ (pg) $\alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \delta \dot{\varsigma}$ (npgm3s) "Hkou $\sigma \alpha \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \delta \dot{\upsilon} \omega$ (viaa--3p) $\tau \alpha \hat{\upsilon} \tau \alpha \ \delta \tau \delta \varsigma$ (near dem. pro./an-p) and said to Him, "We are not blind too, are we?" $\kappa \alpha \dot{\iota}$ (ch) $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \pi \sigma \nu \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ (viaa--3p) $\alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \hat{\omega}$, $\alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \delta \varsigma$ (npdm3s) $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{\iota} \varsigma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ (npn-1p; "We ourselves") $M \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\eta}$ (neg. +) $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$; $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \mu \dot{\iota}$ (vipa--1p; "are not") $\tau \upsilon \phi \lambda \delta \dot{\varsigma}$ (adj--nm-p; "blind") $\kappa \alpha \dot{\iota}$ (adjunctive; "too/also") "are we?" supplied

GNT John 9:41 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰ τυφλοὶ ἦτε, οὐκ ἂν εἴχετε ἁμαρτίαν· νῦν δὲ λέγετε ὅτι Βλέπομεν, ἡ ἁμαρτία ὑμῶν μένει.

ANALYSIS VERSES 40 – 41:

- 1. As noted in the analysis of vs.39, the author now records that there are **Pharisees** present during Jesus' discussion with the man and His present teaching.
- 2. That they heard the entire discourse of vss.35-39 is seen in the plural of hearing "these things".
- 3. It was the combination of hearing the gospel presentation to the man and the subsequent teaching regarding spiritual sight vs. blindness that they have been made privy too.

- 4. Some have interpreted these particular **Pharisees** as being some that have attached themselves to **Jesus** and are disciples of sorts.
- 5. However, there is no corroborating evidence elsewhere in the gospels to substantiate a public attachment in this vein.
- 6. Jesus' response to their question in these verses tells us that these **Pharisees** are unbelievers.
- 7. Though <u>speculative</u>, I would submit that possibly at least some of these **Pharisees** were **those** who were sympathizers with the man during the tribunal and have subsequently relocated the man in sign of silent support.
- 8. This does not mean that they are believers or that they will continue to accept the truth that is being presented and become believers.
- 9. And it can't be denied that some of these present will again manifest hostility towards Jesus' teaching, but does provide an answer as to **those** Jews, at least in part, who retain a supporting position as sympathizers in 10:20-21.
- 10. Otherwise, **the Pharisees** in view are just the normal "tag alongs" that are constantly in view in the gospels.
- 11. In either case or not the case, those of the Pharisees who were with Him heard these things.
- 12. That they have understood that **Jesus** was teaching of spiritual matters regarding sight and blindness is obvious **and said to Him, "We are not blind too, are we?"**
- 13. They understand that implication exists that they are the antecedents of what He is talking about in vs.39c, "and that those who see may become blind", and react with denial.
- 14. Their question is phrased in such a way as to anticipate a negative answer.
- 15. Their question has a sense of knowing what they "think" He is implying, but cannot be readily acceptable by them as intentional, considering they are the religious leaders of Israel.
- 16. Through Jesus' gospel presentation to the man and His teaching, He has made it clear that He is the pivot on which human destiny turns, and that people cannot see apart from **Him**.
- 17. And He has made it clear that salvation and spiritual insight is dependent upon an exercise of faith in His Person.
- 18. It is this foundation of truth that **Jesus** draws on in His response as He said to them, "If you were blind, you would have no sin; but since you say, 'We see,' your sin remains".
- 19. His answer is paradoxical/seemingly contradictory in nature.
- 20. The phrase, "**If you were blind**" is a 2nd class condition that is assumed as contrary to fact.
- 21. In other words, there is a sense that they are not **blind**, yet they need to be **blind**.
- 22. Therefore, blindness in this context deals with the fact that they possessed a certain amount of spiritual information.
- 23. And that information is contained in the very Scriptures that they boast in understanding as the religious gurus of Judaism.
- 24. They were privy to all the light necessary to **see "these things**" regarding **Jesus** and thus are without excuse in not identifying Him as Messiah and the God-man.

- 25. In that sense, they were not **blind**, however, because they are intentionally rejecting the light that they have been given, they willfully make themselves **blind**.
- 26. Because they approach the Scriptures in such a legalist, arrogant and humanistic way, they see no reason for a Messiah to be God and execute salvation on their behalf.
- 27. The force of the apodosis, "*otherwise* **you would have no sin** deals with the fact of the guilt and culpability they incur in their rejection of Messiah.
- 28. Their "sin" contextually relates to the underwriter of all sin, pride/arrogance.
- 29. The fact that they approach God and His plan on their own terms is a product of the arrogance in them that causes them to conclude that they are all right before God.
- 30. This is the force of the final clause, "but since you say, 'We see', your sin remains".
- 31. However, the reality is that under -V in their STA approach to the Scriptures, they are **blind** to the necessity of exercising true humility before God, **but** in contrast they say they can **see** the truth otherwise.
- 32. Therefore, **since** they say they **see** otherwise, their arrogance/pride **remains**.
- 33. Not until they turn a "**blind** eye" to their "cosmic" approach to the truth and accept the need for God to give them sight through His works (salvation by grace), not theirs, will they spiritually **see** the need for a Messiah to provide salvation for them.
- 34. Not until they exercise true humility and intellectual honesty towards the truth inherent in +V, such as the **blind** man has manifested (vss.35-38), will they ever reverse their process of thinking regarding salvation and exercise faith in Christ.
- 35. And only then will their arrogance be removed from its status of primary residency within them effectuating the removal of **sin** accounted against them in unbelief.
- 36. It points to the fact that arrogance and intellectual dishonesty are "twins" that –V and the STA breed.
- 37. These men are likened to **blind** men who could be healed, **but** because they are willfully rejecting the need for healing they remain culpable for their own state of being.
- 38. The principle is clear; the light is present, sight is available and it is the willful rejection of that fact that is criminal. Joh.1:9-11
- 39. Even though they possessed the oracles of God and claim to have insight and understanding into the POG, they in reality reject the light that was sent to them and remain guilty before God.
- 40. And again, it can't be dismissed that these men are those responsible for communicating and interpreting the Scriptures to Israel.
- 41. It points to the reality that there are those who claim "religious" authority to provide an accurate representation of God's plan to others, that in reality are spiritually **blind**.
- 42. And that the scenario of the **blind** man being separated from the authority of **the Pharisees** and placed into the hands of One who will communicate the truth, points to another reality regarding religious authorities.
- 43. And that is that men are not obligated to render themselves under religious authority that does not commend itself to the truth in its representation of God's plan.
- 44. As **Jesus** will now teach in Chapter 10, there is a due process of evaluating all men who claim authority as spiritual leaders and communicators of BD.