

THE MAN WHO GOT INVOLVED

LK.10:25-37

Ed Dye

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Men often get involved with the wrong things or the wrong persons or the wrong crowd; such as:
 - a. Another woman.
 - b. Evil practices.
 - c. An evil gang.
2. Of such things we are not speaking in this lesson. We are speaking of Lk.10:25-37 and a man who got involved in the right thing and how it should apply to us.
3. This text is familiar to all, even to children.
 - a. It is often called “the story of the good Samaritan,” which, of course, it is.
 - b. But there is more. It is a good lesson on involvement in the Lord’s work!
4. The telling of the story of this text arises from a contact Jesus had with a lawyer who asked an all important question, even though he asked it for the wrong reason.
 - a. The account is not just a “story” about a good Samaritan, this is the “record” of a lawyer who came to Jesus with a question about eternal life.
 - b. The “story” was to try to help him deal with a bigger, more basic problem in his life.
5. There are several people involved in the “story”: Jesus, the lawyer, a priest, a levite, a Samaritan, a band of robbers, a wounded man, an inn-keeper and **ourselves** – each played a part. And as it applies to us, we play a part!
6. We must not read the text nor study the lesson and forget to apply it to ourselves.

II. DISCUSSION

A. FIRST, WE CONSIDER THE LAWYER

1. First, his identity.
 - a. He was not a legal attorney for purposes of trial, etc. He was what corresponds more to what we would call today a “professor.”
 - b. He would have been a religious teacher or a scribe, Rabbi, doctor, Master. He knew and taught the Law of Moses in a synagogue.
 - (1) Most of them, if not all of them, loved to be called “teacher,” “Rabbi,” or “Master.”
 - (2) They loved to wear religious titles. Cf. Mt.23:6-12.
 - c. This one called Jesus “Master,” Lk.10:25.
 - (1) He might have thought it would flatter Jesus to be considered among the “teachers.” (The Jews had their “schools,” Ac.22:3; cf. 5:34).

- (2) When they thought it would serve their purpose, they were not above trying to flatter Jesus, Mt.22:15,16.
- (3) But Jesus had never been to one of their schools. And flattery would get them nowhere with Jesus!
- d. Jesus was dealing with an “expert,” a “professional.”
 - (1) Such a professional would have considered Jesus an “amateur” to say the least; one who was unschooled, unlearned. Cf. Lk.4:21,22 (just Joseph’s son); Jno.7:14,15.
 - (2) However, Jesus could have told the people, including the lawyers, what God said – “It is written...” – but he would not have learned that in the Jewish schools, nor their synagogues, nor from the traditions of the elders. There, he would have learned the ideas of the Rabbis and the traditions of the elders, but not God’s word!
 - (3) The common people could easily see the contrast in Jesus and the Rabbis. See, Mt.7:28,29.
- 2. Next, his question, Lk.10:25: “...tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?” Regardless of his reason – good or bad – sincere or insincere:
 - a. It was a popular question among the Rabbis. See Mk.19:16; Lk.18:18.
 - b. It was an important question.
 - (1) It is significant that he did not ask about social welfare, improving living conditions, youth programs or any social problems, though such things have their place in society.
 - (2) What he asked about is much more important than all else!
 - (3) He asked about eternal life – the salvation of his soul in heaven!
 - (4) This was his most important question and it should be mine and yours, too!
 - (5) If we settle every other problem in this world and fail here, we will be an eternal failure!
 - c. It was a personal question: “What shall I do?” Not what did mydo? etc.
- 3. Then, Jesus’ answer, Lk.10:26: “What is written in the law? How readest thou?”
 - a. Remember Jesus is answering one who knew the law! One who was a teacher of the law! A professor of the law!
 - b. Jesus, in effect, is saying, “Your question has already been answered – It is in the Law of God! You should already know the answer!”
 - c. We should be impressed with Jesus’ teaching method and imitate it when questioned about spiritual things such as this lawyer asked!
 - (1) Many folks, including some liberal-minded brethren, say we can’t all see the Bible alike; we can’t expect all people to come to the

- same conclusions on spiritual matters or on matters of faith. But Jno.17:20,21; 1Cor.1:10.
- (2) Jesus did! He expected the lawyer to understand and arrive at the same conclusion as Jesus himself had from merely reading the Law.
 - (3) Note the simplicity of Jesus' response. Jesus was not worried that this man could not understand the Word. He asked, "How do you read it?"
 - (4) The lawyer proved men could understand the Law, the Word of God, and answered correctly, and Jesus said, "Do it!" vv.27,28.
- d. Most religious differences do not arise because people fail to or cannot understand God's Word, but because:
- (1) People do not want to do what God says!
 - (2) People disagree over what God's word does not say, rather what it does say!
- e. We can read, understand and do what God says. He has spoken in our language and said we can understand it, Eph.5:17; 3:3,4; Mt.7:21; Heb.5:8,9.
4. The lawyer's real problem, Lk.10:29: "But he, willing to justify (excuse, vindicate) himself, said...and who is my neighbor?"
- a. He wanted to prove that he was already right, that he did not need to make any changes in his life – remember he was "tempting" Jesus.
 - b. Everybody wants to be "right." But we need to understand that it is more important to be "just" before God than "just" in our own eyes.
 - c. The lawyer wanted to "justify (excuse, vindicate) himself," something he and others like him often tried to do. Cf. Lk.16:14,15.
 - (1) He had correctly quoted the Law (v.27). However, he knows he has not always done that, so the Law does not justify him.
 - (2) Thus, in order to justify himself, he has to make what God has said something obscure and/or unreasonable.
 - (3) He wanted to justify himself by trying to make the requirements of God's Law impossible to apply, as so many today claim they are.
 - (a) "How can I know?"
 - (b) "Can't keep the law perfectly!"
 - (c) "Can't keep from sinning!"
 - (4) Jesus tells the story of the Samaritan to deal with the lawyer's problem.
 - d. The lawyer's view of religion is both interesting and up-to-date.
 - (1) He wanted to be an "expert," not do what the Law said.
 - (a) "An 'expert' is a 'little drip'".

- (2) He did not have a problem understanding the Law. He had a real problem in believing or being willing to do what it required. That is where it is still up-to-date. For it is still the problem today!
- (3) *Application:* After you learn what the law says, you can either do it or you can have trouble trying to “justify yourself.”
 - (a) Apply to obedience to the Gospel, growing spiritually, teaching others, really giving as prospered!

B. NEXT WE CONSIDER THE PRIEST AND THE LEVITE, vv.30-32.

- 1. Their attitude toward religion amounted to a ceremonial type of religion.
 - a. They thought in terms of the fact that they could not go wrong as long as they performed certain specified things; such as, observing the right days, eating the right foods, offering the right sacrifices and performing the right temple ceremonies. See Mt.23:23.
 - (1) After all, they are of their father Abraham, Mt.3:7-9; Jno.8:33-47.
 - b. Therefore, they could pass a dying man and feel justified as long as they went through their ceremonies and temple worship according to the Law.
 - c. They might have said to themselves, “That’s a pitiful case.” Then, in all good conscience, excused or justified themselves. Cf. Mt.15:1-9.
- 2. Their attitude is like some today.
 - a. It is too easy to get like this.
 - (1) We may talk about what a pitiful shape the world is in, the sad state of the church, etc., and never do anything constructive to take care of the problems.
 - (2) We may never talk to others about becoming a Christian or of the need for faithfulness.
 - (3) We may “go to church,” sing, pray, eat the Lord’s Supper, and go home and never really participate in the work of the Local church.
 - (a) In other words, we may be “pew packers, not necessarily doers of the work!”
 - (b) Or, “oncers”; eat the Lord’s Supper, go home, be back next time it is served.
 - (c) Thus, we, as the Priest and levite, pass by other the other side
 - (4) The priest and the levite where that way. They could see what needed to be done, and just pass by on the other side. Cf. Jas.2:14-17.
 - b. Take heed, lest we develop this attitude!

C. NOW WE CONSIDER THE SAMARITAN, vv.33-35.

- 1. “A Samaritan came by...and he had compassion on him,” v.33.
 - a. That was the difference. But what a difference!!
 - (1) The robbers did not have compassion, everything but!

- (2) The priest and the levite did not!
- (3) When you learned that the Samaritan did, you knew he would take care of everything.
- b. The priest and the levite didn't harm the man as did the robbers, but neither did they help him or even offer him any help!
- c. Many today trust in their "goodness", their morality, their not being "bad" people, but forget about the positive side of serving God – they don't get involved in truly serving God and man as God requires. Cf. Mt.25:31-46.
- 2. In his compassion, the Samaritan did what needed to be done.
 - a. His help was impartial. He did not check his color, his race or his social standing before acting.
 - b. His help was spontaneous. He did not have to get a committee together before acting; he did not have to take it to the church before doing his duty.
 - c. His help was personal. He got his hands dirty and blood on his clothes.
 - d. His help was thorough. He did not decide, "I have done my share, someone else can take him to the inn." He saw it through!
 - e. His help was sacrificial. It cost him time, effort, material and money.
 - f. He got involved!

D. FINALLY, NOTE THE APPLICATION: "GO AND BE A NEIGHBOR!" vv.36,37.

- 1. The Law said, "Love God... **and** thy neighbor as thyself," v.27.
 - a. The lawyer's response to the Law was "Who is my neighbor?"
 - (1) In other words, "Whom do I have to love?"
 - (2). The Jews would not have included the Gentiles and would have debated the question indefinitely. Cf. Ac.22:22; 10:13,14; Gal.2:11-14.
 - b. But notice Jesus' concluding question, "Which man of these three, thinkest thou, **was** (proved to be a) neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves?" v.36.
 - c. The lawyer knew immediately, "He that showed mercy on him," v.37.
- 2. The two attitudes contrasted – the lawyer's and the Samaritan's:
 - a. The lawyer's: "Whom do I **have** to love?" ("Who **is** my neighbor?")
 - b. The Samaritan's: "How can **I be** a neighbor?"
 - c. The contrast is evident in our lives today.
 - (1) One Christian is always looking for someone and expecting someone to drop by, ask them out, bring them food, visit them in the hospital, etc.
 - (2) The other is always doing these things for someone!
- 3. Jesus said, "Go, and do thou likewise." In other words, "Go, and be a neighbor."

- a. “Go, get involved.” “Don’t walk by on the other side.” “See what needs to be done and do it!”
- b. It is the effort to give happiness that produces it and it is the effort to get happiness that always kills it.
 - (a) Same principle: To have friends, one must be a friend, Prov.18:24.
- c. It is the effort to give encouragement, to be hospitable, to go the second mile, that brings happiness and contentment.
- d. When we start acting like the Samaritan, then we can start “living,” Lk.10:28, emphasize.

III. CONCLUSION

1. The lawyers quibbled about the law.
2. The priests and the levites went through the motions of religion.
3. The Samaritan “got involved” in the work.
4. What is your attitude when you ask, “What shall I do to inherit eternal life?”
5. The Word of Christ, the Gospel, has the answer. You can understand it, do it and live!
6. You must **get** involved! You must **be** involved! You must **stay** involved!
7. It must not be: What do I **HAVE** to do? But, What **CAN** I do?
8. Mt.25:31-46.

-- from Sowing The Seed