

Coptic Orthodox Diocese of the Southern United States



The Holy Gospel According to St. John

Chapter 9

Bishop Youssef



Introduction

- > This chapter records another of Jesus' great miracles
- ➤ It is especially amazing, because it describes great efforts by Jesus' enemies to minimize it and make look as problematic
- ➤ The result is to provide us with even more convincing evidence for the validity of His miracles, which in turn confirms His claims to be the Son of God
- ➤ This is the only chapter in all of the Old and New Testament Books where there is any mention of opening the eyes of a person born blind

ORTHODOR DIE SELECTION OF THE RIVER OF THE R

Introduction

- ➤ In the Old Testament we read that the light of sight granted to the blind is one of the deeds of the awaited Messiah, (Isaiah 29:18, 35:5, 42:6-7; Psalm 146:8)
- As Jesus continues to work wonders which testify His authority is from God, St. John emphasizes that these miraculous events are not just miracles but "signs" pointing to the fulfillment of prophecy and identifying Jesus not just as a human, earthly Messiah but as the divine Savior of Daniel's vision in Daniel 7:13-14 who will come to rule the nations of the earth, John 4:48



Introduction

Chapter Outline:

- > A Man Born Blind Receives Sight 9:1-12
- > The Pharisees Excommunicate the Healed Man 9:13-34
- ➤ True Vision and True Blindness 9:35-41



- ➤ This chapter is read on the 'Sunday of Baptism' as it is associated with the mystery of baptism which represents inner insight and enlightenment
- > as Jesus passed by, The words are immediately connected with those of the preceding verse, and went out of the Temple
- > This chapter is a continuation of the preceding
- ➤ It was then, as He was leaving the Temple to escape the fury of His enemies who had taken up stones to cast at Him, and was passing by the place where the blind man was, that His eye fell upon this blind man



- ➤ The place was probably some spot near the Temple, perhaps one of its gates
- We know that beggars were placed near these gates to ask alms, Acts 3:2, and this man was well known as one who sat and begged, John 9:8
- The man was known in the city as the one born blind
- ➤ Of the six miracles connected with blindness which are recorded in the Gospels, this is the only case described as blindness from birth



- In this lies its special characteristic, for "since the world began, was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind", John 9:32
- > The disciples too turned their eyes to the blind man
- > Yet instead of praying the Lord to heal him, they questioned Him for the reason why he had been born blind
- ➤ The doctrine of the transmigration of souls appears to have been an article in the creed of the Pharisees, and it was pretty general both among the Greeks and the Asiatics



- ➤ The Pythagoreans believed the souls of men were sent into other bodies for the punishment of some sin which they had committed in a pre-existent state
- ➤ This seems to have been the foundation of the disciples question to our Lord
- The Jewish Rabbis have had the same belief and they based it on the words cited in Ezekiel 18:20, and Psalm 89:32
- > The fact of sin is stated as beyond question
- The problem is, who sinned, this man or his parents?



- ➤ Their question sought to establish a connection between the suffering and some definite act of sin
- ➤ The answer asserts that no such connection exists, and our Lord's words remain a warning against the spirit of judging other men's lives, and tracing in the misfortunes and sorrows which they have to bear the results of individual sin or the proof of divine displeasure
- > We must not understand that he was born without original sin, nor even that he had not committed other sins



- For both he and his parents had sinned
- ➤ But the meaning is, that this blindness was not a penal blindness inflicted in punishment of any sin either himself or his parents had committed
- ➤ The Lord directed the disciple's attention to the supreme care of God and His hidden plan
- ➤ The blindness happened in the ordinary course of Divine providence, and shall now become the instrument of salvation to his soul, edification to others, and glory to God



- ➤ His own great work of doing the work of Him that sent Him, could only be done when that day was present
- ➤ It has, of course, been ever done in the work of His church under the guidance of His Spirit; but the work of His own human activity on earth ceased when the night came, John 11:9 for this thought of the hours of the day
- > By this we are taught that no opportunity for doing good should be omitted
- ➤ If you wish to work, work now whilst you live; for beyond the grave there is neither faith, nor labor, nor repentance



- ➤ Day representing the opportunity: Night, the loss of that opportunity
- > I am the light of the world, The thought is that the two things necessarily co-exist
- ➤ He is the true Light, and this true Light cannot be in the world without shining in its darkness, John 1:5
- The thought is here closely connected with His teaching in the Temple but a short time before, John 8:12, *I am the Light of the world,* and also with the removal of physical and spiritual darkness which immediately followed



- This is the 5thof the 7 public "signs" of the Gospel according to St. John
- ➤ Remember John designates these as "signs" because what each of these events signify is far greater than the supernatural event itself
- > The sign of water turned to wine at the wedding at Cana, 2:1-11
- The healing of the official's son 4:46-54
- The healing of the paralytic 5:1-9
- The multiplication of the loaves to feed the 5,000, 6:1-14
- The healing of the man who was born blind, 9:1-41



- > The manner of this miracle is somewhat unique
- > Jesus spat on the ground and made clay with which to anoint the man's eyes
- ➤ He then told the man to go to the pool of Siloam and wash the clay off
- > When the man did so, his sight was restored
- Obviously, it was not necessary for Jesus to heal in this manner
- ➤ He healed in various manners



- ➤ It is certain, this procedure can never be supposed to have been any likely medical means to restore sight to a man who was born blind
- ➤ Why then go through this procedure, if the manner of healing was not necessary?
- Perhaps it served to prove to others that the manner did not matter
- > This action, therefore, had no tendency to assist the miracle
- > St. Augustine believes that in making the clay with spit, the reference is to the Word being incarnated



- ➤ Perhaps by doing various different things, all of them impossible by their own nature to heal, He was just making it more obvious that there was no magic or power in any ritualistic format
- > The power was in Him, and He could heal anyway He chose
- > Perhaps also the action is symbolic of our spiritual healing
- > To be healed spiritually, there is something we must do
- We must obey Jesus' command and wash in water, Mark 16:15-16; Acts 2:38, 22:16; Romans 6:3,4; Galatians 3:27; 1 Peter 3:21)



- > Siloam, Was a fountain under the walls of Jerusalem, towards the east, between the city and the brook Kidron
- > which is translated, Sent, Either because it was looked upon as a gift sent from God, for the use of the city
- > Or because its waters were directed or sent by canals or pipes, into different quarters, for the same purpose
- Some think there is an allusion here to Genesis 49:10; that this fountain was a type of Shiloh, the Christ, the Sent of God; and that it was to direct the man's mind to the accomplishment of the above prophecy that our Lord sent him to this fountain



- > Following the miracle came a very interesting interrogation procedure
- ➤ People were naturally skeptical that so amazing a healing had really occurred
- ➤ The investigation that followed simply strengthens the conviction of the miracle
- First, the people investigated whether the man who now could see was the same man who had been blind and begging by the road



- ➤ Note that the man was a local man who was known to the people in the area
- > People had seen him and knew his condition
- > Some confirmed that he was the one
- > Others, perhaps not yet so sure, nevertheless confirmed that he looked like the man
- Then the man himself confirmed that he was the one



- ➤ When the blind man testified that he was the one who received the blessing of healing, the neighbors asked how it happened
- > They wanted to know and find the Maker of the miracle
- In response to questions, the man described what had happened and said that a man named Jesus did it
- Note at this point he had never seen Jesus, but only knew His name



- The man's story exactly confirmed the event as previously described, verses 6,7
- ➤ Here we have the exact testimony of the man, which confirms John's original description
- The people then asked where this Jesus was, and the formerly blind man said he did not know
- ➤ They had designed to seize and deliver him up to the Sanhedrin, as a violator of the law, because he had done this on the Sabbath day



➤ "Look how he became a preacher through grace. Look how he preaches the Gospel. Having received insight, he became a confessor. This blind man became a confessor and that agitated the hearts of the wicked. This was due to the fact that they had not received in their hearts what this man had received in his eyes." St. Augustine



- > The investigation then was turned over to the Pharisees
- > We are not told why the people brought the story to the Pharisees
- > Perhaps some wanted to convince the Pharisees to believe
- Perhaps others thought the Pharisees could disprove the miracle
- ➤ However, their question in the previous verse, and the fact stated in the following verse, seem to indicate that they did this in the spirit of opposition to our Lord



- ➤ They may have been influenced also, as the parents were, by the agreement of the Jews to excommunicate any who should confess Christ, John 9:22
- > Some writers believe that the word 'Pharisees' refers to a secondary committee under the council of the Sanhedrim
- > This would be made up of high priests and Pharisees
- ➤ The Council consisted of two committees, each included twenty three members



- Each member had the right to judge a few cases
- > In the big cities, there were similar committees
- ➤ In any case, the Pharisees were the alleged experts in the law, and were generally Jesus' enemies
- > They would no doubt be interested in the case
- And if there were any way to disprove it, they would have done so



- ➤ The Pharisees asked the man how he received sight, and the man confirmed the story again
- > Note that there was no doubt that the man could see
- > Even the Pharisees admitted he could see
- The issue was not whether he could see
- > All admitted that
- ➤ The only question was how it happened and whether this was the same man



- The creation of eyes for the blind man should have been sufficient to silence the Lord's opponents
- > However, there arose a division among them
- ➤ One party observed worship literally and were preoccupied with false glory, these considered that the Lord had broken the Sabbath and so had broken the divine commandments
- > Here the truth of the miracle is granted



- ➤ But it is urged that the power by which it is wrought cannot be of God, because it was exercised on the Sabbath day
- > Others said, "How can a man who is a sinner do such signs?"
- ➤ This question is asked by the better party among the Pharisees, perhaps represented by Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathæa, and perhaps by Gamaliel
- They see the inference implied in the earlier question, and appeal to the nature of the miracles wrought



- ➤ Works of mercy, and love, and power, were not the product of a life of sin, or of communion with the powers of darkness
- ➤ We find evidence of this better spirit among the Pharisees before, in the question of Nicodemus, John 7:51
- This other party considered His deed to be a work of supreme love and an execution of the law
- > Healing, they believed, is a real sign of the Lord's true mission
- ➤ However, they represented a small minority that could not stand up to the angry majority



- ➤ The Jews then asked the blind man what he thought about Jesus for having healed him
- > The blind man said Jesus must be a prophet
- ➤ He did not fear the judgment of the Jews or the opposition of those against the Lord
- ➤ He is convinced that the power which has healed him is direct from God, and that the person who has exercised it is a messenger from God



- ➤ His words are uttered in the brevity and calmness of clear conviction, and they are the direct negative to the statement of the Pharisees, "This Man is not from God."
- Note the progression of faith in those who are converted (compare the woman of Samaria in chapter 4)
- In verse 11 the blind man called Jesus simply "a man called Jesus"
- > Here he calls him, not just a man, but a prophet
- > We will see how his faith grows as the story proceeds



- ➤ In their efforts to disprove the miracle, the Jews then sought to determine if the man had really been born blind
- They called his parents and asked them whether he had truly been born blind and how he could now see
- ➤ They hoped that the parents would from fear, John 9:22 have given an answer which would have enabled them to deny the identity of person, or the fact of congenital blindness
- ➤ Note that the proceedings here take on the form of a judicial hearing



- Witnesses are called and questioned by authorities in the law
- ➤ In this case, however as was usual when the Jewish leaders dealt with Jesus the authorities were determined to disprove Jesus, rather than to determine the truth
- > Yet, they must follow the form of an honest investigation
- The results give us a strong confirmation of the miracle by men who sought to disprove it!



- The man's parents testified that this man really was their son, and that he was born blind
- ➤ However, they were unwilling to state any conclusion about how he was healed, because they feared the consequences
- ➤ The Jews had said that anyone who confessed Jesus as Christ would be put out of the synagogue
- > So, the parents simply told the Jews that their son was old enough to speak for himself, so they should ask him how he was healed



- ➤ However, note the value of the parents' testimony, in confirming the miracle
- The enemies were trying to discredit the miracle, but instead we now have proof that this was the same man and that he had been born blind
- There is no possibility that the blind man had been secretly replaced by another man who was not blind
- > Nor can there be any doubt that the man really had been blind
- ➤ His own parents testified that this very man had been blind from birth



- ➤ Being thrown out of the temple meant being isolated from the worshippers
- > This was the lowest form of excommunication in Jewish practice
- ➤ The punishment for confessing that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Messiah was banishment from the Council
- > Such a person was treated like someone who had denied the Jewish faith
- ➤ Therefore a person who would witness for the Lord would know that he would be exposing himself to be isolated from worshippers



- ➤ He would also be considered a rebel and a traitor to the religious leadership
- ➤ By being banished, such a person was made to realize that he was unworthy of being related to God's people; and prevented from enjoying the privileges of being one of the chosen people of Israel
- Consequently such banishment had dangerous results



- ➤ Deprivation from joining the people in public worship; being regarded as an outlaw, and consequently being deprived of engaging in commercial transactions
- ➤ In fact, this would lead to the loss of one's freedom, and the possibility of sequestering one's possessions
- ➤ They asked the parents three questions: Was this their son? Was he born blind? How did he come to see?
- They answered the first two questions only, while they had no answer to the third one



- The parents in this story illustrate many people today who are compromisers and middle-of-the-roaders
- > The evidence was plain before them
- ➤ If anyone was convinced by the miracle, it should have been them
- > But they were afraid to accept the consequences, so they refused to take a stand
- ➤ Being a disciple in those early days carried heavy consequences for many people



- > They called the blind man a second time
- The expression "Give God the glory" is used similarly in Joshua 7:19; 1 Samuel 6:5; Ezra 10:11
- ➤ It is a Biblical phrase which places a person being questioned under oath to tell the truth
- ➤ This makes clear that these rulers, though they were investigating the healing, they were not doing so with an open mind



- > Their minds were made up that Jesus was a sinner
- ➤ They were just looking for ways to justify their pre-existing conclusion despite the evidence
- ➤ If they could break down the blind man's testimony, they would feel justified in their views and could discredit Jesus before the people
- > They tried to dictate what they wanted him to say
- They wanted him to say that the Lord pretended to be a prophet and that He had transgressed against the law



- In this manner, the blind man would please them
- > But, while they solemnly put him to his oath, they endeavored to put their own words in his mouth, *this Man is a sinner*
- > They asked him to assert this, or he will not please them
- ➤ He pays no attention to them and refused to admit Jesus was a sinner
- > But, in the simplicity of his heart, the blind man told the truth
- Thus he became a true witness to the person of the Lord Jesus Christ



- Failing to establish their denial of the fact, they repeat their questionings as to the means used
- ➤ They were only asking in hopes they could find something in the story to discredit
- Like Balaam, they wanted to hear more in hopes the story would change and they could find something that fit what they wanted to hear
- The man becomes weary of this cross-questioning, the purpose of which is sufficiently clear to him



- ➤ His first answer was in the fewest possible words, John 9:15, compared with John 9:7, and even these he will not repeat
- ➤ Do you also want to become His disciples?, In saying this, he raised, indirectly (and probably somewhat sarcastically), the issue of their motives
- ➤ If they did not want to be Jesus' disciples, then why keep going over and over the story?
- > The facts were clear
- > Their only possible motive was to discredit the evidence



- ➤ If they have been given the proof, but they don't accept it and yet ask for more proof, then what is the point in continuing to repeat what they have already heard?
- ➤ It is proper to question them and throw the responsibility back in their laps to give answer
- ➤ He challenged them to show what is wrong with the answer or why they don't accept it
- ➤ But nothing is to be gained by going around and around the same circle



- ➤ When the blind man pointed out that the Jews had no sensible motive for their continued investigation, they reviled him saying they were disciples of Moses, not of Jesus
- > They were convinced Moses was from God, but could not tell where Jesus was from
- ➤ When they could no longer resist the truth, they turned to the language of abuse
- This is what anyone who adheres to the truth expects



- > They boasted of their relationship to Moses the prophet
- > He was their teacher and they did not need or seek another
- ➤ Previously, they had boasted before the Lord that they were Abraham's children
- > Now they were proud to be Moses' disciples
- ➤ However, they were estranged form Abraham's children and Moses according to their deeds and thoughts
- ➤ If they were truly Abraham's children, they would have seen with him the day of the Lord and would have rejoiced, John 5:56



- ➤ Moreover, if they were truly Moses' disciples, they would have adhered to the Lord Jesus Christ whom Moses foresaw, rather than resist Him
- > They presented proof to justify their pride that Moses was their teacher and that God's Word came to him
- ➤ Yet, they did not understand that the Lord Jesus Christ was Himself the Word of God become incarnate
- > There was no conflict between Jesus and Moses
- It was not an either/or situation



- > The blind man again puts two contradictory positions
- Their assertion that they did not know by what authority Jesus did these things
- > And the evident fact that He had opened his eyes
- ➤ He cannot reconcile their statement with what he knows to be true, and he states his wonder in the strongest form
- ➤ The blind man was astonished that the Jewish leaders did not consider the Lord to be a prophet



- ➤ Indeed, He had done works that Moses the prophet had not; such as opening the eyes of someone who had been born blind
- ➤ God does not hear sinners, In making this statement, the blind man stated a principle elsewhere confirmed in Scripture: God does not hear sinners, but He will hear one who does God's will and worships Him, James 5:16; 1 John 3:22; Proverbs 28:9; 15:8,29; Psalm 66:18; Isaiah 1:15-17, 59:1,2



- Neither Moses nor the prophets have ever opened the eyes of a man who was born blind
- ➤ If this person then were not the best of beings, would God grant him a privilege which He has up until now denied to his great prophets?
- > His argument meets each of their assertions
- ➤ His general assumption, admitted as a universal truth, *God does* not hear sinners, John 9:31, had denied their assertion that this Man was a sinner



- ➤ His conclusion now denies their assertion, "*This Man is not of God*", John 9:16
- > A very just conclusion
- God is the fountain of all good
- ➤ All good must proceed from Him, and no good can be done but through Him
- ➤ If this person were not commissioned by the good God, He could not perform such beneficent miracles as these



- ➤ The rulers responded with the bigotry typical of prejudiced people determined at all costs to defend their position regardless of the facts
- ➤ They had been totally unable to refute his evidence or find any flaw in it
- > Yet, they concluded that he was born in sin and could not possibly teach them anything, so they cast him out of the meeting
- > And all this despite the evidence!



- The claim that the man was born in sin may refer back to the concept discussed in 9:2,3
- The idea was that the man was born blind, therefore he must have committed some horrible sin
- ➤ They immediately excommunicated him drove him from their assembly with despise, and forbade his farther appearing in the worship of God



- ➤ Thus a simple man, guided by the Spirit of truth, and continuing steady in his testimony, utterly confounded the most eminent Jewish doctors
- When they had no longer either reason or argument to oppose to him, as a proof of their embarrassment and of their reproach and shame, they had chose the secular arm, and thus silenced by political power a person whom they had neither reason nor religion to withstand



- ➤ It is clear that the Lord was looking for the man and wanted to find him
- ➤ He did find him when the Pharisees had thrown him out and deprived him of being a member of God's people
- ➤ His parents probably had refused to welcome him to their home for fear they would have the same treatment and fate
- > The God of the banished and abandoned found him
- > There is such beauty in the statement, He had found him
- > Jesus went looking for the man just as He deliberately "looks" for each of us



- ➤ He is the promised Good Shepherd in search of the lost lambs, Ezekiel 34:11-25, 37:24-28; John 10:11-16; Hebrews 13:20; 1 Peter 2:25; 5:4
- ➤ The Jews had cast him out of the temple and the Lord of the temple found him
- ➤ When Jesus asked if the man believed in the Son of God, the man asked who He was so he could believe in Him
- > Jesus' question was obviously asked to get this response



- > Jesus then stated that He Himself was the One
- ➤ The man confessed Jesus, saying that he believed and he then worshipped Jesus
- > Note the power of the man's conviction
- As a result of witnessing this great miracle, the man was ready to accept as Divine whomever was indicated by the One who healed him



- ➤ He was certain the One who had healed him was a prophet from God, so the healed man could be sure that He would speak the truth
- > St. Augustine writes, "Now with the face of his heart washed and with his conscience cleansed, he acknowledges him to be not only Son of man but Son of God."



- > These words arise immediately out of what has preceded
- ➤ The beggar has passed from a state of physical blindness, and has received the faculty of sight
- ➤ He has passed from a state of spiritual blindness, and has received the power to recognize and believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God
- ➤ He did not see, but the result of the manifestation of the Messiah is for him that he now does see



- Conscious of his own spiritual blindness, he asked, *Who is He, Lord, that I may believe in Him?*
- And it was given to him, as to every earnest and humble seeker after truth
- ➤ In marked contrast to this spirit of humility and desire to come to the light, was that of the Pharisees
- > They claimed to have the, key of knowledge, Luke11:52
- Conscious of their own spiritual light, they felt no need of a truer Light, and therefore could not see it



- ➤ This passing from darkness to light, and from light to darkness, suggests thoughts which our Lord has already uttered in John 3:17-19, and which will meet us again more fully in John 12:37-50
- ➤ Jesus' statements about judgment in John 5:22,30, 8:15-16 and here in this passage seem to be two contradictory teachings
- Sometimes Christ does not pass judgment as in 5:30 and later in 12:47, but at other times He does as in 5:22 and 9:39



- The Lord had previously proclaimed that He had not come into the world to condemn it, but had come to save it, John 3:17
- ➤ By shinning on those that are sitting in darkness, those enlightened by His light become a cause of condemnation to those who have loved the darkness more than the light, John 3:19
- > They condemn themselves
- > Those who accept Him see the light spiritually
- > Judgment is not the ultimate end of His coming, for He came to save the world; but it is an end, and therefore a result



- ➤ The special form of the word rendered "judgment" in this place is used nowhere else by St. John, and indicates that what is here thought of is not the act of judging, but the concrete result—the sentence pronounced after judgment
- ➤ His coming was a bringing light into the darkness of men's hearts, a testing of the false and the true, and as men accepted or rejected Him they pronounced a judicial sentence upon themselves



- ➤ These Pharisees understood Christ as speaking of blindness in a spiritual sense, and wished to know if he considered them in that state
- ➤ Jesus' judgment of the Pharisees is that they can see physically, and they are capable of being open to seeing spiritually if they would acknowledge their sins, but they do not have the desire to see the truth, therefore, they are unworthy of the kind of sight He can offer



- ➤ The point is that, if they would admit that they had been wrong and spiritually blind i.e., if they would repent of their sins and of their rejection of Him then they could be forgiven
- ➤ But as long as they continued to claim that they had sight, they would remain in sin. i.e., as long as they continued to claim that they had the truth and other people, like the blind man, were in error, they would refuse to recognize their own sins



- > So, they would continue in the sins
- The only way to remove sin is to admit that you have been in darkness and error
- Then there is hope that you will search for the light and be saved
- > These Pharisees would not admit they were in darkness, so they remained in darkness



- ➤ If they were invincibly ignorant, and had neither read the Scriptures, nor seen His miracles, they would not be guilty of the sin of infidelity
- > But now, as they boast of your knowledge of the Scriptures, they are inexcusable
- ➤ If they had humility enough to acknowledge their blindness and ignorance, and seriously to seek for a remedy, they would soon be delivered from sin, and freed from the evil of blindness

ORTHODOL DIDE

Discussion

- Explain some reasons the Holy Bible gives why disease exists.
- ➤ What similarities exist between the healing of the blind man and our own salvation from sin?
- ➤ What purpose or advantage is achieved by the fact John tells us all these details? Why didn't he just tell the miracle and stop the story there?

Discussion



- > When had Jesus healed the man? What issue was this certain to raise?
- ➤ Did the Pharisees at any point express doubt whether or not the man could now see? Why is this important?
- ➤ What evidence did the Pharisees find to disprove the miracle? What did they demonstrate about their own attitudes?
- > Trace the progress of the blind man's concept of who Jesus was.