Who is My Neighbor?
Luke 10:30-37

Sermon Outline

A. A Question to Ponder (vs. 29-30):

1. Like some theologians and Bible students today, Jewish rabbis enjoyed debating the fine points of doctrine; and this lawyer (a student of the OT law) wanted to hear what Jesus had to say. We get the impression that the man was not seeking truth, but was only trying to involve Jesus in a debate that he hoped he would win. The lawyer proved to be evasive when it came to facing truth honestly and obeying it.[1]
2. There is no evidence that Jesus and His disciples were eyewitness of this incident. This is a true story. So what can also be taken from this is that even though Christ allows people with a freewill to do what they decide, He is always providing help for those in need.
3. Leaving Jerusalem was something this man did in the past, and had just done and was going to do this in the future. So, it could be that this man was a faithful worshipper.
4. Jesus took the time to respond to the lawyers’ question by telling him a story that contradicted cultural norms and misinterpretations of the law.
5. The man was surprised and ambushed. The man did not stand a chance.
6. These men were violent. They were not just after the man’s property, they wanted to seriously hurt him.
7. His clothes and belongings must have been valuable, but it was also humiliating to be left naked and beaten.
8. They forcefully beat the man.
9. They knew the man was in a bad state, but they still left him on this lonely road. They had absolute no care for this man.

B. A Challenge to Accept (vs. 31-35):

1. The priest just happened to decide to go this way.
2. The priest, who is considered a holy man especially well acquainted with the ceremonial law, must had completed his responsibilities in Jerusalem and was heading home.
3. The priest had a full knowledge that the man was not dead yet and badly needed help. This word also means that they had a full knowledge of what was expected based on the Word of God.
4. The priest willfully did his best to avoid the man in a time of crisis. Apparently, the man was on the same side they are walking and they ended up stabbing into him.
5. The Levite like the priest was fully cognizant of all that was taking place when they decided to move to the other side of the road.
6. With a full complete knowledge of all that was taking place the Levite made a cognitive decision to move to the other side. This word also means that they had a full knowledge of what was expected based on the Word of God.

7. Notice that the Samaritan was not coming from Jerusalem, he was on a continuous active mode of traveling.

8. The Samaritan happened to stumble unto this man in the manner as the priest and the Levite. They were on the same side of the road. The circumstances for all the travelers were the same.

9. The Samaritan came to a full complete understanding of what he had just stumbled into just like the priest and the Levite.

10. The Samaritan was stirred with his emotions that came from deep inside him. He was so deeply moved that it became impossible to leave the man on the street.

11. The Samaritan put his life at risk by going to the very location where the man was. He was completely drawn to do something to help this man.
   a) He tried to stop the bleeding.
   b) He sought to ease the man’s pain.
   c) He sacrificed the comfort of his journey and by putting the man on his beast.
   d) He removed the man from danger and took responsibility for caring for the man.
   e) He personally with some foreknowledge sought, on his own, to nurture the man back to health.
   f) His desire from his heart is to work diligently to see the man come back to full health.
   g) He paid the inn keeper to make sure there was nothing that would hinder the man being cared for.

12. He commanded the inn keeper to do what he said.

13. He desired the inn keeper to provide the same kind of compassionate care that he was giving to the man.

14. The Samaritan was not done until the man was better.

C. A Command to Obey (vs. 36-37):

1. Christ requested that the lawyer to give his opinion for his own question based on the reputation of all three individuals.

2. Christ wanted to hear the lawyer’s opinion on who he believes is the most superior neighbor.

3. Christ wanted to know the answer based on the actions that naturally came out of all three individuals. When all three individuals were exposed to the same circumstances their reaction revealed what their true character was. This is what determines who is truly a neighbor.

4. They were all tested with the same circumstances (ran into the man on the same side of the road, dying, alone and destitute. They could not have missed seeing how everything was) their actions revealed who was a true neighbor.
5. The person who from the inside out set their mind to completely care for the man, no matter the obstacles and danger, and followed through on his actions is the neighbor.

6. The lawyer said that the mercy displayed demonstrates the love of God. It as if the lawyer was saying that what the man robbed went through could have taken place because he sinned but the Samaritan did not seek to ensure justice instead he decided to execute grace by helping the man live. It is this that demonstrates the love of God. As a result when the man is healed his guilt was removed. He will find that out when he returned.

7. Christ commands the lawyer to make this his way of life.

8. The lawyer must now be determined to willfully serve his neighbor with the same compassion and mercy.
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