Lawyer Hears the Good Samaritan Story (Luke 10:25-37)

1. This episode follows (and illustrates) the Lord's comments contrasting the wise and intelligent with the babes to whom God the Father unveiled His plan (Lk. 10:21,25).

2. Nomikos Tis takes his stand to put the Lord his God to the test (Lk. 10:25).
   a. \textit{νομικός} nomikos #3544: an expert in Mosaic Law (Mt. 22:35; Lk. 7:30; 10:25; 11:45,46,52; 14:3; Tit. 3:9,13). Largely parallel to the term "scribe" the lawyer was expert in the Law of Moses for Jewish observance (see Mark 12:28 || Lk. 10:25; Mt. 22:35).
   b. \textit{ἐκπειράζω} ekpeirazō #1598: to put to the test, tempt. Mt. 4:7; Lk. 4:12 || Dt. 6:16.

3. The Lawyers question is similar to the Philippian Jailer's but with a contrary motivation.
   a. \textit{ποιέω} poieō #4160: to make, do.
   b. \textit{κληρονομέω} klēronomeō #2816: acquire, inherit.

4. Jesus replied to the Lawyer by appealing to the Law and the Lawyer's own recitation of it (Lk. 10:26).
   a. The Lawyer's answer is a doctrinal synthesis of Deut. 6:5 & Lev. 19:18.
   b. The doctrinal synthesis was correct in itself but also contained a logical fallacy.
      1) Flawed premise with a bare assertion fallacy: Adherence to the Law produces worthiness to earn eternal life (Heb. 10:1; Gal. 3:17–25).
      2) Beyond the flaw in this premise is the inability of man to keep the whole Law 100% perfectly for an entire human life (Mt. 5:48).
      3) Actual truth: Perfect fulfillment of the Law demonstrates worthiness to provide eternal life (Heb. 5:9; Rom. 10:3–5; Gal. 4:4,5).
   c. Jesus affirmed the Lawyer's doctrinal synthesis and let the fallacy continue for the moment. The Lawyer's own shortcomings were about to be exposed through the illustration of "love your neighbor."

5. The Good Samaritan parable illustrates unconditional, sacrificial, integrity love in a timeless manner.
   a. The Good Samaritan transcends dispensations and ages. This principle of love is applicable under law and grace (plus innocence, conscience, promise, tribulation, kingdom, etc.).
   b. The Good Samaritan spans every conceivable interpersonal relationship.

6. The parable specifics.
   a. A certain man fell among \textit{περιπίπτω} peripiptō #4045 robbers (λῃσταί lēstai #3507) and was beaten half-dead (ἡμιθανής hemiθanēs #2253).
   b. By chance (κατὰ συγκυρίαν kata sunkurian #4795) a priest & a Levite passed by (ἀντιπαρέρχομαι antiparerchomai #492) (Lk. 10:1–32).
      1) Both the priest and the Levite should be expected to fulfill the essence of the Law.
      2) This “chance” is a sovereignly designated testing condition.
   c. A Samaritan on a journey (ὁδεύω hodeuō #3919) felt compassion (σπλαγχνίζομαι splanchnizomai #4697) (Lk. 10:33).
      1) The Samaritan is under no obligation whatsoever to adhere to the Mosaic Law, but applies the God fearing principles nevertheless (Rom. 2:14–16).
      2) Άγαπη may not take merit into account, but it certainly is not devoid of emotion.
   d. Neighborly caring goes beyond first aid to in-patient treatment and rehab-therapy (Lk. 10:34).
   e. When the Samaritan left the victim in the innkeeper's care, we see a picture of stewardship and recompense (Lk. 10:35).
7. The parable imperative: Go and do likewise. Our standard of evaluation at the judgment?