

## The Mind of Christ - Lesson 99

March 26, 2021

Welcome to another edition of the “The Mind of Christ”. We are steadily making our way through everything Jesus said and everything Jesus did in the four gospels and we are following A. T. Robertson’s chronological sequence of the life of Christ in his “Harmony of the Gospels”. We are in sections 59 and this is a particularly sweet story. I really love this story and it’s one of those stories that really touch your heart. It can really speak to you where you are but it also reveals amazing insights into the way Jesus thinks, what He does and what He said and how He treated people. Section 59 is about the anointing of Jesus’ feet, and He follows up in that same event with a parable; the parable of the two debtors. This is found in **Luke 7:36-50** and we will begin by reading this. I’m following the New American Standard Bible. The reason I am using the New American Standard Bible is because it’s the most literal translation that I know of, at least in English and it gives us a sense of how to get down into the wording of the text.

This is a very in-depth study; this is not milk; it’s not a study for a very, very new Christian, perhaps. This is for someone who really wants to *dive deep into the Mind of Christ*. So, we’ll start in **Luke 7:36** and read to the end of this chapter:

### Luke 7:36-50

<sup>36</sup> Now one of the Pharisees was requesting Him to dine with him, and He entered the Pharisee’s house and reclined at the table. <sup>37</sup> And there was a woman in the city who was a sinner; and when she learned that He was reclining at the table in the Pharisee’s house, she brought an alabaster vial of perfume, <sup>38</sup> and standing behind Him at His feet, weeping, she began to wet His feet with her tears, and kept wiping them with the hair of her head, and kissing His feet and anointing them with the perfume. <sup>39</sup> Now when the Pharisee who had invited Him saw this, he said to himself, “If this man were a prophet He would know who and what sort of person this woman is who is touching Him, that she is a sinner.”

<sup>40</sup> And Jesus answered him, “Simon, I have something to say to you.” And he replied, “Say it, Teacher.” <sup>41</sup> “A moneylender had two debtors: one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. <sup>42</sup> When they were unable to repay, he graciously forgave them both. Which of them will love him more?” <sup>43</sup> Simon answered and said, “I suppose the one whom he forgave the more.” And He said to him, “You have judged correctly.” <sup>44</sup> Turning toward the woman, He said to Simon, “Do you see this woman? I entered your house; you gave Me no water for My feet, but she has wet My feet with her tears and wiped them with her hair. <sup>45</sup> You gave Me no kiss; but she, since the time I came in, has not ceased to kiss My feet. <sup>46</sup> You did not anoint My head with oil, but she anointed My feet with perfume. <sup>47</sup> For this reason I say to you, her sins, which are many, have been forgiven, for she loved much; but he who is forgiven little, loves little.” <sup>48</sup> And He said to her, “Your sins have been forgiven.”

<sup>49</sup> Those who were reclining at the table with Him began to say to themselves, “Who is this man who even forgives sins?” <sup>50</sup> And He said to the woman, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.”

It’s a wonderful story, so let’s dig into it.

Would it make some difference if we knew who the Pharisee was: his name, his background etc. or if we knew more about the woman designated as a “sinner” in the story – her name and her background? Perhaps; **but the story is powerful, yet very simple.**

What motivated the Pharisee to invite Jesus to eat with him — Curiosity, prestige, gaining favor with some or perhaps the spark of some real interest in Jesus that he may have had? If the latter, then it will be challenged by the way Jesus allows Himself to be served by this sinful woman.

We learn during the story that the Pharisee didn’t go out of his way to show Jesus even the most common courtesies of having a slave, even, to wash Jesus’ feet. Is the Pharisee trying not to get too close to Jesus, not treating Him with any honor so as not to indicate his interest, not wanting others to think Jesus was a friend, or even a legitimate teacher or rabbi? As is the custom, Jesus reclined at the table as opposed to sitting at a table. Why would Jesus accept an invitation from a Pharisee; even one who was not overly excited about it; perhaps even a trap to get Jesus to say or do something to catch Him ... to accuse Him? He got more than he bargained for!

Well, in the story it says here, “Behold, a woman.” “Behold, a woman.” Jesus said this, “Behold, a woman.” A similar thing was said about Jesus in **John 1:36** where John says, “Behold the Lamb of God” and later, Pilate said, “Behold, the man.” In both cases, of the woman and Jesus, the spotlight was put on them; attention was called. So, as the woman entered the room, all heads turned; eyes locked onto her.

She was probably not a stranger; the cities were not that big. She would have been known. We assume she was a prostitute but we do not know that. There are a lot of other sins to choose from; but this seems likely. I wonder if there are any clients in the room, but safe to say, Pharisees to prostitutes were attracted to Jesus. So, we have both a Pharisee and a prostitute, or a ‘sinner’ at least, who was attracted to Jesus.

Remember, previously in the discourse over John the Baptist, Jesus says that he was considered by many to be a glutton and a wine bibber, a friend of tax collectors and sinners, so, for a story like this to follow closely is very appropriate for what Luke is trying to demonstrate in the life of Christ. The text says, **when the woman learned that He was reclining at the table at the Pharisee’s house**, it is interesting to let one’s mind go to the scene just before she came to Jesus. The moment she heard Jesus was nearby, what went through her mind?

She saw an opportunity, she was moved to ‘go to Him’, she was convicted of her sin; she picked up one of the tools of her trade, perfume, **expensive perfume**. Perhaps she had used the scent to lure many men to her bed. Maybe this indicated she was a prostitute of means; a high priced one; so how did she know Jesus? Had she heard Him preach? Did He heal one of her loved ones? Did she sense He was different ... He didn’t want anything from her, His love was pure? **But how did her love overcome her fear?** This could not have been a comfortable place to repent. Did she come alone or did a “Christian” friend bring her to Jesus? Of course, we’ll never know. But we know her coming to Jesus was not in a vacuum.

When I was in Israel I looked for an alabaster vial to buy, but they were all too big and heavy. I was thinking her vial had to be smaller; maybe a stone vase, a perfume vase. Perhaps it was holding myrrh, a perfumed ointment, or any aromatic resin distilling of itself from a tree or plant for special occasions or for burial even.

There will be another story later in **Matthew 26:6-13** of a woman anointing Jesus' head in preparation for His burial. There's the same story in **Mark 14:3-9**, **Luke 23:56** that mentions the perfumes used 'at' Jesus' burial. In **John 11:2**, *Mary is referred to as the one who anointed Jesus*. This story is told in **John 12:3-8**, probably the same as Matthew 26 and Luke 23.

Our text says that she stood behind Him at His feet obviously facing away from the table of food. Her aim was clear ... to do three things:

1. To wash His feet with her tears
2. To dry them with her hair
3. And to anoint them with the perfume.

Tears flowed out of deep remorse and repentance. Remember Jesus' words about repenting in sackcloth and ashes? Her response to sin was heartfelt. Tears usually flow from the heart. There must have been sufficient flow to wet His feet.

What did He feel when the drops hit His feet? We can know a person often by what brings them to tears. Her tears would have been warm, splashing down. Did she remove His sandals first? Probably. Jesus will do the same for His disciples later. It was a sign of "partnership", of being in fellowship with another; but in this case, it is a sign of devotion, a sign of repentance, maybe even shame, and certainly love.

How relieved she must have been when He did not react negatively to her. *He let her do this*. He kept His feet available to her. He allowed the tears, the hair and the perfume. Jesus didn't interrupt devotion. We will read later on about the 'triumphal entry' into Jerusalem where the children were crying out in praise and adoration, and the Pharisees told Jesus to tell them to stop; and He said if I tell them to stop, the rocks will cry out.

Then there was a time when there were some men who were casting out demons but they were not part of Jesus' little band of disciples. James and John wanted to call down fire from heaven; they wanted to tell them to stop, but Jesus said to leave them alone. The word "weeping" is from 'klaio' (Κλαίω). This word is found in **Luke 6:21** of those who mourn will laugh again. But in **Luke 6:25** it's the opposite; those who laugh will mourn. In **Luke 7:13** He told the widow of Nain not to weep. In **Luke 7:32** the children did not weep when the dirge was played. Sometimes people don't weep at the right times.

In **Luke 8:52** people weeping over Jairus' daughter is described. In **Luke 19:41** Jesus wept over the city of Jerusalem. Then in **Luke 22:62** Peter went out and wept bitterly after he had denied Jesus for three times. In **Luke 23:28** Jesus tells the daughters of Jerusalem not to weep for Him but for themselves. The Bible is filled with stories, with incidents of tears. I still see tears. When I wrote this back in May of 2012, I had just attended the funeral of a firefighter paramedic named Deb Shuster. She had had cancer, and as I stood in the crowd

along with a whole host of firefighters, and paramedics and people from the community and her family, I saw firemen weeping. Tapping into this place is important for relationships, for repentance, for grief, for regret, for love, for relief and for tenderness *lest we become too hard*. The scene is vivid ... the tears, the hair, the kisses and the anointing. This was a very outward show of affection by one forgiven much. We have seen the idea of anointing from Luke 4 and we've already done some recording on that. The honor was clear.

In **Luke 7:39** it speaks of the inner thoughts of men. The 'host', the Pharisee, was thinking to himself. Literally, "he spoke within himself". Jesus heard this man, responsible for his inner thoughts, and Jesus is going to address the thoughts of this Pharisee. The Pharisee did not protest out loud; perhaps he had some non-verbal language going on. Self-talk is an important discipline. *We reason that 'if I hold my tongue', thoughts do not count, but thoughts reveal who we are!* This is challenging since most of us "live in our heads" much of the time. I know I need to give more attention to my thought life.

Why does Luke make a point of identifying this man as a Pharisee who had invited Jesus? Perhaps because the point later about not being a very good host, no water for His feet, is made more clear. The Pharisee is watching the woman closely. Does righteous indignation rise within, or disgust, or does he merely cringe at the thought of such a woman touching Jesus? But this man also had a certain view of a prophet; they are supposed to know things that others do not. Prophets have divine insight. They can determine character and sin. He assumes that "real" prophets do not allow themselves to be contaminated by sinful touches. But why not think the opposite; that this sinner was going to get 'cleaned up' by this righteous man ... instead of her contaminating Him, He was going to cleanse her? It is the discussion about clean and unclean that is in the mind of this Pharisee.

There are two different orientations. The Pharisees were separatists, not wanting to be corrupted by the world. Jesus was an intervener wanting to transform a corrupted world. Did He understand the need to walk in a corrupt world **carefully** so as to not be pulled into it? Yes. But He **had** to touch it; and He *had to be touched by it*.

I wonder if the Pharisee was surprised to know Jesus knew what he was thinking. That could be a little unnerving. So Jesus continues the conversation verbally that was going on in the Pharisee's head. Luke says that Jesus 'answered', "apokrinomai", (αποκρινομαι). That's the word that is used in the New American Standard Bible (NASB). The word means, "to conclude for oneself, to respond". It's a Hebraism. He continued to speak. Jesus simply *carried on a conversation that began in someone else's mind!*

"Simon, I have something to say to you." Now we know the Pharisee's name was Simon, a common name of the time. Jesus reshaped the scene with these words. He was transitioning to give Simon and those there a new focus. Up to that point, all they can see is a sinner who looms large in their vision. Jesus will seek to reduce the sinner and increase grace so that Simon and the rest will see the scene the way that He sees it.

Jesus can see the log in Simon's eye, the judgment and condemnation. He knows Simon is blinded. Jesus is going to attempt *eye surgery*. It is evident that Simon does not know what is coming, but Jesus seems so bold.

In that one phrase, “Simon, I have something to say to you”, Jesus has sharpened His pencil and has set the stage to bring everyone in the room to what is important. Simon’s response was, “Say it, Teacher.” It sounds a little cocky to me. This is a moment like Nathan had with David after he slept with Bathsheba. Conviction is coming. Jesus is going to drill down to the heart and Simon has given permission, though he likely does not know what he’s in for.

I don’t mean to belabor the point, but I am fascinated that Jesus can so easily redirect everyone’s attention to what is really important. This is not easy to do. We often get lost in the moment and do not see. We make superficial points in with really important ones until others cannot tell the difference. *Jesus lifts the central point out of the clutter and holds it up as the treasure.*

The story is simple. A money lender and two debtors, two amounts, 550 denarii (the word denarii is only found here in the New Testament). Now a money lender expects a return on his money ... interest. He’s not giving money away unless he has an endless supply. This would not be possible, so what do we make of this money lender as compared to Jesus? Does Jesus, in some way, lend us something? Does He lend us our lives or does He give us our lives?

There is a distinction. A lender never lets go of his assets; he wants it back ... and more. A giver merely lets go of the gift. So does God loan us our lives, and when we squander them and can’t repay Him or give our lives back to Him, does He have only two choices – either to forgive the debt and take the loss Himself, or to require something that we cannot do and ultimately to take our lives in repayment? There are problems with this but we must be careful not to read too much into this short story.

A parable normally has one point. To make everything mean something takes the story beyond its intent. So if Jesus is not in every respect a money lender, are we in every respect debtors. This is the other half of the equation. A debtor technically borrows something and has an obligation to pay it back, usually with interest. But what did we borrow from Jesus, life? We did not ‘ask’ to be born. He merely brought us into existence as a result of natural processes. So the borrowing did not begin a conception. Did it happen when we sinned? If so, how is this borrowing? It seems more like *misappropriation of funds*, wasting or squandering, not “investing” what we were entrusted with. Many parables present things as God putting things into our care – ultimately our lives. But when we fail to manage it, we’ll go into debt to Him.

The word “debtor” here is found twice in Luke. It’s found here (**Luke 7:41**) and also in **Luke 16:5** in the story of the shrewd manager. The meaning is clear ... someone who borrowed something and now owes it. He has to pay it back unless it is forgiven. It is someone who is under obligation; a slave to the lender. Paul says, “Owe nothing to anyone except to love one another. He goes on to say, “Love fulfills the law.” The extent of the slavery is dependent on the amount, and a person’s ability to pay. There is a sick feeling when you have an obligation and you cannot fulfill it. You are at the mercy of the lender. Now we have laws to protect borrowers but it does not relieve the anxiety of obligation. Anytime we are obligated to do something we feel we cannot do, we become anxious.

We wonder, ‘what is going to happen?’ so we all have obligations to God to be obedient, to give back our lives; and there is detail – obligations to family and friends and church and government and self-management and the list goes on. The list even seems endless. There are so many expectations to ‘live up to’; how can we do them all? So, we owe people. Work, and money, and respect, and attention, and explanations, and communication, and consistency and above all; love. We will never pay out love and close the books.

But what of the debt of sin; this is connected? **James 4:17** says, “Sin is failure to do the thing we are obligated to do.” So, in the course of the day, we could say, “I should have done such and such.” I failed to make this call to give this gift, to be there for someone, to be responsible in this or that. Little by little we get deeper and deeper in debt. So, do we often think of ourselves as debtors? Is this a category we think in? We might not use the term, but it is never far away. Obligation sticks to us like oil on the beach – it is hard to wash off. It adds up and we often reach the point where we think we cannot do any more.

Something happened to make me remember the debtor feeling: the sinking, hopeless feeling to know a debt is due, especially one on a house or a car. Something you depend on for your well-being and especially when you have children. The calls come in, one more notice is in the mail, and a man feels stripped of his pride and desperate ‘what to do’... a slave to the lender.

One of the reasons I am emphasizing this is because *we all need to have that feeling that the woman had who was at the feet of Jesus*; a slave to the lender. How much is 500 denarii? Well, it’s estimated to be about \$50,000.00 in our money today. The other owed 50 denarii; about \$5,000.00. That’s a ten-fold difference. But when someone cannot repay it matters little how much the amount is. Neither was able to repay.

Literally, the words here are “not having them to *repay*”, in other words they had nothing – they were broke. They were dried up. ‘Debt’ is “opheile” (οφειλη) is “to render due”, “to recompense”, “to discharge”, “an obligation”, “to pay a debt” “to render back”, “to require”, “to give back”, “to restore” and “to refund”, and they just simply had nothing to give.

In **Matthew 12:36** the word is used in regard to giving an “**account**” for *careless words*. In **Matthew 16:27** it speaks of God’s “**recompense**”. In **Matthew 21:41** it’s used to “**pay the proceeds**” at the proper time. In **Matthew 6:4, 6, 18** it is about God seeing in secret and “**repaying**” you. In **Matthew 5:33** it talks about “**fulfilling a vow**” to the Lord, to repay a vow. In **Matthew 5:26** when you are being sued, you will not get out of it until you have “**paid the last cent**”. In **Romans 12:17** it says, don’t “**pay back**” evil for evil. In **Luke 4:20** it talks about when Jesus gave the book “**back**” to the attendant {in the synagogue}, and He could only give “back” what he had...the book. In **Luke 9:42** Jesus gave the boy “**back**” to his father; He “returned” him. In **Luke 10:35** the Samaritan promises to “**repay**” the inn keeper for any additional expenses that he incurs. And in **Luke 19:8** Zacchaeus promises to “**repay**” all of the money that he had cheated people out of.

All of these are example of people “repaying” something, but what do you do when you don’t have the ability to “repay” something you owe?

There is a fundamental *law of equity*. Things should come out even ... justice; but *this is impossible without God's correction*; either of forgiveness or recompense. The books must be balanced!

The moneylender graciously forgave it, it says. "Charizomai" (χαριζομαι) is "to grant as a favor", "gratuitously", "in kindness", "to pardon", "to rescue", "to forgive freely" from grace ... a willingness to do so. It's not simply that he forgave reluctantly, but he did it graciously, willingly, he wanted to make sure that this was 'forgiven'. This is an important concept; that the one who is owed can sometimes, reluctantly forgive the debt because they can't do anything else. You can't get blood out of a turnip. So, you say, well, I guess I'll just take the loss.

But that was not what this moneylender did. It says that he "graciously forgave" the debt. Let me show you some other places where this word "Charizomai" (χαριζομαι) is used. **Romans 8:32** talks about will Jesus not freely give us all things. The moneylender **freely cancelled the debt**. **1 Corinthians 2:12** says the spirit will help us to understand what God *has freely given us*. This is the word that is used here. **Galatians 3:18** says that God *granted* the inheritance. It was *freely given* to us. **Philippians 1:29** says we have been *granted* to believe and to suffer. In other words, God has freely, has graciously given us the ability to believe and to suffer for him. In **2 Corinthians 2:7** and **2:10** where the man who had been a sinner, and now Paul is telling the congregation to forgive him; he uses the term 'you need to *graciously forgive* him, **freely forgive** him – not reluctantly. In **2 Corinthians 12:13** Paul uses the term, 'forgive me this wrong'. He is saying, 'please, graciously forgive me of this wrong'. **Ephesians 4:32** the word is used here where it says, "be kind, tenderhearted, forgiving one another", not just reluctantly but *graciously forgiving* another person.

In Romans 8 and the 1 Corinthians 2 passage indicates that God is not reluctant to forgive. He is not stingy or under compulsion. He is a cheerful giver, and He loves cheerful givers; with a desire to forgive, a wanting to forgive. But doesn't He know we are going to need more tomorrow? Does He even think, "I'm done?" I know this story doesn't say it all; there is repentance. But this story does express a key element in forgiveness – the inability to repay not demanding something someone cannot do. Can I freely give, and still, for the sake of the forgiven, hold them accountable? But why do we do this? Is it merely to protect ourselves, or because we love the offender and want to help them avoid sin? It might serve both purposes but I think the "why" makes the most difference. Self-protection can merely be selfishness and an excuse not to love. But if I take steps to consider what is in another's best interest, I will have a purer thinking.

To freely forgive, to be generous and giving to people who do not deserve it, and who will need it again is to be like Jesus. Not "being able to repay" is not like "can't earn enough to pay"; it is different than that. **Can't** means **can't**. Just simply, you **can't repay the debt**. The distinction between the two is significant. He forgave them both. They both were freed from their obligation. They both could not pay but the size of the debt is really one of perception; not reality. We might calculate money in amounts, but money is about value.

How many man hours would it take to work off \$50,000.00 versus \$5,000.00? It would take ten times as long. Or how much gold does it take to equal 50,000 versus 5,000? Ten times more! But this is **not** the way sin is calculated. Sin cannot be measured in man hours or of work to repay or in a gold standard. There's not enough gold to pay for one sin! (**1 Peter 1:18**). Sin is not 'erased' by work. The only way to remove sin is by forgiveness, and the only way Jesus could offer forgiveness was to die. The value of sin is determined by its consequences; that is **death**! Only death can defeat death. There must be payment for the debt we cannot pay.

The moneylender had to "eat the debt", if you will. He had to absorb the loss; he had to eat it. In this case, the quality and quantity of the moneylender's life is diminished. He **has** less and therefore can **do** less than if he had his \$55,000.00 back. But is this true with God? Does He experience loss because He forgives or does not get back what is His **because** He **does** forgive? Does fulfillment come by giving? The principle of 'losing life to find it', or 'it is more blessed to give than receive' comes to my mind here. So, the question is: If God forgives us, does He really get "all of us" back? I believe He does.

Jesus ties the response of love to the amount of forgiveness; or the perception of how much is forgiven which is tied to one's perception of the seriousness of his sin. Jesus is not saying a 'big sinner always out-loses a little sinner even when both accept forgiveness.' But perception or recognition is the key.

Simon gave the correct answer. He got the point of the story; the greater the debt the greater the forgiveness and the greater the love response. Even though Jesus commends Simon for his rightly judging the story, Simon begins his answer with, "I suppose". The word I "**suppose**", "hupolambano" (υπολαμβάνω) literally means "to take up by placing oneself underneath what is taken up", it means "to catch away"; "to withdraw". For instance, in **Acts 1:9** Jesus is "**lifted up**" into the clouds. "**To take up** a discourse by continuing", "to answer" in **Luke 10:30** "**Jesus replied**". It means "to take up a notion", "to think" or "to **suppose**". In **Acts 2:15** Peter says, "These men are not drunk as you "**suppose**". In other words, a supposition is something you "take up". It's something you "put up" into the discussion. It is a "theory", if you will. It's a supposition, something that you propose to be true. So these two verses indicate the nature of supposition. It can be "right" or it can be "wrong"! ***Just because "I suppose" it, it does not mean it's true.***

In this case, Jesus was the One who determined whether the supposition was correct. Man lives with the possibility of the fallibility of his judgment. Jesus guided Simon to this conclusion; Simon did not get there by himself. I wonder if "**forgave**" stuck in Simon's throat. Was this something he would have done? He was not very generous with his foot washing or with his oil. Did the story seem "far-fetched" to Simon? ***Why would anyone "graciously" forgive two people a total of \$55,000.00 just because they could not pay?*** But Simon understood that if he were on the **receiving end** of such grace it would be a windfall! Did Simon know Jesus had "set him up" to fall into truth? Satan sets us up to fall into lies, but Jesus sets 'truth traps'. Everyone likes to be told their answer is correct. 'You got it right, Simon.' Simon was looking good in the eyes of the others who were there, but the woman was also hearing this story. How was **she** feeling? Jesus didn't ask her any questions; she simply acted. She served humbly, poured out her love. The scene could not be more of a contrast.

In **Luke 7:44**, Luke says, “turning toward the woman”. Imagine the scene. Jesus is reclining at the table with His feet and His legs stretched out behind Him. Let’s say Simon is directly across from Him and they have this conversation about the woman. But now, Jesus turns and looks at the woman. What did He see? Did He know her? Did their eyes meet? Did she suddenly become self-conscious because the center of attention was on her? Did Jesus convey dignity because He looked at her? This was a moment in time but so significant; a moment neither she nor Simon would forget.

Jesus’ question to Simon, while looking at the woman was, “Do you see this woman?” Do you **see** this woman? Had Simon really ‘see’ the woman? And if he did, **how** did he view her? When we look at people with stereotypical eyes, **we really do not see them**. Simon only saw “**a sinner**”, “**a prostitute**” “**an unclean person**”. As Paul says later in **2 Cor. 5:16** “Therefore from now on we recognize no one according to the flesh; even though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him in this way no longer.” Then Paul showed the true lens through which to view people. “If anyone is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things passed away; behold, new things have come.” You see; **how** do we see?

When we look at another person, what do we see? Did Simon see the transformation happening in this woman **right before his eyes**? She was being made new. She was in repentance heading to forgiveness and salvation, and now Simon is being forced to really look not just at the woman, but her actions, her fruit, her heart, her connection with Jesus, her love. Did he see it? It is like one of those optical illusions. Do you see Jesus in this picture? Some turn the picture every way and still can’t find Jesus in it. Did Simon ever see the woman?

See the contrast of the behaviors of the two – the works that they did or didn’t do, the responses, the **appropriate** responses. Simon gave no water; she gave tears and her hair to dry them. Simon gave no kiss; but she kissed his feet. Simon gave no oil for anointing but she gave perfume. Simon perceived himself as being forgiven little; but she perceived herself as being forgiven much. Simon was the one who loved little; she was the one who loved much. This sums up the contrast, but what does it illustrate? Here are three points:

1. Jesus made foot washing about connection; being a part of another person. John 13, particularly with Peter, Jesus said, “If I do not wash you, you have no part with Me.” Jesus’ point went beyond common courtesy. The welcome one receives into another’s house says something about worthiness and acceptance. See Matthew 10 regarding this as Jesus sent them out on the ‘limited commission’.
2. The second point is the kiss is about worship and affection. “Proskuneo” (προσκυνεω) means “to kiss towards”; it’s the word for worship in the New Testament. Simon had no worship for Jesus because he did not know who He was. You don’t worship men; you worship God. If Simon had truly known who Jesus was, he would have pulled out all the stops. The woman was where she, and we, belong; at His feet. Note the times when people fell at Jesus feet. That’s also where God will place all things – under the feet of Jesus. This woman was there **now**. Simon wasn’t there.

3. The third point is anointing was often about ‘authority’. A greater anointing lesser **but not in this case**. The anointing is preparation for burial, showing respect and honor to the person. There is a connection to comfort given by oil in a dry climate, but in this case, the perfume was more; the expense said **Jesus was worth it**.

**So, we have connection, we have worship and we have honor which springs from love which springs from forgiveness which came because of repentance which was there because of the admission of sins.** If we reverse this, we have this pattern: recognition of sin, confession of sin, repentance, forgiveness, love, connection, worship and honor.

**Just a note here:** Jesus constantly talks in terms of appropriate responses. The way we act in the presence of God, which is everywhere at all times, as we are in His presence and we have a realization of the truth; it tells us a lot about who we are. If we realize we are in the presence of God, we have that realization that we’re in His presence, how do we act? What is the appropriate way to act in the presence of God?

These words to Simon should have struck deep into his heart – He who is forgiven little loves little ... **this stings**. Who could honestly say he has been forgiven little? The enormity of my sin is not just in the quantity, but in **the nature of sin** itself. One sin demands that the justice and love of God be expressed on the cross! **The cross is the measure of sin**. We have little and big sins; all kinds of ways to count them, and size them and grade them. These are merely man-made attempts to minimize sin so it can be managed by us. We can’t manage sin! Only God can. Once committed, we have lost our ability to do anything about it. **The options are punishment** by death or acceptance of God’s forgiveness leading to life.

Jesus tells this woman her sins are forgiven. Of course, this gets the attention of the group. They knew enough to know that they did not have authority to forgive sins and they thought it strange that Jesus thought He **did** have this authority. This was, by Jesus, a very direct proclamation of His deity. He is God. He forgives. He has the right because He is the means by which anyone can be forgiven.

Notice the people around the table are talking to themselves again. Chickens! Not once in the story did **anyone** confront Jesus, as though they took no issue with Him on many points. Jesus didn’t bother to call them out on it. He had made His point so He turns back to the woman and He speaks to her. He says, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.” What a gift. He has just released her from guilt, acknowledged her faith and blessed her with peace.

Wow, what a story! What a story! It’s very important as we study the mind of Christ, not only to get into His mind and His thinking but to put ourselves in the places of the different people in the story. Are we Simon or are we the woman, and how do we view Jesus? Simon viewed Jesus differently than the woman did. How do we view Jesus? Do we **know** Him the way **she** did for do we know Him the way **Simon** did? That is getting into the mind of Christ. That is trying to understand how we can best learn to think like He does so that when we are in similar situations, whether we are on the receiving end of forgiveness or whether we are on the giving end of forgiveness; that we will think like He does.

Thank you for joining us. You can go to our website <https://www.centralsarasota.org/> to find other material or lessons we have done in the past on the Mind of Christ. Thank you again for joining us. Until next time, God bless.