EXPOSITORY THOUGHTS ON THE GOSPELS.

FOR FAMILY AND PRIVATE USE.

WITH THE TEXT COMPLETE,
And many Explanatory Notes.

BY THE REV. J. C. RYLE, B. A.,

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD,
VICAR OF STRADBROKE, SUFFOLK;
Author of “Home Truths,” etc.

ST. JOHN. VOL. I.

LONDON:
WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY, 23, HOLLES STREET,
CAVENDISH SQUARE.
IPSWICH: WILLIAM HUNT, TAVERN STREET.

First Edition
1856AD
7 There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water: Jesus saith unto her, Give me to drink.
8 (For his disciples were gone away unto the city to buy meat.)
9 Then saith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.
10 Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water.
11 The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast thou that living water?
12 Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle?
13 Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again:
14 But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.
15 The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw.
16 Jesus saith unto her, Go, call thy husband, and come hither.
17 The woman answered and said, I have no husband. Jesus said unto her, Thou hast well said, I have no husband:
18 For thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband: in that saidst thou truly.
19 The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet.
20 Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.
21 Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.
22 Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews.
23 But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him.
24 God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.
25 The woman saith unto him, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things.
26 Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he.

THE history of the Samaritan woman, contained in these verses, is one of the most interesting and instructive passages in John’s Gospel. John has shown us, in the case of Nicodemus, how our Lord dealt with a self-righteous formalist. He now shows us how our Lord dealt with an ignorant, carnal-minded woman, whose moral character was more than ordinarily bad. There are lessons in the passage for ministers and teachers, which they would do well to ponder.

We should mark, firstly, the mingled tact and humility of Christ in dealing with a careless sinner.

Our Lord was sitting by Jacob’s well when a woman of Samaria came there to draw water. At once He says to her, “Give me to drink.” He does not wait for her to speak to Him. He does not begin by reproving her sins, though He doubt-
less knew them. He opens communication by asking a favour. He approaches the woman’s mind by the subject of “water,” which was naturally uppermost in her thoughts. Simple as this request may seem, it opened a door to spiritual conversation. It threw a bridge across the gulf which lay between her and Him. It led to the conversion of her soul.

Our Lord’s conduct in this place should be carefully remembered by all who want to do good to the thoughtless and spiritually ignorant. It is vain to expect that such people will voluntarily come to us, and begin to seek knowledge. We must begin with them, and go down to them in the spirit of courteous and friendly offensive. It is vain to expect that such people will be prepared for our instruction, and will at once see and acknowledge the wisdom of all we are doing. We must go to work wisely. We must study the best avenues to their hearts, and the most likely way of arresting their attention. There is a handle to every mind, and our chief aim must be to get hold of it. Above all, we must be kind in manner, and beware of showing that we feel conscious of our own superiority. If we let ignorant people fancy that we think we are doing them a great favour in talking to them about religion, there is little hope of doing good to their souls.

We should mark, secondly, Christ’s readiness to give mercies to careless sinners. He tells the Samaritan woman that if she had asked, “He would have given her living water.” He knew the character of the person before Him perfectly well. Yet He says, “If she had asked, He would have given,”—He would have given the living water of grace, mercy, and peace.

The infinite willingness of Christ to receive sinners is a golden truth, which ought to be treasured up in our hearts, and diligently impressed on others. The Lord Jesus is far more ready to hear than we are to pray, and far more ready to give favours than we are to ask them. All day long He stretches out His hands to the disobedient and gainsaying. He has thoughts of pity and compassion towards the vilest of sinners, even when they have no thoughts of Him. He stands waiting to bestow mercy and grace on the worst and most unworthy, if they will only cry to Him. He will never draw back from that well known promise, “Ask and you shall receive—seek and you shall find.” The lost will discover at the last day, that they had not, because they asked not.

We should mark, thirdly, the priceless excellence of Christ’s gifts when compared with the things of this world. Our Lord tells the Samaritan woman, “He that drinks of this water shall thirst again, but he that drinks of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst.”
The truth of the principle here laid down may be seen on every side by all who are not blinded by prejudice or love of the world. Thousands of men have every temporal good thing that heart could wish, and are yet weary and dissatisfied. It is now as it was in David’s time—“There be many that say, Who will show us any good.” (Psalm iv. 6) utterly unable to fill the soul. He that only drinks of these waters is sure to thirst again. Every Ahab finds a Naboth’s vineyard hard by his palace, and every Haman sees a Mordecai at the gate. There is no heart satisfaction in this world, until we believe on Christ. Jesus alone can fill up the empty places of our inward man. Jesus alone can give solid, lasting, enduring happiness. The peace that He imparts is a fountain, which, once set flowing within the soul, flows on to all eternity. Its waters may have their ebbing seasons; but they are living waters, and they shall never be completely dried.

We should mark, fourthly, the absolute necessity of conviction of sin before a soul can be converted to God. The Samaritan woman seems to have been comparatively unmoved until our Lord exposed her breach of the seventh commandment. Those heart-searching words, “Go, call your husband,” appear to have pierced her conscience like an arrow. From that moment, however ignorant, she speaks like an earnest, sincere inquirer after truth. And the reason is evident. She felt that her spiritual disease was discovered. For the first time in her life she saw herself.

To bring thoughtless people to this state of mind should be the principal aim of all teachers and ministers of the Gospel. They should carefully copy their Master’s example in this place. Until men and women are brought to feel their sinfulness and need, no real good is ever done to their souls. Until a sinner sees himself as God sees him, he will continue careless, trifling, and unmoved. By all means we must labour to convince the unconverted man of sin, to pierce his conscience, to open his eyes, to show him himself. To this end we must expound the length and breadth of God’s holy law. To this end we must denounce every practice contrary to that law, however fashionable and customary. This is the only way to do good. Never does a soul value the Gospel medicine until it feels its disease. Never does a man see any beauty in Christ as a Saviour, until he discovers that he is himself a lost and ruined sinner. Ignorance of sin is invariably attended by neglect of Christ.

We should mark, fifthly, the utter uselessness of any religion which only consists of formality. The Samaritan woman, when awakened to spiritual concern, started questions about the comparative merits of the Samaritan and Jewish modes of worshiping God. Our Lord tells her that true and acceptable wor-
ship depends not on the place in which it is offered, but on the state of the worshipper’s heart. He declares, “The hour comes when you shall neither in this place nor at Jerusalem worship the Father.” He adds that “the true worshippers shall worship in spirit and in truth.”

The principle contained in these sentences can never be too strongly impressed on professing Christians. We are all naturally inclined to make religion a mere matter of outward forms and ceremonies, and to attach an excessive importance to our own particular manner of worshipping God. We must beware of this spirit, and especially when we first begin to think seriously about our souls. The heart is the principal thing in all our approaches to God. “The Lord looks on the heart.” (1 Sam. xvi. 7.) The most gorgeous cathedral-service is offensive in God’s sight, if all is gone through coldly, heartlessly, and without grace. The feeblest gathering of three or four poor believers in a lowly cottage to read the Bible and pray, is a more acceptable sight to Him who searches the heart than the fullest congregation which is ever gathered in St. Peter’s at Rome.

We should mark, lastly, Christ’s gracious willingness to reveal Himself to the chief of sinners. He concludes His conversation with the Samaritan woman by telling her openly and unreservedly that He is the Saviour of the world. “I that speak to you,” He says, “am the Messiah.” Nowhere in all the Gospels do we find our Lord making such a full avowal of His nature and office as He does in this place. And this avowal, be it remembered, was made not to learned Scribes, or moral Pharisees, but to one who up to that day had been an ignorant, thoughtless, and immoral person!

Dealings with sinners, such as these, form one of the grand peculiarities of the Gospel. Whatever a man’s past life may have been, there is hope and a remedy for him in Christ. If he is only willing to hear Christ’s voice and follow Him, Christ is willing to receive him at once as a friend, and to bestow on him the fullest measure of mercy and grace. The Samaritan woman, the penitent thief, the Philippian jailor, the tax-collector Zacchæus, are all patterns of Christ’s readiness to show mercy, and to confer full and immediate pardons. It is His glory that, like a great physician, He will undertake to cure those who are apparently incurable, and that none are too bad for Him to love and heal. Let these things sink down into our hearts. Whatever else we doubt, let us never doubt that Christ’s love to sinners passes knowledge, and that Christ is as willing to receive as He is almighty to save.

What are we ourselves? This is the question, after all, which demands our attention. We may have been up to this day careless, thoughtless, sinful as the woman whose story we have been reading. But yet there is hope—He who
talked with the Samaritan woman at the well is yet living at God’s right hand, and never changes. Let us only ask, and He will “give us living water.”
7.—*Then cometh...woman...draw water.*] The scarcity of water in the hot climates of the East makes drawing water from the nearest well an important part of the daily business of an Eastern household. We learn from other parts of Scripture that it was a work ordinarily done by women. (Gen. xxiv. 11: 1 Sam. ix. 11.) A well became naturally a common meeting-place for the inhabitants of a neighbourhood, and especially for the young people. (Judges v. 11.) The insinuation, however, of some writers, as Schottgen, that the Samaritan woman’s motives in coming to the well were possibly immoral, seems destitute of any foundation. Bad as her moral character evidently was, we have no right to heap upon her more blame than is warranted by facts.

Augustine regards this woman as a type of the Gentile Church, “not now justified, but even now at the point to be justified.” I doubt whether we were meant by the Holy Ghost to take this view. There is great danger in adopting such allegorical interpretations. They insensibly draw away the mind from the plain lessons of Scripture.

Musculus remarks what a wonderful instance it is of sovereign grace, that our Lord should turn away from learned Scribes, Pharisees, and Priests, to converse with and convert such a person as this woman, to all appearance so utterly unworthy of notice. He also observes how singularly our least movements are overruled by God’s providence. Like Rebecca and Rachel, the woman came to the well knowing nothing of the importance of that day’s visit to her soul.

*Jesus saith... Give Me to drink.*] In this simple request of our Lord there are four things deserving notice. (a) It was a gracious act of spiritual aggression on a sinner. He did not wait for the woman to speak to Him, but was the first to begin conversation. (b) It was an act of marvellous condescension. He by whom all things were made, the Creator of fountains, brooks, and rivers, is not ashamed to ask a draught of water from the hand of one of His sinful creatures. (c) It was an act full of wisdom and prudence. He does not at once force religion on the attention of the woman, and rebuke her for her sins. He begins with a subject apparently indifferent, and yet one of which the woman’s mind was doubtless full. He asks her for water. (d) It was an act full of the nicest tact, and exhibiting perfect knowledge of the human mind. He asks a favour, and puts Himself under an obligation. No line of proceeding, it is well known to all wise people, would be more likely to conciliate the woman’s feelings towards Him, and to make her willing to hear His teaching. Simple as the request was, it contains principles which deserve the closest attention of all who desire to do good to ignorant and thoughtless sinners.

The idea of Euthymius, that our Lord pretended thirst in order to introduce conversation, is unworthy of notice.—Cyril thinks that our Lord intended to make a practical protest against the exclusiveness of the Jews, by asking drink of a Samaritan woman, and to show her that He disapproved the custom of His nation.

8.—*His disciples...gone...buy meat.*] This verse is an instance of our Lord’s general rule not to work a miracle in order to supply His own wants. He who could feed five thousand with a few loaves and fishes when He willed, was content to buy food, like any other man.—It is an instance of His lowly-mindedness. The Creator of all things, though rich, for our sakes became poor.—It ought to teach Christians that they are not meant to be so spiritual as to neglect the management of money, and a reasonable use of it for the supply of their wants. God could feed His children, as He fed Elijah, by a daily miracle. But He knows it is better for our souls, and more likely to call grace into exercise, not to feed them so, but to make them think, and use
means. There is no real spirituality in being careless about money. Jesus Himself allowed His disciples to “buy.”

The word rendered “meat” means nothing more than “food or nourishment,” and must not be confined to “flesh.” Out of the sixteen places where it is used in the New Testament, there is not one where it necessarily signifies “flesh.” The meat offering of the Old Testament consisted of nothing but flour, oil, and incense. (Lev. ii. 1, 2.) The meaning of the word “meat,” in the English language, has evidently changed since the last revision of the English Bible.

The whole verse is an instance of one of those short, parenthetical, explanatory comments, which are common in St. John’s Gospel. Its object is to explain the circumstance of our Lord being alone at the well, and the fact that He did not ask a disciple to give Him water.

9.—[Then saith...woman...How is it...a Jew...Samaria.] This question implies that the woman was surprised at our Lord speaking to her. It was an unexpected act of condescension on His part, and as such arrested her attention. Thus one point, at any rate, was gained. It is a great matter if we can only get a careless sinner to give us a quiet hearing. We shall soon see how our Lord improved the opportunity.

How the woman knew our Lord to be a Jew, is matter of conjecture. Some think that she knew it by the dialect that He spoke. Some think that she knew it by the fringe upon His dress, which He probably wore in conformity to the Mosaic law (Num. xv. 38, 39), and which the Samaritans very likely neglected. One thing is very clear. There was nothing in our Lord’s personal appearance, when He was a man upon earth, to distinguish Him from any other Jewish traveller who might have been found sitting at a well. There was nothing eccentric or peculiar about His dress. He looked like other men.

I venture the opinion that in the woman’s question stress should be laid on the word “woman.” She was not only surprised that a Jewish man asked drink of a Samaritan, but also that he asked it of a woman.

[The Jews have no dealings...Samaritans.] This sentence is generally thought, with much reason, to be the explanatory comment of St. John, and not the words of the Samaritan woman. It certainly seems more natural to take it so. The sentence should then be read as a parenthesis. Calvin thinks it is the woman’s words, but his reasons are not convincing.

The enmity between the Jews and Samaritans, here referred to, no doubt originated in the separation of the ten tribes under Jeroboam, and the establishment of the kingdom of Israel. It was exceedingly increased after the ten tribes were carried into captivity by the Assyrians, by the fact that the Samaritans became mingled with foreigners, whom the king of Assyria sent to Samaria from Babylon and other places, and so lost their right to be called pure Jews. (2 Kings xvii. 1, etc.) It was further aggravated by the opposition which the inhabitants of Samaria made to the rebuilding of Jerusalem, after the return from the captivity of Babylon, in the days of Ezra. (Ezra iv. 10, etc.) In the days of our Lord the Jews seem to have gone into the extreme of regarding the Samaritans as entirely foreigners, and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. When they told our Lord that He was “a Samaritan, and had a devil,” they meant the expression to convey the bitterest scorn and reproach. (John viii. 48.) It is clear, however, from the conversation in this chapter, that the Samaritans, however mistaken on many points, were not ignorant
heathens. They regarded themselves as descended from Jacob. They had a kind of Old Testament religion. They expected the coming Messias.

The bitter and exclusive spirit of the Jews towards all other nations, referred to in this verse, is curiously confirmed by the language used about the Jews by heathen writers at Rome. Exclusiveness was noted as one among their peculiarities.—The immense difficulty with which even the apostles got over this exclusive feeling, and went forth to preach to the Gentiles, is noticeable both in the Acts and the Epistles. (Acts x. 28; xi. 2; Gal. ii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 16.)

The utter absence of real charity and love among men in the days when our Lord was upon earth, ought not to be overlooked. Well would it be if men had never quarrelled about religion after He left the world! Quarrels among the crew of a sinking ship are not more hideous, unseemly, and irrational than the majority of quarrels among professors of religion. An historian might truly apply St. John’s words to many a period in Church history, and say, “The Romanists have no dealings with the Protestants,” or “the Lutherans have no dealings with the Calvinists,” or “the Calvinists have no dealings with the Arminians,” or “the Episcopalians have no dealings with the Presbyterians,” or “the Baptists have no dealings with those who baptize infants,” or “the Plymouth Brethren have no dealings with anybody who does not join their company.” These things ought not so to be. They are the scandal of Christianity, the joy of the devil, and the greatest stumbling-block to the spread of the Gospel.

The Greek words translated “have no dealings,” mean literally “use not anything together with the Samaritans.” Pearce says “The Jews would not eat or drink with the Samaritans, would not drink out of the same cup; or eat of the same dish with them.” This fact throws much light on the woman’s surprise at our Lord’s request: “Give Me to drink.”

10.—[Jesus answered, etc.] In this verse our Lord proceeds to use the opportunity which the woman’s question affords Him. He passes over for the present her expression of surprise at a Jew speaking to a Samaritan. He begins by exciting her curiosity and raising her expectations, by speaking of something within her reach which He calls “living water.” The first step to take with a careless sinner after his attention has been arrested, is to produce on his mind the impression that we can tell him of something to his advantage within his reach. There is a certain vagueness in our Lord’s words which exhibits his consummate wisdom. A systematic statement of doctrinal truth would have been thrown away at this stage of the woman’s feeling. The general and figurative language which our Lord employed, was exactly calculated to arouse her imagination, and to lead her on to further inquiry.

[The gift of God.] This expression is variously explained. Some think, as Augustine, Rupertus, Jansenius, Whitby, and Alford, that it means “the Holy Spirit,”—that peculiar gift which it was the Messiah’s special office to impart to men in greater abundance than it had before been imparted. (Acts ii. 38; x. 45.)

Some think, as Brentius, Bucer, Musculus, Calovius, Grotius, and Barradius, that it means “the gracious opportunity which God is graciously giving to thee.” If thou didst but know what a door of life is close to thee, thou wouldst joyfully use it.

Some think, as Euthymius, Toletus, Bullinger, Gualter, Hooker, Beza, Rollock, Lightfoot, Glassius, Dyke, Hildersam, and Gill, that it means “Christ Himself,”—God’s gracious gift to a sinful world. If thou didst but know that God has actually given His only-begotten Son, accord-
ing to promise, and that He has come into the world, and that it is He who is speaking to thee, thou wouldst at once ask of Him living water.

Some think that it means “God’s gifts, and especially His gift of grace,” which is now being proclaimed and made manifest to the world by the appearing on earth of His Son, (See Rom. v. 15.) This seems to be the view of Cyril, Lampe, Theophylact, Zwingle, and Calvin.

Of these four views the last seems to me, on the whole, the most probable and satisfactory. The first sounds strange and unlike the usual teaching of Scripture. “If thou knewest the Holy Spirit, thou wouldst have asked,” is an expression we can hardly expect at this period of our Lord’s ministry, when the mission of the Comforter had not yet been explained.—The second view seems hardly more natural than the first.—The third view is undoubtedly recommended by the fact that Christ is frequently spoken of as God’s great gift to the world. If the woman had really known anything aright about Messiah, and had known that He was before her, she would have asked of Him living water. Nevertheless, it is a strong objection to this view that it makes our Lord apparently say the same thing twice over. “If thou knewest Christ, and that it is Christ who speaks.”

The last view makes the first clause general: “If thou knewest the grace of God; “and the second particular: “If thou also knewest that the Saviour Himself is with thee.” Thus both clauses receive a meaning.

[Living water.] The meaning of this expression, like “the gift of God,” is variously explained. Some, as Calovius and Chemnitus, seem to think it means the doctrine of God’s mercy, pardon, cleansing, and justification. Others, as Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril, Theophylact, Calvin, Beza, Gualter, Musculus, and Ferus, think it means the Holy Spirit, renewing, and sanctification.

I doubt whether either view is quite correct. I am inclined, with Bullinger and Rollock, to regard the expression as a general figurative description of everything which it is Christ’s office to bestow on the soul of man,—pardon, peace, mercy, grace, justification, and sanctification. As water is cleansing, purifying, cooling, refreshing, thirst-satisfying to man’s body, so are Christ’s gifts to the soul. I think everything that a sinful soul needs is purposely included under the general words, “living water.” It comprises not only the justifying “blood which cleanses from all sin,” but the sanctifying grace of the Spirit, by which we “cleanse ourselves from all filthiness”—not only the inward peace which is the result of pardon, but the sense of inward comfort, which is the companion of renewal of heart.

The idea of “water,” we should remember, is specially brought forward in some of the Old Testament promises of good things to come, (See Isa. xii. 3; xliv 3; Ezek. xlvii. 1, etc.; Zech. xiii. 1; xiv. 8.) A sprinkling of clean water was particularly mentioned as one of the things Messiah was to give. (Isa. lii. 15; Ezek. xxxvi. 25.) To an intelligent reader of the Old Testament the mention of “living water” would at once raise up the idea of Messiah’s times.

The word “living,” applied here to water, must not be pressed too far. It does not necessarily mean anything more than fresh, running waters. Thus it is said that Isaac’s servants found a well of living waters. (Gen. xxvi. 19. See also Num. xix. 17; Cant. iv. 15.) There was undoubtedly a deep meaning in our Lord’s words, and a tacit reference to the verse in Jeremiah, where God speaks of Himself as “the fountain of living waters.” (Jer. ii. 13.) Nevertheless, the first
idea that the words would convey to the woman’s mind, would probably be no more than this, that He who sat before her had better, fresher, and more valuable water than that of the well. The fact is that our Lord purposely used a figurative, general expression, in order to lead the woman’s mind gently on. If He had said, “He would have given thee grace and mercy,” she would have been unprepared for such purely doctrinal language, and it would have called forth prejudice and dislike.

There is a vast quantity of deep truth contained in this verse. It is rich in first principles, linked together in a most instructive chain. (1) Christ has living water to give to men. (2) If men would only ask, Christ would at once give. (3) Men do not ask because they are ignorant.—The verse condemns all who die unpardoned. They have not because they ask not: they ask not because they are blind to their condition. To remove this blindness and ignorance must be the first object we should aim at in dealing with a thoughtless, unconverted man.

The notion of Ambrose, Cyprian, and Rupertus, that “living water” here means baptism, is too monstrous to require refutation. It is only a sample of the preposterous views of some of the Fathers and their followers about the sacraments.

Bengel remarks on this verse our Lord’s readiness to draw lessons of spiritual instruction from every object near Him. To the Jews desiring bread, He spoke of the bread of life. (John vi. 33.) To the people at Jerusalem at break of day, He speaks of the light of the world, referring probably to the rising sun. (John viii. 2, 12.) To the woman coming to draw water, He speaks of living water.

11.—[The woman saith,. etc.] The words of the woman, in this and the following verse, imply surprise, curiosity, and perhaps a slight sneer. At any rate they show that her attention was arrested. A strange Jew at a well suddenly speaks to her about “living water.” What could He mean? Was he in earnest or not? With a woman’s curiosity she desires to know.

[Sir.] The Greek word so rendered is generally translated “Lord.” This leads some, as Chrysostom, to think, that the woman’s heart was so far impressed now that she purposely used a term of respect and reverence. We must not, however, lay too much stress on the word. It is certainly translated “Sir,” in other places, where inferiors speak to superiors. Matt. xiii. 27; xxi. 30; xxvii. 63. John iv. 49; v. 7; xii. 21; xx. 15. Rev. vii. 14. Yet it is difficult to see what other word the woman could have used in addressing a strange man, without rudeness and discourtesy.

[Nothing to draw with.] The Greek expression here is simply a substantive, meaning “an instrument for drawing water.” What it was we are left to conjecture. Schleusner suggests from Nonnus that it must mean a cup fastened to a rope.

[The well is deep.] These words, according to the universal testimony of travellers at this day, are still literally true. The well is at least thirty yards deep, and to a person not provided with a rope, as the woman doubtless saw was our Lord’s case, the water would be inaccessible.

[Whence then...that living water.] The Greek word here rendered “that” is simply the article commonly translated “the.” It is like “that prophet.” (John i. 21.)

The ignorance of the woman in thinking of nothing but material water, naturally strikes us. Yet it is nothing more than we see in many other instances in the Gospels. Nicodemus could not see any but a carnal meaning in the new birth; the disciples could not understand our Lord’s
having “meat to eat,” unless it was literal meat; the Jews thought the “bread from heaven” was literal bread. (John iii. 4; iv. 33; vi. 34.) The natural heart of man always tries to put a carnal and material sense on spiritual expressions. Hence have arisen the greatest errors about the sacraments.

12.—[Art thou greater.] This question exhibits the woman’s curiosity to know who the stranger before her could be. Who art thou that speakest of living water? It also savours of a sneer and incredulity. Dost thou mean to say that thou canst give me better and more abundant supplies of water, than a well which the patriarch Jacob found sufficient for himself and all his numerous company? Dost thou pretend to know of a better well? Art thou, a poor weary traveller in appearance, so great a person that thou dost possess a better well than Jacob possessed?

[Our father Jacob ... gave us the well.] Let it be noted that the woman carefully claimed relationship with Jacob, and called him “our father,” though, after all the intermixture of the Samaritans with heathen nations, the relationship was not very easy of proof. But it is common to find people shutting their eyes to difficulties when they want to prove a connection or relationship. The advocates of an extreme view of apostolical succession seldom condescend to notice difficulties when they assert that episcopally ordained ministers can trace their order up to the apostles.

When it says that “Jacob gave” the well, there is probably a reference to the grant which Jacob made to his son Joseph of the district near the well. From Joseph came the tribe of Ephraim, to which, no doubt, the Samaritan woman claimed to belong. (Gen. xlvi. 22.)

[Drink ... himself ... children ... cattle.] These words were doubtless said to show the goodness and abundance of the water. Did the stranger at the well really mean to say that he could really give any better water?

Bucer on this verse, remarks how the Samaritans prided themselves on their relationship to Jacob, and the possession of his well, while they made no effort to imitate his goodness, and points out the tendency of superstition to the same thing, in every age. “True piety,” he says, “does not consist in ‘having Jacob’s well and Jacob’s land,—but Jacob’s spirit; not in keeping the bones of the saints, but in imitating their lives.”

13.—[Jesus answered, etc.] In this and the following verse our Lord proceeds to raise the desires of the woman by exalting the value of the living water of which He had spoken. He still refrains from distinct statements of doctrinal truth: He still adheres to the figurative expression, “water.” And yet He makes an advance, and leads on the woman gently and almost imperceptibly to glorious spiritual things. Now, for the first time, He begins to speak of “everlasting life.”

[Whosoever drinketh...this water ... thirst again.] It will be noted that our Lord does not answer the woman’s questions directly. He keeps steadily to the one point He desires to fasten on her mind: viz., the infinite excellence of a certain “living water” which He had to give. And first He reminds her of what she knew well by laborious experience: the water of Jacob’s well might be good and plentiful; but still he who drank of it was only satisfied for a few hours. He soon thirsted again.

We cannot doubt that there was a deep latent thought in our Lord’s words, in this sentence. He would have us know that the waters of Jacob’s well are typical of all temporal and material
good things: they cannot satisfy the soul; they have no power to all the heart of an immortal creature like man. He who only drinks of them is sure to thirst again.

Some have thought that there is tacit reference in these word to the woman’s insatiable love of sin.

The similarity ought to be noticed between our Lord’s line of argument in this verse, and the line He adopts in recommending to the Jews the bread of life in the sixth chapter. He showed the Jews the superiority of the bread of life over the manna, by the words, “Your fathers did eat manna, and are dead.” (John vi. 49.) Just so in this place, He shows the inferiority of the water of Jacob’s well to the living water, by saying, “He that drinks of this water shall thirst again.”

The two passages deserves a careful comparison.

14.—[Whosoever drinketh...never thirst.] These words contain a precious promise, and declare a glorious truth of the Gospel. The benefits of Christ’s gifts are promised to every one who is willing to receive them, whosoever and whatsoever he may be. He may have been as bad as the Samaritan woman; but the promise is for him as well as for her: “whosoever drinketh, shall never thirst.”—The declaration “shall never thirst” does not mean, “shall never feel any spiritual want at all.” It simply asserts the abiding and enduring nature of the benefits which Christ gives. He that drinks of the living water which Christ gives, shall never entirely and completely lose the cleansing, purifying, and soul refreshing effects which it produces.

Our English translation of this sentence hardly gives the full sense of the Greek. Literally rendered, it would be, “shall never thirst unto eternity.” The same expression is used frequently in St. John’s Gospel. See John vi. 51-58; viii. 51; x. 28; xi. 26; xiv. 16.

[The water ...I...give...well...everlasting life.] To see the full meaning of this figurative sentence, it must be paraphrased. The meaning seems to be something of this kind. “The gift of grace, mercy, and peace which I am ready to give, shall be in the heart of him who receives it an everflowing source of comfort, satisfaction, and spiritual refreshment; continuing and flowing on, not only through this life, but unto life eternal. He that receives my gift of living water has a fountain opened in his soul of spiritual satisfaction. which shall neither be dried up in this life or the life to come, but shall flow on to all eternity.”

Let it be noted that the whole verse is a strong argument in favour of the doctrine of the perpetuity of grace, and the consequent perseverance in the faith of believers. It is difficult to understand how the Arminian doctrine of the possibility of believers completely falling away, and being lost, can be reconciled with any natural interpretation of this verse.

Zwingle thinks, with much probability, that the words “a fountain in him,” point to the benefits which grace once received makes a man impart to others, as well as enjoy himself. (See John vii. 38.)

Rollock remarks on this verse, “Let me say in a word what I feel. You will find nothing either in heaven or in earth, with which you will be satisfied and feel supplied, except Jesus Christ alone, with all that fulness of the godhead which dwells in Him bodily.”

Poole says, “He who receiveth the Holy Spirit and the grace thereof, though he will be daily saying Give, give, and continually desiring further supplies of grace, yet he shall never wholly want, never want any good thing that shall be needful for him. The seed of God shall abide in him, and His water shall be in him a spring supplying him until he comes to heaven.”
In this verse, I think, we see the first sparks of good in the woman’s soul. Our Lord’s words aroused a desire in her heart for this living water of which He had spoken. She does what our Lord said she ought to have done at first. She “asks “Him” to give her the water.

*Give me this water ...that...thirst not...draw.* The motives of the woman in making this request are variously explained.

Some think, as Musculus, Calvin, Bucer, Brentius, Gusher, Lightfoot, Poole, and Dyke, that the request was made in a sarcastic and sneering spirit, as though she would say, “Truly this water would be a fine thing, if we could get it! Give it me, if you have it to give.”

Some think, as Augustine, Cyril, Bullinger, Rollock, Hildersam, Jansenius, and Nifanius, that the request was only the lazy, indolent wish of one who was weary of this world’s labour, and yet could see nothing but the things of this world in our Lord’s sayings; like the request of the Jews, “Evermore give us this bread.” (John vi. 34.) It is as though she would say, “Anything to save me the trouble of coming to draw water would be a boon. If you can do that for me, do it.” As Bengel says, “She wished to have this living fountain at her own house.”

Some think, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euthymius, that the request was really the prayer of an anxious soul, aroused to some faint spiritual desires by the mention of everlasting life. “Hast thou eternal life to bestow? Give it to me.”

I venture to think that none of these three views is quite correct. The true motive of the request was probably a vague feeling of desire that the woman herself could hardly have defined. It is useless to analyze and scrutinize too closely the first languid and imperfect desires that arise in souls when the Spirit begins His work of conversion. It is folly to say that the first movings of a heart towards God must be free from all imperfect motives and all mixture of infirmity. The woman’s motives in saying “Give me this water,” were probably mixed and indefinite. Material water was not out of her thoughts, and yet she had probably some desires after everlasting life. Enough for us to know that she asked and received, she sought and found. Our great aim must be to persuade sinners to apply to Jesus, and to say to Him, “Give me to drink.” If we forbid them to ask anything until they can prove that they ask in a perfect spirit, we should do no good at all. It would be as foolish to scrutinize the grammatical construction of an infant’s cries, as to analyze the precise motives of a soul’s first breathings after God. If it breathes at all and says, “Give,” we ought to be thankful.

*Jesus says...Go, call...husband...hither.* This verse begins an entirely new stage in the history of the woman’s conversion. From this point we hear no more of “living water.” Figurative language is dropped entirely. Our Lord’s words become direct, personal, and plain. The woman had asked at last for “living water.” At once our Lord proceeds to give it to her.

Our Lord’s reasons for bidding the woman call her husband, have been variously interpreted. Some think that He only meant her to understand that He had spoken long enough to her, a solitary woman; and that before He proceeded further, she must call her husband to be a witness of the conversation, and to partake of the benefits He was going to confer. This seems the view of Chrysostom and Theophylact. Others think, with far more probability, in my judgment, that our Lord’s main object in naming the woman’s husband, was to produce in her mind conviction of sin, and to show her His own divine knowledge of all things. He knew that she had no hus-
band, and He purposely named him in order to touch her conscience. He always knew the
thoughts of those to whom He spoke; and He knew, in the present case, what the effect of His
words would be. It would bring to light the woman’s besetting sin.—It is as though He said,
“Thou dost ask Me for living water. Thou dost at last express a desire for that great spiritual gift
which I am able to bestow. Well then, I begin by bidding thee know thyself and thy sinfulness. I
will show thee that I know thy spiritual disease, and can lay my finger on the most dangerous
ailment of thy soul. Go, call thy husband, and come hither.”

Let it be noted that the first draught of living water which our Lord gave to the Samaritan
woman was conviction of sin. That fact is a lesson for all who desire to benefit ignorant and
careless sinners. The first thing to be taught to such persons, when once we have got their atten-
tion, is their own sinfulness, and their consequent need of a Saviour. No one values the physi-
cian until he feels his disease.

Augustine thinks that when our Lord said, “Call thy husband,” He meant, “Cause thine un-
derstanding to be forthcoming. Thy understanding is not with thee. I am speaking after the spir-
it, and thou hearest after the flesh!” I can see no wisdom in this fanciful idea.

17.—[The woman answered...no husband.] These words were an honest and truthful confession, so
far as they went. Whether the woman wished it to be supposed that she was a widow, it would
perhaps be hardly fair to inquire. Theophylact and Euthymius suggest that she did wish to de-
ceive our Lord. The way in which our Lord received her declaration makes it probable that she
did not profess to be a widow, and very likely her dress showed that she was not. In this point
of view the honesty of her confession is noteworthy. There is always more hope of one who
honestly and bluntly confesses sin, than of a smooth-tongued hypocrite.

[Jesus said...Thou hast well said...husband.] Our Lord’s commendation of the woman’s
honest confession deserves notice. It teaches us that we should make the best of an ignorant
sinner’s words. An unskilful physician of souls would probably have rebuked the woman sharp-
ly for her wickedness, if her words led him to suspect it. Our Lord on the contrary says, “Thou
hast well said.”

18.—[Thou hast had five husbands.] Many foolish and unseemly things have been written about
this sentence, which it is not worth while to bring forward. Of course it is utterly improb-
able that the woman had lost five husbands by death, and had been five times a widow. The more
likely explanation is that she had been divorced and put away by several husbands in succes-
sion. Divorces were notoriously common among the Jews, and in all probability among the Sa-
maritans, for very trivial causes. In the case, however, of the woman before us, the second
clause of the verse before us makes it likely that she had been justly divorced for adultery.

Augustine regards these five husbands as significant of “the five senses of the body,” which
are as five husbands by which the soul of the natural man is ruled! I cannot think that our Lord
meant anything of the kind.—Euthymius mentions another allegorical view, making the woman
to typify human nature, and the five husbands five different dispensations, and him with whom
she now lived the Mosaic Law! This seems to me simply absurd. Origen says much the same. It
is well to know what patristic interpretation is!

[He whom ...hast...not thy husband.] These words show plainly that the Samaritan woman
was living in adultery up to the very day when our Lord spoke to her.
Our Lord’s perfect knowledge of the woman’s past and present life is very noteworthy. It ought to remind us how perfectly He is acquainted with every transaction of our own lives. From Him no secrets are hid.

"In that saidst thou truly." There is a kindness very worthy of notice in these words. Wicked and abandoned as this Samaritan woman was, our Lord deals gently and kindly with her, and twice in one breath commends her confession: "Thou hast well said. — In that thou saidst truly." Kindness of manner like this will always be found a most important point in dealing with the ungodly. Scolding and sharp rebuke, however well-deserved, have a tendency to harden and shut up hearts, and to make people bolt their doors. Kindness, on the contrary, wins, softens, conciliates, and disarms prejudice. An unskilful soul-physician would probably have ended his sentence by saying, "Thou art a wicked woman; and if thou dost not repent, thou wilt be lost." All this would have been true no doubt. But how different our Lord’s grave and gentle remark: "Thou saidst truly!"

19.—"The woman saith...I perceive...prophet." I think we see in this verse a great change in the Samaritan woman’s mind. She evidently confesses the entire truth of what our Lord had just said, and turns to Him as an anxious inquirer about her soul. It is as though she said, “I perceive at last that thou art indeed no common person. Thou hast told me what thou couldst not have known, if thou wert not a prophet sent from God. Thou hast exposed sins which I cannot deny, and aroused spiritual concern which I would now fain have relieved. Now give me instruction.”

Let it be noted that the thing which first struck the Samaritan woman, and made her call Jesus “a prophet,” was the same that struck Nathanael, viz., our Lord’s perfect knowledge.—To call our Lord “a prophet” at first sight may seem not much. But it must be remembered that even after His resurrection, the two disciples going to Emmaus only described Jesus as a “prophet mighty in deed and word.” (Luke xxiv. 19.) A clear knowledge of the divine nature of Messiah seems to have been one of the points on which almost the whole Jewish nation was ignorant. Even the learned Scribes could not explain how Messiah was to be David’s Lord and also David’s Son. (Mark xii. 37.)

20.—"Our fathers worshipped, etc." To see the full drift of this verse, we must carefully remember the state of the Samaritan woman’s mind at this moment. I think that she spoke under spiritual anxiety. She was alarmed by having her sins suddenly exposed. She found herself for the first time in the presence of a prophet. She felt for the first time the necessity of religion. But at once the old question between the Jews and Samaritans arose before her mind. How was she to know what was truth? What was she to believe? Her own people said that the Samaritan mode of worshipping God was correct. The Jews said that Jerusalem was the only place where men ought to worship. Between these two conflicting opinions what was she to do?

The natural ignorance of almost all unconverted people, when first aroused to thought about religion, appears strikingly in the woman’s words. Man’s first idea is to attach great importance to the outward mode of worshipping God. The first refuge of an awakened conscience is strict adherence to some outward form, and zeal for the external part of religion.

The woman’s readiness to quote “the fathers” and their customs, is an instructive instance of man’s readiness to make custom and tradition his only rule of faith. “Our fathers did so,” is one of the natural man’s favourite arguments. Calvin’s comments on the expression “fathers” in this
verse are very useful. He remarks among other things, “None should be reckoned Fathers but those who are manifestly the sons of God.”

When the woman spoke of “this mountain,” she doubtless meant the hill on which the rival temple of Samaria was built, to the bitter annoyance of the Jerusalem Jews. It is said that this temple was first built in the days of Nehemiah by Sanhalla, that and his son-in-law, the son of Joia, whom Nehemiah “chased from him,” was its first high-priest. (Neh. xiii. 29.) Some have gone so far as to maintain that the hill Gerizim at Samaria was the hill on which Abraham offered up Isaac, and that the words of the woman refer to this. The more common opinion is that Mount Moriah at Jerusalem was the place.

When the woman says, “Ye say,” she doubtless includes the whole Jewish nation, of whom she regards our Lord as a representative.

Musculus, Baxter, Scott, and Barnes, think that the woman, in this verse, desired to turn away the conversation from her own sins to a subject of public controversy, and in this way to change the subject. I am not however satisfied that this view is correct. I prefer the view of Brentius, which I have already set forth, that she was truly impressed by our Lord’s exposure of her wickedness, and made a serious inquiry about the things needful to salvation. She was aroused to seriousness, and asked what was true religion. Her own nation said one thing. The Jews said another. What was truth? In short, her words were only another form of the jailer’s question, “What shall I do to be saved?”

21. —[Jesus saith, Woman, believe Me.] The calmness, gravity, and solemnity of these opening words are very noteworthy. “I tell you a great truth, which I ask you to credit and believe.”

Jansenius thinks that our Lord uses the expression “believe Me,” because the truth He was about to impart was so new and strange, that the woman would be apt to think it incredible.

Stier remarks that this is the only time our Lord ever uses this expression, “Believe Me,” in the Gospels.

[The hour cometh.] The hour, or time here spoken of, means the time of the Gospel, the hour of the Christian dispensation.

[Ye shall neither...this mountain...Jerusalem...worship, etc.] Our Lord here declares that under the Gospel there was to be no more distinction of places, like Jerusalem. The old dispensation under which men were bound to go up to Jerusalem three times a year, to attend the feasts and worship in the temple, was about to pass away. All questions about the superior sanctity of Samaria or Jerusalem would soon be at an end. A Church was about to be founded, whose members would find access to the Father everywhere, and would need no temple-service, and no priests or sacrifices or altars in order to approach God. It was therefore mere waste of time to be disputing about the comparative claims of either Samaria or Jerusalem. Under the Gospel all places would soon be alike.

It seems far from improbable that our Lord referred in this verse to the prophecy of Malachi: “In every place incense shall be offered to my name.” (Mal. i. 11.)

The utter passing away of the whole Jewish system seems clearly pointed at in this verse. To bring into the Christian Church holy places, sanctuaries, altars, priests, sacrifices, gorgeous vestments, and the like, is to dig up that which has been long buried, and to turn to candles for light under the noon-day sun. The favourite theory of the Irvingites, that we ought as far as pos-
sible, in our public worship, to copy the Jewish temple services and ceremonial, seems incapable of reconciliation with this verse.

Calvin says, “By calling God the Father in this verse, Christ seems directly to contrast Him with the ‘fathers’ whom the woman had mentioned, and to convey this instruction, that God will be a common Father to all, so that He will be generally worshipped without distinction of place or nation.”

22.—[Ye worship...know not what.] In this verse our Lord unhesitatingly condemns the religious system of the Samaritans, as compared with that of the Jews. The Samaritans could show no Scriptural authority, no revelation of God, commanding and sanctioning their worship. Whatever it was, it was purely an invention of man, which God had never formally authorized or accredited. They had no warrant for believing that it was accepted. They had no right to feel sure that their prayers, praises, and offerings were received. In short, all was uncertainty. They were practically worshipping an “unknown God.”

Mede remarks that the Samaritan woman overlooked the object of worship in her question about the place. “You inquire concerning the place of worshipping. But a far more important question is at issue between us, viz., the Being to be worshipped, respecting whom you are ignorant.

[We know what we worship.] In contrast to the Samaritan religious system, our Lord declares that the Jews at any rate could show divine warrant and scriptural authority for all they did in their religion. They could render a reason of their hope. They knew whom they approached in their religious services.

[Salvation is of the Jews.] Our Lord here declares that God’s promises of a Saviour and Redeemer specially belong to the Jerusalem Jews. They were the descendants of the tribe of Judah, and to them belonged the house and lineage of David. On this point at any rate the Samaritans had no right whatever to claim equality with the Jews. Granting that the Samaritans had any right to be called Israelites, they were of the tribe of Ephraim, from which it was nowhere said that Messiah should spring. And in truth the Samaritans were of such mixed origin that they had no right to be called Israelites at all.

I believe, with Olshausen, that “salvation” in this verse, was really intended to mean “the Saviour” Himself. The use of the article in the Greek is striking. It is literally “the salvation.” Does not the saying to Zacchæus point the same way? “This day is salvation come to this house.” (Luke xix. 9.)

The expression “we” in this verse is very interesting. It is a wonderful instance of our Lord’s condescension, and one that stands almost alone. He was pleased to speak of Himself, just in the light that He appeared to the woman, as one of the Jewish nation. “I and all other Jews know what we worship.”

The folly of supposing that ignorance is to be praised and commended in religion, as the mother of devotion, is strongly condemned in this verse. Christ would have Christians “know what they worship.”

The testimony borne to the general truth of the religious system of the Jews in this place is very striking. Corrupt and wicked as Scribes and Pharisees were, Jesus declares that the Jewish
religion was true and Scriptural. It is a mournful proof that a Church may retain a sound creed, and yet be on the high road to destruction.

Hildersam has a long note which is well worth reading on the words “salvation is of the Jews.” Considering the times in which he lived, it shows singularly clear views of God’s continual purposes concerning the Jewish nation. He sees in the words the great truth that all God’s revelations to man in every age have been made through the Jews.

23.—[The hour cometh, and now is.] These words mean that the times of the Gospel approach, and indeed have already begun. “They have begun by the preaching of the kingdom of God. They will be fully brought in by my death and ascension, and the establishment of the New Testament Church.”

[True worshippers...worship ...spirit and...truth.] Our Lord here declares who alone would be considered true worshippers in the coming dispensation of the Gospel. They would not be merely those who worshipped in this place or in that place. They would not be exclusively Jews, or exclusively Gentiles, or exclusively Samaritans. The external part of the worship would be of no value compared to the internal state of the worshippers. They only would be counted true worshippers who worshipped in spirit and in truth.

The words “in spirit and in truth” are variously interpreted, and much has been written about them. I believe the simplest explanation to be this. The word “spirit” must not be taken to mean the Holy Spirit, but the intellectual or mental part of man, in contradistinction to the material or carnal part of man. This distinction is clearly marked in 1 Cor. vii. 34: “Holy in body and in spirit.”—“Worship in spirit” is heart-worship in contradistinction to all formal, material, carnal worship, consisting only of ceremonies, offerings, sacrifices, and the like. When a Jew offered a formal meat-offering, with his heart far away, it was worship after the flesh. When David offered in prayer a broken and a contrite heart, it was worship in spirit.—“Worship in truth” means worship through the one true way of access to God, without the medium of the sacrifices or priesthood, which were ordained till Christ died on the cross. When the veil was rent, and the way into the holiest made manifest by Christ’s death, then, and not till then, men “worshipped in truth.” Before Christ they worshipped through types, and shadows, and figures, and emblems. After Christ they worshipped in truth.—Spirit is opposed to “flesh; “truth to “shadow.” “Spirit,” in short, is heart-service contrasted with lip worship and formal devotion. “Truth “is the full light of the Christian dispensation contrasted with the twilight of the law of Moses.

The view I have endeavoured to give is substantially that of Chrysostom and Euthymius.

Caryl, quoted by Ford, says, “In spirit regard the inward power, in truth the outward form. The first strikes at hypocrisy, the second at idolatry.”

[The Father seeketh such...worship Him.] This is a remarkable sentence. I believe it to mean that “the hour is come, in which the Father has ordained from eternity that He will gather out of the world a company of true and spiritual worshippers. He is even now seeking out and gathering in such worshippers.”—The expression “seeketh” is peculiar. There is something like it in the sentence, “The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost.” (Luke xix. 10.) It seems to show the exceeding compassion of the Father, and His infinite willingness to save souls. He does not merely “wait” for men to come to Him. He “seeks” for them. It also shows the wide opening of God the Father’s mercy under the Gospel. He no longer confines His grace
to the Jews. He now *seeks* and desires to gather in everywhere true worshippers out of every nation.

The clause appears to me specially intended to encourage the Samaritan woman. Let her not trouble herself with difficulties about the comparative claims of the Samaritan and Jewish systems. Was she willing to be a spiritual worshipper? That was the one question which deserved her attention.

Trapp observes, “How should this fire up our hearts to spiritual worship! That God *seeks* for such worshippers!”

24.—*God is a Spirit.* Our Lord here declares to the Samaritan woman the true nature of God. Let her cease to think that God was such an one as man, and that He could not be found, or approached, or addressed, like a mere earthly Monarch, except at one particular place. Let her learn to have higher, nobler, and more exalted views of the Being with whom sinners have to do. Let her know this day that God was a Spirit.

The declaration before us is one of the most lofty and definite sayings about God’s nature which is to be found in the whole Bible. That such a declaration should have been made to such a person as the Samaritan woman is a wonderful instance of Christ’s condescension! To define precisely the full meaning of the expression is past man’s understanding. The leading idea most probably is, that “God is an immaterial being, that He dwelleth not in temples made with hands, and that not, like ourselves, therefore, absent from one place when He is present at another.” These things are all true, but how little we can realize them!

Cornelius à Lapide gives an excellent summary of the opinions of heathen philosophers on the nature of God, in his commentary on this verse.

*[They ...worship...must...worship...spirit...truth.]* Our Lord draws this broad conclusion from the statement of God’s nature which He has just made. If “God is a Spirit” it behoves those who would worship Him acceptably, to worship in spirit and in truth. It is unreasonable to suppose that He can like any worship which does not come from the heart, or can be so well pleased with worship which is offered through types and ceremonies, as with worship offered through the true way which He has provided, and is now revealing.

The importance of the great principle laid down in this and the preceding verse, can never be overrated. Any religious teaching which tends to depreciate heart-worship, and to turn Christianity into a mere formal service, or which tends to bring back Jewish shadows, ceremonies, and services, and to introduce them into Christian worship, is on the face of these remarkable verses most unscriptural and deserving of reprobation.

Of course we must not admit the idea that in this and the preceding verse Jesus meant to pour contempt on the ceremonial law, which God Himself had given. But He plainly teaches that it was an imperfect dispensation, given because of man’s ignorance and infirmity, as we give pictures to children in teaching them. It was, in fact, a schoolmaster to Christ. (Gal. iii. 24.) To want men to return to it is as absurd as to bid grown up people begin learning the alphabet by pictures in an infant school.—On the other hand, as Beza remarks, we must not run into the extreme of despising all ordinances, sacraments, and outward ceremonies in religion. These things have their use and value, however much they may be abused.
25.—[The woman saith, I know... . Messias... Christ, etc.] This verse is an interesting one. It shows the woman at last brought to the very state of mind in which she would be prepared to welcome a revelation of Christ. She had been told of “living water,” and had expressed a desire for it. She had been told her own sin, and had been unable to deny it. She had been told the uselessness of resting on any formal membership of the Samaritan Church, and the necessity of spiritual and heart-worship of God. And now what can she say? It is all true, she feels: she cannot gainsay it. But what can she do? To whom is she to go? Whose teaching can she follow? All she can do is to say that she knows Messias is one day coming, and that He will make all things clear and plain. It is evident that she wishes for Him. She is uncomfortable, and sees no relief for her newly-raised perplexities, unless Messias should appear.

The mention of Messias in this verse, makes it clear that the Samaritans were not altogether ignorant of the Old Testament, and that there was an expectation of a Redeemer of some kind among them, as well as among the Jews. The existence of a general expectation of this sort throughout the East, at the time when our Lord appeared on earth, is a fact to which even heathen writers have testified.

When the woman says, “He will tell us all things,” we must probably not inquire too closely into what she meant. It is very likely that she had only a vague feeling that Messias would remove all doubts and show all things needful to salvation.

Chrysostom remarks on this verse, “The woman was made dizzy by Christ’s discourse, and fainted at the sublimity of what He said, and in her trouble saith, I know that Messias cometh.”

Wordsworth observes, that the Samaritan woman had a clearer knowledge of Messiah’s office than the Jews generally showed. She looked for Him as a Teacher. They looked for Him as a conquering King.

Beza and A. Clark think that the words, “which is called Christ,” in this verse, are St. John’s parenthetical explanation of the word Messias. It is certainly rather unlikely that the woman would have used them in addressing a Jew. Yet most commentators think that they were her words.

26.—[Jesus saith...I...speak...am He.] These words are the fullest declaration which our Lord ever made of His own Messiahship, which the Gospel writers have recorded. That such a full declaration should be made to such a person as the Samaritan woman is one of the most wonderful instances of our Lord’s grace and condescension related in the New Testament! At last the woman obtained an answer to one of her first questions, “Art thou greater than our father Jacob?” When the answer came it completely converted her soul.

Rollock remarks on this verse, how ready and willing Christ is to reveal Himself to a sinner’s soul. The very moment that this woman expressed any desire for Messiah, He at once revealed Himself to her: “I am He.”

Quesnel observes, “It is a great mistake to suppose that the knowledge of the mysteries of religion ought not to be imparted to women by the reading of Scripture, considering this instance of the great confidence Christ reposed in this woman by His manifestation of Himself. The abuse of the Scriptures and the sin of heresies, did not proceed from the simplicity of women, but from the conceited learning of men.”
In leaving the whole passage there are several striking points which ought never to be forgotten. (a) Our Lord’s mercy is remarkable. That such an one as He should deal so graciously with such a sinner is a striking fact. (b) Our Lord’s wisdom is remarkable. How wise was every step of His way in dealing with this sinful soul! (c) Our Lord’s patience is remarkable. How He bore with the woman’s ignorance, and what trouble He took to lead her to knowledge! (d) Our Lord’s power is remarkable. What a complete victory He won at last! How almighty must that grace be which could soften and convert such a carnal and wicked heart!

We must never despise any soul, after reading this passage. None can be worse than this woman. But Christ did not despise her.

We must never despair of any soul, after reading this passage. If this woman was converted, any one may be converted.

Finally, we must never contemn the use of all wise and reasonable means in dealing with souls. There is a “wisdom which is profitable to direct” in approaching ignorant and ungodly people, which must be diligently sought.