happened.

**31, 32.] {32}** The bodily thirst  
(and hunger probably, from the time of  
day) which our Lord had felt before, had  
been and was forgotten in the carrying on  
of His divine work in the soul of this  
Samaritan women. Although **I** and **you**are emphatic, the words are not spoken in  
*blame*, for none was deserved: but in fulness and earnestness of spirit; in a feeling analogous to that which comes upon  
us when called from high and holy employment to the supply of the body or to  
the business of this world.

**33.]** It is  
very characteristic of the first part of this  
Gospel to bring forward instances of unreceptivity of spiritual meaning; compare  
ver. 11; ch. ii. 20; iii. 4; vi. 42, 52. The  
disciples probably have the woman in their  
thoughts.

**34.]** Christ alone could  
properly say these words. In the believer  
on Him, they are partially true,—true  
as far as he has received the Spirit, and  
entered into the spiritual life;—but in  
Him they were absolutely and fully true.  
His whole life was the doing of the  
Father’s will. We can ‘eat and drink,  
&c. to the glory of God,—but in Him  
the hallowing of the Father’s name,  
doing His will, bringing about His Kingdom, was His *daily bread*, and superseded the thoughts and desires for the  
other, needful as *it* was for His humanity.

**My meat is to be (**better, **that I  
may be) doing**, &c.**]** That is, it was our  
Lord’s continued sustenance, to be ever  
carrying onward to completion that performance of His Father’s will for which  
He came into the world. In the words  
**finish his work**, the way is prepared for  
the idea introduced in the next verse.  
These words give au answer to the questioning in the minds of the disciples, and  
shew *that He had been employed in the  
Father’s work during their absence.*

**35.]** The sense of these much-controverted  
words will be best ascertained by narrowly  
observing the form of the sentence.

**Say not ye... .** surely *cannot be the  
introduction to an observation of what  
was matter of fact at the time.* Had the  
words been spoken *at a time when it  
wanted four months to the harvest*, and  
had our Lord *intended to express this*,—is  
it conceivable that He should have thus introduced the remark? Would not, *must*not, the question have been a *direct* one in  
that case—‘*are there not four months*?’  
&c. I know not how to account for this  
**Say not ye that**... . except that it introduces *some common saying* which the  
Jews, or perhaps the people of Galileo  
only, were in the habit of using. **Are  
not ye accustomed to say, that... .?**That we hear of no such proverb elsewhere,  
is not to the point ;—for such unrecorded  
sayings are among every people. That we  
do not know whence to date the four  
months, is again no objection:—there may  
have been, in the part where the saying was  
usual (possibly in the land west of the lake  
of Tiberias, for those addressed were from  
thence, and the emphatic “*ye*” seems to  
point to some particular locality), *some  
fixed period in the year*,—the end of the  
sowing, or some religious anniversary,—  
when it was *a common saying, that it  
wanted four months to harvest*. And this  
might have been the first date in the year  
which had regard to the harvest, and so  
the best known in connexion with it.

If this be so, all that has been built on  
*this* saying, as giving a chronological date,  
must fall to the ground. (Lightfoot,  
Wieseler, and others, maintain, that since  
the harvest began on the 16th of Nisan,  
we must reckon four months back from  
that time for this journey through Samaria, which would bring it to the middle  
of Chisleu, i.e. the beginning of December.)

To get the meaning of the latter  
part of the verse, we must endeavour to  
follow, as far as may be, the train of  
thought which pervades the discourse. He  
that soweth the good seed is the Son of