

CRITICAL INSIGHTS ON THE SALVIFIC INTERACTION BETWEEN OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST AND THE SAMARITAN WOMAN BESIDE JACOB'S WELL

NDUBUISI H. ONYEMELUKWE, Ph.D.

Abstract

Implicitly, the interaction between the woman of Samaria and Christ beside Jacob's well at Sychar transformed her personality. Hence, she ceased to be a prostitute. She became sexually chaste as a married woman nay a remarried woman. Again, the interaction between both of them was quite a lengthy one, a near epic discourse. The interaction as a near-epic discourse implies that it is loaded with lots of insights: divine insights, intercultural insights in relation to Samaritans and Jews, insights on interpersonal relationship cum transgender interaction. All of these insights need to be expounded. They need to be expounded for the purpose of unearthing the underlying value-adding philosophies of life embedded in them as well as the Gospel ideals equally incorporated in them. These aspirations constitute the specific objectives of this paper. Hopefully, realising the objectives of the paper would serve to largely improve Christians' interpersonal relationships with God and other individuals, as well as their immediate and extended neighbours. To effectively realise the foregoing specific objectives of the paper, its analysis section anchors chiefly on critical and logical modes of thinking as the roots of critical discourse analysis (CDA). Major insights unearthed analytically from the passage (John 4:1-45) are as follows:

Christ is indisputably the Saviour of the World, and the Messiah or the Redeemer as severally evident in the passage. God's foremost divine attributes of omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence do not permit Him to be confined to any specific place of worship, most contrary to the impression created by the Samaritan and Jewish religious-cultural practices which at the time of Christ limited worshipping Him to the mountain and Jerusalem, respectively. The woman's expressive polite attitude to Christ suggests overtly that, socio-culturally in Samaria, it is in the place of women, generally, to defer to men just as Christ's request for water from her collapses the wall of discrimination or enmity between Jews and Samaritans. As Christologically asserted in the passage, God is Spirit and by His divine nature, the epitome of truth. Consequently, those who worship Him should and must worship Him in spirit and truth. Saved or redeemed souls or children of God by redemption should and must be Christ-like at all times and places in all situations and at every occasion.

Key words: Samaritan woman, Jacob's well, Critical insights, Salvific interaction and Near-epic discourse

Introduction

More than two thousand years ago, our Lord Jesus Christ (Christ) was a pre-eminent historic religious reformist cum founder in Israel. He was a religious reformist with reference to Judaism into which He was born, but a religious founder with reference to Christianity. Judaism could not accommodate his reformist agenda, hence, the birth of Christianity which has long been historically noted as an offshoot of Judaism. That He founded Christianity makes Him the ultimate head of the religious sect, birthed directly by His earthly ministry, especially in relation to The Catholic Church, which is, therefore, the parent Christian church, historically, with reference to Alan (2002), and as publicly affirmed by Pastor Dr, Enoch Adeboye, the general overseer of The Redeemed Christian Church during one of his

worldwide crusades.

Christ's status as the founder and the eternal head of Christianity is in tandem with His biblically cum world acclaimed status as The Saviour of the world. Hence, His about thirty-three years of sojourn on earth is a salvific mission. At the fullness of time when it was His hour to commence His salvation ministry, having undergone necessary tutelage to become a *rabboni* (Master), He began to teach in synagogues and open spaces. The open spaces where He taught are equivalent to today interdenominational crusade grounds. His teachings or His divine pedagogy incorporated Divine Wisdom principles of righteousness, aptly and infallibly articulated to eternally guard and guide His disciples to everlasting Heavenly life. For avoidance of doubt, His disciples refer here to the totality of those who consciously believe in His person, Divinity and Salvation Ministry which culminated in His Paschal Mystery, crucifixion, death, burial, resurrection and ascension. Cf. Onyemelukwe et al (2017:89-92) on . . . the Nature of Man.

Note-worthy about His Divine Pedagogy is that it was sometimes, many times indeed, as evident in *The*

Department of Languages, School of Liberal Studies, Yaba College of Technology, Lagos-Nigeria. hyginusndubuisi@yahoo.com/ndubuisiubakaamaeze@gmail.com

Corresponding Author

NDUBUISI H. ONYEMELUKWE, Ph.D.

E-mail: happyomolaiyeojo@gmail.com

Holy Bible, dispensed through interpersonal interactions between Him and some fortunate historical figures. The historical figures that interacted with Him interpersonally were fortunate because their life took a turn for the better after the interaction. Some of them earned salvation from Him such as one of the ten lepers He healed who solely appreciated Him for the healing miracle. The Samaritan woman was also one of such historical figures. She was fortunate, because she counts among the people credited with the enviable privilege of physically encountering The Messiah; she became a goodnews bearer or an opportune evangelist.

Implicitly, the interaction between the woman and Christ transformed her personality. Hence, she ceased to be a prostitute. She became sexually chaste as a married woman may a remarried woman. Again, the interaction between both of them was quite a lengthy one, a near-epic discourse. The interaction as a near-epic discourse implies that it is loaded with lots of insights: Divine insights, intercultural insights in relation to the Samaritans and Jews, insights on interpersonal relationship cum transgender interaction. All of these insights need to be expounded. They need to be expounded for the purpose of unearthing the underlying value-adding philosophies of life embedded in them as well as the Gospel ideals equally incorporated in them. These aspirations constitute the specific objectives of this paper. Hopefully, realising the objectives of the paper would serve to largely improve Christians' interpersonal relationships with God and other individuals as their immediate and extended neighbours.

To effectively realise the foregoing specific objectives of the paper, its analysis section anchors chiefly on critical and logical modes of thinking as the roots of critical discourse analysis (CDA), the abridged scholarly bent of the paper. For this reason, the next section presents the essentials of critical and logical modes of thinking vis-à-vis the basics of CDA as the paper's theoretical permutations.

Theoretical Permutations: Critical and Logical Modes of Thinking vis-a-vis the Basics of Critical Discourse Analysis

The central textual message of the last paragraph of the introductory section above indicates that this paper is a CDA-anchored study. In other words, in scholarly terms, CDA is the analytical toolkit for the paper. Nevertheless, its analysis section is not driven by the methodical specifics of CDA as an analytical toolkit. Rather than being so driven, it identifies critical and logical modes of thinking as the basis for CDA as a criticalist tradition for discourse or text analysis proceeds to exploit the

fundamentals of both modes of thinking to identify and expound the target insights embodied in the Christological discourse it sets out to investigate without deviating from CDA's criticalist tradition. This way, the analysis focuses on the purposively slated Biblical interactive discourse as a whole instead of doing so, extract by extract, in line with the methodical specifics of CDA. Moreover, this novel approach to a CDA study of Christ's Salvific Interaction with the Samaritan Woman eliminates the need for setting up levels of analysis as applicable to mainstream CDA. In view of the foregoing necessary clarifications, this section of the paper proceeds to provide the fundamentals of critical and logical modes of thinking one after the other as required with wholesale reference to Onyemelukwe (2020: 4-6; 80-83; 93-95).

Critical Thinking

Critical thinking is the ability to think clearly and rationally about what to believe. It includes the ability to engage in reflective and independent thinking. Someone with critical thinking skills is able to do the following:

- a. understanding the logical connections between various ideas
- b. identifying, constructing and evaluating arguments
- c. detecting inconsistencies and common mistakes in reasoning, i.e., identifying fallacies
- d. solving problems, systematically
- e. identifying the relevance and importance of ideas
- f. reflecting on the justifications of one's own beliefs and values

Critical thinking is not just a matter of accumulation of information. A person with a good memory who knows a lot of facts is not necessarily good at critical thinking. A critical thinker is able to deduce consequences from what he knows and he knows how to use information to solve problems as well as how to seek relevant sources of information to be informed. Critical thinking should not be confused with being argumentative or being critical of other people. Although critical thinking skills can be used for exposing fallacies or illogical reasoning, it can also play an important role in co-operative and constructive reasoning. Critical thinking can help us acquire knowledge, improve our theories and strengthen arguments. We can use critical thinking to enhance work processes and improve social institutions.

Some people believe that critical thinking hinders creativity because it requires following the rules of logic and rationality, but creativity might require breaking rules. This is a misconception. Critical thinking is quite compatible with thinking 'out-of-the-box,' challenging

consensus and pursuing less popular approaches. If anything, critical thinking is an essential part of creativity because we need critical thinking to evaluate and improve our creative ideas. Critical thinking is a general term that covers all thinking processes that strive to get below the surface of emergent issues, propositions, hypothesis, theories, procedures and processes by questioning, probing, analysing, exploring and testing each of them as may be necessary. It is not a negative term, although it may be misconceived as such. Critical thinking requires detective-like skills of persistence to examine and re-examine arguments in order to take in all the angles and weigh up evidence on every side. To think critically is never to accept an idea, concept or theory on its face value but to think and question the idea, concept or theory, independently, however authoritative its originators may be.

Virtually everyone would agree that a primary yet insufficiently met goal of schooling is to enable students to think critically. From a lay man's perspective, critical thinking consists of seeing all sides of an issue, being open to new evidences, deducing and inferring conclusions from available facts or premises and solving problems. Moreover, there are specific variants of critical thinking that are characteristic of varied subject-matters: That is what is meant by 'thinking like a scientist' or 'thinking like a historian.' This proper and common-sense goal has very often been translated to calls to teach 'critical thinking skills' and 'higher-order thinking skills' as well as frequent generic calls to teach students to make better judgements and reason more logically. In a recent survey of human resource officials and in a testimony delivered before the tenth Nigerian senate finance committee, business leaders have repeatedly exhorted schools to do a better job of teaching students to think critically and the committee is not alone. Organisations and initiatives involved in education reforms such as the U.S. National Centre on Education and the Economy, the American Diploma Project and the Aspen institute have pointed out the same needs for students. These calls are not particularly new. In 1983, *A Nation at Risk*, a report by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, found that many seventeen-year-olds did not possess the 'higher-order' intellectual skills their country needed then. It claimed that nearly forty percent could not draw inferences from written materials and only one-fifth could write a persuasive essay. Following the release of *A Nation at Risk*, programmes designed to teach students to think critically across the curriculum became extremely popular. By 1990 most states had initiatives designed to encourage educators to teach critically and one of the most widely used programmes were not very

effective. Hence, today we still lament students' lack of critical thinking as evident in their inability to calculate the components of a compound without noticing that its estimates sum up to more than one hundred percent.

Main Characteristics of Critical Thinking

Critical thinking includes a complex combination of skills. According to Paul and Elder (2006) of the Foundation for Critical Thinking, the standards for critical thinking incorporate the following yardsticks: accuracy, precision, relevance, depth, breadth, logic, significance and fairness. Consequently, critical thinkers display the following characteristics:

- a. **Skepticism:** They are by nature skeptical. Hence, they approach written texts with the same cognitive interrogation or suspicion they exhibit for spoken remarks.
- b. **Being Ever Ready to Interrogate:** Critical thinkers are always mentally active not passive. Hence, they ask questions and analyse the answers. They consciously apply tactics and strategies to uncover meanings to be sure of their understanding.
- c. **Self-criticism:** They do not take an egotistic view of the world. They are constantly open to new ideas and perspectives and are willing to challenge their beliefs and investigate competing evidences.

By contrast passive or non-critical thinkers take a simplistic view of the world. They see things as either black or white rather than recognising a variety of possible diachronic and synchronic dynamics or convergent and divergent admixtures. They see questions as demanding only yes or no answers with no implicitness. They fail to recognise underlying related elements. Moreover, non-critical thinkers take an egotistic view of the world. They view their opinions as the only relevant ones, take their own perspectives as the only sensible ones and regard their goals as the only valid ones.

Some Critical Thinking Strategies

- i. **Reflection:** Engaging in the reflective process. Reflective process refers to introspection or concentrated inward search of the cognitive faculty of the mind for positive useful ideas or silent self-examination of one's own thoughts for the purpose of finally ratifying or discarding them.
- ii. **Rationality:**
 - a. Relying on reason rather than emotion
 - b. Demanding for evidence: Ignoring illogical evidences and appropriating logical ones,

conclusively

- c. Being more concerned with finding the best required explanation than with being right
- d. Identifying and analysing apparent confusions and asking necessary questions

iii. **Self-awareness:**

- a. Weighing the influence of motives and biases
- b. Interrogating and recognising your own assumptions, prejudices, biases or points of view

iv. **Open mindedness:**

- a. Evaluating all reasonable inferences
- b. Considering a variety of possible viewpoints or perspectives
- c. Remaining open to alternative interpretations
- d. Accepting reasonable new explanations, models or paradigms for better interconnection of evidences, for being simpler or for having fewer inconsistencies and for more data coverage
- e. Accepting new priorities in response to the re-evaluation of available evidences or reassessing one's real interests
- f. Not rejecting unpopular views without examining them for validity.

Logical Thinking

Conceptualisation

Onyemelukwe (2020) affirms that logical thinking is a mode of thinking based on proven knowledge and information that is accurate and certain. Logical thinking is the basis for modern technology and it is commonly referred to as left-brain thinking. Logical thinking uses straight facts in order to solve problems as opposed to right-brain thinking which is romantic and emotional in nature. Logical thinkers observe and analyse phenomena, reactions and feedbacks and draw conclusions based on the inputs. They justify their strategies, actions and decisions based on the facts they gather. A good situational example: A sales representative modifies the presentation of a product to emphasize its user-friendly qualities after receiving feedback from customers indicating that ease of use is their primary reason for purchasing the product. Logical thinking follows two patterns of thought or forms of reasoning namely inductive and deductive reasoning.

Inductive Reasoning

Inductive reasoning is not subject to the rules of validity and invalidity. Consequently, inductive reasoning which yields inductive arguments is correct or incorrect; reasonable or unreasonable; sound or unsound. The

meaning of the foregoing elucidation is that the premises do not necessarily provide the ground for the truth of its conclusion. Hence, inductive inferences are basically probable, not certain and never certain. Traditionally, inductive reasoning is understood to take the direction of making general connective assertions about particular claims, ideas, notions or opinions. In other words, inductive reasoning is traditionally perceived as a cognitive tool for generalisations, moving from the particular or specific to the general. The truth, however, is that inductive reasoning can move from the particular to the general, from the general to the particular and even from the particular to the particular. Okoro (2012:77-92) has more expositions on inductive reasoning, allied illustrations and associated fallacies. Fallacies refer to logical loops or errors in reasoning, nay, disconnected reasoning. Disconnected reasoning occurs once there is no relationship or connection, whatsoever, between a conclusion and its premises.

Deductive Reasoning

Deductive reasoning is directly antonymous to inductive reasoning. It, therefore, yields inferences that are tightly logically connected. In other words, conclusions drawn by means of deductive reasoning are automatic outcomes of their corresponding premises. Hence, the premises provide indisputable truth conditions or grounds for the conclusions. Consequently, deductive reasoning yields deductive arguments which are subject to the rules of validity and invalidity. This assertion is another way of stating that deductive inferences are valid or invalid. It must be noted at this juncture that the validity or invalidity of deductive inferences is not a determinant of the truthfulness or falseness of their premises. Hence, a deductive inference is valid, even if its premise is false in so far as there is a water-tight logical connection between it and the premise. Similarly, a deductive inference is invalid even if its premise is true in so far as there is an identifiable logical disconnection between it and the premise.

Traditionally, deductive reasoning is understood as a method of inference which moves from general or complex assertions to particular or simple ones, i.e. from what is true or false of the whole to what is true or false of its parts. The truth, however, is that deductive reasoning can be patterned from the general to the general and from the particular to the particular. Okoro (2012:77-92) has more expositions on deductive reasoning, allied illustrations and associated fallacies as well as the rules of inference.

Logical thinking occupies invaluable place of importance in business and professional spheres of life. Hence, logical thinkers can always reason deductively, identifying acceptable premises with corresponding logical conclusions for business and professional applications. For example, if an organisation has a strong conviction to the effect that employees are more productive, if they are allowed control over the modus operandi for their official duties, a logical thinking manager will, consequently, meet with subordinates, communicate departmental goals and schedule brainstorming sessions for staff to decide strategies for attaining organisational goals and objectives.

The Importance of Logical Thinking

Logical thinking skills are essential to the health of any workplace environment. People at any level can be called and expected to resolve problems that are inherent to their areas of expertise. Therefore, the more logical thinking skills are utilised in a workplace, the better will be the decision-making process with fewer mistakes, if any.

Logical thinking skills help us improve ourselves in many ways, for example, by enforcing intellectual self-improvement because of the need for hard facts even when we are assessing our own performance. The skills also help us become better team players because we are unlikely to let our emotions or ego cloud our judgement. Logical thinking skills also tend to increase one's capacity for creativity, because the skills enhance many logical connections across many subjects. All these improvements even at individual levels translate to eventual organisational growth and development.

More Insights on Logical Thinking

Logical thinking is the process of consistently deploying inductive and deductive reasoning to draw valid conclusions. Problems or situations that demand logical thinking require proper structuring and call for specified relationships between propositions, observations, opinions, facts and other statements. Thus, logical thinking entails chains of valid reasoning. Hence, to be logical means to be reasonable and logic means reasoning, nay, the science of reasoning. The basis for logical thinking is sequential thought. Sequential thought entails thinking in steps or thinking procedurally. Thinking procedurally refers to arranging stretches of thoughts in a chain-like progression, such that one stretch of thought connects the one next to it in a ranked descending or ascending logical order of importance.

Training in logical thinking leading to logical thinking ability makes people to be particularly intellectually smart. Hence, logical thinking prompts a child to reject quick but null answers to questions such as 'I don't know' or 'this is difficult.' A child who thinks logically will rather task his brain or intellect to work out accurate answers to given questions, and in the event of failure, he will resort to the discovery method to unearth the required answers.

According to Dr. Albrecht, Mathematics provides an apt platform for logical thinking. Dr. Albrecht is right, because to solve any given mathematical puzzle, one must think and work procedurally, beginning with relevant first calculations before proceeding to subsequent and higher ones as the case may demand. For instance, to grasp fraction as a mathematical concept, a student must first master division as a basic mathematical operation. Again, to correctly solve questions involving simple and/or complex equations in algebra, the student must have mastered fractions.

Logical thinking is not a magical mental process or a function of genetic endowment. It is rather a learned intellectual skill. It is, therefore, a pattern of thinking which entails clearly connecting related thoughts in a sensible manner. In other words, it is about making sense of available alternatives in a given situation. In view of its procedural nature, logical thinking begins with antecedents and progresses to consequents. Consequents are logical or reasonable conclusions drawn from corresponding antecedents. Antecedents are in form of minor and major premises which inter-relate to yield supporting evidences for corresponding consequents.

Logical thinking is popularly regarded as left-brain thinking. As such a mode of thinking, it governs right-field vision, perceives time and cultivates verbalisation skills as well as analytical thinking. It, therefore, governs language skills cum planning, generally. Conceptually, logical thinking contrasts with creative thinking which is synonymous with right-brain thinking. Right-brain thinking governs the left-side of the body and accounts for creativity and imagination. Moreover, right-brain thinking is responsible for visualisation and spatial rather than temporal perception. Right-brain thinkers focus on specific problems and solutions to achieve specific goals, while left-brain thinkers rely largely on their intellectual faculties to produce pertinent generalisations by means of inductive and deductive reasoning.

With reference to Onyemelukwe (2014:15-44), the concise expository insights above are doubtlessly the roots of CDA as a criticalist discourse cum text analysis

theoretical construct. This assertion means that CDA as a toolkit for discourse or text analysis relies chiefly on critical and logical modes of thinking. It relies on both modes of thinking without neglecting other modes of thinking entirely. Consequently, a critical discourse analyst, while mainly thinking critically and logically to realise appropriate analysis of a given discourse or text, connects concurrently, traces or elements of other modes of thinking, especially creative and scientific modes of thinking, as may be necessitated. Criticalist thinking as associated with critical discourse analysts, generally, embodies thoroughness of analysis anchored aptly on discriminatory thinking aimed at deciphering deliberate subsumed, coated, hidden, implied or omitted and insinuating situational nay contextual facts and/or opinions as information, dictums, precepts, maxims or rules of life cum principles. In the analysis section below, Christ's salvific interaction with the Samaritan woman is subjected to the nitty-gritty of criticalist thinking as conceptualised here for proper analysis with sharp appropriation of the essentials of critical, logical and other pertinent modes of thinking strictly for the purpose of unearthing underlying or implicit useful insights embedded in the near-epic discourse without neglecting its explicit insights.

Critical Insights on the Salvific Interaction in Focus Data Presentation

The analysis of the salvific interaction between the Samaritan Woman and Christ begins here with data presentation. Of course, the data consist of the respective utterances of the woman and Christ's own specific utterances as contained in the salvific interaction between both of them which is the analysis focus of the paper. For ease of joint references to the woman and Christ whenever necessary, both of them shall together be referred to as the interlocutors. As such, Christ is the first interlocutor for initiating the interaction or discourse, while the woman is the second interlocutor, automatically. The interaction as a whole shall always be referred to as the passage. The passage is taken online from the Catholic Pastoral Edition of *Christian Community Bible*, a Claretian publication, noted in the paper as *The Holy Bible*. The passage is sourced, specifically, from The Sacred Gospel according to John: Chapter 4, verses 1-45, reproduced below:

¹ The Lord knew that the Pharisees were informed about him; people said that Jesus was attracting and baptizing more disciples than John;² in fact it was not Jesus himself who was baptizing but his disciples. ³ So Jesus left Judea

and returned to Galilee.⁴ He had to cross Samaria.

⁵ He came to a Samaritan town called Sychar, near the land that Jacob had given to his son Joseph. ⁶ Jacob's well is there. Tired from his journey, Jesus sat down by the well; it was about noon. ⁷ Now a Samaritan woman came to draw water and Jesus said to her, "Give me a drink."⁸ His disciples had just gone into town to buy some food.

⁹ The Samaritan woman said to him, "How is it that you, a Jew, ask me, a Samaritan and a woman, for a drink?" (For Jews, in fact, have no dealings with Samaritans.)¹⁰ Jesus replied, "If you only knew the Gift of God! If you knew who it is that asks you for a drink, you yourself would have asked me and I would have given you living water."

¹¹ The woman answered, "Sir, you have no bucket and this well is deep; where is your living water?" ¹² Are you greater than our ancestor Jacob, who gave us this well after he drank from it himself, together with his sons and his cattle?"

¹³ Jesus said to her, "Those who drink of this water will be thirsty again;¹⁴ but those who drink of the water that I shall give will never be thirsty; for the water that I shall give will become in them a spring of water welling up to eternal life."

¹⁵ The woman said to him, "Give me this water, that I may never be thirsty and never have to come here to draw water."¹⁶ Jesus said, "Go, call your husband and come back here."¹⁷ The woman answered, "I have no husband." And Jesus replied, "You are right to say: 'I have no husband';¹⁸ for you have had five husbands and the one you have now is not your husband. What you said is true."

¹⁹ The woman then said to him, "I see you are a prophet; tell me this:²⁰ Our fathers used to come to this mountain to worship God; but you Jews, do you not claim that Jerusalem is the only place to worship God?"

²¹ Jesus said to her, "Believe me, woman, the hour is coming when you shall worship the Father, but that will not be on this mountain or in Jerusalem."²² You Samaritans worship without knowledge, while we Jews worship with knowledge, for salvation comes from the Jews. ²³ But the hour is coming and is even now here, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for that is the kind of worshipers the Father wants. ²⁴ God is spirit and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth."

²⁵ The woman said to him, "I know that the Messiah, that is the Christ, is coming; when he comes, he will tell us everything."²⁶ And Jesus said, "I who am talking to you, I am he."

²⁷ At this point the disciples returned and were surprised that Jesus was speaking with a woman; however, no one said, "What do you want?" or: "Why are you talking with her?" ²⁸ So the woman left her water jar and ran to the town. There she said to the people, ²⁹ "Come and see a man who told me everything I did! Could he not be the Christ?" ³⁰ So they left the town and went to meet him.

³¹ In the meantime the disciples urged Jesus, "Master, eat." ³² But he said to them, "I have food to eat that you don't know about." ³³ And the disciples wondered, "Has anyone brought him food?" ³⁴ Jesus said to them, "My food is to do the will of the One who sent me and to carry out his work."

³⁵ You say that in four more months it will be the harvest; now, I say to you, look up and see the fields white and ready for harvesting. ³⁶ People who reap the harvest are paid for their work, and the fruit is gathered for eternal life, so that sower and reaper may rejoice together.

³⁷ Indeed the saying holds true: 'One sows and another reaps.' ³⁸ I sent you to reap where you did not work or suffer; others have worked and you are now sharing in their labors."

³⁹ In that town many Samaritans believed in him when they heard the woman who declared, "He told me everything I did." ⁴⁰ So, when they came to him, they asked him to stay with them and Jesus stayed there two days. ⁴¹ After that many more believed because of his own words ⁴² and they said to the woman, "We no longer believe because of what you told us; for we have heard for ourselves and we know that this is the Savior of the world."

⁴³ When the two days were over, Jesus left for Galilee. ⁴⁴ Jesus himself said that no prophet is recognized in his own country. ⁴⁵ Yet the Galileans welcomed him when he arrived, because of all the things he had done in Jerusalem during the Festival and which they had seen. For they, too, had gone to the feast.

Data Analysis

Obviously, the passage chronicles a salvific interaction between the first and second interlocutors. The passage is so identified for three primary reasons: 1. The first interlocutor confirmed Himself as Christ, the Messiah, to the second interlocutor who affirmed to Him, her awareness of an already prophesied Messiah. Moreover, the generality of the people of Sychar who visited Christ at Jacob's well, the venue of His interaction with the second interlocutor at her instance, insightfully declared Him the Saviour of the World: "*We no longer believe because of what you told us; for we have heard for ourselves and we know*

that this is the Savior of the world." 2. The first interlocutor's use of water as a lexical item is semiotic in meaning though the woman understood it literally thus exhibiting her spiritual dryness. In its semiotic sense, as later clarified by Christ, water is a salvation symbol: *for the water that I shall give will become in them a spring of water welling up to eternal life*. In other words, water signifies eternal life in the passage and eternal life is aptly synonymous with salvation, since in strict evangelical terms, nobody earns eternal life who is not saved. Temporally, this semiotic semantics of water in the discourse connects its biological essence to man, animals and plants as the elixir of life. From this perspective, water is life in earthly terms. That water is life in earthly terms explains its indeterminable cum invaluable preventive and sometimes curative health value. Hence, taking together, its semiotic signification as well as its biological essence, water is life, spiritually and non-spiritually nay temporally. Spiritually, water as life, signifies The Immutable Holy Will of God, the only ticket for salvation cum eternal life. It should and must be noted at this juncture that the non-spiritual essence of water as a sustainer of life on earth, basically, prefigures its semiotic signification of eternal life, the real life in its fullness. 3. Christ's self-positioning of Himself as a personality to whom nothing else matters except to do the Will of God: "*My food is to do the will of the One who sent me and to carry out his work.*"

Ultimately, the passage chronicles a salvific interaction between the two interlocutors, because right from the onset, the first interlocutor's discourse purpose was to save the second interlocutor. Offering salvation to the second interlocutor was certainly His discourse purpose, because by means of His Divine Omniscience, He identified her as a sinner in need of salvation as established by her subsequent confessions.

Certainly, her confessions identified her to be a woman incapable of stable marriage, an everlasting happy marriage with zero tolerance for divorce in accordance with God's Immutable Holy Will. In Logical terms, Christ's declaration that the man she was then living with was not her husband translates to declaring her a prostitute. This logical deconstruction is strongly underpinned by her confession to Christ that she had no husband. She had no husband, but had lived with five men when she met Christ. The then current one was the sixth man in her life. From every pragmatic indication, therefore, the woman needed salvation truly. Hence, Christ in demonstration of His most compassionate Divine nature opened the door of salvation for her, interactively and semiotically. He opened the door of

salvation to the woman, opting to be the first interlocutor in the discourse between both of them. The key to the door was His request for water from the woman, real water: *Give me a drink*. It is here observed that God's love for man, as seen in Christ, is most amazing. Hence, He offers man, man as personified by the Samaritan woman, His ultimate gift of salvation, freely, without waiting for man's request for the gift. God's agape love for man is indisputably most amazing, because it beats normal human logic. By normal human logic, beneficiaries are expected to request for desired gifts, benefits or favours from benefactors, but between God as man's Benefactor and man as His beneficiary, the direct antonymous logic is the norm. What a seeming illogicality! Nevertheless, nothing about the seeming illogicality portrays God to be irrational. It rather portrays Him to be man's Benefactor par excellence, an uncommon Benefactor distinct from average benefactors as obtainable in humanity.

Was Christ's offer of salvation to the woman accepted or rejected? The pragmatics of the entire discourse shows that the woman accepted the offer. Her unhindered near hilarious spontaneous return trip to the town together with her virtually loquacious announcement of Christ to her people proves that she accepted the offer: *So the woman left her water jar and ran to the town. There she said to the people,*²⁹ *"Come and see a man who told me everything I did! Could he not be the Christ?"*³⁰ *So they left the town and went to meet him.* This extract of the discourse as well as the allied authorial remarks asserts that her acceptance of the offer was contagious. Her contagious acceptance of the offer explains her people's massive instantaneous visit to Christ, a visit that resulted in their hosting Him for two days. Certainly, her people's hosting of Christ for two days demonstrated their own acceptance of the offer else they would not have even bothered to see him talk less of hosting Him. In the alternative, they would have politely enjoined Him to leave the town as done by the Gardeners in whose river He perished two thousand demon possessed pigs (Mark 5:13-20).

The woman's contagious acceptance of salvation from Christ transformed her to an evangelist, automatically. It, therefore, follows that all Christ's disciples who, by implication, have accepted His offer of salvation, should and must become and remain evangelists. Christ's disciples are evangelists, if they share His goodnews with non-Christians for the purpose of converting them and/or if they consciously make themselves living examples of Gospel values as taught in *The Holy Bible*.

If the woman is regarded as the social persona for

humanity in the discourse, is Christ's offer of salvation accepted or rejected? If she is so regarded, the offer is concurrently accepted and rejected. It is accepted by some people across the globe and also rejected by some people, worldwide. Those who have accepted the offer, He has empowered to be children of God. Such people have been born of God and do not sin (1 John: 3:9). Temporally, they are recognised as believers or children of God just as those who have rejected the offer are known to be unbelievers. Relying on Onyemelukwe et al's (2017), believers are children of God by redemption, while unbelievers are children of God by creation nay potential redeemed people of God, subject to sustained effective creative evangelism.

Did the woman accept salvation easily? No. Consequently, she was initially at sea about the offer. Her initial confusion is evident in her literal understanding of Christ's semiotic reference to water: *but those who drink of the water that I shall give will never be thirsty; for the water that I shall give will become in them a spring of water welling up to eternal life.*" Consequently, she responded: *"Give me this water, that I may never be thirsty and never have to come here to draw water."* It, therefore, took Christ's prophetic beam light on her past and present unholy life to quicken her mind to the reality of His personality cum mission. Even at that, it still took her some time to fully come to terms with the offer as she argued with Christ on the right place of worship. Before their argument, Christ had lectured her on the universality and fundamentals of true worship namely that God cannot be worshipped exclusively on the mountain or in Jerusalem, but everywhere as proper to His Omnipresence and He must be worshipped spiritedly and sincerely. Ultimately, Christ opened her eyes to the fact that Samaritans were worshipping an unknown god quite unlike the Jews who had been worshipping The Almighty God of Heaven and Earth, The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Mt.22:32; Exodus3:6). See verses 21-24 of the passage. The foregoing Christological pedagogy made no immediate impression on her. As implied in her sudden flight to the town shortly after the arrival of Christ's disciples, it took the conversion action of The Holy Spirit to convince, convert and commission her. Thus, she became an evangelist, immediately as evident in verses 27-30 of the passage.

It should and must be observed here that Christ's jettisoning of exclusive worship of God on the mountain or in Jerusalem is a critical Divine soft reprimand against conservative Samaritan and Jewish religious leaders. The reprimand was necessary, because upholding their wrong doctrine translates to denying God an essential marker of

His Supreme Divine identity namely His omnipresence. In other words, permitting exclusive worshipping of God on the mountain and/or in Jerusalem will take away a crucial identity component of His Divinity and God can no longer be God. Can man be man without any of his body, spirit and soul? The undeniable truth with reference to *The Holy Bible* is that God Almighty is omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent and denying that He is omnipresent automatically also denies that He is omnipotent and omniscient for He cannot be omnipotent and omniscient without being omnipresent. Hence, Christ rightly reprimanded the religious leaders.

The foregoing conversion history of the Samaritan woman is representative of all conversion stories. Hence, the pragmatics of conversion stories is that The Holy Spirit is the ultimate evangelist. It follows, therefore, that unless The Holy Spirit converts, the evangelist labours in vain for souls. The import of this assertion is that every real conversion is a miracle. The conversion of Saul to St. Paul as well as St. Augustine's own conversion are popular perfect illustrative instances (Acts.9, Sheed, 163-180). Every real conversion is a miracle, because the mind of man is too limited to comprehend spirituality, ordinarily. Howbeit, the soul to be converted must be found to be receptive or docile as seen in the woman: *Give me this water, that I may never be thirsty and never have to come here to draw water*. Doubtlessly, this her utterance is aptly indicative of her receptive cum docile personality even as it also depicted her shallow mind which perceived spiritual water to be real earthly water. In the final analysis, her shallow mind which embeds her spiritual dryness connects her docility as evident in her cultured attitude to Christ. Her cultured attitude to Christ is expressively polite and suggests overtly that, socio-culturally in Samaria, it is in the place of women, generally, to defer to men. Consequently, as proper to her cultured personality, she was saved and engaged to save others, miraculously.

At this juncture, it should and must also be pointed out that Christ's request for water from the woman is pragmatically significant beyond initiating their interaction to open the door of salvation to her. The woman's reaction to the request points out the significance as well as the adjacent authorial remark: *How is it that you, a Jew, ask me, a Samaritan and a woman, for a drink?" (For Jews, in fact, have no dealings with Samaritans.)*. The authorial remark says it all and underpins the woman's surprise at the request. In explicit terms, the authorial remark discloses impenetrable social barrier between Jews and Samaritans akin to the unbreakable social wall between free-borns and outcasts, *the osu's*, in

ancient Igboland. Therefore, in view of the disclosure and the woman's surprise, the pragmatics of Christ's request for water from the woman is that social barriers are Divinely abominated. Social barriers are proscribed or disallowed by God, because in Christ, as emphatically taught in *The Holy Bible*, there are no Jews, Greeks or Samaritans and no Hausas, Yorubas or Igbos (Galatians 3:28). All Christ's disciples across the globe form one body in Him. Hence, Christianity signifies unity of peoples and cultures with absolute zero tolerance for any shed of discrimination or inter-cultural conflict. Specifically, Christ request served to practically collapse the barrier between Jews and Samaritans which like other such barriers are usually erected by unfounded prejudices or biases.

Summary of Major Insights and Conclusion

Summary of Major Insights

Christ is indisputably the Saviour of The World, the Messiah or The Redeemer as severally evident in the passage. As The Messiah, He is most willing to save spiritually deficient but thirsty cum hungry and docile souls such as the Samaritan woman. Hence, He offers salvation to such souls freely as He offered the woman of Samaritan. Deductively, therefore, no docile soul who encounters Christ remains his sinful self, especially for the first time. Such souls should and must not hide their unholiness from Christ upon encountering Him, because it is practically impossible to hide anything from Him. The woman did not hide her sin of multiple sexual immorality from Him and her honesty paved the way of salvation for her. Consequently, to be saved is to voluntarily admit, confess and flee one's sinful way of life upon encountering Christ and earn eternal life. The foregoing insights indicate that salvation is a gift which one must accept to really earn or own. Hence, like every other gift, whoever rejects it cannot have it.

God's foremost Divine attributes of omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence do not permit Him to be limited or confined to any specific place of worship, most contrary to the impression created by Samaritan and Jewish religio-cultural practices which limited worshipping Him to the mountain and Jerusalem, respectively. By virtue of His omnipresence, He is everywhere, reachable everywhere, and so, can be worshipped everywhere. Nevertheless, relying on genuine evangelical cum Biblical insights, He is best worshipped in His ecclesiastical abodes. His ecclesiastical abodes refer to all dedicated authentic Christian churches. In the same vein, God's Divine attributes in general which personify agape love do not

permit social barriers among His people across ethnic, tribal, religious, class, political, cultural, national and other variants affiliation.

As Christologically asserted in the passage, God is Spirit and by His Divine nature, the epitome of truth. Consequently, those who worship Him should and must worship Him in spirit and truth. To worship Him in spirit and truth is to worship Him spiritedly or dedicatedly and sincerely or honestly, not pretentiously, deceitfully, deceptively or hypocritically. In the final analysis, God is man's Benefactor Par Excellence. Hence, He deserves man's dedicated sincere worship in appreciation to Him for His amazing love for man.

In communication terms, the interaction between the first and second interlocutors is a perfect example of interpersonal communication. If the generality of the people of Sychar is considered to be part of the discourse, it becomes an instance of group communication or even public communication, depending on the total population. Nevertheless, the discourse is analysed, strictly as an interpersonal interaction, because the input of Sychar people is obviously incidental. As an instance of interpersonal communication, the discourse features both interlocutors as trained polite communicators. Thus, it has enjoined all and sundry to always ensure effective communication, obviously, because it is an imperative for effective mutually beneficial interactions.

Conclusion

On the whole, the pragmatics of the entire discourse is that saved or redeemed souls nay children of God by redemption should and must be Christ-like at all times and places in all situations and at every occasion, i.e., always and everywhere. They have been born of God, and so, should and must not sin, because as a theological rule, those born of God do not sin. With reference to the passage, their food should and must precisely be the same

as that of Christ, their Super Master namely to constantly do The Will of God as they work in His Vineyard, relentlessly as portrayed in verse 34 of the passage. This pragmatics as well as the foregoing summarised major insights in the section immediately before this stems from applied critical, logical and some other pertinent modes of thinking in relation to the discourse analysed in the study. Thus, the study has demonstrated that applied pertinent modes of thinking produce the same analytic results with the rigorous level by level CDA methods.

References

- Alan, Shreck (2002). *Compact History of The Catholic Church*. Rome: ICCRO, St. Paul's Acts of the Apostles, Chapter 9, *The Holy Bible*.
 Exodus Chapter 3:6, *The Holy Bible*.
 Galatians Chapter 3:28, *The Holy Bible*.
 I John Chapter 3:9, *The Holy Bible*.
 Okoro, Benjamin C. (2012). Logic: Its Scope and Nature, Ndubuisi, F.M. (ed.) *Philosophy, Logic and Philosophy of Science*. Lagos, Nigeria: UniLag Centre for General Studies.
 Onyemelukwe, Ndubuisi H. (2020). *Modes of Thinking*. Lagos, Nigeria: Seventh Craft.
 Onyemelukwe, Ndubuisi H. (2014). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Novels of Chinua Achebe: . . .* Lagos, Nigeria: Solem Koncept.
 Onyemelukwe, Ndubuisi H. et al (2017). Literary cum Philoso-religious Periscope on the Nature of Man, *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(6) December, 2017.
 Sheed, F.J. (ND.). (translator), *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. Lagos, Nigeria: Criterion Publishers.
 The Gospel of St. John Chapter 4:1-45, *The Holy Bible*.
 The Gospel of St. Mark Chapter 5:13-20, *The Holy Bible*.
 The Gospel of St. Matthew Chapter 22:32, *The Holy Bible*.