that the return from the Temptation to  
Bethany beyond Jordan had taken place  
before the deputation arrived.

**29**–**34.]** *Second witness borne by John  
to Jesus*: apparently before His disciples.

**29.] The next day (the morrow).**Those who wish to introduce the Temptation between vv. 28 and 29, interpret it,  
‘*on some day after.’* Thus Euthym., “*the  
next day*; that is, the next after his return from the wilderness.” But this sense,  
although certainly found in the Old Testament,—see Gen. xxx. 33 (‘*in time to  
come*,’ Heb. “*to-morrow*”),—is not according to the usage of St. John (see ch.  
vi. 22; xii. 12), and would be quite alien  
from the precision of this whole portion  
of the narrative, which, ver. 40, specifies  
even the hours of the day. I understand  
it therefore literally, both here and .in  
vv. 35 and 44.

**coming unto him]**It is not said *whence*, or *why*, or whether  
for the purpose of an interview, or not;  
*the fact* merely is related, for the sake of  
the testimony which follows. I mention  
this, because on these points difficulties  
have been raised.

**Behold the Lamb of God]** This is one of the most important  
and difficult sayings in the New Testament. *The question to be answered* is,  
In calling Jesus by so definite a name as  
**the Lamb of God**, *to what* did John refer?  
And this question is intimately connected  
with that of the meaning of the following  
words, **which taketh away the sin of the  
world.**

(a) The title must refer to *some  
“known and particular lamb*, and cannot  
be a mere figure for a just and holy man,  
as some suppose. It is inconceivable, that  
*the Lamb of God* should, in a testimony so  
precise and formal as this of the Baptist,  
be *nothing but an hyperbole*, and that one  
*wholly unprecedented*, and to his hearers  
*unintelligible*. Had no doctrinal considerations been at stake, we may safely say  
that this interpretation would never have  
been proposed. In its bearing on the  
latter clause of the verse, it is equally untenable. These interpreters make *which  
taketh away the sin of the world* to  
mean, “who shall, though innocent, have,  
throughout his life, grievous experience  
of the wickedness of men, but shall, like a  
lamb, bear the evils inflicted upon him  
with a patient and gentle mind” (Gabler);  
or, “He shall remove the sins of men, i.e. wickedness, out of the earth.” ‘The first  
of these meanings of the verb rendered  
“*takeaway*” is *altogether without example*.  
The second, though common enough in  
other connexions, is never found in connexion with “*sin*.” The common sense  
account of this part of the matter is:—  
John wished to point out Jesus as *the  
Messiah*: he designates Him as *the lamb  
of God*; he therefore referred to some  
definite lamb,—revealed by God, sent by  
God, pleasing to God, or in some meaning  
especially, **of God**. *Whence did this idea  
come?*

(b) Can John have referred  
to the *paschal lamb*? Further than the  
very use of the name brings in with it the  
general typical use of the animal, and  
thus this particular use may lie in the  
background, *I think not*,—and for this  
reason ;—The *ruling idea* in the paschal  
sacrifice has no connexion, in any sense of  
the words, with *taking away sin*. However, by the light *now* thrown back on it  
since the Spirit has opened the things of  
Christ, *we* discern this typical meaning in  
the sprinkling of the blood (see 1 Cor.  
v. 7),—in the *Jewish mind*, no mention  
being made of sin or the removing of  
sin in any connexion with the paschal  
lamb, the two could not be brought forward, in such an announcement as this, in  
close connexion with one another.

(c) Can the reference be to the *lamb of  
the daily morning and evening sacrifice*?  
or to the *sacrificial lamb* generally? With’  
the same reservation as above, *I think not*:  
for (1) this expression is too definite to  
have so general and miscellaneous a reference; (2) of many animals which were  
used for sacrifice, the lamb was *only one*,  
and that one *not by any means so prominent as.to serve as a type for the whole*:  
and (3) the lamb (with only two exceptions, Levit. iv. 32: Num. vi. 14, in both  
which cases it was to be a *female*, as if for  
express distinction from the ordinary use  
of the lamb) *was never used for a sin-offering*, properly so called and known.  
The *question ts not*, whether Christ be not  
typified by all these offerings, which we  
*now know* to be the case (1 Pet. i. 19 al.),  
but whether *the Baptist is likely to have  
referred to them in such words as these.*(d) There remains but one reference, and  
that is, to *the prophetic announcement in  
Isa*. liii. 7. The whole of that latter
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