section of Isaiah, as before remarked on ver.  
23, is Messianic, and was so understood  
by the Jews (see my Hulsean Lectures for  
1841, pp. 62–66). We have there the  
servant of God (the Messiah) compared  
to *a lamb brought to the slaughter* (liii.  
7), and it is said of Him (ib. ver. 4), “He  
hath borne our griefs (in the LXX, “beareth our sins”) and carried our sorrows” —  
ver. 5, “He was wounded for our transgressions”—ver. 6, “The Lord hath laid  
on Him the iniquity of us all” (in the  
LXX, “delivered Him to our sins”)—ver.8,  
“He was cut off out of the land of the  
living, for the transgression of my people  
was He stricken ”—ver. 12, “He bare the  
sins of many, and made intercession for the  
transgressors” (in the LXX., “and was delivered because of their iniquities”). So  
that here, and here only, we have the  
connexion of which we are in search,—  
between *the lamb*, and the *bearing or  
taking away of sin*,—expressly stated, so  
that it could be formally referred to in a  
testimony like the present. And I have  
therefore no doubt that *this was the  
reference*.

(e) We have now to enquire into the specific meaning of **which  
taketh away the sin of the world** (see  
above under [a]). The verb rendered  
taketh away answers to a Hebrew verb,  
which is used frequently in the O. T., in  
connection with *sin*, in the sense of *bearing its punishment*:—see Levit. xxiv. 15:  
Num. v. 31; xiv. 3: Ezek. iv. 5; xxiii,  
35a]. A form of this very Greek verb is  
used by the LXX in the sense of taking  
away sin and its guilt by expiation: see in  
our English Bible, Levit.x.17. The word  
in our verse will bear either of these meanings, or both conjoined; for if the Lamb  
is to suffer the burden of the sins of the  
world, and to take away sin and its guilt  
by expiation, this result must be accomplished by the *offering of Himself*.

(f) But it is objected, that this view of a suffering Messiah, and of expiation by the sufferings of *one*, was *alien from the Jewish  
expectations*;—and that the Baptist (see  
Matt. xi. 2 ff. and note) cannot himself  
have had any such view. But the answer  
to this may be found in the fact that  
the view, though not generally prevalent,  
among the Jews, was by no means unknown to many. The application by the  
early Jewish expositors of Isa. liii. to the Messiah, could hardly have been made,  
without the idea of the suffering and death  
of their Messiah being presented to their  
minds. The same would be the case iu  
the whole sacrificial economy :—the removal of guilt (which was universally  
ascribed to the Messiah) by suffering and  
death would be familiarized to their minds.  
Traces of this are found in their own  
writings. In 2 Macc. vii. 37, 38, the last  
of the seven brethren thus speaks before  
his martyrdom :—“But I, as my brethren,  
offer up my body and life for the laws of  
our fathers, beseeching God that He would  
speedily be merciful unto our nation ; and  
that thou by torments and plagues mayest  
confess, that He alone is God: and that in  
me and my brethren the wrath of the  
Almighty, which is justly brought upon all  
our nation, may cease.” And Josephus  
says of these same martyrs, that they  
were “as it were a ransom for the nation’s  
sin: and by means of the blood of those  
pious ones and the propitiation of their  
death, divine Providence saved afflicted  
Israel.” The whole history of the sacrifices and devotions of the heathen world  
abounds with examples of the same idea  
variously brought forward; and to these  
the better-informed among the Jews could  
be no strangers. And as to the Baptist  
himself, we must not forget that the power  
of the Holy Spirit which enabled him to  
recognize by a special sign the Redeemer,  
also *spoke in him*, and therefore his words  
would not be the result of education  
merely, or his own reasoning, but of that  
kind of intuitive perception of divine  
truth, which those have had who have  
been for any special purpose the organs  
of the Holy Ghost.

As regards Matt. xi. 3, the doubt on the mind of John  
there expressed does not appear to have  
touched at all on the matter now in question,—but to have rather been a form  
of expressing his impatience at the slow  
and quiet progress of Him of whom he  
expected greater things and a more rapid  
public manifestation.

**30.]** See on ver. 15.

**31.]** On the apparent discrepancy  
between this statement, **I knew him not**,  
and St. Matthew’s narrative, I have stated  
my view on Matt. iii, 14. Both accounts  
are entirely consistent with the supposition that John had been from youth  
upwards acquainted with our Lord, and
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