

is not part of the by the knowledge of him, but of the subject, the knowledge of God and salvation which he possesses, which he communicates to others, the reference is to the prophetic activity of the servant, that seems to be cut short by his death, but will be resumed and crowned with success in his exalted state. Isn't that nonsense? Utter nonsense. Skinner gives it as dogmatic statement, with no evidence whatever. It is not the objective genitive, by the knowledge of him, but the subjective, the knowledge of God and salvation which he possesses. Well, there's absolutely no basis for that, I mean, it could be objective, it could be subjective. But for him dogmatically to state this is not substitutionary atonement but this is Christ's prophetic work, by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many. Of course (14 1/4) insist that it doesn't mean to justify but it means to make righteous...

Isa. 62 . (1/2)

...yes, but of course the question is how does he justify it? Is it because of what he knows or because people come to know him? It is ^{his} knowing in the sense of their knowing him. It's the objective (3/4) by knowing him instead of by his knowing. By knowing him, the suffix could be subject or object. (student.1) Yes, that is to say that--

...by the instrumentality of his enabling us to know him, that he justifies. Yes. And it's by the knowledge of him which we come to ^{have} know that individuals are justified. (student.1 1/2) ...in the sense, that if this meant his knowing us, that it would have to have a suffix or an added word to bring that out. That is by his knowing us that he justifies us. It's not by his knowing ^{sin} ~~him~~ that it justifies us, you mean it's by his enduring the cross (1 3/4) (student.2)

oh, acquainted with misery, so this refers back to 3, by his being acquainted, by his experiencing, he shall justify many, very interesting thought, this way, then, to make this refer to the ~~cross~~ cross then, by his knowing, being a reference to the cross. It's not impossible but it's a long ways back to go for a verse to explain it, and most commentators think that one of the other two ideas seems the more likely one. But that certainly would