

But I must confess that I never realized how much the language has changed and how important it is to have the Bible in the language of today. I never wholly realized it until within the last year. Because within the last year I have been reading very considerably from the NIV. At point after point I stopped and thought this this is different! Now what does the original say, and I've looked up and found in many instances this is correct. It is not a perfect translation. There is no perfect translation.

There are points at which I would definitely disagree. But Francis ~~XX~~ Schaeffer said, It is by far the best translation that has yet appeared, and I believe I would concur with him in that.

Hundreds of times I have repeated those wonderful words: And of his fulness have all we received and grace for grace" without ever stopping until two weeks ago to think what does that mean? Grace for grace? If you said that Grace for my needs, that would make sense. Or grace for what is necessary for my life. That would be helpful. But grace for grace? Do I give him grace in return for His grace? NIV says, One blessing after another. That makes good sense. Grace for grace conveys no meaning to us today.

Now perhaps it conveyed a meaning in the time of King James. Perhaps "for" them meant the same as "after" does today. I don't know. I'm not an expert on Elizabethan English, but I know that "grace for grace" conveys no meaning to us today.

I noticed something this morning I hadn't noticed before. Paul said, If after the manner of men I fought with beasts in Ephesus, what does it profit? The reason I looked at the verse was because Paul said he fought with beasts at Ephesus, and Acts says the people attacked him. Beasts is clearly figurative there. We have no evidence he was thrown into the arena and fought with lions or tigers at Ephesus. But the attitude of the men was like that of beasts. Paul went through that ordeal in order to spread the knowledge of Christ.

But this morning as I read it, I read "if after the manner of men I fought . . ." How do you fight after the manner of men? How else would you fight? NIV says, If for human reasons I fought with beasts . . . I forget the exact words. But it makes sense. "After the manner of beasts" may have conveyed the exact idea at that time. It doesn't now.

Over and over young people learn vv. that have "ye" in them. I've never met anybody who knows what "ye" means. It's something like you isn't it? But how? What is the difference? There is a definite difference, and a difference that is carried through consistently in KJV.= and which made sense to people at that day. Most people today think of it as just another way of saying you. Why then use a different _____?

To my mind the great need is to have the Bible in our language. The first step in interpretation is to get the Bible in a language that you understand.