

But that this mechanism, this body that God lends us for a time, that there is something sacred about that, to my mind has brought tremendous unnecessary suffering in recent years. Medicine has advanced to the point where they can keep you alive breathing though you have nothing but agony and misery, they can keep you breathing for a long time. I don't see anything sacred about the human life to keep it breathing and suffering. But you look at the OT Scripture and find God says that the iniquity of the Amorites was so great he was going to order the Israelites to wipe them out and completely exterminate the Canaanites.

How can you read that and many other things in the OT and then say that there is a doctrine of the sacredness of human life taught in the Bible. The fact people will talk so glibly about something like this that has no Scriptural warrant and certainly is not a doctrine--and yet I have not heard anybody criticize it just gives me a renewed feeling that of how important it is that we don't read our ideas into the Bible but that we go to the Bible and see what is there and see what ideas we get out of the Bible.

I consider the NIV a great help to people today because it is a good clear translation of Scripture and on the whole represents the original in general very different to make a really good translation. I think the KJV was a better translation than the NIV is. But it is a translation in a language that nobody understands today. So I say there are three things to do: You can spend a few years studying Elizabethan English and learn exactly what people meant by those words and phrases then, and then get a very good translation of the Bible. You can do that.

Or you can learn Heb. and Greek and studying the meaning of words and phrases and get into it and see exactly what the words mean. Or you can take the NIV which is on the whole a very good translation and you can receive tremendous benefit from it today, far more than book written in language that today is antiquated. If you want to use antiquated language go back to the Latin. It is even more beautiful than the KJV.

The thing that ~~xxx~~ shocks me is that all translations I have been able to see ignore the clear fact of the the wording of certain places in Scripture. They just assume what they are. An illustration that occurs to me is the last v. of Isa. 53. "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great and ~~and~~ he shall divide a spoil with the strong because he has poured out his soul unto death and he was numbered with the transgressors and he bore the sin of many, and he made intercession for the transgressors. Four things in a row that He did and the last one: he made intercessorn for the transgressors seems a sort of anticlimax after the other three.

The NIV is just about the same. It says: Therefore will I give him a portion among the great, and he will divide the spoil with the strong because he poured out his life unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors, for he bore the sin of many." KJV says "and." It's the same word as before the others. It can mean "for"; it can mean "and."