of the meaning immediately in most cases, far more definitely than you get from reading it in the translation made 400 years ago. AT the same time, I would say this, that I believe the KJV was perhaps the best translation made of any book into any language. If we only all knew thoroughly the language of 400 years ago we would be far better of using it than any modern translation that I have seen, that comes somewhat nearer to the original.

The NIV is on the whole a very good approximation of the original and expresses it in language that people today can understand. So for general use I'm going to the KJV, but I think it is also very helpful to consult the KJV and study any passages and if it throws light on it in perhaps a way you don't get it from the NIV.

Now I must say this about NIV. As fine as it is in mahy parts of Scripture, in fact of most parts of Scripture, and good as it is in the prophetical books, I think that in the prophetical books it is not quite as good as it is in most other parts of the Bible. The reason for that is probably this: that when the KJV translators came to a passage that they couldn't quite undderstand what it meant, They followed as closly as they could the words of the original even if it didn't seem to them to make any very good sense.

In the NIV in the prophets I find a number of places where they don't seem to have understood what the original exactly meant and have felt kkere their duty was to give something that would be clearly under stood by the reader, and therefore havegiven what has seemed to them what it meant, and I kretx fear that no one of them was really a close student of the prophetical books, comparing passage with passage, Scripture with Scripture trying to see the progress of thought and to understand kke exactly what some of these difficult massages meant.

Now when you look at a ch. of the Bible the first thing to do is to see whether the ch. is a unit. Does it start with the beginning of a new subject? If you look at the book of Hebrews for instance you will find that nearly every ch. in the book of Hebrews is summarized in the first v. of the next ch. That v. could be the beginning of the ch. or it cmx could be the end of the ch. So if you are really going to understand a passage, it is generally good to start at a few vv. before the beginning of the ch. and run a few vv. into the next ch.

But in this case there is a major didvision in the book of Isa. at the end of ch. 22. So we have a definite new start, a start on a new section of the book which comes here, at the beginning of the ch. The ch. begins with a picture and we find that the first 12 vv. of it form a unit. They give you one rather unified picture—the first 12 vv., then the thought runs wife on from there in the succeeding vv. Therefore I'm going to run a bit rapidly over the first 12 vv. which give you a rather unified picture of a certain situation.

Here I do not think the translators either of the KJV or of the NIV have understood really what the situation is that is there described.