

So we'll naturally call it L.

L. The Lamps. 8:1-4. It is a very brief section. The Lord gave orders about the lighting of the candlesticks. And there is much that might be said about the importance of light, and about the importance of realizing what this stands for in our lives and in our worship. But we have other things that are perhaps much less obvious to go to later, so I'll merely mention it in its place here. The lamps, ~~8~~ 8:1-4. And I won't much more than mention the next section, in fact the next two.

M. The Cleansing of the Levites. 8:5-26. Now between vs. 4 and 5 there is a real division here. The chp. ~~7~~ division I think might better have been made after vs. 4 because you have these 4 verses which certainly belong together, and then you have vs. 89 which you can make an argument either way, but there is a definite sharp <sup>change</sup> ~~cleavage~~ between vs. 4 and 5. So surely that would have been a better place to make the division. Now don't anybody get the idea that I think we should change the divisions of the chapters in our Bible. I think it is important that we recognize that they are artificial divisions. That we don't allow them to mislead us into thinking that the thought is necessarily divided in <sup>accordance with</sup> ~~the/course/of~~ the chapter. But I do feel that we have a tremendous convenience in these ch. and vs. divisions. I think it's a wonderful thing that you can turn to any vs. in the Bible immediately by our ch. and vs. division, and I think in this case the unity ~~you/get~~ that we get from that is well worth the fact that in some cases we have to be careful that we are not misled into thinking that they are natural division. Now there are some people that would carry that same feeling into the relation of the translations of the Bible. I've ~~heard~~ heard that --- When I worked on the New Scofield, the first day we ~~met~~ met I recommended that we take some of the obsolete words and we replace them with words that would be understandable today. And a few people objected rather violently. "After all isn't it much more sacred to say, I do you to wit than to say I want you to know?" Well if you didn't have context, most of us would have no idea what "I do you to wit" means. And when you -- people say Yes but for congregational reading ~~7~~ you want to have it identical." Well, I think it would be wonder~~ful~~ ful if we had a <sup>for</sup> translation today as good as the KJV was in its day. And I fear it will be a long time