

this go a long way toward making it a paraphrase rather than a translation? I wonder whether *sarx* is ever used outside of Christian writings to mean "the sinful nature." Would it not be better simply to give what the original says and let the student interpret it for himself, perhaps with a footnote about unusual usages, rather than to give a paraphrase? I do hope that the Old Testament will be a sound evangelical and accurate version and will not be too much affected by Köhler-Baumgartner or by ideas lingering in the back of the heads of individuals who have studied under modernist scholars.

LETTER 9  
1986

### **THE TEXT OF THE KING JAMES VERSION**

I was sorry to read your statement that "there are increasing numbers of individuals holding or turning to the concept that the King James Version is the only word of God in the English language." It was indeed a very fine version, remarkably accurate, though, like all translations, containing a few mistakes. It was written in beautiful English, and the English language of nearly four hundred years ago was a far more beautiful language than the English language as spoken and understood today.

Unfortunately, the English language has so greatly changed in the course of the centuries that there is probably no one living who easily understands the meaning of all its verses. The average reader misses a great deal of its content because of his ignorance of the meaning of words in the English of the 17th century, the usage of syntactical forms, etc.