

committee working on it, all highly trained men. And yet with the strong emphasis on a good clear style that will be easily understood. Now I've said how much I like it, because ~~f~~ what I say now is critical of it, and I don't want that to be the full impression that I make. But the vs. of which I just read in Gal. 5 where it said, (vs.17) For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh", This translation says, "For the sinful nature desires what is contrary to the Spirit and the Spirit what is contrary to the sinful nature." I find looking at the Greek, that the word sarx which the KJV always translates "flesh" that this version translates it in a number of different ways. Very frequently as "sinful nature" and I don't like that. That is a paraphrase. What the Greek says is flesh, and sarx is the word that is used for meat. It is used for the ^{fleshly part of} flesh of the the body, for the body as a whole, though soma is a common word for body. Maybe it means sinful nature. An argument can be made for that. But that's a pretty good jump from the idea of flesh. It seems to me that it is getting away from a false attitude of asceticism, it seems to me that they have read into it a particular interpretation which has gone pretty far away from the original. The Greek word definitely is flesh. Now if you are going to interpret that as sinful nature, ~~a~~ how are you going to interpret it? But I believe you have a better translation if you can recognize the similarity with this Greek word occurring here and when it occurs in other cases. In relation to the Bible, I would like to say something here ⁱⁿ that seem to me rather important.

I believe the Bible is true. I believe every statement it makes is true. I do not believe that any statement in it is complete. I don't believe that any statement anybody made in any language is complete. Anything you say opens up the possibility of inferences on other matters about it. Consequently what the Bible tells us is true, but there are all sorts of things it does not touch upon. It is very hard to build a negative argument. I read a statement about this word sarx in a very scholarly work, in which it says that sarx