

I need to think further about the distinctions between "spirit" and "flesh," "spirit" and "letter," "spirit" and "law," and so on.

My hypothesis is that "the spiritual," properly so-called, covers more or less the same ground as "the existential" (*sensu lato*), or "the metaphysical," likewise construed in a broad sense. On the other hand, "the spiritual" can also be used more strictly, in which case its coverage is more or less the same as "the metaphysical" (*sensu stricto*).

It would seem, then, that the contrasting terms—"flesh," "letter," "law"—all have to do, in one way or another, with "the factual" or "the empirical," in contrast to "the metaphysical," either broadly or strictly construed.

10 September 1999