

The ch. as they have translated it, very clearly teaches that the virgin birth occurred. But the footnote says: other ancient authorities read-- and then gives the quotation that Jospheh was the father of Jesus. A remarkable thing. To have the NT contradict the OT is one thing. But to read that other ancient authorities actually contradict the principle teaching of the first ch. of the NT, that was amazing! It's no wonder they/put such a footnote on the first page of the NT when it came out separately. But when it came as part of the whole volume, it is sort of buried in the whole volume and will not get nearly as much attention.

I have not seen recently a later printing of the RSV. I have the impression (I was not able to check on it before chapel) but I have the impression that later printings omit that note. I hope they do. Because the note not only contradicts what it says here in the ch., but it is definitely ~~in~~ contrary to fact. It says other ancient authorities read... And when you think of an ancient authority about the text of the NT --other ancient authorities-- you are apt to think there are a number of Greek MSS which say that Jospheh was the father of Jesus, but actually there is not a single one!

This refers not to Greek MSS but to Syriac -- to a Syriac translation. In This Syriac translation of this particular Syriac translation we have only a few MSS. But of those few MSS that we have of that Syriac translation, there is only one that contains it! So "other ancient authorities" is not right! One ancient translation would be a more accurate way, or say one ancient MS. One MS of an ancient translation. Let me read again what they say the other authorities read. "Joseph to whom was