

translators were "dishonest and ~~more~~ unscholarly" is to make an utterly absurd statement. Certainly Christian prejudice did not lead them to do it at all.

Much more important is the matter of the angel who spoke to Joseph as recorded in the last part of the first chapter of Matthew. In telling Matthew why he should not put away his(wife?) as he inclined was inclined toward doing, the angel pointed out that he was simply fulfilling the promise made to Isaian that a virgin would bear a son. The RSV quite incorrectly puts quotation marks ~~about~~ about what precedes and follows, and leaves this out so as to make it a side remark of Matthew instead of part of the angel's ~~angel~~ message to Joseph. Taking it as the RSV does, it makes Joseph Matthew up out to be dishonest and unscholarly ~~more~~ in his reference to Isaiah 7:14. If the quotes quotation marks are placed where they belong, it would represent the angel as ~~not~~ speaking from a dishonest and unscholarly viewpoint in telling Matthew that the birth of Christ was the fulfillment of the promise of a virgin birth in Isaiah 7:14.

Mr. Phil ~~some~~ says that, ~~the~~ " the 'pit' means the 'grave' in the Old Testament. This is typical of the false statements that his letter contains. I know of no scholar of any standing who would make such a statement. ~~There~~ There might, of course, be a rare exception; but this I can say with certainty: Most scholars who accept the RSV view of "pit" have an ~~entirely~~ entirely different idea than this of what they mean ~~by~~ by the word "pit." It is altogether different from the word "corruption" which was the translation by which the Septuagint translated this word two hundred years before Christ, and which was quoted as a correct translation in Acts 2.