

mentioned is one I think is definitely worth taking a second to reiterate. It is hard to make this sort of thing clear in a paper like this, but this I think is a very important point. Our Greek text is the ^{genealogy} ~~geology~~ of Christ, and it tells how Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born the Christ, Well, that is what our Greek says, and I would say that nine tenths of our Greek manuscripts say exactly that. At least 9/10s. Now, we have about 1/10 of our Greek manuscript, or less, a ~~small~~ ~~of~~ small group of Greek manuscripts that, instead of saying Joseph, ~~the~~ the husband of Mary, of whom was born Christ, say Joseph to whom was betrothed the virgin ~~in~~ Mary, of whom was born Christ. Now you see how that has two ~~addition-~~ additional elements to stress the Virgin ~~birth-~~ birth. And we have this in a few Greek manuscripts. Then we have a few early Syriac manuscripts which evidently were translated from one of these Greek manuscripts ~~has~~ that has a text which is to glorify the Virgin Mary by ~~increasing~~ increasing the ~~virg~~ virgin birth in these two cases, and in one of these Syriac manuscripts there is one letter in the Syriac which ~~is~~ ~~is~~ instead of saying changes it from ~~to~~ a ~~femina~~ feminine to a masculine, ~~of~~ of whom was born Christ," it says "Of whom was begotten Christ." And it translates that naturally, who was the father. Other ancient authorities say, Joseph was the father of Jesus. It sounds as if you have a tremendous difference, but actually just one letter in one Syriac manuscript ~~presents-~~ preserving a text in ~~two~~ two new ways Christ emphasized the virgin birth. --In his translation Moffatt put that right in the text, as if it were ... Let me say just a word about this translation of Moffatt: Moffatt, James Moffatt, had a most wonderful ability at taking an ~~exact-~~ exact meaning and putting ~~in~~ it into English. I've never seen anything like it. I've taken a verse in Isaiah and I've struggled