

1.1.1 /- 06A: Incarnation Chart

Texts Included

The overall issue here is basically the claim that some versions mishandle the biblical data, since allegedly biased away from the biblical doctrine that God the son became a human being, becoming God with us in a unique way. I have excluded Mt.1:23, since all versions agree that Mary was sexually a virgin at point of conception. This text surely negates the need for Matthew to have specified, two verses on, that Jesus was her firstborn (*prōtokos*). I have looked at Mt.1:25 to show a preference for paring back to what Matthew said, rather than adding in what he did not. Conspiracy theories ignore the fact that versions that assume that Matthew's text didn't have *prōtokos*, assume that Luke's did (2:7) – these versions simply follow the evidence against human tradition, and translate *Matthew* as *Matthew*, not as *Luke*. Again, we should translate *Isaiah* as *Isaiah*, not as *Matthew*. I think it best follows the Hebrew and the prophetic pattern to translate as *young woman* or such, rather than as *virgin* (Is.7:14). Exegetically I think it best to acknowledge that the first mother being prophesied, conceived a son in King Ahaz' day, a son who was almost prophetically incidental except by signifying a countdown to the deliverance of Judah from the Syrian-Israel alliance. In God's will a fuller fulfilment would be of a special son, no mere countdown: this is a way prophecy has worked. Finally, I have looked at Lk.2:33, an issue of text – did Luke here call Joseph Jesus' *father*? Would it have been wrong for Luke to called Joseph such in Lk.2:33, when he called him such in 2:48 (see also Jhn.1:45)? There is no theological problem when it is seen that Joseph was not being called Jesus' biological father. To recap, the texts I have looked at are A (Is.7:14: ISV); B (Mt.1:25: NRSV); C (Lk.2:33: NET). For the chart, see <http://mdtc.eu/wggc.html>.

Scoring

Three marks for correct text/translation (plus footnoting alternative); two marks for correct text/translation (without footnoting alternative); one mark for incorrect text/translation (plus footnoting alternative); no marks for incorrect text/translation (without footnoting alternative).

Results

The highest versions here are the ISV/NET/NRSV at 8 marks, and the lowest the EJB/KJ21/KJV/WEB at zero. All scores have then been divided by 8%, turning them all into comparative percentages.

Incarnation	A	B	C	T	%	
CEB	2	2	2	6	75	B-
CEV	1	2	2	5	63	C+
CJB	3	2	2	7	88	B+
EJB	0	0	0	0	0	E
EOB <sup>1</sup>	1	0	1	2	25	E
ERV	3	2	2	7	88	B+
ESV	0	2	2	4	50	C-
GNB	2	2	2	6	75	B-
GWT	0	2	2	4	50	C-
HCSB	0	3	3	6	75	B-
ISV	3	3	2	8	100	A
KJ21	0	0	0	0	0	E
KJV	0	0	0	0	0	E
LEB	1	2	2	5	63	C+
MEV	2	0	0	2	25	E
MSG	0	2	2	4	50	C-
NABRE	2	2	2	6	75	B-
NASU	0	2	2	4	50	C-
NCV	1	2	2	5	63	C+
NET	3	2	3	8	100	A
NIV	1	2	2	5	63	C+
NJB	3	2	2	7	88	B+

<sup>1</sup> For the EOB, its OT section unfinished at time of writing, I have assumed that Is.7:14 will follow the Septuagint yet footnote the option.

<b>NKJV</b>	0	1	1	2	<b>25</b>	<b>E</b>
<b>NLT</b>	1	2	2	5	<b>63</b>	<b>C+</b>
<b>NLV</b>	2	2	0	4	<b>50</b>	<b>C-</b>
<b>NOG</b>	0	2	2	4	<b>50</b>	<b>C-</b>
<b>NRSV</b>	3	3	2	8	<b>100</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>NWT</b>	3	2	2	7	<b>88</b>	<b>B+</b>
<b>REB</b>	2	2	2	6	<b>75</b>	<b>B-</b>
<b>TLV</b>	0	2	2	4	<b>50</b>	<b>C-</b>
<b>VOICE</b>	0	2	2	4	<b>50</b>	<b>C-</b>
<b>WEB</b>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>E</b>