

capital can be dated to about A.D. 60–61. A mere nine years later there was another and far more spectacular triumphal entry into Rome, celebrating the victory won by Titus, the future emperor, over the rebellious Jews. An arch remains to this day in the Forum Romanum, and on it can be seen a representation of the branched candlestick, formerly in the temple in Jerusalem, which now lay in ruins.

It was the false charge of taking a Gentile beyond the middle wall of separation that provoked a riot and led to the train of events that resulted in Paul's appeal to Caesar and his arrival in Rome. At the time of the apostle's entry into the capital, Rome seemed an invincible power, but its decline and overthrow are now distant events. However, the gospel proclaimed by Paul is still "the saving power of God for everyone who has faith" (Rom. 1:16, REB).

If we endeavour to determine the identity of the brothers who followed the Appian Way and served as an escort for Paul and Luke, we cannot arrive at any certain conclusion. Whoever they were, they clearly possessed a deep affection for the apostle. At the same time, the final salutations in Romans 16 may well be a guide. At the start of the letter, Paul sends his greetings to all the ecclesia (1:1-7), and at the conclusion of the letter, in final words of salutation, he writes, "Salute Prisca and Aquila my fellow-workers in Christ Jesus" (16:3, RV). Of the identity of the others to whom Paul sends his greetings little is known; it is sufficient for our present purpose that we regard them as possible, if not probable, members of the two escorting parties who accompanied Paul into Rome.

In a proposed Epilogue to this series we hope to take a final look at Paul's truly epic journey.

(To be concluded)

Which Translation?—a correction

A READER has brought to my attention a misquotation of some words of B. F. Westcott quoted in Part 2 of the article "Is your Bible complete?", by Brother Richard Purkis, published in September 1996 (p. 361). This two-part article was subsequently reprinted in the book *Which Translation?*, published in 2000. The quotation, given on page 364 of the article and on page 22 of the book, quotes Westcott as saying in a letter, "I reject the word 'infallibility', of Holy Scripture, overwhelmingly". In fact, the book *Life and Letters of Westcott* by his son Arthur (MacMillan, London, 1903) shows that what Westcott said was, "at present I find the presumption in favour of the absolute truth—I reject the word infallibility—of Holy Scripture overwhelming". It would perhaps help if I went on to state briefly the background as to why this quotation was used.

It was Westcott who, along with F. J. A. Hort, was largely responsible for the Revised Version of the New Testament. This, along with many other modern translations, omits a number of verses that appear in the AV, relegating them to footnotes or excluding them altogether. This is because Westcott and Hort gave preference to two manuscripts of the New Testament that had only recently become available to scholars, the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus, and these omit these verses. Their preference is based

on the fact that these manuscripts are older than the ones used by the translators of the AV and are therefore, they said, more likely to reflect the original inspired writings.

Some scholars, however, opposed this use of these manuscripts, claiming that they were aberrant texts, and that the ones used by the AV translators were the right ones to use. A minority of scholars still holds this view, and the New King James Version (known as the Revised Authorised Version in its original form in the UK) follows the AV. A number of books have been written attacking the preference of the RV translators, especially Westcott and Hort, and seeking to expose them as having undesirable leanings in a number of directions. The quotation in question was taken from one such book, *Final Authority—A Christian's Guide to the King James Bible* by William P. Grady (Grady Publications, Indiana, 1993), though Grady quotes it correctly on page 230 of his book. (Brother Purkis says he unfortunately overlooked the words preceding his quote because the words he quoted were emphasised by Grady in bold.)

The question arises as to whether the two-part article in general misrepresents the views of Westcott and Hort. Brother Purkis has sent me copies of some pages of Grady's book, including the page from which the quotation was taken,

and also some pages of a book called *New Age Bible Versions* by Gail Riplinger (AV Publications, Ohio, 1993). I also looked at what a book called *Which Bible?* had to say about Westcott and Hort. This is a compilation of studies defending the AV, edited by David Fuller (Grand Rapids International Publications, Michigan, 1984). As a result I am satisfied that allegations, based on copious quotations from Westcott and Hort's writings, are correct, namely that they were not fully committed to supporting the inspiration of the Bible but were attracted to Darwinism, that they were attracted by Roman Catholicism and that they were attracted by the occult. On the other hand, it should also be said that the defenders of the AV appear to be Protestant fundamentalists who would have no time for us Christadelphians because we do not believe in the Trinity.

The case for supporting the AV does not depend on what Westcott and Hort believed on matters other than the question of which ancient texts should be preferred. There are, I believe, other good arguments for saying that the texts followed by the AV are preferable to the two texts favoured by Westcott and Hort. Our book *Which Translation?* deals with this and other matters (see rear cover for [details of availability](#)). It should also be noted that modern versions do not slavishly follow these two texts, and generally, but not always, give in the margin the words missed out. However, the question posed by Brother Purkis in his two-part article remains: "Is your Bible complete?". In my view, as well as his, the answer is, "Not if you rely wholly on a modern version that does not use the texts used by the AV".

Tony Benson

Forgiveness

2. Forgiveness must be sought

Geoff Henstock

In the first article we considered the willingness of God to forgive. In this article we consider the fact that this is conditional on us seeking forgiveness of God, repenting of our sins, as illustrated by the psalmist, by the prophet Jonah in the whale's belly, and by the prophet Isaiah.

GOD'S FORGIVENESS is not unconditional. It might be unwarranted, it might be unearned, it might even be undeserved as men would judge such matters, but it is never unconditional. Grace means it is unmerited; grace does not mean it is unconditional.

Psalm 86

In Psalm 86 the psalmist speaks about God's willingness to forgive. In doing so he sets out a precondition for the exercise of Divine forgiveness: that forgiveness is available only to those who approach God on His terms: "Bow down thine ear, O LORD, hear me: for I am poor and needy. Preserve my soul; for I am holy: O Thou my God, save Thy servant that trusteth in Thee" (vv. 1,2).

Poverty is no barrier to accessing the mercy of God, but verse 2 implies that holiness, or

separation, and trust in God are prerequisites. In verse 3 we learn that we must seek forgiveness; it is not extended automatically: "Be merciful unto me, O Lord: for I cry unto Thee daily". Those who approach God appropriately are assured that He will hear and answer:

"Rejoice the soul of Thy servant: for unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul. For Thou, Lord, art good, and ready to forgive; and plenteous in mercy unto all them that call upon Thee. Give ear, O LORD, unto my prayer; and attend to the voice of my supplications. In the day of my trouble I will call upon Thee: for Thou wilt answer me" (vv. 4-7).

The Creator hears prayer when offered in sincerity and faith. When we call upon Him He is willing to respond and willing to forgive.

But the psalmist goes on to show that we cannot presume upon God's mercy, abundant though it is. Our plea for forgiveness must be accompanied by action:

"Teach me Thy way, O LORD; I will walk in Thy truth: unite my heart to fear Thy name. I will praise Thee, O Lord my God, with all my heart: and I will glorify Thy name for evermore" (vv. 11,12).

Repentance is necessary if God is to forgive. Repentance involves a change of direction; turning around and going in another direction. That is the concept implicit in verses 11 and 12. We