

Concise Bible Dictionary

V

By George Morrish

Concise Bible Dictionary

v

By George Morrish



BibleTruthPublishers.com

59 Industrial Road, Addison, IL 60101, U.S.A.

BTP# 16022



Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Vagabond..... | 6 |
| Vail, Veil | 6 |
| Vajezatha | 7 |
| Vale, Valley..... | 7 |
| Valley of the Giants | 8 |
| Vaniah | 8 |
| Various Readings | 8 |
| Vashni..... | 17 |
| Vashti..... | 17 |
| Ve-Adar..... | 18 |
| Veil 18 | |
| Version, the Authorized..... | 18 |
| Version, the Revised English (RV)..... | 22 |
| Versions of the Scripture, Ancient..... | 24 |
| Versions of the Scripture, English | 31 |
| Vestry..... | 38 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Vials | 38 |
| Villages..... | 39 |
| Vine of Sodom | 39 |
| Vine, Vineyard..... | 39 |
| Vinegar..... | 40 |
| Vineyard..... | 41 |
| Vintage..... | 41 |
| Viol | 41 |
| Viper (Ephes,)..... | 41 |
| Virgin, Virginitv (Π)..... | 42 |
| Visions..... | 42 |
| Vocation | 42 |
| Vophsi..... | 42 |
| Vows | 42 |
| Vulgate, the..... | 43 |
| Vulture..... | 48 |

Vagabond

A term not used opprobriously in scripture, but as signifying a “wanderer”; from the Latin *vagabundus* (Gen. 4:12,14; Psa. 109:10). In Acts 19:13 the RV has “strolling.”

Vail, Veil

Beside the allusions to the veils worn by women (a custom which has become almost universal in the East), the veil is often used symbolically in scripture for that which hides the glory of God. It was this literally when Moses came down from the mount; his face shone because of the glory he had seen, and the people could not bear it: therefore he put a veil on his face. That veil remains to this day on the hearts of the Jews when they read the law (Ex. 34:33-35). They do not see the glory of which the law was typical; but in God's due time He will remove the veil, and under the shadows of the law they will see Christ, and will receive Him whom they now refuse. In contrast to that ministration, in which the glory had to be veiled because of Israel's inability to behold it, Christians now can gaze upon the glory of the Lord, whose face is *unveiled*, and be changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Lord the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:13-18).

THE VEIL OF THE TABERNACLE AND OF THE TEMPLE witnessed to the fact that under the dispensation of the law the way into the holiest was not made manifest: God had not come out in full blessing, and man could not go in. On the death of Christ the veil was rent from top to bottom, and God has come out in fullest light. In Christianity the believer has boldness to enter into

the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which He has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, His flesh. Redemption has been wrought, and God is made known in full grace, and the believer can go into His presence (Matt. 27:51; Heb. 6:19; Heb. 10:20). In Hebrews 9:3 the veil of the Temple is called the “second veil,” the curtains at the entrance being accounted the first.

Vajezatha

One of the sons of Haman; he was slain and hanged (Esther 9:9).

Vale, Valley

There are few places in Palestine which resemble the valleys of other countries. Two of the words translated “valley” are also translated “plain,” and signify broad plains between the hills. Two other words refer to the narrow dales or ravines through which the streams run in winter, but many of which are dry in summer, now called *wadys*.

The words are

1. *biqah*, “valley or plain,” which is the word used for the valleys or plains of Aven, Jericho, Lebanon, Megiddo, Mizpeh, and Ono.

2. *erneq*, “valley or plain,” more resembles an English “valley”: it is applied to Achor, Ajalon, Baca, Berachah, Beth-aram, “of decision” (Joel 3:14); Elah; of the giants (Josh. 15:8; Josh. 18:16); Gibeon, Hebron, Jehoshaphat, Jezreel, Keziz, “of the King,” or “the King’s Dale” (Gen. 14:17; 2 Sam. 18:18); Rephaim, Shaveh, Siddim, and Succoth.

3. *gay*, *ge*, ravine, narrow glen: applied to Charashim, Hamon-Gog, Hinnom, Son of Hinnom, Jiphthah-el, Zeboim, and Zephathah; and used symbolically for “Valley of the Mountains” (Zech. 14:5); “of the passengers” (Ezek. 39:11); “of salt” (2 Sam. 8:13; 2 Kings 14:7; 1 Chron. 18:12; 2 Chron. 25:11; Psalms 60 title); “of craftsmen” (Neh. 11:35); “of slaughter” (Jer. 7:32; Jer. 19:6); “of vision” (Isa. 22:1,5); “of the shadow of death” (Psalms 23:4).

4. *nachal*, gorge, wady, often translated “brook” and “river”: the valleys are Eshcol, Gerar, Shittim, Sorek, Zared.

5. *shephelah*, translated “vale” and “valley,” but not specified by any proper name. It refers to the lowlands that lie midway between the highlands and the low plains of Judah. See CANAAN.

6. . “Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low” (Luke 3:5): a quotation from Isaiah 40:4, where the Hebrew word is *gay*.

Valley of the Giants

See REPHAIM, VALLEY OF.

Vaniah

One who had married a strange wife (Ezra 10:36).

Various Readings

These have been briefly considered under the word BIBLE, but as the subject is important more detail is here added, confining attention however to the New Testament “Readings” must be distinguished from different “translations.” Thus, for instance, the Revised Version omits a part of John 5:3, and the whole of John 5:4, placing it

in the margin with the words, “Many ancient authorities insert wholly or in part, ‘Waiting for the moving of the water,’” etc.

As such alterations may cause surprise and uneasiness to simple students of scripture, who believe in its verbal inspiration, an effort is here made to elucidate the subject.

In the first place it must be observed that such variations as the above, and all “various readings,” belong to the Greek text, and do not refer to translation. It is easy to see that the *same* Greek words may be translated differently by different persons; but the “readings” refer to *different* Greek words being substituted; or words may be added by copyists in various MSS, or words or sentences may be omitted as in the above instance from John 5:3-4.

It must be borne in mind that from the time the New Testament was originally written till about A.D. 1452, when printing was invented, copies could only be multiplied by being written with the pen, and that all the ancient copies are in manuscript, and all vary more or less from each other, no two copies being exactly alike. This is not to be wondered at when we consider how difficult it is for lengthy subjects to be copied without mistakes being made; and if they are not discovered and rectified, it can easily be understood how the errors would increase—each copyist adding to the list. Therefore the more ancient the manuscript the more value is placed upon its readings, not that any particular one could, however, be followed entirely.

Printed copies could only be made from the manuscripts, and it is not now known what manuscripts were used for the early printed Testaments.

The COMPLUTENSIAN Edition was the first to be printed: it was finished with the Old Testament in A.D. 1517, but was not published till 1522.

In the meantime the learned ERASMUS brought out his first edition, with a Latin translation (on which he had worked for years), in 1516. It was done in great haste, Erasmus being urged on by John Froben, printer at Basle, so that it could be issued before the Complutensian. The book was gladly hailed by those who desired the light of the word of God, but was strongly opposed by many of the papal clergy. Next to Wycliffe's edition of the New Testament in English among the people, stands Erasmus' Greek Testament among the learned as an instrument used by God in forwarding the Reformation in England. Bilney, Tyndale, and Fryth, three English martyrs, trace their conversion to reading, under God's enlightenment, Erasmus' Greek Testament.

The Editions of STEPHEN, a printer in Paris, followed. The first in 1546, and his most renowned one in 1550 (the one generally reprinted in England as the commonly received text), it was the first to give readings of the MSS in the margin; a fourth edition was issued in 1551, in which he had divided the text into verses. This reminds one that there is no authority for the divisions of chapters and verses, though they are very useful for reference.

The ten Editions of BEZA followed, the first in 1565 and his last in 1611.

The ELZEVIR Editions came next, in 1624 and 1633. The latter is the one which is called the *textus receptus*, or "the text received by all"; "*textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum.*" It is the one commonly reprinted on the continent: and is the same in the main as that of Stephen

reprinted in England, there being only about 287 minor differences between them.

All the above editions are very similar, but at this period more attention was called to the variations in the manuscripts, and they were carefully compared, with the laudable aim to discover *what was the text as it stood originally*.

MILL'S Edition appeared in 1707. He had labored for thirty years in his work: he reprinted Stephen's 1550 edition, and gave the fruits of his research in notes and appendix.

BENGEL'S Edition followed in 1734.

WETSTEIN'S Edition was published in 1751-1752. He had increased the material by which the common text could be improved.

GRIESBACH'S Edition followed. His principal editions were in 1796-1806, and a smaller one in 1805. He was the first who altered the commonly received text where he judged it to be incorrect. He labored to classify the Greek MSS and arranged them in families to indicate where they had apparently been copied from one another, or had followed one recension.

SCHOLZ'S Edition came next in 1830-1836: it is not reliable.

LACHMANN'S principal Edition was published in 1842-1850. He confined his attention to early Greek MSS—not later than the fourth century, though he did not keep rigidly to this rule. He wholly set aside the "received text."

TISCHENNDORF'S Editions followed: his last, the eighth, was issued in 1865-72. He labored many years in his work, and, in searching for more Manuscripts, was

rewarded by discovering and issuing the *Codex Sinaiticus*, one of the most valued copies, though erroneous in many places.

TREGELLES'S followed. He also labored many years and collated more manuscripts; but he confined his attention to ancient copies. It is dated 1857-1872.

ALFORD'S came next, but is not remarkable for fresh critical matter.

WORDSWORTH'S followed. He is distinguished by his conservatism. He believed that God had overruled the issuing of the commonly received text, and he kept to that except where he believed that the Greek manuscripts and other evidence warranted him in making an alteration.

WESTCOTT AND HORT are the last to be mentioned. Their principle may perhaps be said to be the very reverse of that of Wordsworth, altering the text freely where others have hesitated. It dates A.D. 1881.

The REVISERS of 1881, J. N. DARBY, and others, who have translated the Greek Testament have either chosen one of the above texts, or selected for themselves what they should translate, without, however, issuing the Greek separately. The Greek Testament with the Revisers' readings was issued by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1881.

In Dr. Scrivener's Cambridge Greek Testament, 1887, all the readings of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers, are given in the notes. The readings of these Editors with those of Alford and Wordsworth are also given in an appendix to the Englishman's Greek Concordance. The readings from Griesbach to Wordsworth are also given in the notes to the Englishman's Greek New Testament. These collations

are judged to be all that in an ordinary way is needed by most Christians.

It is deemed needful to add as a caution that Dean Burgon (in "The Revision Revised") brings serious charges against the Revisers of the New Testament in that they deviated from the instructions they received in regard to their translation as well as to the Greek text they adopted, and that they followed too often the venturesome readings of Westcott and Hort; also in throwing needless doubts upon many passages with the words "many ancient authorities, &c." in the margin.

This is to be regretted; but it all the more confirms the wisdom of Wordsworth in keeping to the common Greek text except where there is good authority for leaving it. And may it not also be added, amid so many English translations from different texts, that it is better to keep to the text of the Authorized Version (which with few exceptions follows the commonly received Greek text) except where there are godly reasons for differing from it.

The Greek Manuscripts naturally fall into two classes:

1. Those called the *Uncial* from *uncia*, "an inch," not that the letters were actually made as large as that, but they are all capitals, have no spaces between the words, and few if any points. A specimen is here given from the Codex Sinaiticus. It is John 6:14-15. It shows how the words were divided at the ends of lines without any mark being attached (at the end of lines 1, 3, 7 and 9), and sometimes without any regard to syllables, also how contractions were made, IC for $\bar{\iota}$, the line showing that it was a contraction. In some instances the line became invisible in old MSS and then the reading became doubtful. The mark at the end of line 4 shows that a letter has been omitted: in this case it is

the letter . The specimen also shows how corrections were often made by the writer or by later hands.

The letters in the left hand margin answered a similar purpose to the marginal references of the AV They are known as the Ammonian Sections. In the third century Ammonius of Alexandria arranged this numerical system to aid the reader in finding parallel passages in the Gospels; and in the fourth century Eusebius, the historian, in a set of Canons arranged the Ammonian Sections so as to make any particular one more easily found. The NA refers to the Ammonian Section No. 51 of John, which was to be found in Eusebius' canon Δ, that is, No. 4, which was a collation of sections that occurred only in Matthew, Mark and John. They point out Matthew 14:23b-27; Mark 6:47-50; John 6:16-21. These references are given in full in Scrivener's Greek Testament of 1887, and in Wordsworth's Greek Testament.

The principal Uncial Manuscripts, omitting small portions and mere

fragments, are:

| Symbol | Name | Century | Description |
|---------------|---------------------|----------------|---|
| Ⲙ | <i>Sinaiticus</i> | 4 | The whole of the New Testament. |
| A | <i>Alexandrinus</i> | 5 | The whole, but defective in places. |
| B | <i>Vaticanus</i> | 4 | Matthew to Hebrews 9:14, including the Catholic Epistles, which are inserted, as in other early MSS, after the Acts. Timothy, Titus, Philemon and the Revelation are lacking. |
| B | <i>Basilianus</i> | 8 | Also called Vaticanus 2066, contains the Revelation. |

Various Readings

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|--|
| C | <i>Ephraemi</i> | 5 | Portions of the whole; about two thirds of New Testament altogether. |
| D | <i>Bezae</i> | 6 | Nearly all the Gospels and Acts. Greek and Latin. |
| D | <i>Claromontanus</i> | 6 | Paul's Epistles. Greek and Latin. |
| E | <i>Laudianus</i> | 6 | Most of the Acts. Greek and Latin. |
| P | <i>Porphyrianus</i> | 9 | The Acts, the Epistles and the Revelation. |

It should be noted that the same letter does not always refer to the same MS, as D above. Also in the two MSS shown as B, though bound in the same volume, one is some 400 years earlier than the other. Some of the MSS, as C above, are Palimpsests, that is, the old writing had been partly erased, and other works written over it, as shown under WRITING.

2. Other Greek MSS are called *Cursives*, because written in the common running hand and not all in capitals. These are of later date, from about the tenth century to the sixteenth: whereas the Uncial copies date from about the fourth century to the tenth. The earliest of these naturally stand in the first place, and the later ones and the Cursives take a secondary place.

The most important of the Cursive Manuscripts are:

| Name | Century | Description |
|-----------------|---------|---|
| No. 1 at Basle | 10 | All but the Revelation. |
| No. 33 at Paris | 11 | All but the Revelation. It is called 33 in the Gospels, 13 in the Acts and General Epistles, and 17 in Paul's Epistles. |

No. 69 at Leicester 14 All the New Testament. Called 69 in the Gospels, 31 in the Acts and General Epistles, 37 in Paul's Epistles, and 14 in the Revelation.

No. 47 at Oxford 11 Paul's Epistles.

No. 61 at Dublin 16 All the New Testament, but is judged not to be all of one writer. It is called 61 in the Gospels, 34 in the Acts and Catholic Epistles, 40 in Paul's Epistles, and 92 in the Revelation.

There are hundreds of other manuscripts, but most of them are seldom quoted, and some have not been collated.

There is also a class of Greek manuscripts called **EVANGELISTARIES**, books containing portions of the Gospels which were used in religious services: there are more than 900 of these.

Besides the Greek manuscripts there are other helps by which to ascertain what was the original Greek text.

VERSIONS. It will easily be seen that when the early versions were needed they were made from some text that was then available, and the translations show in some degree what was in the text that was translated. For the principal of these translations see **VERSIONS OF THE SCRIPTURES.**

FATHERS. These, both Greek and Latin, are referred to because in their Biblical works they often quoted scripture, and these quotations show what was in the ancient copies from which they quoted. These date from the second century, which is earlier than any Greek manuscript extant.

From the above it may be conceived what labor was involved in the original examination of so many witnesses for or against a reading. These have now been given more or less fully in the editions of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and partially by J. N. Darby. Very few persons are competent

to examine and weigh all the evidence *pro* and *con*; but with the aids now afforded by the above mentioned means it is not difficult to ascertain where *all the editors agree* upon a passage, and it is deemed safe to follow such. But in these questions, as in all others, the guidance of the Holy Spirit should be sought. A spiritual man is less liable to err than a great scholar.

As an illustration of all the editors agreeing in leaving the commonly received Greek text (1 John 5:7-8), may be referred to. All agree in omitting (what are known as “the heavenly witnesses”) from “in heaven” in 1 John 5:7 to “in earth” inclusive in 1 John 5:8.

As explained under BIBLE, only a few passages remain really doubtful, and not one of these affect the fundamental truths of Christianity. This is of God’s mercy any poor sinner can look therein with confidence for the way of salvation, and Christians can learn what has been revealed as God’s truth, and know what His purpose is concerning themselves, His ancient people the Jews, and the world at large.

The various readings do not affect in any way the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration. See INSPIRATION.

If any wish to examine further into the questions here considered they may consult Scrivener’s *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, G. Bell & Sons, or a brief work called *Our Father’s Will*, G. Morrish.

Vashni

See JOEL No. 1.

Vashti

Queen of Ahasuerus, whom he repudiated on account of her refusing to show her beauty before the people and princes at the king's feast (Esther 1:9-19; Esther 2:1, 4, 17).

Ve-Adar

See MONTHS.

Veil

See VAIL.

Version, the Authorized

On the accession of James (A.D. 1603) there were more outcries for a new translation of the Bible, but the suggestion was as strongly discountenanced by others. It was discussed at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, but nothing definitely settled.

The king, however, took up the matter: it would be to the glory of his reign. He proceeded to make the needed arrangements, fifty-four scholars were chosen, though only forty-seven names appear in the lists in Fuller; some were connected with "the church," and others taken from the Puritans. The king exhorted the clergy to contribute 1000 marks, and he was to be informed of what each man gave, intimating that when any vacancies occurred, he would think of the translators for preferment. The colleges were to give free board and lodging to such as came from country places.

The king drew up a list of instructions, among which were

1. The Bishops' Bible was to be followed, being as little altered as the original would permit.

2. The translations of Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Whitchurch (that is, Cranmer's), and the Geneva to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible.

3. The old ecclesiastical names were to be retained, as church, bishop, &c.

4. When any word had various significations, that was to be retained which had been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, if suitable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith.

5. No marginal notes were to be added, only such as explained the Hebrew and Greek words.

6. Marginal references were to be added. (These were but few in the edition of 1611, most of those in modern editions were added afterward.)

Then followed instructions as to the company being divided into committees; each person was to bring his own alterations, and these were to be considered and settled in each committee, and then passed on to the other committees. The work of translation occupied three years, and then six of the company were chosen to superintend its publication. The Company of Stationers gave, in installments, thirty pounds to each of them for their expenses.

The Bible was issued in 1611, and was often re-printed; by degrees errors crept in, some being very serious. A revision of the whole was undertaken in the year 1683 by Dr. Scattergood; and it was again examined in 1769 by Dr. Blayney, who revised the punctuation, corrected the italics, added the translations of the proper names, altered the summaries of the chapters, greatly added to the marginal references, and amended some of the chronology.

The Dedication, with its flattery first of King James, and then of Queen Elizabeth, is commonly inserted in all editions; but the Preface is seldom given. It makes a sort of apology for the work they had done: it was not to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one: "their endeavor was to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principal good one." They had endeavored to take a middle course between the Puritans who had forsaken "the old ecclesiastical words," and the obscurity of the Papists in "retaining foreign words of purpose to darken the sense." They justify their plan of translating the same word by different words on the legitimate plea that the same word could not always be translated by the same English word; but they varied the translation where the sense was the same, under the plea that it would have been advancing some words to "a place in the Bible always," and banishing forever others of like quality: curiously adding "niceness in words was always counted the next step to trifling." John 5 gives an instance of such variations. The word is translated "judgment" in verses 22, 27, 30; "condemnation" in verse 24; and "damnation" in verse 29: "judgment" suits well in all these verses.

The translation was highly extolled by many as next to perfection, but was equally criticized and condemned by some. Hugh Broughton, described as the greatest Hebrew scholar of the age, but who had not been invited to help in the work, declared he "would rather be torn in pieces by wild horses than impose such a version on the poor churches of England"! This is a verdict that has been annulled by the praise bestowed upon it by thousands of learned men ever since, who, without saying that the translation is perfect, have yet spoken in the highest terms of its excellence as a

whole, and indeed this opinion is evidenced in that it has now for 280 years held its ground, and has been the means of carrying the gospel and God's revealed truth wherever in the world the English language is spoken, to the salvation of lost sinners, and to the comfort and edification of believers.

And this is not all: it is a noteworthy fact that amidst all the divisions of Christendom, with its various discussions, all have been content to appeal to the same English Authorized Version.

The version in 1611 was so gladly hailed that five editions were printed in the succeeding three years. The Geneva Version was not, however, eclipsed by it: for between 1611 and 1617 it had as many as thirteen reprints.

Though the Authorized Version was said to have been translated from the Hebrew and the Greek, there is no intimation either in the instructions given to the translators nor in their preface as to what Greek text was used. Being a revision rather than a translation they might have simply followed the Bishops' Bible in this respect, but they did not do that, and it is uncertain what text they followed.

It is commonly understood that the Authorized Version corresponds with the "common Greek text," as given, for instance, in Stephen's 1550. Beza's text came after that of Stephen, and those of Elzevir were not then published. But the AV in about 28 places follows neither Stephen nor Beza, so that it appears they did not follow any strict rule as to the text they adopted. The differences are not of great importance and a few of them have been altered in modern reprints.

To show the cost of the early editions of the English New Testaments, it may be mentioned that in 1429 Nicholas

Belward was accused of having in his possession a New Testament which he had bought in London for four marks and forty pence (£2 16s. 8d.) a sum equal in value to more than £40 in modern times. Now, 1899, a New Testament can be purchased for one penny, and a Bible for six pence.

Version, the Revised English (RV)

This originated with a resolution passed in the Convocation of Canterbury in the year 1870. A Committee of Revisers was appointed for the Old Testament and another for the New, and the work was proceeded with. The New Testament was published in May, 1881.

Besides the few remarks with regard to this Revision under VARIOUS READINGS, as to the violation of the principles laid down for the guidance of the Revisers, both as to the Greek text they should adopt, and as to the translation—a few further notes are added.

The Revisers in their Preface speak enthusiastically of the Authorized Version, stating how they admired “its simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression, its general accuracy,” and did not fail to add, “the music of its cadences, and the felicities of its rhythm.”

In contrast to this, Bishop Chr. Wordsworth says, of the RV, “To pass from the one to the other is as it were, to alight from a well-built and well-hung carriage which glides easily over a macadamized road—and to get into one which has bad springs, or none at all, and in which you are jolted in ruts with aching bones over the stones of a newly-mended and rarely-traversed road.”

The mere *style* of the English is of little consequence in comparison to giving the sense of the original without any room for uncertainty. The same writer says, “We meet in

every page with small changes, which are vexatious, teasing, and irritating, even the more so because they are small; which seem almost to be made for the sake of change.”

To this may be added the marginal notes of readings by “some” or “many” authorities, which leave the reader in doubt as to the text in many places.

On the other hand, Bishop Ellicott and others have strongly defended the Revision both as to its Greek basis and its translation. But Bishop Ellicott was chairman of the revising committee.

In conclusion, a writer, well versed in scripture, and a Greek scholar, who fully acknowledges that the Version has many improvements on the AV, after pointing out many errors, says, “On the whole, I accuse the Revisers of having mischievously erred as to the use of prepositions, particularly ε , to have been entirely ignorant of the force of the definite article, and to have made a complete mess of the Greek aorist, blundering as to Greek and English... I do not find the mind of God apprehended, so as to help a simple Christian; nor do I find, though the grace of Almighty God is referred to, any reference to the Spirit of God as Author, or as help in the work... I believe that a person who takes it up for his daily use will injure his own soul.”

The Revisers had an avowed Unitarian amongst them, and how could God bless such dishonor on His beloved Son?

All the above remarks refer to the New Testament. A different company translated the Old Testament. In that, the Hebrew text did not need much revision, and it does not appear that its translation has met with such censure.

Versions of the Scripture, Ancient

It is very gratifying to find in history how in many places, as the gospel was disseminated and souls were saved, they naturally felt a need for the scriptures, and how that need was by the providence of God supplied. This blessing would doubtless have been vouchsafed everywhere, and continually without a break, had not apostate Rome extended its influence and wickedly suppressed the knowledge of the scriptures in order that its own assumption might have full sway.

Though Christianity entered into the British Isles at a very early date, it was not till the year 1380 that the English New Testament was issued, in spite of Rome, only however to be collected and burnt by the clergy so far as they could.

Under the article VARIOUS READINGS it is shown that early translations of the New Testament are used as evidence of what was in the primitive Greek text, and we now proceed to name the principal of these versions. They are important, as some of them are of an earlier date than any existing Greek Manuscript.

1. THE ÆTHIOPIC VERSION. The date of this is not known: some place it in the fourth century, but it was probably later. The introduction of Christianity into that part of Africa is remarkable. Meropius, a philosopher of Tyre, determined to visit that region, which ecclesiastical historians termed "India." On landing at a port, the whole party was attacked, peace having been broken previously between these "Indians" and Rome: all were massacred except two young relatives of Meropius, named Frumentius and Aedesius, who were carried to the king. He set them at liberty and employed them, and on his death, they were

appointed ministers of the young king. They began to teach the Christian religion to the Abyssinians, and a place was set apart for the worship of the true God. Frumentius was afterward appointed Bishop of that district by Athanasius. It has been judged that the version was made from the Greek, but by one who did not well understand that language.

The Æthiopic New Testament was printed at Rome in the years 1548-9, but it was incorrect, the printers being altogether ignorant of the language. It was reprinted in Walton's Polyglott, with (says Ludolf) the same and additional errors; but it had now a Latin translation, which enabled the Editors of the Greek Testament to quote the Æthiopic as an evidence for or against certain readings. The value of its testimony was enhanced by C. A. Bode, who furnished a more correct text and a better Latin translation. (Brunswick, 1753.) The fact of the MSS being of different recensions lessens their critical value.

2. ARABIC VERSIONS. There have been five printed Editions of the Arabic New Testament. The Gospels issued at Rome in 1590-1591; one at Leyden in 1616, called the Erpenian Arabic; the Arabic in the Paris Polyglott in 1645; the same in Walton's Polyglott in 1657; and one at Rome in 1703, called the Carshuni. It is known that in the eighth century John, Bishop of Seville, translated the holy scriptures into Arabic but it is not known whether he translated from the Greek or the Latin, nor what other translations were made. The Arabic is seldom quoted by the Editors, as it is judged to be of little value as evidence.

3. ARMENIAN VERSION. In the fifth century arose a desire to have an Armenian alphabet, the Syrian having been previously used. Miesrob invented an alphabet

for his nation, and appears to have regarded it as a gift from heaven. He labored to instruct the Armenians, being warmly aided by Isaac the patriarch. They then became eager to have the scriptures in their own tongue, and an effort was made to translate from the Syriac. This was, however, abandoned, and Miesrob, with two or three others, resorted to Alexandria to learn more perfectly the Greek language. The Old Testament was translated from the LXX, and the New Testament from the Greek.

In the seventeenth century MS copies of the Armenian Bible being very scarce, a bishop named Oscan or Uscan was sent to Europe to get it printed. After vainly trying to get it done at Rome, he proceeded to Amsterdam and there it was printed in 1666. Not having, however, any Latin interpretation, it was not readily available to Editors of the Greek Testament, though some of its readings were furnished to Mill, Griesbach, and Scholz. Dr. Tregelles at length succeeded, by the aid of Dr. C. Rieu, in ascertaining its readings more generally.

4. EGYPTIAN VERSIONS. Of these there are two, probably being both dialects of the Ancient Egyptian language. When only one was known it was called the Coptic, but another recension being discovered, the first-named is now called the MEMPHITIC or BOHAIRIC. The translation is assigned to the second century: though there are no MSS of so early a date.

The first printed edition appeared, in 1716, at Oxford, but badly collated from various MSS by Wilkins, with a Latin interpretation. A better edition of the four Gospels was edited by Schwartz in 1846-1848. And the Acts and Epistles were issued by Boetticher of Halle later. Thus the

Memphitic Version became available to the Editors of the Greek Testament, and is often quoted by them.

2. THE THEBAIC VERSION. This has been also called the Sahidic. It is assigned to the second century, some MSS being judged to be of the fifth century and others of the sixth century. Fragments of this recension were issued from time to time, and Ford attempted to gather up the fragments in one edition as an Appendix to the Codex Alexandrinus in 1799. Griesbach and succeeding Editors quoted this version.

There are now accounted to be three other dialects of ancient Egyptian, of which fragments of the New Testament have been found. They are called,

1. The Fayoumic or Bashmuric.
2. Middle Egyptian or Coptic, or Lower Sahidic.
3. Akhmimic.

5. GOTHIC VERSION. This was made by Ulphilas, about A.D. 348. The Goths from Scandinavia had invaded the Roman territory, and carried away a number of captives. These by their intercourse with the barbarians brought a number of them to embrace the true faith, at least nominally. Theophilus was their first bishop: he was present at the Council of Nice and subscribed the Nicene creed. Ulphilas, a Cappadocian, a descendant of some of the captives, became his successor, but the Arian error was at that time dominant in the empire and he subscribed the Arian creed, and this the Goths then generally held. Except in one passage (Phil. 2:6) it is not apparent that the Arian heresy influenced Ulphilas in his translation: the Arians maintained their creed more by interpretation. It was made in the fourth century. The Old Testament was also

translated, but curiously enough the four books of Kings were omitted, being “prudently suppressed,” says Gibbon, “as they might tend to irritate the fierce and sanguinary spirit of the barbarians.”

1. A remarkably beautiful copy of the Gothic Gospels is called the CODEX ARGENTEUS, being written in silver, with the initial words in gold. It is assigned to the fifth or early in the sixth century. Queen Christina gave it her librarian, Isaac Vossius, and from him it was purchased about 1662 by the Swedish nation, and deposited at Upsal. The Gospels are in the Western or Latin order, Matthew, John, Luke and Mark. There are 187 leaves (out of 330) of purple vellum, 4to.

2. CODICES AMBROSIANI, being five manuscripts, now in the Ambrosian Library of Milan. They contain the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, and to Timothy almost entire, and fragments of Philippians, Colossians, Titus, and Philemon. They were discovered and rescued from palimpsests. These are not unlike the Codex Carolinus.

3. CODEX CAROLINUS. This contains about forty verses of the Epistle to the Romans. It is also a palimpsest, and is accompanied by a Latin version. It has been traced to Mayence and Prague, and was purchased by a duke of Brunswick in 1689.

6. LATIN VERSIONS. For these see VULGATE.

7. SLAVONIC VERSION. A portion of the Slavonic race had settled in a district bounded by the Danube and in Great Moravia. The production of the version bearing this name is interesting. A missionary from Thessalonica, named Cyril, visited these tribes, learned their language, and then invented an alphabet that he might translate into

their vernacular tongue the word of God. He commenced his labors there, with his brother Methodius, A.D. 862. The version is assigned to the ninth century, though the oldest known MS belongs to the year 1056. The four Gospels were published in 1512, and in 1581 the whole Bible. It has been quoted by Wetstein, Griesbach, and so forth.

8. SYRIAC VERSIONS. It is generally admitted that as early as the second century a Syriac New Testament was in existence. Eusebius speaks of quotations being made from the Syriac, but the origin of the version is not known. It is clear that as far back as the fifth century the scriptures were in use among the Syrian Christians. Unhappily there was an early division among them, that has never been healed; but the Nestorians, Monophysites (those who believed there was but one nature in Christ, the Word), and those claiming to be orthodox, all use the same recension of the scriptures.

This version became known by being brought into Europe in 1552 for the purpose of being printed. It was finished in 1555. It did not include the Catholic Epistles nor the Revelation. John 8:1-11 was also wanting. (These portions have been found in other Syriac translations.) It found a place in the various Polyglots, and has been highly valued as a faithful record of the Greek text. It is commonly called the *Peshito*, or "Simple."

2. THE CURETONIAN SYRIAC. This takes its name from Dr. Wm. Cureton, who observed, bound up with other Syriac MSS in the British Museum, some leaves containing a large part of the four Gospels in a recension different from the *Peshito*. Its early date is undoubted, and it is highly valued. It has been published with an English translation.

3. THE PHILOXENIAN SYRIAC. This embraces the whole New Testament except the Revelation. It was professedly made by Polycarp, "Rural-bishop," about A.D. 508, for Xenaïas of Mabug, who is also called Philoxenus (whence the name of the version) in 616. It having been revised and modified by one called Thomas of Harkel, very little of the original translation is left, except in one copy at Rome uncollated. Still the translation from the Greek is so literal that it leaves no doubt as to what the Greek copy contained. It is also called the HARKLEIAN from Thomas of Harkel.

4. THE PALESTINIAN or JERUSALEM SYRIAC consisting of fragments; and

5. THE KARKAPHENSIAN SYRIAC, being of much later date, do not need to be referred to here.

All these versions, as they became available, were consulted by the various Editors of the Greek New Testament: some Editors attaching more importance to certain of them than was done by others.

Some of the versions included the Old Testament or portions of it.

All these various translations into different languages are a marked contrast to the policy of Rome with regard to the scriptures. The Dark Ages followed, especially where Rome had its sway, and light and learning diminished. God's set time however arrived: the darkness and ignorance were deplored, and one here and there was empowered by God to seek to spread the light of the holy scriptures among those professing Christianity, and more modern versions of the word of God were gradually made and printed, being hailed with delight by all who wished to know what God

Himself had revealed as the only way of salvation, and to know His will concerning themselves.

From that time, translations have rapidly increased: missionaries all over the world have no sooner obtained a footing and learned the language, than they have constructed a grammar, and proceeded to translate portions of scripture for those whose salvation they seek. "The word of God is not bound" (2 Tim. 2:9).'

Versions of the Scripture, English

Bede relates that Caadmon embodied a history of the Bible in Anglo-Saxon poetry; Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, translated the Psalms in the seventh century; and Bede translated the Gospel of John; he finished dictating it as he breathed his last, A.D. 735. King Alfred translated Exodus 20-23 as the groundwork of his legislation: he desired indeed that "all the free-born youth of his kingdom should be able to read the English scriptures."

There is also an Anglo-Saxon MS of a version of the Gospels interlinear with the Latin Vulgate in the British Museum (cir. A.D. 630); also another (cir. 900) in a different translation at Oxford. There was also a translation of the Psalms. These and other portions were the first sparks of light that created the longing for the full light of God's word in English.

1. WYCLIFFE was the first to give to England a translation of the whole of the New Testament. He completed the four Gospels first, with a commentary, saying in his preface that he did it "so that pore Cristen men may some dele know the text of the Gospel with the comyn sentence of olde holie doctores."

The Old Testament was undertaken by his coadjutor, Nicholas de Hereford. He had proceeded as far as the middle of Baruch (following the order of the Vulgate) when he was in A.D. 1382 cited before Archbishop Arundel. Others followed to revise and increase the copies. All these were translations of the Latin.

Wycliffe's version must have been well circulated, for though Arundel destroyed many copies there are about 150 manuscripts of it still existing.

WYCLIFFE—John 1:1. "In the bigynnyng was the word and the word was at god, and god was the word."

Succeeding translations have "with God." Coverdale and Cranmer have "God was the word."

2. TYNDALE. This man made the translation of the scriptures the work of his life. He said he would cause "a boy that driveth the plow" to know more of scripture than the great body of the clergy then knew. In his work there was a great advance inasmuch as after study he was able to translate from both the Hebrew and the Greek. He had to carry on his work abroad, and to change his abode frequently in order to baffle those who sought his life.

Edition followed edition, which were smuggled into England in various ways, and were there readily bought and circulated. On one occasion his enemies purchased a large portion of an edition to destroy it, and the money thus obtained furnished the funds for bringing out a revised issue.

To show the opposition of the Papists to these copies of the scripture being brought into England, Sir Thomas More may be quoted: "...which books, albeit that they neither can be there printed *without great cost*, nor here sold *without great adventure and peril*: yet cease they not

with money sent from hence, to print them there, and send them hither, *by the whole vatts-full at once*. And, in some places, *looking for no lucre*, cast them abroad by *night*; so great a pestilent pleasure have some devilish people caught, *with the labor, travel, cost, charge, peril, harm, and hurt of themselves*, to seek the destruction of others.”

Through God’s intervention neither Wolsey nor the king, neither More nor Cromwell, with all their agents, were able to arrest the supposed culprit. Other plans, however, were at last successful: Henry Philips and Gabriel Dunne with subtlety entrapped him, the former passing as a gentleman, and the latter as his servant. Philips by mixing with the merchants discovered Tyndale’s retreat, made his acquaintance, and professed great friendship for him, but only first to rob him under the plea of a loan, and then to betray him into the hands of his enemies. He lingered in prison several months and then suffered martyrdom in 1536.

His translation of the New Testament appeared in A.D. 1525, and he translated portions of the Old Testament before his death. The New Testament was reprinted many times abroad and once in London.

TYNDALE—John 10:16. “And other shepe I have, which are not of this folde. Them also must I bringe, that they maye heare my voyce, and that ther maye be one flocke and one shepherde.”

Both Wycliffe and Coverdale agree with the “one flock,” so that if the translators of the AV had made the best use of the translations that preceded them, they would not have put “one fold.”

3. COVERDALE. This translation was produced under a somewhat different spirit from that possessed by Tyndale.

As we have seen Tyndale's was his life's work and a labor of love, but Coverdale could say that he "sought it not, neither desired it," but accepted it as work assigned him. Yet he attempted to do his best, and with good will. The people in England began generally to desire the scriptures. Tyndale's prefaces and notes had given so much offense, that there was no prospect of the king giving his sanction to that translation being reprinted. But through the influence of Cranmer and Cromwell all difficulties were removed as to Coverdale's, and the work was completed. The king sent copies to the bishops, who were in no hurry to give their judgment. They were at length requested to give their opinion as to its merits. They declared that there were many faults therein. "Well," said king Henry, "but are there any heresies maintained thereby?" They replied that there were no heresies. "Then if there are no heresies," said the king, "in God's name let it go abroad among the people."

The edition was issued in 1535, but it is not now known where it was printed. Coverdale placed the Apocrypha at the end of the Old Testament, instead of mixing it with the canonical books, as in the Vulgate.

It is curious to notice that on the title page it says "faithfully translated out of Douche and Latyn." One would have naturally expected that it should have been from the Hebrew and Greek; but it has been remarked that in those troublous times the "Douche" would be pleasing to those who held Luther's name in honor, whereas the "Latyn" would conciliate Gardiner and his party. Coverdale apparently alludes to having Tyndale's translation before him, but also speaks of five others: these were probably the Vulgate, Luther's, the German Swiss, the Latin of Pagninus, and perhaps Wycliffe's.

COVERDALE—Psalm 26 (27) 14. “O tary thou the LORDES leysure, be stronge, let thine hert be of good comforte and wayte thou still for the LORDE.”

4. MATTHEW. This has been judged to have been the translation of Rogers, of Cambridge, the name of Matthew being assumed to conceal the translator. Rogers, when indicted in the days of Mary, is called Joannes Rogers, alias Matthew, and his martyrdom followed. It was probably printed abroad, and published in England by Grafton and Whitchurch, who wanted not only the king’s sanction but a monopoly for five years. This the king would not grant. They then asked that every incumbent should purchase a copy and that every abbey should take six copies. The result was that the king ordered by royal proclamation that a copy should be set up in every church, the cost being divided between the clergy and the people.

This was therefore the first “Authorized Version,” and for it to be in every church was a great advance in the circulation of the scriptures in England. Its date is A.D. 1537.

5. CRANMER’S (passing over TAVERNER’S Edition, 1539, as a reprint of Matthew’s, with the notes altered and some omitted) takes precedence of all that had yet been attempted as to detail of interpretation. Words not in the original were in a different type. It was pointed out, at least partially, where the Vulgate differed from the Hebrew, and where the Chaldee and Hebrew differed. It had marginal references, but no notes.

It appended the Preface to the Apocrypha that had appeared in Matthew’s Bible, but, curiously enough, in order to avoid giving offense to the Romish party by the name of Apocrypha, they sought for some other word, and

adopted the inaccurate statement that the “Books were called *Hagiographa*,” because “they were read in secret and apart”! This term, which signifies “holy writings,” is applied to some of the canonical books, of the Old Testament See BIBLE.

The first edition was in 1539 or 1540 and in 1541 an edition appeared as “authorized” to be used and frequented in every church in the kingdom.

CRANMER 1 John 3:4. “Whosoever commytteth synne, committeth vnryghteousnes also, and synne is vnryghteousnes.”

Tyndale and Coverdale agree with Cranmer; Wycliffe has “synne is wickidnesse,” and the Rheims Version has “sinne is iniquitie”—there were thus five early witnesses against the A. V.’s translation of “sin is the transgression of the law.”

6. GENEVA. Cranmer’s edition did not give general satisfaction. Some thought the English might be improved, and its bulk in folio and its expense were against its circulation. It, however, held its ground until Queen Mary ascended the throne, when a stop was put to all Bible printing in England. The persecution drove many away, and among other exiles the following took refuge at Geneva: Whittingham, Gilby, Goodman, Sampson, and Coverdale, the last-named having labored on Cranmer’s edition. These men zealously set to work on a new translation, and labored for two years or more “night and day.”

In A.D. 1557 the New Testament was ready, and in 1560 the whole Bible. It was largely imported in the reign of Elizabeth, and was reprinted in England. Being smaller and cheaper it found favor, and held its ground for about 60 years—partly owing no doubt to a monopoly being

given to James Bodleigh. This was transferred to Barker whose family held the right of printing Bibles for more than a century.

This edition was printed in Roman type instead of the black letter which had formerly been employed. It was also divided into verses, and was the first English Bible that entirely omitted the Apocrypha.

GENEVA—Rom. 5:11. “And not only so, but we also reioyse in God by the meanes of our Lord Iesus Christe, by whom we haue now receaued the atonement.”

Wycliffe and the Rheims version have “reconciliation,” the right translation.

7. THE BISHOPS’ BIBLE. Fault being found with the Geneva version, especially by the clergy, Archbishop Parker was very desirous for a new translation. Some eight bishops with deans and professors proceeded with the work, and in A.D. 1568 a folio Bible was issued. It was sought to make it attractive: finer woodcuts were inserted, also a map of Palestine, and genealogical tables.

A novelty was introduced by classifying the books as legal, historical, sapiential, and prophetic. The Gospels, the Catholic Epistles, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews were grouped as legal; Paul’s other Epistles as sapiential; the Acts as historical; and the Revelation as prophetic. Some passages were marked to be omitted when read in the service of the church.

Opinions were divided as to the translation: some extolled it highly, but it did not commend itself to scholars generally. On the whole it had but little success.

8. RHEIMS AND DOUAY. The Romanists had often pointed a finger of scorn at the different English translations as not exhibiting unity; and, as they could not hinder the

circulation of Bibles in England, they determined to have a translation of their own. The Protestant refugees had produced the Geneva Edition, and now some Romanists, who had resorted to the continent, set to work at Rheims. The principal persons engaged in it were William Allen, Gregory Martin, and Richard Bristow.

As the title states it was a translation from “the authentic Latin, according to the best corrected copies of the same, diligently conferred with the Greek and other editions in divers languages.” They gave various reasons why the Latin was chosen, such as that it agreed with the Greek, or where it did not, it was better than the Greek. The New Testament was issued in A.D. 1582; and the Old Testament, printed at Douay, in 1609. We give a specimen.

The RHEIMS Edition — Luke 15:7. “I say to you, that euen so there shall be ioy in heauen vpon one sinner that doth penance, then vpon ninetie nine iust that neede not penance.”

It is remarkable that Wycliffe also used the word “penance” in this and other passages.

Vestry

Wardrobe (2 Kings 10:22).

Vials

Golden bowls, mentioned in the symbolical language of the Revelation as

1. Containing incense or odors, which are the prayers of saints (Rev. 5:8).
2. Containing the wrath of God. There are seven direct judgments of the wrath of God (they are no longer mere

providential actings) upon the settled sphere of God's dealings, whereby those who have received the mark of the beast are grievously affected; and upon masses of people outside that sphere, and upon the sources of national life and prosperity; also on those in authority in the world; also on the Euphrates, that it may be dried up to make way for the kings from the sun rising; followed by a general break up of human governments introductory to the reign of Christ (Rev. 15:7; Rev. 16:1-17; Rev. 17:1; Rev. 21:9). See REVELATION.

Villages

A term often used in the Old Testament where a city is mentioned and "its villages," but at times nothing more is meant than its "suburbs," not in the sense of separate villages. The two principal words are *bath*, "daughter" (Num. 21:25,32); and *chatsar*, "hamlet, encampment" etc. (Josh. 18:24,28). In the New Testament it is μ "village" (Matt. 9:35).

Vine of Sodom

Many suggestions have been made as to what tree this refers to. Josephus speaks of some fruits that grew near the Dead Sea, which have a color as if fit to be eaten, but if plucked they dissolve into smoke and ashes." Many have sought for such fruit. Some judge the vine alluded to in scripture to be the poisonous *colocynth*, which grows near the Dead Sea. May not the term be symbolical of that which leads to destruction, which was the doom of Sodom? (Deut. 32:32).

Vine, Vineyard

The vine was extensively cultivated in Palestine. One sign of peace and prosperity was that every man might sit under his own vine. The grapes were large and plentiful, as was proved by the cluster found at Eshcol and borne by the spies. The illustration of a "vineyard" representing Israel was one that would be well understood by them. God had formed it in a very fruitful hill, planted it with the choicest vine, and had done everything possible for its fruitfulness and protection. Yet when fruit was sought, it was found to have brought forth only wild grapes. Eventually God broke down the wall thereof, and the vineyard was trodden down—a picture of the state of Israel until now (Psa. 80; Isa. 5:1-10).

The Lord when He was upon earth said He was the true Vine, and His disciples were the branches. There could not and cannot be any fruit-bearing but by abiding in Him (John 15:1-5).

Vinegar

This was a thin sour wine, that might be called either wine or vinegar, there being other words for wine of a better quality. It was the drink of the reapers and of the Roman soldiers. It is represented as intoxicating, and as irritating to the teeth. "As vinegar upon niter [natron, an alkali], so is he that singeth songs to a heavy heart" (Prov. 25:20). Its acidity is referred to in Proverbs 10:26.

Vinegar was offered to the Lord mingled with myrrh or gall, and He refused it; but He received the vinegar when He had said, "I thirst," according to the prophecy "In My thirst they gave Me vinegar to drink" (Num. 6:3; Ruth 2:14; Psa. 69:21; Matt. 27:34,48, and others).

Vineyard

See VINE.

Vintage

The time of rejoicing when the grapes were gathered. As there were different elevations in the land, the grapes would not be all ripe at the same time. In reference to the future time of blessing for Israel it is said, "Your threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time" (Lev. 26:5; Judg. 8:2; Job 24:6; Isa. 24:13; Isa. 32:10; Jer. 48:32; Mic. 7:1; Zech. 11:2). See SEASONS.

Viol

A stringed instrument. The word is *nebel*, and is often translated "PSALTERY." Its exact form is not known (Isa. 5:12; Isa. 14:11; Amos 5:23; Amos 6:5).

Viper (Ephes,)

All we learn from the passages that speak of the viper is that its bite was poisonous: "the viper's tongue shall slay him." When one fixed on Paul's hand they expected that he would drop down dead. What species of serpent is alluded to is unknown. It is only otherwise referred to in the New Testament as symbolical of evil ones. John the Baptist called the multitude who came to be baptized "a brood of vipers," and the Lord applies the same term to the scribes and Pharisees, showing the deadly character of their opposition (Job 20:16; Isa. 30:6; Isa. 59:5; Matt. 3:7; Matt. 12:34; Matt. 23:33; Luke 3:7; Acts 28:3).

Virgin, Virginit (Π)

Used symbolically for those in separation from evil. Paul had espoused the saints at Corinth to one husband to “present them as a chaste virgin to Christ” (2 Cor. 11:2; compare Rev. 14:4). In their natural application the words apply to both sexes, and in 1 Corinthians 7:36-37 it is perhaps better translated “his virginit.”

Visions

By means of visions God often vouchsafed to make known His will. When Samuel was a child, before the word of Jehovah was revealed to him, for a time “there was no open vision” (1 Sam. 3:1, 15). With the prophets they were frequently employed: more than twenty times we read of them in Daniel. In the future when the Spirit will be poured out, Israel’s sons and daughters will prophesy; the old men will dream dreams, and the young men will see visions (Joel 2:28; Acts 2:17). The book of Revelation is a series of visions (Rev. 1:2).

Vocation

See CALLING.

Vophsi

Father of Nahbi, of the tribe of Naphtali (Num. 13:14).

Vows

The Israelites were not told to make vows, but if they voluntarily made them, God said they must conscientiously perform them. Man is ever ready to boast of his strength,

not being conscious of his own weakness. Israel, on hearing the law, did not hesitate to say, "all that the Lord hath said we will do;" but they alas, miserably failed. The law made vows binding, and gave directions as to exceptional cases where it was impossible to perform them (Num. 30:2-14; Deut. 23:21-23; Psa. 50:14; Eccl. 5:4-5; Nah. 1:15).

The only instances of vows in the New Testament are those of Paul (or Aquila, as some judge) at Cenchrea, which is shrouded in mystery, and the four men at Jerusalem (Acts 18:18; Acts 21:23). These were probably the vows of Nazariteship, by the head being shaven. According to the law the final shaving must be at the tabernacle or temple (Num. 6:18).

Vulgate, the

This is the name usually given to the Latin version of the scriptures, signifying that it is commonly received, and it is the book used and accredited by the Romish church; but there was a Latin version long before that church assumed any authority: indeed the apostle Paul wrote (about A.D. 58) that for "many years" he had desired to visit the saints at Rome, and it is probable that during those many years the saints there had early copies of the Old Testament in the Latin tongue, and of the New Testament as the Gospels and the Epistles came into existence.

It is known by the evidence of Jerome [346-420] and Augustine [354-430] that in the fourth century there was a great variety of Latin interpretations, though more modern scholars have judged that many of them may be traced to some one unknown recension.

Augustine, however, judged that one of them differed from the rest in its clearness and fidelity, and it was

distinguished by the name of *Itala* or *Italic*. This has led to the earliest Latin codices being associated with Italy, where, as already observed, there were certainly assemblies in the days of the apostles (Heb. 13:24).

Some nevertheless, by comparing the earliest copies with the writings of the Latin Fathers, are convinced that the primitive translation into Latin was of *African* origin. This opinion was accepted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Davidson and Tregelles; but others still refer the translation to Italy. May there not have been one made in each place?

The principal MSS quoted by the Editors as dating before the time of Jerome (called *Old Latin* as well as *Italic*, though the distinction is not clearly marked) are

- a. Cod. Vercellensis. Contains the Gospels. Century 4.
- b. Cod. Veronensis. The Gospels. A little later than a., a good specimen of the Old Latin.
- c. Cod. Colbertinus. All the New Testament, but only the Gospels in the Old Latin. 11.
- d. Cod. Bezae. The Latin that accompanies the Greek D., the Gospels, Acts 6 or 7.
- d. Cod. Claromontanus. Paul's Epistles of the same. 6 or 7. It ranks higher than the Gospels and Acts.
- e. Cod. Palatinus. The Gospels. 4 or 5. A mixed text.
- e. Cod. Laudianus. The Acts of the Greek Codex E.
- e. Cod. Sangermanensis. Paul's Epistles. The Latin text of the Greek Codex E, but is judged to be a copy of d.
- g. Cod. Boernerianus. Paul's Epistles. The Latin interlinear text of the Greek Codex G. 9 or 10.
- h. Cod. Claromontanus. The Gospels, but Matthew only is the Old Latin. 4 or 5.

k. Cod. Bobbiensis. Parts of Matthew and Mark. Judged by some to be the oldest representative of the African type. 4 or 5.

m. From a "speculum," a remarkable ancient work. It contains a number of doctrines as heads, under which are quoted passages from the Old Testament and New Testament without note or comment. The text is considered to be generally African as distinguished from Italic. It contains twice 1 John 5:7, known as "the heavenly witnesses." 6 or 7.

There are many other portions, some of which are described as European, but it is judged impossible to class some either as African, European, or Italian.

In the fourth century, the Latin copies having multiplied, with obvious corruptions in some of them, a revision was deemed necessary, and Damasus, Bishop of Rome, laid the duty upon Jerome.

Jerome saw the difficulties he would have to encounter in the prejudices that such a work would excite, nevertheless it had to be done. He said there were errors "by false transcription, by clumsy corrections, and by careless interpolations." The evils could only be remedied by going back to the original Greek.

The Gospels having suffered most, he began with them, not, however, making a new translation, but revising the Old Latin. His revision of the Gospels appeared in A.D. 384, with his preface to Damasus, who died in the same year. It is probable that he completed the rest of the New Testament in 385.

In his Commentary on Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, and Philemon, in 386, he acted as a translator with more freedom than he had exercised as a reviser. And in his new

version of the Old Testament, except the Psalms, which had been made from the LXX, he translated from the Hebrew. Of this freedom Augustine disapproved. The people generally resisted alterations: quite a commotion in a church is recorded, the prophet Jonah being read, because Jerome had used the word *hedera*, "ivy," in his translation, for they had been accustomed to the word *cucurbita*, "gourd." But the agitation gradually subsided.

In the 400 years that followed, as the MS copies multiplied so did the errors, until Charlemagne sought a remedy in getting Alcuin to revise the text for public use. This was accomplished about A.D. 802: and was called Charlemagne's Bible. A copy of this is in the British Museum, but is of later date than Charlemagne.

Copies still increased, and variations were again multiplied; and as soon as printing was invented, several editions were published, all more or less differing. At length the Popes undertook to prepare a correct edition, it was finished by Sixtus V. in 1590, but this proved to be so incorrect, that others were contemplated. In 1592 Clement VIII. published one, and in 1593 another, and in 1598 a third, with a list of errata for the three. The modern printed copies bear the date of 1592. In giving the Vulgate as an authority for various readings in the New Testament the printed editions are not often referred to, but the manuscripts that are still in existence of Jerome's revision. The principal of these are:—

am. Cod. Amiatinus, containing the whole Bible. Centruy 6.

fuld. Cod. Fuldensis. The New Testament. Century 6.

tol. Cod. Toletanus. The whole Bible, in Gothic letters.

for. Cod. Forojuliensis. Portions of the Gospels.

per. Fragments of Luke.

Karl. Cod. Harleian. The Gospels. Century 7.

With portions and fragments of many others.

The passage in John 7:53—John 8:11, “the woman taken in adultery” (which is omitted in many Greek MSS., including A B C L T X Δ, but in L and Δ is a blank space), is found in Codices c. and e. of the Old Latin, and was in b., but had been erased. John 8:10-11 are here quoted, along with Cod. Amiatinus.

c. Cod. COLBERTINUS. Cumque se erexisset Jesus, dixit ad mulierem: Ubi sunt? nemo te condemnavit? Quae dixit, Nemo Domine. Dixit autem illi Jesus: Nec ego te condemnabo: Vade, et ex hoc jam noli peccare.

e. Cod. PALATINUS. Cum adlevasset autem capud ihs dixit ei. mulier ubi sunt nemo te iudicavit. Dixit et illa nemo dne dixit autem ihs ad illam nee ego te iudico. i et amplius noli peccare.

am. Cod. AMIATINUS. Erigens autem se Jesus dixit ei mulier, ubi Bunt? nemote condemnavit? Que dixit, Nemo domine. Dixit autem Jesus Nec ego te condemnabo: vade et amplius jam noli peccare.

This passage gives an illustration of how the Old Latin, preserved in the Vulgate, may be the means of authenticating true readings that would otherwise be condemned because of the supposed preponderance (of weight, not number) of Greek MSS against it. Augustine (A.D. 354-430) and Nikon (cent. x.) both gave as the reason why this passage was omitted that it was thought to give a license to sin!

The Latin text therefore should not be ignored simply because it has been adopted by Rome. It existed long before papal supremacy and for many centuries was the only copy of the New Testament that was available to the

mass of Christians, and was largely used by the Reformers until they could obtain a copy of the Greek, and were able to read it.

Vulture

There are three words so translated.

1. *ayyah*, a bird of keen sight (Job 28:7). It is supposed to be a species of KITE, as the Hebrew is translated (Lev. 11:14; Deut. 14:13).

2. *dayyah*, a bird inhabiting ruins: supposed to be another species of KITE (Deut. 14:13; Isa. 34:15).

3. *daah*, a bird of rapid flight (Lev. 11:14); supposed to be the falcon; the word occurs here only. These are all classed among the unclean birds. For the true vulture see EAGLE.

Courtesy of BibleTruthPublishers.com. Most likely this text has not been proofread. Any suggestions for spelling or punctuation corrections would be warmly received. Please email them to: BTPmail@bibletruthpublishers.com.