are the following, viz. Cod. Cyprius (olim Colbertinus, K) ; Basiliensis, b. vi. 21 (E) ; Basiliensis, b. vi. 27 (vel Reuch- linianus) ; Stephani Octavus (L); Winchilseanus (106); Regius (M) ; Mosquenses Bibliothecæ S. Synodi, iv. v. xliii. xcviii.

Schott, *Isagoge,* p. 591—599; Home, Introd. vol. ii. p. 111-196; Hug, *Einleit.* [Eng. trans, vol. i.].

Sect X.—*Ancient Versions of the Sacred Scriptures.*

These may be arranged either with respect to their his­tory, as *Immediate* and *Mediate,* according as they have been made directly from the originals or from other trans­lations ; or with respect to the languages in which they ex­ist, as *Oriental* and *Occidental.* We shall follow the latter arrangement, as the more convenient ; at the same time intimating, when it is possible, what place each version has in the former.

1. **ORIENTAL VERSIONS.—1.** *Chaldaic Targums.* After the return of the Jews from Babylon they brought with them so much of the language of Chaldæa, that they were unable to understand their own Scriptures. Hence arose the necessity of accompanying the reading of these in the synagogues with an interpretation ; a practice first intro­duced by Ezra (Nehem, viii. 8), and which continued to be followed as long as the Jewish service was maintained. These interpretations were at first merely oral, and con­fined to a literal version of the original into the popular dia­lect ; but gradually they became more paraphrastic, and the idea naturally arose of committing the more valuable of them to writing. From this sprung the Chaldaic Targums, or paraphrastic versions of the Hebrew Scriptures. The oldest now extant is that of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, composed according to some in the first, and to others in the third century of the Christian era. It is the least para­phrastic, and the most correct, of any we possess. Next in point of age and value is that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Prophets. The Jews make him a disciple of Simeon, who took our Lord in his arms ; but the probability is that he was later. His Targum is more diffuse and paraphrastic than that of Onkelos, but contains much that is valuable. Both of these are printed in Walton’s Polyglott. The re­maining Targums, nine in number, are of comparatively recent date, and of little value. Their renderings are very harsh ; and they are filled with idle and foolish fables.

Winer *De Onkeloso ejusnue Paraphrasi Chaldaica,* Lips. 1820 ; Jahn’s *Einleitung,* i. § 46, 47 -, Bauer, *Chrestomathia e Paraphrasibus Chaldai­cis et Talmude delecta,* 1792 ; Home, vol. ii. p. 198.

2. *Syriac Versions.* Eight versions of the whole or parts of Scripture into the ancient Syriac tongue are known to critics, but of these only two deserve particular notice. These are, 1. *The Peschito,* that is, *right* or *correct,* not later than the third century, probably as early as the second. It contains the whole Bible, is pure in diction and faithful in version, and appears to have been made immediately from the original. 2. *The Philoxenian,* so called from Philoxenus, bishop of Hierapolis, under whose direction it was executed by Polycarp, rural bishop of the same dis­trict, a. D. 508. It contains only the New Testament, and is literal to servility ; but its renderings are not good. Its chief value is to the critic, in helping him to judge of vari­ous readings.

Hirzel *De Pentateuchi Pers. Syr. indole.* Lips. 1825 ; Michaelis, In- trod. vol. ii. p. 4-76 ; Horne, vol. ii. p. 220.

3. *The Samaritan Pentateuch.* This must not be con­founded with “ the Pentateuch of the Samaritans,” which is merely a copy of the original Hebrew in Samaritan cha­racters ; whereas the other is a translation of the Hebrew into the Samaritan dialect. This version bears a strong resemblance to the Targum of Onkelos, and even some have deemed it a translation of that. It is probably, how­

ever, from the original, but cannot be dated earlier than the second century.

Winer *De* *Versionis Pent. Samarit. indole,* Lips. 1817 ; Horne, ii. p. 42 ; Gesenius *De Pent. Samarit. origine, indole, et auctoritate,* Halæ, 1815.

4. *Other Oriental Versions.* These are, 1. *The Coptic,* embracing the *Memphitic,* or that in the dialect of Lower Egypt, probably of the third century, published by Wilkins at Oxford in 1716 ; and the *Sahidic,* or that in the dialect of Upper Egypt, ascribed to the second century, and, with the exception of a part of the Gospel of John, still exist­ing only in manuscript : 2. *The Ethiopic,* ascribed to the fourth century, and printed in Walton’s Polyglott, but with many inaccuracies : 3. *The Armenian,* made by Miesrob in the beginning of the fifth century, very faithful, but sup­posed to be in many places interpolated from the Vulgate :

4. *The Arabic,* comprising the Pentateuch, and Isaiah, trans­lated by Rabbi Saadias Phijumensis, in the tenth century, the Pentateuch in Samaritan-Arabic by Abusaïd, the ano­nymous version of Joshua in the London Polyglott, and the Acts and Epistles published by Erpenius : 5. *The Persic* ver­sion of the Pentateuch, by Jacob Ben Joseph, surnamed Dawusi, a learned Jew of the ninth century. All these are mediate versions from the Septuagint or Syriac.

Horne, vol. ii. p. 226-234; Comp. Walton, *Prolegom∙* ix.-xv.

II. Western **VERSIONS.—**1. *Greek Versions of the Old Testament.* The most important of these is the Septuagint, as it is commonly called, or more properly the Alexandrian. Respecting the origin and early history of this version much uncertainty prevails, of which advantage has been taken to clothe the whole in the mist of fable. The common story of Ptolemy Philadelphus having sent, at the instigation of his librarian Demetrius Phalereus, to Judæa for a correct copy of the Hebrew Scriptures, and for seventy-two men of learning (six out of each of the twelve tribes) to trans­late these into Greek, of his having shut them up in the Isle of Pharos, apart from each other, and of their having produced versions *verbatim et literatim* the same, is now rejected by all scholars. The opinion commonly held by such embraces the following points : *1st,* That it is high­ly probable that the work was commenced during the pe­riod when Ptolemy Lagus and his son Philadelphus held the joint sovereignty ; *2d,* that the motive prompting to it was the multitude of Jews in Alexandria and throughout Egypt, who were ignorant of Hebrew, and needed the Scrip­tures in Greek ; *3d,* that it was undertaken under the aus­pices of the Alexandrian Sanhedrin or council of the Jews, who probably consulted their brethren in Judæa about it, and from whom, being seventy-two in number, in all like­lihood the version took its name ; 4*th*, that the different books were executed at different times and by different persons, as is evident from the varieties in point of accu­racy and purity which they present, the Pentateuch being that first executed ; and, *5th,* that the translators of the Pentateuch were evidently Egyptian Jews, from their in­troducing into their version many Coptic words, and ren­dering many Hebrew expressions, not into their Greek equivalents, but so as to give an Egyptian hue to the idea. The version thus executed soon acquired great vogue, not only in Egypt, but also in Palestine, where, in the days of our Lord and his apostles, it had mostly superseded the use of the original Hebrew. In the Christian church it ac­quired the same reputation. Few of the Fathers under­stood Hebrew, and consequently almost all their quotations from the Old Testament are made through the medium of the Septuagint. The best editions of this version are those of Grabe, Oxon. 1707, 1709, 1719, 1720, four vols. folio and eight vols. 8vo, reprinted with the addition of various read­ings from the Vatican manuscript by Breitinger, Tiguri Helvet., 1730-31-32, four vols. 4to ; of Bos, Franequeræ,