

THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA

V1 pdf

1: Septuagint | Definition of Septuagint in English by Oxford Dictionaries

*The Septuagint Version Of The Old Testament And Apocrypha V1: With An English Translation And With Various Readings And Critical Notes [Anonymous] on www.enganchecubano.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. This scarce antiquarian book is a facsimile reprint of the original.*

Textual analysis[edit] The inter-relationship between various significant ancient manuscripts of the Old Testament some identified by their siglum. The Septuagint here denotes the original septuagint. Modern scholarship holds that the Septuagint was written during the 3rd through 1st centuries BCE. But nearly all attempts at dating specific books, with the exception of the Pentateuch early- to mid-3rd century BCE , are tentative and without consensus. These three, to varying degrees, are more literal renderings of their contemporary Hebrew scriptures as compared to the Old Greek the original Septuagint. Much of this work was lost, but several compilations of the fragments are available. In the first column was the contemporary Hebrew, in the second a Greek transliteration of it, then the newer Greek versions each in their own columns. Origen also kept a column for the Old Greek the Septuagint , which included readings from all the Greek versions into a critical apparatus with diacritical marks indicating to which version each line Gr. Thus this combined text became the first major Christian recension of the Septuagint, often called the Hexaplar recension. In the century following Origen, two other major recensions were identified by Jerome , who attributed these to Lucian Lucianic or Antiochene recension and Hesychius Hesychian or Alexandrian recension. Relatively complete manuscripts of the Septuagint postdate the Hexaplar recension and include the Codex Vaticanus from the 4th century CE and the Codex Alexandrinus of the 5th century. These are indeed the oldest surviving nearly complete manuscripts of the Old Testament in any language; the oldest extant complete Hebrew texts date some years later, from the first half of the 10th century. The various Jewish and later Christian revisions and recensions are largely responsible for the divergence of the codices. Differences with the Latin Vulgate and the Masoretic text[edit] The sources of the many differences between the Septuagint, the Latin Vulgate and the Masoretic Text have long been discussed by scholars. Following the Renaissance , a common opinion among some humanists was that the Septuagint translators bungled the translation from the Hebrew and that the Septuagint became more corrupt with time. The most widely accepted view today is that the Septuagint provides a reasonably accurate record of an early Hebrew textual variant that differed from the ancestor of the Masoretic text as well as those of the Latin Vulgate, where both of the latter seem to have a more similar textual heritage. This view is supported by comparisons with Biblical texts found at the Essene settlement at Qumran the Dead Sea Scrolls. For example, Genesis 4: There is only one noticeable difference in that chapter, at 4: If you offer correctly but do not divide correctly, have you not sinned? Be still; his recourse is to you, and you will rule over him. If you do not improve, however, at the entrance, sin is lying, and to you is its longing, but you can rule over it. If thou do well, shalt thou not receive? This instance illustrates the complexity of assessing differences between the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text as well as the Vulgate. Despite the striking divergence of meaning here between the Septuagint and later texts, nearly identical consonantal Hebrew source texts can be reconstructed. The readily apparent semantic differences result from alternative strategies for interpreting the difficult verse and relate to differences in vowelization and punctuation of the consonantal text. The differences between the Septuagint and the MT thus fall into four categories. Evidence of this can be found throughout the Old Testament. Most obvious are major differences in Jeremiah and Job, where the Septuagint is much shorter and chapters appear in different order than in the MT, and Esther where almost one third of the verses in the Septuagint text have no parallel in the MT. A more subtle example may be found in Isaiah The MT reads " The same verse in the Septuagint reads according to the translation of Brenton "and speak not to us in the Jewish tongue: This difference is very minor and does not affect the meaning of the verse. Scholars at one time had used discrepancies such as this to claim that the Septuagint was a poor translation of the Hebrew original. In fact this verse is found in Qumran

1QIsaa where the Hebrew word "haanashim" the men is found in place of "haam" the people. This discovery, and others like it, showed that even seemingly minor differences of translation could be the result of variant Hebrew source texts. Differences in interpretation stemming from the same Hebrew text. A good example is Genesis 4. Differences as a result of idiomatic translation issues i. For example, in Psalm The Septuagint reads "To God are the mighty ones of the earth. This consists of a stable text and numerous and distinctive agreements with the Masoretic Text. These are the manuscripts which have distinctive affinities with the Greek Bible. In addition to these manuscripts, several others share distinctive individual readings with the Septuagint, although they do not fall in this category. The Qumran "Living Bible": These are the manuscripts which, according to Tov, were copied in accordance with the "Qumran practice" i. These are DSS manuscripts which reflect the textual form found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, although the Samaritan Bible itself is later and contains information not found in these earlier scrolls, e. This is a category which shows no consistent alignment with any of the other four text-types. For example, Bastiaan Van Elderen compares three variations of Deuteronomy

2: The Apocrypha, The Septuagint LXX, and the Canon

The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament and Apocrypha V1: With an English Translation and with Various Readings and Critical Notes Paperback Books- Buy The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament and Apocrypha V1: With an English Translation and with Various Readings and Critical Notes Books online at lowest price with Rating & Reviews, Free Shipping, COD.*

Excerpt The very first translation of the Hebrew Bible was made into Greek, probably as early as the third century BC. Its Founders and Associates In memory of those board members who put forth effort, time, prayers, funds, and were the rock on wh A Brief History of Intolerance in Modern Cosmology A review of some recent well-documented cases of intolerance in the cosmology field illustrates a This night had a spec Tags Support Like this artice? Our Ministry relies on the generosity of people like you. Every small donation helps us develop and publish great articles. This letter tells how King Ptolemy II commissioned the royal librarian, Demetrius of Phaleron, to collect by purchase or by copying all the books in the world. He wrote a letter to Eleazar, the high priest at Jerusalem, requesting six elders of each tribe, in total seventy-two men, of exemplary life and learned in the Torah, to translate it into Greek. On arrival at Alexandria, the translators were greeted by the king and given a sumptuous banquet. They were then closeted in a secluded house on the island of Pharos close to the seashore, where the celebrated m. According to the Letter of Aristeas, the translation, made under the direction of Demetrius, was completed in seventy-two days. When the Alexandrian Jewish community assembled to hear a reading of the new version, the translators and Demetrius received lavish praise, and a curse was pronounced on anyone who should alter the text by addition, transposition or omission. The work was then read to the king who, according to the Letter of Aristeas, marveled at the mind of the lawgiver. The translators were then sent back to Jerusalem, endowed with gifts for themselves and the high priest Eleazar. Later generations embellished the story. Philo of Alexandria, writing in the first century AD, says that each of the seventy-two translators were shut in a separate cell, and miraculously all the texts were said to agree exactly with one another, thus proving that their version was directly inspired by God. Origins in Retrospect It is difficult to know how much credence to give to these accounts. There are several known historical inaccuracies in the Letter of Aristeas. One of those credited as being present at the banquet, a certain Menodemus of Eritria, is known to have died two years before Ptolemy II succeeded to the throne. But even if the stories relating to the origin of the Septuagint are not true, at least not in all the details, it seems likely that Ptolemy II at least instigated a translation of the Torah, the first five books of the Hebrew Bible. The Significance of the Septuagint The significance of the Septuagint translation can hardly be overestimated. The Septuagint translation made the Hebrew scriptures available both to the Jews who no longer spoke their ancestral language and to the entire Greek-speaking world. The Septuagint was later to become the Bible of the Greek-speaking early Church, and is frequently quoted in the New Testament. Hints of the Egyptian Origin of the Septuagint Does the Septuagint translation itself give any hints of its supposed Egyptian origins? In Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 are given a list of unclean animals and birds, that is, creatures that the Israelites were prohibited from eating. The precise identification of many of the birds in the list of unclean birds remains uncertain. The detailed identification of the birds need not concern us here. The Septuagint translates this ibis, a bird that the Egyptians knew as hbj. Yanshuph, however, is rendered as a kind of owl by the majority of English versions. However, a number of English translations do not follow the Septuagint, and opt for another type of owl. Earlier in the chapter is a list of unclean animals. Arnebet is clearly the "rabbit" or "hare. A more famous and ultimately more significant example concerns the term "Red Sea. This body of water is often thought to be the lakes or salt water marshes at the northern end of the Gulf of Aqaba. All English versions apart from the Jerusalem Bible stick with this tradition. But where did the term "Red Sea" come from? This sea may have been popularly known as the Edomite or Red Sea. Another explanation is that it was named "red" from the predominant color of the Edomite and Arabian mountains

which border the Gulf of Aqaba. Distinctive Features of the Septuagint Translation A number of the special distinctive features of the Septuagint should be pointed out. It was replaced by another translation whose origins would seem to lie in Asia Minor, that ascribed to Theodotion at the end of the second century AD. Indeed, only one manuscript of the Septuagint of Daniel has survived - a tenth-century manuscript from the Chigi collection in the Vatican. There are numerous examples where the writers of the New Testament follow the Septuagint translation rather than the Hebrew text. Four examples will suffice: Limitations of the Septuagint The Orthodox Church argues that the Septuagint is more accurate than the Hebrew Bible and should be used in Bible translation. The Septuagint of Job is about a sixth shorter than the traditional Hebrew text of the Bible known as the Masoretic Text. The missing portions were supplied from the Greek version of Theodotion. The Septuagint of Jeremiah is about an eighth shorter than the Masoretic Text, repeated passages are cut out and the order is changed. Furthermore, the Septuagint often preserves different numbers, e.

3: Septuagint Old Testament Bilingual (Greek / English) - 1

37 The Septuagint version of the Old Testament and Apocrypha _ with an English translation and with various readings and critical notes 38 The Three Great Races of Men 39 The Uncivilized Races Of Men In All Countries Of The World, vol

The earliest version of the Old Testament Scriptures which is extant, or of which we possess any certain knowledge, is the translation executed at Alexandria in the third century before the Christian era: The history of the origin of this translation was embellished with various fables at so early a period, that it has been a work of patient critical research in later times to bring into plain light the facts which may be regarded as well authenticated. We need not wonder that but little is known with accuracy on this subject; for, with regard to the ancient versions of the Scriptures in general, we possess no information whatever as to the time or place of their execution, or by whom they were made: If, then, our knowledge of the origin of the Septuagint be meagre, it is at least more extensive than that which we possess of other translations. After the conquests of Alexander had brought Egypt under Macedonian rule, the newly-founded city of Alexandria became especially a place where the Greek language, although by no means in its purest form, was the medium of written and spoken communication amongst the varied population there brought together. This Alexandrian dialect is the idiom in which the Septuagint version was made. Amongst other inhabitants of Alexandria the number of Jews was considerable: Hence the existence of the sacred books of the Jews would easily become known to the Greek population. The earliest writer who gives an account of the Septuagint version is Aristobulus, a Jew who lived at the commencement of the second century B. He says that the version of the Law into Greek was completed under the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and that Demetrius Phalereus had been employed about it. Now, Demetrius died about the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and hence it has been reasonably inferred that Aristobulus is a witness that the work of translation had been commenced under Ptolemy Soter. Different opinions have been formed as to what is intended by Aristobulus when he speaks of the Law: The fact may, however, be regarded as certain, that prior to the year B. The embellishments and fictitious additions which this account soon received might be scarcely worthy of notice in this place, were it not that they are intimately connected with the authority which this version was once supposed to possess, and with the name by which it is commonly known. A writer, who calls himself Aristeas, says that when Ptolemy Philadelphus was engaged in the formation of the Alexandrian Library, he was advised by Demetrius Phalereus to procure a translation of the sacred books of the Jews. The king accordingly, as a preliminary, purchased the freedom of more than one hundred thousand Jewish captives, and he then sent a deputation, of which Aristeas himself was one, to Eleazar the high-priest to request a copy of the Jewish Law and seventy-two interpreters, six out of each tribe. To this the priest is represented to have agreed; and after the arrival of the translators and their magnificent reception by the king, they are said to have been conducted to an island by Demetrius, who wrote down the renderings on which they agreed by mutual conference; and thus the work is stated to have been completed in seventy-two days. The translators are then said to have received from the king most abundant rewards; and the Jews are stated to have asked permissions to take copies of the version. Other additions were subsequently made to this story: The basis of truth which appears to be under this story seems to be, that it was an Egyptian king who caused the translation to be made, and that it was from the Royal Library at Alexandria that the Hellenistic Jews received the copies which they used. In examining the version itself, it bears manifest proof that it was not executed by Jews of Palestine, but by those of Egypt: It may also be doubted whether in the year B. Some in rejecting the fabulous embellishments have also discarded all connected with them: Some have thus supposed that the translation was made by Alexandrian Jews for their own use, in order to meet a necessity which they felt to have a version of the Scriptures in the tongue which had become vernacular to them. There would be, however, many difficulties in the way of this hypothesis. We would hardly suppose that in a space of thirty-five years the Alexandrian Jews had found such a translation needful or desirable: The most reasonable conclusion is, that the version was

executed for the Egyptian king; and that the Hellenistic Jews afterwards used it as they became less and less familiar with the language of the original. If the expression of Aristobulus does not designate the whole of the books of the Old Testament as translated in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the question arises, When were the other books besides the Pentateuch turned into Greek? To this no definite answer could be given: The variety of the translators is proved by the unequal character of the version: The Pentateuch is considered to be the part the best executed, while the book of Isaiah appears to be the worst. In estimating the general character of the version, it must be remembered that the translators were Jews, full of traditional thoughts of their own as to the meaning of Scripture; and thus nothing short of a miracle could have prevented them from infusing into their version the thoughts which were current in their own minds. They could only translate passages as they themselves understood them. This is evidently the case when their work is examined. It would be, however, too much to say that they translated with dishonest intention; for it cannot be doubted that they wished to express their Scriptures truly in Greek, and that their deviations from accuracy may be simply attributed to the incompetency of some of the interpreters, and the tone of mental and spiritual feeling which was common to them all. One difficulty which they had to overcome was that of introducing theological ideas, which till then had only their proper terms in Hebrew, into a language of Gentiles, which till then had terms for no religious notions except those of heathens. Hence the necessity of using many words and phrases in new and appropriated senses. These remarks are not intended as depreciatory of the Septuagint version: One of the earliest of those writers who mention the Greek translation of the Scriptures, speaks also of the version as not fully adequate. The Prologue of Jesus the son of Sirach written as many suppose B. Not only so, but even the Law and the prophecies and the rest of the books differ not a little as to the things said in them. Doubtless coming into Egypt he was more conscious of the defects of the Septuagint version than could have been the case with Egyptian Jews, who had used the translation commonly and habitually for a century and a quarter. At Alexandria the Hellenistic Jews used the version, and gradually attached to it the greatest possible authority: In examining the Pentateuch of the Septuagint in connection with the Hebrew text, and with the copies preserved by the Samaritans in their crooked letters, it is remarkable that in very many passages the reading of the Septuagint accord with the Samaritan copies where they differ from the Jewish. We cannot here notice the various theories which have been advanced to account for this accordance of the Septuagint with the Samaritan copies of the Hebrew; indeed it is not very satisfactory to enter into the details of the subject, because no theory hitherto brought forward explains all the facts, or meets all the difficulties. To one point, however, we will advert, because it has not been sufficiently taken into account, -- in the places in which the Samaritan and Jewish copies of the Hebrew text differ, in important and material points, the Septuagint accords much more with the Jewish than with the Samaritan copies, and in a good many points it introduces variations unknown to either. The Septuagint version having been current for about three centuries before the time when the books of the New Testament were written, it is not surprising that the Apostles should have used it more often than not in making citations from the Old Testament. They used it as an honestly-made version in pretty general use at the time when they wrote. They did not on every occasion give an authoritative translation of each passage *de novo*, but they used what was already familiar to the ears of converted Hellenists, when it was sufficiently accurate to suit the matter in hand. In fact, they used it as did their contemporary Jewish writers, Philo and Josephus, but not, however, with the blind implicitness of the former. In consequence of the fact that the New Testament writers used on many occasions the Septuagint version, some have deduced a new argument for its authority, -- a theory which we might have thought to be sufficiently disproved by the defects of the version, which evince that it is merely a human work. But the fact that the New Testament writers used this version on many occasions supplies a new proof in opposition to the idea of its authority, for in not a few places they do not follow it, but they supply a version of their own which rightly represents the Hebrew text, although contradicting the Septuagint. The use, however, which the writers of the New Testament have made of the Septuagint version must always invest it with a peculiar interest; we thus see what honour God may be pleased to put on an honestly-made version, since we find that inspired

writers often used such a version, when it was sufficiently near the original to suit the purpose for which it was cited, instead of rendering the Hebrew text de novo on every occasion. Another important point on which the Septuagint stands in close connection with the New Testament is the general phraseology of the version, -- a phraseology in which the traces of Hebrew elements are most marked, but with regard to which we should mistake greatly if we supposed that it originated with the New Testament writers. Thus we may see that the study of the Septuagint is almost needful to any biblical scholars who wishes to estimate adequately the phraseology and usus loquendi of the New Testament. Besides the direct citations in the New Testament in which the Septuagint is manifestly used, there are not a few passages in which it is clear that the train of expression has been formed on words and phrases of the Septuagint: Thus, whatever may be our estimate of the defects found in the Septuagint -- its inadequate renderings, its departures from the sense of the Hebrew, its doctrinal deficiencies owing to the limited apprehensions of the translators -- there is no reason whatever for our neglecting the version, or not being fully alive to its real value and importance. After the diffusion of Christianity, copies of the Septuagint became widely dispersed amongst the new communities that were formed; so that before many years had elapsed this version must have been as much in the hands of Gentiles as of Jews. The veneration with which the Jews had treated this version as is shown in the case of Philo and Josephus, gave place to a very contrary feeling when they found how it could be used against them in argument: As the Gentile Christians were generally unacquainted with Hebrew, they were unable to meet the Jews on the ground which they now took; and as the Gentile Christians at this time believed the most extraordinary legends of the origin of the version, so that they fully embraced the opinions of its authority and inspiration, they necessarily regarded the denial on the part of the Jews of its accuracy, as little less than blasphemy, and as a proof of their blindness. In the course of the second century, three other complete versions of the Old Testament into Greek were executed: He is described as a Jew or Jewish proselyte of Pontus, and the date commonly attributed to his version is about the year A. His translation is said to have been executed for the express purpose of opposing the authority of the Septuagint: His labour was evidently directed in opposing the passages which the Christians were accustomed to cite from the Septuagint as applicable to the Lord Jesus. The general characteristic of this version is bold literality of rendering: From the scrupulosity of Aquila in rendering each Hebrew word, his work, if we possessed it complete and not merely in scattered fragments, would be of great value in textual criticism. He is described as an Ebionite, a kind of semi-Christian. His version seems to have been executed in good and pure Greek: His version is in many parts based on the Septuagint. He is less servile in his adherence to the words of the Hebrew than Aquila, although he is void of the freedom of Symmachus. His knowledge of Hebrew was certainly but limited, and without the Septuagint it is hardly probable that he could have undertaken this version. Thus, before the end of the second century there were, besides the Septuagint, three versions of the Old Testament in Greek, known to both Jews and Christians. All this could not fail in making the Old Testament Scriptures better known and more widely read. Although many Christians believed in the inspiration and authority of the Septuagint, yet this could not have been universally the case; otherwise the disuse of the real Septuagint version of the book of Daniel, and the adoption of that of Theodotion in its stead, could never have taken place. This must have arisen from an apprehension of the poverty and inaccuracy of the Septuagint in this book, so that another version similar in its general style was gladly adopted. This learned and enterprising scholar, having acquired a knowledge of Hebrew, found that in many respects the copies of the Septuagint differed from the Hebrew text. It seems to be uncertain whether he regarded such differences as having arisen from mistakes on the part of the copyists, or from errors of the original translators themselves. The object which he proposed to himself was not to restore the Septuagint to its original condition, nor yet to correct mere errors of translation simply as such, but to cause that the Church should possess a text of the Septuagint in which all additions to the Hebrew should be marked with an obelus, and in which all that the Septuagint omitted should be added from one of the other versions marked with an asterick. He also indicated readings in the Septuagint which were so incorrect that the passage ought to be changed for the corresponding one in another version. With the object of thus amending

the Septuagint, he formed his great works, the Hexapla and Tetrapla; these were as the names imply works in which the page was divided respectively into six columns and into four columns. The Hexapla contained, 1st, the Hebrew text; 2nd, the Hebrew text expressed in Greek characters; 3rd, the version of Aquila; 4th, that of Symmachus; 5th, the Septuagint; 6th, Theodotion. The Tetrapla contained merely the four last columns. Besides these four versions of the entire Old Testament, Origen employed three anonymous Greek versions of particular books; these are commonly called the fifth, sixth, and seventh versions. Hence in the parts in which two of these versions are added, the work was designated Octapla, and where all the three appeared, it was called Enneapla. References were then made from the column of the Septuagint to other versions, so as to complete and correct it: This recension by Origen has generally been called the Hexaplar text. The Hexapla itself is said never to have been copied: The Hexaplar text is best known from a Syriac version which was made from it; of this many books have been published from a MS. This Syro-Hexaplar translation preserves the marks of the Greek text, and the references to the other translations. It may yet be made of great use in separating the readings which were introduced by Origen from those of an older date. There were two other early attempts to revise the Septuagint besides that of Origen. In the beginning of the fourth century, Lucian, a presbyter on Antioch, and Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, undertook similar labours of the same kind. These two recensions which they were in the proper sense of the term were much used in the Eastern Churches. From the fourth century and onward, we know of no definite attempt to revise the text of the Septuagint, or to correct the discrepancies of various copies. It is probable, however, that just as the text of the Greek New Testament became in a great measure fixed into the same form as we find it in the modern copies, something of the same kind must have been the case with the Septuagint. As to the Greek New Testament, this seems to have occurred about the eleventh century, when the mass of copies were written within the limits of the patriarchate of Constantinople. It is probable that certain copies approved at the metropolis, both politically and religiously, of those who used the Greek tongue, were tacitly taken as a kind of standard. We find amongst the members of the Eastern Churches who use the Greek language, that the Septuagint has been and is still so thoroughly received as authentic Scripture, that any effort to introduce amongst them versions which accurately represent the Hebrew as has been attempted in modern times has been wholly fruitless. Thus the Septuagint demands our attention, were it only from the fact that the whole circle of religious ideas and thoughts amongst Christians in the East has always been moulded according to this version.

4: The Old Testament Canon and Apocrypha

The Septuagint is a translation of the Hebrew Bible and some related texts into Koine Greek. As the primary Greek translation of the Old Testament, it is also called the Greek Old Testament. This translation is quoted in the New Testament, particularly by Paul, and also by the Greek Church Fathers.

The Apocryphal Books Apocrypha is a Greek word meaning things hidden, and in ancient times this word was applied to religious writings esteemed almost as scripture by some, but which were not read to the unlearned in public. In modern Protestant usage the word "apocrypha" refers to all those writings which have wrongly been regarded as scripture by many in the church. The first maintains that it is wine; the second that it is the king himself; the third argues with some irony and humor that women are stronger than either wine or kings, but that "truth" and "the God of truth" are by far strongest. This last young man turns out to be none other than Zerubbabel, who for his prize receives generous help from the king in rebuilding Jerusalem. Also called the Ezra Apocalypse. This is a typical Jewish apocalypse, probably first written in Greek about A. Some hold that it was originally written in Hebrew. It appears to be a composite work, compiled of two or three sources. The Christian editor added some introductory and closing chapters in which reference is made to Christ, but the original Jewish composition was not changed in any important respect. This book was not included in Septuagint manuscripts, and so the Greek text has been lost. The most important witness to the original text is the Latin version, which was included in medieval manuscripts of the Vulgate. The book consists mostly of dialogues between Ezra and angels sent to him to answer his urgent theological questions about the problem of evil, and in particular the failures and afflictions of Israel. All of this is presented as if written long before by Ezra and hidden away. The book was obviously written as an encouragement to the Jews, who had recently suffered the destruction of Jerusalem A. It also includes some symbolical prophecies concerning the Roman empire, in which Rome is figured as a three-headed eagle that oppresses the world and is finally destroyed by a roaring lion a figure of the Messiah. There is a fantastic story of how the Hebrew Scriptures were all destroyed in the Babylonian exile and then perfectly restored by the miraculous inspiration of Ezra as he dictated all of the books to five scribes over a period of forty days. Along with the canonical books, Ezra dictates 70 secret books that are to be reserved for the wise. Second Esdras is presented as being one of these secret books. Nevertheless, they were included in the Apocrypha of the King James version. This is a didactic and romantic tale written in Aramaic probably around B. Fragments of the Aramaic text were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. The story is of a Jewish family taken to Nineveh during the Babylonian captivity. Tobit, the blind father, sends his son Tobias on a journey to collect a debt. On his way Tobias is led by an angel in disguise Raphael to the house of a virgin who had been married seven times, but whose husbands were all slain by a demon on their wedding night. Tobias marries the girl and drives away the demon by burning the heart of a certain fish in the bedroom, and with the help of Raphael. Written in Hebrew about B. The Hebrew text is lost. It is a story about a beautiful young widow named Judith meaning "Jewess" who saves her city from a military siege. She returns with his head and shows it to her people, exhorting the men to go forth and rout the enemy, which they do. Throughout this story she is presented as a woman who is very keen to observe the Law of Moses. These consist of six long paragraphs inserted in the Septuagint version of Esther in several places, and are thought to be the work of an Egyptian Jew writing around B. They are designed to provide the book with a more religious tone, and to make it clear that it was for the sake of their piety that the Jews were delivered from the evil designs of the Gentiles related in the canonical book. These additions were put at the end of the book by Jerome when he made his Latin translation because he accepted only the Hebrew text as canonical. Sometimes called simply Wisdom. This book is a collection of theological and devotional essays first written in Greek by an Alexandrian Jew about B. The author compares Jewish religion with Greek philosophy, and shows faith to be the highest form of wisdom. The book is edifying and worthy of much respect. It has often been quoted by Christian writers in the past. Written first in Hebrew about B. The book

consists mainly of proverbs and other wise sayings about common life, strung together in short discourses or organized in topical sections. It also contains longer discourses about religious life and faith, which are well worth reading. It came to be called Ecclesiasticus the "churchly" book because in early times it was often read in church services, being the most highly regarded of the apocryphal books. This book should not be confused with the canonical book of Ecclesiastes. The material is presented as if by Baruch, the disciple of Jeremiah, during the time of the Babylonian exile. Often printed as chapter 6 of Baruch, this short work purports to be a letter from Jeremiah to the Jews in exile in Babylon, but this is generally regarded as an imposture, or a mere literary device used by an author writing around B. It is essentially a short tract against pagan idolatry, and makes much use of ridicule and sarcasm. An embellishment of the ordeal of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego recorded in the canonical book of Daniel, designed to be added after verse 23 of the third chapter. It consists of prayers and hymns of the sort which might have been offered to God by the three while in the furnace. The Story of Susanna. A short story about how two lecherous old men tried to compel a beautiful and pious young wife, Susanna, to lie with them, and then publicly accused her of adultery when she refused. At a trial they give false testimony and she is condemned by the council of elders. But Daniel the prophet is divinely inspired to know the facts of the case, and he exposes the two men in a second trial, after which they are put to death. Bel and the Dragon. This is a combination of two stories which were also attached to Daniel in the Septuagint, at the end of the book. The story of Bel concerns a Babylonian idol of that name, to which Daniel refused to give an offering. When he was challenged he told the Persian king that the vain idol had no need of offerings because it could not eat anything. The king then required the priests of Bel to prove otherwise or die. The priests tried to deceive the king by entering the temple of Bel at night through a secret entrance and eating the food-offerings themselves, but they were exposed by Daniel, who had spread ashes on the temple floor, revealing their footprints. The priests of Bel were then slain and their temple destroyed. In the story of the Dragon Daniel refuses to worship an actual living "dragon," and accepts a challenge to slay the dragon without sword or staff. He feeds the dragon a concoction of pitch, fat, and hair, which causes it to burst open and die. Both of these stories were evidently written around B. The Prayer of Manasseh. This is a psalm of repentance, composed to suit the situation of Manasseh, the king of Judah who was carried captive to Babylon see 2 Chronicles. This book was rejected by the Roman Catholics at the Council of Trent in 1546. This book was written in Hebrew about B. The Hebrew text was seen by Jerome, but is now lost. It is a sober but stirring historical account of Jewish history from B. It is highly regarded by historians as a source of accurate information. This is not a sequel to First Maccabees, but a different account of many of the same events related in that book down to B. It is generally thought to be later than First Maccabees, but earlier than A. Some statements in this book support the Roman Catholic teachings on purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the intercessory work of glorified "saints. Title to Apocrypha section: The books and treatises which among the Fathers of old are not reckoned to be of like authority with the other books of the Bible, neither are they found in the Canon of Hebrew. If, however, any one receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have by custom been read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate, and knowingly and deliberately rejects the aforesaid traditions, let him be accursed. And the other books as Jerome saith the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners:

5: Brenton's English Septuagint (LXX) (Volume 1) | Original Bibles

The Septuagint Bible arose in the 3rd century B.C., when the Hebrew Bible, or Old Testament, was translated into Greek. The name Septuagint derives from the Latin word septuaginta, which means The Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible is called Septuagint because 70 or 72 Jewish scholars.

These are the books most frequently referred to by the casual appellation "the Apocrypha". The Bible and the Puritan revolution[edit] The British Puritan revolution of the s brought a change in the way many British publishers handled the apocryphal material associated with the Bible. The Puritans used the standard of Sola Scriptura Scripture Alone to determine which books would be included in the canon. The Confession provided the rationale for the exclusion: Other early Bible editions[edit] This section needs expansion. You can help by adding to it. May All English translations of the Bible printed in the sixteenth century included a section or appendix for Apocryphal books. The Geneva Bible placed the Prayer of Manasseh after 2 Chronicles; the rest of the Apocrypha were placed in an inter-testamental section. The 1st edition omitted the Prayer of Manasseh and the Rest of Esther, although these were included in the 2nd edition. In the Spanish Reina Bible, following the example of the pre-Clementine Latin Vulgate , contained the deuterocanonical books in its Old Testament. Modern editions[edit] All King James Bibles published before included the Apocrypha, [37] though separately to denote them as not equal to Scripture proper, as noted by Jerome in the Vulgate, to which he gave the name, "The Apocrypha. They reasoned that not printing the Apocrypha within the Bible would prove to be less costly to produce. Modern non-Catholic reprintings of the Clementine Vulgate commonly omit the Apocrypha section. Many reprintings of older versions of the Bible now omit the apocrypha and many newer translations and revisions have never included them at all. There are some exceptions to this trend, however. Some editions of the Revised Standard Version and the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible include not only the Apocrypha listed above, but also the third and fourth books of Maccabees , and Psalm The American Bible Society lifted restrictions on the publication of Bibles with the Apocrypha in The British and Foreign Bible Society followed in As such, they are included in the Old Testament with no distinction between these books and the rest of the Old Testament. This follows the tradition of the Eastern Orthodox Church where the Septuagint is the received version of Old Testament scripture, considered itself inspired in agreement with some of the Fathers , such as St Augustine , rather than the Hebrew Masoretic text followed by all other modern translations. These texts are not traditionally segregated into a separate section, nor are they usually called apocrypha. In common usage, however, the term pseudepigrapha is often used by way of distinction to refer to apocryphal writings that do not appear in printed editions of the Bible , as opposed to the texts listed above.

6: Septuagint (LXX) Online Texts

The Septuagint (from the Latin: septuaginta• literally "seventy", often abbreviated as or LXX and sometimes called the Greek Old Testament) is the earliest extant Greek translation of the Hebrew scriptures from the original Hebrew.

The Story of Ahikar Poetical 1. The Psalms of Solomon 2. Psalm Historical 1. Books accepted by some-Apocrypha These books are what most people think of when we refer to the Apocrypha. The term was applied because the books were not considered scripture, and therefore handling them did not cause ones hands to be defiled. The early members of the church felt no urge to denounce the additional writings the apocrypha which came along with the Greek translation LXX of the Hebrew Scriptures. These same books Apocrypha were not found in the Hebrew canon, the writers of the New Testament; though they quote from the Septuagint, do not quote from the Apocrypha. The period between Testaments, between B. In the early church, there was debate as some used the Apocrypha to help with Christian instruction. Others such as Augustine d. Calvin and those who followed him rejected the authority of the Apocrypha, stating that its words were not divinely inspired. In the end the Catholic Church, elevated the status of the Apocrypha to the level of scripture, while Protestant churches placed it on par with non-inspired writings. Is the Apocrypha Canon? There are several arguments put forward to show the Apocrypha should be considered part of the Old Testament Canon. Arguments for Inclusion Replies to the Arguments 1. There is no evidence that the Septuagint of the first century contained the Apocrypha. The earliest Greek manuscripts, which contain them, date from the 4th Century. Some of the early church fathers used the Apocrypha as scripture in public worship. Though respected an honored for their status in the early church, the early church fathers were not inspired, so their actions and writings must be compared to scripture as opposed to themselves. Some of the early church fathers accepted all of the books of the Apocrypha as canonical, for example Irenaeus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria. Although some fathers accepted them, others vehemently opposed their use, including Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Origen and Jerome. The earliest Greek manuscripts date to the time of Augustine, whose influence is reflected in the codex manuscripts. In addition, none of the Greek Manuscripts contain all the Apocryphal books. No Greek manuscript has the exact list of Apocryphal books accepted by the Council of Trent 6. The discoveries at Qumran included their libraries which would have included Bibles and other books. Canonical books at the Dead Sea site, were written on special parchment and in script which was not the case with the Apocryphal books. Arguments against the Apocrypha 1. There is not sufficient evidence that they were reckoned as canonical by the Jews anywhere. With a years difference between translation and existing manuscripts. Enough time for Apocryphal books to slip in. LXX manuscripts do not all have the same apocryphal books and names. The manuscripts at the Dead Sea make it clear no canonical book of the OT was written later than the Persian period. Philo, Alexandrian Jewish philosopher 20 BC AD , quoted the Old Testament prolifically, and even recognized the threefold classification, but he never quoted from the Apocrypha as inspired. Jesus and the New Testament writes never once quote the Apocrypha, although there are hundreds of quotes and references to almost the entire book of the Old Testament. No canon or council of the Christian church recognized the Apocrypha as inspired for nearly four centuries. Many of the great fathers of the early church spoke out against the Apocryphafor example, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Athanasius. Not until AD in a polemical action at the counter-Reformation Council of Trent , did the apocryphal books receive full canonical status by the Roman Catholic Church. Summary of Apocrypha Books [4] Book.

7: What is the Septuagint?

The Septuagint version having been current for about three centuries before the time when the books of the New Testament were written, it is not surprising that the Apostles should have used it more often than not in making citations from the Old Testament.

Brenton The history of the origin of this translation was embellished with various fables at so early a period, that it has been a work of patient critical research in later times to bring into plain light the facts which may be regarded as well authenticated. We need not wonder that but little is known with accuracy on this subject; for, with regard to the ancient versions of the Scriptures in general, we possess no information whatever as to the time or place of their execution, or by whom they were made: If, then, our knowledge of the origin of the Septuagint be meagre, it is at least more extensive than that which we possess of other translations. After the conquests of Alexander had brought Egypt under Macedonian rule, the newly-founded city of Alexandria became especially a place where the Greek language, although by no means in its purest form, was the medium of written and spoken communication amongst the varied population there brought together. This Alexandrian dialect is the idiom in which the Septuagint version was made. Amongst other inhabitants of Alexandria the number of Jews was considerable: Hence the existence of the sacred books of the Jews would easily become known to the Greek population. The earliest writer who gives an account of the Septuagint version is Aristobulus, a Jew who lived at the commencement of the second century B. He says that the version of the Law into Greek was completed under the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and that Demetrius Phalereus had been employed about it. Now, Demetrius died about the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and hence it has been reasonably inferred that Aristobulus is a witness that the work of translation had been commenced under Ptolemy Soter. Different opinions have been formed as to what is intended by Aristobulus when he speaks of the Law: The fact may, however, be regarded as certain, that prior to the year B. The embellishments and fictitious additions which this account soon received might be scarcely worthy of notice in this place, were it not that they are intimately connected with the authority which this version was once supposed to possess, and with the name by which it is commonly known. A writer, who calls himself Aristeas, says that when Ptolemy Philadelphus was engaged in the formation of the Alexandrian Library, he was advised by Demetrius Phalereus to procure a translation of the sacred books of the Jews. The king accordingly, as a preliminary, purchased the freedom of more than one hundred thousand Jewish captives, and he then sent a deputation, of which Aristeas himself was one, to Eleazar the high-priest to request a copy of the Jewish Law and seventy-two interpreters, six out of each tribe. To this the priest is represented to have agreed; and after the arrival of the translators and their magnificent reception by the king, they are said to have been conducted to an island by Demetrius, who wrote down the renderings on which they agreed by mutual conference; and thus the work is stated to have been completed in seventy-two days. The translators are then said to have received from the king most abundant rewards; and the Jews are stated to have asked permissions to take copies of the version. Other additions were subsequently made to this story: The basis of truth which appears to be under this story seems to be, that it was an Egyptian king who caused the translation to be made, and that it was from the Royal Library at Alexandria that the Hellenistic Jews received the copies which they used. In examining the version itself, it bears manifest proof that it was not executed by Jews of Palestine, but by those of Egypt: It may also be doubted whether in the year B. Some in rejecting the fabulous embellishments have also discarded all connected with them: Some have thus supposed that the translation was made by Alexandrian Jews for their own use, in order to meet a necessity which they felt to have a version of the Scriptures in the tongue which had become vernacular to them. There would be, however, many difficulties in the way of this hypothesis. We would hardly suppose that in a space of thirty-five years the Alexandrian Jews had found such a translation needful or desirable: The most reasonable conclusion is, that the version was executed for the Egyptian king; and that the Hellenistic Jews afterwards

used it as they became less and less familiar with the language of the original. If the expression of Aristobulus does not designate the whole of the books of the Old Testament as translated in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the question arises, When were the other books besides the Pentateuch turned into Greek? To this no definite answer could be given: The variety of the translators is proved by the unequal character of the version: The Pentateuch is considered to be the part the best executed, while the book of Isaiah appears to be the worst. In estimating the general character of the version, it must be remembered that the translators were Jews, full of traditional thoughts of their own as to the meaning of Scripture; and thus nothing short of a miracle could have prevented them from infusing into their version the thoughts which were current in their own minds. They could only translate passages as they themselves understood them. This is evidently the case when their work is examined. It would be, however, too much to say that they translated with dishonest intention; for it cannot be doubted that they wished to express their Scriptures truly in Greek, and that their deviations from accuracy may be simply attributed to the incompetency of some of the interpreters, and the tone of mental and spiritual feeling which was common to them all. One difficulty which they had to overcome was that of introducing theological ideas, which till then had only their proper terms in Hebrew, into a language of Gentiles, which till then had terms for no religious notions except those of heathens. Hence the necessity of using many words and phrases in new and appropriated senses. These remarks are not intended as depreciatory of the Septuagint version: One of the earliest of those writers who mention the Greek translation of the Scriptures, speaks also of the version as not fully adequate. The Prologue of Jesus the son of Sirach written as many suppose B. Not only so, but even the Law and the prophecies and the rest of the books differ not a little as to the things said in them. Doubtless coming into Egypt he was more conscious of the defects of the Septuagint version than could have been the case with Egyptian Jews, who had used the translation commonly and habitually for a century and a quarter. At Alexandria the Hellenistic Jews used the version, and gradually attached to it the greatest possible authority: In examining the Pentateuch of the Septuagint in connection with the Hebrew text, and with the copies preserved by the Samaritans in their crooked letters, it is remarkable that in very many passages the reading of the Septuagint accord with the Samaritan copies where they differ from the Jewish. We cannot here notice the various theories which have been advanced to account for this accordance of the Septuagint with the Samaritan copies of the Hebrew; indeed it is not very satisfactory to enter into the details of the subject, because no theory hitherto brought forward explains all the facts, or meets all the difficulties. To one point, however, we will advert, because it has not been sufficiently taken into account, -- in the places in which the Samaritan and Jewish copies of the Hebrew text differ, in important and material points, the Septuagint accords much more with the Jewish than with the Samaritan copies, and in a good many points it introduces variations unknown to either. The Septuagint version having been current for about three centuries before the time when the books of the New Testament were written, it is not surprising that the Apostles should have used it more often than not in making citations from the Old Testament. They used it as an honestly-made version in pretty general use at the time when they wrote. They did not on every occasion give an authoritative translation of each passage *de novo*, but they used what was already familiar to the ears of converted Hellenists, when it was sufficiently accurate to suit the matter in hand. In fact, they used it as did their contemporary Jewish writers, Philo and Josephus, but not, however, with the blind implicitness of the former. In consequence of the fact that the New Testament writers used on many occasions the Septuagint version, some have deduced a new argument for its authority, -- a theory which we might have thought to be sufficiently disproved by the defects of the version, which evince that it is merely a human work. But the fact that the New Testament writers used this version on many occasions supplies a new proof in opposition to the idea of its authority, for in not a few places they do not follow it, but they supply a version of their own which rightly represents the Hebrew text, although contradicting the Septuagint. The use, however, which the writers of the New Testament have made of the Septuagint version must always invest it with a peculiar interest; we thus see what honour God may be pleased to put on an honestly-made version, since we find that inspired writers often used such a version, when it was sufficiently near the original to suit

the purpose for which it was cited, instead of rendering the Hebrew text de novo on every occasion. Another important point on which the Septuagint stands in close connection with the New Testament is the general phraseology of the version, -- a phraseology in which the traces of Hebrew elements are most marked, but with regard to which we should mistake greatly if we supposed that it originated with the New Testament writers. Thus we may see that the study of the Septuagint is almost needful to any biblical scholars who wishes to estimate adequately the phraseology and usus loquendi of the New Testament. Besides the direct citations in the New Testament in which the Septuagint is manifestly used, there are not a few passages in which it is clear that the train of expression has been formed on words and phrases of the Septuagint: Thus, whatever may be our estimate of the defects found in the Septuagint -- its inadequate renderings, its departures from the sense of the Hebrew, its doctrinal deficiencies owing to the limited apprehensions of the translators -- there is no reason whatever for our neglecting the version, or not being fully alive to its real value and importance. After the diffusion of Christianity, copies of the Septuagint became widely dispersed amongst the new communities that were formed; so that before many years had elapsed this version must have been as much in the hands of Gentiles as of Jews. The veneration with which the Jews had treated this version as is shown in the case of Philo and Josephus, gave place to a very contrary feeling when they found how it could be used against them in argument: As the Gentile Christians were generally unacquainted with Hebrew, they were unable to meet the Jews on the ground which they now took; and as the Gentile Christians at this time believed the most extraordinary legends of the origin of the version, so that they fully embraced the opinions of its authority and inspiration, they necessarily regarded the denial on the part of the Jews of its accuracy, as little less than blasphemy, and as a proof of their blindness. In the course of the second century, three other complete versions of the Old Testament into Greek were executed: He is described as a Jew or Jewish proselyte of Pontus, and the date commonly attributed to his version is about the year A. His translation is said to have been executed for the express purpose of opposing the authority of the Septuagint: His labour was evidently directed in opposing the passages which the Christians were accustomed to cite from the Septuagint as applicable to the Lord Jesus. The general characteristic of this version is bold literality of rendering: From the scrupulosity of Aquila in rendering each Hebrew word, his work, if we possessed it complete and not merely in scattered fragments, would be of great value in textual criticism. He is described as an Ebionite, a kind of semi-Christian. His version seems to have been executed in good and pure Greek: His version is in many parts based on the Septuagint. He is less servile in his adherence to the words of the Hebrew than Aquila, although he is void of the freedom of Symmachus. His knowledge of Hebrew was certainly but limited, and without the Septuagint it is hardly probable that he could have undertaken this version. Thus, before the end of the second century there were, besides the Septuagint, three versions of the Old Testament in Greek, known to both Jews and Christians. All this could not fail in making the Old Testament Scriptures better known and more widely read. Although many Christians believed in the inspiration and authority of the Septuagint, yet this could not have been universally the case; otherwise the disuse of the real Septuagint version of the book of Daniel, and the adoption of that of Theodotion in its stead, could never have taken place. This must have arisen from an apprehension of the poverty and inaccuracy of the Septuagint in this book, so that another version similar in its general style was gladly adopted. This learned and enterprising scholar, having acquired a knowledge of Hebrew, found that in many respects the copies of the Septuagint differed from the Hebrew text. It seems to be uncertain whether he regarded such differences as having arisen from mistakes on the part of the copyists, or from errors of the original translators themselves. The object which he proposed to himself was not to restore the Septuagint to its original condition, nor yet to correct mere errors of translation simply as such, but to cause that the Church should possess a text of the Septuagint in which all additions to the Hebrew should be marked with an obelus, and in which all that the Septuagint omitted should be added from one of the other versions marked with an asterick. He also indicated readings in the Septuagint which were so incorrect that the passage ought to be changed for the corresponding one in another version. With the object of thus amending the Septuagint, he formed his great works, the Hexapla and

Tetrapla; these were as the names imply works in which the page was divided respectively into six columns and into four columns. The Hexapla contained, 1st, the Hebrew text; 2nd, the Hebrew text expressed in Greek characters; 3rd, the version of Aquila; 4th, that of Symmachus; 5th, the Septuagint; 6th, Theodotion. The Tetrapla contained merely the four last columns. Besides these four versions of the entire Old Testament, Origen employed three anonymous Greek versions of particular books; these are commonly called the fifth, sixth, and seventh versions. Hence in the parts in which two of these versions are added, the work was designated Octapla, and where all the three appeared, it was called Enneapla. References were then made from the column of the Septuagint to other versions, so as to complete and correct it: This recension by Origen has generally been called the Hexaplar text. The Hexapla itself is said never to have been copied: The Hexaplar text is best known from a Syriac version which was made from it; of this many books have been published from a MS. This Syro-Hexaplar translation preserves the marks of the Greek text, and the references to the other translations. It may yet be made of great use in separating the readings which were introduced by Origen from those of an older date. There were two other early attempts to revise the Septuagint besides that of Origen. In the beginning of the fourth century, Lucian, a presbyter on Antioch, and Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, undertook similar labours of the same kind. These two recensions which they were in the proper sense of the term were much used in the Eastern Churches. From the fourth century and onward, we know of no definite attempt to revise the text of the Septuagint, or to correct the discrepancies of various copies. It is probable, however, that just as the text of the Greek New Testament became in a great measure fixed into the same form as we find it in the modern copies, something of the same kind must have been the case with the Septuagint. As to the Greek New Testament, this seems to have occurred about the eleventh century, when the mass of copies were written within the limits of the patriarchate of Constantinople. It is probable that certain copies approved at the metropolis, both politically and religiously, of those who used the Greek tongue, were tacitly taken as a kind of standard. We find amongst the members of the Eastern Churches who use the Greek language, that the Septuagint has been and is still so thoroughly received as authentic Scripture, that any effort to introduce amongst them versions which accurately represent the Hebrew as has been attempted in modern times has been wholly fruitless. Thus the Septuagint demands our attention, were it only from the fact that the whole circle of religious ideas and thoughts amongst Christians in the East has always been moulded according to this version. Without an acquaintance with the Septuagint, numerous allusions in the writings of the Fathers become wholly unintelligible, and even important doctrinal discussions and difficulties such even as some connected with the Arian controversy become wholly unintelligible.

8: Handy Concordance Of The Septuagint PDF | Original Bibles

"The earliest version of the Old Testament Scriptures which is extant, or of which we possess any certain knowledge, is the translation executed at Alexandria in the third century before the Christian era: this version has been so habitually known by the name of the SEPTUAGINT, that the attempt of some learned men in modern times to introduce.

9: Introduction. An Historical Account of the Septuagint Version

The Septuagint is the Old Greek version of the Bible. It includes translations of all the books found in the Hebrew (Old Testament) canon, and as such it is the first known Bible translation. It also includes the so-called Apocryphal or deuterocanonical books, some translated from Hebrew originals and others originally composed in Greek.

THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA

V1 pdf

Scanning letter size ument results in legal size Robert Blake; general-at-sea Scan ument to Brooklyns Green-Wood Cemetery Recycling international The path of wisdom Back to the basics of human health Cold calling for chickens Ma. Lorena Barros Maita Gomez The power of it jobs book Partners in learning 16 Troubles of the Hair-Buyer General Reliability of cardiovascular and metabolic response to hydraulic resistive exercise Telugu to bengali learning The wit and wisdom of Yogi Berra THE SUPREME COURT AND SECTARIAN INSTITUTIONS. Rosies hospital story How You Can Walk in the Spirit (Transferable Concepts (Paperback (Transferable Concepts) Proofiness the dark arts of mathematical deception Design analysis in rock mechanics 2nd edition filetype Analysis of pride and prejudice HIV and social work The Young Officers Companion Or Essays On Military Duties And Qualities With Examples And Illustrations F Geometry integration applications connections Reasoning Phil Johnson-Laird The broken strand Celebrate the Season (Christmas 2005 Daymakers) Great male comedians 2014 kia sedona repair manual The complete idiots pocket guide to Excel 5 The Group Therapists Notebook Punishment of a vixen Spearpoint; teacher in America. Clinical surgery for the instruction of practitioners and students of surgery. The norton anthology of american literature 1865 to present The Cruiser Uganda Ch. 17 On the Subject of Growth K-12 grading system in the philippines Recipe for temptation maureen smith Baggage Masters Report