known how in Palestine the Targum was handed down orally for centuries before it was at last reduced to writing; and, if, on the contrary, at Alexandria a written version came into existence so early, it is far from improbable that this was due to some influence from without. That the work is purely Jewish in character is only what was in­evitable in any case. The translators were necessarily Jews and were necessarily and entirely guided by the living tradition which had its focus in the synagogal lessons. And hence it is easily understood that the version was ignored by the Greeks, who must have found it barbarous and unintelligible, but obtained speedy acceptance with the Jews, first in private use and at length also in the synagogue service.

The next direct evidence which we have as to the origin of the LXX. is the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, from which it appears that about 130 b.c. not only the law but “the prophets and the other books” were extant in Greek. With this it agrees that the most ancient relics of Jewish- Greek literature, preserved in the extracts made by Alex­ander Polyhistor (Eus., *Praep. Ev.,* ix.), all show acquaint­ance with the LXX. These later translations too were not made to meet the needs of the synagogue, but express a literary movement among the Hellenistic Jews, stimulated by the favourable reception given to the Greek Pentateuch, which enabled the translators to count on finding an inter­ested public. If a translation was well received by reading circles amongst the Jews, it gradually acquired public ac­knowledgment and was finally used also in the synagogue, so far as lessons from other books than the Pentateuch were used at all. But originally the translations were mere private enterprises, as appears from the prologue to Ecclesiasticus and the colophon to Esther. It appears also that it was long before the whole Septuagint was finished and treated as a complete work.

As the work of translation went on so gradually and new books were always added to the collection the compass of the Greek Bible came to be somewhat indefinite. The law always maintained its pre-eminence as the basis of the canon ; but the prophetic collection changed its as­pect by having various Hagiographa incorporated with it according to an arbitrary arrangement by subjects. The distinction made in Palestine between Hagiographa and Apocrypha was never properly established among the Hel­lenists. In some books the translators took the liberty to make considerable additions to the original, and these additions—*e.g.,* those to Daniel—became a part of the Septuagint. Nevertheless learned Hellenists were quite well aware of the limits of the canon and respected them. Philo can be shown to have known the Apocrypha, but he never cites them, much less allegorizes them or uses them in proof of his tenets. And in some measure the widening of the Old Testament canon in the Septuagint must be laid to the account of Christians. As regards the character of the version, it is a first attempt, and so is memorable and worthy of respect, but at the same time displays all the weaknesses of a first attempt. Though the influence of contemporary ideas is sometimes perceptible, the Septuagint is no paraphrase, but in general closely follows the Hebrew, —so closely indeed that we can hardly understand it with­out a process of retroversion, and that a true Greek could not have found any satisfaction in it. The same Greek word is forced to assume the whole range of senses which belongs in Semitic speech to the derivatives of a single root; a Hebrew expression which has various Greek equivalents according to the context is constantly rendered in one way ; the aorist, like the Hebrew perfect, is employed as an in­choative with a much wider range of application than is tolerated in classical Greek. At the same time, many passages are freely rendered and turned where there is no

particular need to do so, and that even in books like the *Prophetae Priores,* in which the rendering is generally quite stiff. The literalness of the version is therefore due not to scrupulousness but to want of skill, and probably in part also to accommodation to a kind of Jewish Greek jargon which had already developed in the mouths of the people and was really Hebrew or Aramaic in disguise. This Jewish dialect in turn found its standard in the Septuagint.

As the version is the work of many hands, it is naturally not of uniform character throughout all its parts,—indeed considerable varieties of character sometimes appear in one and the same book. The older constituents of the canon have an unmistakable family likeness as contrasted with the later books ; this one may see by comparing Kings with Chronicles or Isaiah and Jeremiah with Daniel. The Pentateuch is considered to be particularly well done and Isaiah to be particularly unhappy. Some of the Hagio­grapha (Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Chronicles) are reproduced with verbal closeness; others, on the contrary (Job, Esdras, Esther, Daniel), are marked by a very free treatment of the text, or even by considerable additions. It is not, how­ever, always easy to tell whether a Septuagint addition is entirely due to the translator or belongs to the original text, which lay before him in a recension divergent from the Massoretic. The chief impulse in recent times to thorough investigation of the character of the several parts of the Septuagint was given by Lagarde in his *Anmerk­ungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien,* Leipsic, 1863.

The Septuagint came into general use with the Grecian Jews even in the synagogue. Philo and Josephus use it, and so do the New Testament writers. But very early small corrections seem to have been introduced, especially by such Palestinians as had occasion to use the LXX., in consequence partly of divergent interpretation, partly of differences of text or of pronunciation (particularly of proper names). The Old Testament passages cited by authors of the first century of the Christian era, especially those in the Apo­calypse, show many such variations from the Septuagint, and, curiously enough, these often correspond with the later versions (particularly with Theodotion), so that the latter seem to rest on a fixed tradition. Corrections in the pro­nunciation of proper names so as to come closer to the Massoretic pronunciation are especially frequent in Jose­phus. Finally a reaction against the use of the Septuagint set in among the Jews after the destruction of the temple, —a movement which was connected with the strict defini­tion of the canon and the fixing of an authoritative text by the rabbins of Palestine. But long usage had made it impossible for the Jews to do without a Greek Bible, and to meet this want a new version was prepared corre­sponding accurately with the canon and text of the Phari­sees. This was the version of Aquila, which took the place of the Septuagint in the synagogues, and long con­tinued in use there.@@1 A little later other translations were made by Jews or Jewish Christians, which also followed the official Jewish canon and text, but were not such slavish reproductions as Aquila’s version ; two of these were Greek (Theodotion, Symmachus) and one Syriac (Peshito).

Meantime the Greek and Latin Christians kept to the old version, which now became the official Bible of the catholic church. Yet here also, in process of time, a certain distrust of the Septuagint began to be felt, as its divergence from the Jewish text was observed through comparison of the younger versions based on that text, or came into notice through the frequent discussions be­tween Jews and Christians as to the Messianic prophecies. @@@1 *Corpus Juris Ciυ.,* Nov. cxlvl