

his statement is erroneous to say that in the Septuagint 7 and 62 weeks are treated as a single period.

As we have seen Theodotion's translation inserted the word "and" where there is no evidence for it in the Aramaic and changed the == and inserted punctuation in such a way as to make the 7 weeks and 62 weeks all go with the first sentence instead of part of it belonging with the first clause and part with the second clause. It would seem likely that Aquila was a translation from Theodotion and therefore does not constitute a second witness. More important would be the statements in Aquila and Symmachus. As far as they are concerned the evidence he gives is in footnote (2) which says "In the case of AQUILA, and also SYMMACHUS, we have his rendering of verse 26 but not of verse 25 (see Fredericus Field, Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1875, vol. 2, p. 926).

AQUILA's rendering of verse 26 reads: "And after the 7 and 62 weeks the anointed one will be utterly destroyed." SYMMACHUS's rendering differs only verbally."

Thus we see that the statement that the first segment is treated as a single period does ==is not true of either Aquila or Symmachus because such a statement if it occurred would be in verse 25 which is missing as far as our evidence is concerned. In verse 26 these two simply say that after the 7 and 62 weeks the anointed one will be utterly destroyed. Thus showing that reference was made to two different periods rather than one and that what happened at the end of the first of these periods would be mentioned in verse 25 as it is in the Aramaic and in all the original evidence but that verse is missing so there is no foundation whatever for Beckwith's statements.