

---

# Origins, Legends and Rabbinic Attitudes Concerning the Septuagint<sup>1</sup>

Peg Kershenbaum

## WHAT IS THE SEPTUAGINT?

The Septuagint, strictly speaking, is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Pentateuch produced in the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus of Egypt (285-247 BCE). In common parlance, however, Septuagint (or: LXX) refers to the Greek translation of the entire corpus of the Hebrew Bible plus several extra-biblical books. The translation of the complete Hebrew Bible took place over time, progressing as the books entered the canon or as scrolls from Palestine arrived in Egypt.<sup>2</sup> By 132 BCE, according to the testimony of the author of the prologue to *Sirach*, an extra-canonical book, there were Greek translations of the Law, the Prophets and “the rest of the books.”<sup>3</sup> However, not all the books of the Hebrew Bible seem to have been translated even by the 1st century CE. While the authors of the Gospels and other books of the Christian Bible generally cite the Greek version of *Tanakh*, they omit reference to several books.<sup>4</sup>

## OVERVIEW OF FORCES AT WORK THAT LED TO THE CREATION OF THE SEPTUAGINT IN ALEXANDRIA

That a Greek translation of the Torah was produced at all reveals important information about the culture of Alexandrian Jewish society in the time of the Egyptian ruler Ptolemy II Philadelphus. The Jewish inhabitants in the eponymous city of Alexander the Great (356-323 BCE) had assimilated to such an extent that they no longer understood the Hebrew of the sacred texts. Unlike their fellow Jews in Palestine, or Babylonia,<sup>5</sup> they were not even comfortable with the Aramaic of the *meturgemanin*, the translator-commentators who conveyed the meaning of the Torah as it was read to the assembled Jews in the different Jewish communities. The native language of the Alexandrian Jewish community was the special blend<sup>6</sup> of Greek, Egyptian, Aramaic and Hebrew found in the earlier books of the *hebdomekonta*, as the Septuagint was known to them.

The Alexandrian Jewish community had enjoyed civic rights and even full citizenship from the start of their residency in the days of Alexander himself.<sup>7</sup> Jews were held in high esteem for having served loyally as mercenaries in Alexander’s armies and they continued to be an important part of the city after his death. According to Philo (20 BCE-50 CE), two of the five districts of the city were known as Jewish districts because of the high concentration of Jews.<sup>8</sup> While loyal to Jerusalem, the Jews of Alexandria were loyal to the government of the Ptolemies as well and were permitted to live under the direct rule of their own Ethnarch. Even though Ptolemy I (called Lagi or Soter; 322-285 BCE) attacked Judea and carried off Jewish and Samaritan captives from Jerusalem and its environs, he settled them and granted them civic rights in Alexandria.<sup>9</sup> Such was the treatment of Jews under the Ptolemies that many more came to settle throughout the period of their control of the

area (322 BCE-30 CE). Later, during the time of oppression under Antiochus IV Epiphanes (215-164 BCE) in Judea, more Jews took up residence in Egypt.

Alexandria was not the first location in Egypt where Jews had been allowed to settle. About 528 miles to the south of Alexandria there had been a flourishing Jewish community on the island of Elephantine<sup>10</sup> in the Nile, for several centuries. Some believe that the settlement can be dated to the time of Shishaq (or Shashanq<sup>11</sup>), the tenth-century Pharaoh who had protected Jereboam during the reign of King Solomon. When, after the death of Solomon, in the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign<sup>12</sup> (926-917 BCE), Shishaq invaded Jerusalem and plundered the Temple, he is thought to have carried off captives and settled them in Elephantine.<sup>13</sup> A few centuries later, under the reign of King Manasseh (around 650 BCE), Jews fought as mercenaries for Psammetichus I (664-610 BCE) against Ethiopia. Elephantine may have been made a military installation at that time.<sup>14</sup> In the next century, according to evidence in the Book of Jeremiah (44:1), Jews fled to Migdol, Tahpanhes, Noph and Pathros after the death of Gedaliah (586 BCE). At that time, when most Jews were sent into exile in Babylonia, some, dragging the prophet Jeremiah with them, fled to Egypt (Jer. 43:6).<sup>15</sup> Thus, there was an established community in Upper Egypt that attracted some Jews even during the Persian period, although Cyrus the Great declared that Jews might return to their homeland.<sup>16</sup>

One of the most surprising features of the Jewish settlement in Elephantine was its Temple. This was a fully functioning institution complete with priesthood, sacrifices, and a system of mandatory tithing. The construction of the Elephantine temple took place either in the mid-seventh century, contemporary with the reign of King Manasseh of Judah or during the late seventh-early sixth centuries, during the reign of King Jehoiakim. Thus, it predated the Josianic reforms (621 BCE) which would have condemned it out of hand as a "high place" in competition with the Temple in Jerusalem. The Elephantine Temple continued to function after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 586 BCE and even after the building of the second Temple in about 515 BCE. As Joseph Modrzejewski points out, during that time, it was "the only place in the world where Jewish sacrificial worship was practiced. In a manner of speaking, Elephantine had temporarily replaced Jerusalem."<sup>17</sup>

In the fifth century BCE, there was a sudden surge of Egyptian "nationalism" as the native population sought to throw off the yoke of Persian rule. In the midst of the turmoil, the Egyptian community nearest the Jewish enclave at Elephantine lashed out at Jewish practice and sacked the temple. Ostensibly, the animal sacrifice practiced there was abhorrent to the Egyptians whose Temple to Khnum, a divinity represented by a ram, was in the same environs as the Jewish temple. The Jews protested to the local satrap and, while he did not give permission to rebuild the temple, he was able to quell the rebellion. In a politically savvy move, the Jewish community at Elephantine then sent a petition to the satrap of Judah and to the civic governor of Samaria, appealing to them to grant permission for this most ancient institution to be rebuilt. The appeal worked. However, either as a matter of respect for the Jerusalem priesthood or out of concern lest there be a resurgence of violence instigated by the worshippers of Khnum, the authorities did not grant permission for the sacrifice of animals. In about 406 BCE the Temple at Elephantine was reconsecrated. However, the Egyptian rebellion reignited shortly after this and slightly after 401 BCE, the entire Jewish population of Elephantine was destroyed.<sup>18</sup>

Although the settlement at Elephantine was older, the Alexandrian community was more cosmopolitan. Located near the seat of government, and near the remarkable Library,<sup>19</sup> the Jewish citizens of Alexandria were familiar with the culture and shared the pride of the sophisticated majority. There is a tradition attributed to Aristobulus (second century BCE) and preserved in Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius (later Christian sources), that Alexandrian Jews believed that a very old Greek translation of parts of the Torah had existed and had exerted influence on the philosophical thought of Plato (428/7-348/7 BCE).<sup>20</sup> It is possible that this sense of pride colored the legends of the composition of the Septuagint.

### SEPTUAGINT: THE LEGEND

There are three primary Greek sources that describe the creation of this, the earliest known Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, produced after the conquests of Alexander the Great (356-323 BCE): the *Letter of Aristeas* (purportedly second half of third century BCE but "presumably written in the middle or near the end of the second century"<sup>21</sup>), a reference in Aristobulus, and some citations in Philo.

By far the most important source concerning the origin of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Pentateuch is the *Letter of Aristeas*.<sup>22</sup> The *Letter* has been considered of spurious authenticity and even a literary forgery for over four and a half centuries. According to Swete, Ludovicus de Vives (1522) first cast doubt on its genuineness. It was Humphry Hody (1684) who was able to show convincingly that the letter was not by a contemporary of Philadelphus.<sup>23</sup> However, there are some elements in the work that can add to our understanding of the translation and its significance to the Alexandrian community.

The *Letter* is purportedly written by a philo-Jewish Alexandrian official at the court of Ptolemy II to the author's brother, Philocrates, in which he describes his role in the arrangements made for a delegation of Jewish notables from Jerusalem to visit Alexandria in order to create and present a Greek translation of the Torah to Ptolemy's famous Library and to the people of the Alexandrian Jewish community.

The *Letter* is a wonderful example of Alexandrian Greek literary style.<sup>24</sup> Indeed, the use of first person narrative is a standard technique of Greek historiography and, embraced by Alexandrian authors, is used to convey not the historicity of the material but its truth value.<sup>25</sup> The *Letter*, as Orinsky shows, was meant to gain for the Septuagint "the same sanctity and authority long held by the Hebrew original; in a word, to certify the divine origin of the Septuagint, to declare it canonical."<sup>26</sup> Although there are anachronisms, these should not be read as carelessly included by a misinformed fraud, but rather as a trademark of Alexandrian literature, used to mark a work as fiction to the knowledgeable elite while not detracting from the edification and enjoyment of *hoi polloi*, the common people.<sup>27</sup>

Two conspicuous anachronisms are (1) the inclusion of Demetrius as the influential librarian at the time of Ptolemy II and (2) the prominence afforded the 72-man delegation as representatives of the 12 Tribes, six from each tribe. Demetrius had been the Chief Librarian at Alexandria during the reign of the **first** Ptolemy, but had fallen from favor and been retired — if not murdered — by Ptolemy II. It is likely that Demetrius' well-known name would have afforded a flavor of authenticity to the story. The more significant

anachronism was the suggestion that the High Priest Eleazar chose six sages from each of the twelve tribes for the delegation. As Orlinsky points out, the tribes no longer existed as such at that time.<sup>28</sup> Aristaeas uses both the contemporary authority of the high priesthood and the ancient authority of the tribes and their elders to confer legitimacy on the Greek translation of the Torah.

An added measure of acceptability comes from the name of the work: *The Translation of the 70 Men/Elders*.<sup>29</sup> For years scholars and commentators ignored or misunderstood the significance of this title, considering it some sort of rounding out of the number of translators from 72 down to 70. But, as Orlinsky points out, 72 is never otherwise treated.<sup>30</sup> Both 72 and 70 are significant numbers. Of this, the author of the *Letter* was aware. There were seventy elders who, in Exodus 24:1, were to accompany Moses and Aaron, Nadav and Abihu when Moses was to receive the tablets of the Law. There were seventy other elders who, in Numbers 11:16-17, were chosen to receive some of Moses' prophetic powers and to help him minister to the people (a different system from the one proposed by Yitro in Exodus 18:21-26).<sup>31</sup> Thus the number 70 had a special association for Jews. Calling the Greek translation of the Torah "The Translation of the Seventy Elders" improved its pedigree.

Orlinsky points out several other ways in which the author of the *Letter* builds a case for the sanctity of the translation. The author uses language reminiscent of that in Exodus 24:3 and Nehemiah 8:1-6 to describe the acclamation accompanying the acceptance of the Law as official and binding. He has the Alexandrian Jewish community reflect the sentiment of Deuteronomy 4:1-2 that the sacred words are not to be added to or taken away from.<sup>32</sup> Thus, that community resembles the original people at Sinai, and the 72 elders carry with them a gift of inspiration akin to that infused into the 70 at Sinai. In this instance, however, the elders are more important. They stand in the place once held by Moses in relationship with God insofar as they, as translators, were the ones who brought the words to the people.<sup>33</sup> Numerically and by careful designation, they represent all the tribes, all the people of Israel. In esteem, they are the equivalent of those chosen to share Moses' spirit. Their symbolic power is enormous. In an age when prophecy had been declared to be at an end, in a city far from Jerusalem,<sup>34</sup> the words of Torah took on new life.

Most scholars accept Hody's appraisal that the author of the *Letter* was not a contemporary of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. Indeed, it seems most likely that the author of the *Letter* (who, it is widely agreed, was a Jew and not an Egyptian courtier) was roughly contemporary with Aristobulus, a prominent Alexandrian Jewish scholar<sup>35</sup> who wrote about a century after the alleged date of the *Letter*.

Aristobulus' work, a commentary on the Pentateuch, was the first real evidence of the intellectual impact of Greek philosophy on Alexandrian Jewry. According to the Oxford Classical Dictionary, Aristobulus interpreted the Pentateuch "in an allegorical fashion . . . to show that Homer and Hesiod, the Orphic writings, Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle had borrowed freely from a supposed early translation of the OT into Greek."<sup>36</sup> If there was a translation available, as Modrzejewski suggests,<sup>37</sup> themes and ideas could certainly have been shared. But according to Victor Tcherikover,<sup>38</sup> there was a lack of interest in Judaeo-

Alexandrian writings on the part of Greek and pagan intellectuals. The author of the *Letter* and Aristobulus may have been writing to their own community to enhance the prestige of their own, now somewhat Hellenized heritage.

Although the works of Aristobulus are only extant in fragments, pertinent citations are preserved in the respectful work of Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praeparatio Evangelica*.<sup>39</sup> Aristobulus is known to have explained some of the anthropomorphisms in the Pentateuch metaphorically in order to decrease the distance between the Jewish material and Greek philosophy.<sup>40</sup> Eusebius<sup>41</sup> presents Aristobulus' explanation of anthropomorphic language in the following letter by Aristobulus to Ptolemy Philometor who had been questioning him (emphasis added):

WHEN, however, we had said enough in answer to the questions put before us, you also, O king, did further demand, **why by our law there are intimations given of hands, and arm, and face, and feet, and walking, in the case of the Divine Power:** which things shall receive a becoming explanation, and will not at all contradict the opinions which we have previously expressed.

But I would entreat you to **take the interpretations in a natural way, and to hold fast the fitting conception of God, and not to fall off into the idea of a fabulous anthropomorphic constitution.**

For our lawgiver Moses, when he wishes to **express his meaning in various ways**, announces certain arrangements of nature and preparations for mighty deeds, by **adopting phrases applicable to other things**, I mean to things outward and visible . . .

. . . First then the word "**hands**" evidently has, even in our own case, a more **general meaning**. For when you as a king send out forces, wishing to accomplish some purpose, we say, The king has a mighty hand, and the hearers' thoughts are carried to the power which you possess.

Now this is what Moses also signifies in our Law, when he speaks thus: "God brought thee forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand," and again: "I will put forth My hand," saith God, "and will smite the Egyptians."

Whether or not he wrote primarily for Jews,<sup>42</sup> Aristobulus either referred to *The Letter of Aristaeas* in a letter of his own to Ptolemy VII Philometor (182-146 BCE), a descendant of Aristaeas' Ptolemy Philadelphus,<sup>43</sup> or he knew the story independently. The following is preserved in Eusebius<sup>44</sup> (emphasis added):

For others before Demetrius Phalereus, and prior to the supremacy of Alexander and the Persians, have translated both the narrative of the exodus of the Hebrews our fellow countrymen from Egypt, and the fame of all that had happened to them, and the conquest of the land, and the exposition of the whole Law; so that it is manifest that many things have been borrowed by the aforesaid philosopher, for he is very learned: as also Pythagoras transferred many of our precepts and inserted them in his own system of doctrines.

**But the entire translation of all the contents of our law was made in the time of the king surnamed Philadelphus, thy ancestor, who brought greater zeal to the work, which was managed by Demetrius Phalereus.**

Such a reference would have made sense only if Ptolemy was aware of the LXX and its royal sponsorship. There is some evidence that Ptolemy would have been aware of the LXX. This evidence accords well with the history of the Jews in Egypt.

After the destruction of the colony at Elephantine, Jews did not have a good reason to remain in upper Egypt. However, the advantages of life in Alexandria under Ptolemy I attracted Jewish settlers.<sup>45</sup> According to a tradition stemming from Hecataeus (4th century BCE) and repeated in Josephus' *Contra Apionem* (I, 183-189), after the Ptolemaic victory in the third war of the Diadochi<sup>46</sup> (312 BCE), there arrived in Alexandria "a Jewish high priest" accompanied by a number of followers and, more significantly, carrying with them a Torah scroll.<sup>47</sup> The priest, Ezekias, read from the scroll, like Ezra at the Watergate (Neh. 8:1ff.) or like Josiah upon the discovery of the Book of Deuteronomy (II Chron. 34:29ff.). But the people of Alexandria, even if moved, did not thoroughly understand the Hebrew even then. Certainly, an independent motive existed for the creation of the Greek translation of the Torah. The ruler of the region, having been involved in a decades-long struggle for control of the area, would have seen the advantage of obtaining a translation of the law code governing the people who made up a large and somewhat *sui generis* segment of his population.

It appears that under Ptolemy II, a Greek translation of an Egyptian legal compendium was undertaken for a similar purpose. Modrzejewski suggests that there was a like interest in and need for a translation of the law of the Jews.<sup>48</sup> (There is even a hint of this need in the *Letter*. In that text, Demetrius of Phalerum, in his capacity of Chief Librarian, but evidently drawing on his expertise as former Athenian statesman and legal reformer, pointed out to Ptolemy that the Jewish law code would have to be translated into Greek to be understandable.) Although it was often the practice of the heirs of Alexander to encourage officials to subsume local laws under a growing Greek "common law," Modrzejewski suggests that "the Ptolemies did not strive to unify the legal rules throughout the kingdom."<sup>49</sup> Ptolemy II was himself the originator of a method of administering justice throughout his realm that depended on royal judges assigned to each nome as the permanent authority in legal matters for the nationality of their populace. This respect for ancestral law had been afforded to Jews under rulers as different as Artaxerxes, Alexander and Antiochus III. But, there needed to be texts available in the native language of the governed and the official Greek of the empire to assure that a litigant might expect the application of rule of law in his case. Clearly, Ptolemy Philometor would have been aware of the law code of the Jews, the Septuagint, referred to by Aristobulus. Just as clearly, this Ptolemy, living in close proximity to the multiple Jewish sections of Alexandria, would have noticed the esteem in which the text was held by the citizenry.

The third principal source, Philo of Alexandria, who quotes extensively from many of the books of the Greek Bible, brings information of a yearly celebration of the completion of the translation. Although the *Letter* mentions that when the work was read to them, the people acclaimed both the translators and the translation,<sup>50</sup> there is no mention of any festivities to mark the occasion. But Philo describes a festival attended by Jews and all other people of the community, held yearly even in his day, on the island of Pharos, connected to the city by a magnificent causeway, the Heptastadion. Thus, Philo's report is independ-

ent evidence of the importance of the Septuagint in the life of the Alexandrian Jewish community.<sup>51</sup> Philo also contributes a detail about the 72 scholars that differs slightly from the *Letter* but bears out what we have seen in the Talmudic account of Megillah 9a: his scholars are sequestered apart from one another and produce identical results.<sup>52</sup>

It is this combination of documented fact and impossible fantasy that has been misunderstood by centuries of scholars, even as early as St. Jerome (342-419 CE). What they failed to understand was that these earlier Alexandrian authors were using literary conventions to establish the primacy of the Septuagint translation. According to Honigman,

The narrative paradigms in which the author cast his account are crucial in conveying meaning to the story told in B[ook of] Ar[istias]. Such a resort to a literary pattern rather than to explicit exposition in order to convey meaning is somewhat reminiscent of the characteristics of traditional mythtelling. The use of this methodology by the author of B. Ar. strongly suggests that in informing his account with narrative paradigms, his purpose in writing B. Ar. was more than the immortalization of a past event by relating its story. The intent was to *transfigure* it.<sup>53</sup>

The conclusion that one must draw is that the Septuagint was not considered sacred at the actual time of its creation or it would not have needed the very strong push from the later *Letter* or from Aristobulus. It is not unusual for a contemporary work to be held in lower esteem than something of more remote vintage. It is likely that the translation became more and more familiar to the Jews of Alexandria over time<sup>54</sup> and that it thus gradually picked up the luster that is the reward of long acquaintance.

The Talmud, on the other hand, expresses what can only be termed ambivalence about the Septuagint. The passage from Megillah 9a mentioned above is closest to neutral. It shows familiarity with a version of the legend of the quasi-miraculous translation (or possibly with the *Letter* itself). But two other sources are not neutral. The notice in Megillat Ta'anit, an ancient pre-Mishnaic scroll of the holidays, declares a fast<sup>55</sup> because

בשמונה בטבת נכתבה התורה יונית בימי תלמי המלך והחושך בא לעולם שלשת ימים

On the eighth of Tevet, during the rule of King Ptolemy, the Torah was written in Greek, and darkness fell on the world for three days.

Masekhet Soferim 1:7-8 presents a similar opinion but gives an explanation. It also repeats the material from Megillah 9a and from Masekhet Sefer Torah:

מעשה בה' זקנים שכתבו לתלמי המלך את התורה יונית והיה היום קשה לישראל כיום שנעשה העגל שלא היתה התורה יכולה להתרגם כל צרכה שוב מעשה בתלמי המלך שכנס ע"ב זקנים והושיבם בשבעים ושנים בתים ולא גלה להם על מה כנסם נכנס לכל אחד ואחד מהם אמר להם כתבו לי תורת משה רבכם נתן המקום עצה בלב כל אחד ואחד והסכימה דעתן לדעת אחת וכתבו לו תורה בפני עצמה וי"ג דבר שינו בה

Once there were five elders who wrote the Torah in Greek for King Ptolemy, and that day was as hard for Israel as the day the golden calf was made, for the Torah could in no way be translated adequately. According to another story, King

Ptolemy gathered together seventy-two elders and placed them into seventy-two houses, without revealing to them why he had summoned them. Then he went to each and every one of them and told them to write for him the Torah of Moses your teacher; the Omnipresent put wisdom into the heart of each one of them, so that they became all of one mind and wrote him the Torah itself, making thirteen changes.<sup>56</sup>

Masekhet Soferim was edited rather late; according to Strack and Stemberger, it cannot be dated earlier than the mid-eighth century.<sup>57</sup> However, they point out that parts of the material may be from earlier traditions.<sup>58</sup> The reading “five elders,” as Orlinsky points out, “derives from nothing more than a scribal corruption; a scribe misread a reading *b'-ha-z'qenim* (‘the elders’) as *b'he z'qenim* (‘the five elders’; the letter *he* being construed as representing the number ‘five.’”<sup>59</sup> The reference to the 72 scholars placed in 72 houses clearly reflects material in Megillah 9a.<sup>60</sup>

There is, however, a strong philhellenic tradition to be found farther along in Megillah 9b:

רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר אף בספרים לא התירו שיכתבו אלא יונית אמר  
רבי אבהו אמר רבי יוחנן הלכה כרבן שמעון בן גמליאל ואמר רבי יוחנן מאי  
טעמא דרבן שמעון בן גמליאל אמר קרא יפת אלהים ליפת וישכן באהלי שם  
דבריו של יפת יהיו באהלי שם ואימא גומר ומגוג אמר רבי חייא בר אבא היינו  
טעמא דכתיב יפת אלהים ליפת יפיתו של יפת יהא באהלי שם

R. Simeon ben Gamaliel says, “In addition, regarding [the other] books [of Tanakh], they allow that they be translated only into Greek.” Rabbi Abahu said that Rabbi Yochanan said, “The *halachah* is like R. Simeon b. Gamaliel.” And Rabbi Yochanan said, “What is R. Simeon b. Gamaliel’s reason? The Bible said ‘May God broaden Yaphet that he might dwell in the tents of Shem.’ May Yaphet’s words be in the tents of Shem.” Why not say, rather Gomer[’s words] and Magog[’s tents]? Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba: “This is the reason: because it is written ‘May God broaden Yaphet’ — may Yaphet’s beauty (*y’phiuto*) be in the tents of Shem.”

Simeon b. Gamaliel, father of Yehudah haNasi, was, according to Alfred Kolatch<sup>61</sup>, learned in Greek philosophy and he passed the training to some of his children. This characteristic was shared by Abahu,<sup>62</sup> whose relationship with the authorities was such that he was able to effect the annulling of some harsh anti-Jewish legislation. They saw the use of Greek to translate *Tanakh* as in keeping with the biblical verse from Genesis 9:27 that hinted at the peaceable relationship that might grow between the progenitors of the Greek and Jewish peoples.<sup>63</sup> But these sages may have been reacting to the translation of sacred texts by Jewish scholars such as Aquila, student of Rabbi Akiva. After all, Simeon b. Gamaliel was a second century Palestinian Tanna who survived persecution by going into hiding during the times of terror that cost Akiva his life. His approval for the Greek translation, marked by its being linked to a proof-text, may have served the same purpose for Aquila’s work as the *Letter* served for the translation of the Torah.

Was there a political motive prompting the author of the *Letter* to seek to transfigure the Greek translation into something more than an aid to understanding? What might have

prompted Aristobulus to allude to what was familiar as a legal text in terms suggesting it as sacred literature and as a literature replete with links to Greek philosophy?

It is possible that the author of the *Letter* and Aristobulus were both active at about the time when Antiochus IV Epiphanes (215-164 BCE) fought Egypt and then turned his attention to Judaea. Is there an implied criticism of the actions of the Seleucid oppressor in the high praise bestowed on Ptolemy Philadelphus for liberating “no less than 100,000 [Jewish slaves]”<sup>64</sup>? Does the elevation of the importance and legitimacy of the Septuagint have a connection with the building of the Temple in Leontopolis by Onias IV, priest-in-exile from Jerusalem? Are these actions, taken together, a statement of the Alexandrian Diaspora’s independence from the tainted authority of the Hasmoneans? Full discussion of these questions is beyond the scope of this paper.

### THE FATE OF ALEXANDRIAN JEWRY

The focus of this paper turns to the end of the splendid community of proud Diaspora Jews in Alexandria and to the fate of the Septuagint. It is because of the nature of the rescue of the text, considered sacred at least since Maccabean times, that there could have ever been controversies about anthropomorphism or word use or authenticity of the text. The holy Jewish-Greek scrolls were just about the only things saved from the terrible slaughter of the Alexandrian community. They were smuggled out of the conflagration by early Christians who were able to escape the murderous frenzy attendant upon the revolt of 115-117 CE.

That revolt had been brewing at least since the decree of Augustus Caesar in 30 BCE that revoked the privileged status of Jews in Egypt that had been granted by Alexander the Great and all rulers subsequent to him. The Jews outside of Alexandria found themselves subject to a *capitatio*, a head tax, which had been created to draw a distinction between true Greek citizens and mere Egyptians. Jews, accustomed to identifying themselves as Hellenes and disassociating themselves from the Egyptian natives, suffered a painful loss of personal status and sense of security.<sup>65</sup> The resentment constantly clawing at the Egyptians and the Greek citizens *vis-à-vis* Jews began to manifest itself. According to Josephus, “the numerous punishments inflicted daily on the rioters of both parties by the authorities only served to embitter the quarrel.”<sup>66</sup>

With hostilities building under each successive emperor and governor, it was a relatively light thing for Flaccus, the Roman governor in the late 30’s CE to set the Greeks and Egyptian citizenry of Alexandria against the Jews in the city. When the latter refused to place statues of Caligula in their synagogues, Flaccus, trying to show himself valuable to the mad ruler, proclaimed them “foreigners” at the mercy of all. The mob rose to the occasion, as Philo describes in his bitter invective *Against Flaccus*.<sup>67</sup>

After the fall of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 and the defeat of the fighters on Masada in 73, it is believed that some insurgents escaped to Egypt where they began to stir up a passion for revenge. To quell the rebellion before it could ignite, Vespasian ordered the Egyptian prefect, Tiberius Julius Lupus, to tear down the Temple of Onias in Leontopolis.

Although recognizing that this Temple was a reminder of days of glory and independence for the Jews, Lupus at first merely shut the Temple's doors lest it become a rallying point for further unrest.<sup>68</sup> Within a year, his replacement closed the site permanently.

Anger, shame and frustration were not so easily banished. Great resentment was resident among the Jews of Egypt not only because of the loss of two Temples but because of the earlier loss of status and security mentioned above. Thus, the uprising that began in 115 CE among Jews in Cyrenaica on the eastern coast of Libya spread with great rapidity to Egypt and Cyprus. Some say the desperate Jews of Cyrene planned to interfere with the Roman corn supply grown and exported from Egypt. Others suggest that the revolt was due to messianic or apocalyptic fervor spread by Zealots fleeing from Judaea. But others see the hostilities as a continuation of the deteriorating relations between Jews, Greeks and Egyptians. The Emperor Trajan, suspecting that Mesopotamian Jews would rise, too, directed that they be "cleaned out of the province."<sup>69</sup> Jews faced not only heavily armed Roman soldiers, but infuriated mobs of Greek and Egyptians and their slaves, hungry for plunder and out for blood. When the dust and ashes settled, when the tens of thousands had fallen after two full years of war, there were no Jews left in Alexandria.

The words of the ancient Stele of Merneptah rise up from the sands: "Israel lies waste, his seed is no more."

#### THE FATAL OR FATEFUL RESCUE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

But our seed had been planted deep and an offshoot emerged, clinging to the Septuagint as the ancient stock had clung to the Torah. The Alexandrian Christians fled and did not return until several decades had passed. By that time, Christianity had taken hold in most of the Mediterranean, in the East and in parts of Europe and Africa. Copy upon copy of the sacred text had to be made and changes began to creep in. At the same time, despite upheavals in Judaea that left Jerusalem in ruins, a new Greek translation was made by Aquila from the now-fixed Hebrew text possibly<sup>70</sup> using exegetical translation methods approved by Rabbi Akiva. Just a few years later, between 170 and 200 CE, another Jewish translation was undertaken. This one, by Symmachus for the Caesarean community, is described as combining "the best Biblical Greek style, remarkable clarity, a high degree of accuracy regarding the Hebrew, and the rabbinic exegesis of his day: it might be described as a Greek Targum, or Tannaitic Septuagint."<sup>71</sup> Slightly later than these was the translation of Theodotion who is believed to have been a convert to Judaism from Ephesus, a city in Anatolia. He, too, probably based his work on a Hebrew exemplar, bringing the existing Greek translation into line with the new fixed text. The Three, as these scholars were known, produced translations that differed in substance and in method from the text of the Septuagint.

Revisions and copies proliferated very rapidly. Some time in the third century, Origen set out to categorize and display the differences to be found among the main translations of the times. His Hexapla was a six-columned comparison of the text of the Hebrew Bible as it existed in his day (a version that differed from the one that would have been used for the original Septuagint Pentateuch), those of the Three, and that of the Septuagint. Scholars do

not agree as to whether that column contained the standard Septuagint text as it existed in Origen's day or whether he used that column to correct the Septuagint in order to bring it into line with the "new" Hebrew text. The remaining column contained a transliterated Hebrew text which may have been a pronunciation guide for those not fluent in Hebrew. Had that work been widely available, perhaps the devastating disputations that took place over the centuries would have been forestalled. For, in some cases, a glance would have shown that the argument rested on a reading present in one version but not in another. However, the work, when it was finished, stretched some 6,000 pages bound into about 15 volumes. It was probably never copied in full. It was consulted, however, as references to its contents exist in the works of other scholars.

Jobs and Silva point out the complexity of tracing the history of the Greek Bible. What emerges from their clearly written book is that we do not have the text of the Septuagint that was hailed by the Alexandrians so long ago and we do not have the Hebrew *Vorlage* of that translation. We have a composite text that has gone through many recensions and accidental changes. Those whose research includes searching for manifestations of the translators' ideological or cultural outlook have an excruciatingly difficult task. The conclusion that the authors reach is:

Although it may seem natural to expect the LXX to reflect theological perspectives, one must always remember that the people who produced the Greek texts were translators. They had the well-defined task of producing a translation of an existing text, the Hebrew Scripture, not of writing a treatise on the eschatology of their day.

While each translator probably did have a certain messianic concept and view of the afterlife — views undoubtedly shaped by the times in which they lived — it is not obvious that, given the nature of their task, the text they produced would strongly reflect those views. In contrast, books that were composed during the same period might be expected to reflect more directly the perspectives of their authors, who were not constrained by an existing text. Commentaries and midrashim on the Greek Scriptures produced in the Hellenistic period would provide a better window into the development of theological ideas during that time. Unfortunately, such material is rare.<sup>72</sup>

Although we no longer have the ability to recover the original Septuagint and although errors have crept into the manuscripts over many centuries, the art of biblical translation owes a great debt to the original translators of the Septuagint who came from the Greek-speaking Alexandrian Jewish community. Their Greek translation influenced later translations as disparate as Jerome's Latin Vulgate (late 4th century), the King James version (1611) and the most recent Tanakh of the Jewish Publication Society (1985). Despite hostility directed at the work for many political or religious reasons over the centuries, it is likely that "The Translation of the Seventy Elders" will continue to be consulted in the course of any serious Bible translation project in the years to come.

- <sup>1</sup>This article is an excerpt from the author's senior thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for rabbinic ordination from the Academy for Jewish Religion. The full text of the thesis, including evidence that the translators of the Septuagint Book of Judges did not avoid anthropomorphisms or anthropopathisms, is available from the author upon request.
- <sup>2</sup>Henry Barclay Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, (Cambridge at the University Press, 1st ed. 1900; rev. ed. 1902), p. 24.
- <sup>3</sup>*Sirach* (also called *Ben Sira*) Prolog 1:25 *tà loipà tôn bibliôn* — the rest of the books.
- <sup>4</sup>Swete, *op. cit.* pp. 25-26. He mentions Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs and some minor prophets as missing from Greek works cited in the Christian Bible. He reports that Philo's works omit references to Ruth (possibly attached to Judges), Lamentations (possibly attached to Jeremiah), Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Esther, Ezekiel and Daniel. Swete is baffled by missing citations from Ezekiel, as he cannot imagine that the work of a major prophet should have been missing.
- <sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 3. But see *Jewish Encyclopedia*, sub "Meturgeman" where Schechter and Levis make no claims for Babylonian practice.
- <sup>6</sup>According to Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 22, the non-literary register of this language is used as evidence against the tradition of Aristeas that the document was produced by **Palestinian** scholars for the king's library.
- <sup>7</sup>Alexandria was founded in 331 BCE. There is a legend describing Alexander's good treatment of the Jews as stemming from a dream he had concerning a man whom he subsequently recognized as the priest of the Temple in Jerusalem. In the dream, the priest had encouraged him concerning his conquest of Asia. (Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 11.317-345.) Stylistically, the legend has many earmarks of Alexandrian fantasy. See discussion of Alexandrian literary style.
- <sup>8</sup>Charles Duke Yonge, *The Works of Philo Judaeus: The contemporary of Josephus, translated from the Greek* (London, H. G. Bohn, 1854-1890), on-line, <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/yonge/index.html>, cited by [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\\_of\\_the\\_Jews\\_in\\_Egypt#Ptolemaic\\_and\\_Roman\\_.28400\\_BC\\_to\\_641\\_AD.29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Jews_in_Egypt#Ptolemaic_and_Roman_.28400_BC_to_641_AD.29).
- <sup>9</sup>It is interesting to note that the *Letter of Aristeas* mentions the ransoming of Jewish slaves by Ptolemy as one of the author's first orders of business, before he relates how he delivered the royal invitation to sages from Jerusalem to translate Jewish texts. (See *Letter*, sections 12-27.)
- <sup>10</sup>"The origin of this Jewish colony is problematic, though it is now generally accepted that it was part of the large-scale immigration into Egypt that began under Necho I in the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty (ca. 672–664 BCE)," <http://www.iranica.com/articles/v8f4/v8f408.html>. See

- also [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elephantine\\_papyri](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elephantine_papyri). Elephantine is on an island near modern Aswan.
- <sup>11</sup><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shishaq>; [http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/tipd/hd\\_tipd.htm](http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/tipd/hd_tipd.htm)
- <sup>12</sup>See 1 Kings 14:25 ff. and 2 Chronicles 12:2 ff.
- <sup>13</sup>This is not the only parallel to the history of the Jewish community at Alexandria. The tragic ends of the communities are also reminiscent of one another. This will be discussed below.
- <sup>14</sup><http://www.bh.org.il/Communities/Archive/egypt.asp>
- <sup>15</sup><http://www.jewishagency.org/JewishAgency/English/Jewish+Education/Compelling+Content/Jewish+History/3760+BCE+79+CE/Suppression+of+Judah+to+Syrus+defeat.htm>. According to the timeline on this website, that Jewish settlement took root between 585 and 582 BCE.
- <sup>16</sup>*cf.* Ezra 1:1.
- <sup>17</sup>Joseph Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt from Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*, Robert Cornman, tr. (Philadelphia and Jerusalem, JPS, 1995), p. 36.
- <sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 39-43. The pattern of civic service, settlement, accommodation or assimilation, flourishing, and sudden destruction prefigures not only the history of the Jews in Alexandria but elsewhere.
- <sup>19</sup>The Library was established during the reign of Ptolemy I but expanded by his successor who was said to be an intellectual giant and connoisseur of all fields of knowledge. He was not above forcefully appropriating manuscripts from travelers and having them hastily copied for his collection. He is said to have returned the copies and kept the originals!
- <sup>20</sup>See discussion on Aristobulus below, p. 14 ff.
- <sup>21</sup>Modrzejewski, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
- <sup>22</sup>The complete Greek text is reprinted in Swete, *op. cit.* The English translation is that of R.H. Charles, editor and translator, *The Letter of Aristeas* (Oxford at The Clarendon Press, 1913). Hereafter, references will be to the *Letter*.
- <sup>23</sup>Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 15. But it is the sense of scholars today that the harsh language used to describe "Aristeas" and his letter reveals a misunderstanding of Alexandrian literature. See, e.g., Sylvie Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (Oxford, Routledge, 2003), p. 68 *et passim*. The *Letter* was never intended as an historical document in the modern sense, but Swete does find some historicity in it.
- <sup>24</sup>All its Alexandrian elements from its use of documents to its *ekphrasis* on the gifts, to its symposium are described by George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Stories of Biblical and Early

- Post-Biblical Times," in Michael E. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* (Assen, Philadelphia, van Gorcum, Fortress Press), chapter 2, pp. 33-87.
- <sup>25</sup>Honigman, *op. cit.*, p. 68.
- <sup>26</sup>Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text," *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 2, *The Hellenistic Age*, Davies, W.D. and Finkelstein, L., eds. (Cambridge at the University Press), ch. 15, p. 540. Hereafter: *Cambridge*.
- <sup>27</sup>This is an idea presented by Rabbi Robert Fine in his Antiquities class, AJR Spring 2004.
- <sup>28</sup>Cambridge, *op. cit.*, p. 540.
- <sup>29</sup>In Latin: *Interpretatio septuaginta virorum* (or: *seniorum*).
- <sup>30</sup>Cambridge, *op. cit.*, p. 539.
- <sup>31</sup>Rashi (on Num. 11:26) suggests that Moses would have wanted six from each tribe, (much like Aristeeas!) but understood that there could be only 70 *in toto*. He asked the tribes to draw lots to ascertain which two men were not designated to receive the prophetic powers. Eldad and Medad modestly bowed out.
- <sup>32</sup>*Letter*, section 310.
- <sup>33</sup>Here one should also consider the words of Megillah 9a cited above: *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* placed counsel into the heart of each *עצה וְאֶחָד וְאֶחָד בְּלֵב כָּל אֶחָד בְּרוּךְ הוּא בְּלֵב כָּל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד עֲצָה*.
- <sup>34</sup>Modrzejewski, *op. cit.*, p. 121 suggests that the prominence of the elders serves to strengthen the ties between Alexandria and Jerusalem at a time when the Ptolemies had lost their control of the latter.
- <sup>35</sup>Tcherikover suggests that he was Ptolemy Philometor's "counselor for Jewish affairs," (in Modrzejewski, *op. cit.*, p. 121). Arnaldo Momigliano insists that Aristobulus preceded Aristeeas. "Aristobulus was . . . the first to give authority to the tradition that the LXX translation was due to the initiative of Ptolemy Philadelphus and his adviser Demetrius Phalereus. He almost certainly wrote his book, which was dedicated to Ptolemy Philometor, before the publication of the *Letter of Aristeeas* and may indeed have inspired it." Arnaldo Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom* (Cambridge, 1975), p. 116. The possibility of the two working in concourse for a greater purpose is also intriguing, but beyond the scope of this work.
- <sup>36</sup>M. Cary, J. D. Denniston, J. Wight Duff, *et al.*, ed., sv. "Aristobulus (2)," *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1966), p. 91.
- <sup>37</sup>Modrzejewski, *op. cit.*, p. 121. To show that Aristobulus' claim is not mere boasting, Modrzejewski adduces Oxyrhynchos papyrus XLI 2944 which contains a Greek version of the *Judgment of Solomon* similar to that in I Kings 3:16-28, dating from "prior to the death of Plato." While it is not a full biblical translation, it would have been available to the

Greek authors.

- <sup>38</sup>As cited in Modrzejewski, *op. cit.*, p. 67; and cf. Momigliano, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
- <sup>39</sup>E. H. Gifford, *Eusebii I Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis, Libri XV* (Oxford at the University Press, 1903), vol. 3, part 1, published on the web by Roger Pearse, ([http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/eusebius\\_pe\\_00\\_eintro.htm](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/eusebius_pe_00_eintro.htm)). The Greek text for Aristobulus is *The Online Critical Pseudepigrapha* (<http://www.purl.org/net/ocp>). In this collection, it is possible to read Aristobulus' preserved citations of some of the Classical authors whose works he believes were influenced by pre-Septuagint Greek translations of Hebrew originals.
- <sup>40</sup>For the purposes of the larger thesis, of which this article is a part, this fact is quite suggestive. For, if Aristobulus found it necessary to explain anthropomorphisms, it stands to reason that his text, which would have been available for anyone in Alexandria, **did not lack those anthropomorphisms**. The claim of Charles T. Fritsch that the translators of the LXX sought to avoid anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms is thus weakened.
- <sup>41</sup>Eusebius, *Evangelicae Praeparationis*, 8:10.1-3; 7-9. The wording of the Biblical citations differs slightly from Rahlfs' Septuagint text, as is to be expected. All translations of Eusebius are by E. H. Gifford, *op. cit.*
- <sup>42</sup>Aristobulus' discomfort with the anthropomorphisms of the text is a feeling expressed over the centuries when Jews live in areas pervaded by Greek culture. There is a desire to show that our sacred scriptures partake of that admirable rationalism demonstrated by Greek philosophers and are, therefore, worthy of their attention. There is not much evidence that the Greeks did pay attention. But the insecurity may have given "permission" to other groups to challenge the Hebrew texts with lack of sophistication. This attitude may be at the root of Fritsch's research!
- <sup>43</sup>The citation is preserved by Eusebius, *Evangelicae Praeparationis*, 9.6 where Aristobulus' words are given as preserved in Clement's otherwise lost *Stromata*.
- <sup>44</sup>Eusebius, *Evangelicae Praeparationis*, 13.12.
- <sup>45</sup>See discussion of status of Alexandrian Jews.
- <sup>46</sup>After the death of Alexander the Great, his successors struggled for power over the segments of his empire. These were the Wars of the Diadochi. As a result of this war, Ptolemy became master of Syria.
- <sup>47</sup>As Modrzejewski points out (*op. cit.*, p. 99), this was "the Law, the Torah of Moses in the form that Ezra had established a century earlier."
- <sup>48</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 99 ff., especially ch. 5, "A Law for the Jews of Egypt."
- <sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 107.
- <sup>50</sup>*Letter*, sections 308-310.

- <sup>51</sup>It is unfortunate that we do not know when the celebration began. Since neither the *Letter* nor Aristobulus mentions it, it is possible that it began not after the initial translation was completed but after the importance of the translation became clear. Recognition of the importance was fostered by the works of the author of the *Letter* and by Aristobulus.
- <sup>52</sup>His version of the legend is most similar to that preserved in the Church Fathers (2nd century CE). According to Swete, (*op. cit.* p. 14) the rather unlikely occurrence of 72 identical translations emerging without communication made St. Jerome reject the usefulness of the Septuagint text as being not a translation but a result of prophecy! Honigman, *op. cit.*, p. 119, suggests that the collaboration pointed out in the *Letter* gives the document the type of authority that would be given a contemporary edition produced by the scholars at the Library of Alexandria.
- <sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 37. Notice the similarity between this author's premise and that of Orlinsky in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. The latter points out the Jewish themes that elevate the work; the former highlights the scholarly methods employed by the Alexandrians of the Library. Both methods were necessary to transfigure the work in the eyes of the sophisticated Alexandrian Jewish community.
- <sup>54</sup>It was cited by Demetrius the Chronographer (not the same as the Demetrius in the *Letter*), active during the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-04) although it is not clear who his audience might have been.
- <sup>55</sup>This fast is still observed by some Jews on the tenth of Tevet, the culmination of three days of terrible events beginning with the completion of the Septuagint on the eighth of the month.
- <sup>56</sup>Translated by Aryeh Reich, *The Greek Bible — Light or Darkness?* (Bar Ilan University's Parashat Hashavua Study Center, <http://www.biu.ac.il/JH/Parasha/eng/vayigash/rei.html>).
- <sup>57</sup>H. L. Strack and Gunter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, translated and edited by Markus Bockmuehl (Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1996, 2nd printing), p. 228.
- <sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 54-55. Unattributed statements may be calculated as either very early opinions that are undisputed or very late statements by modest scholars chary of setting their names alongside the former greats.
- <sup>59</sup>Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text," *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 2, *The Hellenistic Age*, Davies, W.D. and Finkelstein, L., ed. (Cambridge at the University Press), ch. 15, p. 539, n. 2.
- <sup>60</sup>The wording differs only minimally.
- <sup>61</sup>Alfred J. Kolatch, *Masters of the Talmud, Their Lives and Views* (Middle Village, New York, Jonathan David Publishers, Inc. 2003), pp. 353-4.
- <sup>62</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 94.

- <sup>63</sup>יפת אלהים ליפת וישכן באהל־שם — May God broaden Yaphet, And let him dwell in the tents of Shem.
- <sup>64</sup>*Letter*, section 19.
- <sup>65</sup>The loss of status was thrown into the face of the community not only by local adversaries but by the Emperor Claudius in a decree dated 41 CE, warning that hostilities must stop. In that decree was a dark warning that Jews were under suspicion of planned sedition through welcoming in 'fellow travelers' from Syria and the Egyptian countryside. Although the unwanted characters alluded to by Claudius were probably early Christians, when trouble did come, it came from some of those locales.
- <sup>66</sup>Josephus, *Jewish War* 2, 451-89. Cited in Modrzejewski, *op. cit.*, p. 165.
- <sup>67</sup>One may find echoes of his description of the ensuing carnage and horrors in the savagery depicted in אזכרה אלה of the High Holy Days liturgy. Even if one removes the impassioned and inciting language, the bottom line is the same:  
אלה אזכרה ונפשי עלי אשפכה, כי בלענו זדים "These things I remember as I pour out my heart: How the wicked have devoured us." (translation from *Gates of Repentance: The New Union Prayerbook for the Days of Awe*, (New York, CCAR Press, 1978.)
- <sup>68</sup>Bernard M. Zlotowitz (personal communication) is struck by the similarity between the Roman official's action in this incident and that of the German police chief of Berlin, Wilhelm Krutzfeld, who, in the face of Nazi rioting on Krystallnacht, forbade the torching of the historic synagogue in the city. A number of years ago, a plaque in memory of this brave man was placed at the site of the Oranienburgerstrasse Synagogue by a delegation from the New York City Police Department.
- <sup>69</sup>Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 4, 2, 1-2 ed. K Lake, cited in Modrzejewski, *op. cit.*, p. 198.
- <sup>70</sup>See, e.g., Strack and Stemberger, *op. cit.*, p. 73. They reference D. Barthelemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, (Leiden, 1963), who shows the similarity of method. They also reference the opposing view of L. L. Grabbe, "Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis," *JJS* vol. 33 (1982), pp. 527-36.
- <sup>71</sup>Alison Salvesen, "Symmachus in the Pentateuch," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Monograph 15 (Manchester, University of Manchester Press, 1991), pp. 296-7, as cited in Karen Jobes and Moises Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic 2000), p. 40.
- <sup>72</sup>Jobes and Silva, *op. cit.*, p. 302.

