WOJCIECH SZCZERBA

THE LANGUAGE OF THE SEPTUAGINT AS A WINDOW ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE HEBREW BIBLE

No doubt, it is difficult to overestimate the role that the Septuagint played in history. Its significance may be evaluated on various levels and from many perspectives. One may focus on the Septuagint as a translation of Hebrew Bible that had no precedence and may admire beauty of its language. One may consider primary admiration for the Septuagint in the early Hellenistic Judaism and its subsequent unanimous rejection by the Synagogue. One may think of its assimilation and use in the early Christian Church and of the influence that the Septuagint had on the format of the early Christian theology. One may try to reconstruct the process of transmission of the text of the Septuagint in history and discuss reliability of versions which are extant nowadays. Finally one may focus on both positive and negative influences, which the Septuagint had on later translations of the Hebrew Bible: Aquilla, Symmachus or Teodotion. All these aspects are quite important and they are worth serious researches. However, the fundamental issue, lying somehow below these problems is a question of the nature of the Septuagint and reasons for its existence.

The Septuagint was created in order to give the teaching of the Old Testament to the Greek-speaking community in Alexandria. Most of all it was an attempt to transfer the thought of Hebrew Bible into the ground of the Greek world: oldtestamental ways of perceiving reality, Jewish religious concepts, Jewish spirituality and other ideas contained in Hebrew holy scriptures. As such the Septuagint was supposed to guard Judaistic orthodoxy, to help those, whose ties with Palestine became weaker and weaker in a course of time, to preserve faith of the fathers and to help to preserve the identity of Alexandrine community as a separate religious group among various religions and philosophies, mixed together in Alexandria at the end of the old era.

However, while entering the world of Greek philosophies, the Septuagint did not manage to protect itself from the influence of Greek thought, both on its from and the content. Translators of the Septuagint, coming themselves from the Alexandrine Diaspora, had to modify some Hebrew concepts, so that they become comprehensible and acceptable for the

Greek mentality. Grown up in Hellenized Jewish community, those translators approached Hebrew Scriptures with certain presuppositions, not always being aware of it, and those pre-suppositions determined certain choices made during translation. Greek language itself, which the translators used, possessed huge referential baggage, forcing somehow the reader to certain understanding of Biblical concepts and ideas. Finally, there were books added to the canon of the Septuagint, whose authors consciously represented hellenized Judaistic thought of 2nd and 13th cent. BC and their inclinations are clearly seen in their works.

With reference to this, it seems quite reasonable to define the Septuagint as a bridge, a two-sided bridge between two separate worlds, the world of Greek philosophy and Hebrew thought, between Athens and Jerusalem. The primary goal to transfer the Law, Scriptures and Prophets into Greek language, turned out to be some kind of "Troy horse". Hellenistic thought, in unintended way, penetrated and transformed teaching of the Hebrew Bible. Thus, the Alexandrine Diaspora, in spite of Aristeas' assertions, did not receive *the same* material, which studied its fellow-believers in Palestine. Members of the Diaspora received text, in which gently but at the same time firmly was felt Hellenistic spirit. So we may venture the assertion that the translation of the Septuagint started a long process of philosophication of the Hebrew Bible, taken later up and let to the end by Philo form Alexandria, Clement, Origen and others. And particularly, language of the Septuagint was the fundamental and basic tool in this process of transferring religious thought into philosophical system, seen in thought of latter Judaistic and Christian thinkers.

In this paper I want to focus on this very problem and to try, at least in outline, to answer the question: in what ways language of the Septuagint became a tool of philosophical trans-formation of the Hebrew Bible? What was the basic philosophy of translation of the Septua-gint? To which modifications were the translators "forced" by the very nature of the Greek language and Greek cultural context? In what ways were modified the major theological concepts of the Old Testament? This study consist of two basic parts. The first one traces the current state of knowledge concerning the Septuagint and defines what the Septuagint itself is at the end of 20th century. The second part of this paper presents relationship between the Septuagint (in the current form) and the Hebrew Old Testament. It discusses general meth-odology of translation of the Septuagint and draws up trends in modifications of the funda-mental religious concepts of Hebrew Bible[1].

Origin of the Septuagint

Letter of Aristeas, the oldest extant document speaking about origin of the Septuagint, places its birth in the middle of 3rd century BC[2]. According to its essence, Hebrew Bible, and

---

[1]   Because of the character and the content of the present work I will restrict my discussion mainly to theology sensu stricto and anthropology as the most representative, in my opinion, areas of the Hebrew thought in reference to the above stated thesis.
[2]   E.Stein, Filon z Aleksandrii, Człowiek, Dzieła i Nauka Filozoficzna, Warszawa 1930, p.6

more correctly the Pentateuch, was translated in the time of Ptolemy II Filadelfos (285-247). Thus, Demetrius from Faleron, identified by some with the chief of the Alexandrine Library[3], suggested the emperor that the Jewish Law (i.e. Torah) should be among books belonging to the Library, after being translated. Ptolemy agreed and soon commissioned messengers (among them was Demetrius) to Eleanor, chief priest of Jerusalem with the request to appoint competent translators and to send them to Alexandria. Eleazar appointed 72 men, 6 from every Jewish tribe, and together with valuable manuscripts of Torah sent them to Egypt. Here, after a pompous reception, during which Jewish wisemen roused king's admiration, they were placed on the island Pharos. There in silence and seclusion they translated Torah. The whole translation lasted exactly 72 days. Demetrius wrote down the final version, to which all the translators unanimously agreed. The work was first read to the Jewish community in Alexandria, where it gained total acceptance. Than it was submitted to the king, who similarly was amazed by the spirit of "Lawgiver" and agreed to publish the book. Translators endowed with precious gifts were sent back to Jerusalem.

Letter of Aristeas was generally accepted by ancient thinkers as a reliable explanation of the origin of the Septuagint. Josephus[4] retells in his writings Aristeas' story almost literally. Philo from Alexandria[5], referring also to the same source, explains the birth of the Septuagint as an act of God's inspiration, and the translators, in his opinion, are prophets, who while working in separate cells created one version of the holy text. The fathers of the Church broaden the meaning of the Letter of Aristeas to the whole Old Testament. Pseudo-Justin (2nd cent AD)[6] asserts that he saw the cells on the island of Pharos, where the translators, in total seclusion, created homogeneous version of the Holy Scriptures.

No doubt, Letter of Aristeas shows a beautiful version of the origin of the Septuagint but nowadays it undergoes a thorough criticism and is generally placed rather among fascinating legends than historical accounts. It seems that the beginning of the translation of the Septuagint may be indeed placed in 3rd cent. BC This information confirms the Book of Wisdom (Ecclesiasticus, 132 BC), referring in the prolog to already existing Greek version of the Law, "Prophets and other books." Similarly, it appears that placing the origin of the Septuagint in Alexandrine Diaspora is proper and also the truth is that after Babylonian exile considerably aroused interest of Hebrew culture and thought in Greek and eastern circles. For some, Jewish religion was an interesting alternative to various philosophical schools and religions offered by Hellenistic world.

However, it is obvious, on the basis of critical linguistic study on the Septuagint, that it was not written by a pagan nobleman but rather by a member of Jewish Diaspora praising through the lips of pagan king Greek translation of the Old Testament. Similarly, it is highly improbable that the author lived in times of Ptolemy II Filadelfous. His life should be dated at least one hundred years later. It is probable that Ptolemy indeed was interested in Israel's religion, but the translation of the Septuagint was determined mainly by the needs of the Alexandrine Diaspora. Like in Palestine here also knowledge of Hebrew language was fast di-

[3]   Würthwein, The text of the Old Testament (trans.E.F.Rhodes), Eerdmans, Michigan 1992, p.50
[4]   Antiquitates Judaicae, 12;12-118, Philo
[5]   Filon, Life of Moses 37-41, Philo
[6]   Cohortatio ad gentiles XIII, Philo

minishing. In the "Land of Fathers" Aramaic took over, and slowly infiltrated not only streets but also synagogues and religious life generally. In Alexandria the same place was taken by Greek "κοινή" (street language), *lingua franca* of the Near East since the times of Alexander the Great. In all probability, the desire to preserve pure faith and patriarchal tradition, was more important motif for translation of the Old Testament into Alexandrine language than pagan's interest. Similarly it does not seem very reasonable that the translators were Palestinian Jews. The language of their work reveals clearly that the whole thing wrote people, for whom Greek was a mother tongue, so in all likelihood they were citizens of Alexandrine Diaspora. Huge differences in language of certain books shows that in a whole process of translation of the Old Testament must have been involved a great number of translators[7], perhaps even a few generations. They were people with different qualifications, using different Hebrew texts[8], presenting various approaches toward methodology of translation[9]

Current State of Knowledge Concerning the Septuagint

Until 19th century many scholars preferred the Septuagint over Masoretic text. It was commonly believed that translated before Christ Septuagint was based on earlier and therefore better texts than the ones standardized latter. It was maintained that through analysis of Septuagint's manuscripts it is possible to recreate its original form and the Hebrew text on which it was based. Contemporary critic has changed this opinion. It demonstrated that the Septuagint is much closer to the Masoretic text than it was thought so far. Various additions, abbreviations or modifications are rather effects of independent decisions of translators than differences in the original text[10]. On the other hand, it was shown that questions concerning the Septuagint are, in light of contemporary research, much more complicated than it was supposed previously.

Most of all it was proved in the current state of knowledge it is impossible to reconstruct the origin of the Septuagint. Hypothesis that nowadays function[11] argue if it is even possible to speak about the existence of so called proto-Septuagint i.e. original version of the Greek translation of the Old Testament (Paul de Lagarde, Alfred Rahlfs)[12] or if rather the Septuagint is the final effect a long process of transmission of various Greek texts (Paul Kahle)[13].

---

[7]   See Jelicoe, The Septuagint and the Modern Study, Zondervan 1965, p.312
[8]   Eg. Greek version of the Book of Jeremiah is shorter than the masoretic text about 2700 words, which reflects the Hebrew version found in Qumran (4QJer), Würthwein, The Text of the Old Testament, p.64
[9]   Eg. very literal translation of I Macabees and very liberal attitude toward Daniel or Esther.
[10]   Masoretic text gained support of Aquila, Qumran etc.
[11]   See F.E.Deist, Toward the Text of the Old Testament, Pretoria 1981, pp.173-182.
[12]   F.E.Deist, Toward the Text of the Old Testament, Pretoria 1981, pp.173-7
[13]   F.E.Deist, Toward the Text of the Old Testament, Pretoria 1981, pp.177-9

Scholars did not also achieve any agreement whether the Septuagint was based on an authorized Hebrew text or it was based on one of the local versions of the Old Testament used in Egypt (Harvard school, Frank Moore Cross).[14]

Similarly, it is impossible with full assurance to reconstruct the original text of Septuagint. Nowadays are extant a few hundred codexes, dozens of uncials, more than 1500 full or fragmentary manuscripts of Greek translations and thousands of quotations in works of Philo from Alexandria, Josephus, the New Testament, Clement from Alexandria, Origen and so on. However, in this pile of documents there are no two versions that would be alike. It is known that various versions of the Septuagint came to existence very early. Already Origen, in his Hexapla, had to apply critical apparatus of Aristarch from Alexandria (3rd/2nd cent. BC), in order to unify the fifth column of his work. Hieronimus mentions at least three versions of the Septuagint, existing during his time in the Near East: Lukian version (Constantinople, Antiochia), Hesychius (Alexandria) and Palestine codexes prepared by Origen. In the course of time, in the course of copying manuscripts the situation became even more complicated. Even though contemporary textual criticism is much more advanced than in times of Origen, still we cannot be sure what was the final shape of the original text of the Septuagint.

Thirdly, more and more often are stated questions whether it is possible to talk about uniformity of the Greek translation. Is the Septuagint a uniform book or rather a collection of documents? On its text worked most probably a great number of translators, maybe a few generations. Those people possessed different knowledge of Hebrew language and used various methods of translation. Thus, it does not surprise that books of the Septuagint present different literal level and different convergence with Hebrew text. On the one hand, there are books faithfully translated from the original language, avoiding at the same time to much literalism. To this group belong almost the whole Pentateuch, Book of Joshua, Isaiah, Psalms. On the other hand, the Septuagint consists of books that are very loosely translated, where the translators put greater emphasis on the beauty of the Greek language than on faithfulness to the Hebrew text. In the Book of Job, for instance, attempts were taken to apply Homeric and classical terminology, whereas, in Proverbs hexametric division of verses. The Book of Job is about 1/6 shorter than the Hebrew text, the Proverbs on the other hand contain many sayings that are missing in original. Similar situation is concerning the Book of Ezdra-Nehemia, Ester or Jeremiah. In addition, there are books translated in such a literal way that they are almost incomprehensible without help of the Hebrew version e.g. the Book of Baruch 1:1-3:8, Ecclesiastes. Also there are books on which, most probably, a few translators worked, using various methods of translation e.g. Books of Kings, I and II Samuel. Similar situation concerns books added to the Greek canon but these were clearly composed by hellenized authors (2-4 Maccabean, Wisdom, The Prayer of Manasses, second part of Baruch) and were written with literal pseudo-classical Greek.

With reference to this, it seem justified the assertion of many contemporary scholars, maintaining that concerning deep critical, study on the Septuagint, it cannot be treated as a

---

[14]   F.E.Deist, Toward the Text of the Old Testament, Pretoria 1981, pp.180-182.

unity but rather each book or even each passage should be examined separately[15]. On the other hand, at least with reference to the general characteristic and synthesis of the book, finds its application a canonical approach to the Bible[16] i.e. treating it as a certain, edited unity. The fact itself, that at the basis of the translation of the Septuagint was a general desire to provide the Alexandrine community with an adequate text of the Old Testament, that books of the Old Testament were grouped in a certain way and order, that certain deutero-canonical works were added to them, that the whole thing underwent certain editorial modifications (e.g. new titles of the Pentateuch), which influence we can nowadays only to suspect, that the whole work was treated as a unity by original addressees ...all of it shows that treating the Septuagint as a unity has strong historical basis. Such an assertion expresses Alfred Rahlfs, maintaining that the Septuagint as a unity "(...) is not a translation but theological commentary"[17]. Similar position takes Jelicoe, drawing up a general picture of the Septuagint. He clearly states that it is possible to outline major characteristics of the book and trends that the translators, or editors, followed[18]. This very assumption lays at the basis of the second part of this paper.

The Septuagint and the Hebrew Text

General Characteristic of the Translation[19]

Speaking of the general characteristic of the Septuagint as a translation of the Hebrew text, it must be once more stated that at the basis of the whole process lied a general desire to translate *faithfully* Palestinian text in such a way, so that it became *comprehensible and acceptable* for the average member of Alexandrine Diaspora, for whom Greek was the mother tongue and who was acquainted with palestra and gimnasion.

Most of all one must be aware that the translators viewed the Old Testament as a holy text, God's revelation, which (at least with reference to the Pentateuch) efficiently restrained them from applying to many modification. It seems that prevailing was the general desire to preserve reasonable literal fidelity than to impose particular theological interpretation[20]. When the Septuagint is compared with, for instance, Palestinian Targu-

---

[15] Interpreter's Bible Commentary, Zanderran 1980

[16] Por. Brevard Childs, The Canonical Approach to the Old Testament, Eerdmans 1992

[17] Benzel, Introduction to the Old Testament, 2 ed., Kopenhaga 1952, 1.76 (Rahlfs, Leipzig, Orientalungtag, 1921)

[18] Jelicoe, ibid, pp.315-317.

[19] I restrict the general characteristic mainly to the homogenous text of the Pentateuch. Because of the content of this paper I leave out here a discussion concerning the Hebrew text lying at the basis of the Septuagint and its differences with the masoretic text.

[20] Surely, these tendencies differed concerning various books. Here I concentrate mainly on the characteristic of the Pentateuch.

mim, it turns out that the former is much closer to the Hebrew text than the latter. The Septuagint more often leaves unclear phrases in unchanged form (e.g. Gen. 1:2 h!l)a$ j^Wr translated in an unclear way as πνεῦμα θεου[21]). Also often the Septuagint leaves in historical narrative[22], usually translated fairly literally, a lot of Hebraisms e.g. double accusativus, προτίσθημι with infinitivus for a repeated action, parataxis, characteristic phrases like for example "in the eyes [of the Lord]", "before the face [of the Lord]", etc. All, even the most loosely translated books of the Septuagint (e.g. Proverbs) are still more Hebrew than Greek in their character.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that it was extremely important for translators to adapt the Greek version to the situation of the receivers. Its quite possible that on the basis of this desire translators often shortened Hebrew text[23], where description seemed unclear, darkened general message or were „politically incorrect"[24], they added interpretative gloss when the text was incomprehensible[25], sometimes they also corrected potential mistakes of the Old Testament according to their logic. For example the Book of Genesis 2:16 contains a prohibition to eat fruit from the tree of knowledge even before creation of Eve. This prohibition is stated in the second person singular (lk^aT), i*l+k*a&, tWmT). The Septuagint, on the basis of Genesis 1:27, corrects Hebrew text into: φάγεσθε, φάγητε, ἀποθανεῖσθε.

It seems that translators wanted most of all to convey the sense of Hebrew text, adapting it to the situation of receivers, forms used in their world and demands of Greek grammar. Therefore, for instance, they often used subordinate clauses, prefered in κοινῆν even though Hebrew syntax used coordinated clauses (e.g. Gen.24:28 - hmx tybl dgtw hrunh Jrtw - καὶ δραμοῦσα ἡ παῖς ἀπήγγειλεν εἰ* τοὶ οἶκον τῆ~ μητρὸς -"and having ran she told them these things about mother's house" instead of "and she ran and told them these things about mother's house"). Similarly, Hebrew words with vast semantic field translators rendered with whole groups of Greek equivalents (e.g. rb*d* - Exod.1:18 [pra~gma], 12:35 [suntavssein]; 18:16 [a*ntilogiva]; 18:22 [krivma]; 8:8 [o&rismov_]; 4:10 [i&kanov_]; 5:13, 19 [kaqh~kon]; 16:4 [toV (th_ ~ h&mevra_)]; 18:11, 14 [tou~to]; 29:1 [tau~ta], 5:11 [ou*deiv_][26]).

---

[21]   although it is possible to translate this phrase as "great wind", "wind before God" or "wind sent by the Lord"; Jelicoe, ibid, p.316

[22]   Some narrations are translated so literally that it is virtually impossible to understand them without the Hebrew text, from which they were translated.

[23]   It is obvious that sometimes the translators used shorter versions of original text e.g. in case of the Book of Jeremiah (4QJer). Por. Würthwein, ibid, p.52.

[24]   e.g. Greek term for rabbit is lago_. However, Lagos was also the name of king Ptolemy I, the founder of Lagids dynasty. Most probably from political reasons translators of the Septuagint omitted this word in Lev. 11:6, where Bible lists rabbit as an unclean animal. See Z. Swiderkówna, Roymowz o Biblii, Pwn W-wa 1994 p.320.

[25]   e.g. urim becomes dh~loi(Lb.27:21, Powt.33:8, I Sam.14:41, 28:6), dh~lwsi_ (Ex.28:26, Kap³.8:8), fwtivswn (Neh.7:65) and tumim - a*lhvqeia (Ex.28:26, Kap³.8:8, Powt.33:8) or tevleioi (Ezdr.2:65).

[26]   Some choices made here by translators are erroneous, especially those which were caused by misreading of the Hebrew text lacking, e.g. term rb#D# (desease/plag) translators rendered or as qavnato_, or as rb*D* (Oz.13:14 - divkh, Hab.3:5, Ps.90:3 - lovgo_, Ps.90:6 - pra~gma). Thus, in the Book of Isaiah 9:7 the Hebrew phrase "The Lord sent a word against Jacob" becomes in the Septuagint "The Lord sent death to Jacob ".

On the basis of the general desire to make Hebrew text comprehensible to aver-
age member of Alexandrine Diaspora it is possible to explain idiosyncretisms of the Book of
Job, Proverbs of Salomon, additions to Ester or Daniel. [27] In the same way one may also try to
explain certain new concepts, which the translators employed, or attempts to resign from He-
brew dead metaphors, incomprehensible phrases[28] or inadequate forms in Greek cultural
context. For instance, Deuteronomium 23:18 contains a warning: "None of the daughters of
Israel shall be a cult prostitute (hvdq, LXX: povrnh) nor shall any of the sons of Israel be a
cult prostitute (vdq, LXX: porneuvwn)." Already the fact that in the Septuagint were chosen
terms povrnh, porneuvwn instead of i&erovdoulo_ automatically changes the meaning of
the passage. However, equally or even more important is an interpolation made by the trans-
lator of the Greek version: ou*k e!stai telesfovro_ a*poV qugatevrwn Israhl, kaiV ou*k
e!stai teliskovmeno_ a*po ui&w~n Israhl. The terms telesfovro_ and teliskovmeno_ refer
here to the members of mystery cults. Just as temple prostitution was a threat for the cult of
the ancient Israel, so mystery religions were a dangerous temptation in hellenized Egypt.[29]
Similarly translators of the Septuagint tried to avoid terms that had to vast referential bag-
gage and could lead to serious theological misinterpretations. In such cases they often re-
signed from a literal translation and "imposed a new form on the Hebrew text in order to
preserve the spirit of the Bible, the spirit of God's revelation".[30] In this way, for instance,
they often avoided references to God as a "rock" (rwx) because in Hellenistic religions rocks
and stones commonly symbolized gods or designated places of their dwelling. Therefore a
metaphor of rock in the Old Testament could lead to certain misinterpretations, e.g. that rock
was worshipped as God of Jews. Thus, the term "rwx" was most often replaced with other
words with similar meaning and different connotations in Greek culture. [31]

Moreover one must be aware that the Septuagint as a whole underwent certain
editorial modifications, attempting to shape it in a particular, general way. Unfortunately, it
is impossible today to reconstruct all (or even most of them) aspects of editors' work, how-
ever some seem obvious. For instance, the titles of the Pentateuch, given in Greek version
clearly pinpoint theological messages of each book (e.g. Genesis, Exodus, Numeri, Leviti-
cus...), whereas in Hebrew Bible the titles are simply repetitions of the first words with
which each book starts. Similar case concerns the order of books in the Greek Bible: the
Book of Ruth after Judges, Lamentations after Book of Jeremiah. In all of this are seen con-
scious attempts to put books in a chronological order, began with the prior translation of the
Pentateuch. Through these modifications one may see attempts to shape the Septuagint as a
whole and to impose on it particular general interpretation.

Other important aspect, determining the shape of the Septuagint, is the prob-
lem of philosophical and religious identity of Alexandrine translators and the issue of cul-
tural context, in which they created their translation. Thus, philosophical Hellenistic ideas,
although treated by Diaspora with a certain distance, inevitably penetrated Jewish commu-

---

[27]   Jelicoe, ibid, p.316-317
[28]   e.g. a phrase "man of not circumcised lips" became "man that cannot speak" (Swiderkówna, s.319)
[29]   H.M.Orlinsky, BA 9 (1946),p.24 / Würtwein, ibid, p.67
[30]   G.Bertram, ZAW 57 (1939), p.101 / Würtwein, ibid, p.66
[31]   From similar reasons God in Ex.15:3 is characterized by the name "Destroyer of wars" and not
"Worrier" as in Hebrew original.

nity long before translation of the Septuagint and slowly modified its way of thinking. Therefore, in spite of faithfulness to the tradition and teaching of the fathers, translators were not able to restrain from the influence of Greek thought on themselves and their translation. So, their way of perceiving reality, so far as it is possible to reconstruct it from Greek translation of the Bible, reveals influence of some Greek concepts e.g. apophatic way of viewing God or inclinations to anthropological dualism. These ideas, in a fully or partly conscious way, or at times independently from translators found their place in translation of the Bible, especially where they found support of Palestinian Judaism (e.g. leaving out anthropomorphisms concerning God or rising up popularity of angels as mediators between God and man).

Independent from translators influence of Hellenistic thought, concerns mainly very strong, referential side of koinhv Greek, where particular concepts inevitably were joined to particular ideas in mind of average citizen of Greek world. These connotations, determined by religious traditions, social experiences, cultural trends and hundreds of other issues, which are impossible nowadays to identify, forced the readers of the Septuagint to particular understanding of certain concepts, independently from efforts of translators[32]. So, even ideal translation of certain phrases could lead to misunderstandings and interpretation that differed from those, which were sanctioned in Palestine. For instance "yuchv" (literal translation of Hebrew "vpn"), in Greek tradition meant *apriori* independent aspect of human nature, in opposite to the Hebrew Bible. Similarly "pneu~ma" as a equivalent of "jWr", "saVrx" as a equivalent of "rcB", "liqo_" - „rwx", etc. In each of these cases (and in hundreds other situations), in spite of good Greek substitutes, the translation took another meaning because of differences between "referential side" of the language of sender and the "referential side" of the language of the receiver. A great influence of this "metalinquistic" sphere of language is particularly seen in early Hellenistic writings of Judaism, which by using particular hermeneutic tools and by referring to the referential side of koinhv, tries to find an excuse for some typically-Greek concepts in the Septuagint. [33]

So, these are the major tendencies of the Septuagint as a translation, shown in a short outline. These tendencies are determined mainly by two factors: a desire to adjust the Old Testament to Greek mentality and the cultural context itself, determining both translators, original readers and their interpretation of the text. These factors caused that the Septuagint became not only a translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek language but at the same time a translation of Greek ideas into language of the Old Testament. These factors caused that language (in a broad meaning of this word) of the Septuagint became an important tool of philosophication of the Hebrew Bible and of "making the first bridge between world of the Patriarchs and philosophers of Hellada."

The next part of this paper illustrates in what way these Hellenistic ideas found their expression in actual application in the Septuagint of two fundamental biblical

---

[32]   As citizens of hellenized Alexandria, they had to be aware of this "metalinguistic" side of language. It is clearly seen, for example, in situations, where the translators avoid literal translation, when there was a danger of too serious theological misinterpretations on this "referential level" (e.g. mentioned before description of God Yahweh with the term "rock")

[33]   E.g. preexistence of soul in the Book of Wisdom

categories: theology *sensu stricto*, i.e. a way of perceiving God and anthropology i.e. a way of viewing the nature of man. This chapter outlines basic characteristic of changes that the Septuagint introduced into original Hebrew thought through conscious decisions of translators, character of books added to the Greek cannon and the very nature of Greek language.

TRANSCENDENCE OF GOD IN THE SEPTUAGINT

Hebrew Bible presents God in many various ways. It considers God from many perspectives, and one of the most interesting is the relationship between God and human realm. Using various metaphors the Old Testament introduces God as a Creator, Father, Judge, Law-giver, Guide, Savior, Victor, Friend, etc. On the one hand, He is holy[34], thus He is separated and morally perfect, timeless, unchanging, unknowable, perfect, uncompromising and so on. On the other hand, however, God changes his mind, can be appeased with prayers and sacrifices, dwells in the Arc of Covenant, fights with Jacob, is sorry for his deeds, pay a visit to Abraham, helps Israel to conquer Philistines or other pagan nations, etc. Transcendence and immanence, usually understood as two opposed qualities, in the Old Testament, are joined in a mysterious way in a person of God Yahweh, being above the world but revealing himself in the world.

The relationship of these two aspects: transcendence and immanence of God is being already changed in Hebrew Bible. The oldest passages of the Old Testament, representing so called Yahwistic tradition, show God in a very anthropomorphic way as the one, who visits Abraham, talks with Adam or Noah, who walks through the Garden of Eden and so on. In the Elohist tradition God does not already encounter directly with man but reveals himself in dreams or uses "the Angel of the Lord." In deuteronomistic tradition God "becomes even more separated from the world." Here he is shown as an independent being, having his throne above the world. When the authors of this tradition speak of God, they refer rather to God's hypostatsis than directly to his person. Even the name "Yahweh" is substituted by the phrase "the name of the Lord." The youngest, priestly tradition goes along the same track, speaking rather of "glory of the Lord", which comes to or leaves the people of Israel, than of the person of God.

These tendencies are taken and expanded by the Septuagint[35], which wants to create general abstract and philosophical idea of God, mainly through leaving out anthropomorphisms and anthropopatisms. The Septuagint aims to "create a pure concept of God", according to demands stated by main philosophical systems of then Hellenistic world.

Thus in the Greek book of Exodus (4:24) it is not Yahweh, who attacks and wants to kill Moses, but the Angel of the Lord. Divine stick of Moses becomes in LXX a stick from God (thVn r&avbdon thVn paraV tou~ qeou~ - Ex.4:20). Moses does not come to

---

[34]   Concerning the meaning of the term "holy" in the Old Testament see Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, vol.I, Moody Press
[35]   similarly as Palestinian Targums

God himself to make a covenant, but he comes to the mountain of God (Ex.19:3). A hand of Yahweh (hwhy dy), protecting Israel from other nations, becomes duvnami_ tou~ kurivou (Joz.4:24). In the same spirit, a translator of the Septuagint changes a direct saying "bring to God" (Ex.21:6) into proV_ toV krithvrion tou~ qeou~ prosavgein. In the Greek version of Isaiah doxa qeou~ dwells in the temple and not Yahweh himself[36].

Similarly, according to the Septuagint, one cannot see God nor know him sensually as other physical things. In the Book of Exodus (24:10[11]), Greek translator pinpoints that seventy elder did not see God but only the place, where was standing. In Isaiah 38:11, the Septuagint substitutes "to see God" into "to see God's salvation." Likewise in the Book of Job, the added phrase: a@ o& o*fqalmou_ mou~ e&ovraken, shows that God cannot be seen in the same way as the rest of creation.

Another example of leaving out personifications of God in the Septuagint is omission of, quite popular phrase in the Hebrew Bible: "God has converted"[37], speaking of changing attitude of the Creator. For example, translator of Genesis (6:6,7) maintains according to the Hebrew text that God is sorry for creating man but he omits the phrase that God "converts." In Exodus 32:12 the original prayer for the change of God's attitude becomes in Greek translation an assertion of God's mercy. In a similar way the Septuagint leaves out phrases speaking of God's wrath and tries to focus on human sin. In Numbers (1:53): "There will not be wrath over Israel" becomes in LXX: u*k e!stai a&mavrthma e*n ui&oi~_ Israel, which considerably changes the character of the passage. Likewise in Job 42:7 "my wrath is over you" is translated with the phrase "you have sinned."

Through all these endeavors, the Septuagint wants to pinpoint that God is an absolute, infinite ruler of the universe, independent being. He is the creator, through whom the world came into being and who can always destroy it or alter it, according to his will. There cannot be any other Providence besides him or above him. At the same time it becomes clear, that God belongs to a different reality than man, who is totally subject to God. God's immanence diminishes in the Septuagint and his transcendence becomes a leading motif in a process of philosophication of the concept of divine being. This fact illustrates well a description of a meeting Yahweh with Moses (Exodus 3:14ff), where God reveals his name to the future leader of the nation. He speaks from the flaming bush: "I am who I am"[38]. This, no doubt, difficult to comprehend phrase, underlines mainly "actual, dynamic presence of God with his people and for his people. To the translators of the Septuagint, acquired to Greek philosophy, seemed that a specificatuion is needed. So they wrote: „I am being" and this Greek participle (o& w~n) soon became the only right way to characterize God as the Absolute Being".[39] This philosophical rendering of the name of God, extracted and underlined one of many aspects of divine name, included (probably) in Hebrew version, but perhaps not fully realized by editors of the Pentateuch. This translation or rather interpreta-

---

[36] - Isa.42:13 and Ex.15:3 - hm*j*l+m! vya! and in LXX suntrivbwn polevmou_.
[37] See E. Stauffer, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (ed.Gerhard Kittel), Eerdmans 1965, vol.3; J.W.Wevers, Theologische Rundschau n.s.22, 1954, pp.174-176.
[38] which may be differently understood accordnig to understanding of aspect Imperfectum of Hebrew grammar. See The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew-English Lexicon, Hendricson 1979, pp.224-229
[39] Z. Swiderkówna, ibid, s.320

tion, was consistent with a general tendency of the Septuagint to introduce God as "independent, absolute being."

The Greek translation develops this way of perceiving the person of God, when it makes the term kuvrio_ a representative God's name as a substitute of the holy tetragram JHWH.[40] The word kuvrio_ is a literal translation of Hebrew terms nw)da*, yn*d)a* but the most often it is used as equivalent of divine name Yahweh.[41] The term kuvrio_ in the Greek-speaking world was never used to mean a pagan god, rather by this term was characterized someone, who legally had power. It seems that these two aspects were main causes for choosing kuvrio_[42] and not for example despovth_, which would probably be more natural in Greek language. In its apologetic attitude, the Septuagint underlines that the primary position of Yahweh is legally sanctioned. He is the Lord and ruler of Israel as the one, who has chosen Israel and led her out from Egyptian slavery. At the same time He is the Lord of the whole world, as its creator.[43] Consequent usage of kuvrio_ in *status absolutus* suggests God's juridical, unlimited and invisible power over all things, his e*xousiva. The term kuvrio_, an adequate designation of the only God, must have pinpoints to the receivers God's unlimited and absolute power. "(...) the tittle kuvrio_ became a substitute of the name. Implication of this is that the owner of this title is „sovereign" in an absolute sense. This precedence does not have an analogy in earlier or contemporary to the Septuagint Greek".[44]

This "separation" of God from the world is additionally expressed in the Septuagint through popularization of the idea of mediator (usually an angel) between God and man. Speculations concerning angels developed already much earlier in the times of the second temple. There is underlined their significance as mediators between Yahweh and the material world. Angels help godly people and bring their prayers to God (Dan.3:25, 28), they proclaim and punish according to God's will (Dan.7:10), receive their names: Michael (Dan.9:21, 10:13). The Septuagint, especially in the books added to the cannon, develops even more this picture. New angelic beings appear: Gabriel, Uriel, Raphael and they receive new, particular offices (Tob.12:15, I Enoch 9:1, 4 Ezdr.4:1). Angel as a reveler of God's will, heavenly guide, disclosing divine mysteries, becomes a standard person in relationship between the Creator and material world (I Enoch 17-36). In early Judaism the image of heavenly court is still maintained, but now it becomes more a place of judgment and resolutions

---

[40]   These tendencies "(...) nalezy tlumaczyc uduchowieniem religji, widocznem juz w pismach proroków i we wczesnej literaturze talmudycznej" (E.Stein, Filon z Aleksandrii, Czlowiek, Dziela i Nauka Filozoficzna, Warszawa 1930, p.6). On the other side, it seems that this spiritualization of judaism is an effect of hellenization of Jewish diaspora in Alexandria, in effect of which "God's realm" is separated from "human realm". See Everett Ferguson, Backgrounds of Early Christianity, Eerdmans, Michigan 1993, p.407
[41]   6156 times this term is used as a substitute of the name Yahwe, 60 razy - la@, 23 - H^w)la$, 193 - h!l)a$, 3 - hwhy yh@l)a$. Kuvrio_ qeov_, kuvrio_ o& qeov_, o& kuvrio_ qeov_- usually used to mean Yahwe with or without an apposition (elohim). *Despotes,* meaning Yahwe is used only in Jer.15:11 (vocativus)
[42]   kuvrio_ to describe God is employed from the oldest books of the Bible.
[43]   It seems that the usage of the term kuvrio_ it is a good example of conscious applying of referencial side of Greek language.
[44]   C.Dodd, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, (ed. G.Kittel), v.4, Eerdmans, 1965, p.1082

than a place of debating council as it was shown in Hebrew writings (I Enoch 61:9-13, 15-16).

Moreover, the Septuagint, treating person of God with the great prudence, not only leaves out antropomorphisms and antropopatisms concerning Yahweh but also often, when the Bible speaks of interaction between God and the outer world, it substitutes his person with the person of angel. Thus, Jacob according to the Septuagint (Gen.32:22-32) did not fight with God but with an angel; according to Ps.8:5-7 (LXX) God did not make man a little smaller from God but from angels; it is not God, who visits Abraham but his angel (Gen.18); it is not Yahweh, who attacks and wish to kill Moses but his angel (Ex.4:24), etc.

In summary, one can assert that the Septuagint considerably modifies the concept of God as it is shown in the Hebrew Bible, through changing the relationship of God's transcendence to his immanence. True, the Septuagint preserves the main thrust of Hebrew line of argumentation, it does not make God Yahweh to be Demiurg or god of Greek philosophies but it introduces him in a way that helps Greek mentality to accept him. He is transcendent God, unchanging, timeless being, above everything, impossible to know sensually, interacting with the physical world through mediators and so on. It seems that the Septuagint employs these changes on three fundamental levels: on the level of translation sensu stricto (leaving out antropomorphisms), in books added to the cannon (popularization of the idea of mediators) and through skillful usage of the referential side of Greek language (kuvrio_). These changes will be taken up and expanded in latter hellenized thinkers both Judaistic (Philo from Alexandria) and Christian (Clement form Alexandria, Origen).

ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE SEPTUAGINT

One of the fundamental thesis of the anthropology of the Hebrew Old Testament is defining man as a psycho-physical unity. No division exists within him, no separation into spiritual and material part. Greek dualism (body and spirit)[45] or latter Christian trichotomy (spirit, soul and body) does not exist in Hebrew Bible. True, the Old Testament uses such terms like soul (v\p\n [n\p\v]), spirit (jWr [rW^j]), body (rcB, rac [B^c^r, c^a^r]), heart (bl, bbl [l#b, l#b^b]) and so on, but they never mean ontological division within man, they never constitute independent elements of which a person consists. Most often they are idiomatic characteristic of a being as such (Isa.40:6-7) or they describe particular aspects of human being.

Soul, one or the most important anthropological terms in the Old Testament, designates most of all "a living person" in all aspects of his existence, living, unique being[46]

---

[45]   As it is presented for example in Phaedo (80b), where only soul in man is related to what is divine, immortal; and body belongs to restricted, imperfect, changeable sphere of life. " „Gdy (dusza) styka sie z tym, co zmienne, czyli z rzeczami, wtedy blaka sie, pela niepokoju, zataczajac niby po pijanemu, natomiast gdy oddziela sie od ciala i styka z rzeczami niezmiennymi, wtedy przy tych rzeczach pozostaje zawsze niezmiennie taka sama".

[46]   por.Rodz.2:7: „The Lord formed the man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living being [vpn - *soul*] "

or in more restricted sense "living element", coming from God. Man in the Old Testament is not so much an incarnated soul, having life in itself, but rather alive body, where the principle of life comes from God. Soul without body does not exist, body without soul is dead corps. In this sense, soul becomes a constitutive element of a broadly understood personality of human person (Gen.2:7), it is principle of life of a being, "ego" (Gen.27:25, Jer.3:11).[47]

Another important anthropological term is "body" (rcB, rac [B^c^r, c^a^r])[48]. Various ways of use of the term rcB [B^c^r], show that in Hebrew Old Testament human being is understood in his essence as a body. This assertion of total carnality of a person in the Old Testament underlines very strongly his weakness and transitoriness in this world. As a carnal being, person suffers, dies, fears.[49] Creaturliness, earthly nature, weakness, inadequacy, ephemerality "(...) all these characteristic features of rcB which denote its nature, fate and importance define its situation before God. In spite of his vanishenss and inclinations to sin, body itself is not bad. Hebrew Bible never opposes body and soul. The contrast between body and spirit (see Isa. 31:3) concerns rather opposition between God and man, or a sphere of man and the sphere of God, than two opposed qualities within a person.

Another important anthropological term in the Old testament is word jWr [rW^j] - spirit[50]. Except places, where it clearly refers to God, heavenly beings or purely physical occurrences e.g. wind, it most often means life-giving element in creation (Eccl.3:19.21, Jer. 10:14, 51:17), the sign of life. As such, the term spirit is often used as a synonimus of life (yh jWr [rW^j] hyyfs24]) or life-giving breath, and thus comes close to the usage of the term vpn [n#p#v]. jWr [rW^j] characterizes efficient power of God, which gives life to man, lets him function, which comes back to God at the moment of death of a person (Job.34:14, Eccl.12:7, Gen.6:3). In this sense spirit becomes an inseparatable element of human life (Ps.104:29-30, and other creation as well). It is a source of all higher functions of a human being. It leads or should lead the will of a person, from spirit comes all wisdom (Job.20:3, Dan.6:4), he shapes proper religious attitude (Isa.29:24, Ps.77:7).

So, in such a huge abbreviation may be characterized original Hebrew concept of man. He is unity, which cannot be split into autonomous fundamental elements. It is possi-

---

[47]   The term "soul" (vpn [n#p#v] in the Hebrew Bible, yuchv in the Septuagint) has at least a few shadows of meanig. In the most general sense it is used to describe living psychophysical organism, man as such (Gen.9:4; Lev.17:10-14; Deut.12:23). Quite often soul in the Old Testament is joined with biological functions, such as hunger, thirst, dream (Deut.12:15, I Sam.2:16), with mental functions referring to human emotional life (I Sam.1:10, Ps.27:12) or with spiritual functions, expressing for example desire to be with God (Isa.26:9, Ps.63:2), faith and other similar religious feelings. Moreover, soul, especially in narrative books, often means simply life, which may be lost in fight, gained through mercy of Yahweh, saved in spite of hostile political circumstances (Josh.2:3, Judg.5:18, II Sam.23:17, I King.19:4, Ezech.32:10, Isa.53:12). The Hebrew Old Testament does not speak about immortality of soul, its functions after human death, place of dwelling, and especially its preexistence (potential allusions: Jer.1:5 „Before I formed you in the womb I knew you", Job.38:4-7)

[48]   This word, except usages referring to eatable meat (Lev.7:19, Num.11:4, Deut.32:42), animal's body, or muscular tissue (Lev.13:2, Lev.12:3, Gen.17:11, Lev.15:2, Ex.28:24, Ezech.16:26, Lev.6:3, Ex.28:24), most often describes human body as such or human being generally (I King.21:27, Job 4:15, Ps.63:2, Ps.63:2, Job 14:22, 13:14, 12:10 Isa.10:18), also in a collective sense as humanity.

[49]   „All men are like grass" says Isaiah „and all their glory is like the flowers of the field. The grass withers and the flowers fall (Isa.40:6, see. Eccl.12:7).

[50]   Encyklopedia Katolicka, v.4, p.278-282

ble only to pinpoint various aspects of his existence with reference to God, to material world, to other people, to mental life, etc. Those anthropological terms: soul, spirit, body and many other, serve most of all in this kind of characteristic of man.

However this holistic, consistent picture of man, shaped in the oldest books of the Old Testament starts changing in the time of second temple under influences of various factors. The Septuagint, revealing influence of Greek thought, also modifies this traditional image of human being.

Most of all there are seen in the Septuagint certain tendencies to isolate soul as a autonomous and immaterial part of a human person. As a good example can serve here anthropology of the Book of Wisdom of Salomon, being a part of Greek canon. It clearly states forth a theory of a full autonomy and superiority of soul. Body is nothing more than a prison and a burden for yuchv and other higher elements of human being, like for example nou~_ or logismov_ (9:15). Interest of soul is much more important than interest of body. Only a fool may think that death constitutes the end of human existence (2:1ff). Soul, existing before incarnation (8:19-20) is immortal (3:1, 4:14, 15:8-11), even if its destination is Hades (16:14). Certain ethical characteristics are ascribe to soul, characteristics that human being should extract and cultivate through ascetic life (8:21). This motif taken up and expanded in other books written in the context of Diaspora, e.g. II Book of Ezdra[51], maintains that all the souls are prepared to incarnation from eternity (23:5), just as it happened in case of Adam (chap.32). All the souls will survive till the judgment at the end of the world (7:12-15).

Another important issue, which cannot be left out here, is the problem of translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek language (LXX) and modifications that in this process introduced the translators of the Septuagint. Quite often these are only semantic nuances but sometimes these changes have essential significance. In the case of yuchv, this term substitutes in most instances Hebrew term vpn [n#p#v]. The problem, however, is that in Greek mentality, yuchv somehow automatically was understood as the immaterial and most often immortal part of human being. Thus, such texts as Lb.35:11, Ps.22:3, III King.19:4, Deut.11:18, 18:6, Prov.19:15n, translated with the usage of the noun yuchv as a place of dwelling of spirit or mind, suggest *apriori* that soul exists after physical death of a person. In this way application of Greek substitute gives a new shadow to the word. In Isa 10:18 and Ps.62:2, human being is characterized with two concepts: yuchv / savrx[52]. The Greek text suggests that this is an arrangement of two antithetical characteristics, whereas in Hebrew text it is clearly synonimic parallelism (see Koh.5:5, Ps.83:3, Ps.72:26, Ps.15:10). Hebrew text of Ps.15:10 underlines that God will preserve life of psalmist and will not let him die. The Septuagint asserts in this place that God will not leave his soul in Hades and suggests by this his immortality. Similarly the Greek text of the Book of Job (7:15) suggests resurrection, a conviction characteristic to the later Judaism (see Jer.38[31]:12). It seems reasonable to assert that the translation of Hebrew text itself (through a choice of particular

---

[51] Dihle, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. G.Kittel, Eerdmans 1965, v.7, pp.632-635.

[52] &O qeoV_ o& qeoV_ mou, proV_ seV o*rqrizw:
e*diyhsevn soi h& yuchv mou.
posaplw~_ soi h& savrx mou
e*n th/~ e*rhvmw/ kaiV a*bavtw/ kai a*nuvdrw/;

terminology, an influence of certain philosophical trends and often unconscious connotations) brought considerably nearer Hebrew thought to the Greek world, oldestamental concepts to philosophical Greek ideas.

Similar mechanism may be seen in cases of terms rcB [b^c^r] and jWr [rW^j], where natural associations with these terms in Greek mentality became catalyzes of changes in the Septuagint, through particular translations or through teaching of deuterocanonical books, added to the Greek canon. [53] The noun jWr [rW^j] is more and more often used in the Septuagint to describe the nature of God, the principle of life within human being, religious attitude of a person or even divine element in a person, which generally reflects Hellenistic way of usage of this word. Thus, Salomon in the Book of Wisdom says that God has given him yuchv a*gaqhv and sw~ma a*mivanton (8:19), but he underlines that only as an answer to prayers, divine sofiva or pneu~ma (identical - 1:6) came to his soul as a supernatural gift (9:4, 10:16). So, the spirit, whose nature and work is described in 7:24ff, is not immanent part of a person. Just as in gnosticism he comes into soul in a particular o@soi as emanation a*pauvgasma, a*povrrosia of God. The book creates certain hierarchy pneu~ma-yuchv-sw~ma, which is nevertheless based on theological distinction, in opposition to philosophical anthropology nou~_-yuchv-sw~ma, which is based on separation of ontic qualities within human being.

Concerning rcB [b^c^r], the Septuagint introduces a division into weak and endurable savrx[54] and sw'ma, betraying by this influence of Greek thought and also uses eastern division of the world into two cosmic spheres: of spirit and of flesh. The Lord of all flesh in Num.16:22, 27:16 becomes in the Septuagint the Lord of spirits and all flesh. In this way this phrase was spread in Greek-speaking Jewish and Christian world. The Septuagint, in the Book of Ezechiel 10:12, leaves out the phrase speaking the flesh of cherubs. This division does not seem to reflect Greek antithesis of divine nou~_ and material sw~ma. It rather refers to dualism, based on Persian cosmology dividing world into lower, material sphere and

---

[53] And later they have influence on Judaistic and Christian thinkers. E.g. Philo from Alexandria sees savrx in very negative light, perceiving it as a seat of desires, sinful passions, etc. Similarly, as in Qumran teaching, he sometimes refers to the concept of savrx, as to „(...) independent force in the sphere of psychology, which functions in opposition to spiritually oriented will" (Spec Leg IV,114; Quod Deus 140144). According to Philo, God does not have savrx nor sw~ma, therefore he might be known only by soul, which also does not have body. For this immaterial „yuchv", body is nothing more than the grave, a prison restraining soul from absolute freedom. Consequently Philo asserts that the primary virtue in human life has freeing himself from the boundaries of flesh through asceticism. Otherwise soul will be stopped on its way to heaven. All kinds of passions and desires pollute not only savrx, but also and most of all soul.

[54] The idea of transient and vanishing savrx is very vivid in Greek philosophy and literature. For instance, Homer maintains, that at the moment of death flesh decays like bones and other bodily elements. However, such human elements like qumo_", yuchv or sometimes nou~" survive. At times savrx in his writings is contrasted not only with human vital strength but also with the spirit or intellect of a person. Thus, the saying ai* sarkev" ei*nai frevnon describes someone stupid and naive. Likewise Plato asserts that o!nko" sarkon, which after death is buried in a grave, is not the core of man's nature, but rather cloth or outward covering. Plutarch maintains the same thought, sharply distinguishing between savrx and yuchv (as between sw~ma and yuchv) as two different, adverse elements of humanity, the first destroyable, the second eternal. (G.Kittel, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Eerdmans 1969, vol.VII,s.101-105, Platon, Leges 959c,Plutarch,De Exilio1(II,599c).

higher spiritual. A premise to this distinction in the Hebrew Bible may be division into the sphere belonging to perfect Creator and sinful creation.[55]

Also in books added to Greek canon the anthropological dualism, based on Greek patterns, is more and more obvious and seen in a division between savrx[56] and pneu~na. The Book of Wisdom of Salomon (16:14), referring to this division, characterizes life on the Earth as life e*n sarkiv. The Book of Judith (10:113), describing human being, uses the phrase ou*...saVrx miva ou*deV pneu~ma zwh~_. These two aspects, seen parallelically, describe human being as a unity, just like in Hebrew Old Testament and are totally equal. However, it is obvious that for the author, human being consists of these two spheres and one cannot consider him only from one side, as it often did Hebrew Bible. Thus anthropological dualism is better seen in books, which were under greater influence of Greek thought. Wisdom of Salomon (7:1) describes human being as a mortal being, made by sperma, h*donh, formed as saVrx in a womb but pneu~ma sofiva_ is given to him later. Similarly, according to 4th Maccabees (7:13), human being consists of flesh and muscles to which later spirit is added. Just as in later Hellenism, depreciating significance of flesh, also here flesh starts to be connected with emotions, and through them with evil, although itself it is not sin.[57]

In summary, it should be once more emphasized that the Septuagint considerably changes classical, holistic model of human being, so strongly underlined especially in older books of Hebrew Bible. Motifs taken during Babylonian exile, in Diaspora and also inner development of religious thought find their expression in early Judaistic writings (which were added to Greek canon) and in translation of the Septuagint. Human being slowly seizes to be psycho-physical unity, his spirit becomes a part emancipated from body, and flesh itself is more and more depreciated. In Wisdom of Salomon, Ecclesiasticus and other books, appear motifs about preexistence of soul or even its divine origin. And flesh becomes something like a prison for soul, from which human being should free himself through ascetic life. It appears that just as in case of the concept of God, these changes are introduced on three fundamental levels: on the level of translation (e.g. division into sw~ma and savrx), in books added to canon (e.g. preexistence of soul in Wisdom of Salomon) and also through skillful use of referential side of Greek language (yuchv, pneu~ma, savrx). These changes considerably bring nearer two worlds: Hebrew and Greek, Jerusalem and Athens. They create a kind of a bridge, which leads to later assimilation of Greek concepts and Hebrew thought in Greek Christian philosophy. These modifications taken up and expanded later by hellenized thinkers both Judaistic (Philo of Alexandria) and Christian (Clement of Alexandria, Origen).

---

[55]   See. dualism of Philo from Alexandria, Wladyslaw Tatarkiewicz, Historia Filozofii, v.1, p.162-163, PWN, W-wa 1990; Erwin R.Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, New Haven, Yale University Press 1940, pp.119-130

[56]   most common usage of savrx in books added to the Greek canon: animal's body Sir.17:4; 13:16, human body 1:10, 45:1, foreskin - Judith 14:10, Sir.44:20, flesh as a muscular tissue generally - Sir.19:12, 38:28, 4 Macc.9:20, 28. Whole body with its inclinations toward evil, perishness and vanishness is savrx Sir.31:1. New: describing human being as flesh and blood in Sir.14:18, 17:31, Wisd.12:5 and the phrase sw~ma sarkov_ - Syr.23:17

[57]   E.Schweizer, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. G.Kittel, v.VII, pp.109-110

CONCLUSIONS

The Septuagint, first official translation of the Old Testament into Greek language, was created mainly to transfer the teaching of Hebrew Bible into Hellenistic world: oldtestamental ways of perceiving reality, Jewish religious concepts, Jewish spirituality and other ideas contained in teaching of Torah, Writings and Prophets. Original receiver of the Septuagint was supposed to be Alexandrine Diaspora slowly loosing its ties with Palestine and Palestinian Judaism. The Septuagint was supposed to guard Judaistic orthodoxy of this Jewish community, it was to establish some marking points, borders for its religion and to help new generations of Alexandrine Jews to preserve faith of the fathers. In the context of philosophies, religions, mysteries mixed together in Alexandria at the end of past era, Jewish community dramatically needed a certain guide through life. The Septuagint was supposed to be and actually was such kind of a guide.

However, entering the world of Greek philosophies, the Septuagint did not manage to preserve herself from the influence of Greek thought, both concerning its form and content. The primary goal of one-sided translation of the Law, Writings and Prophets into Greek, turned out to be impossible to fulfill dream. Hellenistic thought, hidden in concepts, attitudes, values, unconscious presuppositions both translators and readers, penetrated and modified teaching of the Hebrew Bible. So, the Alexandrine Diaspora did receive text in which gently but firmly was felt the spirit of Hellada. It seems that it was price necessary to pay for the desire to translate faithfully Palestinian text but in such a way, so that it was comprehensible and acceptable for the Jewish community.

Some Hebrew concepts had to be modified and adjusted to demanding Greek mentality (e.g. God as a rock). Alexandrine translators, grown up in hellenized Jewish community, had their own presuppositions, which to a certain degree determined decisions taken by them in a process of translation (e.g. consequent leaving out anthropomorphisms). Greek language itself, which translators used, possessed a huge referential baggage, "forcing" in a way Alexandrine readers to new understanding of some biblical concepts and ideas (e.g. yuchv, savrx, pneu~ma). Finally, there were some books added to the canon of the Septuagint, whose authors, representing Hellenistic Judaism of 1st and 2nd cent. BC, expressed their believes not always according to the teaching of Patriarchs (e.g. preexistence of soul in the Book of Wisdom). All of this caused that the Septuagint became not only a translation of Hebrew Bible into Greek language but also a translation of Greek ideas into language of the Old Testament.

Concerning these issues, it seems reasonable to define the Septuagint as a two-sided bridge between the world of Greek philosophies and Hebrew thought, between Athens and Jerusalem. The translation of the Septuagint started a long-term process of philosophication of Hebrew Bible, taken up later by Philo of Alexandria, Clement, Origen and others. And language of Septuagint was, without doubt, basic and fundamental tool in this process of transferring religious thought into philosophical system, brought to the mature form in writings of later thinkers both Judaistic and Christian.

INDEX ABBRAVIATIONS

Ag.	- Ksiêga Aggeusza	*Lev.Rab.*	- Leviticus Rabba
Am.	- Ksiêga Amosa	*LXX*	- Septuaginta
Akkad. Dan.	- jêzyk akkadyjski	*£k.*	- Ewangelia Œw. £ukasza
I Enoch.	- Ksiêga Daniela	*Mal.*	- Ksiêga Malachiasza
etc.	- Pierwsza Ksiêga Enocha	*Mk*	- Ewangelia Œw. Marka
Ex.	- et cetera	*Mt.*	- Ewangelia Œw. Mateusza
Ezdr.	- Ksiêga Wyjœcia (Exodus)	*n.e.*	- naszej ery
Ezech.	- Ksiêga Ezdrasza	*Neh.*	- Ksiêga Nehemiasza
Iza.	- Ksiêga Ezechiela	*N.T.*	- Nowy Testament
Jer.	- Ksiêga Izajasza	*Oz.*	- Ksiêga Ozeasza
Jn.	- Ksiêga Jeremiasza	*p.n.e.*	- przed nasz[1] er[1]
Job.	- Ewangelia Œw. Jana	*Powt.*	- Ksiêga Powtórzonego Prawa
Joel.	- Ksiêga Hioba (Joba)	*Ps.*	- Ksiêga Psalmów
Kap³.	- Ksiêga Joela	*Rodz.*	- Ksiêga Rodzaju
Kazn.	- Ksiêga Kap³añska	*I Qs.*	- Regu³a Zrzeszenia
Koh.	- Ks. Kaznodziei Salomona	*I Sam.*	- Pierwsza Ksiêga Salomona
I Król.	- Ksiêga Koheleta	*II Sam.*	- Druga Ksiêga Salomona
II Król.	- Pierwsza Ksiêga Królewska	*Sof.*	- Ksiêga Sofoniasza
III Król.	- Druga Ksiêga Królewska	*Sot.*	- Sotades
Lb.	- Trzecia Ksiêga Królewska	*S.T.*	- Stary Testament
	- Ksiêga Liczb	*Wyj.*	- Ksiêga Wyjœcia
		Zach.	- Ksiêga Zachariasza