Theologica variatio? An examination of the variation in the Greek rendering of אֱלהִים and יְהוָה in LXX Proverbs

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the theology of the different Septuagint (LXX) books. In an attempt to examine whether the LXX Proverbs attests a different theology than the Masoretic Text (MT), I have recently analysed the plusses in LXX Proverbs containing ὁ κύριος and ὅ θεός. The results of these studies have indicated that the LXX translation of Proverbs attests a more nuanced theology than its Hebrew counterpart. However, these studies only focus on the attestations of κύριος and θεός in LXX Proverbs without a Hebrew counterpart in MT and do not examine the rendering of Hebrew divine names into Greek. It is generally accepted that the Greek equivalents of יהוה and אֱלהִים are, respectively, κύριος and θεός. However, in LXX Proverbs, יהוה is rendered 18 times by θεός and אֱלהִים three times by κύριος. In order to come to a more precise understanding of the translation technique of the LXX translator, this article tried to formulate an answer to the reason behind this variation in Greek translation equivalents by examining the usage of κύριος and θεός for יהוה and אֱלהִים in LXX Proverbs and especially those instances where the translator deviates from the standard procedure. This examination has indicated that both the divine names have been used interchangeably by the LXX translator and, contrary to the additional attestations of the divine name, do not reflect a nuanced theology vis-à-vis the MT.

Contribution: This article fits perfectly within the scope of HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies because it focuses on the translation technique and theology of the LXX translator of Proverbs and thus contributes (a) to research regarding historical thought (textual transmission of biblical texts) and (b) source interpretation (because the LXX does not only reflect a translational but also an interpretative process, and this article in particular focuses on whether LXX Proverbs attests a different theology than its Hebrew counterpart).
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Introduction

In recent years, scholars have tried to examine whether the different Septuagint (LXX) books reflect a theology that diverges from the Masoretic Text (MT). In the case of Proverbs, Johann Cook has made ample contributions on this topic, especially regarding the ideology of the LXX translator (e.g. Cook 1997, 2006, 2010, 2017, 2020). Recently, the author of this article has also examined whether LXX Proverbs attests a different theology than MT by examining the additional attestations of ὁ θεός and ὁ κύριος with no counterpart in MT (Beeckman 2020a, 2021). These studies have indicated that LXX Proverbs does indeed reflect a diverging, or more specifically, a more nuanced theology than the Hebrew text. The LXX translator has put more emphasis on the Jewishness of the translation by stressing the Solomonic authorship and the sapiential tradition of God as the One to fear (Beeckman 2020a:386–387, 2021:523). Moreover, wisdom is specifically presented as revelatory wisdom (Beeckman 2020a:386). However, these studies only focus on the attestations of κύριος and θεός in LXX Proverbs without a Hebrew counterpart in MT and do not examine the rendering of Hebrew divine names into Greek. Thus, although the studies of Cook and this author have contributed to the field of the theology of LXX Proverbs, new research can shed more light on the matter.

It is generally accepted that the Greek equivalents of יהוה and אֱלהִים are, respectively, κύριος and θεός. However, throughout the LXX corpus, יהוה is often rendered by θεός and אֱלהִים by κύριος. As Martin Rösel has observed, these nonstandard renderings might reflect theological motivations on the part of the LXX translator(s) (Rösel 2007:419–422). In LXX Pentateuch, θεός is connected to the omnipotence of Yahweh.
of God, whereas קְרֵם is used to express the compassionate nature of God’s actions for Israel (Rösel 2007:423). Thus, studying the nonstandard renderings ה’/θεός and κύριος in LXX Proverbs might not only shed light on the translation technique but also on the theology of the LXX translators.

In LXX Proverbs, there are several instances where ה’ is rendered by θεός and κύριος. In order to come to a more precise understanding of the translation technique and (possible) theology of the LXX translator, this contribution will try to formulate an answer to the reason behind this variation in Greek translation equivalents by examining the usage of קְרֵם and κύριος for ה’ and כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה in LXX Proverbs and especially those instances where the translator deviates from the standard procedure. Firstly, the instances where ה’ is rendered by θεός and κύριος by קְרֵם will be registered. Afterwards, they will be evaluated. By doing so, this examination hopes to come to a better characterisation of the translation technique of LXX Proverbs and might also shed some additional light on the theology of the Greek text.

The registration of ה’/θεός and כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה/κύριος in LXX Proverbs

It is David-Marc d’Hamonville who has noted a discrepancy in the rendering of ה’ and כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה (d’Hamonville 2000:46). In a table regarding the Greek translation of the Hebrew divine names in Proverbs, he records that ה’ is rendered 18 times by θεός and κύριος one time by קְרֵם (d’Hamonville 2000:46). However, apart from giving the sections of the book wherein the divine names are attested, he does not indicate the precise verses. Therefore, before we can start evaluating the different rendering of ה’ and כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה in LXX Proverbs, one needs to discern in which verses the LXX translator provides a nonstandard equivalent for the divine name. By making use of the Hatch and Redpath (HR) concordance (1998) as well as BibleWorks (2016), we arrive at the following verses (Table 1).

Thus, although d’Hamonville’s analysis of the Greek rendering of divine names is correct with regard to the nonstandard equivalent θεός/κύριος (3:4), his amount of ה’/θεός seems to be incorrect. Contrary to d’Hamonville’s 18 instances of ה’/θεός, we find 19 cases. It must be noted that HR records 21 instances (Hatch & Redpath 1998:642). The first difference is verses 6:16 and 17:3. Hatch and Redpath notes 6:16 and 17:3 as instances where ה’ is rendered by θεός. However, θεός is only attested in codex Vaticanus (B). Rahlfis (ed. 2006) notes κύριος in these verses. Secondly, there is a discrepancy in numbering with regard to chapter 16. Hatch and Redpath notes the following verses of chapter 16, where θεός is an equivalent of ה’: 16:1 (MT 16:9), 16:1 (MT 15:33) and 16:5. However, HR’s numbering is off. The Greek text recorded in HR of 16:1 is 15:29b (MT 15:29) in Rahlfis, for the first instance, and for the second, it is 15:33 (LXX and MT). Moreover, for 16:2, HR records this verse as 16:4 and notes that there is no Hebrew text in the MT. This is incorrect, because 16:2 in the LXX represents 16:2 in the MT, although the LXX presents a variant reading.

Now that we have registered all the instances where the LXX attests θεός for ה’ and κύριος for כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה, we can examine why the LXX opted for these renderings for these Hebrew divine names.

The evaluation of ה’/θεός and כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה/κύριος in LXX Proverbs

Before looking at the nonstandard renderings ה’/θεός and כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה/κύριος, it is important to examine how these renderings have been explained by scholars in earlier studies. One of the most prominent scholars in the field of divine names and their Greek rendering in the LXX is Wolf Wilhelm Grafen Baudissin (1929). In four volumes, he meticulously examines the usage of the Greek divine name קְרֵם in the LXX and the development of the Hebrew divine name in Ancient and Hellenistic Judaism. Although his works are focused on קְרֵם, he also deals with the occurrences of θεός in the different LXX books. Regarding LXX Proverbs, he notes that the renderings of θεός for ה’ and κύριος for כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה have to be explained as a result of the translator’s translation technique (Baudissin 1929:264). According to him, both Greek names denote the same thing and have been used interchangeably by the translator (Baudissin 1929:264, 268, 270–271).

D’Hamonville, on the other hand, does not ascribe the nonstandard renderings ה’ and כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה to the translator’s translational activity but explains them as a result of a redactional work that happened to the Hebrew text after the LXX translation when compiling the different sections of the Hebrew book of Proverbs, which is reflected in the MT (d’Hamonville 2000:46–47). This redactional activity is especially visible in chapters 15:27–22:17, where only the divine name ה’ is attested and which is rendered 22 times by קְרֵם, 12 times by θεός and one time not rendered at all (d’Hamonville 2000:46). Although this might be the case, this does not account for the nonstandard renderings in the other parts of LXX Proverbs.

Categorising the nonstandard renderings ה’/θεός and כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה/κύριος

Thus, the question remains open. Are these renderings sheer randomness from the part of the translator because both Greek divine titles denote the same thing in the eyes of the translator, as Baudissin asserts, or can we detect a systematic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divine name</th>
<th>Verse(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כָּל הַקְּדִישָׁה/κύριος</td>
<td>3:4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. HR (1998:642) also notes 6:16 as an instance where ה’ is rendered by θεός. However, θεός is only attested in Vaticanus (B). Rahlfis notes κύριος in this verse. The same is true for 17:3. 2. ‘[…] Weil […] dem Übersetzer (ο) θεός und (ο) κύριος gleichwertig waren, ist es wahrscheinlicher, daß θεός für jwh 30 auf Willkür des Übersetzers, als daß es auf einer Textveränderung im Hebräischen beruht’ (Baudissin 1929:264). Fox (2015:251) also indicates that the LXX translator of Proverbs does not make a distinction between the two Greek divine names.
translating technique? In order to formulate an answer to this question, all the nonstandard renderings of יהוה and אל־יהוה will be examined. Firstly, a description of the Hebrew and its Greek rendering will be provided; afterwards, the nonstandard renderings will be categorised and evaluated on the basis of this description. Sinceחמשה/קָדָשֶׁה only occurs once, in 3:4, no categorisation will be made. For this case, only a description and evaluation will be provided (Table 2).

The description, categorisation and evaluation of the nonstandard renderings יהוה/θεός

Based on the description in Table 2, we can make the following observations concerning the renderings of יהוה by θεός:

1. In the majority of the cases, θεός is used in connection with a preposition: 4x παρά + dat. (16:2, 16:5, 17:15 and 21:3), 2x παρά + gen. (18:22, 19:14) and 2x επί + dat. (3:5 and 16:20).

2. In two instances, it is used in expressions that convey the fear of the Lord, that is, 1:7, 3:7, 15:33 and 24:21.

3. In three cases, θεός is used as a possessive genitive: two times to express an anthropomorphism (in 5:21 the eyes of God [τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ὀφθαλμῶν], in 21:1 the hand of God [χειρὶ θεοῦ]) and one time to denote the curse of God (κατὰ θεοῦ, 3:33).

4. θεός is used two times as the subject of the verse (3:19 and 15:29).

5. Two times θεός is used as (in)direct object of a verb. In 19:3 with αἰτιάομαι (‘to charge, to accuse’), whereby θεός occurs in the accusative (τῶν θεών) and in 19:17 with διανοεῖν (‘to lend or borrow money’) where θεός is attested in the dative (θεοῦ).

On the basis of this preliminary categorisation, we can observe that the LXX translator has rendered יהוה by θεός in a variety of contexts. In order to examine whether he opted to render יהוה by θεός in these specific instances, for example, anthropomorphisms, prepositions, the fear of the Lord, etc., we will investigate whether we can find counterexamples in LXX Proverbs whereby the translator provided the standard equivalent rendering יהוה/κύριος for the categories mentioned above. If a counterexample is found, that category cannot count as a context wherein the LXX translator preferred to render יהוה by θεός instead of κύριος.

θεός in connection with a preposition: As described supra, θεός is used eight times as a rendering of יהוה in connection with a preposition (παρὰ + dat., παρὰ + gen. and επὶ + dat.). Often the preposition is not attested in the Hebrew text. This is the case in 16:2, 16:5 and 17:15, where the translator opts for παρὰ + dat. In the latter two verses, יהוה and παρὰ is rendered accordingly by ἀκάθαρτος παρὰ θεοῦ. In the other instances, the preposition is attested in the MT: יהוה in 21:3 is rendered by παρὰ + dat., in 18:22, and 19:19 is translated by παρὰ + gen., יהוה ראה in 3:5 and in 16:20 by επὶ + dat. Table 3 represents a clear overview of θεός as a rendering of יהוה in connection with a preposition (Table 3).

Concerning the rendering of יהוה by κύριος in connection with a preposition, we can make the following observations. The divine name κύριος in connection with a preposition is used 13 times. In five instances, παρὰ + dat. is used to render יהוה (16:11), יהוה ראה (12:2) and יהוה (with no preposition in the Hebrew; 15:11, 16:7 [LXX 15:28] and 17:3). The preposition παρὰ + gen. is also used five times to render יהוה (8:35, 16:33, 20:24 and 29:26) and יהוה in (21:31). Finally, επί + acc. is applied three times to translate יהוה ראה in (28:25) and יהוה ראה (22:19 and 29:25). Table 4 helps to visualise the attestations of κύριος as a rendering of יהוה in connection with a preposition (Table 4).

When comparing the usage of a preposition + θεός and preposition + κύριος in the LXX text, it is clear that both the divine names are used in connection with a preposition to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ψάλτης ϑεοῦ (LXX). Alexanderinus (A) has χειρὶ. The LXX of Origen (O) records ψάλτης ϑεοῦ, another (Ἄλλος) θεοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐν ὑμῖν (LXX). Symmachus (σ’) reads ἔλπιον κυρίῳ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:7</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐν θεῷ (LXX). Symmachus (σ’) reads ἔλπιον κυρίῳ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐν θεῷ (LXX). כִּבְשֵׁב (κυρίῷ). Codex 106 records the same but without כִּבְשֵׁב.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐν θεῷ (LXX). 4QProv. 125 attests ϕόβος κυρίου, another (Ἄλλος) θεοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:29</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐν θεῷ (LXX). τὸν δὲ θεὸν (LXX). Symmachus (σ’) has καὶ κατὰ κυρίου κατὰρα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:33</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐν θεῷ (LXX). Vatican (B) and Sisinaiticus (α’) attest θεοῦ, whereas the other manuscripts attest κυρίου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:2</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐπὶ θεῷ (LXX).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:5</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐπὶ θεῷ (LXX). A attests τοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐπὶ θεῷ (LXX). A reads κυρίῳ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐπὶ θεῷ (LXX). Codex 106 records the same but without κυρίῳ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:22</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐπὶ θεῷ (LXX). B, X and Venetus (V) read θεοῦ, the other manuscripts κυρίου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:3</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐπὶ θεῷ (LXX). Symmachus (σ’) has καὶ κατὰ κυρίου όργισθήσεται ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:14</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐπὶ θεῷ (LXX). B and X attest θεοῦ, whereas the other manuscripts attest κυρίου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:17</td>
<td>יהוה ראה (MT)/ἐπὶ θεῷ (LXX). 21:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Table 3: θεοῦ as a rendering of יהוה in connection with a preposition. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>παρὰ θεός</td>
<td>יהוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρὰ θεοῦ</td>
<td>יהוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επὶ θεῷ</td>
<td>יהוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επὶ θεοῦ</td>
<td>יהוה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Table 4: κύριος as a rendering of יהוה in connection with a preposition. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>παρὰ κύριος</td>
<td>יהוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρὰ κυρίου</td>
<td>יהוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επὶ κύριου</td>
<td>יהוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επὶ κυρίου</td>
<td>יהוה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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render the same Hebrew terms, that is, הָיָה with or without a Hebrew preposition. Although the similar usage is striking, there is a difference that needs to be addressed, that is, the usage of the preposition אֵת. In all the occurrences of אֵת + a divine name, θεός is always used in the dative form, whereas κύριος is used in the accusative form.4 The word pair אֵת κָרְיוֹס only occurs in the form of אֵת תְוָה וָה (with the article) in the LXX, and the majority of the instances are found in LXX Psalms.5 The dative form of κύριος is only used 13 times in LXX Proverbs: five times following the particle παρά (see supra), eight times after the noun βδέλυγμα (‘abomination’) (see 11:20, 12:22, 15:8, 9, 26, 20:23, 21:27 and 27:20). It is interesting to note that only κύριος is used in connection with βδέλυγμα and never θεός.

Although there is a small difference in usage concerning the declension of the divine name after the preposition אֵת, with regard to the usage of Greek prepositions + divine name, whereby הָיָה with or without preposition is attested in the MT, we observe no clear technique of the translator to opt for θεός or κύριος.

**θεός as used in expressions denoting ‘the fear of the Lord’:**

In 1:7, 3:7, 15:33 and 24:21, θεός is used as a rendering of הָיָה in expressions that denote the fear of the Lord (Table 5).

As is evident from the table supra, in these instances the LXX translator consistently rendered the noun פָּרָס (‘fear’) each time by the Greek equivalent φόβος (‘fear’), हָיָה by θεός. In 3:7 and 24:21, the verb אֵי (‘to fear’) is rendered by the verb φοβέω (‘to fear’) and the particle παρά by the article in the accusative (παρά).

The expression הָיָה פָּרָס, with and without the Hebrew particle παρά, occurs 14 times in Proverbs. Next to its attestations that are rendered by φόβος θεοῦ, it is rendered 12 times by φόβος κυρίου (1:29 [with article in the genitive], 2:5, 8:13, 9:10, 10:27, 14:26, 15:16, 16:6 [LXX 15:27a], 19:23, 22:4, 23:17 and 31:30). In 14:27, the LXX translator translates it by πρόσωπον κυρίου (‘an ordinance or command of the Lord’), which might be a conscious choice of the translator to avoid repetition with the previous verse where הָיָה פָּרָס/φόβος θεοῦ is mentioned.6 Remarkably, in 10:29, the LXX translator rendered הָיָה פָּרָס by φόβος κυρίου, which can be explained because of the translator’s intention to create unity between 10:27–29 (d’Hamonville 2000:223; Fox 2015:184). With regard to the verb אֵי in connection with הָיָה, which only occurs three times in Proverbs, הָיָה is rendered only once with κύριος in 14:2. In the other two instances, 3:7 and 24:21, the divine name is translated with θεός as observed in the table supra.

Thus, as was the case with the first category, here as well the translator opted for both κύριος as well as θεός as a translation of הָיָה without distinguishing between them.

**θεός as a possessive genitive:**

Next to the possessive genitives in expressions concerning the fear of the Lord, θεός is used as a possessive genitive in anthropomorphic statements (5:21 and 21:1) and to convey a curse of God (3:33).

In LXX Proverbs, two anthropomorphisms are found in connection with θεός: the eyes of God (τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ φακῶν, 5:21) and the hand of God (χειρὶ θεοῦ, 21:1). Although it is believed that earlier translations, such as the Pentateuch, mostly got rid of anthropomorphisms (Fritsch 1943),7 it is remarkable that LXX Proverbs renders them into Greek. With regard to the eyes of God, in 15:3 and 22:12 κύριος instead of θεός is used: (ο) φακῶν κυρίου. The hand of God (χειρὶ θεοῦ), on the other hand, does not occur elsewhere in Proverbs. It is, however, attested elsewhere in the LXX, that is, in Isaiah 62:3 (מִּאָדָם לָצְא) and Ecclesiastes 9:11 (אֵל אֶלֶם). Its counterpart with κύριος (χειρὶ κυρίου), although not attested in LXX Proverbs, also occurs in multiple verses throughout the LXX: 2 Samuel 24:14, Psalm 74:9 (MT 75:9), Job 27:11, Isaiah 62:3 and Jeremiah 28:7. Thus, with respect to the anthropomorphisms linked to θεός, the LXX translator also does not exhibit a conscious choice between κύριος and θεός.

In 3:33, הָיָה פָּרָס is rendered by κατάρα θεοῦ. ἐπίκρατος (‘curse’) occurs only five times in the Hebrew Bible (Dt 28:20; Prov 3:33, 28:27; Mi 2:2 and 3:9) but never in construct with הָיָה. In Malachi 2:2 and here in Proverbs 3:33, it is rendered by κατάρα. In Proverbs 28:27, ἀπορία (‘perplexity, anxiety’), a noun occurring 10 times elsewhere in the LXX (Lv 26:16; Dt 28:22; Sir 4:2; PSS 4:15 [2x], 12:4; Is 5:30, 8:22, 24:19 and Jr 8:21), is used as a rendering. For κατάρα θεοῦ, we do not have a counterexample that reads κατάρα κυρίου. Nonetheless, considering the uniqueness of the phrase הָיָה פָּרָס, we cannot examine whether the translator opted deliberately for θεός here.

**ο θεός as the subject of the verse:** In 3:19 and 15:29, θεός + article ο is used as a rendering of הָיָה and functions as the subject of the verse. ο θεός is attested three times elsewhere in LXX Proverbs, where it functions as a subject: 4:27, 21:8 and 22:8. However, these are additional attestations of θεός and do not have a Hebrew counterpart. The other divine name + article, θεός, is also used as a rendering of הָיָה as a subject of the verse, that is, 3:16 (εἰπεν, ‘to be’), 6:16 (μισεω, ‘to hate’), 17:11 (ἐκπέμψατο, ‘to send out’), 22:2 (τοιοῦ, ‘to make’), 22:23 (ἐπηλεμένοι, ‘to be make’).

---

4. For 29:25, Vaticanus (B) and Sinaïticus (S) attest the dative form κυρίου. However, Rahlf’s attests the accusative form.


7. However, scholars such as Ofeltkys (1944) and Wittstruck (1976) have debunked Fritsch’s hypothesis. The debate whether there are anti-anthropomorphic tendencies in the LXX is still ongoing (see e.g. Ausloos 2020).

8. For an analysis of these verses, see Beeckman (2020a).
The goal of this article was to examine the nonstandard renderings of התוֹם and אלִהִים in LXX Proverbs in order to determine whether these renderings can shed more light on the translation technique and theology of LXX Proverbs. After registering 19 instances of התוֹם and only one instance of אלִהִים, this article has described, categorised (except אלִהִים/קָוָרָה) and evaluated them. In order to observe whether these renderings are because of a conscious translation technique applied by the LXX translator, this article tried to find counterexamples for each category, that is, התוֹם in connection with a preposition, התוֹם as used in expressions denoting ‘the fear of the Lord’, התוֹם as a possessive genitive, and התוֹם as (in)direct object of a verb. On the basis of the evaluation, the following results were obtained:

1. With regard to התוֹם, counterexamples were found for each instance where the LXX translator used קָוָרָה instead of התוֹם as a rendering of התוֹם. Only for 3:33 and 19:17, no counterexamples were found. Nonetheless, in these cases, no explanation can be given as to why the translator opted for התוֹם instead of קָוָרָה.

2. For אלִהִים/קָוָרָה, it has been argued that אלִהִים was a common rendering for the form ‘בעיני + a divine name’.

On the basis of these results, one can conclude that the LXX translator did not differentiate between the two divine names התוֹם and אלִהִים. Although Baudissin did not provide a detailed analysis of the nonstandard renderings התוֹם and אלִהִים, he was right when asserting that both Greek names denote the same for the translator and have consequently been used interchangeably in LXX Proverbs.
(Baudissin 1929:264, 268, 270–271). Thus, although they might be suspected to do so at first sight and contrary to the additional attestations of both Greek divine names in LXX Proverbs without Hebrew counterpart, these renderings do not reflect a distinct theology than the Hebrew text (contrary to Rösel’s observation in LXX Pentateuch).

Given the result that the LXX translator of Proverbs used these terms interchangeably, it will be worthwhile to conduct the same study on LXX Job. The results of the study on LXX Job can be compared with the results of this study in order to contribute to the discussion of a single translator for LXX Proverbs and LXX Job.
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