Philosophical Vocabulary in the Psalms of Solomon: The Case of Ps. Sol. 9:4*

Eberhard Bons

1. Introduction

One of the most significant features of the Psalms of Solomon is its Greek style. There is no doubt that nearly each psalm of this collection is replete with so-called Hebraisms. It might suffice to quote some examples: the substantivated infinitive, for example, ἐν τῷ ὑπερηφανεύεσθαι τὸν ἁμαρτωλόν "when the sinner became proud" (Ps. Sol. 2:1); the expression οὐκ ... πᾶς ἄνθρωπος "no person" instead of οὐδείς (Ps. Sol. 2:9)[1]; the use of προστίθημι with infinitive in the sense of "to continue" (Ps. Sol. 5:4); the expression καὶ εἶπα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου "and I said in my heart" (Ps. Sol. 8:3) in the sense of "I thought." Moreover, the terminology of the Psalms of Solomon is largely borrowed from the Septuagint Psalter, as can be illustrated by some expressions of the vocabulary of lamention: for example, ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με "when I am afflicted" (Pss. Sol. 1:1; 15:1; Ps 18[17]:7); μὴ παρασιωπήσῃς ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ "do not pass be my in silence" (Ps. Sol. 5:2; Ps 28[27]:1; cf. Ps 35[34]:22; 39[38]:13; 109[108]:1); πρὸς σὲ κεκράξομαι "to you I will cry" (Ps. Sol. 5:8; Ps 30[29]:9; 86[85]:3).[2] However, the acquaintance with the Septuagint Psalter goes even farther. In the field of theological vocabulary in the strict

---

1. For more examples, see Joseph Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Solomon: Introduction, texte grec et traduction, avec les principales variantes de la version syriaque par François Martin*, Documents pour l'étude de la Bible (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1911), 119–20.

2. For further examples, see Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, JAJSup 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 163–78.

sense, a couple of rare words only occur in the Septuagint Psalter and in the Psalms of Solomon, for example, the divine title ὑπερασπιστής "protector" (Ps. Sol. 7:7; cf. Ps 18[17]:3, 31, etc.), as well as the characterization of God as χρηστὸς καὶ ἐπιεικής "kind and gentle" (Ps. Sol. 5:12; Ps 86[85]:5). Finally, scholars have observed that the Greek language of the Psalms of Solomon displays various features which are typical of translation Greek[3]: on the level of vocabulary expressions like ἰδοὺ δή "see" (Ps. Sol. 8:25) and ἀποστρέφω τὸ πρόσωπον "to turn away the face" (Ps. Sol. 2:8); on the level of syntax the fact that the genitive absolute is very rare (Ps. Sol. 8:11, 30) while subordinate clauses are a little more frequent.[4] Be this as it may, these and other significant stylistic features of the Psalms of Solomon have prompted scholars to draw the following conclusion: the Greek text of the Psalms of Solomon represents a word-for-word translation from a Hebrew *Vorlage* which is no longer available. This result could be corroborated by a striking phenomenon: The Psalms of Solomon uses the terms ἔξοδος and εἴσοδος as synecdoche for a person's everyday activities (Ps. Sol. 4:14). It is noteworthy that this word order—that is, mentioning going out before coming in—corresponds to biblical models (see 2 Kgdms 3:25; Isa 37:28). In this regard, the Psalms of Solomon would be even more literal than the Septuagint Psalter, which quotes the two nouns ἔξοδος and εἴσοδος in reverse order (Ps 121[120]:8).[5]

The idea that the Psalms of Solomon represents a translation from Hebrew is an *opinio communis* shared by the majority of contemporary scholars.[6] Nevertheless, several questions remain open.[7] The Psalms of

---

3. Gerard Mussies, "Greek in Palestine and the Diaspora," in *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, ed. Shemuel Safrai and Menahem Stern, CRINT 2 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976), 2:1048–49.

4. See the list in Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 109.

5. For detailed information about this LXX reading and its Greek background, above all in Egyptian papyri, see Thomas J. Kraus, "'Der Herr wird deinen Eingang und deinen Ausgang bewahren': Über Herkunft und Fortleben von LXX Psalm CXX 8A," *VT* 56 (2006): 58–75.

6. See already Julius Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer: Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte* (Greifswald: Bamberg, 1874), 131–38; Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 120. As for contemporary research, see, e.g., Albert-Marie Denis and Jean-Claude Haelewyck *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 1:521: "La langue de composition a été probablement l'hébreu."

7. See Jan Joosten's contribution in the present volume.

Solomon include some rare words that are completely missing in the Septuagint, for example, ἀκρασία "lack of self-control" (Ps. Sol. 4:3), αὐτάρκεια "sufficiency, self-sufficiency" (Ps. Sol. 5:16), ἀμαθία "ignorance" (Ps. Sol. 18:4). Needless to say the quoted examples are compound words. Therefore, the question arises which Hebrew equivalents were underlying such renderings. Did the translator create these equivalents ad hoc, that is, without depending on a translation vocabulary of Hebrew-Greek equivalents already available at his time?[8] If so, did he borrow these nouns from his Hellenistic socio-cultural environment? Admittedly, it is difficult to give a clear-cut answer to these questions. In particular, it seems impossible to specify with which works or ideas the translator would have been familiar. However, this should not prevent us from looking for other criteria to better define the language and the background of the Psalms of Solomon.

In this paper I will focus on Ps. Sol. 9:4 without paying particular attention to its immediate context.[9] In the past, this verse has attracted the attention of scholars because it defends the idea of the freedom of the will. This idea served as criterion for attributing the Psalms of Solomon to the different currents of contemporary Palestinian Judaism, either to the Sadducees or to the Pharisees.[10] Leaving aside this question, I would like to address another issue, especially two nouns of this verse, ἐκλογή and ἐξουσία, and their exact meaning. The first noun is attested once more in the Psalms of Solomon (Ps. Sol. 18:5), whereas the second is quite frequent in the LXX (e.g., Sir 9:13; Dan 3:2). However, nowhere else in the LXX and in cognate literature are the two nouns used in parallel. On the other hand, the points of contact between the Psalms of Solomon and Hellenistic thinking are much more obvious.

---

8. See Emanuel Tov, "The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of Other Books," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 184.

9. For a more detailed analysis of the Psalm, see Joachim Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Solomos: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des Vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*, ALGHJ 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 50–53; Mikael Winninge, *Sinners and the Righteous: A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters*, ConBNT 26 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995), 69–77.

10. For the Sadducees, see, e.g., Ferdinand Hitzig in the nineteenth century; see also Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 200; for the Pharisees, see Herbert R. Ryle and Montague R. James, ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ: *Psalms of the Pharisees, Commonly Called the Psalms of Solomon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891), l.

2. Ps. Sol. 9:4 in the Light of Its Philosophical Background

To begin with, a look on the complete verse will be helpful:

τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἐν ἐκλογῇ καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν[11]
τοῦ ποιῆσαι δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀδικίαν ἐν ἔργοις χειρῶν ἡμῶν
καὶ ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ σου ἐπισκέπτῃ υἱοὺς ἀνθρώπων.

Our works are in the election and power of our soul,
to do righteousness or injustice in the works of our hands,
and in your righteousness you visit the sons of men. (NETS, slightly
modified)

It goes without saying that the verse addresses the question of free will,
particularly by claiming that man is fully responsible for his acting, be it
just or unjust.[12] No mention is made of other "factors," whose influence on
human actions was debated in antiquity, for example, εἱμαρμένη or μοῖρα.[13]
The third line underscores the idea of human responsibility: it is before
God that humans have to give account of what they do because he will
"visit," that is "call," them to account for their deeds.[14]

The two words to be dealt with in this paper are ἐκλογή and ἐξουσία. It
is my contention that both are borrowed from contemporary philosophy,
especially from Stoicism. To the best of my knowledge, this hypothesis has
not yet been put forward. However, one methodological problem has to
be tackled: The Psalms of Solomon probably dates from the second half
of the first century BCE, or at the latest from the first decades of the first

---

11. Robert R. Hann, *The Manuscript History of the Psalms of Solomon*, SCS 13
(Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 29.83, mentions two slight variants: (1) the omis-
sion of the preposition ἐν in the manuscript group 253 as well as in ms 336, (2) μῶν
instead of ἡμῶν in ms 471 (this second variant is present in neither Oscar von Geb-
hardt, ed., ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ: *Die Psalmen Salomo's zum ersten Male mit
Benutzung der Athoshandschriften und des Codex Casanatensis*, TUGAL 13/2 (Leipzig:
Hinrichs, 1895], nor Robert B. Wright, *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the
Greek Text*, JCTC 1 (New York: T&T Clark, 2007).

12. For a more nuanced position, see Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 51; Win-
ninge, *Sinners and the Righteous*, 73–75; Kenneth Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord: A
Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting*, JSJSup 84
(Leiden: Brill, 2004), 189–90.

13. E.g., Dorothea Frede, "Schicksal," *DNP* 11:156–58.

14. For this use of the verb ἐπισκέπτομαι see, e.g., Sir 2:14; Ps. Sol. 15:12.

century CE.[15] By contrast, many texts and ideas of Stoic philosophers are only accessible in documents of more recent times, for example, in summaries or quotations given by authors like Diogenes Laërtius, Stobaeus, or the fathers of the church. For this reason, it is impossible to prove a direct dependence between a passage of the Psalms of Solomon and a specific Stoic philosopher or a specific Stoic text. On the other hand, it cannot be excluded that Jewish authors living in Jerusalem had a certain knowledge of contemporary hellenistic philosophy.[16]

2.1. The Use of ΕΚΛΟΓΗ in Ethical Contexts

As for ἐκλογή and its underlying verb ἐκλέγω, "to single out, to choose," it is without any doubt a key term in Stoic ethics.[17] Its main ideas are explained by Diogenes Laërtius in a brief outline he gives in the seventh book of his *Vitae philosophorum*. In this context, the idea of "choice" is crucial, man choosing continuously between values whose importance for his own life he has to find out, for example, on the field of the so-called indifferent things (τὰ ἀδιάφορα). Accordingly, he has to choose a value (ἐκλέγω) or choose to avoid it (ἀπεκλέγω), as Diogenes Laërtius explains (*Vit. philos.* 7.105).[18] For Chrysippus, the decisive criterion to be put forward in these issues is εὐδαιμονία: Does a value contribute to it or does it not? The corresponding consequence is either ἐκλογή "choice" or ἀπεκλογή "rejection" (fr. 118 *apud* Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 2.7.7). In short, because humans are enabled

---

15. Robert B. Wright, "*Psalms of Solomon*," OTP 2:645; Denis and Haelewyck, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, 1520–21.

16. E.g., Martin Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr.*, 3rd ed., WUNT 1/10 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 160.

17. *Pace* Felix Perles, *Zur Erklärung der Psalmen Salomos*, SOLZ 5 (Berlin: Peiser, 1902), 30, who claims: "Das Wort ἐκλογή findet sich in diesem Sinne auch noch einmal im NT (Rom 9,11 …) sonst aber nirgends in der gesamten Gräzität; see, e.g., Max Pohlenz, *Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, 7th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 187: "Diogenes [von Babylon] verstand darunter die subjektive Stellungnahme, durch die wir positiv die naturgemäßen Dinge wählen, negativ die naturwidrigen verwerfen (ἐκλογή und ἀπεκλογή)." See the commentary by Robert Dobbin, ed., *Epictetus: Discourses Book 1*, Clarendon Later Ancient Philosophers (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 77.

18. A translation is available in Arthur A. Long and David N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 58B.

to use the freedom of will (Arrian, *Epict. diss.* 1.1.5), they have to practice ἐκλογή.

Among the Jewish authors of the Hellenistic and Roman period, only Josephus seems to be familiar with the ethical use of ἐκλογή. The noun appears in his brief description of the philosophical and religious convictions of the Sadducees in *B.J.* 2.164–165:

> Σαδδουκαῖοι δέ, τὸ δεύτερον τάγμα, τὴν μὲν εἱμαρμένην παντάπασιν ἀναιροῦσιν καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ ἐφορᾶν τίθενται· φασὶν δ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐκλογῇ τό τε καλὸν καὶ τὸ κακὸν προκεῖσθαι καὶ κατὰ γνώμην ἑκάστου τούτων ἑκατέρῳ προσιέναι.
>
> But the Sadducees are those that compose the second order, and take away fate entirely, and suppose that God is not concerned in our doing or not doing what is evil; and they say, that to do what is good, or what is evil, is at men's own choice, and that the one or the other belongs so to everyone, that they may act as they please.[19]

It is obvious that this passage reflects the following idea: good and evil are –according to the vocabulary of the text—lying before the choice of humans—so that it is up to them to make the right decision. At any rate, they cannot shift the responsibility of their actions to God.

2.2. The Use of ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ in Ethical Contexts

The word ἐξουσία has a wide range of meanings going from "power, authority" to "office, magistracy." In ethical contexts, ἐξουσία means "power" in the sense that humans are able to have something at their disposal and command.[20] Probably some decades after the redaction of the Psalms of Solomon, the Stoic philosopher Epictetus (ca. 50–125 CE)[21] makes a sharp

---

19. Translation by William Whiston in Paul L. Maier, ed., *The New Complete Works of Josephus* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999).

20. Klaus Scholtissek, *Vollmacht im Alten Testament und im Judentum: Begriffs- und motivgeschichtliche Studien zu einem bibeltheologischen Thema*, Paderborner theologische Studien 24 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1993), 80. According to Joseph L. Trafton, *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation*, SCS 11 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 101, the Peshitta strengthens the idea of free will by reading ܚܐܪܘܬܐ "liberty" (Ps. Sol. 9:4[7]).

21. See the overview of Epictetus's ethics by Adolf Bonhöffer, *Epictet und die Stoa: Untersuchungen zur stoischen Philosophie* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1890), 232–81; Pedro Pablo Fuentes González, "Épictète," *DPA* 3:130–32.

distinction between things which are in our power and things which are not and which therefore must not trouble us (Arrian, *Epict. diss.*, 1.25.2–3):

περὶ ἃ ἐσπουδάκαμεν, τούτων ἐξουσίαν οὐδεὶς ἔχει ὧν ἐξουσίαν οἱ ἄλλοι ἔχουσιν, τούτων οὐκ ἐπιστρεφόμεθα. ποῖον ἔτι πρᾶγμα ἔχομεν;
The things about which we have been busied are in no man's power: and the things which are in the power of others, we care not for. What kind of trouble have we still?[22]

Needless to say these things do not require any kind of ἐκλογή. Such an idea emerges elsewhere in Epictetus's *Dissertationes*: if things belong to one person who has been entrusted the ἐξουσία of them, nobody else can have them at his disposal so as to claim their ἐκλογή (Arrian, *Epict. diss.* 4.10.30):

τίς εἰμι ὁ θέλων αὐτὰ οὕτως ἔχειν ἢ οὕτως; μὴ γάρ μοι δέδοται ἐκλογὴ αὐτῶν; μὴ γὰρ ἐμέ τις αὐτῶν διοικητὴν πεποίηκεν; ἀρκεῖ μοι ὧν ἔχω ἐξουσίαν. ταῦτά με δεῖ κάλλιστα παρασκευάσαι.
Who am I who wish to have them in this way or in that? is a power of selecting them given to me? has any person made me the dispenser of them? Those things are enough for me over which I have power: I ought to manage them as well as I can.[23]

In conclusion, it is only ἐξουσία over something that qualifies us to make a decision so as to choose or to avoid something.[24] Without ἐξουσία no one is capable of practicing ἐκλογή.

3. Does Ps. Sol. 9:4 Have a Biblical Background?

In the light of the preceding observations, it is possible to draw the following conclusion: Ps. Sol. 9:4 employs a philosophical vocabulary typical of Stoic thinkers. Whether a person acts justly or injustly is not the result of destiny or determination. The author of Ps. Sol. 9:4 makes a similar claim:

22. For a short commentary of this passage, see Dobbin, *Epictetus*, 205.
23. Translation in George Long, *The Discourses of Epictetus* (London: Bell, 1890), 365.
24. See Arrian, *Epict. diss.* 2.2.26: τίς δ' ἐστὶ κύριος; ὁ τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ τινος σπουδαζομένων ἢ ἐκκλινομένων ἔχων ἐξουσίαν "And who is the master? He who has the power over the things which you seek to gain or try to avoid."

human acting is fundamentally rooted in the power and in the choice an individual makes use of in a given situation. If this interpretation is correct, it is not necessary to take into consideration one that would attribute ἐξουσία to humans while this choice is determined by a divine ἐκλογή.[25]

It should be highlighted that the expression ἐν ἐκλογῇ καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ belongs to abstract philosophical terminology. This is all the more true if we compare Ps. Sol. 9:4 with one of the very few Jewish texts of the Hellenistic epoch dealing with human responsibility, Sir 15:11–17.[26] Unlike this passage, Ps. Sol. 9:4 is quite concise. However, the differences between both texts are not solely on the quantative level. On the one hand, Sir 15:11–17 has almost nothing in common with the vocabulary of Ps. Sol. 9:4, on the other hand, Sir 15:11–17 introduces biblical subjects which are not mentioned by Ps. Sol. 9:4: the idea of leading astray (v. 11), fear of the Lord (v. 13), creation (v. 14), the commandments (v. 15). In particular, the idea that God as creator has enabled humans to act freely and to keep the commandments has its biblical background in the creation narrative, especially Gen 2–3.[27] Furthermore, the idea of choice is explained in a different manner. Choice is considered a matter of εὐδοκία, "favourable estimation" (v. 15, cf. v. 17: ὃ ἐὰν εὐδοκήσῃ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ; "whatever one desires will be given to him"). Lastly, the human has the choice between fire and water. It depends on human will (verb θέλω, v. 16) as to which of the two is preferred. Obviously, this idea is influenced by biblical texts like Deut 30:15, 19.[28]

---

25. For this possibility, see Ryle and James, *Psalms of the Pharisees*, 95.

26. For the idea of human responsibility in Sir 15:11–17, see, e.g., Gian Luigi Prato, *Il problema della teodicea in Ben Sira: Composizione dei contrari e richiamo alle origini*, AnBib 65 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1975), 234–36: see also 240: "'al principio' l'uomo è essenzialmente libero, anche se di fatto poi sceglie il male." See Ursel Wicke-Reuter, *Göttliche Providenz und menschliche Verantwortung bei Ben Sira und in der frühen Stoa*, BZAW 298 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 111–22, p. 115: "Nachdem Ben Sira im theologischen Teil seiner Argumentation gezeigt hat, daß Gott nicht der Urheber der Sünde ist, muß er umgekehrt begründen, daß der Mensch selbst die Verantwortung für sein Tun trägt;" Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Theodicy in the Wisdom of Ben Sira," in *"Happy the One Who Meditates on Wisdom" (Sir. 14,20): Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira*, ed. Pancratius C. Beentjes, CBET 43 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 266–270.

27. Prato, *Il problema della teodicea*, 246.

28. Wicke-Reuter, *Göttliche Providenz*, 121; Prato, *Il problema della teodicea*, 245–46.

In conclusion, the comparison between Sir 15:11–17 and Ps. Sol. 9:4 sheds some more light on the literary features of the latter quotation. To be sure, the latter of the two texts mentions the hands and the soul, which could be a reminiscence of Hebrew thought. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that a typical biblical background is missing in the first two lines of Ps. Sol. 9:4.

4. CAN WE RECONSTRUCT THE HEBREW *VORLAGE* OF PS. SOL. 9:4?

As we have seen, Ps. Sol. 9:4 reveals a direct or at least indirect knowledge of Greek philosophical terminology, especially of the currents of Stoic philosophy. This leads to another question: Can we reconstruct an underlying Hebrew text?

In the past, scholars have suggested to read words such as בְּחִירָה "choice,"[29] חֵפֶץ "delight, pleasure" or רָצוֹן "favor, will"[30] as possible Hebrew equivalents of ἐκλογή. As for ἐξουσία, the Hebrew equivalents are mostly מֶמְשָׁלָה "rule, realm, dominion"[31] (e.g., Ps 114[113]:2) and nouns of the root שׁלט (e.g., Eccl 8:8). Of course, we cannot exclude from the outset that these or other words could have been included in a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the verse. However, in the absence of any trace of a Hebrew text of the Psalms of Solomon, it is useless to engage in such speculations. Moreover, the question arises whether the two mentioned Greek terms introduced slight philosophical overtones which were extraneous to a possible Hebrew *Vorlage*.

Perhaps, the terminological evidence of Ps. Sol. 9:4 suggests a consideration of a hypothesis that diverges largely from the *opinio communis*: Nobody can deny that the Psalms of Solomon is written in a Hebraizing style. Analyzing the texts carefully, we find the whole range of characteristics of Biblical Greek, even rare phenomena that are typical of the LXX Psalter. Nevertheless, here and there the texts exhibit literary features, in particular on the level of vocabulary, which appear to be fully incompatible with Biblical Hebrew.[32] In certain cases, it turns out to be impossible to

---

29. Eduard Ephraem Geiger, *Der Psalter Salomo's herausgegeben und erklärt* (Augsburg: Wolff, 1871), 184; Perles, *Zur Erklärung der Psalmen Salomos*, 29.

30. See Gottlob Schrenk, "ἐκλογή," *TDNT* 4:176.

31. Perles, *Zur Erklärung der Psalmen Salomos*, 30.

32. For other arguments that could confirm these observations, see Jan Joosten's contribution in the present volume.

find a corresponding Hebrew word that was already known in the Hellenistic and Roman epoch. The case of Ps. Sol. 9:4 is a good example, which shows that at least its first line is not directly influenced by biblical models. This twofold evidence—Hebraizing style on the one hand and on the other a vocabulary that is not attested in biblical Greek—requires an explanation. Therefore a new hypothesis deserves careful consideration: despite the Hebraizing style of the Psalms of Solomon, some words or expressions betray a Greek background. Thus it seems conceivable that the Psalms of Solomon is not (or not completely) a word-by-word-translation but that it has been rewritten or composed—at least partially—in Greek and not in Hebrew, though imitating Hebrew style and diction.