

**FLATTERERS, WHISPERERS,  
AND OTHER HYPOCRITES:  
NEW DENOMINATIONS FOR SINNERS IN THE  
WRITINGS OF THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD**

Patrick Pouchelle  
(Centre Sèvres)

*1. Introduction*

The identification of the community that produced the Psalms of Solomon remains an open question. For this matter, Ps. Sol. 4 is of special importance.<sup>1</sup> This text, along with Ps. Sol. 12, which is very close to it, describes the terrible actions of one sinner and his fellows.<sup>2</sup> These people are even more dangerous, since they act in secret whereas in public they appear to be virtuous and renowned.<sup>3</sup> For Wellhausen, these sinners were Sadducean and the author of the Psalms of Solomon was a Pharisee.<sup>4</sup> Wellhausen's theory was accepted for many years and is still held by some scholars today.<sup>5</sup> Following the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, other scholars suggested a new hypothesis: the Psalms of Solomon may have been written by Essenes.<sup>6</sup> The scientific assessment of both hypotheses, however, is limited by our lack of knowledge about

1. As Wellhausen 1874, 147, states, "Für die innere jüdische Geschichte ist dieser Psalm der interessanteste von Allen." See also Ryle and James 1891, 38–39.

2. The text gives an inconsistent number. It speaks one time of one sinner, another time of many sinners. Schüpphaus 1977, 34, compares with the way the Psalms of Solomon deal with the righteous. The text also speaks from time to time of one or many righteous.

3. Scholars date this text before the siege of Jerusalem by Pompey because the sinners are not punished and there is no mention of a foreign invasion; cf. Winninge 1995, 13; Atkinson 2004, 96.

4. Wellhausen 1874, 146–47.

5. See also Winninge 1995, 170–80.

6. See Caquot and Philonenko 1987, LXXXIII–LXXXIV.

the groups that constituted Jewish society of the late Second Temple era. Indeed, most of the arguments adduced for either position are based on the comparison of our psalms with the works of Josephus. Hence, the identification of the figure hidden behind the word βέβηλος (Ps. Sol. 4:1) is reduced to finding the person in the *Jewish Antiquities* or the *Judean War* that best fits the figure in the mind of scholar.<sup>7</sup> This method of argument is weak: what if this figure were simply ignored by Josephus? And what if this βέβηλος were only a symbol of the community attacked by our text?<sup>8</sup> We can similarly criticize the argumentations that try to identify the community which produced the Psalms of Solomon, which again are largely based on the Josephus's descriptions.<sup>9</sup> Basically these argumentations are structured the same way: if the Psalms of Solomon are products of neither the Sadducees nor the Pharisees (or the Essenes), they must have been written by the Essenes (or the Pharisees)! Again, the argument relies on weak foundations; as Charlesworth remind us, the sectarian landscape of the Judaism of the Hellenistic and early Roman imperial period was more complex than what Josephus has described.<sup>10</sup> Today, most scholars remain prudent and do not dare to identify the producing community precisely.

The aim of the present study is to deepen the question of community of the Psalms of Solomon by studying how it denotes the sinners and their actions. Indeed, in Ps Sol, the sinners are not systematically designated by the words ἀμαρτωλός or πονηρός, but by other expressions, such as ὁ βέβηλος, ὁ ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, ὁ ὑποκρινόμενος, and ὁ ψίθυρος. The present study reviews these words and their cognates in order to suggest that they demonstrate an evolution of the concept of sin when we compare the Masoretic Text (MT) or the Septuagint (LXX). Their classical context will be analyzed, following which their use in the LXX and in later works including Psalms of Solomon will be discussed.

## 2. *The Profane Person: ὁ βέβηλος*

In classical Greek, βέβηλος does not convey the negative nuance that it does in Ps. Sol. 4:1. According to Chantraine, this word derives from the

7. Alexander Jannaeus (Wellhausen 1874, 146–47), Aristobulus II (Ryle and James 1891, 39), Antipater (Aberbach 1951; Maier 1971, 275–77), or Herod (suggested by Schüpphaus 1977, 34).

8. Holm-Nielsen 1977, 69 n. 1a.

9. E.g. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.8.

10. See the section added by Charlesworth in Wright 1985, 642.

perfect form βέβηχα of the verb βαίνω, “to walk.”<sup>11</sup> Hence, the adjective βέβηλος is used for denoting places that are not consecrated and on which one may tread.<sup>12</sup> Accordingly, this word is frequently opposed to ἱερός<sup>13</sup> and to other words denoting sacred places.<sup>14</sup> For instance, Herodotus<sup>15</sup> describes how some Persian warriors died in a profane place close to one dedicated to Demeter. The goddess has forbidden them to enter her place. They were compelled to stay where everyone, including their enemies, were allowed to enter. Hence, the basic meaning of this adjective is “authorization” rather than “interdiction,” and no concept of defilement seems to be associated with it.

Of course, a sacred place is by definition not profane.<sup>16</sup> In the so-called Letter from Darius to Gadatas,<sup>17</sup> the king of kings rebukes his servant Gadatas for compelling a priest of Apollo to work in profane ground. However, βέβηλος does not here imply impurity. Hence, the action “to defile” is not expressed by the verb βεβηλόω, which instead seems to be a neologism of the LXX, appearing in Jewish and Christian literature only.<sup>18</sup> The word μαινώ and its cognates are used instead.<sup>19</sup>

The word βέβηλος could also be applied to a person who is uninitiated to the mysteries. Hence Theocritus describes a “profane” man who dares to spy on a Bacchanalia forbidden to him.<sup>20</sup> Callimachus describes a procession that causes fear among the profane (i.e. uninitiated) people.<sup>21</sup> The *Law* of Hippocrates explains how some specific knowledge should not be revealed to the profane.<sup>22</sup> These meanings also allow Plato to use it

11. Chantraine 1968.

12. Cf. Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 509; Euripides, *Heracl.* 404.

13. Cf. Dionisius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 5.

14. E.g. Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 10.

15. Herodotus, *Hist.* 9.65.

16. Thucydides, *Hist.* 4.97.3.

17. *IMagnMai* 115, line 25. This inscription dates to the second century CE, but also may be a copy of a Greek translation of a Persian letter from the fifth century BCE. Cf. Hansen 1986.

18. The sole attestation in Julian Emperor, *Or.* 7.22, is probably due to his Christian education. Heliiodorus uses it twice (*Aeth.* 2.25.3; 10.363). However this author is not very well-known. He is traditionally described as a bishop (cf. Photius, *Bibl.* 73). Should this be true, his knowledge of this verb is also due to his Christian education. This verb may have been coined so as to give a verbal Greek correspondence to the root ללח, see below.

19. This corresponds very systematically to the root חמט in the LXX, cf. HRCS.

20. Theocritus, *Id.* 26.14.

21. Callimachus, *Hymn. Cer.* 6.3.

22. Hippocrates, *Lex* 5.

metaphorically for denoting an uneducated person.<sup>23</sup> In no case, however, is the word used to describe a wicked person.<sup>24</sup>

In the LXX, βέβηλος and its cognates βεβηλώ and βεβήλωσις almost always correspond to the Semitic lexeme לָחַן. Its basic meaning is “to liberate/make free.”<sup>25</sup> In Jer 31:5, Israel is allowed to plant a vineyard and to enjoy its fruit. In the cultic semantic field, this root designates, like βέβηλος, everything that is allowed to anybody, as opposed to that which is permitted only to a few. For example, in 1 Sam 21:5, only the priest possesses consecrated breads, and not the ordinary (לָחַן) ones that can be eaten by everyone and at any time. The root לָחַן is otherwise mainly used in the holiness code and in Ezekiel. Leviticus 10:10<sup>26</sup> exhorts a strict distinction be kept between what is holy (קָדֹשׁ, corresponding to ἅγιος) and what is profane (לָחַן, corresponding to βέβηλος), and between what is pure (טָהוֹר, corr. καθαρός) and what is impure (טָמֵא, corresponding to ἀκάθαρτος). Even if Milgrom<sup>27</sup> does not consider these two regulations as simple parallelism,<sup>28</sup> they should help us understand the semantic association between what is profane and impurity. Indeed, certain actions are reprehensible because they cause the divine holiness to become profane.<sup>29</sup> This is the main reason why the root לָחַן and consequently its Greek correspondent βέβηλος acquired such a negative nuance.

The word βέβηλος and its cognates are used twice in the LXX to characterize a human being. In Exod 31:14, the participle βεβηλώ denotes the one who does not respect the Sabbath and thus must be put to death.

23. Plato, *Symp.* 218b.

24. LSJ suggests Euripides fr. 648 (Nauck) for this nuance in the classical Greek. This fragment is to be found in the Suda under the entry βέβηλος. The Suda suggests μαρρός (“impure”). However, according to Macías Otero 2011, this verse gives to βέβηλος the meaning “non-initiate.”

25. Cf. Dommershausen 1980; Maas 1997. From this etymology derives the meaning “to purify.” A second meaning is to be found: “to pierce” (*HALOT*). In the Dead Sea Scrolls, this root occurs mainly in the so-called War Scroll. No person is so-qualified, however, with the notable exception of corpse in a probable confusion of the two meanings of the root; see Jassen 2011; Kugler 2011.

26. See also Ezek 22:26; 44:23, and the Greek addition to Sir 18:3.

27. Milgrom 1991, 615–17.

28. According to Milgrom, what is profane can be pure or impure and what is pure can be holy or profane. Hence, what is holy and what is impure are kept absolutely separated.

29. Examples: to sacrifice one’s children to Molech (Lev 18:21), to swear falsely by the name of God (Lev 19:12), and to make one’s daughter a prostitute (Lev 19:29).

In Ezek 21:30, the root  $\text{לָּחַט}$  has to be understood as an impure corpse,<sup>30</sup> and is rendered by the vocative of  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  associated with  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ , “impure,” and  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\gamma\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , “leader.” In this verse, often considered as messianic in the LXX, a ruler who is considered to be a defiler will be replaced by the one who is to come. Does this allude to the Hasmonean kings who assumed the kingship and high-priesthood, as Lust stated?<sup>31</sup> This is possible, but Van der Kooij suggests that the use of  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  in 2 Macc 5:16 and in 3 Macc. 2:2, 2:14, 4:16, and 7:15 may shed light to this issue. In these two books,  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  denotes the Gentile Seleucid king who dares to touch the sacred things of Israel, which in turn calls to mind Antiochus IV and the “abomination of desecration” (Dan 9:27, etc.). In this context, the one who is to come is the Hasmonean king.<sup>32</sup>

The occurrences of  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  in the Psalms of Solomon uniformly convey a negative nuance:  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  is the result of the process denoted by the verb  $\mu\alpha\iota\acute{\iota}\omega$ .<sup>33</sup> For example, the daughter of Jerusalem has been profaned in Ps. Sol. 2:13,<sup>34</sup> and in Ps. Sol. 8:12, the priests defile the sacrifice because they have intercourse with women during their menstruation.<sup>35</sup> In Ps. Sol. 17:45, God is requested to preserve the community from impure enemies,<sup>36</sup> probably Gentiles.

To conclude with Ps. Sol. 4:1, the use of  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  witnesses an evolution of its meaning. Originally, as in classical Greek, the word is not used to qualify persons who are bad or evil, but rather refers to something that is considered to be profane. The Holiness Code, inheriting the original meaning, put special emphasis on defilement of what is sacred, according to  $\beta\epsilon\beta\eta\lambda\acute{\omicron}\omega$  a negative nuance in this respect. Thus in Exod 31:14, the

30. See Greenberg 1983, 433; van der Kooij 2007, 45. It is not easy to determine whether the meaning is here “to defile” or “to pierce” (see also Kugler 2011). The ruler in the MT shall be put to death by the king of Babylon. In any case, one shall refer to the translation  $\tau\rho\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$  in Aquila and in the translation of the same expression in Ezek 21:34:  $\tau\rho\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon\acute{\nu}\omicron\mu\omicron\omega\upsilon\acute{\nu}$ . This is in line with an interpretation which deals with a divine sword that pierces the sinners.

31. Olley 2009, 379; Lust 2004. For these scholars, the text deals with Jonathan who was the first to blend the offices of high-priesthood and king.

32. Van der Kooij 2007, 49. This scholar thinks that the text deals with a king who usurped the function of high-priesthood. The narrative is nevertheless limited to the exilic time. However, the messianic mention may refer to the Hasmonean kings who, according to this interpretation, have combined the functions of king and high priest licitly.

33. See also Philo, *Mut.* 136; *de Spec.* 4.40.

34. Cf. Lev 21:7, 14.

35. With  $\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$   $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\lambda\alpha$ , a probable reference to Ezek 4:14.

36.  $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota\tau\omicron$   $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$   $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\beta\epsilon\beta\eta\lambda\omega\upsilon\acute{\nu}$ .

participle of βεβηλώ actually designates one who defiles, in the sense of one who considers the divine regulations as nothing. In Ps. Sol. 4:1, the meaning of βέβηλος is further shaded towards the meaning of personal defilement, and in this sense designates either a priest, a member of Israel, or a foreigner, in any case a person who does not belong to the producing community. In this light we might also compare the way Heb 12:16 describes Esau as a βέβηλος.

### 3. *The Flatterer: ὁ ἀνθρωπάρεσκος*

The word ἀνθρωπάρεσκος is attested only in Jewish and Christian sources. It is composed of ἄνθρωπος and ἄρεσκος, meaning “obsequious.” Aristotle uses ἄρεσκος together with κόλαξ, “flatterer.”<sup>37</sup> He also defines ἀρεσκειά as a vice.<sup>38</sup> Henceforth, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος meant flatterer, one who speaks to please men.

This word appears in Ps 53[52]:6 corresponding to קנח. Its Hebrew form is disputed. It could be an active participle qal of the root קנח, “to encamp,” in a military context, followed by a second-person singular suffix, thus “the one who encamps against you.” The form, however, is unusual and cannot explain the reading of the LXX. *BHS* suggests that the Semitic *Vorlage* involved the root קנח, which corresponds to ὑποκριτής in Job 34:30. This interpretation is possible. However, the translator might have interpreted his *Vorlage* as deriving from the root קנח “to please.” Indeed, in Job 19:17 κολακεύω “to flatter” corresponds to קנח, which here carried the added sense “to be loathsome.” Of course, in the MT the root קנח typically conveys a positive nuance, often the divine grace.<sup>39</sup> That being said, however, in Prov 31:30, ἀρεσκειά corresponds to קנח, “Grace, favour.” The MT warns against the deceitfulness of charm, whereas the LXX condemns tricks or allurements. Finally, Peshar Nahum<sup>40</sup> sheds light on the semantic choice of the LXX when it used קנח for denoting the beauty of the prostitutes.

The word ἀνθρωπάρεσκος occurs three times in Ps. Sol. 4, as well as once in the title, which probably is a later addition. First, in Ps. Sol. 4:7 we read: ἀνακαλύψαι ὁ θεὸς τὰ ἔργα ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρωπαρέσκων (“may God reveal the works of men, of men-pleasers”).<sup>41</sup> Here it seems that

37. Aristotle, *Mag. mor.* 2.3.3.

38. Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1171a15–17.

39. See, however, Stoebe 1997, 441–42.

40. 4Q169 3–4 II 7.

41. Unless specified, the translation of the *Psalms of Solomon* is that of NETS.

the men-pleasers are those who sin in secret.<sup>42</sup> In its second occurrence, in v. 8, the word is used in singular: ἐν τῷ ἐξαίρεσθαι ... ἀνθρωπάρεσκον λαλοῦντα νόμον μετὰ δόλου (“when [...] are removed [...] the man-pleaser who speaks the law<sup>43</sup> with deceit). The word δόλος and its cognates designate “deceit” or “treachery.” Homer uses it for denoting deceitful discourses.<sup>44</sup> Not surprisingly, the LXX dedicates δόλος and cognates to “treachery” or “flattery,” and makes them mostly correspond to the root קלח.<sup>45</sup> Initially, the root designates something sweet. Used with נִשְׁלָה, “the tongue,” it creates a metaphor for denoting flattery.<sup>46</sup>

The root קלח also occurs in plural forms for designating “smooth things.”<sup>47</sup> In the Dead Sea Scrolls, the term becomes the distinctive phrase, דורשי החלק, “those who seek smooth things,”<sup>48</sup> likely a derogatory “sectarian” code-word referring to the Pharisees. The same general meaning (if not the specific reference) is probably meant here in Ps. Sol. 4:8: the men-pleaser is someone who interprets the Law so as to please men rather than God. Finally, in Ps. Sol. 4:19 we read: Σκορπισθεισαν σάρκες ἀνθρωπαρέσκων ὑπὸ θηρίων, καὶ ὅστ᾽ ἀπαρνομένων κατέναντι τοῦ

42. In this regard, we should also have few words about a term which occurs once in the MT but often in the Dead Sea Scrolls: מְלֵמָי (1QH<sup>a</sup> XI 28, XII 13, and XV 34). This is the active participle niph'al of the root מלם: “those who are hidden.” In Ps 26[25]:4, it denotes a group of people with whom the psalmist does not want to be associated. The basic meaning of the root suggests that this unusual form designates people who also sin in secret. In the LXX, this root corresponds to the participle of παρανομέω.

43. The best manuscripts suggest μόνον: “who speaks with deceit only” (cf. von Gebhardt 1895; Wright 2007). This reading is not confirmed by the Syriac version (with ܡܘܢܘܢ, a loan word from the Greek νόμος).

44. Cf. Chantraine 1968, s.v.

45. E.g. Pss 5:10; 12[11]:3–4; 36[35]:3; 73[72]:18. They nevertheless also correspond to מְרַמֵּה (e.g. Ps 5:6), רַמְיָה (e.g. Ps 120[119]:2), to the root נבל (e.g. Num 25:18) and שָׁקַר (Ps 109[108]:2).

46. Pss 5:10; 36:3; Prov 28:23. In Proverbs, γλωσσοχαριτέω corresponds to the Hebrew expression already mentioned. The verb χαριτογλωσσέω is attested by Aeschylus, *Prom.* 296, and Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 4.59. See also d’Hamonville 2000, 331.

47. Pss 12:3, 4; 73:18, in Isa 30:10, and in Dan 11:32. In Isa 57:6, the plural form is used but keeps its basic meaning (“Among the smooth stones of the valley is your portion,” NRSV). However, in LXX Isa 30:10, the Hebrew has no correspondent. In the Old Greek witness to Dan 11:32, σῆκλῆ corresponds to σκληρός, whereas in the Theodotion version of the same, it corresponds to δλίσημα, “slip, fall” (see also the versions of Aquila and Theodotion of Isa 30:10).

48. E.g. 1QH<sup>a</sup> X 32 and 4Q169 3–4 I, 2.7; II, 2.4; III, 3.7.

ἡλίου ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ (“May the flesh of the men-pleasers be scattered by wild beasts, and may the bones of the transgressors of the law lie before the sun in dishonor”), which is an allusion to Ps 53[52]:6:<sup>49</sup> ὅτι ὁ θεὸς διεσκόρπισεν ὅσα ἄνθρωπαρέσκων (“Because God scattered bones of men-pleasers”).<sup>50</sup> Both verses use a similar verb for denoting the annihilation of the men-pleasers,<sup>51</sup> and both also allude to the fate of their bones.<sup>52</sup> The description of the bones and the flesh exposed to the sun corresponds to the exposure of dead people,<sup>53</sup> whereas the association of the bones and the flesh also expresses the totality of a person.<sup>54</sup> Hence, as with Ps. Sol. 13:3, where the same association could be found, the whole personality of the wicked is condemned.

In vv. 8 and 19, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος is also used in parallel with cognates of ὑποκρίνομαι. In Ps. Sol. 4:8, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος is associated with Οἱ ζῶντες ἐν ὑποκρίσει in v. 6. Moreover, the death of the men-pleasers in v. 19 could be compared with the death of the hypocrites in v. 20, whose eyes are pecked out by ravens. The association of the ravens and wild beasts is frequent in the biblical literature.<sup>55</sup> The close relationship between ἀνθρωπάρεσκος and ὑποκριτής and its cognates is also to be found in later witnesses. Some patristic authors used both terms in parallel,<sup>56</sup> and the Syriac version of the Psalms of Solomon suggests ܟܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ, “those who show partiality,” corresponding to ἀνθρωπάρεσκος in Ps. Sol. 4:8.<sup>57</sup> Again, this expression generally corresponds to ὑποκριτής and cognates.<sup>58</sup>

In summary, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος was probably coined by the translator of the “canonical” psalms. The Greek version of the Psalms of Solomon used it and put it in parallel with the hypocrite. This usage demonstrates the semantic evolution of the root ʔpn, from “to please” to “to be obsequious.”

49. Ryle and James 1891, 49 also suggests Pss 79[78]:2 and 141[140]:7. However, in these two cases the victim is the righteous.

50. NETS.

51. The LXX uses διασκορπίζω. However, the compound is sometimes absent from some manuscripts of Ps 53[52]:6, perhaps under the influence of Aquila, who uses σκορπίζω.

52. The collocation of σκορπίζω with σάρξ is only to be found in the Psalms of Solomon; the word ἀνθρωπάρεσκος together with (δια)σκορπίζω is always associated with bones.

53. Cf. Jer 8:2 and Ezek 6:5.

54. E.g. Gen 19:24.

55. E.g. Deut 28:26; 1 Kgs 14:11 (= 3 Kgdms 14:11); Jer 8:33.

56. E.g. Cyrillus of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 3.7.

57. Verse 10 in the Syriac version.

58. Trafton 1985, 65 n. 36.



#### 4. *The Hypocrite*: ὁ ὑποκρινόμενος

The semantic history of ὑποκρίνομαι and its cognates is well-known.<sup>59</sup> Whereas the verb designates in Homer the action of giving an authoritative answer,<sup>60</sup> it later came to have the technical meaning of declaiming a text, in the context of a theatrical performance.<sup>61</sup> For this reason, the substantive ὑποκριτής designates an actor. The verb is also used to denote the oral adornment of the discourse of a subtle speaker. Accordingly, in classical literature, these terms began to connote the negative sense of “hypocrisy.”<sup>62</sup>

In the texts of the LXX that have a counterpart in the MT, these terms appear only in the book of Job and solely in verses<sup>63</sup> that belong to the so-called asterisked material, which was added by Origen to the Old Greek of Job. In this material, the word ὑποκριτής corresponds to the root חנן.<sup>64</sup> As with ללח, this root means what is profane, in opposition to what is holy. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion keep this correspondence,<sup>65</sup> the reason for which remains an open question.<sup>66</sup>

In the MT, it is not easy to determine whether or not the root חנן conveys the nuance of “hypocrisy.”<sup>67</sup> Although it is sometimes associated with deceitful discourse,<sup>68</sup> and its etymology seems to be “to twist,”<sup>69</sup> it

59. Lesky 1956; Zucchelli 1963; Spicq 1994.

60. Else 1959; Ley 1983.

61. Aeschylus seems to be the first to introduce a specific character called ὑποκριτής, whose aim is to answer the first actor (Else 1959).

62. Gotteland 2006 describes how Aeschines and Demosthenes criticize the ὑπόκρισις of one another; Lossau 1971 notes how Aristotle attributes the fall of Athens to the ὑπόκρισις of Cleon.

63. Job 34:30; 36:13. The occurrence in Job 40:2 is controversial, since it is received by Swete but not by Rahlfs. Even if Rahlfs considered this stich to be an addition, here ὑποκρίνομαι corresponds to חנן, “to answer,” and may have a basic meaning of “to answer with authority.”

64. Joüon 1930.

65. But not Symmachus. In Prov 16:28, it corresponds to the participle niphal of חנן, “to whisper,” and in Hos 6:9, it corresponds to חנף, “a band, a troop.” However, in Ps 35[34]:16, Prov 11:9, and Isa 33:14, Symmachus confirms the usual correspondence, as well as Aquila (Isa 33:14; Job 15:34, 20:5; Prov 11:9), and Theodotion (Isa 32:6; 33:14; Job 15:34; 36:13; Prov 11:9).

66. Wilckens 1969, 565.

67. According to Seybold 1986, חנן means “hypocrisy” in Classical Hebrew and the asterisked material of Job uses ὑποκριτής accordingly. However, as the asterisked material may be late, we could also consider that the Hebrew root gains this nuance later.

68. E.g. Prov 9:11; Isa 9:16; 32:6; Jer 23:11, 15.

69. Knierim 1997.

typically conveys the meaning of “wicked” or “impious,” with the nuance of “to defile.” The root gave problems to the translators of the LXX, since it has no systematic correspondent in Greek. φονοκτονέω means “to defile with murder,”<sup>70</sup> while μολύνω<sup>71</sup> and μαιίνω<sup>72</sup> can also mean “to defile,” as can ἀνομέω,<sup>73</sup> ἄνομος,<sup>74</sup> ἁμαρτωλός,<sup>75</sup> ἀσεβής,<sup>76</sup> δόλος,<sup>77</sup> and παράνομος.<sup>78</sup> However, the nuanced meaning “hypocrite” is attested in Mishnaic Hebrew<sup>79</sup> and also appears in 1QS IV 10.<sup>80</sup>

The Greek Sirach used ὑποκρίνομαι and its participle for denoting the hypocrite. Sirach 1:29, with no known Hebrew correspondent, requests the reader not to speak as a hypocrite. Sirach 32[35]:15 and 33[36]:2<sup>81</sup> use the participle of ὑποκρινόμενος to describe a hypocrite and his relationship with the Law. In the first occurrence, the Law causes the fall of the hypocrite, whereas in the second occurrence, the hypocrite is compared to a boat in a storm in his relation to the Law. In the Hebrew manuscripts, these two participles do not correspond to the root הִתְּ. In 2 Macc 5:25, the verb ὑποκρίνομαι is used to describe how Apollonius entered Jerusalem like a peaceful person but eventually killed many people. The same book (2 Macc 6:21, 24, 25 with ὑπόκρισις) also condemns the notion of feigning one’s actions in order to obey a foreign king. It is preferable to obey the Law and be killed for that.

70. Num 35:33 (2×); Ps 106[105]:38, as well as Aquila (Jer 3:2, 9) and Symmachus (Isa 24:5).

71. Jer 23:11 and μολυσμός in Jer 23:15.

72. Jer 3:1–2 and OG Dan 11:32.

73. Isa 24:5.

74. Isa 9:16; 10:6; 32:6.

75. Prov 11:9 (but in codices Alexandrinus and Vaticanus: ἀσεβής).

76. Job 8:13; 15:34; 20:5 (but in codices Alexandrinus and Vaticanus: παράνομος); 27:8; Prov 11:9; Isa 33:14. These uses correspond to a correction made under the influence of the revisers, who perceived the word ἀσεβής as translating the Hebrew inadequately.

77. Job 13:6.

78. Job 17:8; 20:5.

79. Jastrow, s.v.

80. Cf. “insincerity” suggested by García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997–98, 1:77.

81. Chapter numbers *apud* Rahlfs [and Ziegler].

82. In the first occurrence, it corresponds to the participle hitpapel of הִתְּ. This infrequent root designates a fool in Prov 26:18; the LXX gives here οἱ λῶμενοι: “those who heal,” see d’Hamonville 2000, 319. In the second occurrence, it corresponds to טתּוּט, a hitpolel form of טוּט, “to sway,” to be compared to 4Q424: א טתּוּטתּוּט cannot be trusted (1. 4) because such a person deviates from his way.

As with βέβηλος, the hypocrite could be an Israelite or a foreigner. For the Israelite, the issue at stake concerns the Law. The hypocrite plays with the Law. Without pressing the analogy too far,<sup>83</sup> such rebukes could be found in the Gospel where Jesus accuses his enemies for their bad relationship to the Law.<sup>84</sup> The Pauline corpus also contains two occurrences in relation to the Law.<sup>85</sup> Like 1 Pet 2:1, the Didache uses these words for denoting vices or sins.<sup>86</sup> The Didache, however, speaks about a precise but unknown to us community<sup>87</sup> which has another fasting calendar and prays with another text than the Lord's Prayer.

In the Psalms of Solomon, ὑποκρίνομαι appears in ch. 4 only, first in v. 6, Ἐξάραι ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἐν ὑποκρίσει ζῶντας μετὰ ὀσίων ("May God remove those who live in hypocrisy with the devout"), and again in v. 22, ἐξάραι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ψυχὰς ἀκάκων παραλογισμῶ ὑπεκρίνοντο ("May he remove them from the earth, because with pretense they have deceived the souls of the innocent"). Here the verb ὑποκρίνομαι is used transitively. Such a usage can also be found in Appian.<sup>88</sup> The meaning of this verse seems to be close to that of Dan 11:32 (יִמְרֹשֵׁת בְּרִית יַחֲנִיחַ בַּחֲלָקִים, "He shall seduce with intrigue those who violate the covenant"), which probably alludes to those who want to adapt the Law to Hellenistic culture.<sup>89</sup> This proximity is confirmed by the use of παραλογισμός, "trick," which denotes the discourse of the flatterer in Ps. Sol. 4:10. Although it never corresponds to חֲלָקִים in the MT, it is used in parallel with it at Isa 30:10 as it appears in the versions of Aquila and Theodotion: דַּבְּרוּ לָנוּ חֲלָקִים חֲזוֹ מִהַחֲלוֹת ("speak to us smooth things, prophesy illusions," NRSV), and Λαλήσατε ἡμῖν ὀλισθηρὰ,<sup>90</sup> ὁραματίσθητε παραλογισμοὺς ("Speak to us slippery, prophesy tricks").<sup>91</sup> The word παραλογισμός corresponds to the *hapax* חֲלָקִים, which derives

83. See Garland 1979, 91–123; Fedrigotti 2004.

84. Mainly in the Gospel of Matthew. For example, in Matt 23:28 ὑποκριταίς is associated with ἀνομία. ὑποκριτής. See also Matt 6:2; 7:5; 15:7; 22:18 (par. Mark 12:15 with ὑποκριταίς); 23:13; 24:51. Luke uses ὑποκριτής twice, to denounce those who refuse to interpret the present time (12:56) and a bad interpretation of the Sabbath (13:15).

85. The term appears in relation to the issue of the circumcision (Gal 2:13) and some food regulations (1 Tim 4:2).

86. Did. 2:6; 4:12; 5:1.

87. See Rordorf and Tuilier 1998, 36–38.

88. Appian, *Hist. rom.* 7.13 (cf. LSJ).

89. The Psalms of Solomon, however, differs slightly from Daniel. Indeed, according to the former, the innocent are seduced, whereas for Daniel, the sinners are seduced.

90. Theodotion: ὀλισθήματα.

91. Personal translation.

from לַתְּה or לַת, “to mock.”<sup>92</sup> Finally, Ps. Sol. 4:20 uses the participle form ὑποκρινόμενος: ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκκόψαισαν κόρακες ὑποκρινομένων (“May ravens peck out the eyes of hypocrites”). As discussed above, this malediction is in parallel with that of the ἀνθρωπάρεσκος.

To sum up this section, ὑποκρίνομαι and its cognates exhibit a double evolution: in their meaning of “hypocrites,” they are absent from the translation of the text now belonging to the MT. Yet they appear in the Greek Sirach and also occur in the Psalms of Solomon, in the New Testament, and in the texts of the revisers of the LXX. These words become the lexical analogue of the root הָנָח. In the MT, this root means “to defile.” However, its meaning evolves in and beyond the Hellenistic literature until the Mishnaic Hebrew, which uses to denote the one who is hypocritical in his relationship with the Law.

### 5. *The Whisperer*: ὁ ψίθυρος

The association between (δια)σχορπίζω and ὄστοῦν observed above, with reference to ἀνθρωπάρεσκος<sup>93</sup> and in Ps 53[52]:6,<sup>94</sup> is also found in Ps. Sol. 12:4 with the word ψίθυρος.

In Classical Greek,<sup>95</sup> the meanings of ψίθυρος and its cognates do not convey negative nuances,<sup>96</sup> but instead are characteristically used in texts dealing with music.<sup>97</sup> In Aristophanes, the terms also denote the gentle whisper of the wind.<sup>98</sup> Pseudo-Theocritus<sup>99</sup> uses the terms for expressing the whispering of lovers after they have made love. ψίθυρος and its cognates can also express words said in secret<sup>100</sup> or quietly into the ear of another.<sup>101</sup> The terms can be used to denote senseless discourse,<sup>102</sup> whispers

92. It sometimes corresponds to παραλογίζομαι (manuscript A of Judg 16:10, 13, 15).

93. Or with a participle of παρεμβάλλω (παρεμβεβληκότων in Aquila and παρεμβαλλόντων in Symmachus) that corresponds to תַּהַח in the MT.

94. It is found also in Pss 22[21]:15 and 141[140]:7 (the Psalmist), and in Ezek 6:5 (the sons of Israel). In all of these cases, the object is personal pronoun.

95. Hummel 1999, 626.

96. Perpillou 1982, 252.

97. Di Giglio 1999.

98. Aristophanes, *Nub.* 1008.

99. Theocritus, *Id.* 27.68.

100. Plutarch, *Alc.* 23.7.

101. Polybius, *Hist.* 15.27.10.

102. Plato, *Gorg.* 485e.

against an orator,<sup>103</sup> and slanderous<sup>104</sup> or persuasive discourse.<sup>105</sup> In all these senses, the act of whispering is the main element.<sup>106</sup>

In the MT, *ψίθυρος* and its cognates<sup>107</sup> are rendered by the rare root *שפח*,<sup>108</sup> which can denote whispers (2 Sam 12:19; Ps 41:8) or, by extension, magical incantation (Isa 3:3), notably for charming snakes (Jer 8:10; Eccl 10:11). In the LXX, this root is translated in one instance by *ἀκροατής* “disciple” (Isa 3:3),<sup>109</sup> or by *ἐπαείδω*,<sup>110</sup> “to sing as an incantation.” The other occurrences correspond to *ψίθυρος* and its cognates. The revisers of the LXX have kept this correspondence.<sup>111</sup> Symmachus also makes *ψίθυρος* correspond to the word *ῥῆψ*. This word is difficult to interpret, meaning either “little” or “whisper.”<sup>112</sup>

In Sir 5:14, *ψίθυρος* denotes a person who lays trap with his tongue, a duplicity for which he is condemned.<sup>113</sup> The term translated here by “duplicity,” *διγλωσσος*, is also used in Prov 11:13, corresponding to *אִישׁ לִשְׁוֹת*. This Hebraic idiom, which is present also in Prov 20:19 and in Jer 6:28, basically means to take a tortuous way.<sup>114</sup> In Prov 11:13, this person is said to reveal secrets in the “Sanhedrin.” In 11QT LXIV 7, a person who slanders his people should be put to death.<sup>115</sup>

103. Polybius, *Hist.* 15.26.8.

104. Sophocles, *Aj.* 148.

105. According to Soverini 1994, this is the reason why Hermes and Aphrodite are called as such.

106. Accordingly, one of the rare inscriptions containing this word speaks about slanderous whispers heard by a father (*Anth. Gr.* 3,3,5, fourth-century CE Cyzicus), *κεῖνος δ' αὖ δολίοις ψιθυρισμασιν ἤχθετο κοῦρω*.

107. *Ψιθυρίζω*, *διαψιθυρίζω*, *ψιθυρισμός*, and *ψιθύρισμα* (only in Symmachus in Job 26:14).

108. 2 Sam 12:19; Ps 41[40]:7; Eccl 10:11.

109. Perhaps for erasing the magical character of this verse. See Baltzer et al. 2011, 2512.

110. Ps 58[57]:5; Jer 8:17.

111. In Symmachus (Pss 41[40]:8; 58[57]:6) and Aquila (Isa 3:3).

112. *Ψιθύρισμα* in Job 26:14 and *ψιθυρισμός* in Job 4:12.

113. *Μὴ κληθῆς ψίθυρος καὶ τῇ γλώσση σου μὴ ἐνέδρευε ἐπὶ γὰρ τῷ κλέπτῃ ἐστὶν αἰσχύνῃ καὶ κατὰγνωσις πονηρὰ ἐπὶ διγλώσσου*.

114. See also the translation by *σκολιῶς* in Jer 6:28. The Syriac version, as well as the Hebrew manuscript “A,” with *יהוה שני*, “Lord of two,” confirms the relationship between *ψίθυρος* and *διγλωσσος*. Wagner 1999, 326, suggests that the Greek translator rendered two similar Hebrew expressions by two different Greek words.

115. According to an interpretation of Deut 21:22–23.

The word δῖγλωσσοσ is associated with ψίθυροσ in Sir 28:13. Here, the one who whispers is cursed because he has destroyed many peaceful people.<sup>116</sup> The next verse asserts that the “third tongues,” γλῶσσα τρίτη, destroy houses of notables. It is probable that Ps. Sol. 12:3 alludes to this idea:<sup>117</sup> συγχῆαι οἴκοουσ<sup>118</sup> ἐν πολέμω χειλέσιν ψιθύροισ (“to confound households in warfare by means of slanderous lips”). Sirach uses the verb ψιθυρίζω twice. In Sir 12:16, the margin of the codex Vaticanus has added the note πολλὰ ψιθυρίσει (“he will whisper much”). This addition should be compared to καὶ πολλὰ διαψιθυρίσει in v. 18. In this verse, ψιθυρίζω corresponds to שׁפֹת in manuscript A. Sirach deals here with the hypocrite who tells smooth things while setting traps in secret. Finally, the relationship between slander and defilement is asserted in Sir 21:28: μολύνει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ὁ ψιθυρίζων (“A whisperer degrades himself”).<sup>119</sup>

In summary, ψίθυροσ and its cognates express the root שׁפֹת in the LXX. The root means “whisper” and by extension “incantation,” whereas ψίθυροσ basically means a more of a gentle whisper. Sirach uses it to refer to a person who causes pain with his tongue, and as one who possesses two tongues. The Psalms of Solomon 12 is in line with this interpretation.

## 6. Conclusion

We have studied the terms that Pss. Sol. 4 and 12 employ to denote different kinds of wicked people: βέβηλοσ, ἀνθρωπάρεσκοσ, ὑποκρινόμενοσ and ψίθυροσ. These terms display shades of meaning that are rarely attested in the books of the MT as well as in their LXX versions. The accumulation of such new attestations suggests an evolution of the terms during the late Second Temple period,<sup>120</sup> whose authors needed to define

116. Ψίθυρον καὶ δῖγλωσσον καταράσασθε. πολλοὺσ γὰρ εἰρηνεύοντασ ἀπώλεσεν with no Hebrew witness. The Syriac version gives only one expression, the same as in the following verse: the “third tongue.”

117. See also Ps. Sol. 4:9, 11 and the relationship between καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπ’ οἶκον ἀνδρὸσ ἐν εὐσταθειᾷ (Ps. Sol. 4:9) and πολλοὺσ γὰρ εἰρηνεύοντασ ἀπώλεσεν (Sir 28:13).

118. All the manuscripts have παρανόμοουσ. This is a probable mistake based on the preceding *stichoi*, according to Von Gebhardt 1895. See also Ryle and James 1891, 105. Wright 2007, 144, has kept this reading.

119. This relationship has no analogue in either Hebrew or Syriac.

120. Of course, the “flatterer” does exist in the MT. However this person is designated by some metaphors based on the “tongue,” such as, e.g., רֶלֶח (Pss 5:10; 36:3; Prov 28:23). Other times the root הֶלַח is used (Ps 45:13; Job 11:19; Prov 19:6; Sir 33:20, 22). It means “to be weak,” but sometimes also “to appease” and “to flatter”

more precisely the sin of “hypocrisy” and “flattery.” This evolution is evident in the Greek texts as well as in the Hebrew texts, as for example the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>121</sup>

The historical context of this evolution is not easy to determine with certainty. However, the crisis of Hellenism and its immediate after-effects might have been the catalyst for the development of new, more nuanced categories of wicked persons. First, the great Hellenistic kingdoms were conceived as profane as they obviously do not belong to Israel. By their tricks and traps, they were seen by many Jews to kill many people, to divide Israel, and even to touch the holy objects, to the point of defiling the Temple itself. Second, in combining the functions of king and high-priest the Hasmonean kings may well have been considered to be defilers and hypocrites. Finally, the appearance of several sects who interpreted the Law in different fashions may have prompted certain groups (such as the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls) to consider their opponents as defiling the Law and hypocritical.

All this does not really shed light on the nature of the community of the Psalms of Solomon. Indeed, it is more than probable that many groups and communities came to use the same words to vilify other groups and communities, insulting them as hypocrites, flatterers, and slanderers. Nevertheless, we have managed to put the Psalms of Solomon in the broader context of the controversies of this era.

### *Works Cited*

- Aberbach, Moshe. 1951. “The Historical Allusions of Chapters IV, XI, and XIII of the Psalms of Solomon.” *JQR* 41: 379–96
- Atkinson, Kenneth. 2004. *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting*. JSJSup 84. Leiden: Brill.
- Baltzer, Klaus et al. 2011. “Esaias. Isaias / Das Buch Jesaja” Pages 2484–690 in vol. 2 of *Septuaginta deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*. Edited by M. Karrer and W. Kraus. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Caquot, André, and Marc Philonenko. 1987. “Introduction générale.” Pages XV–CXLVI in *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires*. Edited by A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko. Bibliothèque de la Pleiade. Paris: Gallimard.

Cf. *HALOT*. But the LXX never uses a verb meaning “to flatter”: e.g. *λιταρεύω*, “to pray,” in Ps 45[44]:13, and *θεραπεύω*, “to do service” or “to worship,” in Prov 19:6 (even if this last word may have the meaning of “to pay court to” [see d’Hamonville 2000, 268] and even “to flatter” [see TLG]).

121. In this context, a comprehensive and comparative study of Ps. Sol. 4 and 12 with other Second-Temple texts that deal with hypocrites and hypocrisy would be useful (Ass. Mos. 7; CD I 18; 1QS IV 9–11; 1QH<sup>a</sup> XI–XII; 4Q169; and 4Q424).

- Chantraine, Pierre. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Di Giglio, Anna. 1999. "Eufemismi e metafore musicali." Pages 85–98 in *Studi sull'eufemismo*. Le Rane 26. Edited by F. de Martino and A. H. Sommerstein. Bari: Levante.
- Dommershausen, Werner. 1980. "הלל hll I; הן; הלי; Profane." *TDOT* 4:409–16.
- Else, Gerald F. 1959. "Ἵποκριτής." *Wiener Studien* 72: 75–107.
- Fedrigotti, Lanfranco M. 2004. "The Multi-Layered Meaning of 'Hypocrisy' in the Gospels." *Theology Annual* 25: 87–127.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 1997–98. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Garland, David E. 1979. *The Intention of Matthew 23*. NovTSup 52. Leiden: Brill.
- Gebhardt, Oscar von. 1895. *Ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος. Die Psalmen Salomo's zum ersten Male mit Benutzung der Athoshandschriften und des Codex Casanatensis*. TUGAL 13. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Gotteland, Sophie. 2006. "La sirène et l'enchanteur: portraits croisés d'Eschine et de Démosthène sur la tribune." *REG* 119: 588–608
- Greenberg, Moshe. 1983. *Ezekiel 1–20*. AB 22A. New York: Doubleday.
- d'Hamonville, David-Marc. 2000. *Les Proverbes*. La Bible d'Alexandrie 17. Paris: Cerf.
- Hansen, Ove. 1986. "The Purported Letter of Darius to Gadates." *RhMPh* 129: 95–96.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend. 1977. "Die Psalmen Salomos." Pages 49–112 in *JSHRZ* 4. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn.
- Hummel, Pascale. 1999. *L'épithète pindarique. Étude historique et philologique*. Sapheneia 3. Bern: Lang.
- Jassen, Alex. 2011. "הלל I hll; הן; הלה." Pages 980–86 in vol. 1 of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*. Edited by H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Jouon, Paul. 1930. "ΥΠΟΚΡΙΤΗΣ dans l'évangile et l'hébreu Hanéf." *RSR* 20: 312–16.
- Knierim, Rolf. 1997. "הן hnp to be perverted." *TLOT* 1:447–48.
- Kooij, Arie van der. 2007. "The Septuagint of Ezekiel and the Profane Leader." Pages 43–55 in *The Book of Ezekiel and Its Influence*. Edited by H. J. de Jonge and J. Tromp. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Kugler, Robert. 2011. "הלל II hālāl." Pages 986–88 in vol. 1 of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*. Edited by H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Lesky, Albin. 1956. "Hypokrites." Pages 469–76 in *Studi in onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli*. Florence: F. Le Monnier.
- Ley, Graham K. H. 1983. "ὑποκρίνεσθαι in Homer and Herodotus, and the Function of the Athenian Actor." *Philologus* 127: 13–29.
- Lossau, Manfred. 1971. "μοχθηρία τῶν πολιτειῶν und ὑπόκρισις." *RhMPh* 114: 146–58.
- Lust, Johan. 2004. "Messianism and Septuagint." Pages 174–91 in *Congress Volume: Salamanca, 1983*. Edited by John A. Emerton. VTSup 36. Leiden: Brill, 1985. Repr. as pp. 9–26 in *Messianisms and the Septuagint*. Edited by K. Hauspie. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Maas, Fritz. 1997. "הלל hll pi. to desecrate." *TLOT* 1:427–30.
- Macías Otero, Sara. 2011. "Echoes of the Formula 'Let the Profane Shut the Doors' (OF1) in Two Passages by Euripides." Pages 23–29 in *Tracing Orpheus: Studies of Orphic Fragments*. Edited by M. Herrero de Jáuregui et al. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Maier, Gerhard. 1971. *Mensch und freier Wille*. WUNT 1/12. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Milgrom, Jacob. 1991. *Leviticus 1–16*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday.



- Olley, John. W. 2009. *Ezekiel: A Commentary Based on Iezekiël in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill.
- Perpillou, Jean-Louis. 1982. "Verbes de sonorité à vocalisme expressif en grec ancien." *REG* 95:233–74.
- Rordorf, Willy, and André Tuilier. 1998. *La Doctrine des douze Apôtres (Didachè)*. SC 248<sup>bis</sup>. 2nd ed. Paris: Cerf.
- Ryle, Herbert E., and Montague R. James. 1891. *Ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος Psalms of the Pharisees, Commonly Called the Psalms of Solomon*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Schüppaus, Joachim. 1977. *Die Psalmen Salomos. Ein Zeugnis jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*. ALGJ 7. Leiden: Brill.
- Seybold, Klaus. 1986. "הָנֵפֶר; הַפָּרֶה; הַפָּרֶה; הַפָּרֶה dissemble." *TDOT* 5:36–43.
- Soverini, Luca. 1994. "ψίθυρος: Hermes, Afrodite e il sussurro nella Grecia antica." Pages 433–60 in *Ἱστορίη. Studi offerti dagli allievi a Giuseppe Nenci in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno*. Edited by S. Alessandri. Lecce: Congedo.
- Spicq, Ceslas. 1994. "ὀποκρίνομαι, κτλ." *TLNT* 406–13.
- Stoebe, Hans-Joachim. 1997. "גַּת הַנָּח to be gracious." *TLOT* 1:439–47.
- Trafton, Joseph L. 1985. *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation*. SCS 11. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Wagner, Christian. 1999. *Die Septuaginta-Hapaxlegomena im Buch Jesus Sirach*. BZAW 282. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Wellhausen, Julius. 1874. *Die Phariseer und die Sadducäer. Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte*. Greifswald: Bamberg.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. 1969. "ὀποκρίνομαι, κτλ." *TDNT* 8:559–71.
- Winninge, Mikael. 1995. *Sinners and the Righteous: A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters*. ConBNT 26. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Wright, Robert B. 1985. "Psalms of Solomon." *OTP* 2:639–70.
- . 2007. *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. JCTC 1. New York: T&T Clark International.
- Zucchelli, Bruno. 1963. *Ἵποκρίτης: Origine e storia del termine*. Genoa: Istituto di filologia Classica.