

This idea is ingenious, and the two Hebrew nouns in the conjectured original are almost identical; the only visible difference is the bottom of the **ס** and **צ**. This minute difference is easily lost in an early cursive manuscript. Another fact in favor of his conjecture is the observation that precedents, e.g. Gen. 1.3, reveal that if **אור** had been in a text it would have probably been translated by  $\phi\hat{\omega}\zeta$ , which in turn would have probably been translated by **OYOEIN** ('light'). However, it is also possible that the corruption originated in the Coptic as **WNE** ('stone') and **OYOEIN** may be confused since they can be pronounced in a similar way. Another observation reduces the force of his conjecture: **צור** is usually translated by **ܨܘܪ** (e.g. Ps. 78.15, 20), while **צף** is usually translated by **ܨܦ**.

Finally, Carmignac suggests that the variant in *Ode* 22.2 between the Syriac ('and throws to me') and the Coptic ('and taught me') is caused by a double meaning in the original Hebrew. The Hebrew verb **ירה** means both 'to throw' and 'to teach' (in the hiphil).

This suggestion is also ingenious since neither the Syriac **ܨܘܪ** nor the Coptic **TCABO** possesses both meanings. One must admit this point increases the probability of a Hebrew *Grundschrift*. However, there are at least two facts that reduce the force of the conjecture: **ܨܘܪ** usually corresponds to the Hebrew verb **רמה** ('to cast'). Second, the extant Syriac form is a peal active masculine participle but the conjectured Hebrew must be in the hiphil. The probability of correlation decreases since the Hebrew hiphil usually corresponds to the Syriac aphel, and hardly ever translates a peal active participle.

In conclusion, the data force us to reject the Hebrew hypothesis both because the above conjectures are not convincing and because the following discussion<sup>151</sup> reveals that the Syriac hypothesis is the most probable.

### *Advocacy of the Syriac-Aramaic Hypothesis*

#### *Direct Dependence on the Targumim: Denial*

J.R. Harris argued that the *Odes of Solomon* borrowed from the Targumim.<sup>152</sup> The force of his argument was weakened by the a priori assumption that some Targumim had been committed to writing when the poet composed the *Odes*.<sup>153</sup> This presupposition has been proved

151. *Vide infra*, in particular the section headed 'Arguments from Variants'.

152. Harris and Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, pp. 85-91; Harris, 'The Odes of Solomon and the Biblical Targums', pp. 271-91.

153. Although J.R. Harris claimed that direct borrowing is possible if the Targumim