

Berichte

The Diccionario bíblico hebreo-español (DBHE)

Luis Alonso Schökel (Rom)

1. Etymology and the comparative method

At the present time there is general agreement that neither etymology nor comparative linguistics is the proper approach to determine the meaning of a word. Who would venture to deduce the present meaning of *Tisch* merely by going back to its greek origin *diskos*? From the meaning of *humus* one cannot deduce the meaning of *humilitas* in a sermon of Augustine. If I know the meaning of *humilitas* I can return to its origin in *humus* in a spiritual reflection or for linguistic pleasure. To take a more complex case: the German word *Ungeziefer* is well defined in present day usage. I can translate it in Spanish as *sabandija*. It is of no help either in understanding the word or in translating it to know that it comes from *āne* = *sin*, a negation, and *zebar* = *sacrificio*.

Something similar applies to comparative linguistics. The meaning of modern English *knight* is not clarified by the German *Knecht*. Knowing the meaning of *selig* is of no help in defining *silly*. I can know the relationship of words as *Zahl*, *taal*, *tale*, *zählen*, *erzählen* etc, and get lost in the ramifications of their meanings. On the other hand, knowing the individual meaning, I can find it useful and pleasurable to go from the various branches to the single trunk.

This much is clear and commonly admitted. Still our Hebrew dictionaries continue to pay attention to etymology and comparative matters. And they do well, for the information can be useful. BDB in the introduction (p. VI) considers the advantages of etymology but at the same time recognizes that its results are provisional and debatable. But etymology is not the most important thing. We have given up this concern, we have sacrificed this value, to concentrate on showing the use that Biblical writers make of the Hebrew vocabulary.

We have put together a dictionary of *usage for usage* providing equivalents in the receptor language rather than describing the semantic content in a metalanguage. In our concern for usage, we have kept in mind the fact that we are dealing with a language that in great part is a literary one: narrative, poetry, rhetoric (Dt Dtr), essay (Ecl).

2. Tradition and change

Preparing a bilingual dictionary of Biblical Hebrew today means putting oneself in a firm tradition: from the „Roots“ of Qimchi, through Reuchlin and Buxtorf, to Gesenius and his descendants. We are not deciphering nor inventing. The problem is how to enter into their tradition. In Spain, although we have a strong Biblical presence in our classical literature, including sermons and spiritual writings, and although we can be proud of a modest renaissance of Biblical studies, our most

famous ancestor is still a Hebrew-Latin dictionary incorporated into the Polyglot Complutense. (The Thesaurus of Gesenius, as well, was written in Latin). In Spanish we have a new task set before us, and no specific antecedents.

How to enter into the tradition. Some would recommend translating from Latin (Zorell) or from English (BDB), or from German (GesB). But such a detour would mean being doubly sidetracked. The path followed was a complete literary translation of the OT into modern Spanish and a brief commentary on each of the books. Nothing contributes so much to one's intimate knowledge of a foreign language, especially a literary language, as translating it at a corresponding literary level. The translator must immerse himself in the original text, appreciate its resources and shades of meaning. Then, like a St. Christopher, he must carry it over to the shore of his own language. Translating involves studying different possibilities, comparing, testing, discarding, and finally keeping what seems best. To translate is to weave a web of interlocking correspondences without getting entangled or losing one's way.

At the first stage, the translator makes use of dictionaries in other languages, of translations in his own and foreign languages, of commentaries. He thus enters fully into the tradition. The second stage, the step from the original to the receptor language, allows of no detours.

The director of the Hebrew-Spanish dictionary went through the preliminary steps of translating and preparing commentaries on the whole of the OT. He had collaborators, but this did not mean that the Bible was divided into sections and distributed for each collaborator to work on his own. There was strong, unified direction, uniformity of criteria and literary exigence, as collaborators in turn worked on different sections or books.

The dictionary has been worked out in the same way. The director has planned all the entries, with various occasional collaborators as the work proceeded. The first entry ^ʿ*ab* was completed in the summer of 1976. The last entries (*mem* and *nun*) were finished in 1989.

But the fact that the dictionary was prepared only after the translation does not mean that an option is imposed on the user. At the beginning of each entry there is a list of possible correspondences from which the user is to make his choice. Not all the choices are repeated throughout the entry. The spread of the proposals is wider than the de facto use in our translation. For instance:

dbq 1. Sentido físico: pegarse, adherirse, ligarse, juntarse, unirse, aglutinarse, conglomerarse, amalgamarse, soldarse.

mdynh Provincia, comarca, territorio, circunscripción (en castellano pervive el topónimo Medina).

3. Minor observations

Modern linguistics has, in many cases, formulated and formalized things already known and practiced. But the formulation brings them to one's consciousness and makes them usable as tools of analysis and exposition. The newness of these points may be merely relative, but not something to be scorned.

I begin with minutiae. We use the term *allomorphs* to refer to two forms which have the same meaning but different phonetic shapes, as in Spanish *hubiera* and *hubiese*.

Allograph refers to a variant way of writing the same phoneme. In Hebrew these and related principles are frequently useful. They apply, for instance, to different pronunciations (whether or not dialectical) such as *šhq* and *šḥq*, *z^cqh* and *ṣ^cqh*, to the confusion in writing of *qr^ʔ* and *qrh*, *dk^ʔ* and *dkh*; the indecision between the forms of reduplicated root ^cc or the vocalic second radical (type *qwm*). It would seem that the Hebrew writers were not always certain themselves about the verbal form and had not done their school homework. This kind of detail can itself cast light on many problems in a dictionary.

Going further and thinking of the confusion which a dictionary user experiences, we expanded the material to include other practical (not theoretical) applications. For consonants like *ḤL*, *ṢR*, *DM*, *ʔL* etc we give first a chart of the words which are formed with these consonants, so as to orient the one who is using the dictionary. Teaching experience has made us realize that both the student and the exegete are sometimes bewildered. E.g.

ṣwr 1 estrechar, alomorfo *ṣrr* 1 asediar, encerrar

ṣwr 2 ser enemigo, alomorfo *ṣrr* 2 hostilizar

ṣwr 3 formar, alomorfo de *ṣsr* modelar

ṣr/ṣrh 1 estrecho, aprieto, peligro

ṣr/ṣrh 2 enemigo/a, rival, adversario

ṣrwr 1 de *ṣrr* 1 zurrón, bolsa, escarcela

ṣyr de *ṣwr* 3 figura

ṣyrym de *ṣwr* 1 espasmos, dolores

ṣwr roca, peña, montaña

ṣwr sílice, Tiro

ṣrwr piedra

ṣyr mensajero legado

ṣw^ʔr cuello, pescuezo

mṣwr, *mṣwrh*, *mṣr*

Naturally, these charts are not scientific assertions about the composition and derivation of words.

From this detail, which might appear irrelevant, we go on to the linguistic forms which we call *morphemes*. Naturally, morphology is the discipline which treats of what morphemes are, their structural differences, and their function. Perhaps it is not worth while to put them all in a dictionary, for instance, the morphemes of the conjugations; some morphemes, however, are elusive and therefore require special attention. This is especially true since we are accustomed to see a text, to look at a language, rather than to hear it spoken. For instance we are used to the morpheme *un-* in German used as a prefix. We don't look at it as something separate. Originally (historically) it was a negativ particle *āne ohne*. Now look at the other language. In Hebrew there is probably a negative prefixed morpheme ^ʔi- (^ʔy-*kbwd* 1 Sm 4,21); Zorell records the data even though the cases are rare and somewhat dubious. But then consider the negatives *l^ʔ* or *bl* joined to the following word in pronunciation and sometimes in writing. We then look for what corresponds to this in our languages. Donner Ges¹⁸ correctly gives *nicht, nein ... noch, un-, -los*, various particles and morphemes. So then such a simple, unquestionable matter can be extended to other linguistic entities, autonomous or not, but always in view of their

function. For example, *bēn* corresponds to the word *hijo*; *ben-* can correspond to the morpheme *-ita*, *-ite*, *-it* (Israelita/ite/it); *b^{ʿl}* would correspond to *-ble*, *-il* (irascible, volátil in *b^{ʿl} ḥmh*, *b^{ʿl} knp*).

The Hebrew morpheme *ma-*, *mi-* has many uses in forming nouns. The student quickly learns this in principle. For the user of a dictionary a preliminary schematic overview can be of great help. For example (selective):

participio pasivo: *-do/a*; adjetivo: *-so/a*
-or, *-ero*, *-ario*: salvador, candelero, incensario
-ción, *-sión*: acción, visión
-anza, *-encia*: esperanza, dolencia
-al, *-el*, *-il*: manantial, plantel, carril
 etc.
MAQTĀL: *m^{ʿkl}* alimento, *m^{ʿrb}* emboscada, asechanza, *m^{ʿrb}* occidente,
mwršh herencia, *mwlđt* nacimiento, *m^{ʿyn}* manantial, *mnwrh* candelero
 etc.

Something similar applies to *ta-*, *tí-*.

From the smaller functional elements we pass on to words (without, however assuming the difficult task of trying to define what a word is). I think that here is one of the principal contributions of our dictionary: *differentiation*, justification and *articulation* of the semantic content of a term. A Hebrew word in passing into a modern language is refracted, not only shifted in the spectrum of the receptor language, but broken up, differentiated for grammatical or stylistic reasons. For Hebrew *ʿkl* I can not be satisfied with German *essen*; I must distinguish at least *fressen* and *speisen*, and in a figurative sense *verzehren*. This is quite simple and in part, at least, put into practice. But it has constant application above all for the so-called *verba-omnibus* such as to make, to say, to go, to get. Differentiation is, at times, obligatory. Originally, when people sat on the ground, the bench for paying taxes or changing money or making a deposit was what the word says, a bench. Later the commercial function of the physical object was separated from its function as a place to sit. If I translate the Spanish *banco* into English, I must necessarily distinguish bench and bank. Likewise a function can be dissociated from its physical object, as *š^{ʿr}* = tribunal. Sometimes differentiation can be required or recommended by the poetic or literary style of the texts we are discussing.

After the differentiation the problem becomes how to justify each meaning, how to organize the different meanings. If there is a semantic logic and not just pure chance, the dictionary cannot rest with a mere listing. In this matter Zorell surpasses all his congeners and we have tried to follow and even improve on Zorell. I will outline an example without specific quotations:

ʿš Fuego, lumbre, candela, brasa; rayo, relámpago, centella; incendio, conflagración, lumbrarada; hoguera, fogata, hogar; llama, llamarada.

1. General. a) Sentido genérico, b) Uso doméstico, culinario o artesano, profano o cónico, c) Meteoro. 2. Como sujeto o complemento directo de verbos que enuncian el comienzo, desarrollo o final del proceso; muchas veces con valor expletivo. a) Comienzo, b) desarrollo, c) final. 3. Como adjetivo o regido. Muchas veces queda incluido como sema componente del significado de la palabra castellana: traducción sintética. 4. Uso

adverbial, instrumental; puede ser expletivo, traducción Ø. 5. Con determinaciones. Notas críticas.

(Prepared with the collaboration of V. Morla. Can be compared with the listing of HALAT).

4. Words in combination

When there is question of a dictionary of usage (*parole* rather than *langue*), it is of great interest to see words in relation to one another.

a) The word in its *syntagm*: as subject, complement, with different verbs. This kind of information is not lacking in the ordinary dictionaries.

b) The word in poetic *parallel*. Poetry and rhetoric frequently cast the paradigm in the syntagm. We have been able to classify parallels in three well defined groups with a fourth to cover all other cases: synonyms, antonyms, correlatives (thirst/water, fire/fuel), associated. The category that is most helpful to define the meaning of a usage is antonym since it narrows the scope. From the repertoire of parallels some are repeated, others are found only once.

c) The words in the *paradigm*, that is, a series of words which can substitute, or be related in absence. Compiling these paradigms would take the dictionary into semantic and lexical field, a project which right now is for us far off.

d) The word in its *semantic field*. The semantic field is usually given by the context, either immediate or remote. The meaning of words can be specified by their field according as it is military, judicial, cultic, familiar, etc.

e) The word in special syntagms which we call *idioms*. These demand in the receptor language something which corresponds to the whole; they can not be analyzed by parts.

In presenting correspondences, in addition to the spread of variations, some particular cases must be taken into account:

a) The explanatory (*expletivo*) use of certain words, which do not have to be translated explicitly. Its correspondence may be Ø. For example *hlk, qwm, wyhy*.

b) The use of the parts of the body with a *merely descriptive significance*, a remnant of a way of looking at things anterior to the abstraction of the „I“. For example, your eyes see, your mouth says, my ears have heard. These expressions can remain linguistic fossils or they can recover an emphatic meaning, „I saw him with my own eyes“.

c) The different *point of view* which two languages adopt. For example, frequently the German expression „Ich komme gleich“ in Spanish is „*voy enseguida*“ (point of view of the interlocutor or speaker). Or *šmħh* = feast, *šrh* = danger, *bšt* = failure: the objective point of view prevails over the subjective.

d) The *synthetic translation* of an analytic formula. Sometimes a single word in our language (when it is more differentiated) has the semes (or meaningful elements) of two Hebrew words. For example, the Hebrew *gbh* means physical elevation, so to transfer the word to a psychological or spiritual domain, it is necessary to add *rwħ*. Our words *altivez, soberbia* (from *alt-, super-*) already have these semes. *špl* means *low* and to express *humility* it is necessary to add *rwħ*, a precision which is not necessary in our languages.

Data such as these can be presented in two ways. One would be simply to label them „emphatic use, descriptive, explanatory, point of view changed, synthetic translation“. Or being more explicit, one would offer correspondences in one's own language. Being conscious of such phenomena and drawing appropriate consequences from them can, I believe, make for great progress in lexicography and will surely be helpful to one who uses the dictionary.

5. The stylistic factor

I mentioned previously the refraction which words and syntagms undergo in passing through the prism of another language. Should we also speak of a Doppler effect which accentuates the displacement in the spectrum? Should we register it or compensate for it? I think that literary usage forces us to reflect seriously. As I have mentioned, by far the greatest part of the OT uses literary language. On the other hand ever since the Greek translation of the Septuagint we have witnessed a massive process of „spiritualization“ of what is corporeal, of abstraction of what is concrete. This process has become crystallized in other translations and perpetuated into our own, in part because of the intellectual and conceptual formation of our culture. Poets and other literati save themselves, not so every exegete. The dictionaries instead of correcting the lack of focus justify and perpetuate it. And one way of practising the historical critical method is closed to the historical fact that we are dealing with literary language, or at least is closed to the consequences of this fact.

Perhaps it is precisely in this area that our dictionary makes its second contribution. We should illustrate this with some more examples.

Imagine a procession or a parade. Two characters (poetic personifications) bring up the rear concluding the procession *yšygw*. Is anyone leading the procession, heading it? Yes; we must imagine it because the poet imagined it, and „what has been written with imagination must be read with imagination“. At the rear come *ššwn wšmḥh* personified, at the front comes *šmḥh*. This is not a hat or a crown placed on the head, but the poetic personage who *heads* the procession. BDB recognizes this use of *r ʾš* in Mi 2,13 and 2 Chr 20,27 (cfr Am 6,7). But it is not extended to Is 35.

Again, imagine the beloved in the Song of Songs. She, who worked, exposed to the weather, in other's vineyards, is now the chosen consort of the fictional Solomon in the wedding. Today she is given a throne not in a palace but in the gardens. At the conclusion she is „the princess of the garden“ *hywšbt bgnym*. BDB recognizes this frequent use of *yšb* for persons and personages; he does not recognize it in the eighth chapter of the Song. –

The author of Ps 33 in his anthropomorphic vision of God as creator, surprisingly combines two complementary aspects: the word as articulated sound and the puff of air or expelling of breath *rwḥ* (the very air one breathes). To reduce here *rwḥ pyw* to „a word of command“ (BDB) is to substitute a concept for an image. The same thing happens in Is 11,4.

If *mšl brwḥ* of Prov 16,32 can be translated „govern one's temper“ (NEB), would not *nšmrtm brwḥkm* of Mal 2,15 be equivalent? The prophet is counselling the husband to control his passion so as not to be unfaithful to his wife. In Hab 1,11 it

seems to me more prudent to admit a transitive use of *hlp* rather than to insert a comparative *k-* without any documentary support. In his case *hlp rwh* would be the equivalent of *hšyb rwh* „to catch one's breath“.

Returning to personifications. The fugitive who has been received and kindly entertained, sets out again on his journey. His host offers two of his men (personifications) as escorts for the journey. In this way of looking at things, *rdp* means „to follow“ or more precisely „to escort“ (Ps 23).

One who has lived in Palestine or Rome or in other places where the phenomenon occurs is well aware of the effect of the hamsin, the scirocco, the Föhn. He who has experienced the effect that this kind of wind can have on body and soul alike would not translate *rwh trdmh* of Is 29,10 as „insensibility of spirit“. He would translate „enervating wind“ or „wind of drowsiness“.

Ps 59 pictures evil men as starving, furious dogs roving through the streets of the city. Does v. 8 still refer to the image of the dogs or to its referent, the evil men? I believe that the poet primarily pictures the dogs, foaming and frothing at the mouth with fangs like knives glistening in the night, and he hears their growling. The Einheitsübersetzung successfully translates „sie geifern mit ihrem Maul. Die Schwertler zwischen ihren Lippen“ (8), „knurren“ (16). BDB reduces *yby^cw bpyhm* to language and for *yhⁿw* gives „murmur“. It is also possible that the poet gives the verse an expressive ambiguity (W. Empson).

In Job 16 there is an accumulation of images: judgment, law-suit, war. In v. 14 Job is assaulted, as though a city in a war, by an enemy, his ulcers are the breaches which the enemy opened in the wall. The Einheitsübersetzung translates correctly „Bresche über Bresche bricht er mir“. BDB puts the phrase in a generic category „break out upon“.

Undoubtedly, some of the above proposals are debatable. But even discussing them is a step forward, it means being aware that there is a „razón poética“ in Biblical language. It is indeed strange that reading poetry as though it were prose is accepted without discussion whereas it is necessary to discuss and justify a poetic reading of poetry. To discredit the imagination as a heuristic principle for the exegete is the same as condemning the imagination as a creative faculty for the poet.

Finally this DBHE is the first scientific dictionary of its kind published in Spanish. Consequently it could not rely directly on any tradition in Spanish.

We hope that as it stands, and even more when corrected and emended, it will be helpful to coming generations of Spanish speaking Biblical scholars. And I believe that it may have a few things to teach scholars of other languages from whom I have learned so much.

Here I give a selection of our writings on the subject:

L. Alonso Schökel y Eduardo Zurro, *La traducción bíblica: Lingüística y estilística*, Madrid 1977

V. Morla, *Estudio sobre Lexicografía hebrea descriptiva en los diccionarios a partir de Gesenius*, Cuadernos Bíblicos 11 (1981) 28-72

L. Alonso Schökel, *El punto de vista en las correspondencias lingüísticas*, en I Simposio Bíblico Español (Madrid 1984) 359-369

idem, Morfemas hebreos y correspondencias castellanas, en: II Simposio Bíblico Español (ed. V. Collado y V. Vilar, Valencia 1987) 199-205

idem, Manual de poética hebrea: (Madrid 1987); English (Rome 1988); Italian (Brescia 1989)

idem, Hebreo-Español. Notas de semántica comparada, Sefarad 47 (1987) 245-254; 49 (1989) 11-19

idem, El Diccionario Bíblico Hebreo-Español, Sefarad 48 (1988) 373-389

The reader will find a sample of our dictionary on the next page.

Book-title and address of the authors:

Diccionario Bíblico Hebreo Español,
preparado por Luis Alonso Schökel.

Director técnico: Vicente Collado Bertomeu; Jefe de redacción: Víctor Morla; asistentes de redacción: Santiago Bretón y Juan Esquivias.

Colaboradores: J. Asurmendi, F. Echeverría, A. Gil Modrego, O. González, S. Guijarro, J. Lamelas, R.H. Lugo, C.A. Maciel del Rio, J. Menchén, J. Pérez Basanta, M. Peinado, T. Ramírez, J.M. Samper, J.P. Tosaus.

EDILVA Trinitarios 3, E-46003 Valencia, Spain

Nota. Algunos tratan como Hi. formas que pueden corresponder a la forma ארץ.

אוֹצֵר [Est. cstr. אוֹצֵר, c. suf. אוֹצְרוֹ, pl. אוֹצְרוֹת, אֹצְרוֹת, אֹצְרוֹת, est.cstr. אוֹצְרוֹת, אֹצְרוֹת, c. suf. אוֹצְרוֹת, אֹצְרוֹת, etc.] *Tesoro*, lugar y contenido.

1. Lugar donde se guardan, conservan, protegen objetos de valor: *depósito, almacén, despensa, granero, silo, bodega, troj, hórreo, cilla, ropero, guardarropa, archivo, arsenal.* a) *De riquezas:* Prov 8,21 מְלֵאָה llenar; Jos 6,24 1 Re 15,18 Esd 2,69 Neh 7,70; del palacio 2 Re 14,14 2 Cr 12,9; ropero Jr 38,11. b) *De víveres y provisiones:* almacén 2 Cr 11,11 Neh 12,44; בִּישׁוּרָה – silos 1 Cr 27,25; הַיַּיִן – bodega 1 Cr 27,27; הַשֶּׁמֶן – depósito de aceite 1 Cr 27,28; J1 1,17 = מְגֵרוֹת graneros. c) *De armas:* arsenal Jr 50,25 correl. מְלִי arma. d) *De información:* archivo Dt 32,34. e) *Metafórico:* de meteoros Dt 28,12 Jr 10,13 Sal 135,7 Job 38,22; del océano Sal 33,7 = וְדֹדֵי.

2. El contenido: *riquezas, bienes, provisiones.* a) *Genérico* Is 2,7 Jr 20,5 = חֶסֶן almacén = lo almacenado, יְגִיעָה bienes producidos, יָקָר objetos valiosos; Is 33,6 30,6 = חֵיל riqueza Jr 49,4; – capital opulenta Jr 51,13; Os 13,15 = חֶסֶן ajuar precioso. b) *Sagrado, del templo* 1 Cr 28,12 = חֶסֶן הדֹּנֵי הדֹּנֵי votivos; 1 Cr 26,20.22. c) *Calificados:* רָשָׁע – injustos, mal adquiridos Prov 10,2 * צְדִיקָה justos; 15,16 * מְעַט poco; חֹשֶׁךְ – ocultos Is 45,3 = מְעַט caudales escondidos; נְחִמָּה – precioso, valioso Prov 21,20.

Fraseología: על- al frente de, administrador Neh 13,13 + חֶסֶן distribuir; – הִקָּה על הִקָּה estar encargado de 1 Cr 9,26; – הִקָּה tesorero mayor 1 Cr 26, 24; – הִקָּה superintendente del tesoro de la corona 1 Cr 27,25.

Verbos usados: נתן entregar, לקח apoderarse, הביא meter, הוציא sacar, מְלֵאָה colmar, על acumular, עשה hacerse, labrarse, se-

llar, פתח abrir, בּוּז saquear, נשא llevarse, בטח confiar.

אור [Q. pf. אור, pl. ארו, impf. wayy. וַיֹּאֲר, pl. f. אור; imptv. f. אורי; inf. cstr. אור; ptc. אור. Ni. ger. אור por לְהֹאֲר; ptc. נֹאֲר. Hi. pf. הָאִיר, הָאִיר, הָאִיר, etc.; impf. הָאִיר; yus. וַיֹּאֲר; wayy. וַיֹּאֲר; imptv. הָאִיר; inf. הָאִיר; ptc. מְאִיר Prov 29,13, f. est. cstr. מְאִירָת Sal 19,9, pl. f. מְאִירוֹת]

Q. *Brillar, lucir, resplandecer:* los ojos 1 Sm 14,27.29; la ciudad en la colina Is 60,1 = וְרַח amanecer; amanecer 2 Sm 2,32 correl. לַיְלָה noche; וְאֹר הוֹלֵךְ se va esclareciendo Prov 4,18.

Ni. *Ser alumbrado* Job 33,30 * שַׁחַת fosa; ptc. *destumbrante* Sal 76,5.

Hi. a) *Alumbrar, iluminar:* Gn 1,15 Ex 13,21 correl. לַיְלָה noche; 25,37 Is 60,19 = נִגַּה brillo; Sal 105,39. b) *Encender, prender* Is 27, 11; el altar Mal 1,10; la lámpara Nm 8,2 Sal 18, 29. c) *Fraseología:* מְנִים – mostrar el rostro radiante, sereno, benévolo Nm 6,25 Sal 31,17 = חֶסֶד lealtad; 67,2 חֶסֶן tener piedad; 119,135 = לְמַד enseñar; Ecl 8,1 Eclo 7,24 13,26. עֵינַיִם – dar luz a los ojos, dar vida Sal 13,4 * יִשְׁן הַמָּוֶת el sueño de la muerte; Sal 19,9 = בָּרַר ser límpido; Esd 9,8 = נָתַן מְחִיָּה conceder respiro; Prov 29,13; מִן – reflejar Ez 43,2; אֶחָדָיו יָאִיר – אֶחָדָיו deja estela brillante (= por detrás ilumina la senda) Job 41,24.

De la misma raíz: אור, אורה, אורה, אורה.

אור [Suf. אורי, אורי, אורי, 3.m. אורה Job 25,3, אורים; pl. אורים] *Luz, brillo, resplandor, fulgor; lumbra, lámpara; sol, día, alba; rayo, relámpago, centella.*

1. El brillo y su fuente. a) *Luz, resplandor:* Gn 1,3-5.18 Is 30,26 60,3 Sal 78,14 + אֵשׁ fuego; Job 18,18 * חֹשֶׁךְ oscuridad; 26,10 30,26 * אֵשׁ oscuridad; Ecl 2,13 Lam 3,2 Eclo 3,25 33(36),7.14 43,9 + מוֹדֵיר resplandecer. b) *La fuente luminosa:* lumbra Sal 136,7 = sol y luna; Job 18,5s = לָמְפָא llama.