

THE ETYMOLOGY OF 'ÓR, SKIN

Heb. 'ór, skin, is identical with Arab. 'áyrāh, pudendum, which we have in Hebrew in the transposed form 'üryâ. The stem 'úr appears in Heb. 'êrôm, naked, more correctly 'îrôm for 'ôrôm (cf. *Mic.* 76; *JAOS* 34, 416). In *mê'ôrêh'ím* (Hab. 2: 15) the ô is due to dittography of the r (*JBL* 35, 288, below): the correct form is *mâ'rêh'ím* (cf. *Nah.* 3: 5 and Arab. *mâ'ran*, plur. *mâ'ârin*). This reading was suggested by Wellhausen. In Assyrian we find both *ûru* (from a stem mediæ *u*) and *urû* (from a stem tertiæ *u* or *i*). Also the form *ûru* may be derived from a stem tertiæ infirmæ: *ûru* may stand for *urru*, *urru* or *urîu* (cf. Arab. 'urîân, naked, 'urîah, nakedness) just as we have *bûnu*, child = *bunnu* = *bunîu*; or *çûmu*, thirst = *çummu*, *çum'u*; *çîfu*, sin = *çîffu*, *çîf'u*; *çîlu*, rib = *çillu*, *çîl'u*, *çîla'u*; *zûru*, seed = *zâru*, *zarru*, *zar'u* (*SFG* 11; *BAL* 90.92; *AG*² 50, e). The primary connotation of both 'ór, skin, and 'üryâ, pudendum, is *nakedness*, bareness. AV renders *gallôt 'üryâ* (e. g. *Lev.* 18: 6): *to uncover the nakedness* (Assyr. *petû ša ûri*). For the semantic development we may compare Heb. *basâr* which denotes both *flesh*, *body*, and *pudendum*, while the corresponding Arab. *bâsar* means *skin* (*AJSL* 26, 1). This etymology is preferable to the explanation cited in *GB*¹⁶ 574. The primary connotation of 'âir, young ass, is *alert*: it must be connected with the stem 'âr, to be awake, which does not correspond to Arab. *ğairân*, jealous (cf. *ğarija* = *âli'a*). Heb. 'ór does not mean *body* or *flesh* in *Job* 18: 13; 19: 20, as Fürst and König think; contrast Budde's commentary. I have subsequently noticed that Gesenius' *Thesaurus* states sub 'ór: *Fortasse cutis a nuditate dicta est*. Fürst gives this explanation as an alternative.

Biššâr, to bring tidings, is a denominative verb derived from *bâsar*, skin; the original meaning is *to affect the skin*, produce a change of countenance, paling or flushing it (cf. Lagarde, *Mitteilungen*, 1, 217). In Syriac we have this stem in the transposed form *sabbâr*; Syr. *sêbârtâ*, gospel, is the Heb. *bêšôrâ*, Arab. *bišârah*, glad tidings. The original meaning of *basâr*, skin, is *covering*, integument (cf. German *Decke*, skin). In Arabic we have beside *âbšaratî 'l-ârdû*, the earth was covered

with plants, the forms *barsâ'u* and *ramsâ'u*. Arab. *âbšara*, to adorn, corresponds to our *to deck*, and the primary connotation of *âbšara*, to conceive (*âbšarati 'n-nâqatu*) is *to be covered* (cf. German *Deckhengst*). See my paper, *Was David an Argyan?* in *The Open Court*, vol. 33, p. 87.

PAUL HAUPT

Johns Hopkins University

THE ALDINA AS A SOURCE OF THE SIXTINA

It is not known to me at the present writing whether the view advanced in the heading to this brief Note has been given utterance to by any Septuagint student. What I mean, of course, is that the editors of the Sixtina may have placed before the typesetters as 'copy' the Aldina into which they had entered the variants from the Vaticanus. In this way only, it seems to me, is it to be accounted for that an error of the Aldina in Joshua 22:25 was carried into the Sixtina: *και απαλλοτριωσουσιν οι υιοι υμων τους υιους ημων*. From the Sixtina (I have before me the Paris edition 1628) the error was carried into the editions based on the Sixtina (Bos, Walton, Holmes-Parsons; these I have on hand). Holmes-Parsons notes in the apparatus that 16, 18, 55, 75, 106, 131, 134, 144, 209, Alex. Cat. Nic. have *τους υιους ημων* and 30 *των υιων ημων*. How careless this note is may immediately be recognized from the fact that the Compl. is not added as a witness for the correct reading. But as a matter of fact the wrong reading is found in none of the Greek manuscripts collated by the editors of the larger Cambridge Septuagint nor in some 17 additional codices of which I possess photographs. In other words, the Aldine reading stands for the present as a singular reading which may have been copied from some Greek manuscript, but most likely in a misprint. Mill prints the correct reading and puts the wrong reading in the Apparatus; and so does Breitingcr. Walton conversely puts the correct reading at the bottom, and in the sixth volume records as witnesses for it O (i. e. cod. Oxoniensis, 75 Holmes-Parson, g Brooke-McLean) and C (Complutensis). It remains to be added that Masius (*Additamenta in Critici Sacri*, Amsterdam 1698) remarks: In Græcis codicibus per