is due to a misreading of and as and is not without its subtlety, we cannot admit that it is very likely that Muḥammad learned such a technical term in the way he suggests.

The most probable solution is that it is from the Syr. **Liam** a writing,² a word which occurs in a sense very like our English lines (PSm, 2738), and thus is closely parallel to Muhammad's use of قرآن, both of which are likewise of Syriac origin.

.(Sawt). سَوْطُ

lxxxix, 12.

A scourge.

The Commentators in general interpret the word as scourge, though some (cf. Zam. in loco) 3 would take it to mean calamities, and others, in an endeavour to preserve it as an Arabic word from $\dot{\vec{c}}$ to mix, want to make it mean "mixing bowl", i.e. a vial of wrath like the $\phi \iota \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ of Rev. xvi.

There can be no doubt that scourge is the right interpretation, and in this sense would seem to be a borrowing from Aramaic. In Heb. Did is a scourge for horses and for men, and Aram. RDID; Syr. Las have the same meaning, but are used also in connection with calamities sent by God as a scourge to the people. From Aram. the word passed also into Eth. as ho-T, plu. happ = $\mu \acute{a}\sigma\tau\iota \xi$, flagellum, and though Mingana, Syriac Influence, 90, thinks the origin was Christian rather than Jewish, it is really impossible to decide. Horovitz, JPN, 211, favours an Ethiopic origin, while Torrey, Foundation, 51, thinks it is mixed Jewish Arabic.

¹ So Buhl in EI, sub voc., but his own suggestion of a derivation from ut up, is no happier. See Kunstlinger in BSOS, vii, 599, 600.

² Bell, Origin, 52; the suggestion of derivation from 12:00 preaching made by Margoliouth, ERE, x, 539, is not so near. Cf. Horovitz, JPN, 212.

³ Cf. also Baid. and Bagh. and LA, ix, 199.

⁴ Barth, Etymol. Stud, 14, and ZATW, xxxiii, 306, wants to make it mean flood, but see Horovitz, KU, 13.