Paz.  $p\bar{\imath}l$ , representing an old Iranian form which was borrowed on the one hand into Skt.  $q\bar{q}^1$  and Arm.  $q\bar{q}_{\bar{q}}^2$  and on the other into Akk.  $p\bar{\imath}ru$ ,  $p\bar{\imath}lu^3$ ; Aram. אבים:

Some of the philologers endeavoured to find an Arabic derivation for the word,<sup>4</sup> but it is fairly clear that it was a borrowing either directly from Middle Persian, or through the Aram. (Horovitz, KU, 98). It occurs in the old poetry and therefore must have been an early borrowing.

Rossini, JA, xi<sup>e</sup> sér., vol. xviii, 31, after pointing out the difficulty of believing that elephants could have made the journey between Yemen and Mecca, thinks that oral tradition among the Arabs confused the expedition of Abraha with an earlier one under the chieftain Afilas whose name  $A\Phi I \wedge AC$  occurs on coins of the end of the third century A.D. as an Ethiopian conqueror of S. Arabia. On this

in the Qur'an would be a corrupted representation of الفيل.

(Qārūn).

xxviii, 76, 79; xxix, 38; xl, 25. Korah.

As Geiger, 155, has shown, the Qur'ānic account of Korah is based on the Rabbinic legends, and we might assume that the word is derived from the Heb.  $\Box\Box\Box$ . The dropping of the final guttural, however, makes this a little difficult. The final guttural, as a matter of fact, is missing in the Gk.  $Ko\rho\dot{\epsilon}$  and Eth. 46, but neither of these help us with the Arabic form. Hirschfeld, New Researches, 13, n., made the

suggestion that is due to a misreading of TTP as TTP, a mistake which is very possible in Hebrew script. It is fairly certain, however, that Muḥammad's information came from oral sources, and it is difficult to believe that anyone sufficiently acquainted with Heb. or Aram. to be able to read him the story would have made such

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Vox apud Indos barbara—Vullers, Lex, i, 402, as against Hommel, 324 ff., and see Monier Williams, Sanskrit Dictionary, p. 630.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Hübschmann, Arm. Gramm., i, 255.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Vollers, ZDMG, 1, 652; Zimmern, Akkad. Fremdw, 50, thinks the Aram. and Heb. forms were derived from the Akkad.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Sībawaih in Şihāh, sub voc.