later scholars <sup>1</sup> has argued for the direct borrowing from Hebrew. Fraenkel, however, noted the possibility of its having been borrowed through the Syr.  $\hbar \Delta = \phi v \lambda \dot{\eta}^2$  and Mingana, Syriac Influence, 86, definitely claims it as a Syriac loan-word. It is impossible to decide, but in any case it was borrowed in the sing. and given an Arabic plural.

There does not seem to be any well-attested pre-Islamic example of the use of the word, for the case in Samau'al cannot be genuine, as Nöldeke shows (ZA, xxvii, 178), and that in Umayya, lv, 7, seems to depend on Sūra, lxxxix, 23. This confirms the idea that it was a late introduction probably by Muḥammad himself.

xviii, 30; xliv, 53; lv, 54; lxxvi, 21.

Silk brocade.

Used only in early passages in description of the raiment of the faithful in Paradise. It is one of the few words that have been very generally recognized by the Muslimauthorities as a Persian loan-word, cf. ad-Daḥḥāk in as-Suyūtī, Itq, 319; al-Aṣma'ī in as-Suyūtī, Muzhır, i, 137; as-Sijistānī, 49; al-Jawharī, Siḥāḥ sub voc.; al-Kindī, Risāla, 85; Ibn al-Athīr, Nihāya, i, 38. Some, indeed, took it as an Arabic word,

attempting to derive it from ¿, (cf. Baid. on lxxvi, 21), but their argument depends on a variant reading given by Ibn Muḥaiṣin which cannot be defended (Dvořák, Fremdw, 39, 40).

The philologers, however, were in some confusion as to the original Persian form. LA, xi, 285, quotes az-Zajjāj as stating it was from Pers.

and TA, vi, 292, quotes Ibn Duraid to the effect that it is from Syr. استروه, neither of which forms exist. The  $Q\bar{a}m\bar{u}s$ , s.v. however, rightly gives it as from برق, which al-Jawhari,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Frachkel, Vocab, 21; Pautz, Offenbarung, 124 n.; Hirschfeld, Beiträge, 41; Horovitz, KU, 90.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Horovitz also notes this possibility. The Palestinian form Assa quoted by Schwally, *Idioticon*, 92, which agrees closely with the Talmudic NIII, is not so close to the Arabic.

 $<sup>^3</sup>$  So TA, loc. cit., and al-Khafājī, in his supercommentary to Baidāwī, cf. also Addai Sher, 10.