

be the equivalent of Taurah. In iii, 2, it is associated with the Taurah and the Injil, and xxv, 1, and ii, 181, make it practically the equivalent of the Qur'ān, while in viii, 29, we read, "if ye believe God, he will grant you a Furqān and forgive your evil deeds." In viii, 42, however, where the reference is to the Battle of Badr, "the day of the Furqān, the day when the two hosts met," the meaning seems something quite different.

The form of the word would suggest that it was genuine Arabic, a form فُرْقَان from فَرَقَ, and thus it is taken by the Muslim authorities. Tab. on ii, 50, says that Scripture is called Furqān because God فَرَقَ بِهِ الْبَاطِلَ وَالْحَقَّ, and as referring to Badr it means the day when God discriminated (فَرَقَ) between the good party and the evil (Rāghib, *Mufradāt*, 385). In this latter case it is tempting to think of Jewish influence, for in the account of Saul's victory over the Ammonites in 1 Sam. xi, 13, where the Heb. text reads הַיּוֹם עָשָׂה יְהוָה תְּשׁוּעָה בִּישְׂרָאֵל, in the Targum it reads יוֹם פּוֹרְקָנָא בִּישְׂרָאֵל, where פּוֹרְקָנָא is exactly ¹يوم الفرقان.

The philologists, however, are not unanimous as to its meaning. Some took it to mean نصر; Baiḍ. on xxi, 49, tells us that some said it meant فَلَاقَ الْبَحْرَ, and Zam. on viii, 29, collects a number of other meanings. This uncertainty and confusion is difficult to explain if we are dealing with a genuine Arabic word, and is sufficient of itself to suggest that it is a borrowed term.²

Arguing from the fact that in the majority of cases it is connected with Scriptures, Hirschfeld, *New Researches*, 68, would derive it from פְּרָקִים, one of the technical terms for the divisions of the

¹ Lidzbarski, *ZS*, i, 92, notes an even closer verbal correspondence with Is. xlix, 8, where for סִבְחָתָא וְשִׁמְחָתָא חֶזְקָא וְיִשׁוּעָא עֲזֵרְתָּךְ the Pesh. has סִבְחָתָא וְשִׁמְחָתָא חֶזְקָא וְיִשׁוּעָא עֲזֵרְתָּךְ.

² This is strengthened by the fact that there are apparently no examples of its use earlier than the Qur'ān. Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, ii, 125 ff., who opposed the theory that it is a foreign word, is compelled to admit that it was probably a coining of Muḥammad himself. See Ahrens, *Christliches*, 31, 32.