The word has no verbal root in Arabic, ito give oil being obviously denominative, as was clear even to the native Lexicographers (LA, ii, 340, etc.).

Guidi, Della Sede, 600, had noted the word as a foreign borrowing, and Fraenkel, Fremdw, 147, points out that the olive was not indigenous among the Arabs.¹ We may suspect that the word belongs to the old pre-Semitic stratum of the population of the Syrian area. In Heb. 1771 means both olive tree and olive,² but Lagarde, Mittheilungen, iii, 215, showed that primitively it meant oil. In Aram. we have \$1771 and Syr. 1411, which (along with the Heb.) Gesenius tried unsuccessfully to derive from 1711 to be bright, fresh, luxuriant. The word is also found in Coptic Stort beside Sector and Societ, where it is clearly a loan-word, and in Phlv. 13 and Arm. 1410 oil, 1410 thip olive tree, which are usually taken as borrowings from Aram.,4 but which the presence of the word in Ossetian zeli, and Georgian Good would at least suggest the possibility of being independent borrowings from the original population.

The Arabic word may have come directly from this primitive source, but more likely it is from the Syr. [A.], which also is the source of the Eth. 18.7 (Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge, 42).6 It was an early borrowing in any case, for it occurs in the old poetry, e.g. Divan Hudh, lxxii, 6; Aghānī, viii, 49, etc.

## مُّ اَعَامُ الْعَامُ الْعَامُ

Of very frequent occurrence, cf. vi, 31; vii, 32; xii, 107, etc. Hour.

It is used in the Qur'an both as an ordinary period of time—an hour (cf. xxx, 55; vii, 32; xvi, 63), but particularly of "the hour",

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> He quotes Strabo, xvi, 781, whose evidence is rather for S. Arabia. Bekrī, Mu'jam, 425, however, says that the olive is found in Syria only, and we may note that in Sūra axiii, 20, the tree on Mt. Sinai yields زنت not نت.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> So Phon. 77 (cf. Harris, Glossary, 99), and 77 in the Ras Shamra texts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> PPGl, 242.

<sup>4</sup> Hubschmann, Arm. Gramm, i, 309; ZDMG, xlvi, 243. Lagarde, Mitth, iii, 219, seemed to think that 31 b was the origin of the Semitic forms (but see his Arm. Stud, No. 1347, and Ubersicht, 219, n.).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Laufer, Sino-Iranica, 411, however, still holds to a Semitic origin for all the forms.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Eth. **الإباء**, however, is from Ar. زيتون, cf. Noldeke, op. cit.