Eth. And. This is fairly clear evidence that Ar. is a secondary formation and in all probability from the Aram. as Fraenkel, Vocab, 25, noted (so Ahrens, Christliches, 27).

رة (Tijāra).

ii, 15, 282; iv, 33; ix, 24; xxiv, 37; xxxv, 26; lxi, 10; lxii, 11. Merchandise.

It will be noticed that the word occurs only in late passages. In three passages (ii, 15; iv, 33; xxiv, 37) it bears the sense of trafficking rather than merchandise or the substance of traffic, and this

latter is perhaps a derived sense. The word تأجر merchant does not occur in the Qur'an, nor any derived verbal form.

There can be no doubt that the word came from the Aram. Fraenkel, Fremdw, 182, thinks that غرق was formed from the verb which is a denominative from أَحَرِي , the form which he thinks was originally borrowed from Aram. In view, however, of the Aram. There would seem no reason for refusing to derive the Aram. there would seem no reason for refusing to derive the Aram. There is some difficulty in deriving مَا جَرِي مُعْلِي وَ مُعْلِي وَمُعْلِي وَ مُعْلِي وَالْمُعْلِي وَ مُعْلِي وَ مُعْلِي وَالْمُعْلِي وَالْم

If, however, the original form in Ar. were جَارَة from جَارِة, and the verb عَاجِر a denominative from this, it is easy to see how عاجر a merchant, i.e. "one who traffics", would be formed as a participle from this verb.

That the borrowing was from the Aram. is clear from the fact that the original word was the Akk. $tamk\bar{a}ru$ or $tamg\bar{a}ru$, whence comes the Armen. $\partial u\bar{u}u u u u u$ or $\partial u\bar{u}u u u u$, so that in the Aram.

¹ Zimmern, Akkad. Fremdw, 16. ² Hübschmann, Arm. Gramm, i, 303.