

The usual explanation of the word is that it is a form **فعليل** from **وزر** to *bear* or *carry*, and thus means one who carries the burdens of the Prince (cf. Rāghib, *Mufradāt*, 542). Lagarde, *Übersicht*, 177, n., however, pointed out that it is an Iranian word, and in his *Arm. Stud.*, § 2155, he derives it from the Phlv. **ویحیر** *vičir*, which originally meant a *decree, mandate, command*, but which later, as in the *Dinkard*, came to mean *judge* or *magistrate*.¹ This word, of course, is good Iranian, being from the Av. **ویمردد** *vičira* meaning *deciding*,² which was borrowed into Arm. as **վիճիւն**,³ and is related to the form behind the Mod. Pers. **وچر** or **وچر** *judge*⁴; **کزی** or *prefect*,⁵ and **وزیر**, which is generally regarded as a loan-word from Arabic but which Bartholomae, *AIW*, 1438, rightly takes as a genuine derivative from the older Iranian word.

The borrowing was doubtless direct from the Middle Persian, for the Syr. **ܐܘܨܬܐ** seems to be late and a borrowing from Arabic (*PSm*, 1061).

يَا جُوجُ وَ مَا جُوجُ (*Yājūj wa Mājūj*).

xviii, 93; xxi, 96.

Gog and Magog.

Both passages are reflections of Syriac legends concerning Alexander the Great.

It was recognized very commonly that the names were non-Arabic (cf. al-Jawālīqī, *Mu'arrab*, 140, 156; al-Khafājī, 215; *LA*, iii, 28), and 'there was some doubt as to whether they should be read with Hamza or without.

The names were apparently well known in pre-Islamic Arabia, and we find references to them in the early poetry, where the statements about them would indicate that knowledge of them came to Arabia

¹ West, *Glossary*, 237. It was a fairly common word, and enters into a number of compounds; cf. Nyberg, *Glossar*, 242.

² Bartholomae, *AIW*, 1438; Reichelt, *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, 490.

³ Hübschmann, *Arm. Gramm.*, i, 248; Spiegel, *Huzvāresh Grammatik*, Wien, 1856, p. 188.

⁴ Vullers, *Lex*, ii, 1411.

⁵ Vullers, *Lex*, ii, 1000; Horn, *Grundriss*, 242; Hübschmann, *Pers. Studien*, 94.