

عيسى بن مريم, and is frequently accompanied by characteristic N.T. titles, e.g. *روح الله*; *كلمة الله*; *المسيح*.

Many Muslim authorities take the word as Arabic and derive it from *عيس* to be a dingy white, whence *عَيْسٌ* a reddish whiteness (Lane, sub voc.), or from *عَيْسٌ* meaning a stallion's urine; so Rāghib, *Mufradāt*, 359 (cf. *LA*, viii, 31). Zam. on iii, 40, however, dismisses these suggestions with some scorn,¹ and there were many who recognized it as a foreign word.² al-Jawālīqī, *Mu'arrab*, 105; al-Khafājī, 134, give it as such, and in *LA*, viii, 30 ff., we read that Sibawaih, Ibn Sīda, Jawharī, and az-Zajjāj classed it as *معرب*. Jawharī, *Ṣiḥāḥ*, sub voc., gives it as Syriac, but Baiḍ. on ii, 81, says it is Hebrew.

The name is still a puzzle to scholarship. Some have suggested that it is really Esau *עֵשָׂא*, and was learned by Muḥammad from Jews who called Jesus so out of hatred.³ There is no evidence, however, that Jews ever referred to Jesus by this name. Others take it as a rhyming formation to correspond with *يحيى* and *موسى*, on the analogy of Hārūn and Qārūn; Hārūt and Mārūt; Yājūj and Mājūj, etc. There may be some truth in this.⁴ Derenbourg, *REJ*, xviii, 128, after pointing out how the Tetragrammaton יהוה in Gk. became Ἰησοῦς, suggests that perhaps *יֵסוּעַ* "lu à la manière occidentale" has produced

عيسى, but this is hardly likely.

Fraenkel, *WZKM*, iv, 334, 335, suggests that the name *عيسى* may have been so formed from *عيسى* by Christians in Arabia before

¹ Baiḍ. follows Zam. in this. Zwemer, *Moslem Christ*, 34, has quite misunderstood Baiḍ. on this point. Baiḍ. does not argue for a derivation from *عيس*, but definitely repudiates it. al-'Ukbarī, *Imlā'*, i, 164, says clearly *لا يعرف له اشتقاق*.

² See the discussion in Abū Ḥayyān, *Bahr*, i, 297.

³ This was suggested by Roediger (Fraenkel, *WZKM*, iv, 334, n.) and by Landauer (Noldeke, *ZDMG*, xli, 720, n.), and is set forth again by Pautz, *Offenbarung*, 191. The case against it is elaborated by Derenbourg, *REJ*, xviii, 127, and Rudolph, *Abhängigkeit*, 66.

⁴ This theory was elaborated by Lowenthal in 1861, cf. *MW*, i, 267-282, and Ahrens, *Christliches*, 25.