

Theology on *the Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes.
Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit
or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the
copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the
ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the
links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

CHUZA.

THE inevitable separation of studies in these days of specialization carries with it the danger that important contributions to knowledge may be overlooked by the student whose work touches, without covering, many fields of enquiry. The textual critic of the New Testament has been stimulated lately by Prof. Blass. The Orientalist has been cheered by Mr. Stanley Cook's *Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions*.¹ But few, too few, textual critics are in any sense Orientalists, and there is a danger that evidence derived from Semitic epigraphy may be neglected by those who approach Biblical questions from the side of classical scholarship.

I am not going to attempt a review of Mr. Cook's admirable and useful compilation. It does not profess to give original results, but it gathers together, with full references, the work of many scholars on Aramaic inscriptions of every kind. A glance down the glossary shows at once which Aramaic proper names that occur in the Bible have hitherto been found on contemporary monuments. We find, amongst others, Gashmu—*Gūshāmu* “the Arabian” (Neh. vi. 6), Aretas—*Hāritha* (2 Cor. xi. 32), Malchus—*Mālīchū* (John xviii. 10),² and Chuza.

Chuza brings us to Prof. Blass, who has lately brought forward a theory about this name in his interesting and deservedly popular book on the *Philology of the Gospels*. He says (Eng. trans., p. 152) :

There is a personage mentioned by Luke, who may be unknown to some of my readers, a man by name Chuzas, steward to Herod, the Tetrarch, and husband to Joanna, who was one of the women accompanying Christ (see Luke viii. 3). The name, of course an Aramaic

¹ Cambridge, 1898.

² Cook, p. 73, six lines from bottom, for vol. 7, read vol. 6.

one, does not occur anywhere else. Now, if we scrutinize our Latin witnesses very carefully, we find in *l* (an old Latin version of the seventh century, existing in Breslau and published by Prof. Haase) instead of *Chuzæ, Cydiæ*. This is a very ancient Greek name; there was one Cydias a lyric poet, and another an Attic orator, mentioned by Aristotle, and another a painter from the island of Cythnus, and so on. How does the Latin copyist come by that name? By chance? Impossible. By correction? Still more impossible. I say he came by it in the simplest way in the world, by tradition, which goes back to Luke himself. That man had two names, one Aramaic and one Greek, of somewhat similar sound, which he had adopted as more convenient for the cultivated and educated circle in which he lived: just as other Jews, as early as in the time of the Maccabees, transformed their name of Jesus into Jason, and as modern German Jews called Aaron prefer to call themselves Arthur. Luke must originally have written: "Of Chuza, who was also called Cydias"; but, when copying first for readers in Syria and Palestine, he left out the Greek name, and, when copying again for Roman readers, he left out the Aramaic one. There cannot be a more simple solution of a puzzling problem, which, if you attempt in any other way, you will find insoluble.

Elsewhere (p. 243) Prof. Blass tells us that "if you are to suspend a hundredweight, you must take a rope and not a thread." But what sort of a rope is *l*? It is a seventh-century MS., giving the Vulgate text in St. Matthew and St. Mark, a mixed text in St. John, while in St. Luke it presents a fairly pure "European" text of the Old Latin. But it very rarely gives us a valuable reading unsupported by other Latin evidence, being in this respect quite unlike *k* or *e*, or the quotations of St. Cyprian. It would be extraordinary if *l* should have preserved the name Cydias uncorrupted, when every other authority has adopted the peculiar and unfamiliar Chuza.¹ The other "singular" readings of *l* hardly inspire confidence: few, I suppose, will care to follow its scribe in making the Nativity take place at *Bethel* instead of at *Bethlehem* (Luke ii. 4, 15).

¹ The spellings of this name in our Latin MSS. are very varied: we have, for instance (the word being in the genitive case), "cusæ" *e*, "chuse" *a*, "chuzae" *b, c, q*, while most codices of the Vulgate have "chuza."

Prof. Blass appears to hold that a scribe's error or thoughtless emendation of a Semitic name could not produce a striking or plausible result. But he has overlooked the most remarkable case of all. In Mark xv. 35 *k*, by far the best MS. of the Old Latin, has *Helion uocat* instead of *Heliam* (or *Helian*) *uocat*. If we were to adopt Prof. Blass's methods here, they might take us very far indeed. Are we to suppose that the exclamation of Christ gave rise to two misunderstandings, one Aramaic and one Greek, of somewhat similar sound, so that the Jews thought He called for Elijah, while the Gentiles understood it as an appeal to Phœbus, whose rays had been so mournfully withdrawn? Are we to go on to declare that Luke (in translating St. Mark's Gospel, as Prof. Blass says he did) must originally have written both misunderstandings, but when copying first for readers in Syria and Palestine he left out the Greek name, and when copying again for Roman readers he left out the Aramaic one?

It is ill jesting with a sacred subject, but it is difficult to treat some of Prof. Blass's arguments seriously, and the success—the otherwise deserved success—of his book makes some note of caution necessary. Every one must feel that the variation between *helian* and *helion* in Mark xv. 35 rests only upon a scribe's error, though it is just conceivable that the confusion originated in Greek—*i.e.* between *'Hλιαν* and *"Ηλιον.*¹ But *Cydiae* and *Cuzæ* (or *Chuzæ*) in Luke viii. 3 are scarcely more unlike, palæographically, than *Helion* and *Helian*. “C” and “Ch” are practically interchangeable in Latin MSS. of the Gospels; in fact, the only other proper name in St. Luke that

¹ Cf. Mark ix. 49 in *k*. While speaking of *k* (the Bobbio Gospels) I must take the opportunity of protesting against Prof. Blass's remarkable statement (p. 81), that *B* and *k* are much nearer together in Matthew than in Mark. A glance at the tables of readings which Dr. Sanday has collected at the end of his edition of *k* (O. Latin Bible Texts, ii.) is enough to show that this is not the case.

begins with χ, viz. "Corazain" (Luke x. 3), is so spelt in *l*, with "c" not "ch." On the other hand, "Cydias" in Greek is spelt Κυδίας, and κ and χ are not generally confounded. Then, again, "u" and "y" not unfrequently interchange: *k* has "Zabulon" for Ζαβουλὼν in Matthew iv. 15, but in verse 13 it has "Zabylon." Finally "di" is a well-recognised equivalent for "z"; I need here only refer to Rönsch, *Collectanea*, p. 21, who cites *baptidiator*, *iudeaediare*, *exorcidiare*.

But some of my readers may feel that there still remains the difficulty that "the name [Chuza], of course an Aramaic one, does not occur anywhere else." Here comes in the evidence to which attention is called by Mr. Cook's *Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions*. Who was the Chuza whose name is actually found? The answer is, that Chuza was the father of a man called Ḥayyān, whose descendants erected the largest and finest of the great rock-cut tombs at El-Heqr in Arabia.¹ These people, though they moved in a circle sufficiently "cultivated and elevated" to possess a magnificent family mausoleum in the Grecian style, as fine as the well-known rock tombs of Petra, were not ashamed of their grandfather's name, and their inscription runs—

לחיין בר כווע אהורה

"To Ḥayyān, son of Kūzā, his posterity (have erected
this tomb)."

Here "Chuza" is quite correctly spelt, just as the name is written in Luke viii. 3 in all the Syriac versions. We do not know the exact date of the inscription, but we shall not be very far wrong in placing it in the first century A.D. or B.C.

¹ El-Heqr is the modern Madāin Sālih on the Pilgrim Route, rather more than half way from Akaba to Medina.

My readers will, no doubt, have guessed the final step to which all the evidence points. Chuza is a real name, but it is not found again in Greek, because it is not a Jew's name but a Nabatean's. There is no evidence that Chuza was a Jew, whatever his wife may have been, and a "steward" to the Herodian family may very well have been of foreign origin, like the Herods themselves. If Chuza was of a Nabatean family, that would explain his having a Nabatean name, which we should no more expect to find again in Greek literature than 'Auida, or Ma'na, or Gusham.

But though all this serves to illustrate St. Luke, and to confirm the historical probability of the existence of Chuza, we must avoid suspending our hundredweights by a thread. My object is simply to point out that the name Chuza has actually been found, independently of Luke viii. 3; and that it is unnecessary to postulate two separate editions of the Gospel, issued by the evangelist himself, in order to explain the irregular spellings in which this name occurs in Latin MSS.

F. C. BURKITT.