

as the best sentence upon his own book: "Je n'hésite pas à y voir l'ouvrage le plus important qui ait été fait sur la vie de S. François."

T. H. DARLOW.

### TRACHONITIS AND THE ITURÆANS.

IN the last two numbers of *THE EXPOSITOR*, Prof. Ramsay has discussed St. Luke's phrase: τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνιτιδὸς χώρας,<sup>1</sup> with the view of disproving Mr. Chase's interpretation, that Luke meant two distinct provinces, Ituræa and Trachonitis. Prof. Ramsay takes Ἰτουραίας as an adjective, and as overflowing Trachonitis, and maintains, in opposition to Prof. Schürer,<sup>2</sup> that the Ituræan territory and Trachonitis were partly the same region. I have nothing to say on the grammatical side of the question. But having had occasion (after a recent journey through parts of the districts discussed) to examine the authorities for the geography, I may be allowed not only to respond to Prof. Ramsay's request for a discussion on the limits of Trachonitis itself,<sup>3</sup> but to go into the whole question at issue between him on the one side, and Mr. Chase and Prof. Schürer on the other.

Two preliminary remarks are necessary. *First*, every one who has worked at the geography of Eastern Palestine knows that it is characteristic of the names applied to the different parts of this region to have always been extremely elastic. This is not only true of the popular use of the names—for example, the use in the Old Testament of the names Bashan and Gilead, the use by Josephus of

<sup>1</sup> Luke iii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *History of the Jewish People*. English Edition. Div. i., vol. i., Appendix i. *History of Chalcis, Ituræa and Abilene*.

<sup>3</sup> *EXPOSITOR* for *February*, p. 148, note.

the name Peræa, or the present popular use of the name Hauran, all of which are applied now to a part, now to a whole, and frequently overlap other names. But it is true also of the official designations, as for example the Kaimakamat of Jaulan, which, forty years ago extended, according to Porter, much farther east than it does today, according to Schumacher. Names drift in Eastern Palestine, especially in its northern division between the Yarmuk and Hermon. They all overlap. Some have been wholly transferred from one district to another.<sup>1</sup> And tribes migrating, as tribes have always been doing across this lawless land, succeed in fastening their name upon a place that did not know it a few years before. Thus the Druses coming from Lebanon to the Jebel Hauran have practically changed its name in the mouth of the people to the Jebel Druz. I feel, therefore, strongly that it is impossible to be dogmatic on such a question as the limits of a name, or whether one name may not have covered another, as Prof. Ramsay maintains about Ituræa and Trachonitis, even though these were originally distinct, as Prof. Schürer has, I think, clearly shown. And in particular, I should not be inclined to accept as readily as Prof. Ramsay does the evidence of Eusebius, of the beginning of the fourth century, for the nomenclature of this restless and chameleon land in the beginning of the first century.

But *secondly*, I distrust the evidence of Eusebius on other grounds. It is true that, as Prof. Ramsay says, he lived in the country, but he wrote on the other side of it, and even in Western Palestine he is sometimes mistaken. When Eusebius treats of places in Eastern Palestine, he is more than once in disagreement with the evidence of the local inscriptions. I should, therefore, hold that Prof. Ramsay's

<sup>1</sup> El Betheniyeh. The Ard el Betheniyeh has been shifted since the Arab geographers of the tenth and eleventh centuries, from the upper Yarmuk to the north-west of the Jebel Hauran.

principle—that “a distinct or positive statement by a competent witness like Eusebius, familiar with the country, cannot be set aside by such an elaborate chain of comparison and inference from inferior authorities as Dr. Schürer relies on”—does not apply here, for Eusebius has not been proved competent or familiar with the country even in his own day, and he lived too far from the period under discussion to be trusted about the then position of its names. Schürer’s authorities are more nearly contemporary with Luke.

From these general remarks I pass to a discussion of our evidence for the two districts, and first take up Trachonitis. I will begin with the answer to Prof. Ramsay’s question (p. 148 n. 1) as to whether Trachon and Trachonitis are identical.

Strabo talks of the “two so-called Trachons” lying behind, that is south of, Damascus.<sup>1</sup> The name is the only purely Greek name given in this region, and has entirely disappeared. But it is generally agreed that Strabo can only have meant the two great deposits of lava, “tempests of stone,” which lie to the south-east of Damascus—the Lejja and the Safa. Each of these gets the Arabic title of Wa’r, or rough stony tract, the exact equivalent of Trachon.<sup>2</sup> The more easterly Safa, being beyond the pale of civilisation, was little regarded, and the Lejja became known as the Trachon *par excellence*. This is confirmed by two inscriptions at Musmī’eh on its northern limit, and at Berêkeh on its southern. Musmī’eh was Phæna, which on a graven stone of the temple is called a *Μητροκομία*, or a chief town of the Trachon.<sup>3</sup> Berêkeh is similarly designated.<sup>4</sup> The Trachon then is undoubtedly the Lejja.

<sup>1</sup> xvi. 2, 20.

<sup>2</sup> Wetzstein, *Reisebericht über Hauran und die Trachonen*, 1860, pp. 36ff.

<sup>3</sup> Burekhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 117. Le Bas and Waddington, *Inscriptions*, No. 2524.

<sup>4</sup> Wadd., 2396. Therefore Merrill (*East of Jordan*, p. 20) is wrong in trans-

But Josephus, who uses the term Trachon in XV. *Antiquities*, x. 1, along with Batanea and Auranitis to describe the territory gifted by Augustus to Herod in 23 B.C., employs in the parallel passage, I. *Wars*, xx. 4, the name Trachonitis.<sup>1</sup> Obviously, however, this is a wider term than Trachon, and presumably to be understood as Trachon *plus* the territory around. Indeed Josephus, again speaking of part of Herod's territory, uses the phrase, XVI. *Antt.*, iv. 6, "part of his dominions about Trachon." And again, from XV. *Antt.*, x. 3, it is probable, though by no means certain, that Trachon, which is there described as being separated from Galilee only by "Ulatha (the district to the east of Lake Huleh) and Paneas and the country round about," extended westwards from the edge of the Lejja, for neither Ulatha nor the territory of Paneas could have come so far east as the latter. Our only other data<sup>2</sup> for this period are Ptolemy v. 15, 4, a passage which speaks of the *Τραχωνίται Ἀρραβες* under Alsadamus, the present Jebel Hauran, and thus indicates that Trachonitis extended also south-east of the Lejja; and Philo, who, it is well to note, uses the name for the *whole* tetrarchy of Philip.<sup>3</sup>

We find, then, that about the period under discussion, Trachon was the name of the Lejja and that Trachonitis (for which Trachon was sometimes used) was the Lejja *plus* some neighbouring territory. The most important things to observe are *first*, that on the north-west Trachonitis marched with "Ulatha, Paneas, and the country round about," for we shall see that these may have borne the name Ituræa, and *secondly*, that Trachonitis

lating *μητροκωμία* as if it were *μητρόπολις* and in taking Phæna as the capital of the Trachon.

<sup>1</sup> Trachonitis also occurs in XV. *Antt.*, x. 1, a few lines lower than Trachon.

<sup>2</sup> Josephus, XVII. *Antt.*, ii. 1, 2, merely defines Trachonitis as bounded on the south by Batanea. Eusebius gives it as in his day north-east of Bostia, south of Damascus, and on the desert.

<sup>3</sup> *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 41.

could be used in a loose way for all the tetrarchy of Philip.

We turn now to Ituræa. Here, again, we are in the same difficulty as with Trachonitis, that we have no modern echo of the name to guide us.<sup>1</sup> In ancient times the Ituræans were a distinct, emphatic race of men. They had much fame as archers, and move through the whole Roman world, sung by Virgil and Lucan,<sup>2</sup> fighting with Cæsar in Africa,<sup>3</sup> rattling with their arrows through the very forum, a body-guard for Mark Antony, while Cicero cries out against the insult to the Senate.<sup>4</sup> They were wild bordermen between Syria and Arabia, to both of which they were reckoned by ancient writers, and Schürer has put it past doubt that their home lay on the Anti-Lebanon, while the sway of their ruler extended over Lebanon to the sea.<sup>5</sup> That justifies Prof. Schürer in speaking of the Ituræans as of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, to which language Prof. Ramsay objects as ambiguous (p. 147). The hills to the east of the Beka', or hollow between the Lebanons,

<sup>1</sup> Jêdûr *جيدور*, which is the name of the plain to the north of Hauran, has been quoted by many (Robinson, Conder, etc.) as the equivalent of Ituræa, but why it is hard to conceive; the initials of the two are quite different.

<sup>2</sup> Virg., *Georg.*, ii. 448. Lucan, *Pharsalia*, vii. 230, 514. Reland quotes Vibius Sequester *de Gentibus*, "Ithyrei Syri usu sagittæ periti."

<sup>3</sup> *Bellum Afric.*, 20.

<sup>4</sup> *Philippics*, ii. 19, 112; xiii. 18. He calls them barbarians, and cries out, "they filled these benches!"

<sup>5</sup> Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, Eng. ed., div. i. vol. ii., Appendix i.: "The History of Chalcis, Ituræa, and Abilene. His evidence for Anti-Lebanon is four-fold. (1) Josephus, XIII. *Antt.*, xi. 3, places the Ituræan country in the north of Galilee, in 105 B.C. (2) On an inscription of about 6 A.D. (alluded to by Prof. Ramsay, p. 147) Q. Æmilius Secundus relates that being sent by Quirinius "adversus Ituræos in Libano monte castellum eorum cepi" (*Ephemeris Epigraphica*, 1881, 537-542). (3) Dion Cassius (xlix. 32) calls Lysanias king of the Ituræans, and the same writer (lix. 12) and Tacitus (*Ann.*, xii. 23) calls Soemus governor of the same; but Lysanias ruled the Lebanon district from the sea to Damascus, with his capital at Chalcis, and Soemus was tetrarch at Lebanon (Josephus, *Vita*, xi.). (4) Above all, Strabo puts the Ituræans in Anti-Lebanon.

were called the highlands of the Ituræans.<sup>1</sup> In 105 B.C., Josephus tells us, their territory bordered with Galilee, —Schürer thinks the name came down over part of Galilee at that time, but this is improbable.<sup>2</sup> Now, if the name thus spread down the slopes of Anti-Lebanon south-west towards Galilee, it is quite possible that it also spread down the same slopes south-east upon the district of Paneas, and even eastwards towards Trachonitis.<sup>3</sup> The Ituræans were of a wild Ishmaelite stock.<sup>4</sup> Strabo speaks of them as mixed with Arabs, and as inhabiting the same inaccessible highlands as the Arabs.<sup>5</sup> Such language cannot refer to the main range of Anti-Lebanon, but must mean districts to the east of that, and, therefore, we have to conclude, I think, that the Ituræan people extended a good deal farther east than Schürer seems willing to admit. How far is precisely what we cannot determine. At the same time Strabo never confuses, but indeed carefully distinguishes the two Trachons from the parts occupied by Ituræans and Arabs together.

We may, therefore, conclude with Prof. Schürer that the Ituræans, though scattered towards Trachonitis, and per-

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, xvi. ii, 16 : τὴν Ἰτουραίων ὀρεινὴν. 18 : τινὰ καὶ ὀρεινὰ ἐν οἷς ἡ Χαλκίς ὤσπερ ἀκρόπολις τοῦ Μασσούου (i.e. the Beka').

<sup>2</sup> Josephus, XIII. *Antt.*, xi. 3. I had written above that Josephus calls the Ituræan region Ἰτουραίων, which is the reading in Dindorf's text in all the older edd. I have access to (e.g. Hirdson's, and the Amsterdam ed.) This reading, if established, would have proved the possibility of Luke's use of the word as a noun. But as Prof. Ramsay has kindly pointed out to me, the reading of Niese, the last editor of Josephus (as well as of Naber in Teubner) is Ἰτουραίας, which (though I think it has no greater documentary evidence) is, as Prof. Ramsay says, more grammatical than the other. This passage in Josephus, therefore, cannot be used as a proof. If the possibility of Luke's use of Ἰτουραίας as a noun.

<sup>3</sup> The border of the Lejja is only 28 miles from the skirts of Anti-Lebanon.

<sup>4</sup> They are no doubt the same as the יִטּוּרַיִם, Jetur, of Gen. xxv. 15, mentioned among other Ishmaelite tribes of Arabs. Cf. 1 Chron. i. 30, v. 19.

<sup>5</sup> xvi. ii. 18 : τὰ μὲν οὖν ὀρεινὰ ἔχουσι πάντα Ἰτουραῖοι τε καὶ Ἀραβες. 20 : ἔπειτα πρὸς τὰ Ἀράβων μέρη καὶ τῶν Ἰτουραίων ἀναμίξῃ ὄρη δύσβατα.

haps up to its very borders, occupied a distinct and separate land.

About 25 B.C., however, political influences drew the country of the Ituræans and Trachonitis together. One Zenodorus "leased the house of Lysanias,<sup>1</sup> King of the Ituræans,"<sup>2</sup> which included Ulatha and Paneas, and the country round about, and at the same time he had some undefined authority over Trachonitis. He exerted this latter so loosely or unjustly that Augustus took it from him and gave it to Herod<sup>3</sup> with Batanea and Auranitis. When he died Augustus gave Herod the rest of his dominion, the Ituræan portion, so that again, that is in B.C. 20, the Ituræan territory, at least in part, and Trachonitis were under the same ruler. At Herod's death Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, with "a certain part of what was called the House of Zenodorus, about Paneas," formed the tetrarchy of Philip.<sup>4</sup>

This "certain part of the House of Zenodorus about Paneas," was, as we have seen, almost certainly overrun by Ituræans, and therefore not unlikely to receive the name Ituræan. If Josephus applied the name to northern Galilee, why should not Luke apply it to the corresponding district on the east of Jordan, which lay even more closely under the eaves of the Ituræan house in Anti-Lebanon?

It seems to me, then, proved, that Luke's words, τῆς Ἰτροπαίας, which Josephus used as a noun, are found to be applicable to the portion of Philip's tetrarchy round the foot of Anti-Lebanon, and as far as the border of Trachonitis. It is not proved, that, as Prof. Ramsay suggests, the name extended into and over Trachonitis, so as to have become one with it. At the same time this

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, XV. *Antt.*, x. 1; I. *Wars*, xx. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Dion Cassius, xlix. 32.

<sup>3</sup> See above.

<sup>4</sup> Josephus, XVII. *Antt.*, xi. 4; II. *Wars*, vi. 3.

was not impossible. The names almost certainly touched, and in that country names that touch have always been names that overlap. Philo, we have seen, extends the name Trachonitis across the whole of Philip's tetrarchy, including, it is to be presumed, the Ituræan portions. And, conversely, so hardy a race as the Ituræans, and so Arab a race, mingling with the Arabs, and likely, when their robber seats on the Lebanon were taken from them,<sup>1</sup> to fly eastwards to the inaccessible Trachons, may have migrated into Trachonitis proper and carried their name with them. If they did so, it would be no more than the Druses, their successors in Lebanon, and by some thought to be their descendants, have done during the present century. The Jebel Hauran is also called the Jebel Druz.

The geographical evidence, then, really amounts to a *non liquet*. Ituræa and Trachonitis were originally distinct territories. We have no proof that their names ever overlapped, but at the same time many analogies indicate how easily they could have done so.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

<sup>1</sup> In 6 A.D.