

“AND DAN, WHY DID HE REMAIN IN SHIPS”¹

(Judges, V, 17)

by

Yigael Yadin

The Hebrew University, Jerusalem

FOREWORD

Most scholars who have made a study of the Tribe of Dan as depicted in Biblical sources admit that much of the information supplied about it is strange and puzzling. This applies not only to the status of the Tribe and the character of the Tales of Samson, but also to its areas of tribal settlement and the course of its northward wanderings. These difficulties, which the scholars usually make no attempt to conceal, derive largely from their common starting-point. On the one hand they set out to clarify the contradictions between the various Bible sources in accordance with the rigid approach of the Bible as finally redacted, while at the same time they tend to disregard the happenings in Philistia reflected and recorded in external sources. In order to bring the difficulties into relief it is fitting to give a brief account of each of the Biblical texts that are connected with the matter under consideration.

1. I have done my best to preserve the following presentation in its original form as a lecture to the Nineteenth Meeting of the Israel Exploration Society, and not to transform it into an essay bristling with references and footnotes. There were two reasons for this: First, because I desire the reader to consider a certain suggestion I have to offer, without being too definite in formulating it; and second, the essential material about the Tribe of Dan may be assumed to be familiar to the reader and has already been discussed in numerous publications. I am, therefore, restricting myself to references which are easily available and which are directly connected with the subject-matter of the lecture. During my London visit in 1962, I outlined the essential idea to Professor Cyrus H. Gordon, who agreed with me about one of the problems to be discussed below (*VT Suppl. IX*, 1963, p. 21). After my lecture Mr. E. Margalit gave me a copy of his (as yet unpublished) essay entitled “The Parallels between the Legend of Samson and the Legends of the Peoples of the Aegean Sea”. Although his main subject is the problem of Samson, as shown by the title of his essay, Mr. Margalit reaches a number of conclusions resembling my own.

THE TRIBE OF THE DANITES

The Status of the Tribe of Dan

The most interesting verse in this connection is undoubtedly Genesis XLIX, 16, translated in the Authorised Version as: "Dan shall judge his people as one of the Tribes of Israel". The difficulties of the scholars reach their height when they try to give this a significance that runs counter to the apparent meaning: ". . . It seems to me"—one of them remarks, for example, "that here the text implies that Dan stands *at the head* (my italics, Y.Y.) of the Tribes of Israel.² And yet the straightforward meaning of this verse appears rather to signify some kind of Amphyctonic Council admitting the Tribe of Dan into the Covenant of the Tribes of Israel.³ Until that time Dan would appear to have been *outside* the Covenant. Henceforward he would judge his people *as one* (i.e., as any other one) of the Tribes of Israel.

This conclusion would appear to be quite significant. As we shall see, it is well suited to the remaining information about the Tribe of Dan, which seems very remarkable if it is interpreted in the light of the view that attributes a supremacy over the Tribes of Israel as a whole to Dan.

The Problem of the Portion of the Tribe of Dan

The difference between the Tribe of Dan and the Tribes of Israel as a whole finds its clearest expression in the Biblical description of its portion, found in Judges XVIII, 1 *et seq.*: "In those days there was no King in Israel; and in those days the Tribe of the Danites sought them an inheritance to dwell in, *for unto that day their inheritance had not fallen unto them among the Tribes of Israel*".

Here as well the *prima facie* meaning of the text clearly indicates that at this stage the Tribe of the Danites had no inheritance *among or within* the Tribes of Israel. This would also seem to be indicated by the text in Joshua, XIX, 47: "And the border of the children of Dan went out from them" (in the A.V. "*was too little for them*"). The problem of the inheritance of Dan appears particularly acute in the light of the verses preceding the one quoted above, which includes within the list of the inheritances of the

-
2. H. Gevaryahu, in the discussion of B.Z. Luria's lecture on "The Settlement of the Tribe of Dan", which was delivered to the Bible Circle at the home of Mr. D. Ben-Gurion. And see: *Studies in the Book of Joshua*, Jerusalem, 1960 p. 263. (Hebrew).
 3. The word-play in the verse in question is based on the shorter form of the name. See also: S. E. Loewenstamm, *Biblical Encyclopaedia* (Hebrew) on this subject. See also: "And Rachel said, God hath judged me (in Hebrew *danani*) and hath also heard my voice and hath given me a son; therefore called she his name Dan". (Genesis XXX, 6).

Tribes of Israel not only Zorah, Eshtaol *et al.*, in the inheritance of Dan, but also "Gath-rimmon and Mei-jarkon and Rakkon with the border over against Joppa". The same applies to the list of the Cities of the Levites found within the inheritance of Dan according to Joshua XXI, 24: "Gath-rimmon with her suburb".⁴

These lists give rise to a serious difficulty. For according to the now generally accepted view the Tribe of Dan never dwelt along the Coasts of the Mediterranean at all (see below). If we accept the version or opinion that the lists date back to the days of Solomon, it is hard to understand why those cities should have been attributed to the heritage of Dan, which is assumed never to have dwelt in them at all. The only explanation would seem to be that such passages derive from a far more ancient tradition, which echoes the possession of these places by this particular tribe. The difficulties of the scholars are evidenced *inter alia* by the view which rejects the assumption "that Dan ever held so extensive an area. It seems reasonable to assume that when the term 'Dan' is applied to this extensive area, it is only the historical name of a relatively small district which was expanded over a far larger one when it came to be included within the borders of Israel".⁵ In other words, it is assumed here that there was an attempt at a historical *reconstruction*. But one must ask: "Reconstruction" of what?

It may be inferred that the two sources quoted involve a very striking contradiction at first sight. For according to one of them Dan has no heritage at all among the Tribes of Israel, while according to the other its boundaries contain many cities, some of them very definitely "Philistine".

In addition, the Bible provides information about the semi-nomadic character of the Tribe of Dan at a certain period. In part it is a nomadic group, and in part is casually settled at the "Mahaneh (Camp of) Dan". (This is stated to have shifted from time to time, being found on one occasion between Zorah and Eshtaol—Judges XIII, 25—and subsequently near Kiryath-Jearim—Judges XVIII, 12). Some of the tribal families, or clans, move (in connection with the tale of the northern migration, and see below) in armed troops with their women and children.

No less interesting is the verse which indicates that there was a certain stage at which the main pressure came not from the Philistines but, specifically, from the Amorites: "And the Amorites forced the Children of Dan into the hill country for they would not

4. On the proposed identification of Gath-Rimmon with Tel-Jerisha see: B. Mazar, *Biblical Encyclopaedia* (Hebrew) s.v.

5. Z. Kallai, *The Northern Boundaries of Judah*, Jerusalem 1960, pp. 27-28 (Hebrew).

suffer them to come down to the valley," etc. (*Judges I*, 34-35). Yet there can be no doubt that one of the most instructive passages regarding the Tribe of Dan, a passage directly connected with the subject-matter of our problem, is that which deals with the migration of the Danites northward. The facts are known, and therefore we shall restrict ourselves to stressing those details which are directly connected with our subject.

During the period when the Danites dwelt in the region of Zorah and Eshtaol, they once again sought a place to settle down, on account of the pressure from east and west. Following a survey far to the north, Laish "was revealed" to them and they conquered it. The essence of this narrative is that the people who lived in Laish before them were closely connected with the Sidonians, who for some reason could not come to their aid (*Judges XVIII*, 2 *et seq.*, 28 *et seq.*). And the Danites changed the name of the city and called it Dan, after their forefather.

At this stage Dan, as remarked, was semi-nomadic, as is shown by the passage in *Judges XVIII*, 21 *et seq.*: "So they turned and departed and put the little ones and the cattle and the goods before them . . . angry fellows". This process of wandering and conquering Laish is also connected, according to Biblical tradition, with the steps taken by Dan to adopt for themselves a Priest descended from Gershom the Son of M(N)SHH.⁶ This story also contains something that seems "peculiar", unless we assume that here as well as there is some hint of a certain change that came about in the religion and worship of the Tribe of Dan.

In any case it is clear that the verse found in *Deuteronomy XXXIII*, 22 ("Dan is a lion's whelp, that leapeth forth from Bashan") refers to the northern portion of the Tribe.

"And Dan, why did he remain in Ships?"

As though to complicate the in-any-case complicated problem of the Tribe of Dan still further, we have the verse from the Song of Deborah which serves as the title to the present study. This verse, possibly more than any others connected with the subject, has enjoyed countless interpretations which derive from two difficulties.⁷ First, it is not clear whether the passage refers to the

6. Although the text indicates only the general family origin of the priest, there are some who view it specifically as a hint of the early period of the wandering of the Danites not long after the period of Moses. See, e.g., B. Mazar, *Studies in the Book of Joshua* (n. 2 *supra*) p. 272.

7. On the various opinions of this verse see, e.g., B. Z. Luria's lecture (*supra* n. 2) p. 250 *et seq.* Also the essay of the late I. Ben-Zvi in *Oz Ledavid* (Heb.) *Jerusalem* 1964, pp. 117 *et seq.*

period when Dan dwelt in the north or in the south; and second, the reference to the ships is vague.

Those who argue that the words refer to the northern area must avail themselves of the forced explanation that these ships are the boats that were used in the Hula Lake, or similar interpretations. The ancient and medieval commentators already found difficulties in interpreting the word given here as "abide", the original Hebrew of which is "yagur". This word *per se* may equally well derive from a homonymous root meaning "fear" or "dread"; and early commentators were hesitant as to which meaning they should select. The Targum Jonathan, for instance, is followed by Rashi when he exclaims: "Dan put his money in ships so that he could rise and flee".⁸ Rabbi David Kimhi similarly remarks: "He does not refer to sea ships since his portion was not by the sea, for that was where the portion of Zebulun was . . . And although Joshua states, regarding Dan's portion (XIX, 46), 'against Joppa', nevertheless, Jaffa was not in his portion; so this means the ships were on the Jordon. As much as to say that he crossed the Jordon and fled for fear of the Gentiles, and bore his belongings away to the other side of the Jordon" and so on and so forth.

Undoubtedly, this verse is particularly hard to comprehend according to the "northern" view, as several scholars have already pointed out at length.⁹ Yet even those who claim that it is the Dan of the south that is referred to, immediately meet with another difficulty, which derives from the approach referred to above, namely: What did the southern Dan have to do with ships? They therefore had to give meanings such as: He fears the ships of the enemy that are upon the Great Sea;¹⁰ he dwells as a slave in the ships of the Sidonians; and more of the same.

None of these offer any solution to the essential problem. The "northern" view involves many difficulties, but the "southern" opinion, in the sense mentioned above, does not clarify the connection between the words and the content of the Song of Deborah either. Is the fact that Dan fears the ships of the foe on the Great Sea sufficient to deter him from entering into battle?

Comparison with the other verses regarding those Tribes which did not join in the War seems to indicate that there is a hint here of *Dan being engaged with ships*, for which reason the tribe did not gird itself for war; like Rueben staying amid the sheep-

8. On these views see the lecture of B. Z. Luria (*supra* notes 2 and 7).

9. See particularly Luria and Ben-Zvi (Notes 2 and 7, *supra*).

10. e.g., M. Haran, *Studies in the Book of Joshua* (Heb.) (*supra*, note 2) p. 262; also Ben-Zvi (*supra* note 7).

folds or Asher which dwells on the sea-coast. Yet if the reference is to Dan and its occupation in the south—we again meet the same original difficulty that Dan does not seem to have dwelt by the shore, and therefore, what can be the connection between them and ships in general? In order to overcome these difficulties one must inevitably reach the conclusion that this verse, as it stands, refers to a stage at which Dan dwelt by the shores of the Great Sea and engaged in ships; of which more will be said below.

Absence of genealogical lists of the Tribe of Dan and description of the conquest of cities in his heritage.

No less astonishing is the fact, already remarked on by commentators, that Scripture contains no genealogical lists of the Tribe of Dan, nor details of the conquest of the cities in the southern heritage. Genesis is restricted to the fragmentary sentence "And the sons of Dan, Hushim" (LVI, 23). Nor can any evidence in this respect be found in the Genealogical Lists of Chronicles. Indeed, the point has justly been stressed by various scholars,¹¹ but the colourful explanations offered do not afford any direct answer to the question before us.¹² The account of the Conquest, likewise, does not indicate the cities mentioned in the heritage of Dan, nor are they in the List of the Thirty-one Kings found in Joshua XII.

Our surprise at all these anomalies (in respect of the Tribes of Israel as a whole) in reference connected with the Tribe of Dan leads us to an additional problem: the problem of Samson.

Samson

Samson, the outstanding hero of the Tribe of Dan, has a special status among all the Judges. For that matter, he can scarcely be regarded as a Judge in the usual sense. The account in Scripture gives the clear impression that his heroic deeds are not the result of any external pressure on the Tribe nor the fruit of an aspiration to aid Israel, but are a response to *personal* injury. In all that is told regarding Samson there is no evidence of any close link whatever between his family, or the Tribe of Dan as such, and

11. See: B. Z. Luria (*supra* n. 2) p. 254. In the discussion on the lecture, Mr. Z. Shazar also repeatedly called on the lecturer to find an answer to "the main question: why have no genealogical lists of the Sons of Dan survived?" (*idem*, p. 269). Furthermore, members of the Tribe of Dan are referred to here and there as children of mixed marriages. And cf. Leviticus XXIV, 10 et seq.).

12. See, e.g., S. Yeivin, *Biblical Encyclopaedia* (Heb.) II, Coll, 679 on Dan: "... it is suggested that in essence this tribe (Dan) was nothing more than a group of families which emerged from the miscegenation of the followers of the Sons of Jacob with Hivite elements in the vicinity of Shechem".

the other Tribes of Israel.¹³ On the contrary, all the contacts preceding his acts of vengeance against the Philistines indicate that there were *normal and family relations* between the Danites and the Philistines.¹⁴ The fact is that Samson and his family maintains close ties with the Philistines alone. His first wife is Philistine (Judges XIV, 1), a daughter of the uncircumcised who dwelt in Timnah. He has ties with a harlot in Gaza (*ibid* XVI, 1); and his second wife, Delilah, dwells in the Valley of Sorek and is the confidante of the chiefs of the Philistines. Samson's main physical strength is connected with the braided hair of his head, while his "spiritual" strength finds expression in his gift for *asking riddles*; and he participates in riddle contests that have dangerous results.

His deeds of valour include the slaying of the lion; the slaying with the jawbone of an ass; the roguery with the foxes; and finally a brave deed in Gaza, and a daring incursion into Ashkelon (*ibid* XIV, 19). He finds himself in difficult and peculiar situations, and certain places appear to have been named on account of events that befell him there; such as the hollow at Lehi which opened so wondrously when Samson was almost dead of thirst. Indeed, it is not surprising that in consideration of the similarity between his feats on the one hand, and his name and that of the cities of his vicinity (Har Heres, 'Ir Shemesh, etc.) on the other, various scholars have compared Samson to some mythological sun-hero and particularly to Hercules, Perseus, etc. All this is familiar.

Interim Summary

At a certain stage the Tribe of Dan was not a member of the Amphyctyonic League of the Tribes of Israel, nor does it have any genealogical lists. Although its most ancient heritage clearly had some connection with the Mediterranean coast between Philistia and Northern Sharon, the Bible does not know of any conquests among those of the Tribes of Israel. The relations

13. Even after Samson fled to the "parting of the Etam Rock" in Judah the men of Judah did not object to his activities against the Philistines but to the fact that he sought a *refuge* within the boundaries of Judah: "Surely you know that over us (over Judah!) rule the Philistines, so what is this that you have done to us? Why have you fled to our confines?" Indeed, it was their intention to surrender him to the Philistines, who had made demands to them in this connection.
14. The commentators have noted this without attempting to draw any conclusions from it. See, for example, the following passage: "Between them (the Philistines—Y.Y.) and the Danites there is no state of war but unrestricted intercourse, *connubium* and *commercium*—nay, the whole life of the Danites seems to gravitate towards the Philistine cities" (K. Budde, *apud*: Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. *Samson*, p. 379a.).

between this Tribe and the Philistines at certain specific periods, are exceedingly close and even find expression in ties of marriage.

In consideration of all that has been said above there is room to examine what was happening along the Philistine coast at about that period in the light of extra-Biblical sources as well.

THE PEOPLES OF THE SEA

Of all the "Peoples of the Sea" who invaded the Land of Canaan and settled along the coast, the Bible actually knows only the Philistines and not only because they constituted the most considerable element in this group of nations, but chiefly because they were the principal foe of the Tribe of Judah. Yet, after all, the Bible is not a history of Palestine, but a work dealing with events and national or tribal groups, only in so far as these were directly connected with Israel. It is therefore natural that if we had only the Scripture to rely on, we would have known nothing at all about the existence of the "Peoples of the Sea" and the fact that several of them, in addition to the Philistines, settled in Palestine. The Philistine penetration of the country is connected with the battles of the group of "Peoples of the Sea" with Rameses III, which are commemorated so magnificently on his reliefs in the Temple at Medinet Habu.¹⁵ From his reliefs and inscriptions we learn of two main battles, one on land and one at sea. The Peoples of the Sea are depicted and described here as shipmen *par excellence*, and as semi-nomads moving in wagons with their wives and children, accompanied by armed warriors. The group of Peoples of the Sea is composed chiefly of five Tribes or Peoples including the Philistines who differ from one another in their costumes and hair-dress and some of whom are also circumcised.¹⁶

The Tjeker

Among the Peoples of the Sea there is a group called Tjeker.¹⁷ If we had to rely on the Bible alone, we would never have known that this group or part of them settled on the coast of Palestine at the same time as the Philistines established themselves there. Happily we have at our disposal an Egyptian document of primary significance which sheds light on the situation along the Eastern coast of the Mediterranean in the eleventh century, B.C. This is the now familiar Wen-Amon Story.¹⁸

-
15. On these reliefs and the relevant literature see, e.g., Y.Y. *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands*, N.Y., 1963, pp. 247-253; plates 333-338.
 16. See also: A. H. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, I, Oxford University Press, 1947, p. 196*.
 17. See also: Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, p. 262b (Tjeker).
 18. *ibid.*, p. 25 et seq. Also see now: B. Mazar, the Philistines and the Foundation of the Kingdoms of Israel and Tyre (Heb.), *Publications of the Israel Academy for Sciences and Humanities*, I, 7, p. 2.

Let us briefly report all it relates regarding the Tjeker. Wen-Amon served as a priest at the Temple of Amon in Karnak and was sent to Byblos on the Phoenician coast to obtain cedars with which to build the ceremonial barge of the god. The adventures of Wen-Amon are instructive in themselves, and *inter alia* show the decline of Egypt at that period. But we are particularly interested in what happened to Wen-Amon when he reached Dor on the Sharon coast, where his money was stolen from him. At this time, according to the document, the ruler in Dor was Beder of the Tjeker.

These Tjeker, whose centre was at Dor, were outstanding seamen, owning a powerful navy, and later Beder was capable of sending eleven warships to Byblos in order to arrest Wen-Amon. From this document we learn that parallel with the occupation of the south by the Philistines, a sea-going group of the Peoples of the Sea, the Tjeker settled along an important section of the coast, namely northern Sharon.

The Dny(n)

As already remarked, five "Peoples of the Sea" are represented on the Egyptian reliefs in separate groups, each in its own costume. Among these groups, one of three peoples, stands out in particular. These three resemble one another in their costume and appearance, although slight differences in details can be observed. The group was studied not long ago by Wainwright.¹⁹ They all wear the familiar feather helmets, and all have thickly plaited hair, which is carefully settled under their helmets. Attention should be drawn to an interesting fact: The group consists of Philistines, Tjeker and a third Tribe of whom more will be said below. Since the Philistines settled in the south of the country and the Tjeker along the coast of northern Sharon, we have a special interest in ascertaining the identity of the third people.

In the battle document dating from the days of Rameses III, this people is called DENE or DNE. Their name is also given in an additional form on account of which it is the practice to refer to them in contemporary literature as the DANUNA. Gardener has proved in his basic study²⁰ that DNE is the original form, at least in respect of the final form which is some kind of ethnic suffix.²¹

We have no document of the period of the Judges analogous

-
- 19. G. A. Wainwright, Some Sea Peoples, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 47, 1961, pp. 71 ff.
 - 20. Gardiner (*supra*, Note 16), p. 124* ff.
 - 21. On this see also: R. D. Barnett, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 73, 1953, p. 142, n. 1: "The form Daniuna recorded on the Egyptian monuments is to be derived from *Daniya-wana. The ending wana(s) is the regular ethnic suffix in the Hittite hieroglyphic language." See more particularly the essay by O'Callaghan in *Orientalia*, 18, 1949, pp. 199 ff.

to that of Wen-Amon, describing the history of the Danuna or their place of settlement after the defeat. But their close ties with the Philistines and the Tjeker may well give rise to the assumption that when they settled on the shores of Palestine they did so in the presumably vacant area, between the Tjeker and the Philistines, i.e., between Dor and northern Philistia.

In order to trace the Danuna of the Egyptian records we have to turn to the Greek "Danai" who claimed descent from their forefather Danaus who settled Argolis. The assumption of identity between the "Egyptian" Danuna and the Greek Danai was strengthened in 1946 with the discovery at Karatepe by the expedition headed by Bossert, of the bilingual (Phoenician and Hittite) inscription²² of Azitawadda, King of the Danunites. Azitawadda (Adorer of Wandash the sun-god) declares that he is a descendant of the House of MPSH, which Alt and Barnett at once identified with the Mopsus of Greek Mythology.²³

This discovery led scholars to recognise an absolute identity between the Greek Danai and those referred to in the Egyptian records, and also between them and the Danunites who settled in Asia Minor. Indeed, Barnett has justly remarked that it should not be concluded from this that the Greek Danai invaded Asia Minor and Egypt; on the contrary, the Danai arrived in Greece from the East, as is attested by Greek tradition.

In view of all this, it is proper to survey what is known from Greek sources about Danaus, the forefather of the Danai, Mopsus and other heroes connected with this Tribe; and their relations with the eastern shores of the Mediterranean.²⁴

Danaus

Danaus originates from the east. His "father" is Belus (Ba'al or Bel) while his "brother" is Aegyptos. Danaus is a shipman and according to one tradition he invented the "fifty-oar" ships and the art of navigation. Most of the tales about Danaus in Greek sources are connected with his daughters and his dispute with Aegyptos. The sons of Aegyptos wished to wed the daughters of Danaus, but the latter refused and he fled with them to Argos in Greece. Aegyptos and his sons pursued them and in the absence of any alternative Danaus agreed to the marriages. The main point of this story is Danaus' advice to his daughters to slay their husbands; that is, the participation of women in order to obtain the murder of husbands.

22. See *apud* Pritchard (*supra* n. 17), p. 499 ff. and literature there.

23. See Barnett's article (*supra* n. 21), note 4.

24. On this see *The Oxford Classical Encyclopaedia*, under "Danaus", "Mopsus", and "Perseus"; the articles by Wainwright and Barnett mentioned above (notes 19 and 21); also below.

Perseus, hero of the sun

Another and far better-known Danaian hero whose "history" is closely connected with our subject, is Perseus, who founded Tiryns (according to another tradition, Mycenae) whose principal hero was Hercules. Most of the legends about Perseus deal with his adventure near Jaffa²⁵ and the familiar story of Andromeda, daughter of the King of the Ethiopians, who was bound to a rock in the sea at Jaffa. On his return from slaying the Medusa, Perseus rescues her from a sea monster. This connection between the Jaffa coast and Perseus has always been regarded by scholars as a proof of some connection between the Greek Danai and this stretch of the Mediterranean coast. Among the many tales told of Perseus, mention should be made of the remark by Pausanias that Mycenae obtained its name on account of the mushroom (mykes) from which water burst miraculously when Perseus was thirsty.

Mopsus

We also find much to interest us in the story of Mopsus, who was undoubtedly a historical individual in the more modern sense of the word. As can be learnt from the Karatepe inscription he was a Danaian. The following are his principal characteristics and main events of his life, according to Greek sources.

He is the son of Apollo, god of the sun, and a priestess. His life story is more particularly connected with wanderings in Asia Minor, Phoenicia and Palestine, immediately after the Trojan War (twelfth century B.C.). At various places he founds cities which bear his name, and builds altars to Apollo. He is best known for his outstanding use of riddles. One of the stories connected with him records a riddle contest between him and the sooth-sayer, Calchas, in which Mopsus is victorious and causes the death of his rival. As remarked, Mopsus was wandering across the Middle East during the twelfth century at the head of a band of warriors. According to one source (Athenaeus)²⁶ he invaded Ashkelon which he conquered. According to Strabo, the Tribes of Mopsus invaded the eastern part of the Mediterranean and settled sections along the coasts of Cilicia, Syria and Phoenicia.²⁷ According to one of the sources he died as a result of snakebite.

25. See particularly: S. Tolkowsky, *The Gateway of Palestine, A history of Jaffa*, London, 1924, pp. 27 ff.

26. Athenaeus VIII, 37; C. & T. Mueller, *Fragmenta Historicorum*, I, 38, Fig. 11. See in particular Wainwright's study (*supra*, n. 19), p. 80, note 1, and the literature there.

27. Strabo, XIV, IV, 3.

The Danai and the Coast of Jaffa

The close ties between the coast of Palestine and the Danai or their heroes according to Greek tradition, as well as the fact that the Danai constitute the third element among the groups of the Peoples of the Sea who fought against Rameses III (the other two being the Philistines and the Tjeker) would appear to provide a basis for the assumption that part of the Danai also settled along the shores of Palestine. Since the Philistines settled from Jaffa southwards, while the Tjeker made their home in the vicinity of Dor, the only area which comes into consideration for the Danai is that which stretched between Dor and Jaffa. And here arises a problem which is also of archeological interest, for one of the cities within this region of coast is Tel Qasila. Unlike the specifically port cities, such as Dor and those along the Philistine coast which were inhabited before they were settled by the Tjeker and the Philistines—from the Late Bronze Age at least—Tel Qasila was founded about the middle of the twelfth century B.C.²⁸ Furthermore, the material and ceramic remains of the first city (Stratum XII) is “Philistine”; that is, pottery of the type characteristic of the dwelling-places of the Peoples of the Sea, including the Tjeker at Dor. If the Danai or part of them settled along this stretch of coast, it would seem that the foundation of the Stratum XII city should be attributed to them; for neither the Tjeker in the north, nor the Philistines in the south needed to build new port cities, since good harbours and ports were at their disposal. The city of Stratum XII was destroyed in a great fire, but the city above it, namely Stratum XI, is also “Philistine” archeologically speaking.

From this it may be concluded that after the Stratum XII city (which goes back to the days of the Peoples of the Sea) was destroyed a new city was built and was also settled by the Peoples of the Sea. In this connection it may be proper to mention the Onomasticon of Amenope in the eleventh century B.C.²⁹ which refers to the following Peoples in the following order:³⁰ Shardans 268; Tjeker 269; Philistines 270; The Shardani are also one of the Peoples of the Sea, and for a long time—even before the contest with Rameses III—they were among the mercenaries of the Egyptian army. Yet they differ entirely in their costume from the group of the Philistines, the Tjeker and the Danuna.

If we assume that the list marks these Peoples according to the order of their settlement, it would follow that in the eleventh century a relatively large group of Shardans lived north of the

28. B. Maisler (Mazar) *IEJ*, 1, 1950, pp. 73 ff; also his article (*supra* n. 18, p. 7).

29. For a detailed discussion see Gardiner (*supra* n. 16), p. 194* et seq.

Tjeker. On the other hand, Alt³⁰ has suggested that at this period the Shardans lived along the stretch of coast between the Tjeker and the Philistines.³¹ In any case it does seem permissible to assume that the residents of Stratum XII (if indeed they were Danuna) were driven from Tel Qasila and their place was taken by other Peoples of the Sea (according to the evidence of the pottery) who may have been Shardans. The wandering of the inhabitants of Stratum XII took place round about the year 1100, as this stratum belongs to the latter part of the twelfth century and the first half of the eleventh century B.C.

The time when the Tribe of Dan wandered north

Quite independent of these considerations, there is room to ask: When was it that the Tribe of Dan wandered north to Laish? From the Biblical account it is clear that the conquest of Laish took place at a time when Sidon, which should have helped the inhabitants of Laish, had been completely weakened and did not have the strength to do its duty. This situation could only have been round about the end of the twelfth century (near the year 1100), both following the victory of Ashkelon over Sidon and as a result of the campaigns of Tiglath-Pileser I.³² That geopolitical situation would appear to provide a solution of this important problem; for it seems impossible to imagine that the Tribe of the Danites settled themselves by force in a territory which had been under the influence of the Kingdom of Sidon until that time. Whether by chance or otherwise, this date accords precisely, as we have already seen, with the date of the destruction of Stratum XII at Tel Qasila.

SUMMARY

The Tribe of Dan

The Biblical data discussed at the beginning of this study seems to show that at a certain stage of its settlement the Tribe of Dan was very close indeed to the Peoples of the Sea. When this Tribe first settled there would appear to have been no formal link between it and the Covenant of the Tribes of Israel. Its principal occupation was with ships, and its men were very specifically seamen. There is reason to think that its hero and his activities are linked with sun-worship. The tribal area of settlement was along the coast near Jaffa to begin with, i.e., in the district lying between the settlement areas of the Philistines and Tjeker. At a certain stage it was forced into the interior, and was finally com-

30. A. Alt, Syrien und Palaestina in Onomastikon des Amenope, *Kleine Schriften 1*, Muenchen, 1959, s. 244, n. 1.

31. *ibid*: "... das Gebiet zwischen den Tkr und den Philistern insbesondere an die Gegend von Japho und Aphek denken."

32. On this problem see *in extenso* the study of B. Mazar (*supra* n. 18).

elled to wander away from the entire area and proceed northward to the vicinity of Laish.

The Danai

From the information available in both historical and historico-mythological sources, it is possible to ascertain the following facts: The Tribe of the Danai originates in the east, and the introduction of the Alphabet to Greece is attributed to it. Its members were outstanding seamen who had some special connection with sun-worship. Its heroes had a special capacity for asking riddles. Sections of this Tribe wandered as warrior bands, invaded various places and established cities which they named for the Fathers of the Tribe. Sections of the Tribe of the Danai are particularly associated with the eastern Mediterranean Littoral in general, and the vicinity of Jaffa in particular.

Conclusions

From all that has been said above it would prove that only one of two conclusions can be drawn: either there were two different tribes (the Danites and the Danai) with an identical name and similar characteristics which operated in the identical geographical region and period, or that there is a link between the Tribe of Dan and the Tribe of the Danai, and possibly even a certain measure of identity. The former case would constitute an exceedingly peculiar and remarkable concatenation of circumstances; whereas the second case, which appears more realistic, enables us to explain various phenomena linked with the Danai themselves, and particularly, all that affects the Tribe of the Danites. From this we may feel entitled to conclude that Dan was an ancient tribe which spread throughout the east, and that at the most ancient period it already had some link with the Tribes of Jacob. Certain sections settled in Palestine and at the beginning of the twelfth century drew near to the Tribes of Israel (again?) and were admitted to the Amphycotic Covenant and given the status of one of the Tribes of Israel. At an early stage of their settlement (that is, at the time of the Song of Deborah) they dwelt on the seashore —between the Tjeker and the Philistines³³—and were engaged with shipping as of old; but after they were forced inland from the coast (by the other Peoples of the Sea) apparently about the end of the twelfth century, when the Kingdom of Sidon began to weaken, they wandered northwards. In any case the second alternative permits a re-examination of several facts connected with the Tribe of Dan which it has hitherto been impossible to account for in any

33. Also cf: *Antiquities*, V, 87, where Josephus defines the area of the Danites on the coast between Ashdod and Dor.

other way. It is only fitting to close with the words of Hecataeus of Abdera as summarised by the late Professor Yehoshua Gutmann, together with the latter's doubts and conjectures,³⁴ which may serve to strengthen our approach in this study.

"Hecataeus commences his essay on the Jews with the Exodus. Once a pestilence broke out in Egypt, which the local inhabitants attributed to the wrath of the gods . . . The Egyptians therefore resolved to expel the strangers. The best and most courageous of the strangers united together and went forth to Greece and other countries; and their most famous leaders were Danaus and Kadmos. But most of the people went to Judaea, which was entirely desolate in those days.

"The link which Hecataeus establishes here between the Exodus from Egypt and the arrival of Danaus in Argos may possibly be the first case in which Greek mythology has been combined with the narrative in the Torah . . . It is hard to know what the sources of Hecataeus can have been . . . It is hard to understand why he saw fit to associate the People of Israel and the Danaï in the story of the Exodus. The only possibility which comes into consideration here is that, precisely as in the details of his essay on the Jews, wherein he used information he received from Jews here and there, so he may have heard of the Exodus from Jews. The question is: Did he hear about the Exodus only from Jews, himself, combining this with the departure of the Danaï? Or were there some Jews who linked the Jews and the Danaians together?"

34. Yehoshua Gutmann, *The Beginnings of Jewish-Hellenistic Literature* (Hebrew), Jerusa'lem, 1958, pp. 50-51.