



The Philistines

Author(s): Elihu Grant

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 55, No. 3 (Sep., 1936), pp. 175-194

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3259802>

Accessed: 09/04/2012 11:27

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE PHILISTINES

ELIHU GRANT*

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

THE travels of the pilgrim before you have usually been by way of the Bible to Palestine, or by way of Palestine to the Bible, and he has sought for a title within the general subject of "Western Contributions to Influences upon Palestine and the Bible." Perhaps Old and New Testament scholars will sniff the breeze of that adjective "western" where once all was thought to be "oriental." One need not confine oneself to Semitic studies even when one assembles the oriental influences upon the sacred collection. This is not to suggest that Semitics have been overstressed but that they have been stressed, perhaps, too exclusively, since there are indeed other Eastern peoples and languages which help us in the balance of our appraisal. Surely it is quite time that all known western contributions should be acknowledged. It will remain true, after a full count of such western contributions, that biblicism and religion are, with us, inevitably Semitic. Bible readers of the farther West have been powerfully semitized as witness our New England forbears, their social, political and religious constitutions, even their infatuations, an instance being their bestowal, so generously, of Old Testament names upon tender infants.

We of the West are very Palestinian in much of our intellectual background, and the question is always pertinent, "What were the components of ancient Palestine?" Our intention now is to deal more specifically with certain aspects of the problem of the Philistines, the most outstanding of the western influences upon

*Presidential Address given before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, December 30, 1935.

Palestine, whose tribal designation provides us with the name of the country: "Palestine" equals "Philistine land." This designation once applied peculiarly to Southern Canaan. If time permitted, I should like to deal with the Canaan which the Philistines found and the Palestine which they left. But at best this address will scarcely do more than introduce the subject.

Despite Matthew Arnold and common usage, we have no reason, except prejudice, for believing that the Philistines were cruder or crueller than other men. On the contrary they were probably as religious as other peoples though in their own way and with a different emphasis. It is possible that Europeans may always have been more accessible to new religious ideas than easterners, especially Semitic peoples. How to appraise this characteristic and how to relate it to our study is less clear. Does it show a greater or lesser genius? Phenicians and Philistines offered little opposition to Semitizing influences. We and our European ancestors have often been as hospitable to new ideas, however we may modify them. We suggest that this spirit of accommodation to foreign teachings is a test which will help us to identify a non-Semitic element among the racial combinations of peoples which crowded upon the lands of early civilizations. In more recent centuries we might illustrate this method of analysis and identification by the case of Arab and Turk and the contrasts in their responses to the religion of Islam.

The great geographers have done notable service in depicting the surface features of Palestine. They and the map-makers prepare all serious travelers for an appreciation of the outstanding geological and geographical facts of the country, north and south, between the River Jordan and the Mediterranean. Of this range, tiny enough to be sure, the problems are more numerous than the stranger to them would at first credit. So we have chosen to confine our inquiry to the southwest quarter of Palestine, and especially to the portion between the highland ridge and the western sea. This is, and as we go southward tends more and more to be, a thirsty land, second only to that dessicated strip, the wilderness of Judea, east of Jerusalem.

Historically, the south-land of Canaan may be considered as a northward extension of Egypt. Physically, it is a westward

thrust of Arabia with its thirsty lip-edge on the Mediterranean. Even the best reconstructions of the biblical history of South-Canaan are so compact, so elliptical and allusive that we have always welcomed the aid which anthropology and archaeology may bring to a more vivid appreciation of what the ancient writers sought to convey out of their learning and experience.

Palestine is part of that Levantine border-land which may be subsumed under larger Syria, itself marginal to Asia Minor, Arabia, Egypt and the Mediterranean. It has always offered a geographical and political land passage between the Euphrates and the Nile. Often it has been important as country which must be traversed in all communication between Asia Minor and Egypt. At other times it has been used as a bridge between the ocean and inner Asia. We surmise that the coastwise influences of North Africa, both of the Delta and of the regions westward of the Delta, were from early times very potent in affecting through commerce, the cultural vigor of lands bordering to the eastward, with trade extending as far as India. And linked with this east-west traffic there came, at an early time, the contributions of the islands, mental and physical, to Canaan.

What is there about Canaan that lends itself so fittingly to the lore of humans? It is border to a great and unified land and race, Egypt which provides it with a constant mental stimulus. To the imagination Palestine is a slightly freer land. It is a Scottish border to Egypt. Wherever in the near East there is a suggestion of a free, or freer races, there arises a fond delight in tales about the wilder stock. It is so in America with respect to the aborigines. In such a secondary region as Canaan, nationalism may grow while dullness, or impotence, or lack-lustre politics may rule the greater land as in Egypt. As to Palestine itself; in a land of such variations, such hungers, such deprivations, such disappointments, together with an intellectual keenness whetted by great stimuli from without and from within, there is sure to be much strife and constant nervous instabilities. In Egypt revolutions were less frequent but more profound. Hostility there was usually from outside abetted by domestic envy and a straitened economics.

In South Canaan the most obvious occupation has ever been farming. The native there has always been the obscure devotee of the land, his patrimony, and has developed a culture having largely to do with agriculture. The fertility cults of the country have impressed and converted all comers who would make peace with the forces that control agricultural prosperity.

The traders in Canaanite towns may often have been the more foreign residents, perhaps those who had no agricultural standing, because they did not belong to the land owning families. They improved on the simple barter, practiced among genuine peasants. So with the specialized cameleer, or caravaner, though this calling develops out of agriculture as does barter, yet it also is more likely to be advanced to its cleverer technique by those not tied to family lands. Here again we indicate functions for the Philistine.

In the last chapter of the book of Amos we read of the Canaanite's ideal and commentary on himself, whether by Amos or another. Amos represents very well the pastoral and agricultural simplicity of the native people of Palestine today, their individuality, poesy, fearlessness and discernment, as we may discover in their genius beneath the overlays of cruel vicissitudes in the centuries since Amos' day. All Amos' invectives against the North (Israel) show by implication the Southern, prophetic ideal at its best. They illustrate also the essential contrast of North and South Canaan at those times and speak for the humanism of the South, a nearer sympathy with the Philistines, for example, and a broader appreciation of the greater world. For some reason the folk of Palestine are the most like Europeans of any Asian people. For this we may thank the succession of Westerners and Northerners who have mingled their blood and their thought with Canaan, the Philistines, Macedonians, Romans, Byzantines, and Crusaders.

The Philistines must have been warlike to arrive and settle where they did. As warriors, the Philistines were the precursors of the Crusaders. This was remarked by Hall in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, volume II, page 293. Both came from the West with cross (Maltese cross in the case of the Philistines) and sword. Both counter-semitisms were victorious and vanquished. Both

gave and destroyed. Probably the Philistines and those Mediterraneans who preceded them in Canaan came, in the first instance, in the interests of trade. As new-comers they would not be welcomed in the ranks of the peasantry. (Note the new agricultural efforts of the Jews in modern times in Palestine, under special economic and financial conditions.) The Philistines must needs have turned to trade in order to live since they were a civilized folk and not nomads. Strange as it may seem, the Philistines and the Hebrews, though in so different a manner, pivoted on Sinai, or near-about, between the water-borne commerce of the Red Sea and the Mediterranean.¹

For our complete picture we need to see that earlier African-Mediterranean world as set in the most salubrious nursery of civilizations, one which encouraged those early human advances which explain Mediterranean, Egyptian and Syrian pre-history. In Southern Mediterranean lands during the ages when Europe was more or less ice-bound, not by one merely but by several ages of ice, and human development was checked, there was, on the southern side of the Mediterranean, a region free from any ice age and blessed with a fertility such as is now enjoyed in Europe. In all North Africa pluvial periods corresponded to the northern glacials with the result that the progress of dessication was gradual. Pleasant grass-lands prevailed in Northern Africa and in parts of Southern Near-Asia. First in North Africa and slightly later in Canaan, there was greater human progress than was possible in Europe. Africa, hospitable ground for human advance in earliest times, held most of the colors of humanity. Here human growth once underway could continue with mild conditions of climate conducive to the conservation of gains in knowledge, reflection, and such husbanding of resources as would give opportunity for man to pursue art and invention, the cultivation of such plants as the vine and the olive and perhaps wheat, the domestication of creatures and other gains on the way to full

¹ On trade between Crete and India cf. Godbey, N. L. O. T. sect. 38, page 35, see Montgomery, *Arabia*, 69-71; Schoff, *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, 133 ff.; Rawlinson, *India and the Western World*, 113; G. F. Hill, *Catalog of Greek Coins of Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Persia, British Museum*, 1922; also his "The Ancient Coinage of South Arabia," *Proc. British Academy*, VII.

enlightenment. Such a favored area was North Africa and, in a secondary degree, Canaan. We have reason then to believe that in pre-history the family arts, social and political advancement, reached the Delta and Canaan from the West rather than from the North or even from the East. Human progress on the northern shores of the Mediterranean was much slower than on the southern shores. The two Neolithic cultures of Europe did not penetrate farther south than Thessaly nor did the Cretan Neolithic go north, since the Peloponnesus and many of the islands were comparatively unoccupied lands. The northern mainland may have been even slower to awaken to early human culture than the nearer islands. But about 3000 B. C. a great change took place, based on metal. Then the comparatively empty lands were occupied.² The Chalcolithic came not from the North as through Thessaly since in such case Thessaly would have been affected and that seems not to have happened. It would then appear more likely that the earlier populations of Crete came from the South than from the North. This immigration into Crete was not accomplished all at once nor uniformly from the same direction necessarily. There was a mixture of peoples which with the necessities of island habitation and seafaring life may account in part for the diverse mental characteristics and the high culture of Crete. It would appear as almost inevitable then that very early cultures passed from the South to the nearest islands including Crete and perhaps chiefly to Crete where great civilizations arose while Greek lands were still barbarous. The investment of the South in Crete was returned richly by Cretan commerce with North Africa, Egypt and Palestine (Canaan). These shores and ports, nearer to Cretan sailors, led the trade yet farther on over land and through waters to Arabia and India. At what time Sumerian trade met with, or anticipated, Minoan is yet to be determined.

The Cretan civilizations, derivative in part from North Africa, were in time to become the parent to Mycenaean and grandparent to the sub-Mycenaean including the Philistine civilizations. That

² See Glotz, *Aegean Civilization*, who dates the Cretan Chalcolithic, or Cretan Cycladic, about 3000 to 2400 B. C.

is to surmise that culture in the Mediterranean before 2000 B. C. was mainly from the southern shores of the Sea and included the island of Crete. In the second millennium B. C. the northern mainland made its contributions of discipleship and oppositions. Minoan civilization was domiciled on the mainland of Greece before the end of the Middle Helladic period (ca 1625 B. C.).³

During the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries Palestine seems not to be directly indebted to Crete for forerunners and associates of the Philistines, but to have received such influences from the same sources as did Crete itself. Palestine caught the impact of the same forces as touched Crete but from a somewhat different angle, one already affected by the Sumerian as well as the very early Libyan cultures. Crete, therefore, would not in any case be the last port of call before Canaan, but a convenient laboratory in which certain elements and relations were formed. Certain Philistines may have been there. Perhaps some Philistines came to Canaan from Asia Minor, others from Cyprus, others from Phénicia and Amor and yet others from Crete. They kept on coming, we may be assured, when they heard how well "John" was doing in Canaan, now-to-become Palestine.⁴

Crete may have extended its connections to Syria, perhaps via Cyprus, earlier than the time of the Hyksos who would have interrupted such communications. A silver vase found at Byblus and dated in the middle Minoan II (Amenemhat III. 1849-1801 B. C.) suggests an Aegean influence, virtually, of a somewhat earlier date.⁵ But the lines of Cretan trade were re-opened about 1500 B. C. in the days of Thothmes III who had come in contact with the Keftiu, they who mediated between the further East and the islands. It is said that the Keftiu "introduced the priestly costume of the East" to Cyprus. Cyprus had been colonized by Cretans. Certain Cretan clans settled on the Phénician coast. Cyprus was in continuous, intimate contact with several cultural

³ See V. G. Childe, *Dawn of European Civilization*, N. Y., 1925, 81 ff.; J. L. Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?* Berkeley, 1930; D. G. Hogarth, *Twilight of History*.

⁴ See A. H. Godbey, *New Light on the OT*, St. Louis, 2nd ed., sect. 58, p. 44, and sect. 58b, p. 50.

⁵ G. Glotz, *The Aegean Civilization*, N. Y., 1925, 39, 215.

centers on the North Canaanite Coast and Canaan was certainly influenced in its trade through such centers. Later the Danaans arrived near Byblus about the beginning of the 14th century. Cyprus, with its Cretan civilization, fell first under a cultural conquest of the Mycenaeans and later under a most violent military assault from the raiding Sea-Peoples. The Argonauts were abroad on their way to Libyan shores, sweeping in the resistant islands enroute.⁶

Concerning the composition of the earliest population of Canaan, it is commonplace to observe that the country is in position to receive immigration and attack because of an intermediate situation among great breeding regions which tend to overflow. It has long been a question just when the ancestors of the historical dominants began coming into the country and from whence they came. Were the parents of the historical peoples of Palestine, and presumably of the native stock today, Semitic or non-Semitic and where in the world did they come from? It is possible, and the modern trend is to consider favorably the hypothesis, that the near, or quite, human Mousterian remains of Palestine indicate the forbears of the folk of Canaan and that there was continuity from those early inhabitants right down to the historic population of the land.

The very early African men of our species made core-tools (i. e. flaked tools), hand-axes, of the Lower Paleo-Chellean and Acheulian (Tanganyika) types and the art prevailed at one time in North Africa, Canaan, and India as it did later in Western Europe and perhaps in South Africa. Skulls from Palestine, found recently, were associated with Mousterian industries (using flake tools as distinguished from flaked tools). These skulls are less warped by the compulsion of cold than their Mousterian analogs of Northern Europe. Also the capacity of these primitive Palestinians was greater, the cranial vault was higher and, most important, they had a distinctive chin formation thus differing from Neanderthal exemplars.

Asia Minor and its influences upon Canaan: Hittite, Hyksos, Hittite again, pre-Mycenaean (Phrygian), Sea-Peoples, Greek,

⁶ Glotz, *op. cit.*, 213.

all have vitalizing answers to our questions. Asia Minor was the field traversed by the land raids and almost the first of the intermediate regions to receive mass movements from inner Asia or from Southwestern Europe. Locked in its present Turkish domain are the secrets we wish to read. Asia Minor has a comprehensible unity of its own in spite of the diversities of its land and its shore. But Syria and Palestine are always harder to bound than Asia Minor. Their definite shore line is part of the northwestern coast of the great rectangular peninsula of Arabia. The inland boundaries of Syria and Palestine bleach into desert, or blend with mellow lands east and north. Yet Syria on the north and Palestine on the south of this debatable stretch of border have their own unities which history exhibits. They are at best secondary countries and provincial whenever there are great powers around them. Occasionally, when the powers were in decline, they have had a measure of independence. Strictly speaking, they have never formed a no-man's land. Rather have they been the lands with which the rest of the world has forever meddled.

The Biblical record appears at first to divide the honors of control of Canaan between Mesopotamia and Egypt. Closer scrutiny shows the scales as heavier on the Egyptian side during the patriarchal period. The Tell-el-Amarna Letters are in cuneiform but their concern is mainly with Egypt or the friends and foes of Egypt even while Egypt was a very ineffective political force in Canaan. Before 2000 B. C. the pre-biblical history of the Near East shows large control over the West-land by the powers on the Tigris-Euphrates. Thus in the Third Millennium B. C. the inhabitants in what was known later as Babylonia had extended through their commerce and their rulers a strong, civilizing influence over the West-land and Canaan. Their successors and rulers, the Kassites, the Assyrians and very much later the Persians vied with Egypt for the mastership in Canaan. All of this is frequently alluded to in the Old Testament and the discoveries in Western Asia have given actual illumination of the facts. But Egypt was the country most largely in control of the higher thought of Canaan in the period 2000–600 B. C. Babylon had already left its stamp and occasionally had a renewed influence and control. In fact all accessible countries have marked

the trade and the art of Canaan. Indo-European hordes, conquerors, displacers, or mere disturbers, may have come from three directions upon the lands behind Canaan and virtually upon Canaan itself, perhaps as early as the 3rd Millennium B. C. Hunger and other necessities crowded these intruders as well as those pressing from behind them. Such non-Semitic forces affecting Canaan were, presumably, the forerunners and ancestors of the Hittites, Mitannians and Hurrians in the 3rd Millennium B. C., Kassites and Hittites in the 2nd Millennium and Scythians, Persians, Macedonians, Greeks and Romans in the 1st Millennium B. C.

As early as the reign of Thothmes III, his campaigns had disclosed a foe of the future antecedent to and perhaps even kindred with the maritime congeries of folk known to history as the Sea-Peoples. Foremost we name the Keftiu. Kaptara, Caphtor, may be mentioned for the sake of order, whether it be decided that the indication is the island of Crete or a shore of Asia Minor. The Keftiu certainly fill the specification of sea-folk and of contributors to the history of Canaan. We must include further the names of the Lycians, also the Sherden and the Danauna. From submissive or harmonious relations as mercenaries they passed by hard necessity, or cupidity, to providing new hostilities for Egypt after they or their successors had done for the Hittites. Myres sees at first a relation of friendliness, secondly an attitude of piracy and adventure and third, "violent and concerted mass movements" (1220-1190) against Egypt and its provinces in Canaan. In the third phase, that of concerted hostile movements by sea and by land as well, we note that the old enemy ground, Libya, westward of the Delta, originated part of this onslaught on the civilization of the Nile Valley.

The immediate enemy of the Minoan power carried forward much of the art and skill of the Minoans. These successors have been designated in history by the term "Mycenaean" because of the excavation of their characteristic remains at Mycenae. Canaan, being in the Mediterranean circuit, was treated to Mycenaean imports and influences in the 15th century when L. M. I. vases and other Aegean imports became more plentiful. Canaan probably received metal work from both Crete and Cyprus. Gezer

showed a Knossus sword. Mediterranean style axes are found at Beth Shemesh. One has an incised double triangle, like a hall-mark, on the node. But we found at least one crude mold in stone for making a similar shape which might indicate that good axes of the type were made locally. Was there, very likely before that, a struggle for the carrying trade of the Levant? At any rate, Mycenaean sailors succeeded in winning that trade. Before that success and during the ensuing period, South Canaan probably sent grain to the islands as part of its *quid pro quo*.

We should study Philistines along with memories of the Minoan Ages but more particularly with constant reference to the Mycenaean Age. The free intercourse of those open seas and centuries was succeeded by closed seas and provincialism, due perhaps to the break-up of civilization and piracy. The latest Bronze Age was divided from the new strength of the Iron Age by a period of weakness. Albright notes the effect of this in the poverty of the pottery of Palestine just preceding the Philistine phase (A P & B). During this same weak period the Southern Levant saw the discomfiture of the Peoples of the Sea and the settlement of a contingent of them to be known to history as the Philistines of Palestine.⁷

Educated barbarians have ever been among the epigoni of genius. Cretans were deprived of much of the Egyptian trade during the Hyksos control and they sought to compensate themselves in Hellas. Glotz enthusiastically exclaims (page 45) "It was magnificent." That attempt and transfer was between 1750 and 1580, or nearly. But after the expulsion of the Hyksos, the Keftiu, during the XVIII Dynasty, offered gifts and established a trading station on the island of Pharos, from which their goods went up the Nile.⁸ Was it the reflex, or along the lines, of these newly established trade arrangements that the Mycenaean commerce went everywhither in the Levant and westerly? Were the Sea-Peoples, Philistines and others similarly brought through

⁷ See A. R. Burn, *Minoans, Philistines and Greeks*, 237 f. and 128, who contrasts the wide spread of Mycenaean pottery and styles with the restricted "geometric" differing in its provincialism from valley to valley, "work of a stagnant age."

⁸ Glotz, *op. cit.*, 44.

barbarism by traders to become the enviers and conquerors of the lucrative business? Probably the Philistines were a driven people from the outset, pressed by the Phrygians for example, seeking habitations and finding in kindred sea-folk an aid for their southward trek.

If our imaginary map of Minoan trade with Asia Minor, the Syrian-Palestine coast, the Delta, its hinterland, and Libya continued to point the ways in the days of the Mycenaeans and their successors the Sea Peoples, then we have virtually a map illustrative of the routes of the attackers of Egypt. We have an explanation, in part, of the alliance of peoples attacking from the direction of Anatolia at the same time as the attacks from Libya. Libya, Crete and the southern coasts of Asia Minor were in collusion against the Delta. (Remember 200 years of Libyan dynasts to follow.) The organization might well have centered in Crete during post-Knossian times.⁹

Proto-Sea Peoples, Mycenaeans, Carians, Pulesati, were no new phenomena. They did not begin with the Iron Age nor usher it in. This squares with our acceptance of a western element in Tyre, Sidon, Carthage, and Ugarit. South Canaan as well as the Delta may have been an age-long granary for the islands whenever trade conditions allowed.

A factitious unity has been provided Palestine and Syria for two reasons. Anciently, ambitious powers by their own overreach tended to absorb or trample the two countries according to the fancied necessities of trade or conquest, or as a counterweight in domestic politics. More lately, ideas have shaped a religious conception of the two countries and enforced a unity upon Palestine which has made the imagined picture of the land vastly different from anything warranted by the material facts. Thus it comes about that wars, mandates, and fanciful claims have sprung up where none of these things belonged naturally. Palestine, as a name, suggests a unity for the mind which was never warranted by its inner physical composition alone. The religious ideas have tended in their expansion to become universals. Thus the history of the country and of the great ideas which

⁹ See Godbey, *op. cit.*, 115.

have gone out to the world from there have in important ways become connected. What the physical basis may be for facts so important for the modern world is a study in ethnography and sociology worthy of careful investigation. Syria and Palestine would seem to us less unified were there no great Arabian Desert. This land-mass fends continents in their approach to each other more effectively than would a sea and forces much traffic aside, south by the waterway and north by the land passage along the "Fertile Crescent" route. Geographically it is Arabia which thrusts Palestine into focus in world history and geography. Canaan was but a step from Arabia and much more vulnerable in that quarter than was Egypt on its Arabian boundary. Canaan, itself a more fertile edge of the Arabian land-mass, was a natural causeway to better lands and richer civilizations. Comparative archaeology shows that the culture of Canaan was oftentimes high and while secondary yet at times Canaan could claim a measure of real world importance. Normally we should expect the secondary to decline with the greater countries, but Canaan has bred ambitious and gifted personalities of a restless intellect and great courage who have sought and at times been able to establish a degree of independence.

The use of the term "Arab" in its widest and ancient sense means a population derived from or occupying Arabia. At a comparatively late date "Arab" has been used to mean those speaking the Arabic language or professing the Arabian religion. This latter, cultural use of the term is recent, historically, and not too accurate. Expert opinion differs widely on the composition of the population of Arabia in both ancient and modern times. But it would seem clear at least that our ignorance of the region and its complexities of peoples inclines us always to adopt a notion of more solidarity, more unity of race, than any careful investigation ever justifies.¹⁰

Canaan as a province of Egypt may be compared with Palestine, or Syria, as a province of Turkey. Culturally, however, Turkey and its provinces separated more readily than Egypt and

¹⁰ Cf. Henry Field in *The New Orient* as published by the Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, 1936.

Canaan ever would. Palestine, archaeologically, as S. A. Cook said in his Schweich Lectures, "is in completest touch with the larger area of which it is an organic part, but it has an individuality of its own. Usually one may count on a certain protest or reaction from Palestine." It "must hammer out its own career or be swallowed up." This, I wish to remark, is a pre-Israelite, Israelite and continuing trait of Canaanites. It is a necessity, perhaps conditioned by geographical facts, which is met by an age-long capacity. The knowledge of it is one of those gifts of history to the councils responsible for the administration of the social and political well-being of the Canaan of today.

Most of the great influences recorded by history have been called "conquests." Of the quiet infiltrations and steady pressures and readjustments less notice is usually taken. There were Horite, Amorite, Hyksos, Habiru, Sea Peoples, Israelite and many others down to the days of the Arabs. With true biblical distortion we generally emphasize the story, conflate, from the books of Joshua and Judges, about whose date the mercury has been jiggling up and down recently. This pre-occupation with the Hebrew conquest of Canaan in the late Second Millennium B. C. arises because of our keen sense of obligation to Hebrew prophecy and Hebrew and Jewish law which leads us to scrutinize as with a glass every trace of root, origin, or explanation of those great institutions. But should not these very considerations lead us to set all within a truly proportioned World History of those times and ours?

From time to time in the past two centuries, certain leading scholars have been able to anticipate much in later material discovery by their analysis of such literary texts as were available to them, notably the Bible, the Fathers and the Classics. For most of us, however, an incomparable vividness, a more satisfying sense of the realities, have come recently with the illumination thrown upon the texts by archaeological research. As an adjunct, too much may not be said for archaeological aid, but it does not yet appear to be a substitute for properly edited texts. The archaeological approach is an aid to historical reconstruction as it seeks beyond literate documents to fill out the picture of the life of the country. That it succeeds in some measure is the testi-

mony of many scholars and of a widely diversified public which has arisen to acclaim the results gained by one of the newest forms of research. A new humanism has arisen in fields thought to be dead. The interest of the man-in-the-street is keen. It is our duty to see that he is kept informed. It is easy in the paucity of data on the one hand and the expectancy of the public on the other to expatiate upon the large importance of small details. We must keep our sense of proportion, our good humor and humility and record faithfully our findings in such form as will be perennially available to the serious minded. After all, facts are our quarry and we should bring them in as clean from debris as we are able to do. The public press has been of considerable assistance in making discoveries known. Too often there is a temptation to venture immature interpretations and unsafe analogies, too often to use the sacred name "proof" where "suggestion" or "illustration" would be more exact. We deal largely with crumbling walls, clay, stone, and metal vessels, weapons, tools, and other artifacts. These are our surest data of record and naturally the skills of the architect, photographer and draughtsman are of the greatest help to the archaeological director. The artifacts and their reassembly will be employed differently by different generations of students. The trained reader will be able to separate our scientific contributions from our more subjective interpretations. When we venture into hypotheses we seek those suggestions that stimulate rather than any which might obscure understanding. Let it be understood always that we are not seeking to prove pre-established positions but to accumulate and to organize all the material facts possible in illustrating human life.

The Philistine problem bids fair to be the point of joining between Greek and Semitic archaeology. From the Greek side claimants put forward the Achaeans as associates if not indeed relatives of the Philistines. Prof. Childe would trace "the most notable Achaean shape, a bell-shaped crater—to that same South Balkan culture—detected in Iron Age Macedonia."¹¹ He is "certain that the Achaean period begins in Greece with no sudden

¹¹ *The Aryans*, 54.

break in culture" (p. 53). We must agree with him when he says that "the division of the surface into panels, or the metope style, has very ancient precursors in Hither Asia and was most richly developed on the Philistine pottery of Palestine and in contemporary Syrian wares." But we must part company with him when he follows the Cretan origin of the Philistines as a whole.

Iron and the Iron Age used to be thought of as the solvent of certain difficult problems in chronology and coincident with the coming of the Philistines to Canaan. Whether the use of iron was introduced from Danubian regions, traversing Asia Minor from west to east or whether its progress was from east to west, it is almost certain that Iron Age culture proceeded from Asia Minor southward to Egypt and probably to Canaan. Iron was not first brought in by the historic Philistines but its use preceded them and may have come gradually in the days of proto-Philistines. The knowledge of iron goes far back in the Bronze Age but the supply was oftentimes scanty. This was true even in the Heroic Age. At Beth Shemesh the Philistines were agile adopters of customs which were once thought to be their own introduction.

The old question whether Philistines or Hebrews entered Canaan first has been deepened to the question of the relative timing of the entrances of proto-Philistines and proto-Hebrews. In the usual presentation of the biblical data for the beginnings of the Hebrew folk-life in Canaan, two great facts are all but obscured. Those facts may be epitomized in the words "Habiru" and "Mediterraneans." The Habiru, certainly, did not come from Egypt and the Mediterraneans did not consist of the Philistines only. The events to which we generally refer, dating them in the Twelfth and Eleventh Centuries, belong to late phases of two earlier movements. Two great racial influences upon Canaan in the Late Bronze Age preceded the conflicts of which we have read between Hebrews and Philistines.

When the northern Hittite power was broken, Carchemish, Samal, and Syria were invaded, and overrun. Egypt lost control in Syria which fell into the hands of local politicians. There was a late attempt by the Pharaoh Setnakht and his son Ramses III which gave Egypt its last semblance of power in Syria until the time of the Libyan dynastic dominance of Egypt. It was in that

disturbed period that Canaan was entered by those Philistines who made homes and wealth and formed a politico-trade confederation which has been compared with the famous Hanseatic League of North German towns. Most historical writing indicates that Ramses III compelled a precipitate of the Sea Peoples, namely the Philistines, to settle in Canaan which was really their internment after their defeat. This is probably a very hazy approximation of the facts. It is true that the raiding movement did not succeed in Egypt but it is not at all clear that the raiders were much in awe of Egypt in Canaan. At any rate the Philistines and the Zakkalu (Zakkara) built up important, wealthy establishments in Canaan.¹² From excavations at Beisan (Beth Shan) it appears that the Aegean colony there which had been founded perhaps during the XIXth. Dynasty became independent as did many other city states. Most such Canaanite states were nearer the coast than Beth Shan and extended from Arvad, Sidon, Byblus in the North to the famous five cities of the Philistines in South Canaan. Dor and Taanach are the best known of a central group of coastal settlements of related race, probably. Two stories of the time of the latest Ramses (1142-1090 B. C.) speak of the indignities suffered by Egyptian messengers in middle and Northern Philistia which could not be punished by the impotent Egyptians. Ramses IX had sent representatives up the coast of Canaan where they were imprisoned for life by the ruler of Byblus. That hard fact was mentioned as a taunt at a later time (1113 B. C.) in the story of a certain man named Wenamon, another Egyptian who was involved in a pitiful fiasco the account of which reads like a "comic strip" of the age.

Usually Canaanites are regarded as early Semites, perhaps Amorites or Amoritic in part. But in the light of the discussion of the continuity of the population of Canaan from earliest human times and also of the detection of Armenoid as a dominant strain, perhaps coming from an invading folk, we may have to assent to an essentially non-Semitic character in the original and enduring Palestine stock.

Arthurian tales and Mediaeval romances are brought to mind as we read analogues in the lore of Canaan. In the famous letters

¹² Myres, *op. cit.*, 70, 126; Hall, in *CAH*, II, XII.

found in the ruins of Tell el-Amarna, Egypt, one has more than a glimpse of Canaan about the middle of the Late Bronze Age. Richest of all our sources is the Old Testament of the Bible where numerous passages bear witness of the country and its peoples in the succeeding Iron Age. It was in the Philistine period of the Early Iron Age, while Egypt was still weak, that the Hebrew peoples were able to consolidate a society even to the extent of setting up kingly government in central Canaan. But Egypt revived from time to time, in the reigns of Solomon and Rehoboam, and indeed occasionally up to the time of the new Babylonian conquest, the Exile. During all those centuries Egypt was the important neighbor on the south, as we may read in the Bible. We see in the report of the spies as told in the Bible (Numbers 13) what tall stories could be told about tall people. Literary peoples tell such tales of non-literary, and thus do literary ages dwell upon the doing and the daring, the finesse and the perfidy of non-literary times. The simple social framework of Canaan appealed to the sophisticated folk always whether of Egypt, or of the Canaanite cities, and wherever there was a ballad-forming folk. The combination of pastoral and agricultural is forever going on in Canaan. In Palestine, the most uneasy province of history, the very physical facts account for much and the minds of its keen folk, trained by observation and shock, take more readily to innovation. When and how has Palestine known peace?

At this point we turn to those studies in ceramics which show an evolution in the wares, shapes and decorations of Mycenaean-Philistine vases traceable in exemplars found in the islands and in the Levantine mainlands including South Canaan. The considerable amount of Mycenaean pottery found at Beth Shemesh is in agreement with the ware of that manufacture scattered so plentifully throughout Levantine lands. It is an excellent fabric, thoroughly baked and handsomely decorated. Its dependence on Minoan patterns is acknowledged. Apparently the Mycenaean trading-range coincided with that of the Cretan. Cretans knew Canaan of old when they traded there and around the coast to Egypt.¹³ When that good organization of the Mediterranean

¹³ Cf. W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Gerar*, Quaritch, 1928, 28 f.

world on lines of commerce was broken by conquests and piracies, the first worthy cultural successor was the power nicknamed by scholarship "Mycenaean." When the grasp of the Mycenaean upon the Levant was loosened by the bending of shores southward in raiding attacks upon the islands and upon the North African coasts, especially the Delta, we are in view of that matrix of the Sea Peoples out of which crystallized the Philistines in Canaan-Palestine.

One criterion which has been used in dating is the progressive change in the decoration of the pottery, for example, from the "close style" through the employment of a free-continuous pattern in a painted band about the vessel and, later, to a panelled division of the decorative elements, or a breaking up of the continuous decorative treatment into metopes, or blocks, of similar decorative effects such as spirals, lozenges, wavy and straight lines, bulls' eyes, crosses, and finally bird pictures, etc. (the swan in various attitudes and markings). The peculiar use of straight and wavy lines in combination with lozenges which were lined within, or cross-hatched, might easily have been derived from Canaanite Late Bronze decoration.¹⁴

After a lapse in the imports of pottery into Canaan and after the phase of poorest Palestinian pottery indicated by Albright as the pre-Philistine phase of Early Iron I,¹⁵ we find at Beth Shemesh a large number of vessels which resemble several of the leading Mycenaean shapes and decorative designs (craters, jugs, strainer-spouted pitchers, stirrup-vases, pyxoid pots), but are in entirely different ware. The preponderance of these vessels continues for less than two centuries. They disappear, except for a few resembling shapes of similar ware and with but little or no decoration. At its peak the Philistine type of dishes shows a creamy slip degenerating to a white wash as background for the surface decoration. The ware appears consistently gritty or sandy, grayish to pinkish, and to resemble in texture a fine-grained sandstone. Generally it has a gray core, sometimes no

¹⁴ See the article by Heurtley in *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine*, V, No. 3, 1936. See also Hogarth, *The Twilight of History*, 1926 and Myres, *op. cit.*, 130 f., 449, 472 f., 508.

¹⁵ *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, 1935, 104 f.

core. Beth Shemesh ceramics shows several steps toward the Philistine type and away from it and numerous sherds are available in America for studies of much of the Late Bronze II-Early Iron I sequence. The development in Palestine of the Early Iron forms after the Mycenaean imports ceased, the advance to the Philistine peak and the subsequent decline, as illustrated from Beth Shemesh, leads us to the impression that the changes were so gradual that we may say that the Philistines stimulated rather than invented or imported. Following the ceramic indication, we may be led to observe that socially the peak Philistines were anticipated by their kindred, or collaterals, before the great historic raids of the Sea Peoples and that they continued to be influential long after the so-called Philistine pottery declined and vanished. We keep an open mind on the possibilities that the best of the Philistine pottery was an importation, as Mycenaean had been. Possibly the sea trade was fairly stable by the time that the Philistines were at their acme. If Philistine pottery ever comes to be called Late-Mycenaean, then its end would appear to have coincided with the Dorian invasion, about 1100 B. C.¹⁶

Although the Philistine decoration on pottery is drawn from the Mycenaean, we may not hastily conclude that the Philistines are Mycenaean though clearly they are in some form of artistic association. Nor is it yet shown that the Philistines and Mycenaean are to be regarded as proto-Greeks. Another caveat; Philistines are not proven to be Minoan-Cretans. It is practically certain that some Pulesati colonized on the island of Crete. There were representatives of different races on Crete. Phaistos, conceivably, may have been Philistine at the time of the famous disk. We might find traces of Philistines on three other shores before their occupation of Canaan without thereby deciding their place of origin or even whence they came to Canaan. Certainly their greatest fame is Palestinian, and they are the most famous Westerners who were in Palestine in ancient times.

¹⁶ On the Philistine as sub-Mycenaean pottery, see Hall, *CAH*, II, 294 f., but compare Heurtley, *op. cit.*, in *QDAP*. See also Mackenzie, *Palestine Exploration Fund, Annals*, I, II (1911-1913); Petrie, *Beth Pelet*, I, London, 1930, 6, §18, plate XXIII; 7, 23; Macdonald, Starkey, and Harding, *Beth Pelet*, II, London, 1932, 31 ff.; Burn, *op. cit.*, 29, 90 f., 108; Myres, *op. cit.*, 130 f.