

STEPHANOS VOGAZIANOS

THE PHILISTINE EMERGENCE AND ITS POSSIBLE BEARING ON THE APPEARANCE AND ACTIVITIES OF AEGEAN INVADERS IN THE EAST MEDITERRANEAN AREA AT THE END OF THE MYCENAEAN PERIOD

INTRODUCTION

This paper has been undertaken with a view to tracing the connection between the Old Testament Philistines - *plst* or *prst* in the Ramessid inscriptions - and the Aegean people during the time of the social and political unrest in the Aegean sea, with special reference to the tribe which is referred to as «Dorians» in the writings of later Greek historians - that is, the «Northern intruders» of Greek written and oral tradition who are credited with having wiped out the Mycenaean palace civilization. Much emphasis has been laid so far on the many common aspects of Philistine and Minoan/ Mycenaean cultures; these aspects have been considered by quite a number of scholars to be so numerous that any resemblance between the Philistine culture and any culture other than those quoted above would require neither to be investigated as remarkable nor even to be thought of as likely. However, there seems to be evidence in favour of a connection between the Philistines and the so-called «Dorians» of the Greek tradition and this paper sets out to render this connection clear and also to put forward the theory that by virtue of this relationship the ties linking the Philistines with the Dorians may well be stronger than those connecting them with either the Minoans or the Mycenaeans. Relevant archaeological and literary records will both be drawn upon extensively throughout the text in an attempt, by supplementing one another, to draw a picture of what the various developments could have been like. Although the lacunas in these records are often much to be deplored, it is hoped that such ideas as might be gained from this work will at least suggest a new approach to the overall problem and help it to be considered from yet another viewpoint.

I. «WARRIORS FROM CAPHTOR» IN PALESTINE

The thorny question pertaining to the identification of Caphtor - Egyptian *K-f-tiw*, that is, Keftiu - now seems definitely settled. The Theban topographical list of Amenophis III (c. 1400 B.C.) which sets out just what the term meant for the Egyptians is the decisive document which simplified things greatly¹. The areas of the thirteen extant names on the left side of the document are defined by the two names on the right side - Keftiu and Tanayu. The latter best applies to the Greek Danaoi - as can be made out from the correspondence of the names - a term used for Greeks in the Argolid, and later on, for the Late Bronze Age population of Greece as a whole. Four names in the list corresponding to Keftiu, namely Amnisos, Phaistos, Knossos, Kydonia, clearly belong in Crete. It follows that Keftiu and its variants, like Caphtor and no doubt Captara, were names employed by such peoples as the Egyptians

1. For a full publication of this document, see E. Edel, «*Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III*», 1966, pp. 33 ff and pl. III. Subsequent studies include: Astour, *AJA* lxx, 1966, pp. 313-17; Kitchen (with Albright), *B.A.S.O.R.* cl xxxi, 1966, pp. 23-4; Edel, «*Archeion Koinoniologias Kai Ethikes*», X, 1967-8, pp. 37-48; P. Feure, «*Kadmos*» VII, 1968, 138-49; W. Helck, «*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*» cc xxxi, 1969, pp. 72-86; Kitchen, *Bi. Or.* xxvi, 1969, pp. 198-202; cf. also id., *J.E.A.* lv, 1969, pp. 223-5.

and the Hebrews to denote Crete. It can thus be safely said that if the Philistines had come from Caphtor, as is unanimously agreed upon, they did so from Crete. Thus far things seem clear and difficulties smoothed over. Yet, a major question that confronts us as we proceed with the survey of the origins of the Philistines is whether or not they were aborigines in Crete. If they were really natives there, then they must have been Minoans. But there are substantial difficulties in accepting this view. The Minoans were definitely known to Egyptians and there are representations of Minoan envoys on Egyptian high-ranked officials' tombs dating from the 16th and 15th cent. B.C., thus making it certain that the Egyptians knew what the Bronze Age Cretans looked like. In the tomb of Senmut, architect of Queen Hatshepsut, a procession of Keftian (Minoan) tributaries can be seen bearing gifts, among which typical LM IA (c. 1550-1500 B.C.) vessels and a huge cup of the so-called «Vapheio type» are easily identifiable. There is a similar procession of Minoans on the walls of the tomb of User-Amen, a royal court official in the early stage of Thothmes III's reign. Cretans are also depicted on the tomb of Rekhmara, User-Amen's nephew, where a typical LM IB (c. 1500-1450) vessel can be seen carried by one of the envoys. Finally, there are Minoans depicted on the tomb of Rekhmara's son, Menkheperasenb, High Priest of Amon at the end of Thothmes III's reign². It is thus reasonable for one to maintain that if the Pelest - Philistines were Minoans, they would have been represented in the same manner as the Keftians (Minoans) on the tombs of Thothmes III's officials. Yet, their appearance involving a feathered headdress and tasseled tunics, is almost totally different. Additionally, they would have been referred to as people from Keftiu, or Keftians, and not as something totally different, as is the case. It follows that the Philistines could hardly have been Minoans who joined the rest of the Sea Peoples in their all-out bid to find a new land for settlement.

However, what else which is related to Keftiu (Crete) could they have been? The Mycenaeans, that is, the Homeric Achaeans, certainly form another strong possibility. Some tombs at Knossos (Crete) which were built above ground like houses have been interpreted as those of the Mycenaean Kings or Princes ruling there during the period after c. 1450³. The Kefala tomb, a tholos with a circular chamber sunk deep in the ground, as well as the Isopata royal tomb, a large rectangular chamber with a high stone vault and a «dromos» (a long passage approaching the chamber), which are both situated near Knossos, are characteristic examples of this group. The imposing underground tholos tomb of Archanes, also near Knossos, is another striking example of the stone-built princely tombs which were apparently in vogue during LMIII (1400-1050 B.C.) and had been, in all probability, since c. 1450. Of the two main patterns of these royal stone-built tombs of LMIII times, that is, the rectangular and the tholos shapes, the latter is unanimously considered as being of Mycenaean origin and as coming into vogue in Crete after the conquest of Knossos by the war-like Mycenaeans (c. 1450)⁴. Additionally, there is literary evidence attesting to Mycenaean - Achaean presence in Crete around the closing stages of the Bronze Age in Aegean. Homer furnishes this evidence in the *Odyssey*, book XIX, vv. 172-9, saying that the island of Crete, at the time of the Trojan War was inhabited by a real mosaic of tribes, among whom the

2. A definitive and authoritative account of this kind of evidence pertaining to what the Egyptians knew about the Aegean people, is given in J. Vercoutter's work «*L' Egypt et le monde egeen prehellénique*», 1956, and also in his «*Essai sur les relations entre Egyptiens et Prehellènes*», 1954.
3. Hood, S. «*The Minoans*», 1971, p. 146; cf. also pp. 58-9.
4. For the Kephala tholos tomb, see R.W. Hutchinson, *BSA*, 51, 1956, pp. 74-80; for a later re-use of the tomb, see Cadogan, G., *BSA*, 62, 1967, pp. 257-65. The Isopata Royal tomb was described by Evans, A.T., in «*The Prehistoric Tombs of Knossos*», London 1906.

Achaean (Mycenaeans) are prominently featured. Since the Trojan War is now taken to have occurred at some time between 1250 and 1230, a conclusion arrived at through the combination of various data, such as the LHIIIB material from the VII A city (identified with the Homeric city) which indicates that the destruction took place not later than LHIIIB (c. 1200), and the record of a King of Ahhiyawa which hints that a kind of military operation occurred in North West Asia Minor after 1250⁵, we may say with certainty that the Achaean presence in Crete was still a feature of the demographic situation in this island at the time when the great land and sea migrations are recorded in the Levant, that is, in the early stages of the 12th century. Could one then postulate a Mycenaean identity for the Philistines? At this particular stage, prior to any answer being given, we must turn our attention to another focal point of the Philistine route to the Levant, namely Cyprus.

This island is attested as having received Greek mainland refugees fleeing from the first wave of disasters which struck the Greek peninsula in the opening stages of the 12th century B.C. The Mycenaean character of the people who settled there to establish a colony is confirmed by indisputably strong evidence, such as the replanning of the town of Enkomi, after it had suffered its first major destruction⁶, the construction of buildings involving ashlar masonry which is a typical feature of Mycenaean architecture, the mass of Mycenaean IIIC1, pottery from the occupation deposits in such sites as Enkomi, Sinda and Kition, as well as the Mycenaean styles of bronzework, plastic, glyptic and ivory⁷. This Mycenaean settlement is now unanimously taken to have occurred c. 1200 B.C., a very short while after the first destruction of the Cypriot town of Enkomi. This is also the time when the Sea-Peoples are reported in the Ramessid records to have overrun Alasiya, that is, Cyprus. This is far too remarkable a coincidence to be passed by and requires a careful survey. The fact that both Mycenaeans and Sea-Peoples, among whom the Philistines are listed, are found in the same site and at the same time, no doubt forms a connection between them and sets one off wondering whether these tribes met there, or even absorbed one another.

Modern scholars nowadays claim the arrival and settlement of the Mycenaeans c. 1200 to have taken place after the first destruction of Enkomi which may well have been due to the Sea Peoples activity⁸, thus implying that the Mycenaeans were not the Sea Peoples whose catastrophic action is to be envisaged as predating the arrival of the Aegean refugees. They think so mainly because archaeological evidence shows that the town of Enkomi was rebuilt very soon after its destruction, the replanning of the new town and its ashlar masonries attesting to Mycenaean presence. Thus, the obvious point they make is that the Mycenaeans could hardly have destroyed the town if they were part of the Sea Peoples, only to rebuild it themselves afterwards. However, this is not as convincing an argument as it probably sounds.

5. Desborough, V.R. d'A., «*The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors*», 1964, pp. 163-5; cf. also pp. 220 ff.
6. Dikaios (*Enkomi*, 1969) believed this settlement happened shortly after the town of Enkomi was ruined. He assigned this destruction to c. 1230. But see Desborough's communication in the International Symposium «*The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean*», 1972, p. 79, where the author takes a slightly different view of the case and suggests that the first main wave of destruction in Cyprus, for which he thinks that the Sea Peoples were responsible, seems to have happened after c. 1200 rather than later.
7. For various discussions relating to the multi-faceted subject of the Mycenaean colonization of Cyprus cf. Catling, H., «*The Achaean Settlement of Cyprus*», in «*The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean*», 1972, pp. 34-9; Hood, S., in op. cit. pp. 40-51, and Desborough, V.R. d'A., «*Mycenaeans in Cyprus in the 11th century B.C.*» in op. cit. (n. 6) pp. 79-88.
8. See Desborough, in op. cit., p. 79.

We should not forget, when examining this case, that the Mycenaean settlers were, in all probability, refugees from the Mainland, people in search of a new land, desperate to find a convenient site for resettlement; that this was a goal for the attainment of which this war-like, stiff-necked people were likely to carry out anything that could assist their aim, to perform even atrocious and at the same time paradoxical deeds. Thus, the possibility of having sailed to Cyprus, warred against the natives in order to achieve their settlement, destroyed by fire, perhaps after a siege, the city of Enkomi in their bid to utterly dislodge its inhabitants and soon afterwards repaired the damages and settled in it themselves, should by no means be put past the belicose nature of the Achaean invaders. Additionally, there is what may perhaps be considered as evidence that the Mycenaean were not unfamiliar with the method of attacking a place and causing considerable damage to it, only to expel inhabitants and thus render it available for their own settlement and the establishment of their rule over the relevant area. The evidence seems to be furnished by the overall picture of the destructions in various Minoan sites of c. 1450 B.C. Although the great volcanic eruption in the Aegean island of Thera in the north of Crete at about that time may well be credited with having been one of the main factors of this havoc⁹, it nonetheless looks as though the nature of these destructions is suggestive of an invasion and consequent warfare, as an additional, even predominant, cause of the disasters that heralded the age of Mycenaean domination and influence in Crete. It has been suggested that the way in which Minoan country houses like those at Vathipetro and Sklavokampos suffered destruction and were never rebuilt is indicative of «a complete overthrow of the existing social order, as a result of invasion and conquest»¹⁰. Also, the severe destruction of sites in the south, such as Aghia Triadha and Phaistos, where the impact of the volcanic eruption is not very likely to have been catastrophic, may also be taken to corroborate the view that, whereas the volcanic activity may have sparked off the wave of the destructions, it was nonetheless the Mycenaean who, taking advantage of the situation, swept all over the island and secured a firm hold on it. So, to come back to the main point, it looks very much as though these invaders destroyed certain towns, or isolated buildings in some cases, no doubt in their attempt to overcome the resistance of the natives, and then settled in them themselves, after having rendered them habitable again by building new houses or making modifications to adapt the old ones to their own tastes. Thus, the archaeological record attests to the erection of a few houses at the town of Gournia in eastern Crete, soon after the destruction, the largest of which is reminiscent of Mycenaean architectural designs¹¹. So also is the case with a palace that was built on the debris of the old one at Aghia Triadha in southern Crete¹². Likewise, the palace at Knossos was adapted to the invaders tastes and the extant Throne Room seems to have been constructed at this time (c. 1450 B.C.) just as the Mycenaean-looking frescoes of the palace seem to date from this period¹³.

The town of Tarsus in Cilicia, that is, the southeast coast of Asia Minor may also be considered as

9. Cf. J.V. Luce, «*The End of Atlantis. New light on an old legend*», London 1969, and A.G. Galanopoulos and E. Bacon, «*Atlantis: the truth behind the legend*», London 1969; also D.L. Page «*The Santorini Volcano and the destruction of Minoan Crete*», London 1970; but see B.C. Heezen, «A Time Clock for History», *Saturday Review*, Dec. 6, 1969, pp. 87-90, favouring a somewhat different development and date of the eruption.

10. S. Hood, «*The Minoans*», p. 58.

11. Op. cit, p. 58.

12. Op. cit, p. 58.

13. Op. cit, pp. 58-9.

hinting at the same kind of activity on the part of the Mycenaeans. This town, though under Hittite domination, was severely destroyed, in all probability later than the period of the reign of Hattusilis III, at some time in the 13th century. Another settlement was erected above the ruins of the destroyed Hittite town. The pottery recorded in the re-occupation deposits was clearly Mycenaean of the transitional period from Myc. IIIB to C (c. 1200 B.C.); the final stage of this settlement is marked by a very rudimentary ware, bearing what may very well be features of the final stage of Myc. IIIC pottery, as well as ceramic links with Syria, Cyprus and Palestine. It has been assumed that the destroyers of this Hittite town were the same as the users of Myc. IIIB-C pottery, who built the succeeding settlement¹⁴. Thus, it looks as though we have in this case yet another instance of Mycenaean activity of the kind which involves invasion and destruction of a settlement as well as subsequent re-building of the ruined edifices and settlement of the invaders in them. Thus, as a corollary ensuing from all these indications one may put forward the thesis that it may well have been the Mycenaean refugees from the Greek mainland who caused the first destruction of the Cypriot town of Enkomi of c. 1200 B.C. and subsequently settled there, after replanning and rebuilding the town. In other words, the Mycenaeans and whoever else might have come along with them from the Aegean area are quite likely to have been those Sea Peoples who are reported in the Egyptian archives to have overrun Cyprus, a catastrophic action which is most probably confirmed by the archaeological record in the town of Enkomi. And of course, one may well maintain that these Mycenaeans came over to Cyprus from Crete, Caphtor. We have already referred to the Homeric verses in *Odyssey* (see *supra*) which inform us that the numerous tribes inhabiting Crete at the time of the Trojan War included Achaeans (Mycenaeans) and may well lead one to believe that co-existence was problematic on account of what we would probably term nowadays population explosion. This, if added to the hectic situation which was created after the first Dorian invasion (c. 1200) would well have forced a number of the inhabitants, among whom one is to envisage the Mycenaeans, to migrate to Cyprus, the latter place being known to Late Helladic folk (Mycenaeans) on account of the extensive trade relationship attested by the archaeological record in Cyprus, mainly during the 14th and 13th centuries B.C.¹⁵ The discovery in 13th-12th century Cypriot contexts of «Horns of Consecration», this unmistakable and unfailing companion to almost every Minoan-Mycenaean cult context, and certainly a cult object of Minoan origin, may also be taken as a hint of the influence of Minoan tradition on those who brought them along to, or modelled them in, Cyprus. It has been suggested that the «Horns of Consecration were introduced into Cyprus by Achaean settlers who established themselves on the island during the 13-12 centuries B.C.»¹⁶. So, the probability of the Philistines being Mycenaeans who came to the Levant from Crete seems strengthened.

The fact that the Philistine pottery seems to derive from the Cypriot version of Mycenaean IIIC1b pottery (c. 1200-1130 B.C.) which does not have affinities with contemporary Minoan ceramics, whereas it does resemble the Myc. IIIC1b pottery of the Argolid¹⁷, may suggest that these Mycenaeans

14. For an excellent discussion of the stratigraphic problems of the Late Bronze Age town of Tarsus with particular reference to the Mycenaean settlement there, see H. Goldman, «*Excavations at Gozlu Kule, Tarsus*,» vol. II, pp. 50, 58, 63 and 205 ff.
15. For various discussions focusing on the contacts between Cypriots and Mycenaeans prior to the latter's establishing themselves there c. 1200, see «*The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean*,» Congress volume, 1972, especially pp. 34-9, 122-128, 207-213.
16. «*Cyprus*» pp. 62 ff., p. 233 and in op. cit (see preceding note), p. 242, *passim*.

who finally migrated from Crete to Cyprus must have come to Crete from the Argolid, presumably fleeing from the catastrophes that struck many a Mycenaean centre in Southern Greece. So, when Homer refers to Mycenaean presence in Crete, he speaks in all probability, in terms of all those Mycenaeans who had either settled there prior to the Dorian invasion, or fled to that island because of the northern invaders (c. 1200) only to set out once more, after a short while, to discover new lands for settlement.

However, there is a difficulty in ascribing a Mycenaean identity to the Philistines. The reason is that the Hebrews used to employ the expression «The Sons of Javan» to denote the Indo-Europeans of the East Mediterranean, and this name may well refer to the Mycenaeans, be virtue of its accepted etymological and phonetic correspondence to «Ionian», another name used for virtually the same people as the Mycenaeans of historic times. This name was no doubt used by the Hebrews to denote these people at the time when the Philistines were their major problem in Palestine, and the well attested fact that these latter people kept their non-semitic identity unalloyed, lends credibility to the suggestion that they could hardly have been pure Mycenaeans for if they really were so, they would be referred to by the Hebrews as Javan, or in one way or another connected with them. So, although there could have been a certain amount of Mycenaean blood in their veins, it looks as if at least one more line of descent should be sought for them and the following pages will endeavour to illustrate how close a relationship, if any, has existed between the Philistines and a tribe that figures prominently in Greek tradition and has proved elusive, if somewhat troublesome, to modern research, namely the Dorians.

II. «THE KNIGHTS OF THE GREEK NORTH»; THEIR ACTIVITIES IN THE LIGHT OF GREEK HISTORIC SOURCES

In the oft-quoted reference in the *Odyssey*, XIX, vv. 172-9, of the various tribes inhabiting Crete at the time of the Trojan War, that is, in the late 13th century B.C., the Dorians are also mentioned as one of these tribes. So, what has been said of the Mycenaeans with regard to the depressive demographic situation in this island and their possible migration of c. 1200 as well as their subsequent settlement in Cyprus may just as well be claimed for the Dorians, who were also inhabitants of Crete at that time. We should not forget that it seems most probable that there was a wave of Mycenaean immigrants from Argolid that fled to Crete, which in the case of a southern or south-eastern migration of Mycenaean people would almost certainly have served as a stepping stone, if not as the ultimate place, for settlement (see previous chapter and note 17). If such, as is likely, was the case, then it must have been these Mycenaeans that, in a way, caused the Dorians of Crete, to join in the daring and risky undertaking of setting out to discover a safer, less densely populated and more fertile land for settlement. This could have happened because of the aggravation of the demographic situation as a result of the coming of these Mycenaeans who, having perhaps settled in the same area as the Dorians, were followed by them in the great overseas expedition to Cyprus. These Dorians were most probably unaware of the sea-route to this island, as well as unfamiliar with the difficulties involved in such a voyage, and thus saw the Mycenaeans as the only solution to help them out of their awkward situation, by literally showing them the way to a more appropriate place for settlement.

17. H. Catling, «Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age,» *CAH II*³, 2, p. 208. See also A. Furumark, «The Mycenaean IIC pottery and its Relation to Cypriote Fabrics,» *Op. Arch.*, 3 (1944), p. 194 ff.

At this stage of our survey, and prior to proceeding with the scrutiny of the sources, we must fully realize the significance of what seems to be a definite feature of these Cretan Dorians. These people, who no doubt form one of the earliest, if not the earliest, occurrences of Dorian people in the Aegean, should by no means be envisaged as the bearers of iron technology, and skilful workers of this precious metal, whose catastrophic action is sufficiently attested in the course of the 12th century B.C. and referred to as the famous Dorian invasion. Although the Cretan Dorians of the late 13th century might very well have been just as boorish and bucolic a people as the later Dorians, and although their arrival in Crete could have been associated with some kind of disturbance of the social and political balance there, it is clear from the archaeological record that their cultural impact, if any, did not necessitate any swing of weapons or tools technology in terms of the material used. Bronze was always predominant and the overall picture of the technology of metallic ware remains virtually the same. So, these Dorians are to be considered a tribe still working in bronze, perhaps the first of the Northern invaders - the people that finally inaugurated the Iron Age in Greece - to have been involved in the gradual infiltration of the Greek peninsula and the Aegean.

And now, to deal with one of the cardinal questions in the overall problem, how much attested is the Dorian presence in Crete and how closely, if at all, can it be associated with the natives there? There is a very interesting reference to the pedigree of Minos, the legendary Minoan King, according to which Minos' predecessor and earthly father Asterios is called son of Tektamos, the son of Dorus, the son of Hellen the son of Deukalion¹⁸. It appears from this that Minos was not even of Minoan descent. His origin is indisputably traced back to Dorus, thus making him a Dorian. Since his grandfather, Tectamus, who was also a Dorian, is said to have sailed to Crete with Aiolians and Pelasgians¹⁹ and to have become a king there, it looks as if what echo of actual events is reflected in this tradition may well hint at a very early Dorian settlement in Crete which occasioned a royal pedigree bearing at least a streak of Dorian blood. Taking the Trojan War (which occurred at some time between 1250 and 1230) as a landmark in our backward computation of dates of events, and adopting the traditional 30-year-average length of a generation, we can obtain some idea of the dates of the events in this case. We learn that there was a second King Minos, later than the one mentioned above, whose grandson Idomeneus was the famous Achaean lord who fought at Troy²⁰. It follows that Idomeneus' grandfather Minos must have «flourished» c. 1300. The father of this Minos was Lycastus, the son of Itone and the first King Minos whose earthly father was the Dorian Asterius, and yet who was also credited with having divine origin by being born of Zeus and Europe²¹. Thus the date of this early Minos must be slightly prior to the middle of the 14th century. In the same way we can go on and date the first entry, that of Tektamos, in the genealogy as c. 1420. This last date must be taken to refer to the arrival of the Dorian ethnic element in Crete, at least according to Diodorus. If this was a small-scale migration to Crete such as would not be likely to leave a detectable impact on the cultural life of the island, we may well accept the date referring to the arrival of these Dorians there. Of course the Dorians as such are traditionally associated with the great upheaval in Greece from c. 1200 onwards. But in this particular case it very much looks as if the Dorian

18. Diodorus, IV, 60.

19. Ibid.

20. In Iliad, XIII, 449-52 we find a pedigree, Zeus, Minos, Deukalion, Idomeneus. The same is virtually repeated in Odyssey, XIX, 177-181.

21. Diodorus, IV, 60.

migration was a peaceful one, perhaps involving not a very large number of immigrants who, being from the comparatively uncivilized Northern parts of Greece, soon came to adopt the sophisticated and attractive Minoan culture and way of life. Thus, their remains should not differ from those of the Minoans. The acquaintance of these people with the Minoan civilization seems to have taken place at the time when Minos was born to, or adopted by (as Diodorus says to save the divine descent theory) the Dorian Asterius. Minos is also said to have been born of Zeus and Europe, daughter of the Phoenician King Agenor, a piece of information that might be taken to suggest that Minos was not of pure Dorian stock. The involvement of divine, Phoenician, and Dorian elements in his birth seems to indicate that he was the offspring of a marriage between a newcomer (a Dorian, that is, Asterius) and a native, the latter to be found in the form of Europe. Whether this arrangement has been used by Diodorus to imply that Minos, and in turn the Minoans, originated directly from a «marriage» of Greek and ancient Syrian population and cultures, or whether it has been employed to suggest that the influx of Dorian immigrants in Crete at a certain time upset the racial development of the Minoans (the latter being already there and having come in all probability from Syria in the first place), it seems clear that the cultural and racial intercourse of the alien Dorians and the native Cretans took place at the time Minos was begotten by his Dorian father, Asterius, that is, at about the middle of the 14th century (see above). It is therefore more than likely that these are the Dorians that Homer considers as being an element of Cretan population already, at a time prior to the Trojan War.

Strabo, quoting Staphylus of Naucratis²², says that these Dorians occupied «the part towards the east» and that the Eteo-Cretans (pure Cretans) dwelt in the southern part; this information suggests that contact between the two peoples must have been easy and, what is even more important, that the Dorians had easy access to the eastern sea-shore, something that favours the view that in the case of utmost emergency, they could take to the sea. Strabo goes on to say that, according to Andron²³, the Dorians, Achaeans and Pelasgians who are said to have been inhabitants of Crete in Od. XIX, 174-6 were foreigners who had come there from Thessaly, from the country which was at early times called «Doris», and later on, Hestiaiotis. Andron also says that the Dorians who lived in the neighbourhood of Parnassus set out from this country, that is Hestiaiotis in Thessaly, and founded Erineus, Boeum and Cydinium, and hence by Homer are called «trichaices»,²⁴ that is, «three-fold». But the most definite statement linking the Dorians with Thessaly is made by Herodotus who says²⁵ that the Dorian race,

22. Strabo, X, 475.

23. Ibid.

24. Strabo's translator in the Loeb Classical Library Series, H.L. Jones, argues for this word meaning «hair-shaking» and brings forward the word «KORITHAIX» (= «crest-shaking») as a parallel, but it is of fundamental significance that the social and political organization as well as various activities of the Dorians were interlaced with the number *three* (= «tria», whence «tricha» meaning «in three parts;») their tribal organization involved three tribes (see Burn, «*Minoans, Philistines and Greeks*,» 1930, p. 205, commenting upon the issue,) their bid for new lands for settlement, after having been dislodged from Doris in Thessaly by the Kadmeians and returned there later, resulted in the foundation of three cities in the Parnassus area (see Diodorus, IV, 67), and, when Homer speaks of the «Herakleids» in Rhodes, who are virtually Dorians, he informs us that each of their three tribes was allotted an area to settle in, thus dividing the whole island into three regions, those of Lindus, Ialissus, and Kamirus (Iliad II, vv. 653-6, 668). «Trichaices is generally interpreted as «three-fold» (usually meaning «of three tribes») in most modern translations of Iliad and Odyssey (So Odyssey, XIX, 176, about Dorians in Crete). Thus, Andron, in loc. cit. is doing nothing more than recording a certain Dorian undertaking, involving the number «three» just like other Dorian activities, and the above quoted passage from Diodorus agrees with Andron by virtually repeating this particular information. Thus, the interpretation «three-fold» of «trichaices» seems much more fitting than anything else (So Liddell and Scott q.v.).

25. Herodotus, I, 56.

which he also calls «Hellenic», thus identifying the Dorians with «Hellenes» (=Creeks) proper, inhabited the country called Hestiaeotis, under Ossa and Olympus, in the time of Dorus son of Hellen²⁶. It is therefore safe to say that these people who had come to Crete from Hestiaeotis in Thessaly, as Andron puts it, were mainly Dorians who had probably migrated to Crete at roughly the same time as the expedition of other Dorians, also from Hestiaeotis, to Parnassus where they founded the so-called Dorian tetrapolis, namely the cities of Erineus, Boeum, Pindus and Cydinium²⁷. The fact that both these Dorian activities, that is, the migration to Crete and the foundation of the Dorian tetrapolis at Parnassus, occur in the same context in the aforementioned reference by Strabo to Andron, and, perhaps in the original work by Andron, from whom Strabo is quoting, makes the above suggestion likely.

We shall now endeavour to reconstruct those stages of Dorian history which might lead us to find in them some bearing on the question of the relationship of the Aegean peoples and the elusive Philistines.

Phthia in Thessaly is the first Greek land which the Dorians as such are said to have inhabited in the days of king Deukalion²⁸. Then, in the time of Dorus, son of Hellen, they inhabited the country called Hestiaeotis in Thessaly²⁹. It looks as if the double reference to the name «Dorian», to be seen in the case of King Dorus and also in the name «Doris» in which Hestiaeotis was also known, attests to this area as having been a turning point in the history of this tribe, in as much as these wanderers seem to have acquired a fraction of their tribal identity as Dorians, in this area. Herodotus, who furnishes all this information, goes on to say that the Dorians were dislodged from Hestiaeotis by the Kadmeians who were on the move in search of a new land for settlement, after they had been worsted in war against the descendants of the «seven chieftains» that is, of the Achaean army that tried unsuccessfully to sack Kadmeian Thebes in the first place³⁰. After that, the Dorians «settled about Pindus,» so says Herodotus, in the parts called Macedonian. Diodorus tells us that the Kadmeians, after having defeated and expelled the Dorians from their native country, which he calls Doris and which is the same as Hestiaeotis (as Strabo, quoting Andron in loc. cit. says), settled in Doris themselves for some time, «some of them remaining there permanently and others returning to Thebes when Creon, the son of Menoeceus, was King».

Meanwhile, the Dorians were settled in the Pindus area, where significant events took place. We learn that it was there that they intermingled with the «Herakleidai», the sons of Herakles who sought refuge there, among the mixed hordes of the Dorians, from their father's numerous enemies. It is in this context that we learn that the Dorians were divided into three tribes: the Hylleis, a section of whom still figures in Hellenic times as part of South Illyrian population³¹, and must have some connection with Hyllus, the eldest of the sons of Herakles, after whom they were perhaps named; the Dymanes,

26. See Strabo, IX, 3, speaking about the geographical division of Thessaly and furnishing the information that the four parts it consists of, are Phthiotis, Hestiaeotis, Thessaliotis, Pelasgiotis.

27. Strabo, IX, 10.

28. Herodotus, loc. cit.

29. Ibid.

30. See Diodorus, IV, 66-67; Herodotus, loc. cit.

31. Skymnos, XI. 403 ff., quoting Timaios.

involving a termination reminiscent of Akarnanes, Ainianes and other north-western tribes of classical Greece; and, the Pamphyloi, «those of all tribes,» who indicate that there was a real multitude of different races to be detected in the ranks of the Dorians. It must have been at the same time also that the Dorians were joined by a remnant of Kadmeians, who were among the survivors of the disaster that overwhelmed Kadmeian Thebes as a result of their defeat by the descendants of «the seven chieftains» (see supra). These Kadmeians seem to have trekked to Dorian territories in their bid to find refuge somewhere out of reach of their foes³². One really wonders whether these Kadmeians were the same as the «Herakleides,» mentioned above, the latter doubtless having strong ties with Thebes by virtue of their father, Hercules, being a Theban. The contexts are strikingly similar; two bands of people, fleeing their enemies, anxious to find refuge out of their reach, imbued with hatred against their pursuers and eventually ending up in the far North among the warlike Dorian bands with whom they teamed up; both these migrations must have been roughly contemporary. Be that as it may, we find the Dorians again in Hestiaeotis in Thessaly whence they set out to find new lands for settlement in the area of Parnassus where they founded the Dorian Tetrapolis (see supra). Of these four cities, three, namely Erinium, Cydinium and Boeum must have been founded either by the same group of Dorians, or on the same expedition or something of the kind, since on several occasions they are mentioned³³ together as if having something in common. It is quite likely that another expedition from Hestiaeotis at this time resulted in the colonisation of the eastern parts of Crete, by Dorians who formed a conspicuous element of the island's population, as is said by Homer in the often-quoted passage from the *Odyssey* (see supra). Homer uses the adjective «trichaices» in his reference to the Dorians of Crete, which surely implies their «three-fold» tribal organization. Thus, all three Dorian tribes were present there and the «Pamphyloi» make one wonder, mainly on account of the very strong probability of the Dorians having accompanied the Mycenaeans to Cyprus in c. 1200, whether this Dorian tribe came to be known later as «Philistines», «Pamphyloi» and «Philistines» being somewhat similar words and perhaps involving the same root, the Greek word «phyle», meaning «tribe»³⁴. We should not forget that among the Dorians of Crete there may well have been «Herakleides» as well as Kadmeians, both these people having teamed up with the Dorians earlier in Northern Greece as we have already seen. There is a very interesting passage from Strabo³⁵ in which he informs us that the Phoenicians who had come along with Kadmus and came later to be known as Kadmeians, returned to their homeland, that is, Phoenicia, at the time when the Aeolian fleet near Aulis, that is, the fleet which «the Sons of Orestes» were dispatching, was ready to sail for Asia Minor. According to this information, the Kadmeians returned to the Levant at the time of the Great Sea-Raids, because it is easily deducible that the time of «the Sons of Orestes» should be envisaged as being after the fall of Troy and almost contemporary with the Sea-Peoples raids. Strabo also says that these Kadmeians were for a long time inhabitants of Thessaly and that afterwards they returned to their homeland³⁶. Since the chronological context of these happenings is clearly said to

32. Herodotus, v, 61.

33. Strabo, X, 475, quoting Andron; Diodorus, IV, 67.

34. Cf. A. Jones, «*The Philistines and the Danites*», 1975, particularly his preface and pp. 76-83. Jones argues wittily for the root «phyle» being involved in the name «Philistines», but he only answers problems by analogy and he mainly speculates. Yet a root «phyle» may not at all be out of place for «Philistines», particularly in view of the Dorian «Pamphyloi» being in Crete (Caphtor) and, very probably, in Cyprus at the time of the Sea-Raids.

35. Strabo, IX, 401.

36. Ibid.

be later than the destruction of Thebes by the descendants of the «Seven Chieftains», we may claim that these Kadmeians were still in Thessaly when the Dorians moved in Hestiaeotis again, after having been expelled thence. So perhaps a number of these Kadmeians joined in the southward expedition of the Dorians that resulted in Crete. Subsequently, when the Mycenaean refugees from the Argolid reached Crete, only to spark off the great sea voyage to Cyprus, not only the Dorians but also the Kadmeians who were among them, are very likely to have followed them.

III. THE ROUTE TO THE LEVANT

The Mycenaean refugees from the Argolid might well have stopped at Naxos, before coming to Crete. Or, as one could reasonably argue, the Mycenaean of Naxos formed another wave of immigrants to Cyprus. In any case, the Naxian version of Myc. IIIC1 pottery appears to have strong stylistic ties with the early Philistine pottery, which in turn, is a development of the Argolic version of Myc. IIIC1 ceramics³⁷. It looks as if both the Naxian and the Argolic ceramic traditions intermingled with the native Cypriot pottery, thus producing the Cypriot Myc. IIIC1 pottery which was copied by the Philistines. It is safe to say that if anything, it must have been the drought described by Greek historians that caused migration from Naxos³⁸. It is also likely that the Mycenaean-Dorian refugee movement from Crete stopped at certain islands in the Dodecanese, where tradition speaks of Dorian presence and rule³⁹. We learn in the Iliad that Rhodes had passed under the rule of Tlepolemos, a son of Herakles, even before the Trojan War, and that Nisyros, Kos, Kasos, Karpathos and the Kalydnai were under the rule of Pheidippos and Dutiphos the two sons of Thessalos, the son of Hercules. Perhaps part of the Dorian population of these islands joined in the refugees from Crete, or even migrated as well, only to end up in Cyprus, not far off from Rhodes. An echo of Dorian presence in Cyprus at the time of the Sea-Raids is perhaps to be seen in the traditions about Gergithes in this island, said to be of Thessalian origin (and Thessaly was virtually the homeland of the Dorians) and to have been brought to Cyprus by Teukros⁴⁰, the renowned Achean hero who fought at Troy and who was said to have colonized Salamis in Cyprus. Now, if these Gergithes are the O.T. Girgashites who were sons of Canaan⁴¹, we discern a relationship between these Girgashites (the Thessalian/Dorian Gergithes) and the Philistines, both the latter and the Girgashites being Canaanite tribes, at least geographically⁴².

37. See H. Calting «Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age». CAH II³, 2, 208; cf. A. Furumark, «The Mycenaean IIIC pottery and its Relation to Cypriote Fabrics», *Op. Arch*, 3 (1944), 194 ff.

38. Diodorus, V, 50; cf. also Herod., I, 7 and 94 for drought in Lydia, Diodorus V, 53 for famine due to drought in Syme, and Apollodorus I, 9.16 connecting this drought with the voyage of the Argo.

39. So Homer, Iliad, II, 653-670, for Dorian rule in Rhodes, and Iliad II, 676-680 for Nisyros, Kos, Kasos, Karpathos, Kalydnai.

40. Athenaios, VI, 255, quoting Klearchos of Soloi.

41. Genesis, 10, 15-20.

42. See Burn, A.R., «Minoans, Philistines, and Greeks.» 1930, p. 156, making this suggestion and also maintaining that these Gergithes might also be identified with the New Testament Gergesenes («Varia Lectio in St. Luke» VIII, 26).

One feels inclined to blame the Dorians rather than the Mycenaeans for the destruction and warfare in Cyprus of c. 1200, the latter having had friendly links with the Cypriots as attested to by the evidence for trade in the 14th and 13th centuries. So it may very well have been these Dorians who, restless, stiff-necked and adventurous, as they were, crossed over to Palestine, perhaps along with a small number of Mycenaeans, and joined forces with the rest of the Sea-tribes who, in the beginning, were only «bands scattered in war» as the Ramessid scribe puts it, and then formed a league in Amurru (Syria) in view of the major attack against Egypt. Thus, the Dorian «Pamphyloï» kept up the tradition which they had initiated in the Aegean; wanderers and addicted to warfare as they were, they helped establish what later generations consider to be the bad reputation of a typically savage tribe: the Philistines. And the rendering of the name of the Philistines by the word «Hellen» (=Greek) in Isa. ix. 11 of the Septuagint (English ix. 12), if coupled with the additional identification of the Dorians with «Hellenes» (=Greeks) by Herodotus in I, 56, may very well tell its own story.

Stephanos Vogazianos, Athens

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Καταβλήθηκε προσπάθεια να διευκρινιστούν οι σχέσεις μεταξύ των Φιλισταιών της Παλαιάς Διαθήκης (πλστ ή πρστ των Ραμεσσιδικών επιγραφών της Αιγύπτου) και των κατοίκων του Αιγαίου κατά τη διάρκεια της κοινωνικής και πολιτικής αναταραχής του 13ου π.Χ. αιώνα, με ειδική αναφορά στους Δωριείς στους οποίους αποδίδεται η καταστροφή του Μυκηναϊκού πολιτισμού. Εκ πρώτης όψεως φαίνεται κάποια σχέση των Φιλισταιών με τους Δωριείς της ελληνικής παράδοσης, και μάλιστα η σχέση αυτή παρουσιάζεται ισχυρότερη από αυτή που συνδέει τους Φιλισταιούς με τους Μινωίτες ή τους Μυκηναίους. Αν οι Φιλισταιοί ήσαν Μινωίτες, ασφαλώς οι Αιγύπτιοι θα τους παρουσίαζαν ως τέτοιους, επειδή τους γνώριζαν καλά από προηγούμενους αιώνες, αφού τους ζωγράφιζαν στους τάφους τους και μάλιστα θα τους ονόμαζαν Κέφτιου. Αντ' αυτού χρησιμοποιούν άλλο όνομα και τους παριστάνουν με εντελώς διαφορετικό τρόπο από ότι στις τοιχογραφίες τάφων του 16ου και 15ου αιώνα.

Από το δεύτερο μισό του 15ου αιώνα έχουμε στην Κνωσό εγκατεστημένους Μυκηναίους, άρα θα μπορούσαν και αυτοί να θεωρηθούν Μινωίτες για τους Αιγυπτίους και πράγματι υπάρχουν αρκετά δεδομένα που υποστηρίζουν ότι οι Φιλισταιοί ήσαν Μυκηναίοι που ζούσαν στην Κρήτη. Το γεγονός όμως ότι η Παλαιά Διαθήκη δε χρησιμοποιεί το όνομα Ιαβάν (όρος που χρησιμοποιείται για τους Έλληνες), αλλά το όνομα Φιλισταιοί, δείχνει σαφώς ότι δεν τους θεωρούσαν Μυκηναίους, γ' αυτό και διερευνάται η πιθανότητα οι Δωριείς να ήσαν τελικά οι Φιλισταιοί.

Ο Όμηρος στην Οδύσσεια, XIX στιχ. 172-9, αναφέρει και τους Δωριείς ως μια από τις φυλές που ζούσαν στην Κρήτη την εποχή του Τρωϊκού πολέμου. Κατά την εποχή των μετακινήσεων των διάφορων λαών, οι Μυκηναίοι θα έφυγαν από την Κρήτη για την Κύπρο και ήταν φυσικό να τους ακολουθήσαν και Δωριείς, αφού ζούσαν στο ίδιο νησί. Οι Δωριείς στην Κρήτη ήσαν χωρισμένοι στις τρεις γνωστές φυλές τους, δηλ. Υλλείς, Δυμάνες και Πάμφυλοι. Φιλισταιοί και Πάμφυλοι μοιάζουν ως λέξεις και ίσως να προέρχονται από την ίδια ρίζα, τη ρίζα «φυλή». Εξάλλου ο Στράβων μας πληροφορεί ότι οι Καδμείοι (Φοίνικες;) επέστρεψαν στην πατρίδα τους μετά τον Τρωϊκό πόλεμο κι εμείς γνωρίζουμε ότι οι Καδμείοι (Hrod. V, 61) μετά την καταστροφή των Θηβών από τους 7 Μυκηναίους αρχηγούς πήγαν στην περιοχή των Ηρακλειδών για να γλυτώσουν, επομένως και θα τους

ακολούθησαν εντασσόμενοι στους Παμφύλους που και η ονομασία τους δηλώνει την ύπαρξη διάφορων φυλών. Κατέφυγαν αρχικά στην Κρήτη, αλλά λίγο αργότερα οι Δωριείς με τους Καδμείους ακολούθησαν τους Μυκηναίους στην Κύπρο. Οι καταστροφές που προκλήθηκαν στο νησί θα οφείλονταν μάλλον στους Δωριείς παρά στους Μυκηναίους που γνώριζαν τους Κύπριους από τις εμπορικές συναλλαγές τους. Όντας στην Κύπρο οι Δωριείς δε θα δυσκολεύτηκαν να περάσουν μαζί με λίγους Μυκηναίους στην Παλαιστίνη, όπου ενόθησαν με «μικρές πολεμικές συμμορίες», όπως τις αποκαλούν οι Αιγύπτιοι, για να κάμουν ένα μεγάλο συνασπισμό στην Αμούρρου (Συρία), ώστε να επιτεθούν εναντίον της Αιγύπτου από το Φαράω της οποίας με δυσκολία αποκρούστηκαν.