

DOR*

F. Luciana, Milan

The plain south of Carmel is distinguishable, by its particular structure, from any other region of Palestine.

Bound on the north and east by Carmel, on the west by the Mediterranean, there stretches across it lengthwise a narrow ridge of calcareous sandstone called *kurkar* to a maximum height of 32 m., dividing it into two parts: the eastern with the hills of Samaria and the western bathed by the Mediterranean.

The whole region is crossed from east to west by various perennial water courses that flow into the Mediterranean: Naḥal Oren, Naḥal Me'arot, Naḥal Daliya and Nahr ez-Zerka, called by the Israelis Naḥal Tanninim, the biblical Shihor Libnath (*Josh.* 19:26), which we can consider approximately the southern boundary of the region being studied.¹

The eastern part is formed by accumulations of *kurkar* of alluvial origin in which, since early times, openings have been made to regulate the flow of the streams. The western coastal region is formed by ridges of *kurkar*, originally dunes,

* In the course of this work, besides abbreviations commonly used, a list of which appears at the end of this periodical, we have used the following that we enumerate in alphabetical order: AJ = *Atlas Jisrael*, Jerusalem 1955; FHG = C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, Paris 1874ff.; FGH = F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, Berlin 1923ff.; Gauthier = H. Gauthier, *Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques*, Cairo 1925ff.; Kl. Schr. = A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2 vols., Munich 1959; Simons = J. Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*, Leiden 1959.

¹ Simons §332. For the geological structure of the region, cf. Y. Ben-Arieh, Y. Nashiv, S. Reichman, "Geographical Survey of the Southern Carmel Coast," *Yediot* 25, 1962, 3-14; D. Safra, "The Abrasion Platform of the Southern Carmel Coast," *ibid.*, 15-30; Z. Ron, "The Morphographic Configuration of the Southern Carmel Coast," *ibid.*, 41-47; also AB, 23-24; AJ 1/III (stratigraphy)..

corroded by sea water, that have shaped inlets of various width. From the same origin are the ancient ports of Atlit and Tanṭurah. The first of these localities may correspond to Kartah of the O. T. (*Josh.* 21:34) but the identification is somewhat debated.² The second is biblical Dor.

The climate of the region, influenced by the proximity of Carmel to the sea, has a median temperature of 19° with a differential of 8°-10° between the maximum and minimum. The winds are strong. The annual precipitation reaches about 500-550 mm.³

The terrain, formed by the kurkar and the black soil brought down by the streams, became proverbial in antiquity for its fertility (*Isa.* 35:2; *SofS.* 2:1).⁴ Yet further south were swamps, in ancient times infested with crocodiles--hence the name "river of crocodiles" given to Nahr ez-Zerka by some classical author.⁵

In recent years Israeli settlement has transformed the economy of the whole region, restoring the unproductive ground to agriculture by means of draining almost all the swamps and a practical system of irrigation, exploiting to the maximum the resources of the earth. To the traditional cultivating of vine and olive have been added the planting of bananas, citrus fruits, vineyards. Important is the breeding of fish in fishponds. To meet the needs of the intensive agriculture, rural settlements, scattered on the cultivated land, have increased and new centers

² The excavations conducted by C. N. Johns in 1930-1931 disclosed ceramics from the end of Middle Bronze and Phoenician tombs of the 1st millenium B. C. Cf. C. N. Johns, "Excavations at Atlit (1930-31), Southeastern Cemetery," *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 2, 1932, 41ff. On the identification cf. AB, 21; Simons §337, 338.

³ Y. Ben-Arieh, Y. Nashiv, S. Reichman, art. cit., 8-10; AJ 1/IV (temperature); 2/IV (rainfall).

⁴ Cf. the inscription of Eshmunazar cited further on. AJ 1/II; on the matter of the plain of Sharon, see further on.

⁵ Pliny, *NH* V, 75, "There was (in Phoenicia) a city of crocodiles; now it is a river."

have emerged.⁶ The Arab population lives in the two ancient localities already mentioned, Atlit and Tanṭurah.

The identification of Tanṭurah with Dor of the O. T., going back to an ancient tradition, has been confirmed by the excavations conducted in 1924 by the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem under the direction of J. Garstang on the tell called el-Burğ situated north of the present-day locality.⁷

The city is situated on the sea in an inlet protected from western winds by some small islands and bound on the north by a promontory, north of which was ancient Dor, it too on the sea (*Josh. 11:2; 1 Macc. 15:11, 14*) near Carmel (*Fl. Josephus, Against Apion II, 116*), 13 km. from Caesarea.⁸

The coastal road that connected Caesarea with Acre passed through it as well as Atlit.⁹ Its port was protected by two small promontories, rocky bluffs pushing into the sea, now partially destroyed. Because of its position it was always the chief town in the region.

We are poorly informed regarding its history due to meager documentation. The Greek writers called it city of Phoenicia.¹⁰ Claudio Iolao¹¹ relates its founding to the work of Phoenicians who settled there because the site was particularly adapted to the making of purple. Its settlement probably goes back to the 14th century B. C., according to data from Garstang's excavations.

⁶ Y. Ben-Arieh, Y. Nashiv, S. Reichman, "Land Utilization in the Southern Carmel Plain," *Yediot* 25, 1962, 48-70; *AJ* 2/VI (flora), 3/VIII (fauna).

⁷ *RB* 33, 1924, 422-423; 35, 1926, 157 and *DBS* II, Paris 1934, 445-446.

⁸ S. Girolamo, *PL* 23, 937: ". . . Dora, 9 miles from Caesarea of Palestine which is direct to Tyre"

⁹ A second road finished in 1936 in the eastern part of the region put Hadera, 7 km. southeast of Caesarea, in communication with Haifa; cf. Y. Ben Arieh, Y. Nashiv, S. Reichman, "Geographical Survey," 14.

¹⁰ Cf. *Ecateo* by Stefano di Bisanzio, *FGH* I, 17, n. 260 and *FGH* I, 1, 275; *Apollodoro* by Stefano di Bisanzio, *FGH* IIB, 1026, 19; *Fl. Josephus, Against Apion II, 116; ibid., Life, 31; Pliny, NH* V, 75; *Charax* by Stefano di Bisanzio, *FGH* IIA, 408, 29, calls it "city of Celosyria."

¹¹ By Stefano di Bisanzio, *FGH* IV, 363, n. 2.

Egyptian texts from the New Kingdom, which give ample evidence of expeditions of the Pharaohs into Syria-Palestine, do not mention it, not even the el-Amarna texts. It is mentioned for the first time in an account of a trip by Wen-Amon (11th century B. C.) at which time it was inhabited by the Tjeker, an ethnic group who were part of the coalition of Sea Peoples.

Cf. ANET, 25-29. The city is called *Dir*; Gauthier VI, 87; *ibid.*, 97 notes the form *Dr* which in the list of Kom Ombo (no. 176) follows the word *Tagr*: Gauthier advances the theory that the first name is a variant of Tjeker, the second a variant of *Dir*. In the O. T. we have two spellings: *Dō'r* (*Josh.* 17:11; *1 Kings* 4:11) and *Dôr* (*Josh.* 11:2; 12:23; *Judg.* 1:27; *1 Chron.* 7:29). In the Phoenician inscription of Eshmun^cazar the city is called *D'r*; in the Assyrian texts *Du'ru*.

According to A. Legendre, *DB* II, 2, Paris 1912, 1487, the name *Dôr* in Hebrew and Phoenician means "dwelling-place," as Arabic *dār*, very likely from the root *dwr*. This interpretation is contradicted by the form *Du'ru* of the Assyrian texts in which the *aleph* always appears, in Accadian never a mater lectionis, as in Arabic, but actually pronounced. Cf. W. von Soden, "Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik," *An. Or.* 33, Rome 1952, §23.6. This spelling, that is transcription of the place-name, proves that the *aleph* was pronounced. The inscription of Eshmun^cazar, two or three centuries later than the Assyrian texts, gives further confirmation; cf. J. Friedrich, "Phönizisch-punische Grammatik," *An. Or.* 32, Rome 1951, §13a, who cites the name of Dor as an example of the pronunciation of the *aleph*. Consequently in the O. T. the spelling *Dō'r* is original since the *aleph* is etymological as is normal in Hebrew; cf. P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*, Rome 1947, §7b. The form *Dôr* must have its origin in a late period when Hebrew was no longer spoken. Probably the mater lectionis *w* was substituted for the *aleph*, no longer pronounced, in the texts cited and the root *dwr* was seen in the name. The form *Dôr* ordinarily occurs in Jewish literature; cf. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, V, Berlin 1930, 1193-1194, s. v. *Dor*, where texts are cited that are not readily accessible to us.

Therefore the etymology of the name remains obscure. F. Hommel, *Ethnologie und Geographie des Alten Orients*, Munich 1926, 28 and n. 1, thinks the name Dor derived from *Do'or* and this from *Dogor* according to the evolution of *qoph* into *aleph*, still existing on the Palestinian coast, and connects it with the name of the Tjeker.

In that coalition they were closely bound with the Philistines and Dardanians whom Ramses III attacked and defeated in the 8th year of his reign.

"I slew the Denyen in their islands, while the Tjeker and the Philistines were made ashes," *ANET*, 262. G. A. Wainwright, "Caphtor-Cappodocia," *VT* 6, 1956, 199-210, *ibid.*, "Some Early Philistine History," *VT* 9, 1959, 73-84, espec. 74, thinks that these peoples came, not from Crete but, from Cilicia and accepts the identification of the Tjeker with the Homeric Trojans, previously acknowledged by Hommel, *l. c.* In *ANET*, 26, n. 6, this identification is accompanied by a question mark. On the Tjeker in Egyptian sources cf. Gauthier VI, 69-70.

After their defeat the Philistines settled on the central and southern coast of Palestine, the Tjeker in the region of Dor, probably as vassals of the Pharaohs with the task of defending the territory belonging to Egypt in which they lived.¹² It appears that the occupation was not limited just to the coast but also extended into the interior, especially on to the southern plains of Jezreel and Acre. It must not have been altogether peaceful; rather it must have brought about important changes in the region. The newcomers must have taken away power from the old ruling families and created new centers of political importance at the expense of others deprived of it. These changes are attested in the O. T. which, at the time of the formation of the Israelite nation, conceals the names of localities that appear on Egyptian monuments of preceding centuries and names localities never mentioned by them.¹³

This theory seems to be confirmed by the Egyptian onomasticon of Amenhotep which, after various cities in the south such as Ascalon, Gaza and Ashdod, names three peoples: Sardinians (*srdn*), Tjekers (*tkr*) and Philistines (*prst*). In all probability the cities are Palestinian strongholds held by the Egyptians, the people their allies.¹⁴

The prevailing political system in the region was the city-state. The Egyptians occupied individual localities immediately

¹² A. Alt, "Aegyptische Tempel in Palästina und die Landnahme der Philister," *Kl. Schr.* I, 216-230, espec. 228-230.

¹³ A. Alt, "Megiddo in Uebergang," *Kl. Schr.* I, 246-273, espec. 260, n. 2 and 3.

¹⁴ A. Alt, "Syrien und Palästina im Onomasticon des Amenope," *Kl. Schr.* I, 231-245, espec. 242-245.

or entrusted them to their allies, the ruling families, as the el-Amarna letters give evidence.¹⁵

The newcomers became part of the city-state system and would become most ardent defenders of it. Thus Dor, which must have been a port or storehouse controlled by the Pharaohs, was occupied by the Tjekers, at least nominally their vassals.¹⁶ In the time of Amenhotep it was no longer part of Egyptian territory proper but maintained relations with Egypt.¹⁷

When Egyptian power in Palestine declined, the Tjekers would be replaced, not only in fact but also in name, by the old rulers. Their contribution to the culture of the region must have been rather slight.

A. Alt, "Zur Geschichte von Beth-Sean," *Kl. Schr.* I, 246-255, espec. 254-255, calls attention, among archaeological evidence from the Beth-Shan cemetery, to death masks similar to Mycenaean ones; A. T. Olmstead, *History of Palestine and Syria*, New York 1931, 263, notes the well baked ceramics of metallic sound of which a characteristic form is the small pear-shaped amphora.

After the time of Amenhotep we again find Dor mentioned in the O. T.; however the Tjekers are never mentioned in it. Probably they were already absorbed into Canaanite civilization which flourished abundantly in the region for centuries.

However in *Deut.* 2:23 there is an allusion to other ethnic groups, besides the Philistines, coming from Caphtor; cf. Simons §194. Gauthier, 69-70, thinks they were absorbed by the Philistines.

The Israelite invasion of Palestine began a period of struggles that would be concluded only with the advent of the monarchy. The invaders, coming from the east, settled in the mountainous, less populated, more controllable region, source of serious agitations until the el-Amarna period.¹⁸

Different from the Sea Peoples, they aimed at subduing or eliminating the natives. Because of this the inhabitants of the

¹⁵ A. Alt, "Die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palästina," *Kl. Schr.* I, 89-125, espec. 98-99.

¹⁶ A. Alt, "Aegyptische Tempel . . .," *Kl. Schr.* I, 207 and n. 3.

¹⁷ A. Alt, "Syrien und Palästina . . .," *Kl. Schr.* I, 224-225.

¹⁸ A. Alt, "Die Landnahme . . .," *Kl. Schr.* I, 121-125.

inner plain and the coast, powerfully united (*Josh. 11:1-3*), withstood them effectively and, strong in their strategic positions, penetrated into the groupings of Israelite tribes, breaking up their solidarity.

Notwithstanding the results achieved (*Josh. 12:7-24*), the Israelites did not succeed in subjugating the coast and only in theory was it incorporated into the territories of the various tribes. Although one of the cities conquered by Joshua (*Josh. 12:23*) and assigned to Manasseh (*Josh. 17:11; 1 Chron. 7:29*), Dor remained outside its territory because ". . . Manasseh did not subdue . . . the inhabitants of Dor and its outlying villages . . . and dared the Canaanites to dwell in that land" (*Judg. 1:27*).

The dissension was resolved by the political genius of David who, overcoming the old tribal boundaries and the nationalistic aims of the Israelites, made tributaries of the coastal city-states and inserted them into the new civil structure he created. With this he becomes heir to Egyptian policy; the small tributary states that are part of his kingdom continue to develop an autonomous culture and economy.¹⁹

The O. T. does not mention Dor in the Davidic era, but surely it was already a part of the Israelite nation.²⁰ In the time of Solomon, his kingdom, like his father's, included the coastal city-states in the west, the Israelite tribes in the east, and the kingdom of Judah in the south (*1 Kings 4:7-19*).²¹ Dor was the chief town of the fourth administrative district (*1 Kings 4:11*) governed by a son-in-law of the king. Its southern boundary must have been Nahr ez-Zerka.

The district is called *Nāfôt Dôr* in *Josh. 11:2* (Vulg.: in regionibus D.); *Nāfat Dôr* in *1 Kings 4:11* (Vulg.: Nephath Dor). The Jerusalem Bible translates respectively "the hillsides of Dor" and "the whole region of Dor"; The Vaccari Bible "sulle coste di D." and "in tutta la regione di D." Gesenius-Buhl, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch*, Leipzig 1921, 151, s. v. *Dō'r*, translates the expression with "höhenzüge von Dor"; Dhorme, *La Sainte Bible* I, Paris 1950: "les ondulations de Dor" and in the note on *Josh. 11:2*, p. 661, observes that it pertains

¹⁹ A. Alt, "Das Grossreich Davids," *Kl. Schr. II*, 65-75, espec. 68-69.

²⁰ Cf. also the matter of the plain of Sharon.

²¹ A. Alt, "Israels Gaue unter Salomo," *Kl. Schr. II*, 76-89, espec. 88-89.

to the ridge of hills that hug the Mediterranean south of Carmel. The diversity of interpretation depends on the word *nāfâ* which, as Abel notes, *Géographie de la Palestine* II, Paris 1938, 59, n. 4, means "district" in modern Hebrew (cf. A. Eben-Shoshan, *Millôn Hadaš* II, Jerusalem 1955, 1021, s. v. *nāfâ* II), but originally had the sense of "elevation" because of the rocky cliff that hugs the sea or rather the Carmel's erosion south of Tanṭurah. He cites Dahl, *The Materials for the History of Dor*, who, on p. 21, discusses this etymology. We did not consult this work. However, the explanation is the same as Gesenius-Buhl, loc. cit., that connects *nāfâ* to the root *nwf* (cf. p. 494) = "to be high" which is also in Arabic *nāfa*, form IV of which has the same sense; cf. G. W. Freytag, *Lexicon arabico-latinum*, Halis Saxonum 1837, 638; A. De Biberstein Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire arabe-français* II, Paris 1960, 1638. The etymological interpretation of all these authors agrees with the region's physical aspect. Opposing them is Simons, §510, 29, who accepts the etymology but considers the geographical point of view inexplicable. His statement does not seem at all convincing. If we keep in mind the physical structure of the region, its "rolling nature," as Dhorme happily says, it is due to the *kurkar*. Yet without wanting to assume an arbitrary position, we think that Abel's explanation is still the best.

Concerning the southern boundary of the region, cf. Simons, §874, 11.

With Solomon the union between Israelites and Canaanites is complete and reaffirmed, which does not mean the latter's absorption into the organization of the former, since, to the contrary, history shows the powerful cultural and religious influence that the Canaanites exercises over Israel with a negative and quite disadvantageous outcome for Israelite moral and religious life. The coastal region never was really Hebraized but initially remained autonomous from a cultural point of view, then, very likely, also from, at least partially, a political point of view.

After Solomon's death (930) Dor belongs to the divided Northern Kingdom. We are not informed about it from sources that are silent for two centuries. We are only in a position to incorporate its history within that of Palestine which is known to us in broad strokes.

Perhaps the region experienced the uneasiness of the Egyptian invasion of Palestine in the time of Rehoboam (1 Kings 14:25f.; 2 Chron. 12:1-12) and Jeroboam. At least certainly the repeated attacks of the Aramaeans would have affected it. Yet even in

this period a strong Phoenician influence must have been exerted on it. However Dor remained in the political sphere of the kingdom of Israel whose events it shared.

A decisive turn was begun with the Assyrians who at various times went south and Dor, in its position, saw their troops pass by often directed against Palestine or Egypt.

Probably Adad-nirari III passed by there in his campaign in the 5th year of reign, in which Tyre, Sidon, Israel, Edom and Philistia were conquered and forced to pay taxes; cf. *ANET*, 282, but the brief account of the campaign does not name the localities.

In 734 Tiglath-pileser III began a great expedition into Syria, then proceeded south. A damaged fragment recently discovered gives a brief report of this.

Discovered by Mallowan at Nimrud during the 1950 excavations, published by Wiseman, *Iraq* 13, 1951, 21ff., and translated by A. Alt, "Tiglatpilesers III erster Feldzug nach Palästina," *Kl. Schr.* II 150-162, espec. 155-167. In lines 1-9 the Syrian campaign is recorded, in lines 10-13 a victory and tribute. Since in lines 14-19 an expedition to the south is mentioned and Gaza named, it is very likely that there is a reference to the war against Israel in the middle part. Known to us only from Alt's translation, the middle fragment reports:
". . . ¹⁰ like grass the camp filled with corpses
of their soldiers . . . ¹¹ . . . their property,
their oxen, their small animals, their donkeys . . .
¹² within his palace . . . ¹³ . . . their tribute (?)
was handed over. Their land . . . I" The
data is confirmed by a list of eponyms that mentions
the king's expedition; A. Alt, loc. cit., 155.

The Assyrian king, after having defeated the Israelite army, perhaps ally of the Philistines, in a locality near the coast, received the tribute of the king who almost certainly is Pekah. The incomplete phrase, "Their land . . . I . . .," may mean the conversion of Israelite territory into an Assyrian province; in this case it might be the territory of Dor. The fact seems corroborated by two Assyrian fragments in which are named the cities and regions paying taxes to Assyria, constituted by districts, the chief town of which, center for payment of taxes, shelters a governor and Assyrian garrison.

A. Alt, "Das System der assyrischen Provinzen," *Kl. Schr.* II, 188-205, espec. 199-201. In the creation of a new province, the Assyrians kept the existing territorial subdivisions, naming the chief town for them.

Among these districts is Dor, in Assyrian Du'ru, whose territory is increased: in fact to the south it reaches the biblical Yarkon, modern Nahr el-^cAwgā, and includes most of the 3rd Solomonic district with the cities of Hefer and Sokho.

Isaiah 8:23 refers to this with the expression "Way of the Sea". Cf. A. Alt, "Befreiungsnacht und Krönungstag," *Kl. Schr.* II, 206-225, espec. 210-211; Simons, §1233b, who advances the theory that Ashdod made up part of the province; A. Penna, *Isaia*, Turin-Rome 1958, 115.

Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine* II, 103-104, s. v. Du'ru, says that under Esarhaddon it became the headquarters for the province of Philistia, distinct from the province of Ashdod created in 711, and cites Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* II, nos. 589-590.

It may have survived the fall of Samaria and the fall of the kingdom of Israel. In fact it is named in 676 B. C. in a treaty between Esarhaddon and Ba^cal, king of Tyre, in which is mentioned a reward granted to the latter by the Assyrian king and various routes and port cities are named. Unfortunately the text has a lacuna where the word would tell us the character of this reward.

E. F. Weidner, "Der Vertrag Assarhaddons mit Ba^cal von Tyrus," *Afo* 8, 1932-1933, 29-34, espec. 33-34. "V. ¹⁸ These are the ports (and the) routes that Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, to Ba^cal, his servant . . . ¹⁹ as far as the city of Du'ru in the district of the land of the Philistines [all] . . . ²⁰ and among the cities of the territory of Assyria on the coast all . . . ²¹ the cities of Byblos, mount Lebanon, the cities of the mountain, all" Weidner fills the gap of V. 18 i (?) - ti (?) - di - nu - u^s - "has given" and thinks that the territories named in the document had been granted by the king.

According to Weidner it would be a matter of territorial concessions; however it seems absurd that Assyria conceded such a vast territory to the king of Tyre. Following Alt,²² we think that the localities mentioned may be open to commerce with Tyre. The fact that in the treaty no other localities between Acre

²² A. Alt, "Galiläische Probleme. 2. Die assyrische Provinz Megiddo und ihr spätestes Schicksal," *Kl. Schr.* II, 378.

and Philistia, except Dor, are named shows the importance of this headquarters and commercial trade center.²³

Again the documents of this period are silent about Dor.

Frequently the city must have seen the Assyrian armies on march against Egypt. We know that the same Ba^{ca}, in 670 after the capture of Memphis, lost all privileges, removed by Esarhaddon because Pharaoh Taharka was the favorite, and was besieged by Ashurbanipal to no purpose; then the Assyrians lent a hand against Egypt; S. Streck, VAB VII, 396f., E. Ebeling, RLA I, 327. With the decline of Assyrian power, Josiah attempted reconstruction of the Solomonic kingdom, but it is not likely that he took possession of Dor which always was alien to the Israelite world. Probably Pharaoh Nekho passed by on the *via maris* when he was confronted at Megiddo to no purpose by the unfortunate Josiah (2 Kings 23:29). Perhaps Dor, with other coastal cities, endured the action of the navy of Pharaoh Apries, the Hophra of the O. T. (Jer. 44:30), (cf. Bib. e Or. 4, 1962, 128-131) to which the fall of Jerusalem (586) put an end. Cf. also *Bijbels Woordenboek* I, Roermond en Maaseik, 1954, s. v. *Chophra*. The region was handed over to the rule of Nebuchadnezzar who kept the Assyrian administrative districts unchanged.

After a silence of at least two centuries, Dor was again named in the tomb inscription of Eshmunazar, king of Sidon, of the Persian period, in which are attested the administrative changes carried out by the new rulers in the Palestinian coastal region. In fact it says that Eshmunazar received Dor and Jaffa and agricultural land from the great king as a reward for the services rendered by him, very likely in the war against Greece.

CIS I, 9ff., 1.18ff., cited by M. Lidzbarski, *Kanaanäische Inschriften*, Giessen 1907, n. 7. The extract that interests us is the following:
 "18 And again the master of the king gave to us
 19 Dor and Jaffa, the splendid grain fields that are found in the plain of Sharon, according to the great deeds that I have accomplished, and he added it 20 to the territory of the country, in order that it might be the Sidonians forever."
 Some think this data pertains to the 5th cent.

²³ A. Alt, "Das System der assyrischen Provinzen," *Kl. Schr.* II, 199-201.

B. C., others to the 4th. Well-disposed to the lower date is A. Alt, "Das System der assyrischen Provinzen," *Kl. Schr.* 11, 200, *ibid.*, "Galilaische Probleme," 2. Die assyrische Provinz Megiddo," *Kl. Schr.* 11, 381-382.

Since the inscription mentions the plain of Sharon in relation to Dor, we shall touch briefly on the subject of the extent of this plain on which biblical texts do not give specific information: *Isa.* 33:9, 35:2, 65:10 puts it in relation to Carmel; *Josh.* 12:18 with Aphek but the passage is debated. Omitting the other texts of the O. T. that do not give more precise information, *Acts* 9:35 puts it in relation to Lydda. Divergent are scholars' interpretations. Some say it extended from Carmel to Jaffa, thus Lemaire, *AB*, 238 (however on p. 23 he places it between Carmel and Caesarea). Of the same opinion is A. Alt, "Das Gottesurteil auf dem Karmel," *Kl. Schr.* 11, 135-149, espec. 140, who says it is a plain south of Carmel. Others place it between Jaffa and Caesarea, thus Grollenberg, *Atlas of the Bible*, New York 1956, 162; A. Penna, *Isaia*, Turin-Rome 1958, noted at 33:9. The Eshmunazar inscription places Dor and Jaffa in the plain of Sharon, providing us with definite geographic data. However we can also ask ourselves if in the period before the exile the size of the plain was the same. If it was *1 Chron.* 27:29 would confirm that all of the coastal plain, and therefore even the region of Dor, was part of David's kingdom. The matter is open and does not permit deciding with certainty. Perhaps it will occupy us in the near future.

It is a matter of an innovation introduced for the first time by the Persians into the administrative system inherited from the Assyrians. Thanks to it Eshmunazar immediately ruled Persian territories, maybe even as fiefs, and Dor, like all the coastal cities, became a possession of the Phoenicians; on account of this the pseudo Skylax calls it a "Sidonian city".²⁴

The Palestinian coast, and with it our region, saw Alexander's army march past toward Egypt.

In the age of the Diadochi, Dor, called Dora by the Greeks, was incorporated into the maritime region called Paralia and from this period documentary evidence is more frequent. On

²⁴ *Geographi Graeci Minores* I, Paris 1855, 79, not directly known to us.

account of its location it had considerable importance in the wars between the Seleucids and Lagids. In 217, during the war between Ptolemy Philopator and Antiochus III, among the coastal cities only it withstood the latter who besieged it in vain (Polibio, *Hist.* V, 66). In 138/7 Diodotus, called Trypho, took refuge there and it was by land and sea by Antiochus VII Sidetes (1 Macc. 15:11-37; Fl. Josephus, *Ant.* XIII, 223-224, *Wars* I, 50). From 1 Macc. 15:25 we know that the city at that time was increased in size: outside the circle of the walls to the east, along the road, emerged a new suburb that served as the base of operations for Antiochus.

This is the meaning of the expression *עַל הַדְּוִיטָה* (1 Macc. 15:25), Abel explains, *RB* 55, 1948, 191-193, on the basis of 2 Kings 22:14 in which *ham-miṣnâ* "the second" indicates a new section of a city. On a coin minted under Trypho, Dor is called "sacred and inviolable".

During the war between Antiochus VIII Grypus and Antiochus IX Cyzicenus, a certain Zoilus took possession of Dor; he held it like a tyrant, resisting Alexander Jannaeus, but was vanquished by Ptolemy Lathyrus (*Ant.* XIII, 324-335). The city was then made part of the Jewish state. In 63 Pompey detached it from this and annexed it to the Roman province of Syria, at the same time proclaiming its autonomy which lasted through the Roman period (*Ant.* XIV, 76, *Wars* I, 156-157). Coins date the new era from this year.

In Fl. Josephus, *Ant.* XIV, 88, *Wars* I, 66, it is included among the cities that Gabinius, Syrian proconsul, restored in 56 B. C. for the loss suffered by the Jews; but the more recent critical editions read Adoreus instead of Dora.

Even under the reign of Herod the Great it preserved its autonomy and continued to be part of the Syria-Phoenician province together with other coastal cities. In A. D. 42, under Claudius, the inhabitants' hostility against the Jews exploded into a serious incident: some young persons carried a statue of the emperor into the synagogue. King Agrippa requested the intervention of the acting Publican Petronius who, in order to assure the Jews freedom of worship, intervened with a written order (*Ant.* XIX, 300-311). But those at Dora were always few, inasmuch as Jewish tradition considered it a border city, not really belonging to Jewish territory.

Talmûd Jeruṣalmî, Sebi'îṭ VI, 1 (M. Schwab, *Le Talmud de Jérusalem*, Paris 1960, II, 379). Other Jewish texts are cited in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, loc. cit., s. v. Dor.

Flavius Josephus tells us (*Life*, 31) that in 66 Cestius Gallus, Syrian legate, held some Jews hostage in Dora. Some coins of the time of Trajan and Hadrian call it "sacred, inviolable, autonomous, admiral's flagship (*ναυαρχίς*)," the last title makes us think of its maritime importance. But the city was by this time in decline and Pliny records it as such (*N. H. V*, 75). Two centuries later St. Jerome confirmed Pliny's words: "Dornapheth . . . this is Dora . . . now deserted" (*PL* 23, 937).

At this point a problem arises: either the city was later rebuilt or the words of the two authors cited are not to be taken literally. In fact, although we are not informed on the spread of Christianity in the region, we know that at the end of the 5th century it was the seat of a bishop, dependant on the metropolitan parish of Caesarea. This situation reflected the administrative one. In fact, in 399 Emperor Arcadius had divided Palestine into three regions, the first of which, called "Palestine I," had Caesarea as its capital.

The year in which we have the first information on the diocese of Dora is 484 or 485; the bishop was Fadus, nephew and namesake of the archbishop of Caesarea. In 528 Bishop Barachius assisted at the Jerusalem Council and signed the letter of Patriarch John to John of Constantinople. In 536 Bishop John participated in the Jerusalem Council.²⁵

Between 611 and 629 Palestine underwent serious damage from the invasion and occupation by Chosroes; it was reconquered by the Byzantines who would hold it for a brief time since shortly the Arab invasion put an end to their rule. In 640 Caesarea was conquered by Mu^cawijjah. The Arabs kept the Byzantine administrative subdivisions so that Dora continued to be part of the province of Palestine (Philistia). The last historical information about the city is from 649, the year in which Bishop Stephen was invited to Rome by Sophron, the courageous bishop of Jerusalem who had handled the surrender of the holy city with Caliph Umar (638). Stephen's task was to reach an agreement with the Pope on the war against the monothelitic heresy. In Rome he attended a Lateran Council and was able to return to Palestine and make his report to Sophron.²⁶

After this period there is no information on the place. It was almost abandoned and became a heap of ruins called el-Burğ (= the fortress). The inhabited area moved farther south,

²⁵ R. Janin, *Dora in Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique* XIV, Paris 1960, 674; M. LeQuien, *Oriens Christianus* III, Graz 1958, 574-575.

²⁶ R. Janin, art. cit.; M. Le Quien, op. cit., 575.

became a poor village built with material taken from the tell of the earlier site which probably preserved the name, corrupted to Tanṭurah. Arab geographers, who give ample information on Palestine, never mention Tanṭurah.

As we see, the brief history sketched here is imperfect because of the numerous gaps in documentation. It is to be hoped that future excavations will provide archaeological materials and documents so as to illustrate thoroughly the history of the site and the region.

Translated by C. Faith Richardson

March 1980