

words of St. Paul had reference, but to its pleasurable side also; and that, with a mind fully made up, he proclaims the result of his deliberate estimate, and leaves it on record, that the world can neither inflict pains nor hold out attractions which should compare in the Christian's mind with the hope for which he yearns.

J. RAWSON LUMBY.

DAN AND DAN-LAISH.

WHEN Abraham and his little army pursued Chedorlaomer, they overtook him at Dan (Gen. xiv. 14), and when Moses from the top of Pisgah took his survey of the promised land, he is said to have seen "all the land of Gilead *unto Dan*" (Deut. xxxiv. 1).

Again, we learn that after the division of the land, the children of Dan found their portion too small for them, and sent forth a party of armed men, who took the city of Laish, and called it Dan after the name of their father (Jos. xix. 47; Jud. xviii: 27-31).

From these facts it has been argued that Genesis and Deuteronomy must, in their present shape at least, be of later origin than the occupation of Canaan by the Israelites; or, that Laish and not Dan must have originally stood in the passages quoted from these two books; and that Dan was substituted by some later hand.

In the first place, it seems very unlikely that any later hand should have substituted Dan for Laish in Genesis xiv. Several other places are there mentioned by their ancient names, and in these cases the more modern name is attached to the ancient one. Thus we have "*Bela*, which is Zoar;" "the vale of *Siddim*, which is the salt sea;" "*En-mishpat*, which is Kadesh." Why, if Laish was in the original document, did the corrector not write, as in the other instances, "Laish, which is Dan"? Of course this argument does not apply to the occurrence of Dan in Deuteronomy.

But, secondly, it is plain that any objection to the occurrence of Dan, either in Genesis or Deuteronomy, would be removed if it could be shewn that there were two places called by that name. Nor is this suggestion to be regarded as a makeshift to get rid of the pressure of an inconveniently strong argument. Instances can be given, by the score, of names which belonged to two or more cities in Palestine; indeed we had almost said that it was more common for a given name to belong to two places, than to be the exclusive property of one. And there *are* two Dans mentioned in Scripture. When David sent out Joab to number the people of Israel from Dan even to Beersheba, we are told that he came "to Gilead, and to the land of Tahtim-hodshi; and they came to Dan-jaan, and about to Zidon, and came to the stronghold of Tyre" (2 Sam. xxiv. 6, 7). What town was this, which is called Dan-jaan to distinguish it from some other Dan; and that even although the Dan, which is commonly coupled with Beersheba, is mentioned a few verses before? All we know of it is that Joab came to it after he had passed through Gilead. If then Dan-jaan were situated in the northern border of Gilead, it would very well agree with Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1: "And the Lord shewed him all the land of Gilead unto Dan." It would also very well suit with the mention of Dan in the history of Abraham; for Dan at the head of the Jordan (Tel-el-Kadi) did not lie on any of the great roads from the Jordan to Damascus, while Dan-jaan, on the border of Gilead, might well lie either on the road which crossed the Jordan below the sea of Galilee, and passed by Fik and Nowah; or on the other road which crossed above the sea at "Jacob's bridge." This solution, which is in the main that given by Hengstenberg, is sufficient to set aside the hypothesis that the passages in Genesis and Deuteronomy in which Dan occurs were the work of a later hand: for if it cannot be proved that Dan-laish and Dan-jaan are the same, then it follows that it cannot be proved that the Dan of the days of Abraham was the same city as that which derived its name from the Danites.

The weak point of this hypothesis, however, is the assumption that Dan-laish is identical with the Dan which was situated close to the source of the Jordan. No doubt this is the commonly received opinion, but there are circumstances which render it extremely improbable that this should be the case.

Let us examine the geographical position of Dan. There are

two principal sources of the Jordan, about four miles distant from each other. The most easterly is at the modern Baniyas, the ancient Paneas, or Cæsarea Philippi, and possibly the Hebrew Baalgad. The westerly source of the river is at Tel-el-Kadi, the "hill of the judge," or, "of Dan." The former of these two places, Panias, was for a long time identified with Dan-laish. Even the Jerusalem Targum calls the Dan mentioned in Abraham's days, "Dan of Cæsarea"; and this also was the only Dan with which Jerome was acquainted. When therefore it was found that Josephus spoke of "Dan, for so," says he "the other source of the Jordan is called," it was supposed that he spoke of a second Dan, different from that one which had been identified with Panias. Josephus however knows of only one Dan. When he relates the adventure of Abraham, he speaks of it as the other source of the Jordan in the language just cited. When he relates the expedition of the Danites, he describes Laish as a day's journey from the great plain of Sidon, not far from Lebanon and the head of the lesser Jordan. And in his account of the idolatry of the calf he describes Dan in the same terms, as at the head of the lesser Jordan. It is plain, then, that if there was in point of fact more than one Dan, Josephus has confounded them. The same is true also of Jerome. No great stress however can be laid on this. They knew of one Dan, and not unnaturally referred to it all Scripture notices in which its name was mentioned.

The question now assumes this form: As it is quite certain that there was a Dan at Tel-el-Kadi (in which name the original Dan seems to be preserved), at the head of the lesser Jordan, we have to ask, does this place agree with the notices we have of Laish, afterwards called Dan? We submit that it does not.

For, in the first place, immediately after the narrative of the taking of Laish by the Danites (Jud. xviii.), there follows the story of the Levite and his concubine, in the course of which it is said (Jud. xx. 1), that the children of Israel were "gathered together as one man from *Dan* even to Beersheba." Is it likely that so soon after the Danite expedition, Dan-laish could have come to be recognized as the northern boundary of Israel? It is true that we are left altogether to conjecture as to the relative dates of these two events; but critics are generally agreed that the two occurrences took place much about the same time.

In the second place, the springs of Jordan, and therefore Dan

at Tel-el-Kadi, were within the bounds of the territory of the tribe of Naphtali, and could not well have been seized and appropriated by the Danites. At least, if the city thus violently taken possession of had belonged to Naphtali, we should have expected some notice of the fact. The 19th chapter of Joshua, though the account of the boundaries is somewhat obscure, owing to our ignorance of the geography of Northern Palestine, makes it very clear that the territory of Naphtali extended to the Jordan. And when, in the reign of Baasha, Benhadad sent his captains against Israel, Ijon, and Dan, and Abel-maim are mentioned among the store cities of Naphtali which they smote (1 Kings xv. 20; 2 Chron. xvi. 4).

Thirdly, let us examine what data we have for the determination of the geographical position of Laish or Leshem. It was "far from Zidon;" and "in the valley that lieth by Beth-rehob" (Jud. xviii. 28). Tel-el-Kadi, according to Josephus, is not more than a day's journey from Tyre. Unfortunately, Beth-rehob has not yet been identified. In some maps the name Rehob may be found assigned to a place nearly due north of Dan, and on the south bank of the Litany. This site, however, is purely conjectural; and if it were the true one, Rehob and Dan would not be in the same valley, as the text just quoted appears to imply. Something more, however, may be learned from Scripture concerning it. In the reign of David, the Ammonites hired "the Syrians of Beth-rehob, and the Syrians of Zoba," with men of Maacah and Ishtob, to assist them against Israel (2 Sam. x. 6). When they put the battle in array, "the Syrians of Zoba, and of *Rehob*, and Ishtob and Maacah, were by themselves in the field" (ver. 8). Hence it is plain that Beth-rehob was one of those small Syrian kingdoms of which Damascus was the chief, and that it was sometimes called by the name of Rehob. Now there were within the territory of the tribe of Asher two cities of the name of Rehob, neither of which, however, can be the Beth-rehob of which we are in search; for a Syrian kingdom could not in the reign of David have been within the borders of Israel's land, and, besides, they must have been near Zidon, whereas Laish was far from it. For the same reason we may safely conclude that Beth-rehob could not have been the modern Hunin, with which Robinson has identified it. For Hunin is south-west of Tel-el-Kadi, and at no great distance from Zidon.

But there is another notice of Rehob, which throws further light on its situation. When the spies went up to search the land of

Canaan, they began at the wilderness of Zin on the south, and continued till they arrived at "Rehob, as men come to Hamath," which was the northern terminus of their labours (Num. xiii. 21). The words in the original (*leboa Hamath*), are the same which in other places are rendered "the entering into Hamath," and are frequently used to designate the northern limit of the promised land in Israel's most prosperous days. Here another geographical question opens, for there is *not* a settled agreement as to where this "entering into Hamath" was. Even the articles in Dr. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible are not altogether consistent on the matter. The great valley which lies between Libanus and Anti-libanus, and is watered by the Litany or ancient Leontes,—the Cœlo-syria of ancient times, now called *el Buka'a*,—extends from the mouth of the river near Tyre to the neighbourhood of Baalbek, or Heliopolis. Above Baalbek is the water-shed which separates the valley of the Leontes from that of the Orontes, or modern Asy. The sources of the two rivers are not more than 15 miles apart. The valley beyond Baalbek still preserves the same north-eastern course to Emesa, the modern Hems; and thence in a more northerly direction to Hamath, or Epiphania. The distance from Dan on the Jordan to Baalbek is about sixty miles, from Baalbek to Hems seventy miles, and from Hems to Hamath thirty miles. Those who support the opinion that this Dan was Laish, and near Rehob, make the "entering into Hamath," to lie in the lower portion of the valley, *160 miles from Hamath*. This is surely very improbable. But it may be positively disproved. Among the dozen passages in which "the entrance into Hamath," is mentioned, there are two or three which throw light on its geographical position. Among the nations which God left to prove Israel at their settlement in Caanan were "the Sidonians, and the Hivites that dwell in Mount Lebanon, from Mount Baal-hermon unto the entering in of Hamath" (Jud. iii. 3). Now Mount Baal-hermon was the southern extremity of Anti-libanus, and the entering in of Hamath must therefore have been a considerable distance to the north, in order to include the territory of the Hivites. Again, among the parts of Canaan that still remained to be possessed at the end of Joshua's life were "the land of the Giblites" (*i.e.*, Gebal, the ancient Byblos, now Jebeil, on the coast, and more to the north than Baalbek), "and all Lebanon towards the sunrising, from Baal-gad under Mount Hermon unto the entering into

Hamath" (Jos. xiii. 5). The phrase used here is evidently intended to be equivalent to that employed in Judges; Baal-gad, if not Pnias (*i.e.*, Cæsarea Philippi), as some have supposed, must have been in its immediate neighbourhood; and the entrance to Hamath must, to include all eastern Lebanon, have been farther to the north than Baalbek. The western boundary of Canaan is thus described by Ezekiel. "The west side shall be the great sea, from the border *till a man come over against Hamath*" (*ghad nokach leboa Hamath*, Ezek. xlvii. 20). To illustrate this phrase of the prophet it is only necessary to observe that at the northern extremity of the range of Libanus, there is a low-lying plain, some ten miles across, lying between Lebanon and the next mountain range, called Jebel-el-Anzeyry, which also runs parallel with the coast. This gap or depression, called El-Junie, opens into a plain called El-Budkeia, watered by the Nahr Abrosh, the ancient Elentherus; and this level country stretches, not only across Libanus, but across Anti-libanus also. Thus it necessarily happens that not only the access to Hamath from the sea is through this depression, but also that the great road from Palmyra and other places toward the east finds its way into the valley of the Orontes through this gap. This then, surely, is the entering in to Hamath, and it is so marked in the map attached to Wilson's "Lands of the Bible." Hems, the ancient Emesa, is situated exactly on this plain, and the city of Hamath is about thirty miles to the north; but the territory belonging to it extended far to the south of the city; in all probability as far at least as this "entering in to Hamath."

There is not much evidence to assist us in ascertaining the geographical position of the small Syrian kingdoms of which Rehob or Beth-rehob was one. They were Aram-damasek, Aram-zobah, Aram-hamath, Aram-maachah, Aram-rehob, and Ishtob. Damascus is of course well known; Maachah, which was a small territory, must have lain between Bashan and Damascus; Zobah, again, must have been to the north of Damascus, between that city and Hamath, and adjoining the territory of the latter. Hamath, as we know, was on the Orontes, and, after David's victories, appears in the time of Solomon to have been united to Zobah (2 Chron. viii. 3, 4). Ishtob or Tob probably lay to the east of Maachah. In all probability, Rehob lay south of Hamath, for there only can room be found for it. Perhaps the chief city, Beth-rehob, was on the site of Emesa, or Hems. If then Laish lay at the foot of the

eastern slope of Lebanon, somewhere not far from the source of the Orontes, the situation would answer all the necessary conditions. It is far from Zidon; it is "in the valley that lieth by Beth-rehob," "as men come to Hamath." Furthermore, the phrase "far from Zidon" seems to imply that Laish was a Zidonian town, which might expect help from the parent city, and it is well to observe that, according to Joshua xiii. 6, all the hill country, that is, all Lebanon, belonged to the Zidonians.

The result, if the argument in the preceding pages is well-founded, (and at the least it will be allowed to be probable), is that Dan at the source of the Jordan was a very ancient city, probably also a sanctuary and a seat of judgment, whence it derived the name by which it was known, long before the patriarch received, in Mesopotamia, the same name, which he transmitted to one of the tribes of Israel. To this place the confederate kings repaired after their victory at Sodom, and there Abraham surprised them, and rescued Lot. It was this Dan also that bounded Moses' views from Pisgah of the promised land. And, indeed, the phrase, "from Dan to Beersheba," became the current one for expressing the whole extent of the land of Israel.

But when the men of the tribe of Dan found the limits of their territory too contracted, and set forth in quest of a habitation, they did not appropriate a city belonging to the territory of Naphtali; but, passing beyond the boundaries of that tribe, yet not beyond the limits of the land given to them by God, as laid down in the days of Joshua, they travelled for one hundred miles or more up the great valley of Lebanon; and there finding the Syrian city of Laish, took violent possession of it. We do not know that it is ever again mentioned in history.

With respect to Dan-jaan, it is impossible to come to any certain conclusion. It may have been the same as Dan-laish; for, before the numbering of the people, David had subdued the Syrian kingdoms of Zobah and Rehob. If so, there may be some affinity between the name Dan-jaan and Baal-jaan, a Phenician divinity, whose name, according to Furst, occurs on coins. Or, this town may be the same as Dan on the Jordan, which Joab visited on his way from Gilead to Tyre.

There is one other Scripture passage which ought to be referred to. We read of Hiram, the worker in brass whom Solomon employed in building the temple, that he was a widow's son

of the tribe of Naphtali, and that his father was a man of Tyre (1 Kings vii. 14) ; and, again, that his mother was of the daughters of Dan (2 Chron. ii. 14). This statement has been explained as illustrating the mingling of races likely to be found in Dan on the Jordan, *on the supposition that it was Dan-laish*. It was a city of Naphtali, originally inhabited by Tyrians, who were driven out by the men of Dan. But as there is no mention made of any locality, the description would be equally applicable to Dan-laish, if situated, as it is the object of this paper to shew, "as men go to Hamath." No doubt it is not within the bounds of the tribe of Naphtali; but a mixed population of Tyrians and Danites would certainly be found there; and if the Israelites dwelling in that city desired to intermarry with their own people, the daughters of Naphtali were their nearest neighbours.

WALTER WOOD.
