

Shiloh between Shechem and Jerusalem

DETLEF JERICKE

In recent decades, studies of the history of Samaria often include the discussion of biblical place names.¹ They concern Mount Gerizim with the central sanctuary of the Samaritans in the second half of the first millennium BCE located above the old city of Shechem,² the role of Shechem itself,³ or the place of Beth-el-Luz.⁴ However, the place of Shiloh seems less prominent in relation to the history of Samaria and the Samaritans, perhaps because Shiloh is not mentioned in the Pentateuch.⁵ Nevertheless, this essay attempts to demonstrate that the biblical tradition concerning Shiloh shows some connection not only to the temple in Jerusalem but also to the Samaritan sanctuary on Mount Gerizim.⁶

1. The Biblical Traditions

1.1 *Joshua 24 and Jeremiah 41 (LXX 48)*

Especially the Septuagint (LXX) reveals connections between the place names of Shiloh, Shechem, and Jerusalem/Salem. Well known is the case of Josh 24.

¹ Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*; Nocquet, *La Samarie*.

² Jericke, “Garizim”; Hensel, “JHWH-Heiligtum”; Kartveit/Knoppers, “Qumran, Mount Gerizim”; Pummer, “Samaritan Studies.”

³ Nihan, “Torah between.”

⁴ Jericke, “Bet-El und Lus”; cf. also the essay of Schmid in this volume.

⁵ It is not clear whether the term שִׁילֹה in the phrase עַד כִּי־יִבֶא שִׁילֹה (Gen 49:10) means the place name Shiloh, because it is otherwise not written as שִׁילֹה. The LXX (τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῶ) and the rabbinic tradition presuppose the reading שֶׁל “what is to him.” Many commentators follow this interpretation (cf. the references given by Frolov, “Judah”). The *qere* of Gen 49:10 changes into שִׁילֹה, a common notation for Shiloh (cf. Judg 21:21; 1 Sam 1:24). Scholars who approve this reading postulate that the text reflects political circumstances in the time of David (tenth century BCE; cf. Schley, *Shiloh*, 161–163) or in the time of Josiah (seventh century BCE; cf. Frolov, “Judah”; Knittel, *Schilo*, 179–186), when, according to the biblical tradition, the area around Shiloh (the “hill country of Ephraim”) was under Judahite control. These assumptions are implausible.

⁶ This essay is a slightly revised version of the paper presented at the conference “Samaria and Diaspora in the Persian and Hellenistic Period” in Montpellier, December 6–8th 2018. I thank all participants of the conference for the inspiring and constructive discussion of the matter treated in the essay.

The Hebrew text places the event, the assembly of the Israelites under Joshua, at Shechem (Josh 24:1,25). In contrast, LXX writes Σηλω “Shiloh” instead of Shechem.⁷ The reason for the displacement is found, *prima facie*, in the book of Joshua itself. Joshua 18 mentions a first assembly of all Israelites at Shiloh, where the allotments of seven tribes were distributed by Joshua. For the LXX, the assembly of Josh 24 is the continuation of this first one reported in Josh 18.⁸ There is an ongoing discussion about which version preserves the supposed “original” text of Josh 24:1, 25.⁹ Irrespective of the solution of this problem, the case of Josh 24 demonstrates that in the Hellenistic and Roman periods the two place names of Shiloh and Shechem were interchangeable, at least to a certain degree.

A close connection between Shechem, Shiloh, and Jerusalem/Salem appears in the book of Jeremiah in chapter 41 (LXX 48). According to the MT, eighty men came from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria to bring offerings and incense to the “house of YHWH” (Jer 41:5). It probably means that they are on the way to the temple of Jerusalem or rather to the ruins of the temple allegedly destroyed by the Babylonians some years earlier (2 Kgs 25:9; Jer 52:13).¹⁰ At Mizpah,¹¹ ca. 12 km north of Jerusalem, a man named Ishmael, a member of the former royal dynasty, kills seventy of the eighty men (Jer 41:6–7)¹² after having murdered Gedaliah, the short-lived governor of Judah (v. 2). The Greek text of v. 5 replaces the Hebrew name Shiloh with the toponym Σαλεμ “Salem” (Jer 48:5 LXX). The “men from Shechem, from Shiloh, and from Samaria” become ἄνδρες ἀπὸ Συχεμ καὶ ἀπὸ Σαλεμ καὶ ἀπὸ Σαμαρείας.

⁷ Followed by Josephus in his re-telling of Josh 24 (*Ant.* 5.68–79), probably depending on the LXX version. Even the church fathers Jerome (*Epist.* 46.12.4; 108.13.2; cf. Hilberg, *Epistulae*, 1:344; idem, *Epistulae*, 2:322) and Augustine (*Quaest. Hept.* 6.30 ad Josh 24:25–27; cf. PL 34:791) write “Silo” instead of “Sychem” (so the version of the *Vetus Latina*).

⁸ On the other hand, the localization of the events at Shechem by the Hebrew text can be explained by the combination with the tradition of Joseph’s burial at the same place (Josh 24:32), a tradition which seems deeply grounded in the book of Genesis (Gen 33:19; 37:14; 48:22). Therefore, in the case of Josh 24:32, the LXX does not change the place name and writes ἐν Συκίμοις for Hebrew בשכם.

⁹ For a thorough discussion with reference to older publications, see now Mäkipelto, *Uncovering*, 51–56, 67–71.

¹⁰ What is meant by the term בית יהוה remains unclear because the scene is placed after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians and after the murder of Gedaliah, who resides as governor of Judah in the town of Mizpah (Jer 41:3 [48:3 LXX]). Most commentators think that the term designates the temple of Jerusalem (cf. Lundblom, *Jeremiah* 37–52, 118; Fischer, *Jeremia* 26–52, 385–386; Middlemas, *Troubles*, 122–133). Some scholars suppose that the center of the cult of YHWH after the destruction of Jerusalem was at Bethel (e. g., Knauf, “Bethel”; for a critical discussion, see Middlemas, *Troubles*, 130–144).

¹¹ Today *Tell en-Naşbeh* (1706.1436 Palestine Grid = 31.8853197° N, 35.2165379° E).

¹² The remaining ten are perhaps among the people trying to flee to Egypt after the expulsion of Ishmael to the land of Ammon (cf. Jer 41:17).

Salem is prominent as a place name in Gen 14:18, probably an alias for Jerusalem (cf. Ps 76:3).¹³ On the other hand, a village named Salem existed in the vicinity of Shechem since the Hellenistic period, which is mentioned in the book of Jubilees (30:1): “During the first year of the sixth week he [Jacob] went up safely to Salem, which is on the east side of Shechem.”¹⁴ The phrase is an interpretation of the passage in Gen 33:18 *ויבא יעקב שלם עיר שכם* “Jacob came safely to the city of Shechem.” While the Samaritan Pentateuch clarifies the Masoretic version by writing *שלום* instead of *שלם*, the tradition of the Jubilees was adopted by the LXX, which writes *καὶ ἦλθεν Ἰακωβ εἰς Σαλημ πόλιν σικιμων* “Jacob came to Salem, a city of the Shechemites.”¹⁵ The Salem of the Hellenistic-Roman times is located at the village of *Sālim*¹⁶ some five kilometers east of the site of biblical Shechem.¹⁷ The LXX text of Jer 41(48):5 changing the Hebrew Shiloh to the Greek Σαλημ probably means this village near Shechem, so that the men who come to Mizpah, all come from the core region of Samaria. Nevertheless, the name Salem is homonymously open to Jerusalem.

In this way, the Greek tradition of the Hellenistic period connects the place of Shiloh with the two centers of the contemporary Yahwistic cult. The link to Shechem is evident from Josh 24 and Jer 41(48). The association to Jerusalem is not so obvious, but rather indirect.

1.2 1 Samuel 1–4

The preceding observations provoke the question of whether the main traditions concerning Shiloh in the Old Testament show similar references to Shechem and/or to Jerusalem. The central text in this respect, 1 Sam 1–4, describes the birth and the first years of Samuel in the sanctuary of Shiloh.¹⁸ At the end, the local priests, the sons of Eli named Hophni and Phinehas, are punished severely, and they are replaced by Samuel. With regard to the concern of this essay, two

¹³ At least, Josephus in his re-narration of Gen 14 (Σολυμᾶ ὕστερον ἐκάλεσεν Ἱεροσόλυμα; *Ant.* 1.180), Targum Neofiti I, and Targum Pseudo-Jonatan (cf. Jericke, “Salem”) understand the Salem of Gen 14 in this way, followed by most modern commentators, cf. Jericke, *Ortsangaben*, 142–143.

¹⁴ VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 190.

¹⁵ For the problems of Gen 33:18, see now Nocquet, *La Samarie*, 62–63 and Nihan, “Abraham Traditions,” 274–275.

¹⁶ Coordinates 1814.1795 Palestine Grid = 32.2090032° N, 35.3311323° E; cf. Schmitt, *Siedlungen*, 306–308; Jericke, *Ortsangaben*, 142–143. One could inquire whether the Salem of the Hellenistic period located explicitly near Shechem is an attempt by the local people, the Samaritans, to move a prominent tradition from Jerusalem to the vicinity of Shechem. There are some traces of a Samaritan Melchizedek tradition in later times; cf. Hertzberg, “Melchizedek-Traditionen.” But the name Salem and the root *ŠLM* are very common. Therefore, a direct connection of the place name of the Hellenistic period to a certain biblical tradition is difficult to prove.

¹⁷ Today, *Tell Balaṭā* (1769.1798 Palestine Grid = 32.2117472° N, 35.2834043° E).

¹⁸ Naʿaman, “Birth Legend.”

aspects of 1 Sam 1–4 are of special interest: (1) the description of the sanctuary itself and (2) the role of the priests, especially the role of Phinehas. The literary observations should be correlated with relevant archaeological finds of the last decades, partly from the site of Shiloh itself, partly from the excavations at the top of Mount Gerizim.

2. The Sanctuary

The story of 1 Sam 1–4 describes Shiloh as an important, perhaps the most important central sanctuary for all tribes of Israel in the pre-monarchic period.¹⁹ There is a regular annual celebration with sacrifices and common meals. Every year people from the surrounding area come to this event (1 Sam 1:3, 7, 21, 24). The two main cultic paraphernalia of the wilderness wanderings, the ark (1 Sam 3:3) and the tent of meeting (1 Sam 2:22), are found at the sanctuary of Shiloh. Most commentators assume that the Shilonite sanctuary of 1 Sam 1–4 should be understood as a forerunner of the Solomonic temple of Jerusalem inasmuch as the ark and the tent of meeting are later transferred into that temple (1 Kgs 8:3–4).²⁰

The designation of the sanctuary of Shiloh itself is ambiguous. Three times it is called בית יהוה “the house of YHWH” (1 Sam 1:7, 24; 3:15) and twice היכל יהוה “the sanctuary of YHWH” (1 Sam 1:9; 3:3).²¹ Both terms indicate a temple building at Shiloh. The phrase בית יהוה normally designates the Jerusalem temple erected, according to the biblical tradition, under Solomon (e.g., 1 Kgs 3:1; 6:37; 7:12; cf. also above Jer 41:5).²² However, in some verses of the books of Exodus and Joshua, the term is used anachronistically (Exod 23:19; 34:26; Josh 6:24). The evidence in the first chapters of 1 Samuel could be understood along the lines of these anachronisms. The phrase היכל יהוה is the *terminus technicus* for

¹⁹ Jericke, “Schilo.”

²⁰ Some historical aspects were already recognized by Eißfeldt, “Silo.” More literary observations are given by Haran, “Shiloh”; he argues that the existence of a temple building at Shiloh is implausible, but the description of the building depends on the Jerusalem temple. The similarity of the Shiloh sanctuary and the Jerusalem temple was already noted by the rabbinic tradition, cf. Knittel, *Schilo*, 11–12; for a review of older publications, see Knittel, *Schilo*, 13–25. Knittel herself sees the interconnections between Shiloh and Jerusalem mainly in the reconstructed redactional layers of 1 Sam 1–4 (Knittel, *Schilo*, 55–108).

²¹ First of all, it seems clear that YHWH was also venerated at Shiloh. In continuity with the time of the exodus from Egypt – Exod 6:25 lists a certain Phinehas as one of the descendants of Aaron (Thon, *Pinhas*, 19–20) –, the wilderness wanderings (cf. the ark and the tent of meeting), and the settlement in Canaan under Joshua (cf. Josh 18), the place was the first permanent sanctuary in the land of Canaan to worship YHWH.

²² Middlemas, *Troubles*, 126, mentions the similarities between the designation of the Shiloh sanctuary and the Jerusalem temple in Jer 41:5 without discussing the text-critical problems.

the main room of the Jerusalem temple, the proper temple house (1 Kgs 6:3, 5, 17, 33, et al.). Another detail of the story in 1 Sam 1 seems to indicate a real building. Eli, the father of the two priests acting at Shiloh, is sitting on a seat על־מזוזה “beside the doorpost of the sanctuary of YHWH” (v. 9). The doorposts of the היכל are also mentioned in the description of the Jerusalem temple (1 Kgs 6:33). But, whereas in 1 Sam 1:9 the word מזוזה is used in singular:²³ one doorpost, in 1 Kgs 6:33 we read the plural מזוזות: two or more doorposts.²⁴ Striking parallels to the singular formulation are found in the book of Ezekiel, in the vision of the new Jerusalem. The doorpost of the new temple house is called מזוזה הבית (Ezek 45:19),²⁵ and also other doorposts in the temple area are described as מזוזה “one doorpost” (Ezek 43:8; 45:19; 46:2). In 1 Sam 3 we find another difference from the description of the Jerusalem temple. At Shiloh the ark sits in the היכל יהוה (1 Sam 3:3), whereas in the temple of Jerusalem the ark was situated in the דביר, the “holy of holies” or “the most holy room” (1 Kgs 8:1–9; esp. v. 6).²⁶

So, at first glance, it seems clear that the story of 1 Sam 1–4 has in mind a massive temple building standing at Shiloh. But the description of the sanctuary of Shiloh shows not only characteristics of the temple of Jerusalem erected – according to the biblical tradition – by Solomon in the tenth century BCE, but also some traits of the later temple building from the post-monarchic period, the so called “Second Temple” of Jerusalem.²⁷ Moreover, some open questions remain. How should one imagine the presence of the tent of meeting at Shiloh? Was there a separate area for the tent? And was there an altar and a special area for public sacrifices and public common meals? And why was the ark in the main room of the temple building? Finally, the assumption that there was a temple building at Shiloh beside the tent of meeting and the ark contradicts the wording of 2 Sam 7:6 that YHWH never dwelt in a house from the exodus

²³ LXX reads the plural like 4QSam^a I, 17 (Fincke, *Samuel Scroll*, 8).

²⁴ In 2 Kgs 18:16 the doorposts are named דביר.

²⁵ LXX writes the plural like in 1 Sam 1:9. Some scholars think that the LXX version is the preferable text, cf. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel 25–48*, 1158; Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 660. However, it seems that LXX aligns 1 Sam 1:9 and Ezek 45:19 to the readings of 1 Kgs 6.

²⁶ Furthermore, the young Samuel is sleeping in the היכל יהוה (1 Sam 3:3), what would seemingly be impossible in the Jerusalem temple. Some versions of 1 Sam 3:3 try to mitigate Samuel's shocking behavior. LXX^B and 4QSam^a IV, 3 do not translate the Tetragrammaton (Fincke, *Samuel Scroll*, 11 and 42). Samuel is sleeping only in the ναός respectively in the היכל. Nevertheless, in contrast to 4QSam^a, the LXX translates the following relative clause “where the ark of God was,” suggesting that the sleeping place is the “holy of holies”; for the discussion of the problems see Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 160.

²⁷ The statement counts irrespective of the question whether Ezek 40–48 describes actual traits of the “Second Temple” (“Ob die Ezechiel-Vision jedoch, immerhin ein apokalyptischer Text, tatsächlich zutreffend den 2. Jerusalemer Tempel beschreibt, ist sehr fraglich”; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 42) because the text could not be written as long as the “First Temple” – supposedly erected in the Solomonic period – stood.

out of Egypt until the days of David, but that he moved in a tent or a tabernacle, a transportable chest.²⁸

First of all, the ambiguity and the vagueness of the description result from the fact that the text of 1 Sam 1–4 is a story mentioning the details of the imagined sanctuary in an unsystematic way.²⁹ The aim of the story is not to describe the sanctuary, in contrast to the systematic descriptions of the Jerusalem temple, the so-called Solomonic one (1 Kings 6–8), as well as the visionary post-monarchic one at the end of the book of Ezekiel. Nevertheless, the open questions formulated above call for more detailed answers. With respect to the description of the sanctuary of Shiloh, I see two solutions: (1) The authors of 1 Sam 1–4 only had a vague memory of the earlier sanctuary. They included it in the story of the young Samuel without the intention of giving a systematic description of the holy site itself. (2) The details concerning the sanctuary are part of a literary construction designing a pre-monarchic holy site. The authors combine cultic paraphernalia from the wilderness wanderings with the tradition of an urban temple building. The blueprint of the building is not solely the so-called Solomonic or “First” temple in Jerusalem, but also the vision of a new temple for Jerusalem in the post-monarchic period, described in the final chapters of the book of Ezekiel.

In light of the many apparent literary interconnections of the text, the first solution seems implausible. At best, it was the precondition for the second one. Because the authors had only vague memory or no information concerning a sanctuary at Shiloh, they constructed their own one by means of other literary traditions concerning cult objects and cult places. If we follow the logic of the

²⁸ Normally commentators propose a diachronic solution; for a thorough discussion of older literature see Knittel, *Schilo*, 66–105. Haran states that the tradition of the “tabernacle” was old (cf. also Knittel, *Schilo*, 86–88), whereas the indications of a temple building were formed by later editors in analogy to the temple in Jerusalem (Haran, “Shiloh”). In contrast, most commentators identify 1 Sam 2:22b, mentioning the tent of meeting, as a later addition to the story (Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, 114–115; Caquot/de Robert, *Samuel*, 50–53; Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 125 and 135–136); cf. also Knittel, *Schilo*, 74: “Der sehr späte Nachtrag des Begegnungszeltes in 1. Sam 2,22b impliziert auch, dass die Verbindung von Begegnungszelt und Schilo ihren Ursprung nicht in 1. Sam 1–3 hat.” In a similar way, McCarter postulates an “interpolation [...] by a post-Exilic scholar.” He likewise points to the fact that LXX^B and 1QS^a III 13–14 omit the phrase mentioning the tent of meeting (McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 81; cf. now Fincke, *Samuel Scroll*, 10 and 37). In this way, two early receptions of the text resolve the problem of the coexistence of a temple building and the tent of meeting by eliminating the latter. According to LXX^B and 1QS^a, there was only a temple in the sanctuary of Shiloh. Nevertheless, the MT as it now stands leaves the problem of the relation between a temple building and the tent open. Knittel must concede: “Durch die ‘Ankunft’ des einen wahren Exodusheiligtums in 1. Sam 1–4 wird die Darstellung von Schilo als Vorläufer des Jerusalemer Tempels letztgültig legitimiert” (Knittel, *Schilo*, 85). And, with respect to 2 Sam 7:6, she proposes that “diese spätere Einfügung des Heiligtums von Schilo rückwirkend zum Zeltheiligtum der Wüstenwanderung uminterpretiert” (*ad loc.*). Such a solution seems unconvincing.

²⁹ The inconsistencies are largely explained as the result of one or more editions of the story; cf. the literature in n. 28.

second solution, we must note that the chronological horizon of the authors was the post-monarchic period in the second half of the first millennium BCE.³⁰ Therefore, it seems necessary to ask whether one can find more contemporary paradigms which had an effect on the literary construction of 1 Sam 1–4. In this respect, archaeology can contribute significant insights.

3. Archaeology

3.1 Shiloh

The place of biblical Shiloh is well known.³¹ The ruins of *Hirbet Sēlūn* have preserved the old name (1778.1626 Palestine Grid = 32.0566337° N, 35.2928016° E). The site is located in the highlands of Palestine, halfway between Shechem and Jerusalem. It was excavated mainly between 1922 and 1932 by a Danish expedition³² and from 1981 to 1984 by a team under the direction of Israel Finkelstein.³³ Among other finds, the excavations exposed some buildings of the Iron Age I, erected in the eleventh century BCE, the time the biblical figure of Samuel should be imagined. The buildings are of the “pillared house” type, a very common and characteristic type in the Iron Ages in the southern Levantine highlands.³⁴ Furthermore, the archaeologists excavated many storage vessels from the same Iron Age I levels.³⁵ As a result, the site can be interpreted as a central place for collecting and storing products, presumably agricultural products. There is no trace of a sanctuary or a holy place in the Iron Age I.³⁶

³⁰ Normally, commentators presume a long-standing process of editing and re-editing of the text, cf. Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 108–156; Knittel, *Schilo*, 55–105, and n. 28. Besides the observations regarding 1 Sam 1:9 and Ezek 45:19, one can find further evidence in 1 Sam 1–4 that the text presupposes Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions, e. g., the promise that Samuel will live as a Nazirite (1 Sam 1:11; cf. Num 6:1–21), cf. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, 97; Caquot/de Robert, *Samuel*, 39; Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 31–32 and 45–46; Knittel, *Schilo*, 67. The LXX adds the prohibition to drink wine to the text of 1 Sam 1:11, clarifying the link to Num 6 (esp. v. 3); for more text-critical aspects regarding to 1 Sam 1:11, see Fincke, *Samuel Scroll*, 26. Furthermore, the sacrificial rites described – and criticized – in 1 Sam 2:12–17 refer to the rules of Lev 3:3–5 and Lev 7:29–36 (cf. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, 108). Some scholars interpret 1 Sam 2:12–17 as a reflex of an old Shilonite custom: “Viele Ausleger vermuten, es liege hier die Beschreibung einer sehr spezifischen und relativ archaischen Kultordnung am Heiligtum von Schilo vor” (Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 129); cf. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, 111 (against his observations on p. 108); McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 83; Caquot/de Robert, *Samuel*, 52; they are criticized by Knittel, who claims that some traits of 1 Sam 2:12–17 allude to the regulations of Deut 18 (Knittel, *Schilo*, 75–84).

³¹ Jericke, “Schilo”; Knittel, *Schilo*, 31–53.

³² Buhl/Holm-Nielsen, *Shiloh*.

³³ Finkelstein, *Settlement*, 205–234; Finkelstein et al., *Shiloh*; cf. Knittel, *Schilo*, 31–41.

³⁴ Finkelstein, *Settlement*, 220–228; Bunimovitz, “Area C”.

³⁵ Finkelstein, *Settlement*, 224–225, Fig. 72 and 73; Bunimovitz, “Area C”, Fig. 2.9–2.12.

³⁶ There are current excavations on the site organized by a society called “Associates for Biblical Research”; cf. www.biblearchaeology.org. They follow the slogan “Bible in the one hand and

The archaeological evidence is highly problematic with respect to 1 Sam 1–4. At first, Israel Finkelstein presented some objects like the fragment of a so-called cultic stand to support his interpretation that there was a sanctuary in the Iron Age I despite the lack of any architectural vestige.³⁷ He likewise speculated that the sanctuary was at the top of the hill, an area that he did not excavate.³⁸

In a later publication of 2013, he revised his arguments. Now he refers more or less to the biblical tradition of a holy place at Shiloh.³⁹ We find nearly the same arguments in the commentary of Walter Dietrich, and in a dissertation of 2017 (published in 2019) written by Ann-Kathrin Knittel in Heidelberg. Dietrich claims that a good part of the story of 1 Sam 1–4, mainly the chapters 1 and 2, were old traditions from the late pre-monarchic era. Therefore, he has no problem postulating the existence of an old sanctuary at Shiloh.⁴⁰ In contrast to Dietrich, Finkelstein and Knittel presume that the oldest literary strata of 1 Sam 1–4 date of the eighth or seventh century BCE, at the earliest.⁴¹ They therefore have to bridge a gap of at least three centuries between the postulated sanctuary at Shiloh and the first formulation of the text of 1 Sam 1–4. In her critical analysis, Knittel claims that the story was continuously supplemented and revised until the Persian or the early Hellenistic period.⁴² She tries to bridge the gap of three to seven centuries between the supposed time of Samuel and the date of the literary formation of the story by referring to the theory of cultural memory (“kulturelles Gedächtnis”) developed in Germany by the Egyptologist Jan Assmann and his wife Aleida.⁴³ It means that impressive events, important traditions, etc. remain in the memory of humankind and can be evoked by texts or images over centuries. Whereas such a model perhaps functions when describing the culture of ancient Egypt, I have serious doubts with respect to the cultures of Mesopotamia or the Levant.

shovel in the other.” Their excavations unearthed some more finds from the Iron Age II, which is not of special interest for our problem. Moreover, they claim to have found the place of the sanctuary and the tabernacle. Until now, the documentation seems not reliable in this regard.

³⁷ Finkelstein, *Settlement*, 228–234, esp. 227, Fig. 75.

³⁸ Finkelstein, “The History,” 384–388.

³⁹ He speaks of “circumstantial evidence” (Finkelstein, *Kingdom*, 25–26). It means that in the vicinity there are some other places inhabited in the Iron Age I, and Shiloh could be understood as a sort of central place (cf. Finkelstein, “The History,” 387, Fig. 19.3). Therefore, a sanctuary seems highly probable. Nevertheless, the idea that the sanctuary was at Shiloh is taken from the biblical tradition.

⁴⁰ “Die beiden ältesten Textstraten in 1 Sam 1–4 [...] bezeugen, dass in (spät)vorstaatlicher Zeit in Schilo ein Heiligtum von überregionaler Bedeutung existierte und dass dort das”Haus Eli“ residierte, eine Priesterfamilie von altem Adel und hohem Ansehen, deren Stern aber, aus welchen Gründen auch immer, im Sinken begriffen war” (Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 127); cf. already Noth, “Samuel.”

⁴¹ Finkelstein, *Kingdom*, 23–24; Knittel, *Schilo*, 107–109.

⁴² Knittel, *Schilo*, 55–109 and 233–239.

⁴³ Knittel, *Schilo*, 238–239.

Therefore, it seems more likely to assume that the text of 1 Sam 1–4, and the description of the Shilonite sanctuary in particular, is a literary construction of a later time, probably of a post-monarchic date. As stated above, the description of the sanctuary not only shows motifs from the Solomonic temple in Jerusalem, but also those from the visionary temple described in the book of Ezekiel. Furthermore, the story of 1 Sam 1–4 includes the most important cultic paraphernalia of the wilderness narratives. None of the last-mentioned texts (Ezekiel or the wilderness narratives) should be dated before the late monarchic or even the post-monarchic period.⁴⁴ Therefore, one should assume that the story of 1 Sam 1–4 as it now stands was not formulated before the middle of the first millennium BCE. As a result, it seems doubtful that the text describes an old sanctuary in Shiloh.⁴⁵ Rather, the sanctuary seems to be the result of a complex literary construction. Therefore, we should seriously consider whether the authors also refer to the contemporary Yahwistic sanctuary on the top of Mount Gerizim.

3.2 Mount Gerizim: The Architecture

In contrast to the Jerusalem temple of the pre-Roman period, we have archaeological finds from Mount Gerizim.⁴⁶ The excavations cleared an expanded sacred area and a nearby settlement from the Hellenistic period. The finds mainly come from the second century BCE. Under the ruins of the Hellenistic period, there are traces of a 98 x 96 m walled rectangular platform interpreted as a sacred precinct of the Persian period, the fifth or fourth century BCE.⁴⁷ The most impressive

⁴⁴ For the wilderness narratives and the book of Numbers, see Roskop, *Itineraries*; some essays in Frevel et al., (ed.), *Torah*; Frevel, “Alte Stücke”; also the balanced discussion of Ska, “Old and New.”

⁴⁵ This assumption does not mean that there was definitely no sanctuary at Shiloh. It only states that the historical questions – whether there was a holy place and how it looked – cannot be answered at the moment because archaeology gives no clear indication and because the texts are too late to describe the historical circumstances of the pre-monarchic times. This also pertains to Jer 26:6, where the place name has some symbolic value as a model for the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem. Certainly, the verse indicates the deeply rooted tradition of a sanctuary at Shiloh. However, Jer 26:6 refers not necessarily to historical facts, but rather to the literary tradition of a Shilonite sanctuary, unless one could show that the verse was formulated before the text of 1 Sam 1–4.

⁴⁶ Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*; Magen, “Gerizim”; Kartveit, *Origin*, 206–208; Zangenberg, “Sanctuary”; de Hemmer Gudme, *Before*, 64–70; Magen/Pummer, “Gerizim”; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 35–50; Hensel, “JHWH-Heiligtum”; Kartveit/Knoppers, “Qumran, Mount Gerizim,” 1–3; Pummer, “Samaritan Studies,” 57–64.

⁴⁷ Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:97–137; Zangenberg, “Sanctuary,” 404–409. The director of the excavations, Yitzhak Magen, claims that the sacred precinct was founded in the fifth century BCE. He argues mainly on the basis of some coins and some C-14 samples (Magen, “Dating”; idem, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:165–180). However, only one of the published coins dates from the first half of the fifth century BCE, three others from the late fifth century BCE (cf. Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:194–195, Pl. 7). The other coins of the Persian period are from the fourth century BCE (Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:194–199, Pl. 7–9).

structure of this earlier compound is a multi-chambered gate at the north side.⁴⁸ Some vestiges seem to indicate two more gates at the east and the south side. The excavators reconstruct the precinct with a temple building and a massive altar in the courtyard before the temple.⁴⁹ The reconstruction is influenced by the imagined conception of the “Second Temple” of Jerusalem.⁵⁰ Others claim that Mount Gerizim only had an open space with an altar.⁵¹ Therefore, the architectural remains of the earliest Samaritan cult place provide no indication of any reference to the literary construction of the Shilonite sanctuary in 1 Sam 1–4, with the exception that in both cases the exact appearance of the site remains unknown.

3.3 Mount Gerizim: The Inscriptions

Some more information is provided by the inscriptions found in great quantity on Mount Gerizim.⁵² Most of them date to the second century BCE. One very fragmentary text shows the word ביה and some other letters reconstructed to the word הכל respectively the Aramaic הכלה.⁵³ This evokes the terms ביה יהוה and הכיל יהוה, the designations of the Shilonite sanctuary in 1 Sam 1–4. But the reading of the Gerizim inscription is very difficult, and the proposed reconstruction far from certain.

The C-14 samples range from the late ninth to the early second century BCE (Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:169, Table 1). Until now, the published pottery is scanty. It contains four very fragmented pieces of Attic *lekythoi* (Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:192–193, Pl. 6). They cannot support a dating in the fifth century BCE. Therefore, the excavator must concede that the first sacred precinct of the Gerizim can be dated only approximately in the fifth to fourth century BCE, in any case before the campaign of Alexander the Great: “After examining the parallels, we maintain that there are no early forms at Mt. Gerizim; all the pottery discovered at the site’s sacred precinct is to be securely dated to the period between the fifth and fourth centuries BCE; that is, before Alexander the Great’s conquest of the Land of Israel. This dating is further supported by the numismatic finds.” (Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:168). Nevertheless, the dating in the fifth century BCE is widely accepted, cf. Zangenberg, “Sanctuary,” 404; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 39–40; idem, “JHWH-Heiligtum,” 78–80. For some critical remarks see Dušek, *Inscriptions*, 3 (late fifth century BCE); also Pummer, “Samaritan Studies,” 62–63. Zangenberg discusses the possibility that there was an occupation in the late Iron Age II (seventh to sixth century BCE), because the Gerizim excavations unearthed two or three fragments of volute capitals, known as architectural components from the Iron Age II (Zangenberg, “Sanctuary,” 402–404; cf. Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 43–47). Magen dates the findings to the Persian period (Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2: 152–153), and Zangenberg, in the end, seems to follow the argumentation of Magen.

⁴⁸ Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:152–153.

⁴⁹ Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:103, Fig. 185; cf. Zangenberg, “Sanctuary,” 405, Fig. 2, with some critical remarks (*ibid.*, 406–409); similarly Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 40–43.

⁵⁰ Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 2:139–164; cf. Zangenberg, “Sanctuary,” 405–406. Interestingly, Magen also refers to the vision of the new temple in the book of Ezekiel (cf. Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 42), a text which has some relation to 1 Sam 1–4, see above.

⁵¹ Zangenberg, “Sanctuary,” 404–409, esp. p. 409; cf. the discussion by Pummer, “Altar.”

⁵² Magen et al., *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 1; Kartveit, *Origin*, 209–216; Dušek, *Inscriptions*; de Hemmer Gudme, *Before*; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 51–67.

⁵³ Magen et al., *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 1:180–181, inscr. no. 211.

4. Phinehas the Priest

The most fruitful interconnection between the biblical story and the finds on Mount Gerizim appears in the personal name Phinehas. The name is documented four times in the published Gerizim inscriptions, three times in connection to the title of a priest.⁵⁴ Before the excavations on Mount Gerizim, it was known that the priestly figure of Phinehas⁵⁵ was highly esteemed in the so-called Samaritan tradition.⁵⁶ In documents of the fourth century CE and later, he was equated with Elijah.⁵⁷ One of the self-identifications of the Samaritans was “sons of Joseph and sons of Phinehas.”⁵⁸ On the basis of the excavations, we know that the priestly family of Phinehas already played a prominent role when the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim was active. All epigraphic documents mentioning Phinehas probably date from the second century BCE.⁵⁹ Because of the long-lasting Phinehas tradition, one cannot exclude the possibility that the family already acted in priestly roles in earlier times, when the first sanctuary stood on the mountain, in the fifth to fourth century BCE, that means, in the time when the story of 1 Sam 1–4 was brought in its current shape.

Phinehas has a prominent role in the story itself together with his brother Hophni. They are both active priests at the sanctuary. It seems that they have a higher status because they have some minor priests as assistants (1 Sam 2:12–17). The story constructs a close relationship between the two priests and the place of Shiloh, especially the sanctuary of Shiloh. When the place name and its sacral function are first mentioned, the two, Phinehas and Hophni, are present (1 Sam 1:3). And when the Israelites send for the ark to accompany them in their fight against the Philistines, men come to Shiloh, where Hophni and Phinehas are “with the ark” (1 Sam 4:4).⁶⁰ After the death of Hophni and Phinehas, a messenger immediately runs to Shiloh to inform their father Eli (1 Sam 4:11–12). In

⁵⁴ Inscr. no. 24, 25, 384, and 389 (Magen et al., *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 1:67–68, 255–259; cf. Kartveit, *Origin*, 210–211; Zangenberg, “Sanctuary,” 413, Fig. 4.1 and Fig. 4.3; Dušek, *Inscriptions*, 58 and 83.

⁵⁵ The name Phinehas is of Egyptian origin, like the name of his brother Hophni. The Egyptian equivalent of Phinehas means “black man” or “the Nubian” (Thon, *Pinhas*, 2–3; Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 38). The biblical tradition reflects the Egyptian origin of the name by constructing a genealogical link to Aaron (Exod 6:25).

⁵⁶ Cf. Colpe, “Pinehas-Grab,” 173–177; Janowski, “Psalm CVI”; Thon, *Pinhas*, 12–18.

⁵⁷ Thon, *Pinhas*, 12–14.

⁵⁸ Thon, *Pinhas*, 13. Some references to Phinehas in later documents of the Samaritans in Zangenberg, *ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΑ*, 196–197.

⁵⁹ Dušek, *Inscriptions*, 154.

⁶⁰ Deist indicates that the names stand in “syntactical apposition,” a formal marker to emphasize their relevance for the story (Deist, “By the Way,” 25–26).

this way, the two sons of Eli are closely connected to the place and the sanctuary of Shiloh, and especially to the ark.⁶¹

On the other hand, Hophni and Phinehas are the “bad boys” of the story. They are described as בני בליעל “sons of evil” (1 Sam 2:12).⁶² They abuse their higher status and send assistants to take pieces of meat before the fat is burned (1 Sam 2:13–17), although, according to the torah of YHWH, the burned fat belongs to YHWH (Lev 3:3–5). Furthermore, they have sex with the women who serve at the entrance of the tent of meeting (1 Sam 2:22).⁶³ They stand in contrast to the figure of Samuel.⁶⁴ Whereas the sin of the two priests is great את פני יהוה “before YHWH” (1 Sam 2:17), Samuel acts as a loyal minister את פני יהוה “before YHWH” (1 Sam 2:18).⁶⁵ At the end of the narrative, a man of God announces a severe punishment to the Elides (1 Sam 2:27–36), and Samuel is elected as the new priest of YHWH acting at the sanctuary of Shiloh (1 Sam 3).

The Samaritan tradition documented by the Gerizim inscriptions obviously cannot refer to the Phinehas of 1 Sam 1–4. Rather, the Samaritan tradition refers to another priest Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, who is primarily mentioned in the book of Numbers, but also in the books of Joshua and Judges, as one of the assistants to Moses and Joshua. At the end of the wilderness wandering, when many Israelites took part at the cult of Baal Peor, Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, stops a severe punishment of the people by murdering one Israelite and his Midianite wife (Num 25).⁶⁶ He also plays a role when Israel fights against Midian (Num 31).⁶⁷ The book of Joshua narrates that Phinehas, on the authority of Moses, mediates between the western and the eastern tribes (Josh 22).⁶⁸ Afterwards, he is mentioned as a priest at Bethel, where the ark stood in “those days” (Judg 20:27–28),⁶⁹ a somewhat odd tradition in relation to the story of 1 Sam 1–4.⁷⁰

The relation between the two biblical figures of Phinehas is an ongoing matter of debate. There is some evidence that the genealogies in the Old Testament

⁶¹ At the end, it seems that Phinehas was more prominent than his brother Hophni. Chapter 4 notes the birth of Ichabod, the son of Phinehas (1 Sam 4:19–22). The notice implicates that the genealogical line of Eli continues by Phinehas and Ichabod, whereas Hophni leaves the story without any offspring.

⁶² The accusation seems hard, because it is formulated by the narrators. In contrast, Hannah is wrongly suspected by Eli to be a בת בליעל, a “daughter of evil.” Phinehas and Hophni are what Hannah is definitely not; cf. Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 27 and 128–129.

⁶³ Most commentators consider the notice a late addition to the story; cf. above n. 28; for some aspects of the reception of the verse in the Jewish tradition, see Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 135–136.

⁶⁴ The aspect is emphasized by Deist, “By the Way.”

⁶⁵ Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 132.

⁶⁶ Thon, *Pinhas*, 33–64.

⁶⁷ Thon, *Pinhas*, 79–83.

⁶⁸ Thon, *Pinhas*, 85–95.

⁶⁹ Thon, *Pinhas*, 95–98.

⁷⁰ Sometimes scholars propose that the mention of the ark in Judg 20 is an addition to the text; cf. Thon, *Pinhas*, 98; Knittel, *Schilo*, 202.

try to consolidate both lines, the sons of Eli and the sons of Eleazar. The matter is highly complex and cannot be discussed in this essay.⁷¹ At first sight, Phinehas ben Eleazar mentioned in the book of Numbers, and Phinehas ben Eli of the book of Samuel are different figures. But, on the other hand, there are some structural similarities: they are both priests, and they are connected to the ark.⁷² Furthermore, there is another similarity: the actions of both figures have direct impact on all Israel. In the case of Phinehas ben Eleazar, it is obvious. But also the activity of Phinehas ben Eli in 1 Sam 1–4 impacts Israel as a whole.⁷³ This is expressed in the commentary by Eli with regard to the sacrificial abuse of his sons (1 Sam 2:22–24)⁷⁴ and in the speech of the man of God against Eli and his sons (1 Sam 2:28–29).⁷⁵ Here we find another interconnection with the Samaritan tradition of the Hellenistic era. Two Greek inscriptions found on the island of Delos, evidently written by members of the Samaritan community, indicate that the Samaritans saw themselves as true “Israelites” Ἰσραελ(ε)ῖται.⁷⁶

Even though the Samaritan tradition refers to the Phinehas ben Eleazar, the assistant of Moses and Joshua, the figure of the “bad boy” Phinehas in 1 Sam can be read as a reference to the Samaritan priestly tradition as well. The authors of 1 Sam 1–4 combined allusions to the Jerusalem temple with elements of the Samaritan cultic activities. To say it in a somewhat abridged, but concise way: The building at the sanctuary of Shiloh is the Jerusalem temple, the Shilonite priesthood is the Samaritan one. If this interpretation of the literary constructed cult of Shiloh is appropriate, then the construction was obviously not in favor of the Samaritan cult place on Mount Gerizim. The recourse to Samaritan traditions

⁷¹ For a detailed discussion of the genealogical problems, see Schley, *Shiloh*, 142–151; Thon, *Pinhas*, 125–140. In contrast, Dietrich avoids treatment of the matter. He only writes: “In diesem Zusammenhang ist auch der in verschiedenen literarischen Zusammenhängen erwähnte Priester Pinhas ben Eleazar ben Aaron zu erwähnen” (Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 38). The formulation looks more or less like a stopgap, but at least it indicates the complexity of the question of the two Phinehases.

⁷² For Phinehas ben Eleazar, see Judg 20:27–28.

⁷³ Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 118–119.

⁷⁴ “Eli was very old. He kept hearing about everything his sons were doing to all of the people of Israel [לכל־ישראל] [...] So Eli said to his sons, ‘Why are you doing those things? All of the people [כל־העם] are telling me about the evil things you are doing. No, my sons. The report I hear isn’t good. And it’s spreading among YHWH’s people [עם יהוה].” 1QS^a III 14 and LXX show minor variants somewhat reducing the severity of the reproaches. 1QS^a III 14 reads לבני־ישראל instead of לכל־ישראל in the MT of 1 Sam 2:22; LXX writes λαός θεῶ “God’s people” instead of “YHWH’s people” in 1 Sam 2:24; see the discussion of the text critical problems by McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 80–82; Dietrich, *1 Sam 1–12*, 113–114.

⁷⁵ “I chose your ancestor out of all the tribes of Israel [מכל־שבטי ישראל] to be my priest, to go up to my altar, to burn incense, and to wear an ephod in my presence. I also gave your ancestor’s family all the food offerings presented by the Israelites [בני ישראל]. Why do all of you laugh at my sacrifices and offerings? I require them to be brought to the house where I live. Why do you honor your sons more than me? Why do you fatten yourselves on the best parts of every offering that is made by my people Israel [כל־מנחת ישראל לעמי]?”

⁷⁶ Cf. Kartveit, *Origin*, 216–225; Dušek, *Inscriptions*, 74–81; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 76–85.

is ambiguous at best. This corresponds to the role of the Shilonite sanctuary in the biblical narration. Despite the fact that it is an orthodox Yahwistic cult place, it cannot exist besides the temple of Jerusalem. It functions only as long as Samuel acts there (1 Sam 3:21). After the erection of the temple in Jerusalem in Solomonic times, Shiloh is no longer mentioned as a sanctuary.⁷⁷ It disappears from the biblical construction of the history of Israel. Following the story of 1 Sam 1–4, the priests of Shiloh provoke the decline of the sanctuary.⁷⁸ Phinehas does not act in favor of the Israelites/Samaritans, which contrasts with the role of Phinehas the priest mentioned in the Samaritan inscriptions. The book of Jeremiah interprets the decadence of the Shilonite sanctuary as a punishment by YHWH. Jeremiah extends the sinful activity to the entirety of Israel, saying in the name of YHWH: “Go now to the town of Shiloh. Go to the place where I first made a home for my Name. See what I did to it because of the evil things my people Israel [עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל] were doing.” (Jer 7:12) It obviously provides a different interpretation than the one found in 1 Samuel, where the people practice a correct sacrifice, in contrast to the priests.

Conclusions

To sum up, the name Shiloh in 1 Sam 1–4 not only foreshadows the temple of Jerusalem but also functions as something of an alias for the Samaritan sanctuary at Shechem, on Mount Gerizim. The message of the text seems unambiguous. The Samaritan holy place is a truly Yahwistic one indeed, but the cultic practice is dubious. Therefore, the sanctuary cannot permanently exist besides the Jerusalem temple. As a result, the story of 1 Sam 1–4 could be understood as part of the constructive dispute between the two Yahwistic sanctuaries in Judah

⁷⁷ Shiloh is mentioned only as the birthplace of the prophet Ahijah (1 Kgs 11:29; 12:15; 14:2, 4; 15:29; 2 Chr 9:29; 10:15). In these cases, the place name has an ambiguous connotation similar to 1 Sam 1–4 because Ahijah plays a dubious role with respect to the proclamation of the kings Jeroboam and Baasha. The verses in the book of Jeremiah mentioning Shiloh refer to the story of 1 Sam 1–4 (Jer 7:12, 14; 26:6, 9); with respect to Jer 41:5, see above.

⁷⁸ This aspect of the story is highlighted by Deist, “By the Way.” He claims that not the place itself, but only the priests are concerned by the punishment of YHWH: “It is not the place of worship that matters, so the story seems to suggest, but the obedience of the priests serving in the sanctuary. To stress this fact the narrator had to emphasise the presence of the ark at Shiloh and had to refer to Shiloh more often than was necessary from a strictly informational point of view and to introduce the name in syntactical positions that would catch the eye of the reader.” (Deist, “By the Way,” 33). I can follow the interpretation insofar as the description of the sanctuary (the temple building, the ark, and the tent of meeting) are also found in the Jerusalem temple. In this respect, Shiloh itself partly escapes decline. The place revives to a certain degree when the Jerusalem temple is built. However, the assessment of place names largely depends on the events told in the story; therefore, the interpretation by McCarter, who explicates that Shiloh is rejected “with its priesthood,” seems reliable, too (McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 93).

and Samaria in the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Shiloh is situated between Shechem and Jerusalem not only geographically, but also in the literary construction of 1 Sam 1–4. And if the preceding considerations are relevant to some degree, then one can understand why the authors of the LXX in the Hellenistic period interchanged the place names of Shiloh, Shechem and Jerusalem/Salem. It is probably because they knew something of the alias functions of the place name of Shiloh in the tradition of 1 Sam 1–4.⁷⁹

Bibliography

- Block, D. I., *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, 1998).
- Buhl, M.-L./Holm-Nielsen, S., *Shiloh: The Danish Excavations at Tall Sailūn, Palestine in 1926, 1929, 1932 and 1963: The Pre-Hellenistic Remains* (Copenhagen, 1969).
- Bunimovitz, S., “Area C: The Iron Age I Pillared Buildings and Another Remains,” in: *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site* (ed. I. Finkelstein et al.; TAMS 10; Tel Aviv, 1993), 15–34.
- Caquot, A./Robert, P. de, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT 6; Genève, 1994).
- Colpe, C., “Das samaritanische Pinehas-Grab in Awerta und die Beziehungen zwischen Hādir- und Georgs-Legende,” *ZDPV* 85 (1969): 162–196.
- Deist, F., “‘By the Way, Hophni and Phinehas Were There’: An Investigation into the Literary and Ideological Function of Hophni, Phinehas and Shilo in 1 Samuel 1–4,” *JNSL* 18 (1992): 25–35.
- Dietrich, W., *Samuel: Teilband 1: 1 Sam 1–12* (BKAT VIII/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2010).
- Dušek, J., *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim and Samaria between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV Epiphanes* (CHANE 54; Leiden, 2012).
- Eißfeldt, O., “Silo and Jerusalem,” in: *Volume de Congrès: Strasbourg 1956* (ed. P. A. H. de Boer; VTSup 4; Leiden, 1957), 138–147.
- Fincke, A., *The Samuel Scroll from Qumran: 4QSam^a Restored and Compared to the Septuagint and 4QSam^c* (STDJ 43; Leiden, 2001).
- Finkelstein, I., *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement* (Jerusalem, 1988).
- , *The Forgotten Kingdom: The Archaeology and History of Northern Israel* (ANEM 5; Atlanta, 2013).
- , “The History and Archaeology of Shiloh from the Middle Bronze Age II to Iron Age II,” in: *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site* (ed. I. Finkelstein et al.; TAMS 10; Tel Aviv, 1993), 371–393.
- , et al., (ed.), *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site* (TAMS 10; Tel Aviv, 1993).
- Fischer, G., *Jeremia 26–52* (HThKAT 39; Freiburg i. Br., 2005).

⁷⁹ And perhaps it elucidates why a later Samaritan tradition in the so-called Chronicles II describes the origin of the Shilonite sanctuary as the separation of a priest named Eli from the cult of the Gerizim, cf. Deist, “By the Way,” 32–33; Kartveit/Knoppers, “Qumran, Mount Gerizim,” 14 n. 23; see also the translation of the text by Zangenberg, ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΑ, 197–198. The legend in some way notes that the biblical story of the sanctuary of Shiloh preserves aspects of the Samaritan cult, but qualifies that cult as irregular with respect of an imagined exclusive central sanctuary.

- Frevel, C., "Alte Stücke – späte Brücke? Zur Rolle des Buches Numeri in der jüngeren Pentateuchdiskussion," in: *Congress Volume Munich 2013* (ed. C. M. Maier; VTSup 163; Leiden, 2014), 255–299.
- , et al. (ed.), *Torah and the Book of Numbers* (FAT II/62; Tübingen, 2013).
- Frolov, S., "Judah Comes to Shiloh: Genesis 49:10ba, One More Time," *JBL* 131 (2012): 417–422.
- Haran, M., "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch," *JBL* 81 (1962): 14–24.
- Hemmer Gudme, A. K. de, *Before the God in this Place for Good Remembrance: A Comparative Analysis of the Aramaic Votive Inscriptions from Mount Gerizim* (BZAW 441; Berlin, 2013).
- Hensel, B., *Juda und Samaria: Zum Verhältnis zweier nach-exilischer Jahwismen* (FAT 110; Tübingen, 2016).
- , "Das JHWH-Heiligtum am Garizim: ein archäologischer Befund und seine literar- und theologischeschichtliche Einordnung," *VT* 68 (2018): 73–93.
- Hertzberg, H.-W., "Die Melkisedek-Traditionen," *JPOS* 8 (1928): 169–179.
- Hilberg, I., *Epistulae I–LXX*, Vol. 1 of Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae: Editio Altera Supplementis Aucta (CSEL 54; Wien, 1996).
- , *Epistulae LXXI–CXX*, Vol. 2 of Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae: Editio Altera Supplementis Aucta (CSEL 55; Wien, 1996).
- Janowski, B., "Psalm CVI 28–31 und die Interzession des Pinhas," *VT* 33 (1983): 237–248.
- Jericke, D., "Bet-El und Lus: Lokalisierung und theologische Konnotation der Toponyme," *WO* 38 (2008): 176–193.
- , "Der Berg Garizim im Deuteronomium," *ZAW* 124 (2012): 213–228.
- , *Die Ortsangaben im Buch Genesis: Ein historisch-topographischer und literarisch-topographischer Kommentar* (FRLANT 248; Göttingen, 2013).
- , "Salem," <http://www.odb.bibelwissenschaft.de/ortsnamen/ortsname.php?n=101>, accessed on January 18, 2019.
- , "Schilo," <http://www.odb.bibelwissenschaft.de/ortsnamen/ortsname.php?n=162>, accessed on January 31, 2019.
- Kartveit, M., *The Origin of the Samaritans* (VTSup 128; Leiden, 2009).
- /Knoppers, G. N., "Qumran, Mount Gerizim, and the Books of Moses," in: *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* (ed. M. Kartveit/G. N. Knoppers; SJ 104/SSam 10; Berlin, 2018), 1–15.
- Knauf, E. A., "Bethel: The Israelite Impact on Judean Language and Literature," in: *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (ed. O. Lipschits/M. Oeming; Winona Lake, 2006), 291–349.
- Knittel, A.-K., *Das erinnerte Heiligtum: Tradition und Geschichte der Kultstätte in Schilo* (FRLANT 273; Göttingen, 2019).
- Lundblom, J. R., *Jeremiah 37–52: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 21C; New York, 2004).
- Mäkipelto, V., *Uncovering Ancient Editions: Documented Evidence of Changes in Joshua 24 and Related Texts* (BZAW 513; Berlin, 2018).
- Magen, Y., "The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence," in: *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B. C. E.* (ed. O. Lipschits et al.; Winona Lake, 2007), 157–211.
- , "Gerizim, Mount," *NEAEHL* 5:1742–1748.

- , Mount Gerizim Excavations: Volume 2: *A Temple City* (JSP 8; Jerusalem, 2008).
- /Pummer, R., “Gerizim, Mount,” *EBR* 10:105–117.
- , et al., Mount Gerizim Excavations: Volume 1: *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* (JSP 2; Jerusalem, 2004).
- McCarter, P. K. Jr., *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB 8; Garden City, 1980).
- Middlemas, J. A., *The Troubles of Templeless Judah* (Oxford Theological Monographs; New York, 2005).
- Na’aman, N., “Samuel’s Birth Legend and the Sanctuary of Shiloh,” *JNSL* 43 (2017): 51–61.
- Nihan, C., “Abraham Traditions and Cult Politics in the Persian Period: *Moriyyāh* and *Šalēm* in Genesis,” in: *The Politics of the Ancestors: Exegetical and Historical Perspectives on Genesis 12–36* (ed. M. G. Brett/J. Wöhrle; FAT 124; Tübingen, 2018), 259–282.
- , “The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua,” in: *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G. N. Knoppers/B. M. Levinson; Winona Lake, 2007), 187–223.
- Nocquet, D. R., *La Samarie, la Diaspora et l’achèvement de la Torah: Territorialités et internationalités dans l’Hexateuque* (OBO 284; Fribourg, 2017).
- Noth, M., “Samuel und Silo,” *VT* 13 (1963): 390–400; repr. in: idem, Aufsätze zur biblischen Landes- und Altertumskunde, Band 1: *Archäologische, exegetische und topographische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Israels* (ed. H. W. Wolff; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1971), 148–156.
- Pummer, R., “Was There an Altar or a Temple in the Sacred Precinct on Mt. Gerizim?,” *JSJ* 47 (2016): 1–21.
- , “Samaritan Studies – Recent Research Results,” in: *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* (ed. M. Kartveit/G. N. Knoppers; SJ 104/SSam 10; Berlin, 2018), 57–77.
- Roskop (Erisman), A. R., *The Wilderness Itineraries: Genre, Geography, and the Growth of Torah* (HACL 3; Winona Lake, 2011).
- Schley, D. G., *Shiloh: A Biblical City in Tradition and History* (JSOTSup 63; Sheffield, 1989).
- Schmitt, G., *Siedlungen Palästinas in griechisch-römischer Zeit: Ostjordanland, Negeb und (in Auswahl) Westjordanland* (BTAVO B 93; Wiesbaden, 1995).
- Ska, J. L., “Old and New in the Book of Numbers,” *Bib* 95 (2014): 102–116.
- Stoebe, H. J., *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT VIII,1; Gütersloh, 1973).
- Thon, J., *Pinhas ben Eleasar – der levitische Priester am Ende der Tora: Traditions- und literargeschichtliche Untersuchung unter Einbeziehung historisch-geographischer Fragen* (ABiG 20; Leipzig, 2006).
- VanderKam, J. C., *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511/Scriptores Aethiopic 88; Leuven, 1989).
- Zangenberg, J. K., ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΑ: Antike Quellen zur Geschichte und Kultur der Samaritaner in deutscher Übersetzung (TANZ 15; Tübingen, 1994).
- , “The Sanctuary on Mount Gerizim: Observations on the Results of 20 Years of Excavation,” in: *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.): Proceedings of a Conference on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Institute of Biblical Archaeology at the University of Tübingen* (ed. J. Kamlah/H. Michelau; ADPV 41; Wiesbaden, 2012), 399–418.
- Zimmerli, W., *Ezechiel, 2. Teilband: Ezechiel 25–48* (BKAT XIII/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1979).