

## Shiloh and Shechem: Competing Traditions?

Paper for SBL Berlin, 2002

By Ingrid Hjelm, University of Copenhagen

Diachronically, in biblical tradition, whether Hebrew or Greek, and in Samaritan chronicles, Shiloh stands between the Shechem of the Patriarchs and the Jerusalem of the Davidides. While in biblical traditions, Shiloh's connotations are ambiguous, in Samaritan tradition, the location is presented entirely negatively, as a competing cult place from the time of the interim between the kings of the *Ra\*w#n* (MT: judges) and the kings of the *Phanuta*, i.e. the Israelite monarchies. In Samaritan tradition, Shiloh owes its origin to the priest Eli's departure from Gerizim. The narrative occurs in all Samaritan traditions with slight variations. The young Eli, son of Jefunneh of the lineage of Ithamar, is given the honorary office of being the chancellor of the temple treasures<sup>1[1]</sup> under the leadership of the high priest Uzzi (𐤀𐤍), whose authority he challenges.<sup>2[2]</sup> The quarrel results in Eli's departure from Gerizim and his erection of a temple and cult in Shiloh. A variant tradition involves exclusion, because of non-observant behaviour (*Chron. II*, §LK\*, U\*, *AF* page 41).<sup>3[3]</sup> Eli's departure turns the fate of all Israel, which loses its coherence and becomes split into three separate groups (cf. *Chron. II*, Judg. §LO\*-T\*; 1 Sam. §BA\*-F\*; *AF* page 42): 'A faction on Mount Gerizim; an heretical faction that followed false gods; and the faction that followed Eli son of Yafn3 in Shiloh'. Later, in the beginning of Saul's reign, another quarrel broke out, with some opting for Shiloh and others for Mount Gerizim,

---

<sup>1[1]</sup> Cf. Lev. 38.21.

<sup>2[2]</sup> Macdonald, *Chron. II* §JI\*; KS\* and *AF* page 41; *Liber Josuae*, ch. xliii, says that Eli is fifty years old and that 'he had obtained for himself the lordship over the treasure house of the children of Israel'. The offering without salt is done 'as if he was ignorant' and his leave is planned.

<sup>3[3]</sup> In a paradigmatic use of Gen. 4, it gives the role of Cain to Eli, as the unsuccessful priest, whose offer God rejects because it has not been properly salted. Cf. Lev. 2.13; Salt as a sign of eternal covenant is mentioned twice in the OT. Num. 18.19, regarding the Aaronide priests, and 2 Chron. 13.5, regarding the everlasting kingship over Israel, which 'Yahweh, Israel's God gave to David and his sons by a covenant of salt' (𐤀𐤍 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍).

while still others said “Neither here nor there” (*AF* page 46). Abandoning Shiloh, they chose Jerusalem at the initiative of David, who went to Saul to counsel him to:

‘make war on the sons of Israel who were still living in the Beautiful Plain<sup>4[4]</sup> because they had not abandoned the illustrious mountain nor followed their (i.e. Jesse and Saul’s) whims, nor were they sacrificing wherever they sacrificed; and because they (the Samaritans) had the remnants of the Philistines fighting on their side. For when the sons of Israel had become weak and fewer in number, they had entered into a treaty with the nations and sued for peace. Consequently the hatred between them and the erroneous children of Israel intensified and hardened.’ (*AF* page 47).

Saul’s attack, ‘on the Feast of Tabernacles’, results in a killing of ‘Sh3sh3 the Great High Priest in Greater Salem’<sup>5[5]</sup> and a great number of the people, women and children taken captive, a destruction of the stone altar on the top of the Mountain and a demolishing of Luzah, the city on the top of the mountain.<sup>6[6]</sup> A possible variant is found in 1 Samuel 22’s narration about Saul killing Ahimelech, son of Ahitub, and the priests in Nob ((□).<sup>7[7]</sup> Josephus implicitly bears witness to the Samaritan variant in his statement that Saul ‘not only slaughtered a whole family of priestly rank, but furthermore demolished the city

---

<sup>4[4]</sup> Synonym for the Plain of Nablus.

<sup>5[5]</sup> According to Macdonald, *Samaritan Chronicle II*, p. 125, this is Salem Rabhta, SE of Sychar and NE of Sam. Gilgal. R. Abel, *La Géographie de Palestine* (2 vols.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1933-1938), II p. 442: ‘Les Samaritains la nomment Salem la Grande dont le nom est conservé par le village de S#lim, à 5 kilomètres à l’est de Bal#}a. mais le site ancien, d’après Alt, serait à *ēih Na{rallah*, éminence isolée à l’ouest de ce village. Sa prospérité aurait commencé avec la déchéance de Sichem, c’est-à-dire aux temps hellénistiques.’ The location finds support in Epiph. *Haer.* LV, 22, Euseb, *Onom.* 160.13 and Jdt. 4.4. For a discussion of Alt and Abel, see L. Wächter, ‘Salem bei Sichem’, *ZDPV* 84 (1968), pp. 63-72, who equates Shalem with S#lim. For identifications of biblical Shalem, see L. Koehler, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* / subsequently rev. by Walter Baumgartner and Johann Jakob Stamm with assistance from Benedikt Hartmann et al. (5 vols.; Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1994-2000), *ad. loc.* See also note 000 below.

<sup>6[6]</sup> The narrative is missing in Juynboll, *Liber Josuae*, and far more elaborated in Macdonald, *Chronicle II*.

<sup>7[7]</sup> Hjelm, *Samaritans and Early Judaism*, pp. 246-249.

(<sup>8[8]</sup> which the Deity himself had chosen as the home and nurse of priests and prophets’,<sup>9[9]</sup> and strove to leave what was virtually their temple destitute of priests and prophets, by first slaying so many of them and not suffering even their native place to remain, that others might come after them.’<sup>10[10]</sup> This last non-scriptural sentence resembles the destruction of the soil by planting ‘salt’, as Abimelech did in Shechem (Judg. 9.45; Jos. *Ant.* 5.248) or ‘an undesirable plant’, as Simon did on Gerizim (*Megillat Taanit*).<sup>11[11]</sup> In *AF* page 48 ‘they (Saul and his men) sowed it, like (all other) fields’ and the sons of Israel were abandoned from the Mountain for 22 years. The Samaritan narrative shares quite many features with variants related to 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE ‘events’, known from the Books of Maccabees and Josephus.

The provisional character of the time of the judges in masoretic tradition also includes the status of Shiloh as a cult place for all Israel<sup>12[12]</sup> from the division of the land (Josh. 18.1) until the capture of the ark during Eli’s reign (1 Samuel 1-4). Under the priestly leadership of Eli as a judge in Shiloh,<sup>13[13]</sup> Israel is no better off than during the tribal leadership of the judges. Biblical ambivalence towards Shiloh might be the reason that the covenant making in Joshua 24 takes place in Shechem and not in Shiloh. The narrative about the covenant, considered by Wellhausen to be Yahwistic (E) with few additions,<sup>14[14]</sup> is found in both Samaritan tradition and Josephus, however, in a significantly shorter version in Josephus reflecting Joshua 23 rather than 24, lacking any direct reference to the past and with no renewal of the covenant and no ceremonies or sacrifice (*Ant.* 5.115-116). In the Samaritan Chronicle II, Josh. 24.2-5, 6b-10,

---

<sup>8[8]</sup> An act not mentioned in scripture.

<sup>9[9]</sup> Jos. *Ant.* 6.262. Scripture does not mention prophets.

<sup>10[10]</sup> Jos. *Ant.* 6.268.

<sup>11[11]</sup> Lichtenstein, ‘Die Fastenrolle’, pp. 288, 339-340; *b. Yom.* 69a; cf. *Hjelm, Samaritans and Early Judaism*, pp. 128-129. The act belongs to the curse for not keeping the Law (Deut. 29.22), illustrated in the Sodom and Gomorrah narrative and invoked as the ultimate curse in e.g. Amos 4.11; Hos. 11.8; Jer. 23.14-15; 49.18; 50.40; Zef. 2.9; Ps. 107.34; Sir. 39.23.

<sup>12[12]</sup> Cf. Joshua 18-19; 1 Sam. 3.20-4.1

<sup>13[13]</sup> 1 Sam. 4.18

<sup>14[14]</sup> Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 133-134. So also Van Seters, ‘Joshua 24 & the Problem of Tradition’.

11b-12, 19-21a of the masoretic version are lacking,<sup>15[15]</sup> all of which caused Wellhausen, Noth and quite a number of scholars trouble in their assignment.<sup>16[16]</sup> *AF* brings a version, which in length, though not in content, comes closest to Josephus' version. Without any reference to the past, Joshua, after having summoned the assembly of Israel to the plain of Nablus, said to them (underlined text is not in the masoretic version):

'Do not swerve from the service of the Lord, neither to the right nor to the left (cf. Josh. 23.6); do not serve foreign gods; accept no Qibla<sup>17[17]</sup> other than the illustrious Mountain which God made known to you in his unchangeable Law, lest the disasters written down on the scroll of the Law fall upon you." They replied and said, "Far be it from us to do such a thing, or to follow anybody but our Lord. we will swerve neither to right nor to left: we will serve our Lord on this mountain forever." So Joshua then took a young lamb and sacrificed it on the Mountain, because of the covenant they had made with him on behalf of themselves and their children.' (*AF* page 37).

The LXX stands out as the only text, which names the place as Shiloh. Except for a harmonising tendency with Josh. 18.1; 19.51; 21.2, 22.9, 12; (Judg. 18.31; 21.12-24), there is no obvious reason for this variant and it may well belong to a different *Vorlage*.<sup>18[18]</sup> The possibility that the reason is theological, as is argued

---

<sup>15[15]</sup> MT Josh. 24.6b-10 is 'replaced' by 'You know all that Yahweh did to you; how he brought your fathers out from Egypt with sign, with wonders and with a strong hand and an outstretched arm and with great miracles (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יָצָאנוּ מִמִּצְרָיִם בְּאֵימָה וּבְחַסְדֵּי יָדוֹ וּבְחַסְדֵּי יָדוֹ וּבְחַסְדֵּי יָדוֹ וּבְחַסְדֵּי יָדוֹ); how you crossed the Sea of Reeds on dry land (וְעָבַרְתֶּם אֶת-יָם-סוּף עַל-יַבֵּשֶׁת וְעָבַרְתֶּם אֶת-יָם-סוּף עַל-יַבֵּשֶׁת) and everything he did for you in the wilderness (וְכָל-אֲשֶׁר-עָשָׂה לָכֶם בְּאֶרֶץ-מִדְבָּר וְכָל-אֲשֶׁר-עָשָׂה לָכֶם בְּאֶרֶץ-מִדְבָּר); how you also went over the Jordan on dry land (וְעָבַרְתֶּם אֶת-יַרְדֵּן עַל-יַבֵּשֶׁת וְעָבַרְתֶּם אֶת-יַרְדֵּן עַל-יַבֵּשֶׁת); ST. Josh. U B\*; cf., *Samaritan Chronicle No. II*, p. 98; Hebrew text, p. 30 (my translation).

<sup>16[16]</sup> Cf. L. Peritt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT, 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), pp. 239-284; Van Seters, 'Joshua 24 & the Problem of Tradition', pp. 141-146; Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative*, pp. 7-95.

<sup>17[17]</sup> 'An Arabic term referring to the direction towards which one should pray. For the Samaritans, Mount Gerizim is the Qibla, the "Chosen Place"; cf. Stenhouse, *Abu'l-Fath*, p. i, n. 3.

<sup>18[18]</sup> Tov, *Textual Criticism*, pp. 327-330; Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative*, p. 94, with bibliographic references.

by Eduard Nielsen and Alan Crown,<sup>19[19]</sup> has serious implications, given the ambiguous attitude towards Shechem and Shiloh in the masoretic tradition.<sup>20[20]</sup> Josephus' silence about the covenant or cultic ceremonies found in masoretic and non-masoretic traditions, might be his solution to a diminishing of Samaritan claims of importance - a tendency noticed also with regards to Abraham and Jacob's altars at Shechem,<sup>21[21]</sup> the burial of Joseph's bones at Shechem<sup>22[22]</sup> and the 'transformation' of the El-Berith temple at Shechem<sup>23[23]</sup> into a rocky place.<sup>24[24]</sup> From Josephus' denigration of Shechem to his favouring of Shiloh, most explicitly expressed in Joshua's moving the camp from Gilgal into the hill country in the fifth year, where he set up the holy tabernacle at the the city of Shiloh, since that spot seemed suitable on account of its beauty until circumstances should permit them to build a temple' (Jos. *Ant.* 5.68; cf. Josh. 18.1, 9),<sup>25[25]</sup> it becomes clear that the LXX has not merely changed a name, but reflects a tradition that purports a continuity from the Shiloh tabernacle in the time of Joshua to Solomon's temple in Jerusalem. In Josephus, the problem of competing traditions is solved by his addition:

'Proceeding thence to Shechem,<sup>26[26]</sup> [from Shiloh] with all the people, he erected an altar at the spot foreordained by Moses,<sup>27[27]</sup> and divided his army,

---

<sup>19[19]</sup> E. Nielsen, *Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation* (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1955), p. 86: 'the ancient translator felt there was a problem in the prominence held by Shechem in this tradition.' Crown, 'Redating the Schism', p. 32: 'The Septuagintal reading of Shiloh instead of Shechem (Joshua 24) and the statement in the Testament of Joseph (2.6) that Joseph was buried in Hebron rather than near Shechem suggests that the Jewish authorities were already troubled by Samaritan interpretations of the sacred writ in favour of Shechem and Mt Gerizim.'

<sup>20[20]</sup> Hjelm, *Samaritans and Early Judaism*, pp.146-149.

<sup>21[21]</sup> Shechem is not mentioned: Jos. *Ant.* 1.157; cf. Gen. 12.6-7; the verses are missing: Jos. *Ant.* 1.337; cf. Gen. 33.18-20.

<sup>22[22]</sup> Shechem is not mentioned: Jos. *Ant.* 2.200; 5. 117-119; cf. gen. 50.25; Exod. 13.19; Josh. 24.29-33.

<sup>23[23]</sup> Jos. *Ant.* 5.248; cf. Judg. 9.46.

<sup>24[24]</sup> T. Thornton, 'Anti-Samaritan Exegesis Reflected in Josephus' Retelling of Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges', *JTS*, 47 (1996), pp. 125-130.

<sup>25[25]</sup> Jos. *Ant.* 5.68; cf. Josh. 18.1; 8.30-34. For other references to Josephus' preference of Shiloh for other cult places, such as Mizpa, Gilgal and Nob, see Thornton, 'Anti-Samaritan Exegesis', pp. 127-129.

<sup>26[26]</sup> Not mentioned in the biblical account, but SP Deut. 11.30 states that the place should be 'facing Shechem' (פְּלִי שֶׁחֶם) (פְּלִי שֶׁחֶם), which also the Mishnah confirms: 'When Israel crossed the Jordan and came upon mount Gerizim and unto mount Ebal in Samaria, near by Shechem, beside the oaks of Moreh, as it is written, *Are they not beyond Jordan* (there it is written, *And Abraham*

posted one half of it on mount Garizin and the other half on Ebal,<sup>28[28]</sup> whereon also stood the altar, along with the Levites and the Priests. After sacrificing (èýóáíôâð) and pronouncing imprecations (äd êár PñNò ðíéçóŪiáííé), which they also left graven upon the altar, they returned to Shiloh.<sup>29[29]</sup>

Combining traditions of Joshua 8 and 18, Josephus has ‘solved’ the difficult placement of the blessing and cursing event after the conquest of Ai in the masoretic tradition (Jos. 8.1-29) and given priority to Shiloh as the first place visited after the moving of the camp from Gilgal.

In 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>, this same problem is ‘solved’ by placing MT Josh. 8.30-35 between the crossing of the Jordan in Joshua 4 and the beginning of Joshua 5. The variant appears similar to Josephus’ description of ‘Joshua’s building of an altar immediately after the crossing of the Jordan (Jos. Ant. 5.16-21), while not mentioning either the journey to Mount Ebal or an altar at the point where the masoretic text places it.<sup>30[30]</sup> Though he eventually describes an altar at Shechem, it is not until noticeably later in the narrative.<sup>31[31]</sup> Josephus’ version emphasises, in a passage unparalleled in Deuteronomy that the sacrifices in the Ebal-Gerizim area are to be a strictly singular affair, never to be repeated.<sup>32[32]</sup> In Ant. 5.20 (cf. Josh. 4.19-5.12), Josephus does not mention Gilgal, but settles the camp ‘at a distance of ten stades from Jericho.’<sup>33[33]</sup> He mentions sacrifices, the

---

*passed through the land unto the place of Shechem unto the oak of Moreh; as there the oak of Moreh that is spoken of is at Shechem, so here the oak of Moreh that is spoken of is at Shechem’ (m. jot. 7.5).*

<sup>27[27]</sup> Deut. 11.29-30; 27.4; Jos. Ant. 4.305: ‘when they had utterly vanquished the land of Canaan and destroyed its whole population, as was meet, they were to erect the altar pointing towards the rising sun, not far from the city of Shechem (iš ðüññü òyò Æééßiùí ðíéâùð) between the two mountains, the Garizaeon on the right and that called “Counsel” (Áĩðëx ) on the left.’

<sup>28[28]</sup> ÇâPëv; LXX: ÁáéáŪë

<sup>29[29]</sup> Jos. Ant. 5. 69-70; cf. Josh. 8.30-31.

<sup>30[30]</sup> Jos. Ant. 5.45-48, 49-57; cf. Josh. 8.8.1-29, (missing 30-35); 9.3-27.

<sup>31[31]</sup> Jos. Ant. 5.68-69; cf., Abegg, Flint and Ulrich (eds.), *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, pp. 201-202.

<sup>32[32]</sup> Thornton, ‘Anti-Samaritan Exegesis’, p. 127; cf. Jos. Ant. 4.308.

<sup>33[33]</sup> However, Jos. Ant. 5.34: ‘The place where Joshua had established his camp was called Galgala’ (ĂŪëääéá); cf. Josh. 5.9 added to Josh. 7.1; cf also Jos. Ant. 5.48, 62, Joshua’s camp in Galgala, which he moves to Shiloh after the conquest of the land (5.68).

Passover, but no circumcision and no blessings or curses.<sup>34[34]</sup> In the LXX, a parallel to MT Josh. 8.30-35 is placed after Josh. 9.2.

*AF* page 10-11 reflects both biblical (Josh. 5.10-12) and Josephus' (Jos. *Ant.* 5.16-21) variants by referring to the camping in Gilgal on the first night and on the plain of Jericho on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month, the eating of unleavened bread, the produce of the land and the cessation of eating manna.<sup>35[35]</sup> The altar, sacrifice and circumcision are not mentioned. Paralleling masoretic tradition (Josh. 8.30-9-2), Joshua builds an altar on Gerizim after the conquest of Ai and before the forming of the coalition of the nations. Compared to the repetitive masoretic text, *AF* offers rather what might be termed a paraphrase of MT Josh. 8. 30-35:<sup>36[36]</sup>

'It was at that time that Joshua built an altar of stones on Mount Gerizim,<sup>37[37]</sup> as the Almighty had told him (to do) and offered sacrifices upon it. *Half the people stood facing* Mount Gerizim, while *the other half faced* Mount Ebal. *Joshua read out the Torah in its entirety* in the hearing of all Israel, *men, women and children and the stranger who was in their midst*' (*AF* page 14).

The 'paraphrase', however, might be that of 4Q Josh<sup>a</sup> (or a similar text), about which we cannot know whether the entire passage of MT Josh. 8.30-35 was intended, as only the last word of verse 34 and the entire verse 35 are present in a slightly varied form followed by an editorial transition to Josh. 5.2.<sup>38[38]</sup> Eugene Ulrich, however, assumes that although there is no textual certainty of

---

<sup>34[34]</sup> Josephus' text is thus not quite so similar to 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> as the of authors of *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, assert.

<sup>35[35]</sup> Cf. MT. Josh. 5.10-12; Jos. *Ant.* 5.16-21; Juynboll, *Liber Josuae*, ch. xvi-xvii, paralleling *AF*.

<sup>36[36]</sup> Parallels to MT Josh. 8.30-35, which are not in Deut. 11.29 and 27. 2-8, 12-14, are in italics.

<sup>37[37]</sup> MT: { }<sup>TM</sup>; LXX: δί -ñãé Ãáéááé.

<sup>38[38]</sup> E. Ulrich, '4QJosh<sup>a</sup> and Joshua's First Altar in the Promised Land', in G.J. Brooke (ed.), *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 89-104.



the building of the altar in 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>,<sup>39[39]</sup> scripture links the building of the altar with the reading of the Torah. Thus the first altar was in Gilgal. The names Gerizim and Ebal were added secondarily to Deut 27.4 and linked with Deut. 27.9-26, while ‘Deut. 27.12-13 appears to be redactionally connected with Deut. 11.29-30.’<sup>40[40]</sup> Although a neat solution to a difficult problem, Ulrich’s assertion ‘that 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> and Josephus preserve the earlier and /or preferable form’,<sup>41[41]</sup> is far from being proven. It might as well be that Josh, 8.30-35 has been ‘inserted’ in 4 QJosh<sup>a</sup> at the junction of ch. 4 and 5, in order to show the expediency with which Joshua carried out the Deuteronomistic Law, such as suggested by Alexander Rofé.<sup>42[42]</sup> This interpretation finds support in rabbinic tradition: ‘everything, the ceremonies near Shechem and the journey from Gilgal and back, took place on the very day of the crossing into Canaan (*t. Soḥ.* 8:7; cf. *m. Soḥ.* 7:5); ‘Rabbi Eliezer (ben Hyrcanus, 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE) “transferred” Gerizim and Ebal to two artificial mounds which had allegedly been heaped up by the Israelites near Gilgal’ (*y. Soḥ.* 7.3).<sup>43[43]</sup> A divergent opinion, however, also appears from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE, Rabbi Ishmael, who ‘ruled that all the laws that had to be performed upon entering the land were really enforced after the fourteen years of conquest and distribution of tribal inheritances (*y. Soḥ.* 7.3). Thus, in his view, the right chronological position of Josh. 30-35 would be after 19.31 or 21.42 (LXX).’<sup>44[44]</sup> Rofé is well aware of Josephus’ second narrative at exactly this point, however not that similar to Josephus’ proceeding from Gilgal to Shiloh, passing quickly over Shechem, Rabbi Ishmael’s mention of the fourteen years of conquest implies the

---

<sup>39[39]</sup> Ulrich, ‘4QJosh<sup>a</sup>, p. 91: ‘‘Though the first two lines of frg. 1 correspond with Josh. 34-35 (the reading of the Torah), it is not certain that 8.30-31 (the building of the altar) preceded, since that would occur at the unpreserved bottom of the preceding column.’

<sup>40[40]</sup> Ulrich, ‘4QJosh<sup>a</sup>, p. 96; *idem* ‘4QJosh<sup>a</sup> (Pls. XXXII-XXXIV), in E.Ulrich and F.M Cross (eds.), *DJD XIV* (1995), pp. 143-152.

<sup>41[41]</sup> Ulrich, ‘4QJosh<sup>a</sup>, p. 96.

<sup>42[42]</sup> A. Rofé, ‘The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>’, in G.J. Brooke (ed.), *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 73-80.

<sup>43[43]</sup> Rofé, ‘Editing of the Book of Joshua’, p. 79.

<sup>44[44]</sup> Rofé, ‘Editing of the Book of Joshua’, p. 79-80.



transference of the tabernacle from Gilgal directly to Shiloh.<sup>45[45]</sup> Here mention shall be made of a Samaritan variant.

Paralleling Josephus (*Ant.* 5.68-69), a third narrative appears (*AF*, page 28) after the conquests of the land (in traditions, which vary greatly from MT and LXX Joshua 9 [11]-17). On Gerizim, they set up the stones from the Jordan. Joshua built the temple on Mount Gerizim in the second year, put the tabernacle in it and constructed an altar of stones (*AF*, page 28). After the sacrifice, the tribes uttered the blessings from Mount Gerizim and the curses from Mount Ebal. Compositionally placed after the conquests, the text, however, recalls the entrance situation and claims that, according to ‘tradition’, the event took place ‘in the first month’<sup>46[46]</sup> of the second year<sup>47[47]</sup> after the entrance into the land of Canaan. This, of course, marks the conquest narratives as *inclusio* and lends priority to the Gerizim as the first ‘settlement’ of the Tabernacle, which had ‘stood in the Plain for the space of a year: from Passover to Passover.’

It seems that it is not literary chronology, as asserted by Rofé,<sup>48[48]</sup> but location which is the driving force behind the existence of variant traditions. MT and ST’s agreement that the reading of the law took place on Gerizim and Ebal necessarily separates this event from the entrance event. While MT presents this as a single event including the blessings and the curses, ST separates the two. Similar to Josephus, the blessing and the cursing are placed at the end of the conquests, before the land distribution, which in *AF* page 29 takes place in

---

<sup>45[45]</sup> Cf. the fourteen years of the sanctuary at Gilgal (*b. Zeb.* 118b).

<sup>46[46]</sup> Reflective of MT Josh.4.19-20, the erection of the 12 stones in Gilgal.

<sup>47[47]</sup> Cf. also Juynboll, *Liber Josuae*, ch. xxi; Jos. *Ant.* 5.68: the sixth year, which appears also in a 19-20<sup>th</sup> century Sam. manuscript composed by Ab-Sikkuwa b. Saed (1856-1912) the Danfi or the priest Jacob b. Ezzi (1899-1987). Either of them based their composition on the writings of Pinhas b. Yitzhak (Samaritan: Phinas ban Yessak - 1841-1898); cf. B. Tsedaka, ‘The Samaritan’s Departure From Israel: The Quarrel Between the High Priest Ozzi and the Priest Eli’, *A.B.- The Samaritan News*, 801-803 (2001), pp. 23-33 [32]. For the spelling of names based on pronunciation, B. Tsedaka, private conversation.

<sup>48[48]</sup> Rofé, ‘Editing of the Book of Joshua’, p. 80: ‘the same problems which troubled scribes of the Second Commonwealth kept bothering later Tannaim and Amoraim: what is the proper time of the execution of the ceremonies enjoined in Deut 27? Or in other words, how does Joshua carry out what is commanded in the Torah.’

Shechem, but in Josephus in Shiloh (Jos. *Ant.* 5.72, 79). Hence, the quick return to Shiloh (ἄκὸ ὁπί Ὁέϊρ™ί ΠίΎæãîáí) in Jos. *Ant.* 5.70, where the tabernacle has already been set up (*Ant.* 5.68). In MT Josh. 18.1: ‘Then the whole congregation of the Israelites assembled at Shiloh, and they set up the tabernacle there; the whole land lay subdued before them.’ Why did Josephus harmonise the Shiloh with the Shechem event? The answer probably lies in the troublesome passage of Josh. 8.30-35, which implicitly gives priority to Shechem against Gilgal and Shiloh. Hence, the compositional separation of the Shechem event with the Gilgal event is prior to their combination in 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>. It is not that 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> and Josephus present an earlier form, which did not specify the place where the altar was to be built, prior to a possible Samaritan claim that the first altar should be “on Mount Gerizim”, as suggested by Ulrich.<sup>49[49]</sup> Josephus’ denigration of Shechem has this claim as its background. It rather seems that variant traditions existed contemporaneously. Josephus’ choice had its own reason: a support of Jewish claims for cultic sovereignty, and hence a denial of any Samaritan claim to such sovereignty.<sup>50[50]</sup>

With this examination, it has become clear that in the Septuagint, Joshua 24 underscores a text tradition, found also in Jeremiah and rabbinic writings, which points forward to the Deuteronomistic History’s replacement of the cult in Shiloh with that in Jerusalem,<sup>51[51]</sup> while the masoretic text creates a continuum

---

<sup>49[49]</sup> Ulrich, ‘4QJosh<sup>a</sup> (Pls. XXXII-XXXIV)’, p. 146: Thus it may be conjectured that the witnesses display three stages in the history of the text. First, 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> and Josephus present an early form of the narrative which places the building of the altar at Gilgal at the end of chapter 4, in accord with the command as read in Deut 27.2-3 and Deut. 27.4 without the insertion of a place-name. Secondly, the Samaritan tradition includes Ⲛⲓⲣⲓⲙⲉⲗ Ⲛⲓⲣⲓⲙⲉⲗ; Vetus Latinae: Garzin] at Deut 27.4, constituting a Samaritan claim. A tertiary sequence is preserved in MT and LXX, with Ⲛⲓⲣⲓⲙⲉⲗ in MT at Deut. 27.4 as a Judaeian counterclaim to Ⲛⲓⲣⲓⲙⲉⲗ. According to this hypothesis then, the narrative about the building of the altar, which originally followed the crossing of the Jordan and preceded the circumcision account, was subsequently transposed in accordance with Moses’ revised command in MT to its present, curious position at Josh. 8.30-35.’

<sup>50[50]</sup> Hjelm, *Samaritans and Early Judaism*, pp. 222-238.

<sup>51[51]</sup> In the masoretic Bible, most explicitly argued in Psalm 78 and Jeremiah 7; cf. D.G. Schley, *Shiloh: A Biblical City in Tradition and History*, (JSOTS, 63; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), pp. 167-181.



