

The Earliest Israel: Territorial History in the Highlands of Canaan

Israel Finkelstein

Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University

INTENSIVE RESEARCH ON THE EMERGENCE of Ancient Israel in the last several decades has left two related questions unanswered: (1) What is the earliest territorial formation that can be identified as Israelite? (2) How was the name of a group of people in the Merneptah stele in the late thirteenth century BCE transformed into the name of a territorial entity three centuries later? The second question can be phrased in a slightly different way: With the nascent Northern Kingdom of the late tenth century and Shechem of the Amarna period in the fourteenth century BCE covering approximately the same territory, how to explain the name change from Shechem to Israel? Evidently, the change in scholarly perception regarding the rise of Ancient Israel, from viewing it as a unique event in the Late Bronze/Iron I transition, possibly involving the introduction of groups from outside of Canaan, to understanding it as a long-term process within the local demographic stock, complicates answering both these questions.

The key to addressing these issues is a reconstruction of the sequence of territorial formations in the central highlands of Canaan (especially in its northern sector) in the Late Bronze and early phases of the Iron Age—their extent and identity. For this endeavor, we have relatively good evidence for the two extremities of the process: the Late Bronze Age city-state of Shechem in the Amarna period at one end and the early days of the Northern Kingdom at the other.¹

In the Amarna period, Shechem ruled over the Samaria highlands, bordering in the south on the territory of Jerusalem. Shechem attempted to expand its territory or political sway to the Jezreel Valley in the north, the coastal plain in the west, and across the Jordan River in the northeast (Finkelstein 1996; Finkelstein and Na'aman 2005). Shechem was among the most powerful city-states in Canaan; it ruled over one of the largest territories in the network of city-states in the southern Levant, although this territory was sparsely settled. Information in the Amarna letters is restricted to a short period of several decades in the fourteenth century BCE. Still, though we do not have clear evidence—textual or archaeological—for the rest of the Late Bronze Age, one can assume that the situation depicted in the tablets continued in the thirteenth

To my dear colleague and friend “Jacob d’Alep,” King of the book of Judges, with great esteem.

1. By “early days of the Northern Kingdom” I refer to the 50 years before the rule of the Omride Dynasty. For reasons which are beyond the scope of the present study I accept the historicity and years of reign of the pre-Omride kings, but as explained below, this does not mean automatically consenting to the biblical notion of continuity of an “Israel” from Jeroboam to Omri, because this may come from the ideology of biblical authors—first Northern and later Southern.

and much of the twelfth centuries BCE—until the collapse of the Late Bronze system of city-states under Egyptian hegemony.

A few years ago, I dealt with the territorial extent of the Northern Kingdom in its first decades (which I described as the “Tirzah polity”), that is, before the rule of the Omride Dynasty. Looking at the archaeological evidence and chronistic materials in the book of Kings, I reached the conclusion that this polity extended over the territory of the highlands north of Jerusalem, the Jezreel Valley, and the western slopes of the Gilead (Finkelstein 2011). Expansion into the coastal plain, the mountainous Galilee, the Upper Jordan Valley, the *mishor* in Moab, and possibly the area of Ramoth-gilead came only in the days of the Omrides, in the first half to middle of the ninth century BCE. In an article published over ten years ago, Nadav Na’aman and I pointed to similarities between the expansion efforts of Late Bronze Shechem in the Amarna period and the expansion of Omride Israel (Finkelstein and Na’aman 2005). On second thought, the territory of Shechem (and the maneuvers of its rulers) in the Amarna period better resembles the territorial growth of the Northern Kingdom *before* the rule of the Omrides. In both periods, a polity which had its hub in the area of Shechem ruled over the northern part of the central highlands and expanded (or attempted to expand) to the Jezreel Valley and the slopes of the Gilead in Transjordan. Analyzing Northern foundation myths, royal traditions and heroic tales embedded in the Bible, I have recently suggested that in the days of Jeroboam II, in the first half of the eighth century BCE, the territory of the kingdom in its early days—as delineated above—was conceived as the core area of Israel and the Israelites (Finkelstein 2017).

Assuming that the Late Bronze city-state of Shechem prevailed until the late twelfth century BCE, a question remains: What was the territorio-political situation in this area in the interval between the collapse of the Late Bronze city-state system under Egyptian domination and the rise of the Northern Kingdom (the Tirzah polity)? I refer to the Iron I in the ca. 200 years between the second half of the twelfth and the middle to second half of the tenth century BCE. Though this is a relatively short period, I believe that archaeology, clues in the biblical text, and an extra-biblical source can help delineate two different, consecutive territorial systems in the central highlands north of Jerusalem, one seemingly replacing the other. Let me start with the later one, which I would date to the late eleventh and first half of the tenth century BCE.

I refer to a territorial entity that emerged from the area of the Gibeon–Gibeah plateau. It can be identified according to three pieces of evidence: (1) archaeological clues, mainly a system of fortified sites in its core-area; (2) the list of places taken over by Sheshonq I, which refers to at least three towns in this area—I see no reason for the exceptional penetration of an Egyptian army into the heart of the highlands other than the need to deal with threats posed by this polity to renewed pharaonic interests in Canaan; (3) assuming that 2 Sam 2:9 and early Saul stories in 1 Samuel, such as the rescue of Jabesh-gilead and the battle of Gilboa, preserve a germ of genuine memory, this formation must have ruled over the entire northern part of the central highlands and the eastern slopes of the Gilead, and attempted to expand into the lowlands in both the west and north. The Gibeon–Gibeah polity flourished in the first half of the tenth century and declined in the middle of that century or a short while later; in archaeological terms, its history covers the late Iron I. I have dealt with this polity elsewhere (Finkelstein 2013, 37–61; in press b), so there is no need to repeat the

detailed arguments here. For the current discussion, I would only note an anomaly—the location of its hub in the area of Gibeon, to differ from other Bronze and Iron Age entities in the northern part of the central highlands, which were ruled from the area of Shechem–Tirzah–Samaria. I will return to this issue later.

Accepting the existence of this entity, the only missing temporal link left in the Late Bronze–Iron IIA sequence is the early Iron I, in the late twelfth and the eleventh century BCE. Indeed, a not-as-well documented territorial entity seems to have existed at that time in the area of Shechem. It can be gleaned mainly from the archaeological record. The most important evidence for this entity comes from the site of Shiloh.

Past excavations at Shiloh—both the Danish dig in the late 1920s and early 1930s and my own work there in the early 1980s—revealed evidence for the administrative nature of the site in the Iron I. A set of well-built, pillared storage houses were unearthed on the upper, western slope of the mound, and stone-built silos were found in other places (Finkelstein 1993). The two digs did not reveal remains of habitation buildings. Based on the results of the excavations I estimated the size of the Iron I site to have been ca. one hectare (Finkelstein 1993, 384).

In order to understand the nature of Iron I Shiloh, one needs to look at the character of the site in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. In the Middle Bronze III Shiloh featured a massive stone-constructed support wall on its periphery, earthen glacis, which functioned as revetment, outside of it, storage rooms adjacent to the inner side of the peripheral stone support wall, and earthen fills laid on the slope on the inner side of these rooms (Finkelstein 1993, 374–77). In this case, too, there was no evidence for habitation quarters. In the Late Bronze Age, the site was apparently not inhabited, but a *favissa* in the northeastern side of the mound testifies to cultic activity, probably by people living in the region around it. These finds shed light on the long-term administrative function of the site, probably as an elaborate cult place, rather than a common, densely inhabited town (Finkelstein 1993).

Iron I Shiloh came to an end in a fierce conflagration. The pottery assemblage from the destruction layer can be ascribed to the early- to mid-Iron I (Finkelstein and Piasetzky 2006), that is, before the latest phase of the period (in the latter I refer to the late Iron I, best manifested by Stratum VIA at Megiddo—Arie 2006; 2013). Radiocarbon results for samples taken from the destruction layer provide a date for the devastation of Shiloh in the second half of the eleventh century BCE (Sharon et al. 2007, 26). This means that Shiloh prospered during the eleventh century BCE, perhaps starting as early as the late twelfth century.

These data led me to suggest that the biblical tradition on the importance of Shiloh in pre-monarchic times and its brutal destruction (Jer 7:12) may preserve a memory that goes back to the late eleventh century (Finkelstein 2013, 49–50). Composition of literary texts in the Northern Kingdom is evident starting in the early eighth century (Deir Alla and Kuntillet Ajrud); hence preservation of the Shiloh memory over a period of two centuries seems possible.²

Recent excavations at Shiloh throw further, important light on the subject discussed in the present study. Additional Iron I buildings that were probably used for storage

2. But see a different scenario, emphasizing the existence of an Iron IIA cult place at the site, which seems to better fit a Yahwistic tradition (Jer 7: 12), in Finkelstein in press a.

were unearthed close to the surface in the southeastern sector of the site (<http://www.a-shiloh.co.il/2496>). From the published pictures, they too seem to have been destroyed in a fierce conflagration. Evidently, this destruction must be contemporary with the one traced in past excavations on the western slope of the mound. This means that the Iron I site was bigger than previously estimated, with more extensive storage facilities;³ it could have reached up to 2.5 hectares, much larger than the average Iron I habitation site in the highlands.

We are dealing, then, with a large administrative center. To judge from the biblical tradition and long-term history of the site (Middle Bronze to Iron I), its focus and *raison d'être* was probably a cult place on the summit. The question is: What was the territorial entity that it served, and where was the hub of this polity located? In other words: Where was the seat of the ruler it served? The same question can be asked regarding Middle Bronze III Shiloh. For both periods, the logical answer would be that the center of power was located at Shechem—only 17 km as the crow flies to the north of Shiloh.

The Iron I settlement at Shechem is represented by Stratum XI, which was destroyed by a fierce fire that left a thick accumulation of debris (Toombs 1979, 70, 72; Campbell 2002, 199–200, 213–15, 221, 223; Finkelstein 2006). Thus far, sherds from only two loci of this stratum have been published (Boraas 1986; 1999). Some of them—cooking-pots and bowls—date to the Late Bronze Age, while others can be placed in both the Late Bronze II–III and Iron I. Evidently, the important items for dating the stratum (in fact, its destruction) are the latest ones in the two assemblages, which belong to a later phase of the Iron I. This is clearly seen in the shape of some of the cooking-pots (Boraas 1986: Fig. 1:11, 12; 1999, Fig. 10:1, 11:4). The collared rim jars (Boraas 1986: Fig. 5:9–10; 1999, Fig. 3:1) can be dated any time in the Iron I, but note that rims with reed impressions have not been found at early Iron I sites, such as Giloh and Izbet Sartah III, while they do appear in strata representing the later phases of the period, such as Shiloh V. The same holds true for several sherds and vessels in the Leiden collection (e.g., Kerkhof 1969: Figs. 9:10, 29–32; 21:45, 47). Additional evidence for the occupation of Shechem in the Iron I comes from the collection of vessels found by the Austro-German expedition in 1913–14 (Horn and Moulds 1969). Two of the vessels (idem: Pl. VI:159 and Pl. VIII:179 [for the latter, see also Kerkhof 1969: Fig. 11:11]) are typical of the late Iron I; they have parallels in Stratum VIA at Megiddo (Finkelstein, Zimhoni, and Kafri 2000, Figs. 11.13:7, 11.16:3 and Figs. 11.3:8, 11.8:2, 11.12:3 respectively).

I am inclined to date the destruction of Stratum XI to an advanced phase of the Iron I. With the limited number of ceramic items published, it is difficult to say if the devastation occurred in the end phase of the Iron I, around the middle of the tenth century, or slightly earlier, in parallel to the well-dated (pottery-wise for relative chronology and radiocarbon for absolute chronology) destruction of Shiloh V (Finkelstein and Piasezky 2006). The sheer logic—big destruction layers at neighboring sites—point to the latter possibility. This means that an Iron I territorial entity that existed in the highlands

3. Recent excavations in the southwestern sector of the mound unearthed Iron I structures that were also devastated by fire. From the preliminary report (Gat 2015) it is not clear whether they were used for storage, habitation or both.

around Shechem–Shiloh was utterly devastated in a single event sometime in the late eleventh century BCE. This catastrophe—the most significant known thus far in the highlands in the thousand years between the end of the Middle Bronze and the end of the Iron Age—was inflicted on both the hub of this entity and its important cult center.

Who could be the destroyer of the Iron I Shechem entity? There is not enough data to answer this riddle firmly. Had this been a question posed in pre-Columbian Meso- or South American archaeology, a link would probably be made between the contemporaneous fall of the Shechem–Shiloh polity and rise of the nearby Gibeon–Gibeah territorial formation. This would also explain the anomaly in the location of the seat of power of the Gibeon–Gibeah formation away from the traditional Shechem. One could speculate that the Gibeon–Gibeah territorial entity destroyed the Shechem polity, took over its territory, and replaced it as the ruler of the northern part of the central highlands. According to this scenario, in long-term perspective I would see a polity centered at Shechem in the Late Bronze and the early to middle Iron I (with or without disruption between the periods), destroyed and replaced by the Gibeon–Gibeah entity in the late Iron I. The growth of the latter posed a threat to the rising interests of Egypt of the late 21st and early 22nd Dynasties. Consequently, Sheshonq I, the founder of the 22nd Dynasty, conducted a military campaign into the highlands, which brought about the decline of the Gibeon–Gibeah polity. Arrangements imposed by Egypt after the campaign led to the rise of new dynasties in the two traditional hubs of territorial entities in the highlands—Jerusalem and Shechem (I refer to the two Hebrew kingdoms; Finkelstein 2018; in press b).

Still, the destruction of Shechem and Shiloh could have been the result of other (or more complicated) upheavals in the highlands. The Abimelech story in Judges 9 comes to mind in this connection. Similar to the heroic stories in Judges, in this chapter too one can distinguish between an old tale and later additions, mostly polemic in nature (recently Na’aman 2011; Irwin 2012), the former seemingly committed to writing in the early eighth century (Finkelstein 2016). Regarding the old tale, the question is whether it is based on a memory of a historical event. The story deals with a struggle between two *apiru* groups over the rule of Shechem and ends with the destruction of the city. It depicts *apiru* ambiance (Reviv 1966; Na’aman 2011), which testifies to its antiquity—before the Northern Kingdom with its well-organized administration and control over its territory. If one is looking for a specific historical event behind this tale, attention should be given to the massive destruction of Stratum XI at Shechem.

It is possible that Abimelech was described as a deliverer from oppression by Shechem—a late-“Canaanite” town that was located in the midst of “Israelite” (that is, rural highlander) territory (also Oeste 2011, 235; this portrayal of the events may reflect the ideology of the centuries-later author). De Castelbajac (2001) proposed that the old story is made of two separate, antithetic accounts: a Northern tradition with Abimelech as a Canaanite military leader (the struggle with Ga’al) and a description of an Israelite savior, which can be found in the three confrontations—with Shechem, Migdal Shechem and Thebez. Yet, the destruction of Shechem cannot be separated from the Ga’al episode, and the Migdal Shechem and Thebez episodes seem to belong to the late polemic layer in the story (Finkelstein 2016). One way or another, an equation of the old layer in the Abimelech story with the destruction of Shechem XI is a viable option. This does not necessarily stand in contradiction to the theory regarding

a Gibeon–Gibeah takeover of the region; internal strife in the Shechem area could have caused the destruction of the city, which opened the way for a Gibeon–Gibeah takeover.

Can the Shechem–Shiloh polity of the Iron I be identified as the earliest Israel? In other words: When was the territorial-name Shechem, designating a city-state, replaced by the name Israel for a polity in approximately the same territory?⁴

In line with my *territorialgeschichtliche* reconstruction above, the Shechem/Israel transition could have happened in any of the following disruptions in the highlands:⁵

- The rise of the Iron I Shechem–Shiloh polity on the ruins (?) of the Late Bronze city-state ca. 1100 BCE;
- The destruction of the Shechem–Shiloh polity and the rise of the Gibeon–Gibeah entity in the late eleventh century;
- The emergence of the “Tirzah polity” in the middle of the tenth century BCE;
- The rise of the Omride Dynasty in the early ninth century BCE.

There are two difficulties here. The first is seemingly obvious: in order to answer the question of the Shechem/Israel name transformation, one must shed all “filters” which represent the realities and needs of the biblical authors—both a possible Northern author in the first half of the eighth century (Finkelstein 2017) and the Deuteronomistic author(s) in the late seventh century and later. The second difficulty: with all due attention to demographic oscillations, we are dealing with the same, local population stock in the entire Late Bronze–Iron Age sequence, and with close to similar geographic extent of the territorial formations under discussion.

The Late Bronze/Iron I transition in the highlands was characterized by a spectacular (though gradual) settlement transformation, from a depleted rural landscape in the Late Bronze to a wave of new settlements in the Iron I. Indeed, at least demographically, it was the latter that eventually brought about the rise of the Hebrew kingdoms. Yet, in view of the chronological and territorial continuity in this transition, and considering that both polities were centered at Shechem, the Iron I Shechem–Shiloh polity should probably be viewed as another Shechem city-state (possibly portrayed as such in the old layer in the Abimelech story). This would fit the Late Bronze–Iron I continuity of the city-states system featuring second-millennium BCE material culture also in the lowlands (New Canaan in Finkelstein 2003).⁶

4. Needless to say, the distinction between “city-state” and “territorial entity” for the same territory in the highlands comes from the terminology of modern research rather than realities of the past.

5. The location of the early group of people named Israel remains a riddle. Regarding the Merneptah Stele, as far as I can judge the three cities mentioned in the inscription and the structure of the hymn cannot be of help. Long-term logic would side with those who identify Merneptah’s Israel in general terms in the central highlands (Ahlström and Edelman 1985). One should note Lemaire’s proposal (1973, with bibliography) to equate the name Israel with Asriel of the Manasseh genealogies (Num 26:31; Josh 17:2; 1 Chr 7:14) and Samaria Ostraca. In the latter, Asriel is associated with two villages that are probably located south of Shechem. Ostrakon 48 mentions Yashub, most likely the village of Yasuf 12 km south-southwest of Shechem (for the archaeology of the site, see Porat 1968, Site 158; Finkelstein, Lederman, and Bunimovitz 1997, 618). Ostrakon 42 refers to As(h)eret, possibly the village of Asira el-Qibliya, 7 km to the southwest of Shechem (for the archaeology, see Porat 1968, Site 108).

6. The Yahwistic Ark tradition may refer to an Iron IIA (rather than Iron I) shrine at Shiloh—see Finkelstein, in press a. The same holds true for the reference to “Israel” in the story about the battle of Eben-ezer (1 Sam 4).

The dramatic devastation of Iron I Shechem in the mid-Iron I (late eleventh century) can be considered as the closing act of this important second-millennium city-state. There is no archaeological or textual indication for a territorial polity centered at Shechem in the late Iron I (first half of the tenth century BCE), and indeed there seems to have been an occupational gap at the site at that time (see below). Hence, the change of the center of power from Shechem to the Gibeon–Gibeah area probably called for parting with the name Shechem. Whether the name Israel was introduced for the Gibeon–Gibeah polity is difficult to say. Two episodes in what I consider to be the old, Saul Northern royal tradition—the rescue of Jabesh and the Battle of Michmash (possibly also the Battle of Gilboa)—refer to a group of people or an entity named Israel. Yet, here too the name “Israel” could have been introduced to the old stories when they were committed to writing in the Northern Kingdom in the first half of the eighth century BCE (Finkelstein 2017), if not later.

The first extra-biblical reference to the Northern Kingdom as Israel is the mention of “Ahab as Israelite” in the Kurkh Inscription of Shalmaneser III. One can wonder whether this had already been the name of the polity that was ruled by the pre-Omride kings referred to in the Bible as Israelite. It is not sufficiently clear from chronistic texts in Kings if the seat of Jeroboam in the first years of his rule was set at Shechem or whether it was located at Tirzah from the outset. The book of Kings, possibly in a chronistic account (1 Kgs 12:25), says that Jeroboam I built Shechem⁷ but also hints (14:17) that he later moved to Tirzah. It then specifically mentions Tirzah as the capital of the Northern Kingdom starting in the days of Baasha (15:21, 33; 16:6). Had the first seat of Jeroboam been located at Shechem, the territorial name of his polity could have been the same as that of the old city-state. Yet, whether Jeroboam moved to Tirzah during his reign or located his seat there from the outset, there is no logic in the name Shechem for a territorial formation ruled from Tirzah, even if the territorial extent of the new polity was not much different from that of the old one.

In a previous work (Finkelstein 2017) I suggested that Jeroboam’s coronation at Shechem (1 Kgs 12:1, where a Deuteronomistic author replaced Jeroboam with Rehoboam), as well as the reference to his building activity at Shechem and possibly Penuel (12:25), belong to the original Jeroboam royal tradition, which was composed in the first half of the eighth century BCE. The coronation at Shechem could have stemmed from the city’s cultic importance, while the transfer of power to Tirzah may be seen as an attempt to distance the new entity from the old aristocracy and traditions of Bronze Age Shechem. The archaeology of Shechem in the second half of the tenth century BCE is difficult to assess without full publication of the finds from the Drew-McCormick excavations. If Stratum XI was destroyed in the late eleventh century, a short occupational gap followed (in the late Iron I), as the pottery of Stratum X apparently features Iron IIA forms (Boling and Campbell 1987, 265) and hence cannot be dated before the middle of the tenth century.

The last possible scenario for the introduction of the territorial name Israel is the rise of the Omride Dynasty. This datum signals two major changes in the history of the region: the first is the move of the seat of power to the new capital at Samaria; the second is the expansion to new areas that have never been governed by rulers from the

7. But this account may refer to the building activities of Jeroboam II.

northern part of the central highlands—the mountainous Galilee, the northern Jordan Valley, and areas in Transjordan beyond the western slopes of the Gilead. But if the North can be described as a territorial kingdom from its early days (with the takeover of city-states in the lowlands), why should there be a name-change (to Israel, rather than, say, Samaria) with the transfer of the capital?

To summarize, in this article, I surveyed the sequence of territorial entities that existed in the northern part of the central highlands of Canaan from Shechem of the Amarna period to Israel of the Omride Dynasty. Special emphasis was given to an early-to-mid-Iron I (eleventh century BCE) polity, which had its hub at Shechem and an elaborate cult place at Shiloh. I then dealt with four temporal possibilities for the transition from the name Shechem for a city-state to the name Israel for a territorial formation in this region. There is no clear-cut answer to this question; even so, I will take the risk and refer to the Shechem–Shiloh polity of the Iron I as Shechem. Thus the change should best be identified with the rise of the Gibeon–Gibeah polity in the late eleventh/early tenth century, or with the rise of the Tirzah polity in the middle of the tenth century BCE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahlström, G. W., and D. Edelman. 1985. “Merneptah’s Israel.” *JNES* 44: 59–61.
- Arie, E. 2006. “The Iron Age I Pottery: Levels K-5 and K-4 and an Intra-site Spatial Analysis of the Pottery from Stratum VIA.” Pages 191–298 in *Megiddo IV: The 1998–2002 Seasons*. Edited by I. Finkelstein, D. Ussishkin, and B. Halpern. Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University 24. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology.
- . 2013. “The Late Bronze III and Iron I Pottery: Levels K-6, M-6, M-5, M-4 and H-9.” Pages 475–667 in *Megiddo V: The 2004–2008 Seasons*. Edited by I. Finkelstein, D. Ussishkin, and E. H. Cline. Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University 31. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology.
- Boling, R. G., and E. F. Campbell. 1987. “Jeroboam and Rehoboam at Shechem.” Pages 259–72 in *Archaeology and Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Memory of D. Glenn Rose*. Edited by L. G. Perdue, L. E. Toombs, and G. L. Johnson. Atlanta: John Knox.
- . 1986. “Iron Age Ceramics at Tell Balatah: A Preliminary Investigation.” Pages 249–63 in *The Archaeology of Jordan and Other Studies Presented to Siegfried H. Horn*. Edited by T. L. Geraty and L. G. Herr. Berrien Springs: Andrews University.
- Boraas, R. S. 1999. “Shechem Pottery—Locus 14.132.” Pages 18–27 in *On the Way to Nineveh: Studies in Honor of George M. Landes*. Edited by S. L. Cook and S. C. Winter. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Campbell, E. F. 2002. *Shechem III: The Stratigraphy and Architecture of Shechem/Tell Balatah Vol. 1: Text*. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- De Castelbajac, I. 2001. “Histoire de la rédaction de Juges IX: une solution.” *VT* 51: 166–85.
- Finkelstein, I. 1993. “The History and Archaeology of Shiloh from the Middle Bronze Age II to Iron Age II.” Pages 371–93 in *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site*. Edited by I. Finkelstein. Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University 10. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
- . 1996. “The Territorio-Political System of Canaan in the Late Bronze Age.” *UF* 28: 221–55.
- . 2003. “City States and States: Polity Dynamics in the 10th–9th Centuries B.C.E.” Pages 75–83 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and their Neighbors*. Edited by W. G. Dever and S. Gitin. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

- . 2006. “Shechem in the Late Bronze Age.” Pages 349–56 in *Timelines: Studies in Honour of Manfred Bietak*. Edited by E. Czerny et al. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2011. “Stages in the Territorial Expansion of the Northern Kingdom.” *VT* 61: 227–42.
- . 2013. *The Forgotten Kingdom: The Archaeology and History of Northern Israel*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- . 2016. “Comments on the Abimelech Story in Judges 9.” *UF* 46: 69–84.
- . 2017. “A Corpus of North Israelite Texts in the Days of Jeroboam II?” *HBAI* 6: 262–89.
- . 2018. “Jerusalem and the Benjamin Plateau in the Early Phases of the Iron Age: A Different Scenario.” *ZDPV* 134: 190–95.
- . In press a. “Jeroboam II’s Temples.” *ZAW*.
- . In press b. “Saul and Highlands of Benjamin Update: The Role of Jerusalem.” In *Saul and Benjamin in Biblical and Archaeological Perspective*. Edited by J. Kraus, O. Sergi, and K. Weingart.
- Finkelstein, I., Z. Lederman, and S. Bunimovitz. 1997. *Highlands of Many Cultures: The Southern Samaria Survey, the Sites*. Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University 14. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
- Finkelstein, I., and N. Na’aman. 2005. “Shechem of the Amarna Period and the Rise of the Northern Kingdom of Israel.” *IEJ* 55: 172–93.
- Finkelstein, I., and E. Pisetzky. 2006. “The Iron I–IIA in the Highlands and Beyond: ¹⁴C Anchors, Pottery Phases and the Shoshenq I Campaign.” *Levant* 38: 45–61.
- Finkelstein, I., O. Zimhoni, and A. Kafri. 2000. “The Iron Age Pottery Assemblages from Areas F, K and H and Their Stratigraphic and Chronological Implications.” Pages 244–324 in *Megiddo III: The 1992–1996 Seasons*. Edited by I. Finkelstein, D. Ussishkin, and B. Halpern. Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University 18. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology.
- Gat, O. 2015. “Excavations in Area J2 in the Southwest of Tel Shiloh: A Renewed Look at the Findings from Middle Bronze Age II and Iron I.” *Judea and Samaria Research Studies* 24: 35–58 (Hebrew).
- Horn, S. H., and L. G. Moulds. 1969. “Pottery from Shechem Excavated 1913 and 1914.” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 7: 17–46.
- Irwin, B. P. 2012. “Not Just any King: Abimelech, the Northern Monarchy, and the Final Form of Judges.” *JBL* 131: 443–54.
- Kerkhof, V. I. 1969. “Catalogue of the Shechem Collection in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden in Leiden.” *Oudheidkundige Mededelingen* 50: 28–109.
- Lemaire, A. 1973. “Asriel, Šr’l, Israel et l’origine de la confederation Israelite.” *VT* 23: 239–43.
- Na’aman, N. 2011. “A Hidden Anti-Samaritan Polemic in the Story of Abimelech and Shechem (Judges 9).” *BZ* 55: 1–20.
- Porat, Y. 1968. “Inventory of Sites, Samaria Survey II.” Unpublished Report, the Israel Antiquities Authority. Jerusalem.
- Oeste, G. K. 2011. *Legitimacy, Illegitimacy, and the Right to Rule: Windows on Abimelech’s Rise and Demise in Judges 9*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Reviv, H. 1966. “The Government of Shechem in the el-Amarna Period and in the Days of Abimelech.” *IEJ* 16: 252–57.
- Sharon, I., A. Gilboa, T. A. J. Jull, and E. Boaretto. 2007. “Report on the First Stage of the Iron Age Dating Project in Israel: Supporting a Low Chronology.” *Radiocarbon* 49: 1–46.
- Toombs, L. E. 1979. “Shechem: Problems in the Early Israelite Era.” Pages 69–83 in *Symposia Celebrating the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Schools of Oriental Research (1900–1975)*. Edited by F. M. Cross. Cambridge: American Schools of Oriental Research.