In his first major work, The Northern Boundaries of Judah (Jerusalem, 1960), Zechariah Kallai studied one of the central problems of the historical geography of Eretz-Israel, namely, the delineation of ancient tribal and national borders. He analyzed the complex interplay between natural topography, demographic developments, and man-made political demands all factors, which over the generations produced a fluidity in the demarcation lines along the northern border of the Judean monarchy. Furthermore, as an astute student of biblical history, he is aware of and sensitive to the textual problems of the Bible produced by the different versions, the various formulations, and in particular the historiographic tendencies found in our sources. Kallai takes all of these aspects into consideration in his studies, which have become a model for all serious work in the field. As a modest expression of my appreciation of his scholarship and of our long friendship, I dedicate this clarification of a small point on the shared border of Ephraim and Manasseh.

The Chronicler has joined two difficult and independent genealogies of the tribes of Manasseh and Ephraim in 1 Chron 7,14–27. He has then added in vv. 28–29 a description of their borders beginning from the south: “Their possessions and settlements were Bethel and its dependencies, and on the east Naaran, and on the west Gezer and its dependencies, Shechem and its dependencies, and ‘Aiah and its dependencies; also along the borders of the Manassites, Beth-
Shean and its dependencies, Taanach and its dependencies, Megiddo and its dependencies, Dor and its dependencies. In these dwelt the sons of Joseph son of Israel”.

The description in verses 28-29 seems to be a composite of several sources since the southern border is formulated on the principle of citing a central fixed point, from which emanated two extremes in opposite directions, first to the east and then to the west. This type of demarcation is found in some of the tribal borders described in the book of Joshua for the tribes of Zebulun (19,12), Issachar (19,27), and Naphtali (19,34). On the other hand, the northern side of Manasseh described in v. 29 is a series of points on a boundary running from east to west and is reminiscent of, though not identical to, Josh 17,11; Judg 1,27 (Beth-Shean, Jibleam, Dor + En-Dor, Taanach, Megiddo), which seems to be two parallel lines “comprising three districts”.

The mention of Shechem between the two descriptions would indicate the Chronicler’s attempt to note a common point shared by both tribes. Indeed, Shechem is identified as an eponym of one of the clans of Manasseh (Num 26,31; Josh 17,2; Samaria Ostraca #44) and a Levitical city in the territory of Ephraim (Josh 21,20; 1 Chron 6,52). The question is, what is the function of the city of ‘Aiah in this list?

Zechariah Kallai has returned to this problem on several occasions. Following the better versions of the Masoretic Text supporting the reading נוע, he identifies the site with Ha‘Ai (Gen 12,8; Josh 7,2; Ezra 2,28; Neh 7,32), ‘Aiath (Isa 10,28), and especially ‘Aiah (Neh 11,31), located to the east of Bethel. The toponym ‘Aiah preserves the name of the older settlement destroyed by Joshua, commonly identified with et-Tel (1747/1472). Kallai’s solution to the problem is that the Chronicler, by citing both Shechem and ‘Aiah on a north-south axis, is indicating the depth of the territory of Ephraim, somewhat like the formular “from Dan to Beer-sheba”. The ancient historian may even have been influenced by the north-south boundary of these two tribes noted in Josh 17,7: “The boundary of Manasseh ran from . . . Michmethath, which lies near Shechem. The boundary