Ever since ALT published his study "Judas Gaue unter Josia" in 1925 1) it is generally accepted that in the Book of Joshua we have to differentiate between the boundary-system and the town-lists, as there is no conformity between these two sources. ALT’s main conclusion was, that the town-lists of the southern tribes were secondarily produced by cutting up a single document which originally described the administrative division of the Kingdom of Judah. Although such administrative lists may have had early origins the date reflected in the recompleted document was, in his opinion, that of King Josiah’s reign. NOTH accepted both the principle and the date of ALT’s proposal and in dealing extensively with the enumer-

*) My thanks are due to my teacher Prof. B. MAZAR who gave me his advice in several discussions of the problems involved.
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1) PJB 21 (1925), pp. 100-116 and map.
ated towns in his commentary: *Das Buch Josua*¹, he proposed certain changes in the internal and external geographical extent of the list, but did not introduce any major changes.

While examining the geographical material in the book of Joshua and related sources for my M.A. dissertation² in which these problems are more extensively dealt with, I came, inter alia, to the following conclusions:

1. Following Alt I differentiate between the boundary-system and the town-lists.

2. I differ with Noth's theory³, that the boundary-descriptions were based on a series of unconnected boundary-points, and were later on provided by an editor with connecting phrases making up the present text. In his opinion the editor created in some instances parallel lines where originally only one set of points was at his disposal. In some other cases he assumed that no connecting phrases or insufficient ones were provided, and thus some boundaries make the impression of town-list fragments. Contrary to this view it is clear that the boundary descriptions are given with their full text, though sometimes in a very shortened form. The boundaries were described for each tribe separately from the point of view of its particular territory. Similarities and discrepancies in parallel lines are an obvious result of the individual problems of each tribe described. Extensive or brief descriptions in different areas are not under discussion now.

3. The boundary-system is probably based on David's census (see below) and reflects the situation under David and Solomon. These lists were made use of in the Book of Joshua in order to describe in retrospect the conquest of the country and the allocation of its lands (see also p. 148 n. 1). Thus the final set-up of Israel's settlement and its expansion as it was in the days of David and Solomon, is reflected in this document. The inclusion of Gezer in the area under Solomon's jurisdiction is the final rounding off of the Israelite territory. This took place very early in his reign (1 Kings iii 1)⁴, perhaps even while still co-regent with David.

Alt's school stresses the difference between the boundary-system and Solomon's districts and dates the boundaries to a pre-monarchy

---

¹ Most recently, 2nd edition, Tübingen, 1953 pp. 13-14 and a.l.
² The History of the Northern Boundary of Judah (presented 1953).
³ M. Noth, ZDPV 58 (1935), 185-235; and *Das Buch Josua*², passim.
⁴ See also J. Goldwasser, *BIES* 14 (1949), pp. 82-84 (Hebrew).