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More ‘Boundary of Gezer’ Inscriptions: 
One New and Another Rediscovered

ERIC MITCHELL   R. ADAM DODD   S. CAMERON COYLE
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Fort Worth, Texas

ABSTRACT: The article discusses two ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions found in 2012. One inscription, classified as no. 4, had previously been discovered by Clermont-Ganneau but was never fully published, and had not been seen in the field since his time. The other is a newly discovered thirteenth Gezer boundary inscription; the tenth one with both øæâîçú and ÁËÊÉÏÕ. In an appendix, the authors also attempt to sort out the disjointed nature of the discovery, publication and attribution of the ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions over time.

INTRODUCTION
The 2012 season of the Gezer Regional Survey yielded two new ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions, one previously discovered but thought to be lost and a second heretofore unknown by modern scholarship. The former was initially discovered by Charles Clermont-Ganneau in 1881 and was the fourth to be documented by him. The latter, the thirteenth in the series, is located not far from no. 4 and is in a

---

1 The Gezer Regional Survey, sponsored by Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, is directed by Eric Mitchell with the assistance of Jason Zan and Adam Dodd. A preliminary report of the first five seasons has recently appeared (Mitchell et al. 2012). Our thanks are extended to Steven Ortiz and Samuel Wolff for their help and counsel; to team member Amos Davidowitz (Kibbutz Gezer), who helped our team gain the skill to see things in the field; and to architect J. Rosenberg for the technical drawings of the inscriptions (figs. 4 and 6).

2 By overlaying a map created by R.A.S. Macalister in Google Earth (based on the narrative description of Clermont-Ganneau) and importing the resulting image into a GPS unit, the survey was able to navigate to the general area recorded by Macalister; within minutes it had located both nos. 4 and 13. For full narratives of the early explorations by Clermont-Ganneau and Macalister, see Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 86–87, 224–233, 257–274; Macalister 1911: 37–41; 1912; pls. x–xi. Clermont-Ganneau discusses four inscriptions in the context of the boundary of Gezer. However, the third inscription is not of the bilingual type, but consists of four Hebrew characters in an Early Jewish script. Although it is included in the discussion by Clermont-Ganneau, he himself questions its function as a boundary marker (Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 257–259). The same indecision as to the meaning, nature and function of this epigraph is expressed by Macalister directly (1911: 40), as well as by his numbering system. He refers to it as no. 6 (i.e. the last in the sequence known at that time), thereby moving up
rather poor state of preservation. Clermont-Ganneau’s abbreviated remarks in his *Archaeological Researches in Palestine* are the only documentation to date for no. 4. Therefore, both inscriptions will receive a full report here.

**HISTORY OF DISCOVERY**

Of the now 13 known bedrock inscriptions potentially related to the boundary of Gezer, ten bear the distinctive Hebrew and Greek legends ת.fix and ΛΩΚΙΟΥ (table 1). The first of these was discovered in 1874 and later published by Clermont-Ganneau. He soon recognized the significance of the inscription for by one position those inscriptions discussed elsewhere as nos. 4, 5 and 6. Despite these reservations about the relation of this inscription to the corpus of boundary stones, it is typically included in discussions of the ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions (cf. Reich 1985: 169; Rosenfeld 1988: 235).

Similarly, nos. 10 and 11 do not bear any shared content with the bilingual inscriptions; however, their inclusion in the discussion of this topic is justified since, like the bilingual type, they preserve forms of personal names (Alexa and Archelaos respectively) with Greek characters. Nevertheless, we have chosen to restrict our focus to the archetypical ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions. For this reason, nos. 3, 10 and 11 are not included in the synopsis of discovery below, although we have retained the standard numbering designations for the epigraphs.

We plan to prepare a review of all 13 inscriptions and a critique of the various theoretical models, which will incorporate the new data from nos. 4 and 13. Such a project will evaluate the current state of research and provide a comprehensive publication in English. While Reich’s thorough treatment (1985) is excellent, it is only accessible in Hebrew and has now been supplemented by several subsequent publications.

It is debatable whether the Semitic legend of the bilingual inscriptions is best classified as Hebrew or Aramaic. The multilingual context of this period is a matter of evolving discussion and will not be treated here. In this paper, the term ‘Hebrew’ will be used consistently to refer to the non-Greek legend. Cf. Millard 2000: 88; Beattie and Davies 2011; Cook 2010; van der Horst 2010; Bar-Asher 2010; Lim 2010.

Clermont-Ganneau made port at Joppa for his second expedition to Palestine on November 3, 1873; on the sixth day of that month, his party departed for Jerusalem (Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 1). Upon describing a brief stop at Gezer, an ambiguous remark is made in the text referencing the discoveries that would be made ‘there a few months after’ (p. 8). In another place, it is stated that Ibrahim Ahmed, the guide who first made Clermont-Ganneau aware of the inscription, first mentioned the inscription...
and presented a sketch of it to him in March (p. 87). More precisely, the excursion that resulted in the recording of the first ‘boundary of Gezer’ inscription departed from Jerusalem on June 3, 1874, and was to last 17 days (p. 54). It seems that the excursion did not go for the full duration since the second trek to Gezer in order to perform a more thorough exploration departed from Jerusalem on June 20 (p. 225). Therefore, the inscription was certainly discovered between June 3–20, 1874. How Ibrahim Ahmed came to know of the inscription is never mentioned.

Table 1. The ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions (italicized locations and distances are approximate; these distances have been taken from Reich and Greenhut 2002: 61, table 1; brackets signify a grapheme that is minimally preserved or disputed; a single dot [*] signifies a grapheme that is absent but presumed to have been present in the pristine condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>GPS Coordinates</th>
<th>Distance from Tel</th>
<th>Year of Discovery</th>
<th>Discovered by</th>
<th>Present Location</th>
<th>Epigraphic Content and Arrangement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31°51’38.87”N 34°56’14.32”E</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>C. Clermont-Ganneau (Palestine Exploration Fund)</td>
<td>Large fragment: Istanbul Archaeological Museum; short fragment: unknown</td>
<td>ΛΛΚΙΟΥΩΝΑΤΗ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31°51’36.04”N 34°56’17.48”E</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>C. Clermont-Ganneau (PEF)</td>
<td>Istanbul Archaeological Museum</td>
<td>μπάταλ ΛΛΚΙΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31°51’36.46”N 34°56’15.59”E</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>C. Clermont-Ganneau (PEF)</td>
<td>In situ, last known verification: c. 1902</td>
<td>ιτ[η]τ[ε]τ ιτ[η]τ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31°51’42.78”N 34°56’7.62”E</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>C. Clermont-Ganneau (PEF)</td>
<td>In situ, last known verification: 2012</td>
<td>ΛΛΚΙΟΥ ιτ[η]τ[ε]τ [η]τ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31°50’31.62”N 34°55’37.56”E</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Fr. M.-J. Lagrange (Couvret Saint-Etienne)</td>
<td>In situ, last known verification: 2012</td>
<td>μπάταλ ΛΛΚΙΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31°50’34.14”N 34°55’24.60”E</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>R.A.S. Macalister (PEF)</td>
<td>In situ, last known verification: 2012</td>
<td>[υ][π][σ][τ][λ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31°50’27.83”N 34°56’1.83”E</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>G.E. Wright (Hebrew Union College)</td>
<td>Rockefeller Museum, Jerusalem</td>
<td>μπάταλ ΛΛΚΙΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>31°50’36.18”N 34°56’13.86”E</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>J. Seger (HUC)</td>
<td>In situ, last known verification: 2012</td>
<td>ΙΑΛΩΧ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31°50’38.49”N 34°55’20.79”E</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Z. Kallai and B. Brandl (Hebrew University)</td>
<td>National Treasures Storehouse (IAA), Beth Shemesh</td>
<td>ι[ο][ι][κ][κ] ι[ο][ι][κ][κ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>31°51’45.12”N 34°55’29.50”E</td>
<td>On SE slope of tel</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>J. Seger (HUC)</td>
<td>In situ, last known verification: 1982</td>
<td>ΑΙΛΣΑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>31°51’45.12”N 34°55’29.50”E</td>
<td>On NE slope of tel</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Z. Kallai and B. Brandl (HU)</td>
<td>In situ, last known verification: 1982</td>
<td>ΑΡΧΕΑΑΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>31°50’34.25”N 34°56’7.74”E</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>J. Seger (HUC)</td>
<td>In situ, last known verification: 2012</td>
<td>μπάταλ ΛΛΚΙΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31°51’41.27”N 34°56’11.70”E</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>E. Mitchell (Tandy Institute for Archaeology)</td>
<td>In situ, last known verification: 2012</td>
<td>ΑΑΚ[-][Ο][Υ] [Σ]ην [Γ][Γ][Γ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
confirming the identification of the nearby site, Tell el Jezer, as ancient Gezer and theorized that these stones were markers of an ancient boundary. Clermont-Ganneau went on to discover two more bilingual inscriptions identical with the first in content but distinct in arrangement. Since then, additional bilingual ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions have been discovered by Father Marie-Joseph Lagrange of the monastery of Saint-Étienne in Jerusalem (no. 5; Lagrange 1899: 427), by R.A.S. Macalister (no. 6; Macalister 1911: 37), by G.E. Wright at the beginning of the Hebrew Union College Phase I excavations (no. 7; Dever, Lance and Wright 1970: 2), by a student survey led by Z. Kallai and B. Brandl from the Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (fragments of no. 9; ESI 1982: 32), and by J. Seger during the Hebrew Union College Phase II work (nos. 8, 12; Seger and Hardin 2013: 34–36; Seger 1972: 160–161; 1973: 251; 1974: 135). These inscriptions are concentrated in the hills to the east, southeast and south of Tel Gezer, forming a semi-circular arc around the tel from 77° to 175° (fig. 1).

In 1881, seven years after the discovery of nos. 1 and 2, Clermont-Ganneau returned to Gezer to resume his search for additional boundary markers. He was successful in locating a fourth inscription some distance from no. 1, but due to...
an immediate recall to France, was unable to plot the exact position of the marker or prepare a squeeze of the text. Subsequently, Macalister attempted, on multiple occasions, to locate the inscription using Clermont-Ganneau’s narrative, but failed to do so. Macalister therefore concluded that the inscription had been destroyed since the initial discovery, but plotted the approximate location on his maps (fig. 2). Until its recent relocation, the rough sketch and cursory description provided by Clermont-Ganneau and the approximated plotting by Macalister were the only data available for this specimen (cf. Lagrange 1899: 426 and pl. II, no. 5).

Fig. 1. Map of the 13 ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions; yellow points indicate confirmed locations of *in situ* inscriptions; red points mark approximate locations (map data: Google, GeoEye)

below. However, the most likely conclusion is that the markings reported by Clermont-Ganneau’s workmen were a case of confusing natural features with human activity (cf. Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 233–234; Macalister 1911: 37, 41).

13 Macalister parenthetically recorded on his ‘Plan of the Surroundings of Gezer’ (Macalister 1912: pl. viii) the words ‘site of 3rd boundary inscription?’ Likewise, on his ‘Map of the Boundary Inscriptions’ (Macalister 1911: 38), he marked no. 3 (= no. 4; see above, n. 2) with a hollow ‘X’. See Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 231–233 and Macalister 1911: 39 for narratives of these early explorations.
INSCRIPTION NO. 4

Inscription no. 4 (figs. 3–4) is not incised on a flat face of bedrock, like several of the others, but is inscribed on a relatively small isolated hemispherical bedrock.

---

The media upon which nos. 5, 8, 12 and 13 are inscribed, after having been inspected in the field by the authors, can reasonably be referred to as flat, horizontal exposures of bedrock. Nos. 1 and 2 were described in this manner by Clermont-Ganneau (1896: 87, 227). On the basis of images and inspection at their current locations, nos. 7 and 9 — although removed from their context and, in the case of the latter, very fragmentary — seem to have been incised on flat surfaces as well, albeit in the case of no. 7, not horizontally oriented. However, factors such as human construction, soil redistribution, and erosion should be taken into consideration when discussing the landscape of these inscriptions. Topographical changes may distort our understanding of their placement and conceal those not presently plotted with modern technology. Cf. Clermont-Ganneau’s similar statements regarding the serendipitous elements of the discovery of these inscriptions (Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 232).
Fig. 3. Inscription no. 4

Fig. 4. Inscription no. 4, with reconstructed letters; grey strokes represent more tentative reconstructions; lower right: Clermont-Ganneau’s sketch of the inscription (Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 232)
outcrop, located 1,327 m to the east of the tel. The inscription (1.25 m NE×SW; 0.80 m NW×SE) arcs across the eastern exposure of the outcrop. The median letter height for both the Hebrew and the Greek portions of the inscription is 0.18 m. The letters are not deeply cut into the stone (average depth: 0.01 m); this may be due solely to erosion or in part due to an initially shallow incision. The original inscription was of the ΚΑΙΟΥ/ΤΕΤΕΒΕΧΕ variety. However, the Hebrew and Greek were not oriented tête-bêche, as is the case of most of the other boundary markers. Instead both ΚΑΙΟΥ and ΤΕΤΕΒΕΧΕ are to be read facing northwest above the Hebrew.

At least a portion of all the Greek graphemes is preserved, with the complete forms of the kappa, iota, omicron and upsilon discernible. The right leg and crossbar of the alpha are badly eroded, and the left leg of the lambda and the join of the two letters, which is characteristic of the boundary inscriptions, are non-extant. The Hebrew characters are not as well preserved. All three strokes of the taw are clear, with the exception of the lower portion of the left vertical. The het is nearly completely obscured by a naturally-eroded cupmark (cf. Clermont-Ganneau’s sketch, fig. 4), with the extreme upper portions of the downstrokes and a remnant of the horizontal slightly visible. The mem is not well preserved, but portions of all strokes are at least partially apparent. No trace of the gimel was noted, but two linear depressions may be proposed for the zayin and the vertical cut of the resh.

INSCRIPTION NO. 13

Inscription no. 13 (figs. 5–6; 1.34 m E×W; 1.06 m N×S) is incised into a level horizontal surface on a sizeable bedrock outcrop, which is broken into four fragments (labeled A–D in fig. 6). It lies 117 m to the southeast of no. 4 and 1,425 m

---

15 All distances from the tel have been measured from the Iron Age city gate.
16 With the exception of nos. 1, 4 and 13 of the bilingual type.
17 The texture of the surface area around the potential incisions suggests that significant erosion/breakage has occurred, leaving only the deepest portions of these characters and no trace of the gimel. Alternatively, one might propose that the gimel has been preserved and is evidenced by two very shallow depressions (representing the right and left legs) immediately left of the mem. However, such a proposal would require the zayin and resh of the Hebrew legend to overlap the alpha and lambda of the Greek legend. Furthermore, this proposal for the gimel is not compatible with our current proposal for the zayin and resh. In light of such mutual exclusivity, the texture and depth of the various potential incisions, as well as the more likely letter environment, persuade us that the proposal in the text above is preferable.
18 The possibility that no. 13 was in fact the inscription noted by Clermont-Ganneau’s workers following his 1874 departure (see Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 233) has been considered and determined to be a near-impossibility. The grapheme sequence reproduced in Clermont-Ganneau (1896: 233) does not correspond with that of no. 13, and it is unlikely that the prominent alpha-lambda sequence of no. 13 — the most domi-
east of the tel. The Greek graphemes are larger in height than in any of the inscriptions examined (the letter heights of no. 13 range from 0.27 to 0.34 m), and those letters that remain are incised deeply into the bedrock. The proposed reading of the inscription is the bilingual ΑΛΑΙΟΥΔ, but the poor state of preservation renders any conclusion tentative. Like no. 4, the Greek and Hebrew may both be read from the same position (contra the tête-bêche presentation of others), and the Greek is arranged above the Hebrew. However, contrary to the orientation of no. 4, this inscription is to be read facing north/northeast.

As mentioned above, this inscription’s state of preservation is quite poor, due both to erosion and to organic intrusions within the bedrock (see figs. 5–6). Therefore, several of the interpretations are presented with extreme caution. With this said, the alpha, lambda and kappa are mostly extant. The iota is completely obliterated by the north–south fissure on the east end of the outcrop. Parts of the

nant and clearly recognizable letters — would not have been reported by the workmen had they discovered no. 13. Instead, it is likely, as mentioned in n. 12 above, that the markings reported by Clermont-Ganneau’s workmen were merely natural features confused with human activity (cf. Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 233–234; Macalister 1911: 37, 41). We have also considered the possibility that Macalister had marked no. 13 on his maps as the questionable site of no. 4 (i.e., what he refers to as no. 3). Macalister plotted a quarry as the questionable ‘site of the 3rd [i.e. 4th] boundary inscription’ on his ‘Plan of the Surroundings of Gezer’ (Macalister 1912: pl. xiii; cf. Macalister 1911: 38, fig. 8). No. 13 is immediately adjacent to quarrying activity and he has evidence of further quarrying activity in the vicinity. Furthermore, he has plotted tomb 251 nearby to the southeast. The Gezer Regional Survey did observe a prominent tomb nearby, to the southeast of no.13. However, because no. 13 was located on the final day of the survey, this tomb was not processed, though a cursory evaluation of the tomb was made by team members. Given the incongruence between the brief description given for tomb 251 by Macalister (1911: 389) and the unofficial examination of this tomb by the survey team, we do not believe that Macalister’s plotting corresponds to no. 13. Moreover, it is unlikely that Macalister plotted the extensive quarrying activity in the area but failed to identify the inscription. As a point of interest, quarries and tombs are ubiquitous in this area; the Gezer Regional Survey recorded 10 tombs and 37 quarries on the western slopes of this hill alone.

Letter heights were gathered only for those graphemes with a firm upper and lower limit preserved. All ΑΛΑΙΟΥΔ type boundary inscriptions have been personally examined by the authors, with the exception of nos. 1 and 2, which were removed by Clermont-Ganneau and are now in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum. Even though no. 1 has not been examined, a replica (presumably created from a mold of the original) was installed high on the interior of the western courtyard wall at Tabor House, home of the Swedish Theological Institute and former residence of Conrad Schick, in East Jerusalem, and this replica has been visually examined from ground level.

The precedent of nine other such inscriptions warrants this proposal, but without such a control group, this reading would not be substantiated.
Fig. 5. Inscription no. 13

Fig. 6. Inscription no. 13, with reconstructed letters; grey strokes represent more tentative reconstructions
outline of the omicron are still visible despite severe obscuring by organic disturbances within the bedrock. The only portion of the upsilon that may remain is the upper extent (0.07 m) of the left arm.\textsuperscript{21} The upper portions of the taw, het and mem are quite eroded but still visible, while their lower thirds are not. No trace of the gimel, zayin, or resh is found extending to the west. However, two vertical strokes (0.05 m and 0.08 m in length) immediately below the legs of the het are apparent, with the latter stroke intersecting a faint horizontal linear depression. It may be conjectured that these are the upper parts of the zayin and resh, though this is highly speculative.\textsuperscript{22} If this is the case, the Hebrew would have been incised in two lines, an aspect unique to this inscription.

This possibility is supported by the erosion patterns on the western and southern faces of the bedrock. Both surfaces show evidence of breakage, but the face of the former has a texture worn smooth by erosion, while the latter is still quite jagged. This observation indicates the sequence in which the bedrock has lost its surface area. We propose that the stoneworker, realizing that he was left with insufficient space to the west, chose to finish the Hebrew inscription below the first line.\textsuperscript{23} This portion of the bedrock has subsequently broken away, leaving only the faintest traces of possible characters.

DISCUSSION

Inscriptions nos. 4 and 13 are palaeographically consistent with all the other bilingual 'Boundary of Gezer' inscriptions. No. 13 displays the characteristic join of the right leg of the alpha and the left leg of the lambda (cf. nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 12, and probably 7). While this feature is no longer extant in no. 4, reconstruction

\textsuperscript{21} At the northeastern edge of fragment B (fig. 6) there is an incision that matches the depth, width and texture of the confirmed strokes of the inscription. It is slightly arched, matching the trajectory and shape of the upper arm of an upsilon. However, it diverges significantly from the line of the Greek portion of the inscription. We propose that the organic growth has damaged and shifted fragments B and C of the bedrock so much that this stroke of the upsilon has been taken out of alignment. We estimate that fragment B would need to be shifted 0.10 m to the southwest and rotated approximately 20° clockwise to be brought into line with the Greek legend. The quantity of organic matter and the extent of separation between fragments A and D and between fragments B and C respectively leaves this degree of shifting within the realm of possibility. Such shifting for both fragments B and C was confirmed upon inspection of the southeastern and northeastern faces of the bedrock.

\textsuperscript{22} Consideration of letter environment in parallel inscriptions is inconclusive.

\textsuperscript{23} The surrounding area bears the footprint of quarrying activity (e.g., remnants of channels used to outline the stones prior to removal, including one channel less than 0.03 m from the upper northward-extending stroke of the kappa; figs. 5–6). These remnants are focused west of the inscription, and this activity may be the cause of the breakage on the western exposure.
suggests that the pristine object would provide another witness to this phenomenon. Although this may support Reich’s theory of a master inscription, it is certainly not a mandatory conclusion, especially given the occurrence of this feature in other Second Temple lapidary inscriptions. Like nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 (possibly) and 12, both inscriptions witness a kappa with short narrow arms disproportionate with the long vertical. Reich and Greenhut have noted the wide arched arms of the upsilon as a shared characteristic of the corpus (Reich and Greenhut 2002: 58). No. 4 is consistent with this observation; no. 13 is too poorly preserved for evaluation, even if our partial reconstruction of this grapheme is accepted.

Less can be said for the Hebrew legend of these two inscriptions since the most diagnostic features have eroded or broken away (e.g., the nature or absence of the foot of the tav, any extant keraia or ‘ticking’ of the zayin, clear definition of a short ‘tick’ associated with the oblique of the mem, or the exact relation and curvature of the right and left legs of the gimel). However, those features that do remain are consistent with other ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions. The crossbar of the het proceeds horizontally (or dips only slightly) relatively low between the verticals, which are consistently straight. Likewise, the mem is clearly open in no. 4 and possibly so in no. 13, and is most closely aligned with the morphology of the Herodian formal hand. Proposals for absolute dates are limited to the Hasmonean, Herodian, and early post-Herodian periods. Although some isolated palaeographical commentary has been presented here, in the interest of expediency with the publication of these new data, we have refrained from proposing or affirming an absolute date or a context for the installation of the inscriptions.

The data provided by the newly located (or newly relocated) inscriptions are helpful in furthering our understanding of Hellenistic/Roman Gezer and its environs. Most obviously, the boundary that was delineated by the markers can be

24 Reich 1985: 172; Reich and Greenhut 2002. See, for example, an inscribed statue base of Ptolemy VI Philometer (Nicolaou 1971: 24, pl. xxvi), the Hefzibah Inscription (Landau 1966) and the Heliodorus Stele (Cotton and Wörrle 2007). Cf. numerous funerary inscriptions (e.g., Cotton et al. 2010: nos. 210, 232, 339, 555) and one incised vessel (Ameling et al. 2011: no. 2140). For the same phenomenon exhibited in alternative grapheme sequences, see Cotton et al. 2010: nos. 199, 390, 500, 562, 566, 676.

25 The proposed splitting of the Hebrew legend into two lines and the perpendicular relation of the two extant strokes of the mem leave open the possibility that this grapheme is a final form. This, however, is quite speculative.

26 For elaboration on the terminology adopted in this article, see Cross 2003; Yardeni 2002; and Birnbaum 1971.


28 Dever, Lance and Wright 1970: 6–7 and n. 31; Dever 1993: 496; Rosenfeld 1988: 236

29 Cross preferred this date with no major objection to a slightly earlier conclusion; Cross 2003: 4, n. 11; Dever, Lance and Wright 1970: 7, n. 31; Cross 1955: 163, n. 34.
refined in its northeasternmost extent, and two new specimens are now available for palaeographical consideration. Further analysis may elucidate the occasion for the inscriptions, the relation of the ancient site to its occupational landscape in later periods, and even the literacy of the craftsmen in this period.

APPENDIX: ON THE HISTORY OF DISCOVERY OF THE ‘BOUNDARY OF GEZER’ INSCRIPTIONS

Several questions surround both the ancient and modern history of the ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions. One of the more sensitive issues is the account of their modern discovery and study by various researchers. In our article, and particularly in table 1, we have attempted to summarize this recent history with consistency, accuracy and clarity. In a few cases (inscriptions nos. 4, 8 and 12), the history of discovery has been complicated by the overlapping work of distinct projects. Our preference in the table is to credit the discovery of each inscription to the first researcher known to have documented the objects. This preference has led to several differences between our summary and those of previous publications regarding attribution of discovery.

While we have credited only professional or institutionally supported researchers in our table, a number of the ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions were first discovered by individuals not associated with a research project, who subsequently pointed them out to researchers. This was the case with the first ‘Boundary of Gezer’ discovery. Clermont-Ganneau reports that he was shown inscription no. 1 by his local guide, Ibrahim Ahmed, who had informed Clermont-Ganneau of the object months prior to their visit (Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 86–87). How Ahmed came to know of the inscription is not disclosed. Similarly, Dever, Lance and Wright reported that inscription no. 7 was shown to the HUC team by members of the nearby Kibbutz Nahshon.30 While the history of inscription no. 8 is convoluted, Seger and Hardin note that a member of the same

---

30 Dever, Lance and Wright 1970: 2. Reich and Greenhut credit the discovery of no. 7 to S. Sharon of Kibbutz Nahshon (Reich 1985: 170; Reich and Greenhut 2002: 61, table 1). Regarding the date of the discovery, Dever, Lance and Wright state that the inscription was shown to the HUC team in December 1964 (1970: 2); see also Bullard 1969: 13, fig 5b (thanks are extended to Samuel Wolff for this reference). However, Reich (1985: 168, table 1), Reich and Greenhut (2002: 61, table 1) and Seger and Hardin (2013: 35) list the date as 1963. We have listed the date as 1964 in our table 1 because of the congruence of this date with the narrative timeline presented in Dever, Lance, and Wright (1970: 2, 8–9), whom we have credited for the discovery. It may be that Reich and Greenhut have listed 1963 in view of their credit to S. Sharon, perhaps when this individual located the object. Seger and Hardin’s statement that ‘one of these (no. 7) was pointed out to HUC excavators… in 1963, just before the start of the Phase I HUC work at the site’ (2013: 35) bears an internal contradiction since the excavation did not start until November 1964 (Dever, Lance, Wright 1970: 8).
kibbutz took the HUC team to this inscription in 1972 (Seger and Hardin 2013: 35). To simplify this history for the presentation of table 1, we have opted to credit these discoveries to the director of each associated research project: Clermont-Ganneau for no. 1, G.E. Wright for no. 7, and J. Seger for no. 8. Some confusion has developed around the discovery of inscriptions nos. 8 and 12. As mentioned above, no. 8 was shown to the HUC team led by Seger in 1972 and was promptly announced by them (Seger 1972: 161; Seger and Hardin 2013: 35). However, the find was not reported in any detail until 2013 (Seger and Hardin 2013: 34–36). In 1980, R. Reich also located no. 8 (ESI 1982: 32; Reich 1985: 170–171). However, since the HUC team had not published the details of their find, it was difficult for Reich to judge whether his recent discovery was a new specimen or a rediscovery of the previous HUC find. Thus, subsequent publications by Reich (1985) and later by Reich with Z. Greenhut (2002), attributed the discovery of no. 8 to Reich and listed its year of discovery as 1980. More recently, Seger and Hardin 2013 presented the HUC team’s account of the discovery of no. 8, confirming that the 1972 find by HUC and the 1980 find by Reich are the same inscription. We have, therefore, listed no. 8 in table 1 as having been discovered by Seger and the HUC team in 1972.

A similar complication exists with regard to inscription no. 12. Seger and Hardin report that the HUC team discovered their third ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscription in 1973 while mapping the locations of their ‘1963 [sic]’ (no. 7) and 1972 (no. 8) finds (Seger and Hardin 2013: 35). As with no. 8, the new inscription’s discovery was announced without detailed description of the find or of its location (Seger 1973: 251; cf. Seger 1974: 135); details of the find were published 204 E. MITCHELL, R.A. DODD AND S.C. COYLE

31 Reich, in his 1985 publication, states that the inscription may be the same one announced by Seger in 1972 (Reich 1985: 177, n. 23). Reich also notes the possibility that the inscription appeared in a photo published by Biblical Archaeology Review in 1983 (Shanks 1983: 41); the photo was credited to Robert Wright, a member of the HUC expedition’s staff. Inspection of this photo confirms that the inscription pictured is no. 8 of the current numbering system. Additionally, Reich mentions the possibility that no. 8 may have been seen in the early 1980s by a Mr. Sharabi of Moshav Bekoa, as recorded in the Israel Antiquities Authority archive. Reich 1985: 177, n. 23.

32 Seger and Hardin 2013: 34–36. The discussion of the ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions in Seger and Hardin 2013 suffers from an unfortunate error that potentially complicates the issue. The discussion of the finds includes two photographs — photos II.2 and II.3 — which, according to their captions, should be of no. 8 and no. 12 respectively (referred to in the captions by year of discovery). However, photo II.2 is a picture of no. 12, rather than no. 8, as is clear from that stone’s distinctive damage around the vertical of the upsilon. Further complicating the issue, photo II.3 should be of no. 12, but in fact it is the same photo of no. 7 that appears in Dever, Lance and Wright 1970: pl. 2A. This error leaves Seger and Hardin 2013 without any photo of no. 8. It should be noted that Dever incorporated an image of no. 8 in the NEAEHL entry for Gezer (Dever 1993: 505).
only in 2013 (Seger and Hardin 2013: 34–36). In 2000, Reich and Greenhut discovered an inscription that they believed to be undocumented close to the location of no. 8.33 This new inscription was labeled no. 12 in the corpus, and it is easily identified by a distinctive damaged area on the surface of the bedrock, obscuring the lower portion of the Greek upsilon. With the recent publication of the HUC team’s 1973 photo34 and description of their find, it is now clear that they had also discovered no. 12. Therefore, in our table we have listed no. 12 as discovered in 1973 by Seger and the HUC team.

The discovery of no. 4 is in many ways analogous to the preceding narrative regarding nos. 8 and 12. This inscription was initially discovered by Charles Clermont-Ganneau in 1881, but only a brief description and rough sketch of the stone were published (Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 231–233). Although later researchers knew of the existence of the inscription, they could not locate the stone itself for further study (Macalister 1911: 39; Reich 1985: 177, n. 18; cf. Lagrange 1899: 426 and pl. II, no. 5). When the Gezer Regional Survey rediscovered no. 4, it was clear to us that we had in fact located Clermont-Ganneau’s ‘missing’ inscription because the cupmark that cuts the Hebrew graphemes is easily recognizable in Clermont-Ganneau’s published sketch (Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 232). Therefore, in our table 1, Clermont-Ganneau has retained his status regarding attribution of discovery; we make no claim for the find — shared or otherwise — since we are confident that he was the first to locate the stone.

The guiding principle in each of these cases (inscriptions nos. 1, 4, 7, 8 and 12) is to attribute the discovery of each to the first researcher to have noted the existence of the inscription. It is not our intent to diminish the important role that various individuals and projects have served in the location and study of the ‘Boundary of Gezer’ inscriptions, with particular mention of Reich and Greenhut. On the contrary, we are deeply indebted to these scholars for the important contributions they have made to our understanding of these unique inscriptions. Since the late nineteenth century, a combination of slow publication, inexact plotting and imperfect communication have obscured the true state of the field, with almost every new discovery potentially being a ‘rediscovery’ (e.g., nos. 4, 6, 8, 12, 13).35 Reich (1985) has significantly clarified this confused situation. We have tried to continue in this trajectory by elucidating further this still-muddled condition.

33 Reich and Greenhut 2002. Given the lack of any publication of the details of the 1973 HUC find during the intervening quarter century, Reich and Greenhut certainly cannot be faulted for their conclusion.

34 The photo is mislabeled in Seger and Hardin 2013: 34. The discussion of the 1973 find there describes no. 12’s distinctive damage around the upsilon (Seger and Hardin 2013: 35), but the same damaged stone is labeled as the 1972 find in the caption accompanying the photo (Seger and Hardin 2013: 34, photo II.2). See above, n. 31.

35 Cf. Clermont-Ganneau 1896: 233; Macalister 1911: 37; ESI 1982: 32; Reich 1985: 177, nn. 18 and 23; Seger and Hardin 2013: 35; and see above, nn. 12 and 18.
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