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This paper emphasizes the nature of trade relations in the Eastern Mediterranean in general and from a Levantine inland perspective in particular. The ‘maritime’ trade relation of the ancient city of Hazor, located in the interior of LB Canaan is a case study investigating the Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery on the site. The influx of these vessels peaked during LB IIA. The distribution and types of this pottery at Hazor point to four interested groups that wanted it. These were the royal and religious elites; the people in Area F; the religious functionaries of the Lower City; and the craftsmen of Area C. The abundance of imports in Area F, among other evidence, indicates that this area might have contained a trading quarter from where the imports were distributed to other interested groups.

A model of ‘interregional interaction networks’, which is a modified world systems approach, is used to describe the organization of trade connections between the Levant, Cyprus and the Aegean and even beyond. The contents of the Ulu Burun and Cape Gelidonya ships, wrecked on the coast of south Turkey, show that luxury items were traded from afar through Canaan via the coastal cities overseas to the Aegean. Such long-distance trade with luxury goods requires professional traders familiar with the risks and security measures along the routes and with the knowledge of value systems and languages of diverse societies. These traders established networks along main trade routes and settled in trading quarters in particular node cities.

The paper suggests that Hazor, as one of the largest cities in Canaan, located along the main trade routes, possessed such a node position. In this trade the Levantine coastal cities of Sarepta, Abu Hawam, Akko and possibly Tel Nami seem to have played important roles. These main ports of southern Syria and northern Palestine were all accessible to Hazor, although some of them in different periods of LB.
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ABBREVIATIONS

Following abbreviations are used in the text:

BR    Base Ring
EBR   Early Base Ring
FM    Furumark Motifs
FS    Furumark Shape
LBA   Late Bronze Age
LC    Late Cypriot
LH    Late Helladic
LM    Late Minoan
MBA   Middle Bronze Age
MM    Middle Minoan
NAA   Neutron Activation Analysis
PBR   Proto Base Ring
PPI   Peer Polity Interaction
PWS   Proto White Slip
WS    White Slip
WST   World Systems Theory
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND - HAZOR’S POSITION IN A LATE BRONZE AGE CONTEXT

The Canaanite city of Hazor was located about 15 km north of the Sea of Galilee. The designations of this region, used by archaeologists, sometimes cause some confusion because of their present day geographical, cultural or political connotations. However, commonly accepted terms along with Canaan are the Levant or Syria-Palestine, where Syria characterizes the ancient northern and Palestine the ancient southern part of this geo-cultural area. The city-state Hazor was located between the northern and southern part of the region (Fig. 1).¹

Fig. 1. Hazor in Canaan

¹ The Levant includes parts of present-day Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Jordan and the Palestine Autonomy (Wijngaarden van 2002, 31). LB Canaan was somewhat smaller and extended from Wadi al-‘Arish (the brook of Egypt, just south of Gaza) to the vicinity of Ugarit in northern Syria. It is mentioned in Egyptian sources, several Akkadian documents, statue inscriptions etc (Hacket 1997, 409 and references therein; Rainey 2003, 169-172). LB Canaan should be seen as a city-state culture, comprising several interacting city-states, among them Hazor, in the definition of C. Renfrew’s Early State Module (Renfrew 1986, 2; Zuckerman 2003b, 216 in Hebrew).
Excavations of Tel Hazor were conducted by Y. Yadin in 1955-1958 and 1968, followed by renewed excavations by A. Ben-Tor from 1990 onwards. The city consisted of two distinct parts: the Upper City, which is the tell proper, and the Lower City comprising a vast plateau to the north and partially to the east of the tel (Fig. 2).

Fig. 2. Tel Hazor with Area designations, aerial photo (looking north)

The Upper City, which was occupied from the Early Bronze Age to the Persian period, had impressive fortifications and public buildings and was densely populated. The Lower City was well fortified by natural slopes on the east, a deep and narrow valley on the

---

3 No final reports from the renewed excavations are yet published, however preliminary results and a couple of extended summations are available see Ben-Tor 1992-2007; 1999; Ben-Tor & Rubiato 1999. The so far most extensive research concerning the LB levels of the renewed excavations is made by S. Zuckerman in her unpublished Ph.D. thesis (2003a; 2003b in Hebrew).
north and a manmade moat and earthen rampart on the southwest side of the plateau. Excavations in this area yielded remains of temples, dwellings and well-planned sewage systems. The occupation of the Lower City is dated from approximately the 18th to the 13th century B.C. (MB II – LB II). This period constituted the heyday of the city.

   During the Late Bronze Age the city-states of Canaan were dominated by Egypt. Across this land-bridge, main roads, fortifications, granaries and water installations supplied the Egyptian troops and facilitated their movements to their enemies in the north, the Hittites and the Mitannians. In addition the pharaonic court levied tribute on the Canaanite city-states and requested different kinds of goods to be sent to Egypt. Egyptian lists of tribute and booty, especially those of Thutmose III (1479-1425 BC), as well as Akkadian documents, primarily the Amarna letters, provide information about these goods.

   Hazor’s important position on the crossroad of the main inland trade routes between Egypt and Mesopotamia and between the coast and the Transjordanian desert promoted contacts and exchange with different cultural spheres, which also possessed different realms of raw material. This paper will mainly focus on aspects of the imported Cypriot and Mycenaean pottery found on the site. Cypriot pottery has been uncovered in MB IIB contexts at Hazor, as well as a few sherds of Kamares Ware from Crete, dated to MM IIB or IIIA (the end of MB II). It is suggested that these types indicate indirect contacts with those islands as part of the relations with Levantine coastal cities such as Ugarit and Byblos. The imported pottery of interest in this paper derives, however from the Late Bronze Age, generally seen as an era of internationalization because of the prevailing flourishing trade and intercultural contacts throughout the Eastern Mediterranean.

---

5 Ben-Tor & Bonfil 1997, 13.
6 The degree of this domination fluctuated through times. The scholarly opinions differ regarding the nature of this domination, see e.g the views of Higginbotham 2000; Mazar 1992; Weinstein 1981.
10 See e.g Nordquist 2007.
1.2 AIM AND QUESTIONS

Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery constitute a category of externally influenced material found at Hazor. An investigation of these pottery types and their implications will be offered in this paper as well as an investigation of trade routes and Levantine harbour cities, aiming to disclose the nature of Hazor’s (indirect) maritime trade connections as well as some aspects of the Mycenaean and Cypriot trade in the Eastern Mediterranean in general. Questions of importance are related to the influx of pottery types and forms in the Levant and particularly at Hazor. Why was the pottery imported to Hazor? What was its find context in the city? Who used this pottery and how? Other questions of importance are associated with the infrastructure, for example the location of the city in relation to trade routes and harbours.

1.3 METHODS AND THEORIES

The special type of view adopted in this paper, viz an inland site’s connection to maritime trade, offers an extended understanding of the Late Bronze Age trade between the Aegean, Cyprus and the Levant, since it explains aspects (social, economic and cultural) of the movement of goods not only overseas but also from the maritime harbours to, and beyond, the Levantine interior and vice versa. The interior, in this paper, is exemplified by the city of Hazor and the movement of goods is studied through an investigation of accessible trade routes and harbours. The distribution and use of the imported Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery on this site will hence be considered as well as possible exchange goods the other way around.

P. Nick Kardulias’ discussion on multiple levels in the Aegean Bronze Age World System is, in part, applicable to the particular inland Levantine perspective of this paper. He observes three levels of interaction spheres in the Aegean:11 1) the internal system which involved the exchange of goods on a local level, e.g. between the small states within Crete or Argolid; 2) an intermediate system of interaction between the Aegean islands and/or between the islands and the mainland;12 3) a system of long-distance

---

12 Both these spheres included entities on rather equal stature, which he compares to the small states within an Early State Module according to Renfrew’s description (1975; 1986.)
interactions which included connections with the Near East, Anatolia and Egypt.
Kardulias explains the Eastern Mediterranean World System as:

…an international interchange that involved the transfer of both bulk goods and
preciosities to and from the Aegean, Egypt, the Syro-Palestinian coast, Cyprus, and
Anatolia. Direct Aegean contacts were limited to coastal areas in these other lands. The
network, however, did extend far beyond the littoral zones.13

By applying Kardulias’ concept, the interaction sphere of Hazor can be divided into
three levels as well: a) a local system which included the exchange of goods (possibly
redistributive) between the city of Hazor and the subordinated towns and villages in its
fertile hinterland;14 b) a regional system which operated within the Canaanite city-state
culture, comparable to C. Renfrew’s Early State Module;15 c) an interregional system that
places Hazor within an Eastern Mediterranean World System of trade and interaction. It
is mainly this last level, although in a modified way, that will be described in this paper
since it focuses on the inter-regional trade of Hazor as part of a wider long-distance
distribution network in the Eastern Mediterranean and even beyond.

The original model of the World Systems Theory (WST) was developed for
modern societies and was based on the current political and economic structure of
capitalist world domination.16 This domination is maintained by economic processes that
link regions together in dependent relationships through the exploitation of raw-material
rich peripheries by dominating cores.17 Since WST is a modern concept, it has been up to
the archaeological establishment, together with sociologists, to adjust it to the ancient
world and archaeological demands.18 A matter of adaptation has been Wallerstein’s
assumption that pre-capitalist societies were not part of economic systems and thus not
suitable for WST. This is however not a problem if adopting a formalist view of ancient

14 The nature of this local exchange is hard to investigate since an administrative LB palace is not yet
unearthed at Hazor.
16 Wallerstein 1974.
17 Wallerstein 1974, 349f.
18 See e.g. Champion 1989; Chase-Dunn & Hall 1993; Edens 1992; Kohl 1989; McGuire 1986; 1989;
Another matter of adaptation has been the erroneous supposition that “core dominance denies any kind of agency to the periphery”, an assumption derived from the economic determinism of the World Systems model and its sole focus on the core activities. This, together with other drawbacks of WST, caused G. Stein to develop a theory, applicable to ancient economics, based on the more flexible term ‘interregional interaction networks’, which were operated by trade groups/diasporas that established networks along major trade routes. Inspired by P. Curtin and A. Cohen he describes these systems as operated by trade groups/diasporas that established along major trade routes.

The kind of interactions described in this paper are mainly core-to-core based, since the relations between the Levant, Cyprus and the Greek mainland should be seen as operating on a rather equal basis.

In short, an interregional network model will be used in this paper to explain Hazor’s indirect long-distance trade relations via the Levantine coastal cities. This trade should be regarded as part of a modified perspective on an Eastern Mediterranean World System.

1.3.1 Criticism of the Sources

The pottery and finds of the renewed excavations at Tel Hazor (Area A and M) are to a certain extent considered in the discussions below; however, since the examination of these findings is not yet finished and is only briefly described in preliminary reports and articles, it is not possible to include it in the catalogues and statistical diagrams of this paper.

It should also be noted that the number of sites excavated, and thus pottery found, in the southern Levant is much higher than in the northern part, which is caused by

---

20 Stein 1999a, 42f; 1999b, 155.
22 Curtin 1984. Cohen, A 197?
23 The Hazor team is currently producing the final reports, which will be published within a couple of years.
scientific traditions as well as historical efforts invested in exploring the biblical sites of
the former.\textsuperscript{24} In addition the political situation has prevented sufficient excavations of the
important coastal cities of modern day Lebanon.\textsuperscript{25} Such factors are considered as much as
possible in this paper when comparing the amount of pottery and other aspects of the
cities in different parts of the Levant.

1.4 PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The increasing research field dealing with trade relations in the Eastern Mediterranean
has resulted in several conferences and studies these last decades.\textsuperscript{26} This attention to
ancient maritime trade involving the Aegean, Cyprus and the Levant has, to a great deal,
been sponsored by the discoveries of the Cape Gelidonya and the Ulu Burun
shipwrecks.\textsuperscript{27}

Pottery constitutes the cultural and chronological framework of trade and
interaction studies because of the possibilities of determining its origin, date and use as
well as its advantages of being a lasting material. In this sense the fine Mycenaean and
Cypriot wares imported to the Levant are highly essential.

The primary study of the Mycenaean pottery was made by A. Furumark. He
divided the then known material into 336 vessel-shapes (FS= Furumark Shape) and the
painted decorations into 78 motifs (FM=Furumark Motif), which all were assigned a
place within a framework of relative chronology.\textsuperscript{28} In the 1920’s, E. Gjerstad already
regarded the relations between Cyprus and Palestine as commercial and all the Cypriot
pottery in the southern Levant as imported. In addition he suggested that commercial
agencies existed along the Palestinian coast who were supplied by Cypriot ships charged
with wares which were then transported inland by caravan,\textsuperscript{29} E. Sjöquist observed in
1940’s the distribution of LC I pottery in southern- and LC II pottery in northern and
central Palestine with Megiddo and Beth-Shean as transit centers.\textsuperscript{30} Today, however,

\textsuperscript{24} Hankey 1993, 101; Wijngaarden van 2002, 16.
\textsuperscript{25} Seeden 1990, 5f.
\textsuperscript{26} E.g. Cline 1994; Cline & Harris-Cline 1998; Gale 1991; Laffineur & Greco 2005.
\textsuperscript{27} Bass 1967; 1986; 1998; 2005; Pulak 2005a; 2005b.
\textsuperscript{28} Furumark 1941a; 1941b.
\textsuperscript{29} Gjerstad 1926, 310-312.
\textsuperscript{30} Sjöqvist 1940.
additional sites have been excavated and probable emporia, for both Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery, on the Levantine coast are identified (see Chapter 5 below). Sjöquist also created long and useful lists of all the Cypriot pottery found in Palestine. These lists were later supplemented by P. Åström in 1972, and in a Ph.D study by B. Gittlen in 1977, who contributed a great deal to the understanding of the distribution of this pottery in Palestine. Also, the importance of V. Hankey’s studies on Mycenaean pottery and trade in the Levant cannot be overestimated. Her work on Mycenaean finds in the Middle East were updated and extended in 1994 by A. J. Leonard.

These chronological frameworks and lists function as a base for more developed and recent studies regarding different aspects (e.g. reasons of importation, main influx, trade and possible emporia) of the interactions between the Levant and the Aegean and Cyprus. A recent tendency towards a more contextual archaeology concerning the interpretation of imported pottery within certain sites in the Levant can be observed.

The Mycenaean pottery at Hazor has earlier been given scholarly attention. In G. J. van Wijngaarden’s book on Mycenaean pottery in the Levant, a contextual investigation of the distribution and use of Mycenaean pottery at Hazor was conducted, which has been useful for this study; however, his investigation did not deal with the city’s trade relations or how and why the pottery reached Hazor, neither did he discuss the Cypriot pottery. A subchapter of S. Zuckerman’s PhD thesis is dedicated to the occurrence of Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery at the site. Her focus is however solely on the chronological aspects of the pottery in discussions related to the dating of the destruction stratum of the final Late Bronze Age phase.

---

31 Åström 1972.
36 Steel 2002; Wijngaarden van 2002.
37 Wijngaarden van 2002, 75-79.
2 THE INFLUX AND USE OF MYCENAEAN AND CYPRIOT POTTERY IN THE LEVANT DURING THE LATE BRONZE AGE

2.1 CHRONOLOGY IN THE LEVANT, CYPRUS, AEGEAN AND EGYPT

![Comparative chronology chart of Eastern Mediterranean areas](Fig. 3)

The chronological division in the table above (Fig. 3) should be used as a guideline in this paper. It is based on suggestions made by scholars dealing with chronologies from different areas in the Eastern Mediterranean. The Aegean and Cypriot chronology adopted in the chart derive from Warren and Hankey. Their discussion regarding absolute dates refers to the Egyptian chronology made by Kitchen. Hence, the dates of

pharaohs mentioned in this text follow his suggestions.\textsuperscript{40} The Levantine LBA is dependent on the Egyptian chronology as well. LB I starts with the beginning of the 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty and the expulsion of the Hyksos from Avaris by Ahmose I. LB IIA is the second half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, mainly the Amarna period. LB IIB correspond to the 19\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty and ends with the Egyptian decline and withdrawal from Canaan and the invasion/immigration of new groups of people especially along the coastline of northern and southern Palestine.\textsuperscript{41}

2.2 CYPRIOT AND MYCENAEAN POTTERY IN THE LATE BRONZE AGE LEVANT

2.2.1 Cypriot Pottery

\textit{Cypriot types and forms}

The Cypriot ware found in the Levant (Fig. 4) include mainly the Monochrome bowls, Bucchero jugs, White Shaved jugs and juglets, White Slip bowls (the so called ‘milk bowl’), and zoomorphic figurines, bowls, jugs and juglets of Base Ring ware. Of these BR II (especially the jugs called ‘bilbils’) and WS II (‘milk bowls’) were the most widely distributed types.\textsuperscript{42} WS Bowls were most common in habitation context while BR juglets and jugs, which constitute the most frequent form, occurred mainly in funerals.\textsuperscript{43} This contrasts to Cyprus where bowls are the most common form in LC burials.

The export of a large amount of jugs and juglets and the occurrence of less decorated and less elaborated LC forms in Palestine compared to Cyprus, in combination with the “invention of White Shaved juglets for Palestinian consumption” made Gittlen propose a selective trade which “was based upon the thorough knowledge of the Palestinian market”.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{40} Kitchen 1987; 1989; 2000, 49.
\textsuperscript{41} Gonen 1992.
\textsuperscript{42} The investigation dealing with the Cypriot pottery is mainly based on Gittlen’s research on sites in Palestine (1977 (1984); 1981). Although no thorough investigation and compilation on the Syrian LC material has been conducted most of his results could be adopted on the northern part of the Levant as well, see e.g. Yon 2001.
\textsuperscript{43} Gittlen 1977 (1984), 510f; 1981, 52.
\textsuperscript{44} Gittlen 1977 (1984), 513; 1981, 52f.
Fig. 4. Cypriot pottery

1. Monochrome bowl
   Hazor III-IV, H CCL.XXVI, 26

2. White Slip 'milk bowl'
   Hazor I, C XCII, 16

3. Base Ring bowl
   Hazor III-IV, H CCLXIX, 44

4. Base Ring jug 'hilbil'
   Hazor II, Γ CXXXVI, 2

5. White Shaved jug
   Hazor II, Γ CXXIXI, 1

6. Bichrome jug
   Hazor II, Γ CXXVI, 15

7. Bichrome Jar
   Hazor III-IV, F CCXLII, 1

8. Bichrome bowl
   Hazor III-IV, H CCLXIX, 35
Bichrome ware is usually described apart from the ordinary LC assemblage of the Levant because of the problematic issue of its origin and influence and how to separate the imports from the locally produced vessels of this type (see below Chapter 2.2.3). This ware includes mainly storage jars, jugs and kraters which are decorated in black and red. It is suggested that the distinct colors and the appearance of the decoration on the upper part and neck signifies a Cypriot production.\(^{45}\).

**Influx and distribution of the Cypriot pottery**

The occurrence of Bichrome in Palestine is limited between late MB and early LB; therefore these vessels are important tools for dating.\(^{46}\) Monochrome is another type appearing in MB II. BR, Bucchero, WS and White Shaved arrived during LB I. The earlier types of these (Proto BR, Monochrome, Proto WS and WS I) ceased before the entrance of LB II while BR I, BR II, Bucchero, White Shaved and WS II reached their zenith in LB IIA, the Amarna period. The trade during this period was completely dominated by BR II pottery (46 %).\(^{47}\)

The Cypriot pottery is distributed along the coastal cities as well as in the interior of Palestine. Some types (PBR, Early BR II, Bucchero, PWS) appear even more frequently on inland sites, which might depend on chronological reasons. Abu Hawam was, for example, not an important trade center until LB II. The distribution map of the Bucchero ware (LB II) shows a very odd picture however; it appears at six inland sites but only one coastal site, Tell el Ajjul in southern Palestine.\(^{48}\) According to an investigation cited by Åström the distribution of WS II reveals a change in trade pattern within the Levant. The ties between Cyprus and northern Levant were stronger in the first and last phase of WS II, while the Cypro-Palestinian trade appears to have been more intense in the middle phase.\(^{49}\)

According to a brief investigation by Yon, the large scale importation of Cypriot pottery in the northern Levant was concentrated in the coastal sites. She claims that the

\(^{45}\) For the difference between imported and local Bichrome ware see Artzy, et al. 1978, 103. However their suggestions are not unequivocal (see Chapter 2.2.3).

\(^{46}\) Prag 1985, 161.

\(^{47}\) Gittlen 1981, 50f.


\(^{49}\) Åström 1993, 309.
Cypriot pottery at e.g. Ras Shamra “was mainly destined for local consumption or for distribution amongst the coastal population who were accustomed to this category of product”. Inland redistribution did occur, although it was “minimal”. However, it is hard to accept that the distribution of pottery differs so hugely between the inland of the northern and southern Levant even considering the separating mountain chain running along the Lebanese and Syrian coast, which actually has gaps, passes and valleys located where the largest coastal cities were located (see chapter 5 below). More likely, the differences depended on the less explored and published sites of the northern Levant, especially in its interior.

The scarcity of Cypriot imports in LB IIB Levant caused Gittlen to suggest that this trade ceased in the beginning of LB IIB. This fact is however questioned by some other scholars, who suggest that the trade continued throughout the Cypriot production period of the vessel types. However, as stated by Gittlen, the Cypriot ware might have been used long after its importation ceased and caution should be taken when using this pottery for dating.

2.2.2 Mycenaean Pottery

*Mythecaen types and forms*

The most common Mycenaean vessels found in Syria-Palestine (*Fig. 5*) belong to the group of closed forms, which include stirrup jars, flasks, pithoid jars, square-sided alabastron, piriform jars and pyxis. About 60% of the imports belong to this group and hence 40% constitute the open forms. Of the open forms small vessels like chalices, cups and mugs were common, as well as large vessels like deep bowls and kraters. Except for the classification of ‘open’ or ‘closed’ the Mycenaean vessels in the Levant can also be categorized into three main groups depending on their usage: Storage vessels (jars, small wide-mouthed containers, stirrup jars and flasks); dinner vessels (kraters, jugs,

---

50 Yon 2001, 123.
52 Mazar 1992, 293, footnote 26; Prag 1985, 157, 159, 162.
54 Hankey 1993; Leonard 1981.
Fig. 5. Mycenaean pottery

1. Lentoid flask
   Hazor II/F CXXXV

2. Tall Stirrup Jar
   Hazor II/F CXXXVII, 12

3. Globular flask
   Hazor II/F CXXXVII, 8

4. Rounded Alabastron
   Hazor II/F CXXXVII, 4

5. Piriform jar
   Hazor II/F CXL, 4

6. Pyxis
   Hazor I/D CXXI, 10

7. Semi Globular Cup
   Hazor II/F CXXXVII, 2

8. Mycenaean figurine
   Hazor III-IV
   H CCLXXXII, 14

9. Female figurine
   Hazor II
   F CXLVIII, 8
cups/stemmed cups and bowls); ritual vessels (e.g. kernos and rhyta). The figurines belong to an additional category.  

At Tell Abu Hawam and at ancient Ugarit the open forms exceed the closed. One might have expected a majority of closed forms (transport containers) at these main emporia; however the easy access to imports probably made the open dinner vessels more integrated in the various contexts of these cities. Quantitative division between open and closed forms differs further from site to site as exemplified by Tel el-Ajjull, where almost no open forms are found.

The Mycenaean pottery was valued both for its own sake and also imported as containers for other commodities like oil (e.g. in narrow-mouthed jars, flasks and stirrup jars) and unguents (in wide-mouthed jars like pyxis and alabastron). The main contents of the vessels, according to Leonard were olive oil and olive oil-based products combined with herbs and spices made by Greek specialists. Leonard also asserts that the trade in fine tableware filled gaps in the production of local pottery. This is however rejected by Wijngaarden who claims that the quantities of Mycenaean pottery were too small (less than 1% even at Ugarit) to fill any gaps in the local repertoire.

**Influx and distribution of Mycenaean pottery**

Prior to the Late Bronze Age, contacts between the Aegean world and the southeast Mediterranean were limited to a small-scale trade at an elite administrative level. The Minoan palace centers, Egypt and the large flourishing towns in the Levant (Ugarit, Alalakh and Byblos) dominated the interaction. This state changed in the Late Bronze Age when Mycenaean pottery was spread all over the Levant and Egypt. The main influx was of LH IIIA2 and IIIB1 pottery. From this period more than one hundred sites are known in the Levant.
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55 Wijngaarden van 2002, 14f, fig. 2.2.
57 See e.g. Wijngaarden van 2002, 73.
58 Steel 2002.
60 Wijngaarden van 1999, 31f.
61 Warren 1995, 2-5.
The distribution of the Mycenaean pottery shows that it was not only the coast cities that were involved in the commerce; the commodities also reached inland urban centers through a network of trade routes. Wijngaarden’s distribution map of 111 sites of Mycenaean finds in the Levant shows that Hazor belongs to one of the eleven sites with the most rich finds. To include the finds from the renewed excavations would make the city belong to the group of eight largest importers, together with Minet el Beida, Sarafend, Megiddo, Amman and Lachish, after the cities Abu Hawam and Ugarit. Thus, four out of eight are actually located in the interior. This suggests that Abu Hawam and Ugarit functioned as main importers both of Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery, and were primary nodes of the exchange with the hinterland, based on the large quantity of pottery (more than 500 Mycenaean finds) and the wide range of forms found there. However, they were not the only entries to the Levant, and furthermore their importance was not consistent throughout the whole LB period.

2.2.3 Provenance Studies and Imitations

To establish the provenance of the pottery and to separate the originals from the locally-made imitations, a special method can be used called Neutron Activation Analysis (NAA), which matches the composition of the pottery with the clay of its origin. The method was used, for example, to establish the origin of a chariot crater and other Mycenaean vessels in tomb 387 at Laish/Dan. The result showed that this pottery derived from one region in Greece, Mycenaea/Berbati, which supports Biran’s suggestion of a Mycenaean colony in Dan, especially considering the context of the vessels – a two generation tomb (beehive-shaped, known from Greek Argolid) with 40 skeletons and Mycenaean grave goods. Although it might be hard to prove a Mycenaean trade diaspora, it seems plausible that the inhabitants of this grave had some kind of connection to trade. Another analysis shows that some Mycenaean pottery from the so-called ‘Persian Garden’ tombs in the vicinity of Tel Akko originated in Nichorie on Cyprus.
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63 Wijngaarden van 2002, map 6.
64 Wijngaarden van 2002, map 7.
67 Biran 1970.
Additional imports, stone weights and luxury items among the grave goods, suggest that some of the deceased might have been related to merchantry.  

However, the most important contribution of this method is the appearance of different origins of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant, which appears to have been made in workshops at Argolid, Cyprus and the Levant. This phenomenon is suggested to have chronological ramifications and/or depend on trade alliances (see below), and will of course have further implications for the interpretation of interaction studies in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The widespread imitation of Cypriot pottery in the Levant is a well known phenomenon. K. Prag claims that imitations follow the dates of importation and production. In other words, imitation was not an activity due to lack of imported goods, as earlier stated. She also reflects that White Slip wares appears to have been imported for aesthetic reasons and is also the least imitated. In imitation the aesthetic considerations were not the major factor and there seems to have been a strong tendency to adapt the foreign forms to the local tradition. The potters adopted/adapted for instance only those features which they could easily produce within their own craft tradition. They never produced handmade vessels, they did not push the handle through the body of the pot, they mostly avoided the round-based shape and continued to prefer red paint and local panel styles of decoration. In other words, this reflects a kind of hybridization. According to Prag, Cypriot pottery found in cultic context is almost exclusively imports.

However, regarding the Mycenaean ware an increase in imitations coincides with the fall-off of this pottery in LB IIB / Iron I Levant. This decrease depended, according to Hankey, on a scarcity of supplies in the Aegean which also affected the Mycenaean pottery imports to Cyprus. The imitations of these imports, which had become a “part of daily life”, were meant to solve this problem.

A. Killebrew instead explains the end of importation and concurrent increase in imitation as the last of three phases in the organization of the trade: The first phase
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69 Prag 1985, 162f.
71 Hankey 1993, 103.
reflects the concentration of pottery originating in the palatial centers in the Argolid region and consisted of LH IIA2-IIIB containers of precious oils and ointment and a smaller number of fine table ware. The second phase, represented by LH IIIB pottery, which is the end of LB when the Greece palatial centers declined and new multiple manufacturing centers emerged, points to a taking over by peripheral groups. This phase included fewer and more declined forms (stirrup jars and flasks) from multiple workshops (acc. to NAA), representing the diffusion of the west Aegean style to the east and hence a trade, although less intensive, including eastern Aegean, the southern coast of Turkey and Cyprus. A third phase is Mycenaean IIIC:1b at the end of LB IIB/Iron I, which appeared first on the coastal cities in the Levant and replaced the indigenous pottery. Their shape and technology are Aegean, with some Cypriot inspired forms, but they are locally produced and reflect more everyday use. This last phase indicates, according to Killebrew, the incursion of new groups of people with probable origin in Cyprus, Rhodes and/or southern Anatolia.72

The Origin of the Bichrome Ware

The origin of the Bichrome Ware, which occurs in late MB and early LB in the Levant,73 has rendered some problems among scholars.74 C. Epstein made the first serious study of this pottery type in her PhD. She regarded it as a mainland ware influenced by the Hurrians.75 NAA studies, conducted by M. Artzy et al, instead point to eastern Cyprus, particularly Milia, as the provenance of this pottery.76 However the provenance of Bichrome Ware is more complicated than that. Recent excavations on Cyprus have shown that this pottery is not only concentrated on the east side but spread all over the island, and maybe especially on the western part.77 Further, it is suggested that this ware which consists of two categories, one very fine ware with neatly motif-painted decorations covering the surface and a second inferior made of gritty clay simply

73 Prag 1985, 161; Åström 2001a, 136.
74 See e.g. Åström 2001b.
75 Epstein 1966.
77 Karageorghis 2001, 144.
decorated on part of the body, should be classified as two separate pottery types.\textsuperscript{78} There are different opinions on the original source of inspiration of the motifs of the fine ware; Anatolia, Syro-Mesopotamia, the Aegean and Egypt are suggested.\textsuperscript{79} What seems to be concluded though is that the original main production of the Bichrome Ware came from Cyprus, but local imitations are prevalent in Syria-Palestine and Egypt as well.\textsuperscript{80} The distribution of Bichrome Ware in Palestine shows that it is concentrated in the coastal cities and along important inland routes such as the main north – south trade route passing Hazor, as well as the Jezreel Valley route from the sea to the interior.\textsuperscript{81}

3 THE DISTRIBUTION OF IMPORTED POTTERY AT HAZOR

3.1 Area Descriptions

The areas of the Upper City of Hazor consist of Area A, B, BA, G, L and M (Fig. 2), of which only Area A and M contain substantial LB structures. The Northern Temple of Area A, its courtyard and surroundings, as well as the NE corner of the Southern Temple were excavated in the 1960's. The finds and plans of the former temple are published and fully included in the investigation below. The Southern Temple though was completely unearthed in the renewed excavations which started in 1990 and are still in progress. These excavations focus on the tel and have yielded several monumental structures in Area A (A1-A6). A large Ceremonial Palace with a courtyard constitutes the focal point on the summit of this area. This structure should rather be seen as a royal/religious building where cultic and ceremonial activities were performed, rather than as an administrative palace.\textsuperscript{82} Such an administrative palace is instead indicated by a podium complex found in Area M on the northern slope of the tel. This complex most likely constituted the entrance of a huge Late Bronze Age administrative/living palace, which is still hidden in the dirt of the tel.\textsuperscript{83} The pottery of these recently excavated areas, in Area A and M, is not yet published and will therefore not be included in the tables and

\textsuperscript{78} Karageorghis 2001, 148f.
\textsuperscript{79} Artzy 2001, 163; Karageorghis 2001, 152f.
\textsuperscript{81} Artzy 2001, 167.
\textsuperscript{82} Ben-Tor 2006; Zuckerman 2006.
\textsuperscript{83} Zuckerman 2003b; 2006.
diagrams below. However, these areas are to a certain extent considered in the discussions.

The areas of the Lower City are Area C, D, E, F, H, K and P (Fig. 2). The two latter, K and P, constitute city-gates with connected buildings. Area D and E are hard to interpret and only contain fragments of badly preserved walls. A couple of kilns in Area D hint at some kind of industrial activities. Several large cisterns, originally used as water reservoirs but later reused as silos and for burials, are most noticeable in these two areas which have yielded a remarkably large amount of imported pottery. Area C included dwelling quarters, a temple and a couple of pottery workshops. Area F also included a dwelling quarter and a probable cult place; this area yielded the most imported pottery of all the areas so far reported at Hazor. The implication of this phenomenon will be further discussed below. Area H consisted of succeeding (from the end of MB until the end of LB) monumental temples with courtyards and adjacent buildings. All the imported pottery found in this area is, in this investigation, regarded as being connected to the temple in the respective period.

Table I and II (see appendix), show the Cypriot and Mycenaean pottery found in the different areas at Hazor during LB. The distribution of these types in the areas of the Upper and respective areas of the Lower City are displayed in the diagrams below, divided into their find contexts in LB I and LB II (Fig. 6-12). As seen, no Mycenaean pottery is found in LB I contexts, which concurs with the general picture of the importation of this pottery type into Syria-Palestine. Bichrome pottery does, as expected, only occur in LB I, except for two sherds in Area A, which appeared in disturbed LB II layers. The difficulties in several areas of establishing the division between level 1A (LB IIB) and 1B (LB IIA) prevent a more precise division of the pottery within LB II. However, about 75% of the LB II Cypriot as well as 70% of the LB II Mycenaean pottery should be ascribed to LB IIA. This statement though has to be updated when the imported pottery of the renewed excavation has been published, of which most originated from the destruction level (LB IIB) of Area A and M and include
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85 Wijngaarden van 2002. se också Leonard, Killebrew etc
86 According to an estimation made by the author.
approximately 150 Mycenaean and 220 Cypriot sherds of hard-identifiable and fragmented character (see below Chapter 3.3.1).  

3.2 THE LB I CYPRIOT POTTERY

The total number of LB I Cypriot vessels/sherds (excluding Bichrome) is 31 pieces. As seen in Fig. 6 and Tables II (in the appendix) the most abundant Cypriot pottery in LB I appeared in Area E and H were it was found in specific contexts.

---

Fig. 6. Distribution of Cypriot pottery at Hazor during LB I

Fig. 7. Cypriot pottery forms in different contexts at Hazor in LB I

---

In Area E the LB I pottery, which consisted of bowls (Monochrome, WS I and II ‘milk bowls’) and jugs and juglets (BR I, White Shaved), was only found in cistern L. 7021, as it seems, “thrown” or fallen down. This pottery may have been connected to some kind of cultic activities, based on the composition of this pottery assemblage and the general character of this area, e.g. several carved cup marks on the bedrock surface. Except for a few additional jugs/juglets in Area E the Cypriot pottery types of this area are similar to the assemblage of Area H. In this latter area the LB I pottery was associated with the Stratum 2 temple, where it appeared both inside and outside this structure. A somewhat smaller amount of LB I Cypriot pottery appeared in Area F where a juglet was found in a burial and two BR I jugs so called ‘bilbils’ were uncovered in unstratified contexts; only one bowl (Monochrome) appeared, also unstratified. Two Monochrome bowls appeared in habitation contexts in Area C and two sherds, probably bowls, in a structure connected to the Area K gate (other/indef. context). The most common forms (Fig. 7) in LB I were bowls (Monochrome and WS I and II) followed by the ‘bilbil’ jugs (BR I and II). Strangely no Cypriot pottery from this period is found in Area D.

3.2.1 The Bichrome Pottery at Hazor

Neither NAA tests nor visual attempts have been made to distinguish possible local from imported Bichrome ware at Hazor. Thus, since its Cypriot origin cannot be concluded, it is treated in a separate diagram (Fig. 8). Most of the 20 sherds of this pottery type found on the site appeared in temples (A north and H) and consisted of various shapes, bowls, kraters and jugs. Three jugs and three kraters were found in a burial in Area F and the rest of the Bichrome pottery in this area appeared in unstratified levels. In Area E they were all found in cistern L. 7021 except for one that was found in an indefinable context. As mentioned above, the character of the pottery in L. 7021 hints to a special use, perhaps connected to cult. This pottery type seems to have been concentrated in cultic contexts at Hazor, a picture that differs from the Bichrome at Tell el Dab’a and ‘Ezbet Helmi where most of the Bichrome pottery is found in settlement contexts, especially in a palace.
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88 Yadin, et al. 1958, 148. Cistern L. 7021 is labelled as ‘other’ in the diagram since its use is unknown.
89 According to an investigation in my forthcoming PhD.
However, almost no habitation contexts of LB I have been excavated at Hazor, which might explain the absence of Bichrome in this situation.

Thus the Bichrome pottery at Hazor including the Cypriot LB I pottery discussed above, appeared mainly in cultic circumstances. This is especially true if the Area E pottery should be attributed to this context.

![Bichrome Pottery LB I](image)

Fig. 8. Distribution of Bichrome pottery at Hazor during LB I

### 3.3 The LB II Cypriot and Mycenaean Pottery

In LB II the number of Cypriot vessels increases on the site, 107 pieces derive from this period (*Table II*), of which the main part, approximately 75%, is found in LB IIA strata.

Continuing occurrences of this pottery can be found in the temples in Area H, and now also in Area A (the Northern Temple), where the pottery had an obvious cultic function and consisted mainly of bowls of the Monochrome and White Slip I and II types as well as some BR I and II jugs (*Fig. 9 and 10 and Table II*). It was used also in smaller cultic connections in the Area K gate and in the open cult place of Area F. In Area C, on the other hand, no Cypriot pottery was found in connection to the temple, but instead a few WS bowls were found in habitation contexts. However, about a third of all Cypriot pottery in this period derives from Area F, of which most appeared in burials, L. 8144-8145 and L. 8065 and consisted of mostly jugs of the BR I and especially of the BR II type.

---

As seen in the diagram (Fig. 10), the most common form is the WS bowl in cultic contexts, followed by BR jugs in burials. The noticeably high amount of Cypriot pottery found in other/indefinable contexts derives mainly from unstratified levels and unidentified contexts in Areas A, C, D and F.

Fig. 9. Distribution of Cypriot pottery at Hazor during LB II

Fig. 10. Cypriot pottery forms in various contexts at Hazor in LB II
The strata of LB II have yielded 59 sherds and vessels of Mycenaean pottery. Some interesting aspects can be observed regarding the distribution of Mycenaean pottery on the site (Fig. 11, 12 and Table I). Area F contained more than twice as much of this pottery type than the next areas, which are Area A and D, followed by Area C. Most of the Mycenaean pottery in Area F derives from the same burial, L. 8144-8145, as the Cypriot imports. This tomb of multiple burials, located just outside the dwelling quarter, is conspicuously rich in finds. Unlike the WS bowls of Cypriot origin, the Mycenaean
pottery in this burial consists mainly of containers such as flasks, stirrup jars and pyxides. This together with the remarkable abundance of Mycenaean pottery in and around the rather large and well built houses in this area hints to its inhabitants’ wealth and easy access to imports.\(^91\) Except for an unidentifiable sherd in house L. 6022 in Area C, no other area has yielded any Mycenaean pottery in habitation contexts. Area D also included a burial with Mycenaean pottery. This was located in a cistern, L. 9027, which yielded three pyxides, an amphoroid krater and a deep bowl. Another cistern, L. 9017 interpreted as a silo, included a couple of Mycenaean sherds. Van Wijngaarden observes the atypical nature of the assemblage in this silo and suggests its connection to a nearby kiln and perhaps some industrial activities.\(^92\) A few sherds were also found in unstratified levels in this badly preserved area. As with the Cypriot pottery the Mycenaean examples in Area A and H are connected to the temple. Interesting is Area C where most of the Mycenaean sherds were found in industrial contexts in the workshops. These vessels included pyxides and a piriform jar, which might have been connected to the pottery production.\(^93\)

### 3.3.1 Some Notes on the Imported Pottery of the Renewed Excavations

The pottery is derived from the destruction level (XIII and 1A), LB IIB of Areas A and M. This imported pottery is not yet published, but briefly discussed in an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, hence it is impossible to include it in the diagrams.\(^94\)

**Area A – The Ceremonial Palace**

About 90 Mycenaean sherds appeared in the areas of the Ceremonial Palace and its courtyard, many of which were found in recent contexts of the Iron Age. The sherds were in most cases very small and hard to identify and no complete vessels were found. The shapes are typical of the LH IIIA2 ware and continue to appear in the LH IIIB1. The quality of these vessels is high and the pottery in general is similar to the Mycenaean
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\(^91\) For a description of these houses and those in Area C see Daviau 1993, 219-252; Foucault-Forest 1996, 67-73; Yadin, et al. 1960, Chapter 4 and 5.

\(^92\) Wijngaarden van 2002, 91.

\(^93\) Wijngaarden van 2002, 89f.

\(^94\) The description below of the pottery in the Area A and M of the renewed excavations is based on Zuckerman 2003b, 269-281.
assemblage of the Lower City. Only a cup fragment in one of the southern rooms and two vessels in the porch were found inside the building. Most of the reconstructed vessels were of closed forms, and included stirrup jars, piriform juglets, a pyxis and a flask as well as open cups and kraters.\textsuperscript{95}

Some 100 sherds of Cypriot pottery were found in the Ceremonial Palace and its vicinity and some 60 more sherds in other parts of Area A. Most of the sherds were ‘milk bowls’ of the WS II type, although some were fragments of the BR and Monochrome ware. The only complete vessel was a decorated ‘milk bowl’, of the WS II (1a) type, which was found in the western room of the northern pair of rooms. This type of bowl appears in stratum 2, 1a and XIII in other areas at Hazor.\textsuperscript{96}

Imitations of Mycenaean and Cypriot Pottery appeared in and around the Ceremonial Palace, particularly in Area A3. Ten imitation Cypriot and three imitation Mycenaean vessels were found.\textsuperscript{97}

\textit{Area M – The Podium Compound}

The primary documentation in the field gave a number of some 60 Mycenaean sherds found in Area M. This number should probably be lowered though, since a similar preliminary identification of this type of sherds found in the Ceremonial Palace (areas A1, A3 and the court in A4) gave a number of 130, which was later reduced to 90 after closer inspection. Closed forms of Mycenaean sherds in the destruction layer of the Podium Complex were identified as stirrup-jars, piriform juglets, and a flask. Of the open forms, cups and kraters were found. This pottery was of high quality and nicely decorated.\textsuperscript{98}

Some 60 sherds of Cypriot pottery were found in the new excavations; however most of the Cypriot sherds found in Area A and M were too small and fragmentary to be typologically and chronologically positively identified. Most of the sherds identified are ‘milk bowls’ of the WS II type.\textsuperscript{99}

\textsuperscript{95} Zuckerman 2003b, 276f. Zuckerman 2003a, pls. stirrup-jars (pl. 6. 2: 16-18), piriform juglets (pl. 6. 2: 11-13), pyxis (pl. 6. 2: 15) flask (pl. 6. 2: 14) open cups (pl. 6. 2: 1-3), and kraters (pl. 6. 2: 4-7).
\textsuperscript{96} Zuckerman 2003a, pl. 3, 55; 22; 2003b, 280f.
\textsuperscript{97} Zuckerman 2003a, pl. 4.12.
\textsuperscript{98} Zuckerman 2003a, fig. 6.2, 1, 2, 4-7, 11-14, 17-21.
\textsuperscript{99} e.g. Zuckerman 2003a, fig. 3.12
In comparison to Area A, no local imitations of imported pottery were registered from the Podium Complex.
4 SHAPE, CONTENT, CONTEXT AND USE OF THE IMPORTED POTTERY AT HAZOR

This chapter will offer some aspects of the Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery forms and their find contexts at Hazor in order to discuss its possible content, the purpose of its use and importation as well as the category of user.

4.1 WHITE SLIP BOWLS AND BASE RING JUGS – MOST COMMON CYPRIOIT SHAPES AND TYPES

Of the Cypriot imports open forms are the most commonly found in the Levant and more specified the WS II bowls, also known as ‘milk bowls’. These vessels as well as bowls of Monochrome and Base-Ring were often found in habitation contexts, while the closed forms, mainly BR jugs and juglets appeared in funerary contexts. This contrasts with the local pottery, which consists mainly of bowls in both habitation and funerary situations.\(^{100}\) The open shape of the Cypriot bowls precluded any content while traded, which is also verified in the large number of these vessels found stacked into each other in a large pithos in the Ulu Burun shipwreck.\(^{101}\) They were thus requested solely for aesthetic qualities and for their function as tableware, which probably included the serving of liquids such as water, milk or wine in the destined Syro-Palestinian contexts. Åström suggests that they might have been used as yoghurt bowls, similar to a type still in use today. Other alternatives he offers are as plates, e.g. fish plates hinted by the decoration of octopus, squid or cuttlefish on a few examples. The carinated monochrome bowls are further compared with a similar modern type used to make *tava*, a stew of meat and onion.\(^{102}\) The suggestions deal not only with drinks or food. Gittlen observes that in several tombs these bowls were to cover the mouth of storage jars, which enhanced the beauty of these vessels’ exterior decoration.\(^{103}\) This was, however, not the case at Hazor where no bowls were reported to have covered the mouths of storage jars. Instead the bowls at Hazor were
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\(^{100}\) Gittlen 1977 (1984), 510.
\(^{101}\) Bass 1986, 277f.
\(^{102}\) Åström 1993, 310.
\(^{103}\) Gittlen 1981, 52.
found mainly in temples which might correlate with Gittlen’s suggestion that they were used for conveying offerings or taxes.\textsuperscript{104} In LB I just a few bowls were found in the houses, and those were not of the WS type that appeared instead in temples. In LB II the WS bowls appear both in temples and houses, which might support Hankey’s assumption that imports (although in her case Mycenaean) were originally imported for elites (palaces and temples) and later trickled down to ordinary people.\textsuperscript{105} The Cypriot pottery found in the Ceremonial Palace and the Podium Complex in the renewed excavations consisted mainly of WS bowls, which accentuate the cultic significance of these structures.

More limited though appears the range of uses of the BR jugs and juglets, which mainly have been found in funeral contexts in Levantine sites.\textsuperscript{106} This is also true for the BR jugs/juglets found at LB II Hazor where the most common contexts are burials followed by temples (\textit{Fig. 10}). In LB I, none of the few examples found appeared in indefinable circumstances and none in burials (\textit{Fig. 7}), which might be related to the very few LB I burials excavated on the site. The Base-ring II (and some Base-ring I) jugs/juglets, often called ‘bilbils’, are handmade without potters wheels and decorated with white strips; the handles are inserted through the wall (in contrast to local imitations). The supposition by Merrillees that some of these contained opium seems to be supported by analyses conducted.\textsuperscript{107} Åström suggests that opium might have been used as a “sedative for dying people”, like morphine is currently used.\textsuperscript{108} More probable though is a connection between opium smoking and funeral rituals, perhaps as a drug for the mourning or, as suggested by G. Nordquist, in transcendental rites for contacts with the deceased.\textsuperscript{109} As with the Mycenaean closed vessels listed below, the BR jugs are also proposed to have been related to the importation of oils, scents and wine.\textsuperscript{110} Like the

\textsuperscript{104} Gittlen 1981, 52.
\textsuperscript{105} Hankey 1993, 104.
\textsuperscript{106} Gittlen 1977 (1984), 101 chart 24, 142; 1981, 52.
\textsuperscript{107} Merrillees 1989, 183-186. See also Merrilles’ selected articles on this subject in Åström 2003.
\textsuperscript{108} Åström 1993, 310.
\textsuperscript{109} Oral communication with G. Nordquist March 2008.
\textsuperscript{110} Bergoffen 1989, 281-291; Sjöqvist 1940, 200.
ordinary grave repertoire, they are suggested to have been re-used from their supposed domestic purpose.\textsuperscript{111}

4.1.1 Importers and Users of the Cypriot Pottery at Hazor

At LB I Hazor, the appearance of Cypriot pottery mainly consists of bowls in cultic contexts, especially connected to the Area H temple. This temple also is associated with Bichrome vessels of various shapes. In Area E, Cypriot and Bichrome pottery was also considerably used, probably in cultic circumstances.

In LB II the Bichrome no longer was in use, but instead the importation of other Cypriot types increased hugely. The religious leaders of the Area H, and in this period also the Area A (north), temple showed a continuing interest in this pottery type which also seems to have attracted more modest religious groups of Area K and F. Hence, the Cypriot bowls (mainly WS I/II) that were connected to the temples were probably imported on behalf of the temple personnel to be used in rituals conveying offerings such as libations. Some examples, however, trickled down to the people of the domestic houses in Area C, where they might have been used as food and drinking vessels.

Most remarkable though is the easy access to Cypriot and Mycenaean vessels in area F. The collective burials, L. 8144-8145, L. 8065 in this area contained multiple individuals, imported pottery and about 500 local vessels and other finds (including imports from Egypt). The plentiful Cypriot jugs (mainly BR I/II) were most likely used in the funeral rituals and hence requested by the deceased’s families. Thus we assume that the rather wealthy people who lived in this area had easy access to imports. The tombs were in use during LB IIA, and L. 8144-8145 also, as it seems, in parts of LB IIB.\textsuperscript{112} The significance of this area related to imports will be further discussed together with the Mycenaean pottery below.

4.2 FINE TABLE WARE AND TRANSPORT CONTAINERS FROM THE AEGEAN

Leonard has investigated the morphology of the most common Mycenaean vessels that occur in Syria-Palestine in order to reveal their function and content and hence some

\textsuperscript{111} Prag 1985, 163.
clues as to the nature of Eastern Mediterranean commerce in the Late Bronze Age. The open forms, which are less numerous, can be divided into small vessels (chalices, cups and mugs) and large vessels (deep bowls and kraters). The most common types in the Levant as well as at Hazor belong to the closed forms including the narrow mouthed stirrup jars and flasks and the wide mouthed pithoid jars, alabastra and pyxides.

According to Leonard, the open forms represent a trade in fine table ware, desired for its own sake, particularly the shapes that complement the shortage of the local repertoire, e.g. the handled cups. The kraters though might have been imported with some kind of content, and later secondarily used as table ware, perhaps for mixing wine and water. However, most likely the appreciation of the Mycenaean ware should not be mixed with the usage or shortage of the local types. The imported pottery may rather be connected to “consumption at special occasions, public ceremonies or celebrations”, thus distinct from everyday food consumption. The special role drinking and serving vessels fulfilled in this context, and the production of wine and olive oil in LM Crete is discussed by Y. Hamilakis, who shows that the production of grapes (for wine) and olives (for oil) was not just a “routine agricultural practice” but rather labour intensive and economically more risky, and thus restricted to elite control. The intensive wine, oil and ointment production in combination with a mass production of drinking and serving vessels in the LM II suggests a peak in collective drinking and feasting in this period. The ritual character of these feastings, which also may include mortuary feastings, is revealed in the large number of structured deposition of drinking cups and other feasting evidence. This period is also characterized by intensified external contacts in which wine and perfumed oil played a significant role in the inter-regional exchange of produces. Wine production though might originally have been a Near Eastern tradition, and public, ritual feastings in the courtyards of the Ceremonial Palace and the Area H temple at

113 Leonard 1981.
116 See e.g. Wijngaarden van 1999, 31f.
117 Hamilakis 1999, 40.
118 Hamilakis 1999, 47-50.
Hazor have recently been thoroughly investigated and suggested. In these feastings the hundreds of locally produced bowls found might have filled a special function.\(^{120}\)

At Hazor there are only a few examples of the open Mycenaean vessels, mainly cups, found in temples and burials (\textit{Fig. 12}) and in the destruction levels (LB IIB) of the Ceremonial Palace and the Podium Complex.\(^{121}\) The great majority of Mycenaean vessels at the site were represented by the closed vessels and were found mainly in the burials and habitation contexts of Area F (LB IIA and B) as well as in the workshops of Area C (LB IIA).\(^{122}\)

Leonard’s investigation shows that the closed forms were imported to the Levant as containers for thin oil (stirrup jars, flasks and other narrow mouthed jars) and thicker unguents (in wide mouthed jars like pyxis and alabastron).\(^{123}\) These desirable oils of best quality were herbed with mighty sage, rose and maybe also cyperus, designed to meet the specific demands of the Near Eastern public.\(^{124}\)

So why then did the Levantine elite import perfumes and unguents based on olive oil, with ingredients actually widely produced in the Near East itself?\(^{125}\) First the Mycenaean olive oil may not have been used primarily for food, but rather for industrial purposes, such as the manufacture of perfume and unguents. In this production the \textit{wild} olives, common in the Aegean, were most suitable.\(^{126}\) Hamilakis suggests that the production \textit{knowledge} of perfumed oils, based on wild olives, was \textit{controlled} by the Aegean palatial authorities.\(^{127}\) In this connection Palmer’s investigation of evidence for elite cultivation of exotic herbs in Greece is of interest.\(^{128}\) Some of the stirrup jars might

\(^{121}\) Some examples of Mycenaean pottery from the renewed excavations in Area A1 and M are listed by Zuckerman 2003a, fig. 6.2.
\(^{123}\) The, often, three and disproportionately small handles on the alabastron, pyxis and the pithoid jar is shown to have functioned to seal these vessels with help of a (waxed?) cloth and a cord (Leonard 1981, 94, fig. 5.A and 6.A).
\(^{124}\) Leonard 1981, 91-94.
\(^{125}\) The Jordan Valley, and especially Teleilat Ghassoul, is considered to have been the origin of domesticated olives. In the Aegean they were actually cultivated rather late (Hadjisavvas 2003, 117).
\(^{126}\) Hadjisavvas 2003,117, 120.
\(^{127}\) Hamilakis 1999, 49.
\(^{128}\) Palmer 2003, 127.
also have been used for wine, as suggested by Palmer. A reuse of the Mycenaean vessels at the destination place is also plausible.

4.2.1 The Users of the Mycenaean Pottery at Hazor

Who used the oils and unguents and in what circumstances were they found at Hazor? The most common Mycenaean forms at Hazor were the flasks and stirrup jars in the burials and houses of Area F. This area contained the most varied assemblage of Mycenaean pottery including almost all types found at Hazor. These narrow mouthed containers, classified as storage vessels by Wijngaarden, in his division between table ware and storage vessels, were most likely imported for their content but also for their beauty. It is not just a coincidence that they were found in Area F. This area also contained the largest amount of Cypriot pottery as well as other imported finds, e.g. Egyptian. Most of these finds derive from the multiple burials L. 8144-8145 and L. 8065 that in character and content are comparable to tombs at Tel Dan, Akko, Lachish and Gezer, of which at least the two former are suggested to have been related to traders/merchants. A tomb at Sarafend, ancient Sarepta with similar content perhaps should be added to the list. This in combination with the rather wealthy large houses, the indefinable cultic activities accented with foreign attributes, and the relative closeness to the Area P gate would motivate a cautious suggestion that the inhabitants of Area F, at least in the LB II period, were in some way connected to merchantry and trade. Such an internal or external trade community/quarter, might have served both private and palatial interests.

Thus, the imported Mycenaean, as well as Cypriot pottery found in elite contexts on the tell (the Area A temples, the Ceremonial Palace and the Podium Complex) might have been obtained through traders and merchants in Area F. The amount of imported pottery on the tell will probably increase within the next few years when the ongoing excavations uncover a suggested administrative palace, of which today only the assumed
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132 Reg. karum serving palatial and private interests see e.g. Larsen 1989.
entrance (the Podium Complex) is unearthed. This entrance expanse has already yielded more Mycenaean pottery (related to excavated surface) than the entire Ceremonial Palace area.\footnote{Zuckerman 2003b, 202.}

The workshops of Area C might also have been clients of the (possible) Area F merchants. The wide-mouthed containers (pyxis) found in these workshops, of a late LB IIA level,\footnote{The Mycenaean pottery of Area C are suggested to have derived from this period (Yadin, et al. 1960, 101).} are considered to have served a special purpose associated with the artisan activities in this area.\footnote{Wijngaarden van 2002, 90.}

In cultic contexts various types but just a few Mycenaean vessels were found (Fig. 10 and 11). According to Wijngaarden the Mycenaean vessels from the first part of LB were concentrated in Area A (the Northern Temple and its surroundings). He suggests that the groups associated with the temple and the palace (now the Ceremonial Palace) might have had exclusive access to the pottery in this period. Wijngaarden asserts that in

\begin{figure}
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\caption{LH style in various contexts}
\end{figure}

the second half of LB, Mycenaean pottery seems to be more integrated in the rest of the society and occurs as dinner vessels ‘everywhere’.\footnote{Wijngaarden van 2002, 79.} This statement however is not really true since it is only in Area F (with one exception in Area C) that Mycenaean pottery
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occurs in habitation contexts during the whole LB II (Fig. 11). In addition, it is hard to
distinguish the pottery from the different periods in LB II. Nevertheless, the diagram
(Fig. 13) showing the chronological appearance of the LH styles in different contexts
indicates that the later produced Mycenaean pottery appears in houses (although only in
Area F) while it decreases in all other contexts.\footnote{LH IIIA-IIIB period in the diagram include pottery which is hard to determine whether it should belong to LH IIIA or IIIB}
5 Levantine Harbor Cities – Accessibility and Imports

The imported Cypriot and Mycenaean pottery at Hazor includes the types generally common in the Levant in this period, thus these pots are found at most inland as well as harbour sites, although the harbour assemblages show some additional types. A number of the most plausible coast cities that could have supplied Hazor with these goods will here be investigated and discussed. Attention will be given to their importance as trade cities, to the distance and location (along important trade routes) in relation to Hazor and to the composition of their assemblages as well as their active periods. However as mentioned in the beginning of this paper, such a comparison should only be seen as an indication, depending on the differences in the exploration of archaeological sites in the region.

Two harbor cities along the Levantine coast are often mentioned as main emporia based on their strategic position connected to interior trade routes as well as their abundant number of imports. These are Ugarit along the northern Levantine coast and Tell Abu Hawam along the southern Levantine coast. Hazor was located in the interior between these sites although further from Ugarit (Fig. 14). The investigation below shows some more important entries to the Levant and its interior. However, first an overview of the land-based accessibility to these port cities will be given.

5.1 The Levantine Terrestrial Communication Network

The geographical features of Syria-Palestine, especially in the northern part, strongly control the direction of the roads which run along valleys between mountain chains, and follows passes and wadi systems. This broken landscape made old routes more or less fixed through times.

The S-N main roads (Fig. 14): The main road that ran from south to north through Syria-Palestine, connecting Egypt with Mesopotamia, was in later periods known as ‘Via Maris’. This road went from Egypt along the Palestinian coast, although a few km from
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139 Åström 1993, 312.
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the shore because of swamps, and bifurcated in the vicinity of the Sharon and Jezreel plain. One branch continued northwards along the coast to Ugarit; the other branch turned northeast, passed Hazor and went further north through the Syrian interior. At Aleppo (Halab) it turned east to Emár and continued along the Euphrates to Mesopotamia. A closer route from Hazor to the Euphrates is mentioned in texts from MB. This road left the S-N interior road at Qatna where it turned eastwards to Tadmor (Palmyra) and continued to present day Deir es Zor by the Euphrates. The approachability of this semi-desert road was dependent on the season and was thus most frequented in winter and spring. Yet another main route from far-away South Arabia followed the Red Sea, continued northwards on the eastern side of the Bay of Aqqaba and the Jordan Valley to Damascus, and further. This road might have branched to Hazor as well since one of the easily accessible fords of the Jordan River is located close to this site.

The main E-W transverse roads (Fig. 14): The closest road from Ugarit to the Euphrates goes along the Nahr el-Kebir Valley. The next transverse route is suggested by the Homs gap, which opens from Tell Kazel on the coast to the sites of Qadesh and Qatna in the interior. Another probable transverse route was from Sarepta along the Litani River to Kamid el-Loz. A road from Hazor to the northern Levantine coast, probably in the vicinity of Tyre and Sarepta, is suggested for the MB period and was most likely also in use in LB. From Akko a probable transverse road connected to the main road to Hazor. Routes to the interior of Tell Abu Hawam and Tel Nami passed the sites along the Jezreel Valley e.g. Jokneam, Megiddo, Taanach and Beth Shean, crossed the transverse Jordan Valley to Transjordan and connected to the main S-N route to/from southern Arabia to northern Syria. It seems that this road was used for the incense trade from South Arabia via Tel Nami to the Aegean and to Egypt.

141 Aharoni 1979, 45-54; Astour 1995, 1415; Malamat 1989, 65.
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5.1 NORTHERN LEVANTINE HARBOUR SITES

5.1.1 Ugarit / Minet el Beida

The site of ancient Ugarit is located on the coast of Syria near modern Latakia (Fig. 14). The ancient city, which was the capital of the kingdom of Ugarit, consisted of the port (the Bay of Minet el Beida) and the tell (Ras Shamra) 800 m inland; a nearby site (Ras Ibn Hani) included a royal residence built in the 13th century BC. The site is most known from LBA because of the large number of tablets found and the well preserved archaeological remains of this period. The Amarna letters and other texts reveal that during the first part of LB II the Ugaritian city-state was under Egyptian domination. In
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the last phase of the Late Bronze Age, Egypt lost its grip and the city fell under Hittite control.\textsuperscript{150} The city was finally destroyed at the end of LB and never rebuilt.

The center of the tell consisted mainly of crowded dwellings, shops and workshops which coexisted within insulae. No socially-differentiated districts or specific areas for craftsmen could be identified there. The western part of the mound was however reserved for the royal quarters. On the acropolis two temples, the temple of Baal and the temple of Dagan, were located from where the port could be viewed.\textsuperscript{151}

The cultural and economic engine in the Ugaritic society was its maritime location. This location connected the city with the Levantine coastline all the way to Egypt in the south not only through the seaway but also through the land-based coast roads. Northwards, the city’s maritime network was linked to Anatolia and westwards to Cyprus and further to the Aegean. According to recently found Akkadian documents, the city also had lively commercial relations with Emar by the Euphrates.\textsuperscript{152} This made it an important crossroad for cultural meetings and trade, which constituted the main part of its economy both in MB and LB. The archaeological evidence derived from imported pottery at these inland sites are sparse though, with just a few imports found near Aleppo at Oumm el-Mara and at Emar; a chariot krater found in Alalakh might have been imported via Ugarit as well.\textsuperscript{153}

The Cypriot pottery in general and the White Slip ware in particular are discussed by Yon in a brief overview of these pottery types in the northern Levant.\textsuperscript{154} At Ras Shamra, including the port Minet el-Beida and the subsidiary site Ras Ibn Hani, quantities of Cypriot pottery vessels have been found but unfortunately only a few of these are published examples. The forms are ordinary and consist mainly of White Slip II bowls, Base Ring ware, especially ‘bilbils’ and some bowls. In addition a few Red Lustrous spindle bottles are found, and rarely some tankards and craters.\textsuperscript{155} Yon notices that there are two categories of imported Cypriot pottery: 1) those from the settlements, which are less abundant and consist of small sherds of mediocre but functional quality,
and appear more frequently at the end of LB when they seem to have been used in every day contexts; and 2) those used as elite grave goods which are a large majority and of carefully made quality, and often found in association with other luxury items such as ivory, faience and fine Mycenaean vessels.\textsuperscript{156}

The Mycenaean pottery at Ugarit was mainly produced in the Aegean mainland with a few earlier examples deriving from Crete and some, especially later examples, originating in (Aegean) workshops on Cyprus. More than ten times as much Mycenaean pottery (ca 616 finds) has appeared so far in Ugarit compared to Hazor.\textsuperscript{157} In addition to the types found at Hazor, several examples of rhyta (esp. conical and zoomorphic) and a couple of kernoi were found only at Ugarit, mainly in cultic contexts. Various bowls (shallow, deep, spouted, stemmed, handled etc) as well as a few feeding bottles from the different areas hint at domestic use of the Mycenaean pottery at Ugarit.\textsuperscript{158} This is also confirmed by Wijngaarden’s investigation of the distribution of Mycenaean pottery at the site and within the buildings, showing that it was an integral part of the everyday life and used in ordinary houses as well as in palaces and mansions, workshops and temples. The pottery was thus used in many social groups. However, most of the people in the capital of Ugarit belonged to the sub-elite group of the ‘people of the king’ consisting of specialists: priests, merchants, artisans and military personnel. The differentiation in distribution of Mycenaean pottery between these groups was a case of vessel type. Mycenaean rhyta appeared for example mainly in strong cultic associations and wealthy, high status contexts such as the royal palace and in the Maison d’Albâtres. Thus it seems as easy access to Mycenaean pots at Ugarit made these vessels more valued for their function than as exotica.\textsuperscript{159}

5.1.2 Tell Kazel (ancient Sumur)

Tell Kazel, the ancient Sumur capital of Amurru,\textsuperscript{160} is located about 3.5 km from the sea shore between Tartous and Tripoli on the northern part of the Akkar plain. On the

\textsuperscript{156} Yon 2001, 122f.
\textsuperscript{157} Wijngaarden van 2002, 39-41. This number does not include the imported pottery of the renewed excavations at Hazor.
\textsuperscript{158} Wijngaarden van 2002, Catalogue II.
\textsuperscript{159} Wijngaarden van 2002, 52-66, 73.
\textsuperscript{160} Badre 2003, 98; Badre, et al. 1990, 14.
southern end of the same plain is Tell Arqa. The plain, which constitutes part of the great depression stretching from Homs toward the sea, creates an opening between the two mountain chains, Mount Lebanon and Jabal al-Ansariyeh. This strategic position at the main passage towards inland Syria (Fig. 14), enabled the city to control the major trade routes which led to e.g. Qadesh, the only inland site in Syria, beside Kamid el-Loz, that have yielded more than 10 Mycenaean finds. The Late Bronze Age and the Persian period were the most important in the history of Tell Kazel.

Imported pottery has been found mainly in the temple complex of Area IV and to a lesser extent in the so-called palace or building of Area II. The lower of the LB II levels from these areas yielded abundant Cypriot and some Mycenaean pottery. These levels correspond to the Amarna period and the beginning of the Hittite period of Amurru.

Cypriot pottery: The most common type is the White Shaved juglet of which about one hundred were found among the ex votos in the courtyard of the temple; one example of this type derived from the palace. Bronze sheet figurines of the same type found at. Kamid el-Loz, Hazor, Beth Shean and Megiddo were found associated with, or inside, these vessels. A few WS II and monochrome sherds were found in the temple complex, as well as several BR jugs, a Bucchero jug and a Red Lustrous spindle bottle. A few BR ware appeared on the early floor of the palace. The later phase of LB II of the temple yielded about the same types and numbers of Cypriot pottery. This level of the palace was, however, almost completely lacking any imports.

Mycenaean pottery: A wide range of Mycenaean pottery types, not yet entirely published, appeared at Tell Kazel. Some examples include a piriform amphoriskos, a kylix with an unusual fish motif and another with vertical whorl shells, as well as a zoomorphic and a conical rhyton, which were found in the temple complex. They were mainly dated to LH IIIA2-IIIB and had their counterparts in the Argolid, especially in Mycenae.
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5.1.3 Sarepta

Ancient Sarepta/modern Sarafand, is situated just to the east of the coastal road, midway between Tyre and Sidon about 50 km south of Beirut. This site is the most completely excavated and reported of all sites in Lebanon. The inland access was likely via the valley of the Litani River to the Biqa Valley (Fig. 14).

C. Bell has made a comparison between the imported Mycenaean pottery at Sarepta and some other Levantine coastal sites such as Ugarit by counting the number of imports per hundred square meters from similar contexts of these sites. She came to the conclusion that the investigated habitation area at Sarepta contained more than twice as much Mycenaean pottery as at a comparable context at Ugarit. Besides, the composition of the assemblages differed remarkably; for example, the concentration of transport/storage containers was much higher at Sarepta than at any other of the investigated coastal sites. The concentration of Mycenaean pottery at Sarepta even exceeds comparable domestic contexts at Enkomi. This suggests a greater intensity in trade at this site, which may have acted as an import node for further distribution to the interior, such as Kamid el-Loz. The pottery assemblage on the whole (not only imports) at Kamid el-Loz is strikingly similar in size and types, to the one at Hazor.

The amount of Cypriot pottery at Sarepta is much smaller than the Mycenaean pottery. It is actually only in the initial phase of LB II in Area II, X, at the time when Mycenaean pottery started to appear at the site, that Cypriote pottery exceeds the Mycenaean.

Based on the high concentration of Mycenaean wares together with the fall-off of Cypriot pottery, Bell concludes that Sarepta might have been the only Levantine site with direct Aegean contacts. Suggesting some kind of cultural ties between Sarepta and the Aegean (colony?), she further associates this with the fact that the city evaded destruction at the end of the Late Bronze Age when almost all Levantine coastal sites
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were destroyed, including main cities such as Ugarit, Abu Hawam, Ashdod and also Enkomi at Cyprus.\textsuperscript{172}

5.1.4 Some notes on other Northern Levantine coastal sites

There are of course more Late Bronze Age sites of interest along the northern Levantine coast. As mentioned in the introduction (Chapter 1.3.1), just a few sites have been sufficiently excavated and reported in this part of the Levant. Excavations at Sidon and Beirut are in process, and it is also known from textual evidence that sites like Byblos (Gubla), Tyre and others were very important during this period.\textsuperscript{173} In the Middle Bronze Age Syro-Mesopotamian sphere, Byblos was regarded as the town which in a way was a source of information, an open ‘window’, to the world with contacts further south in Egypt.\textsuperscript{174} These relations continued in the Late Bronze Age, testified to by the extended Amarna correspondence between the ruler of Byblos and pharaoh.\textsuperscript{175} Frequent trade relations between Tyre and Egypt are also documented in Egyptian sources, especially from the Iron Age.\textsuperscript{176} The few and insufficient investigations and excavations made at these sites have yielded some Cypriot and Mycenaean imports.\textsuperscript{177}

5.2 SOUTHERN LEVANTINE HARBOUR SITES

5.2.1 Tell Abu Hawam

Tell Abu Hawam was first extensively excavated in the 1930s; most of the finds come from these excavations.\textsuperscript{178} Later excavations and projects have been conducted at the site to investigate environmental aspects and to correlate earlier chronology, for example.\textsuperscript{179}

The strategic and sheltered position of the ancient port of tell Abu Hawam, protected by the Mount Carmel ridge and within the limits of modern Haifa (\textit{Fig. 14}),
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\textsuperscript{179} See Artzy 2005 and Balensi et al 1993 for more extensive descriptions of the projects and excavations connected to the site.
made B. Mazar suggest that it was founded by Sethos I as an Egyptian naval base which simultaneously functioned as a port for the Jezreel Valley.\textsuperscript{180} Although the suggestion of an Egyptian naval base was rejected and flatly argued against by Weinstein,\textsuperscript{181} it is quite clear that the abundant imported pottery in the Jezreel Valley (Jokneam, Megiddo, Beth Shean, Pella in Transjordan etc.), arrived via the harbour of Abu Hawam.\textsuperscript{182} The question of Egyptian interests in the site has recently arisen again, although a date of the initiation of this involvement in the Eighteenth Dynasty is now proposed. At the time an Egypto-Canaanite semi-artificial island including three harbour facilities may have been founded.\textsuperscript{183} Except for the harbour facilities, the LB site comprised dwellings, a temple, a necropolis and a fortification rampart built to prevent natural erosion. The architectural skills and amount of labor needed for this structure require a strongly organized society.\textsuperscript{184}

Cypriot pottery highly exceeds the Mycenaean pottery at the site, In Stratum VA, the oldest LB phase, close to 50% of the pottery was Cypriot and included two third of monochrome and the rest consisted of decorated cooking cauldrons and some classical types. Later strata included a wide assemblage of Cypriot ware: BR and WS types, Bucchero, zoomorphic vessels and fragments of female figurines.\textsuperscript{185} Petrographic analyses of the Cypriot pottery give a likely origin in the area of Maroni and Kalavasos Ayios Dhimitrios or possibly Hala Sultan Teke, on SE Cyprus. These areas seem to have been associated with copper as well as oil production.\textsuperscript{186}

The Mycenaean pottery at Abu Hawam, which According to NAA derived largely from Argolid,\textsuperscript{187} is, especially in the earlier periods, similar to the repertoire of el Amarna and Mycenae. The assemblage is even larger than at Mycenae itself, depending on the Levanto-Mycenaean types dated mainly to LH IIIA2 and IIIB.\textsuperscript{188} These selected types caused Balensi to suggest a “proto-marketing” production at Argolid directed at the
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Oriental market in the 14th to the 13th cent. BC.\textsuperscript{189} In contrast to other sites in the Near East (with exception of Ugarit), the closed shapes are not in majority at Abu Hawam. Stirrup jars are frequent but not as common as drinking vessels such as cups, kylakes and chalices. Balensi suggests that the assemblage fitted local needs and complemented the local repertoire. The abundant fragments of shallow cups might be a sign of some Mycenaean presence.\textsuperscript{190}

The site, located in the middle of the Levant equidistant from Cyprus and Egypt, is suggested to have been a ‘port of trade’ that served interests in Cyprus, the Levant and Egypt.\textsuperscript{191} Pithoi and other types of storage ware probably produced in the vicinity of Abu Hawam have been found in Egypt. Metals for recycling testify to some kind of metal industry at the place and at Tel Nami and Akko as well. Abu Hawam might have obtained its trading products from nearby Shiqmuna, some 4km SW of the harbour town, which was rich in grape vines and olive trees.\textsuperscript{192} At the end of the Late Bronze Age immigrants from Cyprus and northern Levant appear to have settled at Abu Hawam.\textsuperscript{193}

5.2.1 Akko and Tel Nami

On either side of Tell Abu Hawam are the coastal sites of Akko, approximately 13 km to the north, and Tel Nami, approximately 15 km to the south, located (Fig. 14). These, including Abu Hawam, were situated around river estuaries and all were important nodes in the trade between the seashore and the hinterland and further to the transjordanian desert and vice versa. However the heyday of their trading activities appears to have been in different periods within the Late Bronze Age. Likewise, these various cities had different geographical and ecological qualifications, which mirror their various function as trade centers.\textsuperscript{194}

Akko had a perfect location next to a natural harbour and at the mouth of the Na’amān River, which also served as an anchorage. In addition it was situated at the crossroad of two important trade routes, the coastal highway, leading northwards to Syria
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and southwards to Egypt, and a lateral road leading to and from the Syrian hinterland.
This location made it an important port city from the beginning of the second millennium
BC onwards. Its international trade character is particularly attested to by the Cypriot and
Mycenaean pottery deriving from the Late Bronze Age. However, the rich agricultural
hinterland was as well (and maybe even more) important for its economic development,
especially since the use of the harbour may not always have been consistent. The
Mycenaean pottery at the site reported so far only included LH IIIA2 and LH IIIC types,
and was not abundant.

Artzy suggests that recently found, and not yet published, LH IIIB and IIIC
pottery, together with Cypriot imports, at Tel Akko derives from Cypriot workshops. She
bases her assumptions on style and calls attention to NAA tests of the Mycenaean pottery
in the so called Persian Garden necropolis which points at an origin around Nichoria. The
assumption of a Cypriot workshop as an origin of the Mycenaean pottery at Tel
Akko might be true, especially in light of the large Cypriot involvement on this part of
the coast at the end of LB (see e.g. Tell Abu Hawam and Tel Nami). The necropolis is
however, a few km distant from Tel Akko; also, the imported pottery in these graves is
earlier, dated to LC IIA-B and LH IIIA1-A2, which in this case would testify to an
even earlier Cypriot involvement in the Akko surrounding. At Abu Hawam, as mentioned
above, the Mycenaean pottery of this period derived from Argolid according to NAA.

Another strategic location on the coast with access to the main coast-road and an
eastern overland supply route was occupied by the much smaller but yet important
anchorage of Tel Nami. This site was inhabited in MB IIA and in LB IIB, especially in
the later phase of the thirteenth century BC. Tel Nami did not have any agricultural
land and was situated in a swampy area; hence it was purely dependent on trade, and
particularly the combination of sea- and land-based trade on the lateral route that
connected to the southerly-directed inland route from Megiddo to Lachish and further
south, as well as with the main trade route from South Arabia that ran east of the Jordan.
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River. It is suggested that it was the metal production in combination with the resinous and incense trade with Egypt, Cyprus and the Aegean that brought its wealth. The success of this trade is testified to by the very large number of imported luxury items at the site, and especially in the graves where gold, silver bronze, ivory and numerous bronze objects were found. However, the site only served as an important port during a limited time in the thirteenth century when it may have replaced Tell Abu Hawam as the main port of entry. The Cypriot ware included BR II, WS II and White Shaved. The Mycenaean ware, which according to NAA originated in Levantine workshops and Cyprus, consisted mainly of small stirrup jars and some kraters.

Artzy interprets the importance of the coastal cities of northern Palestine as shifting in priority depending on the geological conditions evoked by the change of river course and the accumulation of sand in the estuaries at Tel Nami and Tell Abu Hawam. The accommodation of large Egyptian naval forces may be the reason that Abu Hawam seems to have replaced or complemented the harbour of Akko in the 14th and the first part of the 13th century BC. In the second half of the 13th century, Tel Nami may temporarily have replaced Abu Hawam.

5.2.2 Other Harbor Cities along the Southern Levantine Coast

Jaffa, Ashkelon, Ashdod and Tell el Ajjul all served as important harbour cities along the southern Levantine coast in the Late Bronze Age. However their southerly location together with the suggested direction of the shipping trade (Fig. 14) excludes them from being of importance for the indirect trade connections between Hazor and Cyprus/Aegean, hence they will not be further discussed in this paper.

5.3 CONCLUSION LEVANTINE HARBOUR CITIES

The archaeological evidence currently at hand verifies that Ugarit and Tell Abu Hawam served as two of the most important Levantine harbours in LB. Ugarit functioned as an active port city during the entire period while Abu Hawam mainly flourished in the LB

---

201 Artzy 1994, 125-133.
203 Artzy 2005, 358.
IIA and the beginning of LB IIB. Both these cities also served as nodes for further distribution of imports, although Cypriot and Mycenaean pottery in the Ugaritian interior are sparse.

Sarepta, on the plain north of the mouth of the Litani River, was particularly rich in Mycenaean finds. Actually, the concentration of these finds highly exceeds the Mycenaean finds in similar contexts at Ugarit. Sarepta, which existed during the entire LB, is suggested to have supplied the inland site of Kamid el-Loz with imports and most likely Hazor as well.

Direct contacts between the Aegean and northern Levant, especially with Sarepta, seems to have occurred while southern Levant had closer ties to Cyprus, particularly at the end of the period when the Mycenaean pottery found in Akko, Abu Hawam and Tel Nami was made on, and/or transshipped via, this island.

Thus, according to this small investigation, Hazor’s most plausible maritime trade connection was via Sarepta, although at times the harbours of Akko (in the beginning of LB) Abu Hawam (in LB IIA and the beginning of LB IIB) and possibly Tel Nami (at Hazor’s latest phase) most likely also exchanged goods with Hazor. Thus Hazor had the favourable advantage of choosing and using harbours depending on economic and political circumstance, as well as the selection of available goods (e.g. Cypriot or Mycenaean). Likewise it could choose its export harbour depending on similar conditions.
6 CIRCULATION, TRADE AND EXCHANGE

6.1 THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN TRADE

6.1.1 Substantivists vs. Formalists

The starting point of the debate on how ancient trade and economy were organized came in the middle of the last century with a publication by the economic historian K. Polanyi, in which he defines two meanings of the word 'economy', the substantivist and the formalist.\(^{205}\)

Two views, particularly on pre-capitalist economy developed from these definitions, which since then have been a source of debate, particularly in the 1960s and 70s. The formalist approach emphasizes the man as a rational being who always struggles against a scarcity of supplies and hence makes decisions founded on an inherent acquisitiveness and a universal thinking of maximum utilization of labor, land and supply.\(^{206}\) The substantivists, on the other hand, consider the ancient economy as embodied in institutions in society connected to cultural and social phenomenon. Ancient man is not considered capable of seeing a comprehensive economic system.\(^{207}\) According to substantivism, the economic consciousness and a market economy thinking did not develop until the industrial revolution in the 19th century, and are thus not applicable to ancient economy.\(^{208}\) The earlier economies were instead mainly based on redistribution and reciprocity (= gift exchange), and to a certain degree market-exchange, without firm prices.\(^{209}\)

M. Finley was the first to analyze the Mycenaean Linear B tablets from an economic substantivist perspective. Influenced by Polanyi’s ideas, he saw in the material a huge redistributive palace-organization where long-distance trade was of minor importance in the economy.\(^{210}\) This view on Mycenaean palace economy and trade still

\(^{205}\) Polanyi 1952.
\(^{206}\) Cook 1966; Morley 2004, 43.
\(^{207}\) Morley 2004, 40f.
\(^{208}\) Morley 2004, 35f.
\(^{209}\) Polanyi 1952, 250-256.
\(^{210}\) Finley 1957, 135f.
prevails among some archaeologists.\textsuperscript{211} However, several arguments against these ideas have been stressed:\textsuperscript{212} 1) The large quantity of Mycenaean pottery distributed outside the Aegean mirrors extensive trading activities; 2) There is doubt that pottery was considered suitable for elite gift exchange; it did not, for example, appear in Near Eastern diplomatic documents as such, and it might rather have been meant for the sub-elites; 3) The seemingly specialized Mycenaean pottery production for the eastern market does not go along with a purely redistributive system. 4) The commercial appearance of a growing group of independent merchants and traders was based at strategic nodes on international routes.\textsuperscript{213}

6.1.2 Complex Network Systems of Multifaceted Economics

There is a recent revival of the debate between substantivism and formalism, although in a more nuanced form, without the dichotomous discussion of modern and ancient times that prevailed earlier.\textsuperscript{214} Thus, in my opinion, focus should not be on similarities/differences between modern market economy and ancient pre-capitalist economy, but instead on the interaction between various synchronous ancient societies with different or similar economic systems. This is in line with Wijngaarden’s and Liverani’s suggestion of a dependent coexistence in the Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{215} Wijngaarden states that:

\[
\text{…trade was carried out by many, among whom were local producers and distributors, palace-based traders and independent merchantmen. The mechanisms at work in such a system were diverse and complex, with objects traveling through several modes of exchange run by different participants before being deposited at their place of archaeological recovery.} \textsuperscript{216}
\]

\textsuperscript{211} See e.g. Snodgrass 1991.
\textsuperscript{212} See e.g. Sherratt 1999, 169, 173, 176-185; Wijngaarden van 2002, 24.
\textsuperscript{213} Astour 1972; Rainey 1963; Sherratt 1999, 176; Yon 2003, 48.
\textsuperscript{214} Morley 2004, 48f; Morris & Weingast 2004.
\textsuperscript{215} Liverani 1989, 67f; Wijngaarden van 2002, 7.
\textsuperscript{216} Wijngaarden van 2002, 7. See also Knapp 1993, 340f.
The city-states of Canaan and the growing cities of Cyprus had a less controlled palace economy, more open for private entrepreneurship, than at Egypt, Hatti and Mycenae. Yet all these states were interconnected in the Eastern Mediterranean trade and exchange system, although in various ways. After the Amarna period, temples in Egypt were given some trade privileges from the very strict redistributive palace administration. Later they were allowed to send ships to foreign countries. In the course of time, some prominent persons were also granted these privileges. However, not until Ramessess II is there evidence for buying and selling in a more private way slowly appearing in the records, hence the strict palace economy started to loosen up. Gift exchange was long conducted by Syrian merchants arriving in Egypt, and tribute was delivered by the Canaanite vassals, or collected by an Egyptian governor stationed in Canaan. This contrasts with the vivid descriptions of free merchantry and trade in Ugarit, serving both palace and private interests.

6.1.3 The International Character of Trade and Exchange in Eastern Mediterranean

The discovery of the wrecked Late Bronze Age ships outside the coast of Cape Gelidonya and Ulu Burun has clarified several issues of ancient trade in Eastern Mediterranean. The firm belief that Mycenaeans monopolized the maritime trade, in the 14th and 13th century was not questioned until the finds of the Gape Gelidonya wreck confused this conviction in the 1960s. The personal possessions of the traders on board this ship were of Canaanite or Syrian origin. This new view on ancient Mediterranean trade and exchange was further supported by the discovery of the somewhat older Ulu Burun ship a couple of decades later. The objects on this ship originated from almost ten ancient cultures, from northern Europe to tropical Africa and from Sicily in the west to Mesopotamia in the east. The main cargo, raw material and manufactured goods, were however of Canaanite or
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217 Helck 1987; Sherrat 1999, 171f.
218 Helck 1987, 18.
219 Pulak 2005b, 296.
220 See e.g. the papyrus Hermitage 1116 A dated to the 19th or 20th year of Amenhotep II. The document mentions a delegation of envoys from various cities in Canaan arriving in Egypt with tribute to pharaoh (Epstein 1963; Golénischeff 1913, No. 1116 A vs., lines 68-78).
221 A mar šipri, an Egyptian official, visited Hazor in the Amarna period according to EA 227:16, maybe to collect tribute (Bienkowski 1987, 56).
222 Astour 1972; Rainey 1963; Yon 2003, 47f.
Cypriot origin, and was most likely taken on at a harbor from there. Moreover the personal items of the sailors and traders on board, especially the numerous weights (150) and cylinder seals used by merchants were of Syrian or possibly Cypriot origin, as were several anchors found on the ship.\textsuperscript{224} Other types of personal items and heavy weapons, which often appeared in pairs, imply that two Mycenaeans were on board. A thorough investigation made by Pulak indicates that they “acted as emissaries or envoys, accompanying a cargo of reciprocated ‘gift exchange’ to the Aegean”, and probably represented Mycenaean palatial interests returning from a diplomatic mission rather than itinerant merchants on a foreign ship. These emissaries might have been accompanied by a protecting mercenary from Balkan, suggested by the remains of a set of weapons and personal items from this region.\textsuperscript{225}

The international and multicultural character of maritime commerce (both gift exchange and trade) is further testified to by documents from Ugarit. “The tablets include lists of merchandise, commercial contracts, bills of lading, and lists of residents, sailors and merchants of diverse origins (Tyre, Akko, Byblos, Alashiya, etc)”.\textsuperscript{226} Cline as well points out that a “wide variety of people, of varying nationalities” were involved in the Mediterranean Bronze Age trade.\textsuperscript{227}

**Sea routes**

The traditional view of the counter clockwise sea routes in the Eastern Mediterranean goes from the Greek mainland to Crete, south to Egypt, north to Syria-Palestine and Cyprus then completing the circle via the southern coast of Anatolia, Rhodes and the Cyclades (Fig. 15). The clockwise route departs from Egypt to Crete and further to mainland Greece. From there the journey continues via the Cyclades, Rhodes, Anatolia, Cyprus, Syria-Palestine and back to Egypt. It is pointed out that the journey could have been initiated at any point and that direct routes between countries also existed.\textsuperscript{228}

\textsuperscript{224} Bass 1986; 1998; Pulak 2005a; 2005b.
\textsuperscript{225} Pulak 2005b.
\textsuperscript{226} Yon 2003, 48.
\textsuperscript{227} Cline 1994, 91.
\textsuperscript{228} Cline 1994, 91-93, map 4.
Fig. 15. Suggested trade routes by sea and land
After analyzing the cargo of the Ulu Burun ship it is suggested that this ship took off from either the Syro-Palestinian coast or from Cyprus; alternatively it was visiting both these places, thus sailing from Syria-Palestine via Cyprus and then heading NW when it was wrecked outside the craggy Ulu Burun to the west of Cape Gelidonya, where yet another ship sank about a century later. The final destination of the ship is not known but a major Mycenaean port on the Greek mainland is probable.²²⁹

A regular return route from Syria-Palestine to the Aegean via Cyprus is suggested by Bell, who, based on the Mycenaean assemblage at Sarepta, suggests this city as the Canaanite departure/arrival port (Fig. 15). She also implies a direct route between Ugarit and Enkomi and maybe further along the southeast Cypriot coast, and vice versa.²³⁰

6.2 Levantine Maritime Trade Relations

It was early observed that the Mycenaean pottery types found outside the Aegean differed from those found in mainland Greece. These types were called Levanto-Helladic or Levanto-Mycenaean. The assumption that this pottery was produced for a certain market in the Eastern Mediterranean originated in differences in the frequency of Mycenaean types that occurred between the Aegean and the Levant.²³¹ The large assemblage at Tell Abu Hawam of certain Mycenaean vessels that originated in Argolid caused Balensi to suggest a kind of ‘proto-marketing’ trade between Argolid and Abu Hawam.²³² Gittlen likewise asserts, regarding Cypriot pottery though, that there is a distinct difference both in shape and decoration between the Cypriot vessels in Palestine and those distributed in Cyprus. He interprets this distinction as evidence of a Cypro – Palestinian trade catering to a known Palestinian market.²³³ However, these differences might also be related to particular trade relations between certain areas in the Levant and specific sites in Cyprus and the Aegean.²³⁴ Inspired by Sherrat & Sherrat, Artzy even touches on the possibility of international maritime economic alliances, which, besides chronological implications,  

²²⁹ Pulak 2005a.  
²³⁰ Bell 2005, pl. LXXVIIIa.  
²³¹ Furumark 1941b, 9f; Sjöqvist 1940, 3. The existence of such a group is however disputed see e.g. Leonard 1994, 6f.  
²³² Balensi 2004, 162f.  
²³³ Gittlen 1981.  
²³⁴ Wijngaarden van 2002, 12f.
could be an explanation of various provenance (Argolid, Cyprus, Levant) of the Mycenaean pottery in Syria-Palestine during LB II.\textsuperscript{235}

C. Bell divides the Levantine littoral including its interior into four different zones of maritime trade, with accessibility depending on geographical conditions such as mountain chains, wadi systems and rivers, connected to main coastal cities. She claims that Ugarit and Sarepta were the main trading cities in the two northern zones. In the southern Levant, Abu Hawam and Ashdod were the main ports.\textsuperscript{236} After analyzing origin, quantity and chronology of the Mycenaean pottery on these sites, she suggests that most of the Mycenaean pottery found in the port cities of the Levantine coast, including Ugarit, were transshipped via Cyprus. Sarepta, though, stands out from the others based on the high concentration of pottery as well as its seemingly early Mycenaean contacts. This city was one of a few not destroyed at the end of LB which, according to Bell, might have depended on cultural contacts with the Aegean. Sarepta is thus suggested as the only site along the Levantine coast with direct Aegean contacts.\textsuperscript{237} Her investigation regarding Sarepta is highly interesting, although her assumption that Ugarit did not have direct contacts with the Aegean is only based on lack of written evidence. Such evidence is however abundant regarding the relations between Ugarit and Cyprus.\textsuperscript{238} The other sites included in her investigation are not sufficiently examined though.\textsuperscript{239}

Specific relations between Abu Hawam and Argolid (mainly Mycenae and its surroundings) are shown in the NAA tested pottery, dated especially to LH IIIA2-LH IIIB. Whether a suggested Mycenaean colony existed at Abu Hawam cannot be concluded, although there might have been a production area in Mycenae especially directed to Levantine export. Cypriot pottery outweighs the Mycenaean, however, and immigrants from Cyprus are suggested to have peacefully settled down in the city along with groups from the northern Levantine coast at the end of LB.\textsuperscript{240}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{235} Artzy 2005, 358f; Sherratt & Sherratt 2001.  \\
\textsuperscript{236} Bell 2005, 363.  \\
\textsuperscript{237} Bell 2005, 365-369.  \\
\textsuperscript{238} Bell 2005, 368. Regarding the contacts between Ugarit and Cyprus see also Hadjisavvas 2003, 121; Yon 2003, 47f.  \\
\textsuperscript{239} Bell 2005, 363, 368.  \\
\textsuperscript{240} Balensi 2004, 162f.
\end{flushright}
6.2.1 Exchange products

Several products may have constituted the content of the closed shapes of imported Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery (see Chapter 4 above). A more difficult issue, though, is what the Levantine cities exported in return. Bass suggests that ‘invisible’ goods such as raw material (copper, tin, ivory, gold, cloth and spices) which left no traces because they were consumed or refined were shipped in return for the imported pottery found in Syria-Palestine. Some of these goods, however, are not natural to the Syro-Palestinian area, and thus must have been obtained/transited from afar. Some of the precious metals and stones might have been reworked at some Canaanite workshops before they were exported. This is indicated by the Canaanite jewellery of gold that belongs to the refined finds of the Ulu Burun assemblage. Interesting in this connection is a mould for jewellery production found in Area A at Hazor. The hippopotamus tooth as well as elephant tusks found on the ship are suggested to have originated in Palestine near the Tel Aviv area and in northern Syria.

The ‘invisible’ goods of agricultural produce shipped from the fertile Levant were of high value and worth shipping at long distances. The Ulu Burun ship included 150 so-called Canaanite jars of a type widely distributed in the Eastern Mediterranean. One of the jars contained glass beads and several jars held olives, but the majority of these jars contained resin which analyses show were grown in a specific region just west-northwest of the Dead Sea. This produce might have been used as incense. As mentioned above, some resin was also imported from South Arabia for further distribution via Palestinian coastal cities. Highly interesting are the pilgrim flasks found on board the Ulu Burun ship with parallels at Abu Hawam and especially at Hazor. However these were probably not traded, but instead belonged to the merchants' personal equipment.
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246 See Tel Nami Chapter 5 above and Artzy 1994, 131-136.
6.2.2 Trading quarters/diasporas

Valuable goods traded over long-distance required professional intermediaries, especially as the trading network of involved societies increased and became more complex. These intermediaries were able to function within the value system of distinct societies and with the knowledge of security measure, risks and protection through organizing along major trade routes and establishing channels of communication and cooperation with other parts of the network. These trading groups/diasporas emphasized a separate cultural identity by identifying themselves with other trade diasporas and, to a certain degree, with their country of origin. They usually occupied special quarters in the city and provided the local rulers with exotic prestige goods, often used in emulation purposes, and with other economic benefits and taxes. The trade diaspora’s dependency and therefore loyalty to the local leaders, its contacts with other diaspora nodes, and maintained relations with a possible homeland created a socioeconomic and mediating position for the group.

The existence of ancient merchant groups and trading quarters has been indicated in different parts of the Eastern Mediterranean such as Kanesh in Anatolia and at Crete. Except for the large coastal cities such as Ugarit and probably Abu Hawam, the existence of such a phenomenon is suggested by some find-rich tombs containing a large number of imported luxury items as well as merchant items including seals, stamps and weights, in cities such as Laish/Dan, Akko and Hazor (Area F), and perhaps also in Gezer, Lachish and Sarepta. However, trading colonies can also be invisible in the archaeological material as in the case of the karum in the Anatolian city of Kanesh. The Assyrian families who lived in this city adapted the local culture, hence their well-organized trading institution was only revealed in the archive found in one of the houses.
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6.3 THE IMPORTANCE OF TRADE AT HAZOR

Hazor, located along main trade routes, already had a long tradition of long-distance trade from the Middle Bronze Age when documents reveal close trading and diplomatic contacts with Syria-Mesopotamia and particularly with the city of Mari. In this period Hazor is suggested to have been a transit city in the indirect trade connections between Egypt and Mesopotamia. The scarcity of written evidence makes it more difficult to describe the trading activities during the Late Bronze Age though. Nevertheless, several external influences in the archaeological material, such as Aegean and Cypriot pottery described above testify to the influx of goods to the city.

The city’s favorable location in the fertile district of the Hūleh Valley was perfect for local agricultural and sheep farming production, of which probably wine, olive and textile produces were prominent. Thus some of the exports most likely were agricultural goods from the city and its subordinated towns and villages.

Recently found documents on the tel suggest (although tentatively) some trading activities at Hazor. A small administrative LB tablet dealing with the transfer of articles of clothing was found. In connection to textiles, an Amarna letter should be recalled (EA 22). This letter mentions a garment of the ‘Hazor type’ together with an extensive inventory list of gifts given to the king of Egypt from the king of Mitanni as wedding presents when marrying his daughter. Garments of a luxury type requested from Hazor as well as a large amount of other textiles are mentioned in an MB II letter found on the tell and suggests luxury textile production at Hazor in this period. Thus this production seems to have continued into LB.

A three-line administrative document from the destruction level of the Ceremonial Palace contains toponyms, of which one is Hazor, and personal names connected to them. According to provenance studies, this document was most likely sent from
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254 Hesse in print; Maeir 2000; Malamat 1982; 1993.
256 Wine from Hazor is suggested to have been sent to Mari in MB Malamat 1993, 68 see ARMT XXIV 75.
257 Horowitz & Oshima 2002, 182f.
Sumur by the Syrian coast. It is suggested that this tablet was a docket dispatched with special goods, maybe silver, which suggests Hazor’s trade relations to the north.\textsuperscript{261}

The city’s outstanding location on the trade routes between different realms of raw material sources made it easy to obtain requested goods for its own refining and for further transportation.\textsuperscript{262} Unfortunately, as with the MB period, not much of these goods are found in the excavations today which might be explained as: a) Hazor’s probable role as a transit city for long-distance luxury goods, which means that these goods were further transshipped and didn’t remain in the city; b) the assumable luxury agricultural (olive oil, wine) and textile production (cloth and garments), which might have been involved in the city’s own interregional trade, were of the ‘invisible’ kind.

\textsuperscript{262} Crucibles found in the city, e.g. in Area D and F (Yadin et al. 1960), might testify to some kind of metal production maybe the refinement of precious metals to jewellery, indicated by a jewellery mould in Area A, and other luxury items (Yadin, et al. 1961, CXLIII, 26).
7 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION - THE NATURE OF HAZOR’S MARITIME TRADE RELATIONS

Hazor, located along the main trade route which connected Egypt with Syria and Mesopotamia, already had a tradition of long-distance trade in the Middle Bronze Age when documents reveal close trading and diplomatic contacts with Syria-Mesopotamia. In Late Bronze Age though, the scarcity of written evidence is instead completed by the international character of the material culture, in particular the relative abundance of imported Cypriot and Mycenaean pottery at this inland site. These imports testify to the city’s indirect connection with the maritime trade in an Eastern Mediterranean interregional network during this period.

The Cypriot pottery at Hazor was imported already in the MB. This pottery at LB I Hazor appeared primarily in cultic contexts and consisted mainly of monochrome bowls used in offering rituals. In LB IIA the Cypriot imports peaked at Hazor, as well as in the rest of Syria-Palestine. In the LB II period, the vessels appeared in all contexts with a predominance of temples. This suggests that Cypriot pottery first was imported for the elite and later ‘trickled down’ to ordinary people. Most of the Cypriot vessels were found in the LB II burials of Area F. Unlike the predominance of WS bowls in temples, the Area F burials consisted primarily of BR jugs that probably contained opium to be used in funeral rituals.

The Mycenaean pottery did not appear until LB IIA when it was most abundant. These vessels included mainly closed forms, so called transport containers e.g. flasks, stirrup jars, pyxides and alabastron. A great variety of the Mycenaean pottery was distributed in most of the areas on the site, although they were found almost exclusively in cultic and ceremonial contexts, except for in Area C, where it was found in workshops, and in Area F where it appeared in burials and houses. Noticeably, more than twice as much pottery appeared in Area F than in any other area at Hazor. In the houses of Area F the Mycenaean types consisted of flasks and stirrup jars. These forms may have been imported for their content of perfumed or herbed olive oils. The wide-mouthed alabastra/pyxides and piriform jars found in the workshops might have been imported for their content of unguents. However a secondary use of both the narrow-mouthed and the
wide-mouthed containers is probable. The few open forms, mainly cups found in temples, burials, the Ceremonial Palace and the Podium Complex, were imported for aesthetic and functional reasons and might have been used for wine in special occasions such ceremonies or celebrations, distinct from everyday food consumption.

Thus, four categories of interested parties in the imports at Hazor can be identified, these are: 1) the royal and religious elite on the tell; 2) the people in Area F; 3) the religious functionaries of the Lower City; and 4) the craftsmen of Area C.

Not surprisingly the imports appear in cultic and royal buildings; however the most remarkable feature is the abundance of imported pottery in Area F. This people’s easy access to Cypriot and Mycenaean vessels for use in their everyday life as well as their afterlife, together with other indications implies that some kind of trading and merchant activities were connected to Area F. Evidence includes the large amount of other imported finds, especially Egyptian; the large multi-room houses; the cultic activities accented with foreign attributes; the rich collective tombs; and the location of this area close to the city gate. I would cautiously suggest that in LB II this area functioned as a trading quarter, possibly a diaspora, which served palatial, religious and private/manufacturing interests at Hazor. Thus it might have been to this quarter that the imports first arrived and from this quarter that exports from the city were loaded and traded.

Based on the investigation in Chapter 5, the most probable port cities from where Hazor obtained its Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery, were the southern Syrian city Sarepta and the northern Palestinian cities of Akko (in the beginning of LB), Abu Hawam (in LB IIA and the beginning of LB IIB) and possibly Tel Nami (the end of LB). Hazor was located in the interior on the boarder of the northern (Syria) and the southern (Palestine) Levant. This location implies that Hazor had access to the main harbour of southern Syria as well as the leading harbours of northern Palestine. This is indeed a politically and economically strategic location.

Canaan was a transit region for long-distance trade and exchange between and beyond the Levant, Cyprus and the Aegean. This state is verified by the cargo and crew of the Ulu Burun and Cape Gelidonya ships and in the imported finds of the many port cities along the Canaanite coast, of which several seem to have functioned as emporia.
Some goods were transported from as far as South Arabia and Mesopotamia. These goods, which included valuable luxuries worth trading at long-distances, had to cross cultural borders and pass risky zones of pirates and bandits. Thus the trade had to be organized and carried out by professional intermediaries with the knowledge of risks, security, diverse value systems and languages. Channels of communication were established through a network of trading colonies/diasporas in important node cities along the trade routes. These trading groups formed a separate cultural identity by identifying themselves with other trade diasporas. The rulers of the city were provided with exotic prestige goods and benefited from taxes levied on these traders.

The investigation shows that Hazor is part of an extended Eastern Mediterranean world system. Thus the interregional network approach discussed in Chapter 1 is suitable as a model for the understanding of Hazor’s indirect maritime trade relations. The concept should include both the regional land-based trade between Hazor and the harbour city-states with exports produced in the city exchanged with imported Aegean and Cypriot pottery (with and without content), and the long-distance caravans, loaded with raw materials and luxuries, which passed the territory of Hazor on their way to/from the harbour cities for further overseas/inland distribution. A plausible scenario might be that due to Hazor’s large size and strategic location, long-distance caravans stopped at the city on their way to/from the coast. Once there they tended to rest, change pack-animals, provision, reload and take on/off goods. Thus the city was in many aspects involved in the commerce from which it greatly benefited. Such commerce is not spontaneous but highly organized and according to a model of ‘interregional interaction networks’ a trading centre/colony, as part of a larger system, must have been located at Hazor - one of the largest cities of Canaan.

This significant location along the main trade routes, and between the most important ports directed to Cyprus and the Aegean, indicates that Hazor might have been a transit site for diverse long-distance luxury items from distant places such as Egypt, Africa, South Arabia and Mesopotamia, destined for the Aegean palaces.263 The city must

263 See the luxury items, of the Ulu Burun ship, that originated in these exotic places and are suggested to have been loaded in Canaan or Cyprus (Bass 1986; Pulak 2005a.)
have benefited from this location as well as its strategic position on the crossroad of different cultural and natural environments.
## APPENDIX

### TABLE I MYCENAEAN POTTERY AT HAZOR

Mycenaean pottery and its find context according to plans and plates in the Hazor reports (I, II, III-IV and V) with some dating and revision completion by A. J. Leonard.²⁶⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper City Areas</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Find Context</th>
<th>Str/ Find Per./ Prod. Period</th>
<th>Reference Hazor Vol/ Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 6547/1</td>
<td>Pyxis (FS 94-95)</td>
<td>L. 270b Temple</td>
<td>XIV / LB IIA / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>III-IV/CLVIII, 29 Leonard no. 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6047/1</td>
<td>Stemmed Cup</td>
<td>L. 263b Temple?</td>
<td>XIII / LB IIB / LH III A2-B</td>
<td>III-IV/CLXIII, 24 Leonard no. 1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5174/1</td>
<td>Sherd</td>
<td>H 16 Unstratified</td>
<td>LB / LH IIB</td>
<td>III-IV/CXCVI,20 Leonard no. 2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6470/1</td>
<td>Rounded Alabastr. (FS 83)</td>
<td>L 20 Unstratified</td>
<td>LB II / LH IIB</td>
<td>III-IV/CXCVI,21 Leonard no.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5174/2</td>
<td>Sherd</td>
<td>L. 351a Temple</td>
<td>XIV / LB IIA</td>
<td>III-IV/CCXXII,26 Not in Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4184/1</td>
<td>Sherd (open form)</td>
<td>239b Temple</td>
<td>XV-XIII / LB / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>III-IV/CCXXII,27 Leonard no. 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3545/1</td>
<td>Sherd</td>
<td>335a-b S. Temple?</td>
<td>XIII / LB IIB / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>III-IV/CCXXII,28 Leonard no. 2103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 490/1</td>
<td>Sherd</td>
<td>L.548 Pit</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>V/Fig. II.61, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 617/5</td>
<td>Sherd</td>
<td>L. 548+549 Unclear</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>V/Fig. II.61, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 742/7</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>L. 583 Pit</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>V/Fig. II.61, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 5019/4</td>
<td>Stirrup-Jar</td>
<td>L. 3284 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II / LH IIIA-B (?)</td>
<td>III-IV/CC,22 Leonard no. 956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 20/6</td>
<td>Stirrup Jar Simple style (FS 178-180)</td>
<td>L. 4017 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB phase 9, LB IIB / LH IIIB</td>
<td>III-IV/CCXXXVII,21 Leonard no. 1145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower City Areas</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Find Context</th>
<th>Str/ Find Per./ Prod. Period</th>
<th>Reference Hazor Vol/ Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 5245</td>
<td>Piriform Jar (FS 44-48)</td>
<td>L. 6063 Workshop</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA/ LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>I/LXXXVI, 2 Leonard no.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2301</td>
<td>Pyxis (FS 94-95)</td>
<td>L. 6063 Workshop</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA /LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>I/LXXXVI, 3 Leonard no. 439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁶⁴ Ben-Tor & Bonfil 1997; Leonard 1994; Yadin, et al. 1989; Yadin, et al. 1958; 1960; Yadin, et al. 1961. The table does not show the yet unpublished Mycenaean pottery of the renewed excavations, preliminary est. to some 90 sherds in and around the Ceremonial Palace in Area A as well as somewhat less than 60 sherds in Area M. These are very small and hard to identify although the majority belongs to open forms of LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB1 (Zuckerman 2003b, 269-281).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C 1179</th>
<th>Sherd (open form)</th>
<th>L. 6022</th>
<th>1B-A/LB II / LH IIIA-B</th>
<th>I/LXXXIX, 12 Leonard no. 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 1204/7</td>
<td>Pyxis (FS 94-95)</td>
<td>L. 6226</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>II/CXXXIII, 10 Leonard no. 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 848/1</td>
<td>Pyxis (FS 94-95)</td>
<td>L. 6225</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2</td>
<td>II/CXXXIII, 11 Leonard no. 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 351/10</td>
<td>Pyxis (FS 94-95)</td>
<td>L. 6188 C/H</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>II/CXXXIII, 12 Leonard no. 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1052/16</td>
<td>Handle</td>
<td>L. 6244/6230 Worksh/Hab</td>
<td>1A-B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXV, 13 Not in Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 907/1</td>
<td>Anthropomorphic Figurine</td>
<td>K, G-3</td>
<td>Surface /LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>II/CLXXXIX, 7 Leonard no. 2176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D 8081</th>
<th>Female Figuren</th>
<th>Q 16 Indefinable</th>
<th>LB II / LH IIIA-B</th>
<th>I/XCIX, 24 Leonard no. 2224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 1709</td>
<td>Stirrup Jar</td>
<td>Q 15 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>I/XCIX, 25 Leonard no. 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2759</td>
<td>Stemmed Cup</td>
<td>Q 16 Indefinable</td>
<td>XIII/LB IIB / LH IIIA2-B</td>
<td>I/XCIX, 26 Leonard no. 1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 3305</td>
<td>Stirrup Jar</td>
<td>P 16 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>I/CIV, 28 Leonard 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2980</td>
<td>Decorated Stemmed Cup (FS 256-258A)</td>
<td>L. 9017 Store (cist)</td>
<td>LB II / LH IIIA-B (local?)</td>
<td>I/CX, 6 Leonard no. 1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4154/a</td>
<td>Pyxis (FS 94-95)</td>
<td>L. 9017 Store (cist)</td>
<td>LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>I/CX, 7 Leonard no. 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 5475</td>
<td>Pyxis (FS 95)</td>
<td>L. 9027 Burial (cist)</td>
<td>2?/LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>I/CXXXI, 9 Leonard no.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 5459+5471</td>
<td>Pyxis (FS 94)</td>
<td>L. 9027 Burial (cist)</td>
<td>2?/LB II /LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>I/CXXXI, 10 Leonard no. 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 11749</td>
<td>Amphoroid Krater</td>
<td>L. 9027 Burial (cist)</td>
<td>2?/LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>I/CXXXI, 11 Leonard no. 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 11734/b</td>
<td>Deep Bowl (FS 284)</td>
<td>L. 9027 Burial (cist)</td>
<td>2?/LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>I/CXXXI, 12 Leonard no. 1772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| F 1076/172| Semi-Globular Cup | L. 8144 Burial | 1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2-B1 | II/CXXXVII, 1 Leonard no. 1508 |
| F 1076/27 | Semi-Globular Cup | L. 8144 - “ “ | 1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2-B1 | II/CXXXVII, 2 Leonard no. 1496 |
| F 1076/152| Lentoid Flask (FS 186) | L. 8144 - “ “ | 1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA-B | II/CXXXVII, 3 Leonard no. 1216 |
| F 1076/335| Rounded Alabastron (FS 85) | L. 8144 - “ “ | 1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2 | II/CXXXVII, 4 Leonard no. 366 |
| F 1076/336| Pyxis (FS 94-95) | L. 8144 - “ “ | 1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA-B | II/CXXXVII, 5 Leonard no. 454 |
| F 1076/185| Globular Flask (190-192) | L. 8144 - “ “ | 1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2-B1 | II/CXXXVII, 6 Leonard no. 1342 |
| F 1089/26 | Globular Flask (190-192) | L. 8144 - “ “ | 1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2-B1 | II/CXXXVII, 7 Leonard no. 1337 |
| F 1076/19 | Globular Flask (190-192) | L. 8144 - “ “ | 1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2-B1 | II/CXXXVII, 8 Leonard no. 1336 |
| F 1076/174| Squat Stirrup Jar (FS | L. 8144 - “ “ | 1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2-B1 | II/CXXXVII, 9 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>Layer &amp; Culture</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Leonard no.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/53</td>
<td>Stirrup Jar Simple style</td>
<td>L. 8144</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>II/CXXXVII,10 Leonard no. 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/54</td>
<td>Tall Stirrup Jar (FS 171)</td>
<td>L. 8144</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>II/CXXXVII,11 Leonard no. 573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/184</td>
<td>Tall Stirrup Jar (FS 171)</td>
<td>L. 8144</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>II/CXXXVII,12 Leonard no. 578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/173</td>
<td>Tall Stirrup Jar (FS 166)</td>
<td>L. 8144</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>II/CXXXVII,13 Leonard no. 534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 679/5</td>
<td>Piriform Jar (FS 45)</td>
<td>L. 8065</td>
<td>LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>II/CXL, 4 Leonard no. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/337a</td>
<td>Piriform Jar (FS 44-48)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>II/CLXXXVIII,10 Leonard no. 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 461/19</td>
<td>Stirrup Jar</td>
<td>L. 8037</td>
<td>I/IIA-B</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 1 Leonard no. 937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 83/3</td>
<td>Tall Stirrup Jar (FS 171)</td>
<td>L. 8015</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIIB</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 2 Leonard no. 587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 700/8</td>
<td>Stirrup Jar Simple style</td>
<td>L. 8036</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIIB</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 3 Leonard no. 1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1015/1</td>
<td>Lentoid Flask (FS 186)</td>
<td>L. 8137</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIIB</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 4 Leonard no. 1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 194/1</td>
<td>Lentoid Flask (FS 186)</td>
<td>L. 8024</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIIB</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 5 Leonard no. 1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 194/2</td>
<td>Lentoid Flask (FS 186)</td>
<td>L. 8024</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIIB</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 6 Leonard no. 1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 250/26</td>
<td>Kylix (FS 258A)</td>
<td>L. 8030</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIIB</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 7 Leonard no. 1616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F -</td>
<td>Female Figurine</td>
<td>L. 8139</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>2192</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 8 Leonard no. 2192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 864/4</td>
<td>Female Figurine</td>
<td>L. 8153</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 9 Leonard no. 2225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1164/21</td>
<td>Pyxis (FS 94-95)</td>
<td>L. 8153</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1B/LB II / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>II/CLII, 13 Leonard no. 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 515/1</td>
<td>Open form (unidentified)</td>
<td>L. 2123</td>
<td>III-B</td>
<td>1B/LB IIA / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>III-IV/CLXXXVI, 35 Leonard no. 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 242/1</td>
<td>Decorated Stemmed Cup (FS 256-258A)</td>
<td>L. 2114</td>
<td>III-A-B</td>
<td>1A/LB IIB / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>III-IV/CLXXXII, 13 Leonard no. 1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 263</td>
<td>Figurine Bovine type II</td>
<td>L. 2115</td>
<td>III-A-B</td>
<td>1A/LB IIB / LH IIIA-B</td>
<td>2236</td>
<td>III-IV/CLXXXII, 14 Leonard no. 2236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Stirrup Jar / flask</td>
<td>L. 1418</td>
<td>IIIIB</td>
<td>Phase B / LB II / LH IIIIB</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>V/Fig. V.4.4 Mazur 1997a, 377, fig. V.4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II Cypriot Pottery at Hazor

Cypriot and Bichrome pottery and their find contexts according to plans and plates of the Hazor reports with dating and revision completion by Gittlen.265

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper City Areas</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Find Context</th>
<th>Str/ Find Per./ Prod. Period</th>
<th>Reference Hazor Vol/ Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 5941/2</td>
<td>Krater Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 270c Temple</td>
<td>XV / LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CLVII,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5810/2</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 366b Temple</td>
<td>XIV / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLVIII,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6446/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 270b Temple</td>
<td>XIV / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLVIII,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5359/6</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 349 Temple</td>
<td>XIV-XIII/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLX,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5087/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 254b Temple</td>
<td>XIV-XIII/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLX,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5748/8</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 349 Temple</td>
<td>XIV-XIII / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLX,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5270/2</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 254b Temple</td>
<td>XIV-XIII / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLX,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5548/9</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 368b Cultic? (above temple stairs)</td>
<td>XIII / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLXIII,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5872/17</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 262a Temple</td>
<td>XIII / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLXIII,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5345/3</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 366a Cultic? (above temple stairs)</td>
<td>XIII / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLXIII,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5646/6</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 375b Cultic? (above temple stairs)</td>
<td>XIII / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLXIII,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5223/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 348a Temple</td>
<td>XIII / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLXIII,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5073/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 335a Temple S.?</td>
<td>XIII / LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CLXIII,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5305/2</td>
<td>Krater Bichr.</td>
<td>H 16 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CXCVI,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4518/3</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>F 19 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CXCVI,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1257/9</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II?)</td>
<td>L. 628/Pit 622</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>V Fig. II.14, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1149/14</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II?)</td>
<td>L. 628/Pit 622</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>V Fig. II.14, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5603/15</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS I)</td>
<td>Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCCXII, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6050/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS I)</td>
<td>L. 259b Temple</td>
<td>XIV/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCCXII, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 259/3</td>
<td>Krater Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 540A Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II?</td>
<td>V Fig. II. 32, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 236/5</td>
<td>Goblet (?) Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 539 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II?</td>
<td>V Fig. II. 32, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 66/2</td>
<td>&quot;Bibbil&quot; Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 4020 Indefinable</td>
<td>Phase 11/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXXXVI,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 66/3</td>
<td>&quot;Bibbil&quot; Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 4020 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXXXVII,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 20/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 4017 Indefinable</td>
<td>Phase 9/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXXXVII,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 1300/1</td>
<td>Bowl w. spout</td>
<td>L. 1177 Pit</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>V Fig. III.15, 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

265 Ben-Tor & Bonfil 1997; Gittlen 1977; Yadin, et al. 1989; Yadin, et al. 1958; 1960; Yadin, et al. 1961. The table does not show the yet unpublished Cypriot pottery of the renewed excavations, preliminary est. to some 100 sherds of Cypriot pottery in the Ceremonial Palace and its vicinity and some 60 more sherds in other parts of Area A as well as about 60 sherds in Area M. These are however very small and hard to identify although most are Milk-Bowls of the WS II type, and some are fragments of the BR and Monochrome wares (Zuckerman 2003b, 269-281).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower City Areas</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Find Context</th>
<th>Str/ Find Per./ Prod. Period</th>
<th>Reference Hazor Vol/ Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 12016</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 6116 Habitation</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>I/LXXXV, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 8764</td>
<td>Juglet (Wh. Shaved)</td>
<td>L. 6088 Indefinable</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>I/LXXXVI, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 12415</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 6061 Cult/Habitat?</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>I/LXXXVII, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 15087</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 6041 Indefinable</td>
<td>1A-B/LB II</td>
<td>I/LXXXIX, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 10446</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>J, K-5 H/Indefinable</td>
<td>1A-B/LB II</td>
<td>I/LXXXIX, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1177</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 6022 Habitation?</td>
<td>1A-B/LB II</td>
<td>I/LXXXIX, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2945</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 6045 Indefinable/street</td>
<td>1A-B/LB II</td>
<td>I/LXXXIX, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2931</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 6062 Indefinable/street</td>
<td>1A/B/LB II</td>
<td>I/XCII, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 355/17</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 6183 Habitation</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>II/CXVI, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 427/21</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 6183 Habitation</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>II/CXVI, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 913/21</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 6229 Habit./courty</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXIII, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 977/12</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 6229 Habit./courty</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXIII, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1122/13</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 6244 Workshop</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXIII, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 978/17</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 6229 Habit./courty</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXIII, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1322/7</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>L. 6222 Indefinable/street</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXIII, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1222/1</td>
<td>Jug (BR II) piriform</td>
<td>L. 6245 Habit./courty</td>
<td>1A/B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXIV, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 7780 (D1)</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 9040 Indefinable</td>
<td>1/LB II</td>
<td>I/XCVI, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 5543 (D2)</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>Q 16 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/XCIX, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 10229 (D2)</td>
<td>&quot;Bibil&quot; Jug (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 9020 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/XCIX, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 10846 (D2)</td>
<td>Bowl handle (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 9020 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB I-II</td>
<td>I/XCIX, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 1292 (D3)</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS I)</td>
<td>P 16 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB I-II</td>
<td>I/CIV, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 1540 (D3)</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (PWS)</td>
<td>P 16 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/CIV, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2894 (D3)</td>
<td>Bowl (BR II)</td>
<td>L.9017 Store (cistern)</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/CX, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 5922 (D3)</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 9017 - &quot; -&quot;</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/CX, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4793 (D3)</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 9017 - &quot; -&quot;</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/CX, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 11785 (D5)</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 9027 Other (cist)</td>
<td>1/LB II</td>
<td>I/CXXXI, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 540</td>
<td>Milk Bowl WS II</td>
<td>L. 7017 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/CXXXIII, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 342</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 7017 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/CXXXIII, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 83</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 7005 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/CXXXIII, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2511</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 7013 Other (cave)</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>I/CXLIV, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 4285</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 7021 Silo? (cist)</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 4272</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 7021 - &quot; -&quot;</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 3676</td>
<td>Bowl (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 7021 - &quot; -&quot;</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 4705</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS I)</td>
<td>L. 7021 - &quot; -&quot;</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 5655</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 7021 - &quot; -&quot;</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 4342</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 7021 -</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 5362</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 7021 -</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 5654</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 7021 -</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 5525</td>
<td>Juglet (Wh. Shaved)</td>
<td>L. 7021 -</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 4284</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>L. 7021 -</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 4281</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>L. 7021 -</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXV, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 4343</td>
<td>Jar Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 7021 -</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXL, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 4343</td>
<td>Jar Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 7021 -</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXL, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 3657</td>
<td>Jar Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 7021 -</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXL, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 343</td>
<td>Sherd (Bichr)</td>
<td>L. 7017 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>I/CXXXII, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1155/4</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>LB II? (see SCE IV:IC, p. 464, 1A)</td>
<td>II/CXCIV, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1180/26</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>-“-”</td>
<td>-“-”</td>
<td>II/CXCIV, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1181/12</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>-“-”</td>
<td>1C / LB II? (see SCE IV:IC, p. 464, 1C)</td>
<td>II/CXCIV, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1218/5</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>-“-”</td>
<td>LB II? (see SCE IV:IC, p. 464, 1C)</td>
<td>II/CXCIV, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1176/25</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>-“-”</td>
<td>LB II? (see SCE IV:IC, p. 464, 1A)</td>
<td>II/CXCIV, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 914/18</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>-“-”</td>
<td>LB II? (see SCE IV:IC, p. 464, 1C)</td>
<td>II/CXCIV, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1108/24</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>-“-”</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>II/CXCIV, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1202/3</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>-“-”</td>
<td>-“-”</td>
<td>II/CXCIV, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/18</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 8144-8145 Burial</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/4a</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CLXXXIX, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/338</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CLXXXIX, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/205</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CLXXXIX, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/26</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/26a</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/10</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/44</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/182</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/181</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/180</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/179</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/40</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/79</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/183</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/208</td>
<td>Tankard (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/204</td>
<td>Tankard (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/171</td>
<td>Juglet (Wh. Shaved)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXI, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/350</td>
<td>Juglet (Wh. Shaved)</td>
<td>L. 8144 -“-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXI, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/46</td>
<td>Juglet (Bucchero)</td>
<td>L. 8144 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1076/26b</td>
<td>Juglet (Bucchero)</td>
<td>L. 8144 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXXXVI, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 621/2</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8065 Burial</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXL, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 621/3</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8065 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXL, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 599/1</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 8065 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXL, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 904/71</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 8140 Cultic</td>
<td>1/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXLVIII, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 539/6</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochr)</td>
<td>L. 8059 Cultic</td>
<td>1/LB II</td>
<td>II/CXLVII, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 83/5</td>
<td>Juglet (Wh. Shaved)</td>
<td>L. 8112 Burial</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXL, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 628/9</td>
<td>Juglet (?</td>
<td>L. 8113 Unstratif</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXL, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1050/10</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochr)</td>
<td>L. 8199 Unstratif</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLIV, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1079/41</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 8129 Unstratif</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLIV, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 959/7</td>
<td>Jug Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 8130 Burial</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLII, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 946/35</td>
<td>Jug Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 8130 Burial</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLII, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1499/9</td>
<td>Krater Bichr.</td>
<td>M 2 Unstratified</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCCXIII, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 811/47</td>
<td>Jug Bichr.</td>
<td>L 1 Unstratified</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLIII, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1305/4</td>
<td>Krater Bichr.</td>
<td>K 20 Unstratified</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLIII, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1563/25</td>
<td>Krater Bichr.</td>
<td>M 2 Unstratified</td>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLIII, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 812/15</td>
<td>Sherd Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 10053f Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLVI, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 312/4</td>
<td>Bowl (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 10024 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLVI, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 400/1</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 10045 Indefinable</td>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXLVI, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1376/1</td>
<td>Krater Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 2177 Tempel</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXIX, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 834/3</td>
<td>Jar Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 2144 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXIX, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 713/3</td>
<td>Jar Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 2142 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXIX, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 713/1</td>
<td>Jar Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 2142 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXIX, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1065/9</td>
<td>Jar Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 2133 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXIX, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 474/5</td>
<td>Jug (?) Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 2132 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCCXII, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 501/1</td>
<td>Bowl Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 2179 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXIX, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 810/3</td>
<td>Bowl Bichr.</td>
<td>L. 2142 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXIX, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1138/2</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS I)</td>
<td>L. 2133 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXIX, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1167/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 2133 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-V CCLXIX, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 633/3</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS I)</td>
<td>L. 2138 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-V CCLXIX, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 446/1</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2132 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-V CCLXIX, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 447/2</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2132 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-V CCLXIX, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1085/2</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2132 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-V CCLXIX, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 408/1</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2132 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-V CCLXIX, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 905/4</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2117 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-V CCLXIX, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1088/3</td>
<td>Bowl (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 2133 - “ -</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-V CCLXIX, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 696/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 2156 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-V CCLXXV, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 604/2</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2126 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-V CCLXXVI,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 355/1</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2121 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-V CCLXXVII, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 424/11</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2102 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-V CCLXXVI, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 608/3</td>
<td>Bowl (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 2140 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-V CCLXXVI, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1280/1</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Juglet (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 2182 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-V CCLXXVI, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 670/1</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 2145 - “ -</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-V CCLXXVI, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1142/5</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 2135 - “-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXXVI,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1333/4</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Juglet (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 2119 - “-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXXVI,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 165/3</td>
<td>“Bilbil”? Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 2113 - “-”</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCCXII,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1258/1</td>
<td>Juglet (Wh. Shaved).</td>
<td>L. 2156 - “-”</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXXVI,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 744/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 2119 - “-”</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXXXII, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 106/14</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS I)</td>
<td>L. 2113 - “-”</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCCXII,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 358/2</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2102 - “-”</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXXXII,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1333/2</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2119 - “-”</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXXXII,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 880/2</td>
<td>Bowl (Monochrome)</td>
<td>L. 2119 - “-”</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCLXXXII,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 256/10</td>
<td>Milk Bowl?</td>
<td>L. 5001 Gate (Connected building)</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXC, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 447/6</td>
<td>Sherd</td>
<td>L. 5030 - “-”</td>
<td>2/LB I</td>
<td>III-IV CCXC, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 236/13</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 5010 Cultic (gate)</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXCIII,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 274/1</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 5013b Cultic (gate)</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXCIII,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 180/3</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR I)</td>
<td>L. 5006a Cultic (gate)</td>
<td>1B/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXCIII,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 193/4</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 5009 Gate</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXCIII,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 79/9</td>
<td>Milk Bowl (WS II)</td>
<td>L. 5005 - “-”</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXCV,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 217/1</td>
<td>Bowl (BR)?</td>
<td>L. 5013 - “-”</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXCV,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 246/4</td>
<td>“Bilbil” Jug (BR II)</td>
<td>L. 5010 - “-”</td>
<td>1A/LB II</td>
<td>III-IV CCXCV,29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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