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PART II

The Levant

Previous research

The Syro-Palestinian littoral, commonly known as the Levant, is now taken up by six modern nation states: Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Jordan, and Palestine. This configuration and the political instability in the region over the last five years have impacted archaeological research and any interpretation of distribution patterns in this area is hazardous. This is true also for the distribution of Mycenaean pottery, which has been found at 140 sites, ranging from Chlemoutsi (type no. 121) in Turkey to Ish-Harroun (type no. 128) in Israel (Map 6). The concentration of sites in the northeastern Levant is at least partly caused by the intensity of archaeological research since the foundation of Israel in 1948. Moreover, for a long time research has been difficult at many sites in Lebanon, which has influenced the quality of the information available.

The central region, where knowledge of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant is given by E. El-Bir in 1884, who then discovered it at El-Hesy (site no. 219) in Palestine. Welch visited Tell en-Nasbeh (site no. 211) as another site with Mycenaean imports. As the Aegean influence in Levantine was superficial and decorative, J.C. Drioton incorrectly referred to these site names where he observed the presence of Mycenaean pottery in southern Palestine. None of these sites should be confused with actual Mycenaean pottery that included Philistine pottery, a distinction that was first made by H. Tirone in 1906.

In the early decades of the twentieth century, several sites with Mycenaean pottery were excavated in southern Palestine, among them Qeiyafa (site no. 174), Gezer (site no. 207) and Arad (site no. 210). As a result, D. Potts in 1924 was able to date them. The discovery of a major site Minet ed-Deir (site no. 128) in Syria in 1926 and the subsequent excavations by C.P.A. Schaeffer at the site and at nearby Ras Shamra (site no. 129) can be considered a landmark in the research of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant. Not only did these discoveries establish the presence of Mycenaean pottery in the northern Levant, the majority of the pottery on both sites at the time consisted of an ex-voto offering made by the Levantine.
The differentiation in the distribution pattern which should be mentioned along with the
Mycenaean sites. These sites should be evaluated with regard to the
geographic and topographic factors which have an import and, with regard to the latter, to
the existence of similar sites or other areas in the Mediterranean.

My old objections about the Mycenaean sites, which at first sight is separate relatively
individual, have now been replaced by the different variety on local and regional levels
between cities. It is a question that these differences in the distribution pattern are related to
geographic facilitating factors of the Mycenaean sites.
CHAPTER 4

Mycenaean pottery in the Levant: introduction

Previous research
The Syro-Palestinian littoral, commonly known as the Levant, is now taken up by six modern nation states: Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Jordan and Palestine. This configuration and the political instability in the region over the last fifty years have influenced archaeological research, and any interpretation of distribution patterns in this area is hazardous. This is true also for the distribution of Mycenaean pottery, which has been found at 110 sites, from Charchemish (site no. 121) in Turkey to El-Harruba (site no. 228) in Israel (Map 6). The concentration of sites visible in the southern Levant is at least partly caused by the intensity of archaeological research since the foundation of Israel in 1948. Moreover, for a long time research has been difficult at many sites in Lebanon, which has influenced the quality of the information available.

The earliest report, to my knowledge, of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant is given by F.J. Bliss in 1894 who had discovered it at El-Hesy (site no. 219) in Palestine. Welch named Tell es Safiyeh (site no. 211) as another site with Mycenaean imports and saw an Aegean influence in Levantine vase shapes and decoration. R.C. Bosanquet probably referred to these publications when he asserted the presence of Mycenaean pottery in southern Palestine. None of these scholars distinguished between actual Mycenaean pottery and so-called Philistine ware, a distinction that was first made by H. Thiersch in 1908.

In the early decades of the twentieth century, several sites with Mycenaean pottery were excavated in southern Palestine, among them Garife (site no. 174), Gezer (site no. 207) and ‘Ain Shems (site no. 210). As a result, D. Fimmen in 1924 was able to list six sites. The discovery of a tomb near Minet el-Beida (site no. 129) in Syria in 1928 and the subsequent excavations by C.F.A. Schaeffer at the site and at nearby Ras Shamra (site no. 128) can be considered a landmark in the research of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant. Not only did these discoveries establish the presence of Mycenaean pottery in the northern Levant, the amounts of that pottery on both sites at the time exceeded that on any other. Schaeffer’s ideas about

---

1 Hankey 1993a, 101. Before the establishment of the state of Israel, this area also received much archaeological attention by scholars interested in the archaeology of the Bible.
2 Bliss 1898, 61-63 (first published in 1894).
3 Welch 1899-1900, 118-120: “When (...) we turn to the actual Mycenaean imports, we find that they occur usually in the form of small fragments, chiefly at Tell es-Safi.” (p. 119)
4 Bosanquet in Dawkins 1904, 127-128.
5 Thiersch 1908, 378-384. He discovered two strata in Tell es Safiyeh with Mycenaean inspired pottery and concluded that the lower level contained genuine Mycenaean ware, while the upper level consisted of local imitations by the Philistines. For Philistine ware see Hurely 1936; Buchholz 1974, 431-434; Dothan 1982, 94-218; Killebrew 1998, 162-163 (all with further refs.)
6 For Mycenaean pottery in Garife, see, for example, Woolley 1921, 181-183. For Gezer, see MacAlister 1912, 155-156 Pl. CLI. Thiersch 1909, 384-386. For ‘Ain Shems, Mackenzie 1912-13, 10; Grant & Wright 1939.
7 Fimmen 1924, 98, 106-107.
8 For a history of excavation at Ras Shamra - ancient Ugarit - and its port town Minet el-Beida, see Saadé, 1979, 38-54; Yon 1997a, 17-18.
Mycenaean colonisation and even domination of Ugarit by Mycenaeans\textsuperscript{9} were not taken over by scholars working at other sites with much Mycenaean pottery, such Tell Beit Mirsim (site no. 214), Alalakh/Tell Atchana (site no. 125) and Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162).\textsuperscript{10}

During and shortly after the Second World War several important studies appeared. Furumark treated Mycenaean pots from twenty-five Levantine sites and used them to help constructing his basic typology and chronology of Mycenaean pottery.\textsuperscript{11} An analysis of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant was given in 1951 by F.H. Stubbings who listed 28 sites.\textsuperscript{12} He did not only discuss the pottery, but also tried to connect its distribution with historical developments. Stubbings made a distinction between the northern Levant (Syria) and the southern part (Palestine) and concluded that most of the LHIII material is found in the south, which was the area controlled by Egypt.\textsuperscript{13} Although cities like Ugarit (site no. 128) and Alalakh (site no. 125) were notable exceptions, Mycenaean trade with the Hittite area in the north, seemed to Stubbings to have been restricted.

Stubbings’ work was brought up to date in 1967 by Vronwy Hankey. She discussed the Mycenaean pottery from 57 sites in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Israel. On this basis she was able to make general observations of considerable importance.\textsuperscript{14} Hankey found only little evidence for the presence of LHIII pottery in the Levant and even less for LHI. She stated that the repertoire of LHIII pot shapes in the Levant is similar to that of Cyprus and differs from mainland Greece in the absence of kylikes, jugs and bowls. The quality of the pottery in the Levant equals that in Cyprus, although the island possesses larger quantities. Hankey also noted that there was very little LHIIIC pottery in the Levant and that imports seem to have ended at the end of the Late Bronze Age around 1200 BC. An important observation made by Hankey was that Mycenaean pottery in the Levant generally is found on sites where Cypriot pottery is also present. On the basis of these characteristics, Hankey evaluated Mycenaean trade with the Levant, thus providing a framework in which to view the import of Mycenaean pottery. Stubbings had suspected that much of the Mycenaean pottery found in the Levant was produced on Cyprus.\textsuperscript{15} Hankey, in contrast, assumed that the Mycenaean pottery originated in mainland Greece and that Cyprus had been the first stopping place of Mycenaean ships, which later continued to Near Eastern harbours.\textsuperscript{16}

An overview of the available evidence for Mycenaean contacts with the Levant was given in 1974 by H.G. Buchholz.\textsuperscript{17} He presented a catalogue of sites and discussed Levantine finds in the Aegean. General remarks on the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Eastern Mediterranean were made in 1973 by G. Cadogan. He commented on the fact that Mycenaean pottery is not only found on the Levantine coast, but also in the interior.\textsuperscript{18} In his view, this spread shows that there was a demand for Mycenaean pottery or their contents as luxury products. Cadogan also discussed the presence of LHIIIIB2 material, which is thought to have

\textsuperscript{9} Schaeffer 1936b, 99-103. The evidence for this hypothesis, according to Schaeffer, was more than the sheer amount of Mycenaean pottery: “...il y a apparaît alors aussi en grand nombre des idoles et de rhytons attestant l’introduction de culte mycéénienne. Les installations pour le rite funéraire ressentent également de l’influence mycéénienne”

\textsuperscript{10} Tell Beit Mirsim was excavated from 1926 onwards; see Albright 1930-31. Tell Atchana was excavated from 1936 to 1949; see Woolley 1955. Tell Abu Hawam was excavated in 1932-33; see Hamilton 1934-1935.

\textsuperscript{11} Furumark 1941a, 644-654.

\textsuperscript{12} Stubbings 1951, 53-87.

\textsuperscript{13} Stubbings 1951, 104-105.

\textsuperscript{14} Hankey 1967, 145-146.

\textsuperscript{15} Stubbings 1951, 87, 108.

\textsuperscript{16} Hankey 1967, 146-147; see also Hankey 1970, 20-23.

\textsuperscript{17} Buchholz 1974, 389-439, with extensive bibliography.

\textsuperscript{18} Cadogan 1973, 170. He expressed doubts about the presence of Mycenaean material at Charchemish (site no. 121).
been imported on a smaller scale than that of the previous phase.\textsuperscript{19} In the same volume, J.-C. Courtois likewise addressed the issue of late LHIIIB imports in the Levant. He discussed a group of amphoroid kraters from the latest phase of Ras Shamra, which were probably produced in the Dodecanese or the south-western coast of Asia Minor. According to Courtois, peripheral areas in the Aegean became more important for the import of Mycenaean pottery during the final stages of LHIIIB.\textsuperscript{20} This would tie in with evidence that the production of LHIIIB2 pottery within Greece was less centralized than in the preceding periods.\textsuperscript{21}

Important information regarding the use and appreciation of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant was provided by Albert Leonard Jr. in 1981. He showed that the most popular open shapes filled specific gaps in the local ceramic repertoire, suggesting that the popularity of Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery in the Levant is somehow related to the Levantine pottery industry.\textsuperscript{22} Closed pots were, according to Leonard, imported for their contents.\textsuperscript{23} The stirrup jar most likely contained pourable oil, while the wide-mouthed alabastron, amphoroid jar and pyxis could have held more viscous oils or unguents. Leonard also commented on the social status of those who acquired Mycenaean pottery in Transjordan.\textsuperscript{24} The fact that the chariot krater is also found in the interior of the Levant suggests, in his view, that the owners were familiar with the iconography of such a vase and therefore would most likely be influential persons in their communities. Using contextual evidence, Hankey likewise commented on the social status of those importing Mycenaean pottery.\textsuperscript{25} Mycenaean pottery found in palaces and temples testifies that the demand for it originated in the upper levels of the societies. However, according to Hankey, this pottery, like other exotic goods, trickled down to people of more modest stature as well.

Recent research has focused on the provenance of the Mycenaean pottery found in the Levant. Clay analyses have led to a better understanding of the extent to which Mycenaean pottery was imitated locally.\textsuperscript{26} In contrast to Cyprus and Italy, manufacture of Aegean-type pottery in the Levant was limited to a few closed pot shapes such as flasks and stirrup jars.\textsuperscript{27} A most useful overview of the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant has recently been given by Hankey, who discussed 43 sites in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Israel.\textsuperscript{28} In this publication she also discussed the contexts in which the pottery is found, the historical background and the development of the trade, thus providing a summary of all the available evidence. An up-to-date index has recently been published by Leonard, who catalogued the Mycenaean pottery from 89 sites by pot shape and decorative motives.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{19} Catling 1964, 35 was among the first remarking on this phenomenon. Cadogan (1973, 169) doubted whether there really was a decline in imports. Although some LHIIIB2 potshapes are missing in the eastern Mediterranean, other shapes, such as shallow bowls do occur.

\textsuperscript{20} Courtois 1973, 149-165, 153 especially.

\textsuperscript{21} Sherratt 1980, 199; 1982, 185.

\textsuperscript{22} Leonard 1981, 90-91.

\textsuperscript{23} Leonard 1981, 91-96.

\textsuperscript{24} Leonard 1987, 264-266. In this article he also identified regional trade routes from the major Mediterranean to the interior, see p. 264.


\textsuperscript{26} Leonard et al. 1993; Killebrew 1998.

\textsuperscript{27} Killebrew 1998, 161-162. Levantine production of so-called ‘Mycenaean IIIIC1b’ bowls began during a somewhat later period.

\textsuperscript{28} Hankey 1993a, 105-107. Gregori & Palumbo 1986, 365-368, 389 listed a total of 111 sites and gave a very useful statistical analysis for each of the successive ceramic phases.

\textsuperscript{29} Leonard 1994.
Regional distribution of Mycenaean pottery

As has been stated in chapter 2 (p. 20), the Levant, Cyprus and Italy will each be subdivided into heterogeneous regions in order to select sites suitable for contextual analysis. The criteria used to define these regions are the distribution pattern of Mycenaean pottery, geographical factors and the concept of cultural area. Map 6 shows the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant. This class of material has been found at places along the coast, as well as in the interior. In Syria and Lebanon, sites with such pottery in the interior are concentrated in the Orontes and Beqa valleys, although there is a notable distribution in the direction of Carchemish (site no. 121) along the upper Euphrates. In the south, there is a clustering of sites in the valley of the Jordan river and its branches, including sites in Transjordan. Another grouping of sites leads from the coast near Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) to the Jordan valley. A large concentration of sites is also visible in south-western Israel, including the Gaza strip.

This pattern can be refined if we take the quantities of Mycenaean pottery into account (Map 7). It is clear that in Syria and Lebanon most of the more important findspots are situated along the coast. Only Alalakh (site no. 125) and Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) are located inland, both along routes to the sea. In the southern Levant, sites with notable quantities of Mycenaean pottery occur in the interior more often. One site with more than a hundred Late Helladic finds is located in Transjordan: Amman (site no. 189); Hazor (site no. 159), Beth Shean (site no. 178) and Dothan (site no. 179) each have yielded 50-100 Mycenaean finds (class 3). From Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) and Megiddo (site no. 175) the largest quantities of Mycenaean pottery in northern Israel have been reported. In the south, there are a few sites with notable quantities of this pottery, among which are Lachisch (site no. 213) and Ashdod (site no. 206).

Geographically, the Levant consists of a complex of rather small, highly individual units. There are several ways to group these into regions, ranging from a tripartite scheme (coastal plain, mountain ranges and interior lowlands) to a subdivision that separates each unit. Taking a middle course, a northern geographical region is formed by the Jebel Ansariyeh in western Syria, a mountain range that contains the Orontes valley. In this valley, which was swampy until modern times, several of our sites are situated, from Qadesh (site no. 143) to Khan Sheikoun (site no. 139). The northern part of this geographical unit is more fragmented and contains Alalakh (site no. 125). In the south, the region opens up to the plain of Akkar and Homs near Tell 'Arqa (site no. 138). The western side of the Ansariyeh slopes relatively gently towards the coast to form the coastal plain, which in this area is fairly wide. Some important sites are located there, such as Ugarit (site no. 128), Tell Sukas (site no. 132) and Tell Kazel (site no. 135).

A second geographical region consists of the Lebanon and anti-Lebanon mountain ranges, between which the Beqa is situated. In this valley, the most notable of our sites is Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154). In the north east, near Tell el Ghassil (site no. 152), the valley opens up to the plain of Akkar and Homs. In the south, near Khan Selim (site no. 157) and Tell Dan (site no. 158), the Beqa connects with the valley of the upper Jordan. The Beqa reaches the coast near Tyre (site no. 151). North of this site, the coastal plain forms a very narrow strip, in which Byblos (site no. 144) and Sarepta (site no. 150), among others, are located. The western slopes of the Lebanon - on which Garife (site no. 147) and Qraye (site no. 149) are situated - are fertile, due to abundance of water and varied soils. East of the anti-Lebanon stretch the plateaux of Hauran and Leja, with Tell el Salihyeh (site no. 155) and Deir Khabie (site no. 156). These plateaux form a geographical region of their own.

---

30 All geographical information about the Levant comes from Fisher 1978, 398-448; see, especially, 398-415, with figs. 14.1 and 14.3.
The Lebanon range opens up, without a clear break, to the uplands of Galilee, Samaria and Judea. In the Galilean uplands, no sites are located, while the Samaritan highlands contain Tell Eran (site no. 170), Tell Aron (site no. 173) and Jatt (site no. 174). This subregion has a very diverse landscape, with fertile valleys and high peaks. The Judean uplands consist of a craggy high plateau and the eastern desert near Jerusalem. Shechem (site no. 182) and Jerusalem (site no. 196), among others, are situated here. Between the Uplands of Galilee and Samaria, the Esdraelon lowland (or Jezreel valley) forms a route of communication from Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) on the coast to the Jordan valley. A string of sites in this valley has yielded Mycenaean pottery, for example Megiddo (site no. 175) and Dothan (site no. 179).

The Jordan valley extends from the connection with the Beqa valley in the north near Tell Dan (site no. 158) to the Dead Sea. In the valley are situated several important sites, such as Hazor (site no. 159), Beth Shean (site no. 178) and Tell es Saidiyeh (site no. 186). The northern part of the valley is rather fertile, but in the south the river becomes increasingly saline and deeper encrusted in its bed.

W.B. Fisher treats the coastal plain of the Mediterranean, which stretches from Turkey into the Sinai, as one distinctive geographical region. Here, however, the part near the Jebel Ansariyeh and the Lebanon range have been treated together with these mountains. The coastal plain widens south of modern Haifa. All along the Palestine coast the plain consists of a coastal strip, sometimes with steep cliffs, the main western plateau and the foothills of the mountains in the interior. Directly south of Haifa, sites with Mycenaean pottery in the plain and Shefela foothills are for example Tel Nami (site no. 341) and Dor (site no. 171), as well as Tell Mevorakh (site no. 172) and Tell Burgatha (site no. 181). In the south, the coastal plain widens and opens up to the Negev and Sinai deserts. Several important sites with Mycenaean pottery are located in this subregion, of which Ashdod (site no. 206) and Lachish (site no. 213) are the most notable.

The Middle Bronze Age settlement pattern in the Levant changed profoundly during the sixteenth century BC, due to destructions and abandonments of which signs are visible at many sites. These phenomena are usually associated with the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan by the first pharaohs of the Eighteenth Dynasty. Although settlement evidence points to many new sites in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, these were generally small and seem related to Egyptian rule in this area. The settlement pattern of the Late Bronze Age in the Levant, then, like the material culture of the area, seems to have varied in response to Egyptian political and economic initiatives. The extent to which influence of Egypt and of other foreign powers made itself felt is, obviously, important in distinguishing a cultural regionalisation in the Levant.

In the beginning of the Late Bronze Age I, the Mittanni rose to power in the north-east of Syria. Thutmose I's (1504-1492) military campaigns took him to the borders of this kingdom, but the Levantine city states remained independent of both powers. This changed with the campaigns of Thutmose III (1479-1325) into Canaan - initially directed against a revolt of Syrian princes gathered at Megiddo - during which cities as far north as Kadesh (site no. 143) were captured and put under Egyptian rule. As the coastal towns of Syria are absent in Thutmose III's annals, it is assumed that these remained independent. After a treaty between the Mitanni and Egypt under Thutmose IV (1400-1390), however, most north Syrian city

---

32 Gonen 1984, 70.
33 Leonard 1989, 5; Falconer 1994, 326.
34 Leonard 1989, 9. Dates for the reign of pharaohs are taken from Kitchen 1987; these are not undisputed.
states befell to Egyptian domination.\textsuperscript{36} Political and economic control of Egypt over Canaan increased under Thutmosis IV and his predecessor Amenhopis II (1427-1400), although more so in the south than in the north.

The second half of the fourteenth century saw two important developments. First, Egyptian control over southern Canaan weakened during the reign of Amenhopis IV/Akhenaten (1352-1336), caused partly by attacks of the nomadic Habiru and partly by the pharaoh’s unwillingness or inability to stop them.\textsuperscript{37} Secondly, the military campaigns of the Hittite king Suppiluliumas I (1344-1322) brought large parts of northern Syria under Hittite control.\textsuperscript{38} Only in the reign of pharaoh Sethos I (1294-1279) could firmer Egyptian rule in Canaan be re-established and parts of northern Syria be re-conquered.\textsuperscript{39} Through the first part of the thirteenth century control over northern Syria was disputed, until the pharaoh Ramesses II (1279-1213) and the Hittite king Hattusilis III (1264-1239) signed a peace treaty in 1259 BC, in which all of western Syria north of Byblos (site no. 144) fell under Hittite control, while the Egyptians dominated Canaan from Byblos southwards.\textsuperscript{40}

Given the fact that material culture in the Levant varied in response to the degree of Egyptian rule, it is clear that a distinction must be made between the northern and southern Levant. North-western Syria and northern Lebanon came relatively late under Egyptian domination and this was never as strong as in the south. Moreover, this region in turn came under Hittite influence from the second half of the fourteenth century onwards. This distinction between north and south is also archaeological visible, as settlement patterns seem to follow different trajectories.\textsuperscript{41} For example, the wide-scale destructions and abandonments at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age are less clearly visible in the north than in the south. Furthermore, the material culture in the north expresses more influences from non-Canaanite cultures, especially Hurrian.\textsuperscript{42} The border between the northern and southern cultural regions is situated in the area of the plain of Akkar and Homs, between Tell Arqa (site no. 138) and Byblos (site no. 144). North of this boundary, 22 sites have yielded Mycenaean pottery, of which Alalakh (site no. 125), Ugarit (site no. 128), Tell Sukas (site no. 132) and Tell Kazel (site no. 135) are the most notable. The north-east of this region, with Charchemish (site no. 121), Meskene Emar (site no. 122) and Oumm el-Mara (site no. 123), never experienced real Egyptian control and may be taken to constitute a cultural subregion of its own.

Within Palestine, Egyptian influence can be seen to have differentiated between areas that were of prime strategic importance - the coastal plain and the Jezreel, Jordan and Beqa valleys - and more marginal areas such as the Lebanese and Palestine uplands and Transjordan.\textsuperscript{43} This differentiation is also archaeological expressed in burial practices. Cave burial for multiple interment - already practised during the Middle Bronze Age - was preferred in the mountains and western foothills, while in the coastal plain and, to a degree, in the Jezreel and Jordan valleys pit burial for individual interment became increasingly popular.\textsuperscript{44} Gonen explains this dichotomy by differences in the reception of Egyptian values and norms. An internal process of cultural segregation between regions that were easily accessible to Egyptian influence and regions of low accessibility seems to have taken place. Of all the sites in Palestine with Mycenaean pottery, most are located in the coastal plain or one of the valleys. They include

\textsuperscript{36} Astour 1981, 15.
\textsuperscript{37} Leonard 1989, 19-20.
\textsuperscript{38} Astour 1981, 20-22.
\textsuperscript{39} Leonard 1989, 23-27.
\textsuperscript{40} Liverani 1988, 559.
\textsuperscript{41} Falconer 1994, 305-306.
\textsuperscript{42} Rainey 1962, 248.
\textsuperscript{43} Bunimovitz 1995, 325.
\textsuperscript{44} Gonen 1992, 32-36. She describes the valleys as areas in which burial practices were mixed.
notable sites such as Lachish (site no. 213), Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) and Sarepta (site no. 150). A minority of our sites is located in the Palestinian uplands or Transjordan. Of these, only Tell es Saidiyeh (site no. 186) and Amman (site no. 189) have yielded substantial amounts of Mycenaean pottery.

Selection of sites for detailed contextual analysis
The first of the heterogeneous regions within the Levant is the whole area north of the plain of Akkar and Homs in Lebanon and Syria. This is a separate geographical and cultural unit, while the distribution pattern of Mycenaean pottery includes some coastal centres from which the scatter along the Orontes and in the direction of Carchemish (site no. 121) probably originated. Of the 22 sites in this area, six have yielded more than 10 ceramic units of Late Helladic ware: Alalakh (site no. 125), Ugarit (site no. 128), its port Minet el-Beida (site no. 129), Ras Ibn Hani (site no. 130), Tell Sukas (site 132) and Tell Kazel (site no. 135). Of these, Minet el-Beida, Ras Ibn Hani and Tell Sukas all belonged to the kingdom of Ugarit. All the larger sites have provided Mycenaean pottery from several periods, although from Tell Kazel (site no. 135) LHIIA1 ware has not been reported. With regard to contexts of the Mycenaean pots, only Ugarit and its port town of Minet el-Beida have a higher rating than three. As these sites belong together, they can both be selected for contextual analysis.

South of the plain of Akkar, the Lebanon forms a distinct geographical unit. However, the Late Bronze Age material culture in this unit is not different from that of Palestine and it is best not to separate these two regions. Rather, one should follow Bunimovitz' and Gonen's idea that there was a division in the southern Levant between the coastal plain and valleys on the one hand and the uplands and Transjordan on the other. Most of the sites with more than ten ceramic units of Late Helladic pottery are located in the coastal plain and the valleys, of which Byblos (site no. 144), Sarepta (site no. 150), Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), Ashdod (site no. 206) and Lachish (site no. 213) - each with more than 50 Mycenaean finds - are located in the coastal plain, while Hazor (site no. 159), Beth Shean (site no. 178) and Dothan (site no. 179) are situated in the Jordan and Jezreel valleys or the foothills thereof. All these major sites, with the possible exception of Dothan (site no. 179), have produced Mycenaean pottery of more than one stylistic phase. Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), Ashdod (site no. 206), Beth Shean (site no. 178), however, do not have pottery from the LHIIA1 phases. Of these major sites, only for Sarepta (site no. 150) and Hazor (site no. 159) are the contexts rated higher than 3. Since it is sensible to contrast an inland city with the coastal town of Ugarit, Hazor is the most suitable site to select for contextual analysis.

In the Palestine uplands and Transjordan circa 25 of our sites are situated. Of these, only Shechem (site no. 182), Tell es Saidiyeh (site no. 186) and Amman airport (site no. 189) have yielded more than ten Mycenaean finds, with Amman leading as a class 4 site. The contextual rating of the Mycenaean pottery at Amman airport is higher than 3. However, the presence of the large body of Mycenaean pottery there appears to have been the result of very specific activities taking place at the sanctuary during a very short period. Even though elsewhere Mycenaean pottery may have been part of similar rituals, the Amman airport does not seem to be representative for the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery. Instead, it seems wise to select a more regional site with lower quantities of Mycenaean pots in contrast to the large

46 The information available to me about this site does not allow a stylistic differentiation of the Mycenaean pottery found there.
47 The borders between uplands and lower areas are unclear. For several sites, individual analysis of the material culture would be necessary to be able to assign them definitively to one of these two regions.
cities of Ugarit and Hazor. The site of Deir 'Alla (site no. 187), which has a context rating of 5, is a suitable candidate.
CHAPTER 5

Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida

Introduction

The sites of Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida are situated in the Syrian coastal plain, ca. twelve kilometres north of the modern harbour town of Lattakia. Minet el-Beida is the name of a bay, characterised by the white chalk rocks which surround it, somewhat north of Cape Ibn Hani. This natural harbour - now the location of a military port - is one of the most important on the Syrian coast. Near the mouth of the Nahr al-Fayd in this bay, the archaeological site of Minet el-Beida was excavated. Less than a kilometre to the south-east is situated the tell of Ras Shamra, which has produced the remains of ancient Ugarit. The two sites are located favourably with regard to inter-regional connections. To the north, Anatolia could be reached via the Amuq valley, while a route passing Charchemish and Emar led to Mesopotamia. The coastal plain to the south opens up to the Lebanon and Palestine and, eventually, to Egypt. Its location at a cross-roads of maritime and landroutes has been of major importance for the history of Ugarit.

Archaeological research at the sites began in 1928, when L. Albanese of the French Service des Antiquités investigated a tomb that had accidentally been discovered by a farmer in Minet el-Beida. Systematic excavations started in 1929 under the directorship of Claude F. A. Schaeffer, who would lead a total of 31 campaigns at the sites up to 1969. The research began in Minet el-Beida, where excavations were carried out from 1929 to 1935. Already in the first campaign, Schaeffer turned his attention to Ras Shamra, where eleven campaigns were conducted before the Second World War. Finds from these campaigns were partly taken to France and partly to the museum of Aleppo. After the war, excavations recommenced at Ras Shamra in 1950. All post-war finds have been transported to Aleppo and Damascus. Apart from the twenty large scale excavations conducted by Schaeffer, several soundings were conducted by Henri de Contenson to explore the deeper levels of the site. In 1970, when the Syrian army constructed a gun emplacement in the south-west of the tell, a tomb was discovered and investigated by N. Saliby. From 1971 to 1973 two excavations were carried

---

1 The name Minet el-Beida, in fact, means ‘white harbour’; see, Saadé 1979, 36; 1995, 212.
2 The identification of Ras Shamra with Ugarit, a town known from the Amarna and Boghazköy tablets, was first proposed by W.F Albright (1931-1932, 165). Their suggestion was confirmed when a multi-lingual tablet was found in Ras Shamra that mentioned this name; see Schaeffer 1932b, 24-27. The ancient name of Minet el-Beida is most likely Ma’hadou, which is mentioned on tablets from Ras Shamra and Ras Ibn Hani; see Astour 1970, 113-127; Saadé 1995, 212; Yon 1997b.
3 Astour 1981, 3.
4 A useful overview of the archaeological campaigns to Ras Shamra and Minet-el Beida before 1978 is provided by Saadé 1979, 43-48. See also Yon 1997a, 18.
5 In 1957 and 1958 Hicham Safadi conducted excavations at Minet el-Beida, during which remains from the 6th and 5th century BC were explored; see Abdul-Hak 1958-1959, 83-86.
6 Saadé 1979, 41.
7 Saadé 1979, 51-52.
8 Saliby 1979-1980; Courtois 1979a, cols. 1279-1280.
out under the directorship of Henri de Contenson, while in 1974 a Syrian-French mission took place headed by A. Bounni and J. Lagarce. J.C. Margueron conducted excavations in 1975 and 1976. Since 1978 the Mission de Ras Shamra is directed by Marguerite Yon, who has not only continued the excavations, but also instigated the investigation of areas that had earlier been excavated with modern approaches and techniques.\(^9\)

The earliest habitation at Minet el-Beida dates from the first phase of the Late Bronze Age.\(^9\) In contrast, the lowest levels from Ras Shamra are from the preceramic Neolithic and the site appears to have been inhabited continuously until its abandonment at the end of the Late Bronze Age.\(^11\) In the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age, new groups of people may have arrived at Ugarit.\(^12\) During this period, the metal industry developed greatly and the city grew to encompass the whole tell. Relations with the Aegean during the Middle Bronze Age are attested by some cups in Kamares style and Minoan eggshell-ware.\(^13\) The majority of the buildings on the tell date from the Late Bronze Age, which has been divided into Ugarit Récent 1 (c. 1600-1450 BC), Ugarit Récent 2 (c. 1450-1365 BC) and Ugarit Récent 3 (c. 1365-1180 BC).\(^14\) During UR1, Cypriot pottery begins to appear at Ras Shamra, while Mycenaean pottery is imported from UR2 onwards. The UR3 period can, according to Courtois, be subdivided into three phases on the basis of a succession of floor levels which has been attested in several parts of the site.\(^15\) The latest of these floor levels is connected with a substantial reconstruction of the urban space sometime in the thirteenth century, during which houseblocks were reorganised in order to accommodate more dwellings and the royal palace was effectively isolated from the rest of the town.\(^16\) The city and its harbour were destroyed and subsequently abandoned at a time when the Mycenaean pottery shows signs of the transition from LHIIIIB to LHIIIC, most likely at the beginning of the twelfth century BC.\(^17\) After the abandonment, the site lay barren for a long time. Some habitation took place from the 6th to 3rd centuries BC as well as in the first two centuries AD.\(^18\) After this period, the area became agricultural territory.

The Late Bronze Age remains at Ras Shamra seem to cover the whole tell (Map 8).\(^19\) The excavated parts of the ancient city are generally referred to as if they constitute city areas. It must be understood, however, that the excavations have largely been conducted independent of the town’s urban layout and that the areas represent archaeological trenches, rather than town quarters. In fact, recent research indicates that only the area of the royal palace can be considered as a separated urban zone, designated for specific social groups and functions.\(^20\) Everywhere else on the tell structures meant for habitation are interspersed with shops,

\(^9\) Yon 1982; Callot 1994; Callot & Yon 1995, 158-159.

\(^10\) Courtois 1979a, col. 1283.

\(^11\) Courtois 1979a, cols. 1132-123.

\(^12\) Courtois 1979a, cols. 1150-1156.

\(^13\) Caubet 1982, 17.

\(^14\) Courtois 1974, 101. The absolute dates and the length of these three periods is not undisputed; see, for example, Callot 1986, 747-749.

\(^15\) Courtois 1974, 100. Apparently, this tripartite subdivision is reflected in the ceramic repertoire.


\(^17\) Courtois 1973, 165; Yon 1992b, 119-120. A tablet found in 1986 indicates that the reign of the last king of Ugarit, Hammurapi, began when pharaoh Merneptah ruled Egypt and continued into the time that Bay was Great Chancellor; see Freu 1988. According to the low chronology, this means that the destruction of Ugarit took place after 1196 BC.

\(^18\) Courtois 1979a, cols. 1280-1282.

\(^19\) Callot and Yon (1995, 158) estimate that 1/6 of the total surface of the tell has been excavated.

workshops and religious structures. Generally, houses of larger size and superior architecture, which may be interpreted as having belonged to wealthy social groups, are juxtaposed with smaller, more modest dwellings. It is impossible to speak of wealthier and poorer parts of the town, even though the Quartier Résidentielle, directly east of the royal palace, seems to possess a relatively high proportion of larger mansions. Similarly, it has been impossible to identify industrial quarters at Ugarit. If artisans were at work in the city, they appear to have conducted their trade on a domestic scale. The evidence for agricultural production within the city, notably the production of oil, indicates that members of all social groups were involved in their own food supply.

The tell of Ras Shamra is dominated by its acropolis in the north-east, which rises c. 40 m. above the coastal plain. The excavated part on the acropolis (abbreviated here as RS Acr.) was opened up from 1929-1937. It has produced two temples, which must have been visible from the sea and which were the largest in the city. The northern temple was consecrated to Baal and contained a cella and courtyard with an altar, surrounded by massive enclosure walls. To the south-east, the temple of Dagan has a similar, but less elaborate floorplan, with even thicker walls. The two temples, two insulae have been discovered that were labelled the Maison et bibliothèque du Grand Prêtre by the excavators on the basis of a deposit of religious texts. Most of the acropolis was designated for habitation. The part of this area on the western flank is referred to as Chantier C (RS Ch. C) and was excavated in 1932 and 1933.

The western part of Ras Shamra is occupied by the royal palace (RS PR), excavated from 1939-1955, which encompasses 6500 square meters and contained 90 rooms and six courtyards. The palace has been built in several phases, the last of which dates to the 13th century BC and effectively isolated the building from the rest of the town. With this final rebuilding, the imposing forteresse, which had previously served as a city gate for the whole north-western part of the site, was reorganised so as to exclusively serve the palace. The western part of the Quartier Nord-Ouest (RS NO), excavated from 1937-1939 and in 1973, was also reorganised during this rebuilding to become part of the royal zone, comprising the buildings known as the Manège and the Arsenal. A small temple, which had been in existence since the Middle Bronze Age, was included into the royal quarter as well. A large mansion in the extreme north of this area, however, remained outside the palace area proper.

Directly east of the royal palace lies the Quartier Résidentielle (RS QR), excavated in 1953-1958, 1968, 1973 and 1975, which comprises more than 15 houses, varying from small dwellings with three rooms to mansions with more than 30 rooms. In this area are situated

---

21 The only area for which this is not altogether certain is the Acropole, where two large temples are situated. Analysis of the structures which separate these two temples, 'Bibliothèque' and the 'Maison du Grand-Prêtre', should indicate whether this was an area reserved for religious practices; see Callot & Yon 1995, 161.


23 Courtois 1979a, cols. 1195-1197; Saadé 1995, 212.


25 Tarragon (1995, 207) expresses doubts as to the identification of the deity to which this temple was consecrated.

26 Courtois 1979a, col. 1156-1157. The names given to the buildings by the excavators are suggestive and should not be taken literally.

27 Courtois 1979a, cols. 1218-1222.

28 Callot 1986, 747-754.

29 Callot 1986, 737, 753; Courtois 1979a, cols. 1209-1216. The Quartier Nord-Ouest was also the location of the first palace of Ugarit, the Palais Nord. This building, located directly north of the later palace, was abandoned sometime in the 14th century and remained an open space throughout the use of the new palace.

30 Callot 1986, 746. This mansion is the so-called Résidence de la Reine Mère and the house of the rich tomb 50.

31 Courtois 1979a, cols. 1249-1261.
three large mansions, each containing an archive, of which the Maison d’Albâtres is the largest. South of the palace, another large building was excavated in 1964 and 1965, which, on the basis of its size and rich finds, was labelled the Palais Sud (RS PS). Amongst other things, this mansion yielded a large archive with tablets of mainly economical nature. Three tablets were written in the so-called Cypro-Minoan script. The mansion was separated from the royal palace by a square (RS PR/PS) that was excavated in 1964.

North of the acropolis, two excavation trenches were dug from 1932-1939 in a habitation area, the Ville Basse (RS VB) revealing mainly small houses built on terraces on the flank of the hill. On the eastern flank of the acropolis a large trench was opened up in 1959 to the edge of the tell (RS TTE). Several buildings were found here, one with a large cellar with many pithoi. On the more gently sloping southern flank of the acropolis two trenches were dug. The easternmost trench, the Sud Acropole (RS SA), excavated from 1961-1964, produced a tightly knit street pattern with many small houses. However, a building which was rich in finds, the Maison du Prêtre Hurrite, was also found in this area, while the northern part likewise produced some larger houses. The westernmost trench is called the Ville Sud (RS VS) excavated from 1959-1960. This area has recently been re-evaluated by O. Callot, who showed that the area contained fourteen insulae, with some thirty houses. Interesting from the point of view of city planning is a large square, probably created in the thirteenth century, in the centre of this area. According to Callot and Yon, this square testifies to urban planning at a time when the city saw an increase in population.

Since 1978 excavations have been conducted in a trench situated between the Ville Sud and the Quartier Résidentielle, which is labelled the Centre Ville (RS CV). The houses in the northern part of this area are relatively small, with six or seven rooms and courtyards each. In the southern part a sanctuary has been discovered which, on the basis of the finds, has been called the Sanctuaire aux rhytons. In the southern part of the tell, a bunker was constructed in the 1970’s. In the debris of the construction works for this bunker, a large number of cuneiform tablets have been discovered. After the removal of the bunker in 1986, the area around the trench (RS SC) has been investigated, yielding parts of at least two buildings surrounding a square. The western part of this area has recently been labelled the Maison d’Ourtenu and has produced the largest cuneiform archive outside the royal palace. Somewhere in the southwestern part of the tell the tomb discovered in 1970 (RS SW) must have been situated. In 1975 and 1976 a large mansion has been explored between RS NO and RS VB, which is here labelled RS NNO. The fact that a substantial part of this mansion has disappeared, indicates the heavy erosion to which the tell has been subject. The most recent

---

32 Courtois 1979a, cols. 1235-1239.
33 Courtois 1979a, cols. 1246-1249.
34 Schaeffer 1960, 135.
35 Courtois 1979a, cols. 1267-1269.
38 Yon, Lombard & Renisio 1987, 8-10. The last excavations in this area, to my knowledge, took place in 1994, see Weiss 1997, 137.
41 This area has been explored from 1986-1994 and is still being investigated; see Yon, Gachet & Lombard 1987, 184-190; Yon, Gachet, Lombard & Mallet 1990, 18-28; Yon 1995, 433-444; Weiss 1997, 137.
42 Yon 1995, 445-449.
43 See note 8. The exact location of this tomb is not known to me; it is therefore indicated by an asterisk in Map 8.
44 Margueron 1977.
research has focused on a trench in the south of the tell, which is referred to as the Grande Rue. 45

The harbour town of Ugarit, Minet el-Beida (MB), has been estimated to encompass 70 hectares. 46 The excavated area was much smaller, but, as a plan of the site has never been published, it is impossible to estimate the proportion of the site that was actually explored. From the description of the excavators, it is clear that houses, storehouses and workshops have been discovered, as well as spaces designated for ritual practices. 47 One of the storehouses contained more than eighty pithoi which probably served for the storage of fluids. Seven vaulted funeral cellars have been excavated in Minet el-Beida. As similar tombs in Ras Shamra are situated below habitation structures, the tombs indicate the presence of domestic buildings in Minet el-Beida. Even though ancient Ma’hadou must be considered as an independent urban area, it is clear that the harbour was closely related to the capital. 48 As in Ugarit, the buildings were situated along narrow streets and show a similar floor plan of rooms surrounding a courtyard. The material culture of Minet el-Beida, with its high proportion of imported objects, likewise, is similar to that of Ras Shamra.

The population of Ugarit was mainly of Semitic origin, but also contained a substantial Hurrian element. 49 In addition, there were foreigners present in the city: Hittites, Egyptians, Assyrians and people from Alashiya. These were stationed at Ugarit as diplomatic and commercial emissaries and did not count as citizens. For this reason they could not own land and were subject to other limitations as well. Seven different languages have been recognised on the tablets found in the city: Ugaritic, Hurrian, Hittite, Egyptian, Sumerian, Babylonian and Cypro-Minoan. 50 This international character of the tablets is reflected in the material record of Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida, which have produced objects from all these regions and others. 51 Even though imported objects, among which is Mycenaean pottery, constitute only a small proportion of the total of finds, they must be considered an integral part of Ugaritic material culture.

Within the society of the kingdom of Ugarit there was a distinction between the ‘people of the king’ and ‘free people’. 52 The royal court was ranked above these two groups and the king had an almost divine status, which was exemplified in public ceremonies. The palace administered the internal flow of goods and maintained international diplomatic relationships, while military duties were carried out by its generals. The group of ‘free people’ consisted mainly of farmers, who lived in villages among their estates. 53 In the capital of Ugarit lived the ‘people of the king’, among which at least forty different professional groups have been distinguished: priests, merchants, military personnel and a variety of artisans. 54 Although the tablets indicate substantial specialisation among the artisans, archaeological research has shown that social groups of all levels in the city were involved in agricultural activities, which were

45 Weiss 1997, 137; Yon 1997a, 95.
46 Saadé 1995, 211.
47 Courtois 1979a, cols. 1283-1287.
48 Yon 1997b. Saadé (1995, 217) proposes that Ma’hadou should be considered as the mina of Ugarit: a harbour town dependant on a larger city located more inland.
49 Rainey 1962, 174, 248. It is estimated that the capital held 6000 - 8000 inhabitants in all; see Liverani 1979, col. 1319-1320.
50 Courtois 1968, 25. These languages were written in five different systems, of which alphabetic Ugaritic and syllabic Akkadian were the most widely used.
51 See, for example, Courtois 1979a, col. 1283-1284.
52 Liverani 1979, col. 1333-1336.
53 Liverani 1979, col. 1342. In the territory of Ugarit 36 archaeological findspots are known, see Saadé 1979-1980, 223.
54 Liverani 1979, cols. 1334, 1339-1341.
organised on a domestic scale.\textsuperscript{55} This indicates not only that the distinction between rural and urban realms was not absolute, but also that the “people of the king” were, at least to some extent, not wholly dependant on the palace for their income.

Social stratification within Ugaritic society should be sought within the two main social groups, rather than between them.\textsuperscript{56} Nevertheless, the material record of Ras Shamra indicates that the people living in the capital enjoyed a rather high standard of living.\textsuperscript{57} Even the houses that have been qualified as modest, are of good quality and have inventories testifying to a considerable level of wealth.\textsuperscript{58} It is for this reason that the whole population of the capital may be considered as representing the upper social strata in the kingdom of Ugarit. However, differences seem to have existed within the urban population. Olivier Callot classifies the houses in the Ville Sud in three different groups on the basis of their architecture and archaeological inventory: three rich houses, all in possession of an archive; a multitude of “middle class” houses and several modest houses.\textsuperscript{59} Apart from these, a group of large mansions situated in the vicinity of the royal palace, such as the Palais Sud and the residence of tomb 50 in the Quartier Nord Ouest, should be considered a special class.\textsuperscript{60} Even though the urban areas outside the palace cannot be classified according to wealth, the urban population of the capital does appear to have been socially stratified.

It is impossible to know whether the population of Minet el-Beida was comparable to that of Ugarit itself. The tombs at this site, which had very rich inventories, indicate that at least some inhabitants possessed considerable material wealth.\textsuperscript{61} The material record of the harbour town is, in general, very similar to that of Ras Shamra, although writing seems to have been limited to seals and vases, thereby indicating that the palace administration did not extend to the harbour town.\textsuperscript{62} The involvement of the people in Minet el-Beida with trade and shipping is demonstrated by storehouses and a great number of anchors.\textsuperscript{63} We may therefore assume that traders and sailors were part of the population. Textual evidence makes clear that these professions were among those of the “people of the king” and that traders could acquire considerable wealth.\textsuperscript{64} The fact that the royal palace was an important organising and regulating force in maritime trade may suggest that a large part of the inhabitants of the harbour town were related to the palace. Social stratification within Minet el-Beida is suggested by the fact that, apart from the elaborate vaulted funeral cellars, two graves consisting of rectangular pits cut into bedrock have also been discovered.\textsuperscript{65}

**Quantity and quality of data**

From the numerous publications about the two sites, I have been able to isolate a total of 616 Aegean ceramic finds: 168 from Minet el-Beida, 443 from Ras Shamra, while 5 sherds may

\textsuperscript{55} Callot 1994, 202.
\textsuperscript{56} Liverani 1979, col. 1334.
\textsuperscript{57} Callot 1994, 200-201.
\textsuperscript{58} The tightly knit quarters with very small dwellings of the Ville Basse Est are a possible exception to this pattern; see, for example, Courtois 1979a, cols. 1246-1249.
\textsuperscript{59} Callot 1994, 200-201.
\textsuperscript{60} Callot 1986, 744-746; 1994, 200. A comparable mansion has been excavated in RS NNO in 1973; see Margueron 1977, 168-179. The Maison d’Albâtres, in RS QR, might also be included among this group.
\textsuperscript{61} Courtois 1979a, cols. 1283-1287.
\textsuperscript{63} Saadé 1995, 214, 219-220.
\textsuperscript{64} Heltzer 1978, 124-129, 131-132, 137. International trade is likely to have been conducted outside the sphere of the palace as well; see, for example, Liverani 1972, 308-309; Zaccagnini 1973, 79-81; 1984. The fact that state merchants were subject to taxes and served as money lenders indicate that they too had possibilities for private trading.
\textsuperscript{65} These tombs were situated in the western part of Minet el-Beida and contained a single inhumation each, see Schaeffer 1933, 99-100. Both burials produced finds dating to the 15th and 14th centuries BC.
come from either of them. This pottery is listed in catalogue II, with bibliographical references and information concerning the circumstances in which it was discovered. Although very few chemical analyses have been conducted on Mycenaean pottery from the two sites, most of the ceramics included in the catalogue seem to have been produced on the Greek mainland. In 1945 the fabrics of an unknown number of samples from Ras Shamra were investigated by petrology and compared with pottery from Cyprus and the Greek mainland; it was determined that the Ugarit vessels resembled the sherds found in Greece more than the Cypriot examples. Five pictorial specimens from Minet el-Beida and one from Ras Shamra were later analysed by spectography and appeared to have been produced in the Argolid. On stylistic grounds, Courtois distinguished a group of amphoroid kraters, which may have originated in the south-eastern Aegean. Pottery deriving from Crete has also been included in the catalogue: nine vessels can certainly be classified as Late Minoan, while eleven vases may derive from that island. The catalogue only includes pottery that was produced in the Aegean. Vessels of Mycenaean inspiration which were certainly produced on Cyprus, such as those in the ‘Rude’ or ‘Pastoral’ style, have been excluded from the catalogue. However, in a few cases it is unclear whether the vessels were produced in the Aegean or in Cyprus; these specimens have been included here. Similarly, Aegean-style pottery that was manufactured locally has been left out of the catalogue; seven vessels of which it is uncertain whether they are imported or locally made have been included.

It is clear that the ceramics which are listed in catalogue II do not represent all the Mycenaean pottery which has been found at the sites. Two corps céramique have been published, which cover the campaigns from 1929-1938 and 1959-1968 respectively. We can assume that most of the pottery found during these excavations and recognised as Mycenaean is included among our data. However, it is also certain that imported Aegean wares have been...

---

66 See the foreword to catalogues II-X (p. 547-548) for the criteria for and method of classification. These figures vary somewhat from those by Leonard 1994, who lists 180 Mycenaean finds from Minet el-Beida and 451 from Ras Shamra. This difference is caused to an extent by the fact that Leonard has included related pottery that is not produced in Greece, such as Cypriot ‘Rude’ or ‘Pastoral’ style pottery and local imitations. In some cases, Leonard has given separate catalogue entries to fragments which belong to the same pot; these are listed here under one number. Some finds included here, were not listed by Leonard.

67 Immerwahr 1945, 555: note 77.

68 Anson 1980, 117, 121, fig. 2. The analysed sherds are catalogue nos. 017, 053, 080, 125, 135, 472; the specimen with catalogue no. 191, which was found either at Ras Shamra or in the harbour town, likewise turned out to derive from the Argolid.

69 Courtois 1973, 149-164. Vessels of this type are those with catalogue no. 077, 175, 314, 315, 371, 372, 374, 375 and 402.

70 Catalogue nos. 156, 408, 462, 474, 475, 476, 479, 521, 534.

71 Catalogue nos. 129, 140, 161, 171, 201, 290, 378, 445, 477, 478, 502 are here referred to as Helladic, but might rather be Minoan.

72 Catalogue nos. 42, 064, 103 and 518. Possibly, shallow bowls with horizontal handles (FS 295-296) were produced on Cyprus at the end of LCII as well; see Sherratt 1980, 196-197. All these vessels have been included in the catalogue.

73 Catalogue nos. 52, 172, 177, 267, 286, 438, 459. It has been suggested by E.B. Miller that some of the zoomorphic rhyta at Ugarit may have been made in the town itself, especially those with catalogue nos. 136-138, which are all of the animal-head type. According to Miller, these vases deviate from Aegean examples in the carelessness of the decoration and the heavy proportions with too prominent rims. However, one should also note that these vessels are decorated with fill ornaments, which are purely Mycenaean, notably parallel chevrons (FM 58) and lozenges (FM 73). Pending technical analyses of the clays of the zoomorphic vessels, I consider them Mycenaean imports.

74 Schaeffer 1949, 131-301; Courtois & Courtois 1978, 192-370.
left out of these publications, especially in the case of the first corpus céramique.\textsuperscript{75} The campaigns from 1978-1984 have been extensively published and we can consider the data-set for these campaigns to be more or less complete.\textsuperscript{76} Material found during twenty campaigns has only been published in preliminary reports and in a variety of different places. Although a substantial amount of pottery from the excavations is thus available, it cannot be assumed that the data-set is complete.\textsuperscript{77}

Several other factors make it unlikely that the catalogue constitutes a sample that is fully representative of the Mycenaean pottery at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida and the contexts in which it has been found. First of all, neither of the sites has been excavated completely.\textsuperscript{78} The excavated part of Ras Shamra is relatively large and comprises the royal palace, official buildings, large mansions, smaller houses, workshops and sanctuaries. This compares well to the assumed population of the town, which consisted of the royal court and the ‘people of the king’. It seems unlikely that the depositional circumstances of Mycenaean pottery in unexcavated parts of the city are completely different from those already dug. This is less certain for Minet el-Beida, where most of the material comes from tombs, although some finds have been published from storehouses, possible sanctuaries, refuse-pits and domestic contexts. For this site, in particular, a second factor relating to the excavations seriously affects the extent to which the Mycenaean pottery catalogued can be considered a representative sample. The archaeologists working at the site in the 1930’s thought for a long time that they were excavating a necropolis and realised only much later that they had actually discovered an urban area.\textsuperscript{79} This has not only seriously affected the amount of information available for the contexts in which the Mycenaean pottery was discovered, but has most likely resulted in the loss of material that was not found in tombs. In general, the possibility that Mycenaean finds have been thrown away cannot be excluded, especially for the earlier excavations. Finally, the extent to which the contexts of the Mycenaean pottery has been published varies highly.\textsuperscript{80}

Of a different nature are depositional and post-depositional factors, which also have influenced the data-set. The deposition of Mycenaean pottery is, to a certain extent, connected with the subject of this thesis: the use and appreciation of this class of material. However, part of the depositional factors will be related to the destruction of the city early in the twelfth century BC.\textsuperscript{81} The battle which led to the downfall of Ugarit has left its mark on the material record, as have, for example, attempts to flee and looting.\textsuperscript{82} Post-depositional factors likewise will have influenced the material record as it has been found by archaeologists. Erosion seems

\textsuperscript{75} An example in case is the pottery from tomb VI in Minet el-Beida. From the notebooks it is known that this tomb contained 282 Late Helladic vessels and 35 Mycenaean figurines; see Courtois 1979a, col. 1283. However, only 38 vessels and 4 figurines occur in the first corpus céramique.

\textsuperscript{76} Yon, Lombard & Renisio 1987, 11-128. Pottery is also published in several other articles in this volume, for example in Calvet & Geyer 1987; Mallet 1987, Yon 1987.

\textsuperscript{77} In the depots of the Louvre museum in Paris, there are more than 400 Mycenaean vases and sherds thereof, which are unpublished and currently are being studied by Nicolet Hirschfeld (pers. com.). In addition, we may expect unpublished Mycenaean pots from Ugarit in various Syrian museums.

\textsuperscript{78} Callot & Yon 1995, 158 estimate that 1/6 of the total surface of the tell has been excavated. The situation in Minet el-Beida is less clear, but Saadé 1995, 212-213 estimates that about 1.4 hectare has been excavated and that the total area of the site was much larger.

\textsuperscript{79} Saadé 1995, 213.

\textsuperscript{80} In the first Corpus céramique most finds were published together with other objects found in the same complex, or, if this was not the case, associated finds are often mentioned, see Schaeffer 1949, 131-301. In the second corpus, however, this system was abandoned and finds were grouped according to different wares and provenance’s, see Courtois & Courtois 1978, 192-370. Although the topographical point at which these objects have been found were mentioned, it is not possible in many cases to reconstruct the contexts of the pottery.

\textsuperscript{81} Yon 1992b, 119-120.

\textsuperscript{82} Yon 1992b, 117-118
to have been particularly extensive at the steep northern slope of the tell. Perhaps more important are activities at the tell after the destruction of the city. Shortly after the abandonment the site was inhabited by ‘squatters’, during the 6th-3rd century BC, the area of the Ville Sud was the location of a settlement, while some construction from the Hellenistic and Roman date has also been noted. Agricultural activities have taken place on the tell for an extended period, while robbers have also been active: with a few exceptions, all tombs seemed to have been looted either during or after the destruction of the town, and in the beginning of the twentieth century a large trench was dug by treasure hunters in the area of the acropolis and the Ville Basse. These depositional and post-depositional processes, will have influenced the circumstances in which the Mycenaean pottery was found and the analysis and subsequent interpretation will have to take these processes into account.

The fact that the catalogue cannot be considered a sample that is fully representative of all the Mycenaean pottery at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida severely limits its possibilities. Each archaeological expedition to Ras Shamra focused - naturally enough - on specific areas. The fact that the material of many of these campaigns has not been fully published means that there is unequal data for the different parts of the site. Similarly, the quality of the data varies spatially, as certain areas have been excavated more recently than others. All this prohibits a purely statistical approach to study the on-site distribution of Mycenaean pottery at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida. Instead, a method needs to be adopted in which only very marked quantitative differences between excavated areas are taken into consideration. These differences need to be checked with regard to the extent to which they can be related to archaeological phenomena, rather than to insufficient data. Fortunately, the recently excavated and published Centre Ville can, in some cases, serve to compensate for the loss of data bearing on other areas.

The on-site distribution of Mycenaean pottery
The 616 entries in Catalogue II consist of 554 ceramic vessels or sherds thereof and 62 (fragments of) figurines. The excavated areas of Ras Shamra, including Minet el-Beida, each have produced the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>pots and sherds</th>
<th>figurines</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minet el-Beida</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Acr.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS QR</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VB</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VS</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS CV</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS CR C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS TTE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NNO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PR/PS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS unknown</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meb or RS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1

---

83 Schaeffer 1936b, 137; Contenson et al. 1973b, 124; Yon 1992a, 20.
84 Yon 1992b, 118-119.
85 Stucky. 1983.
86 Courtois 1979a, col. 1282
87 Courtois 1979a, cols. 1200-1202.
88 Schaeffer 1931, 9-10.
As is evident from Map 8, the various areas differ in size and in nature. Minet el-Beida, of course, is a site of its own. Some excavated areas of Ras Shamra are large trenches comprising habitation areas of substantial size in which several houses, streets, squares, etc. have been revealed.\textsuperscript{89} Two other trenches are much smaller,\textsuperscript{90} while two areas concern single, albeit large, buildings\textsuperscript{91} and one ‘area’ is a single tomb.\textsuperscript{92} Finally, one ‘area’ has been included because the finds could not be ascribed to one of the other excavation trenches.

In considering the figures in Table 5.1, one should always keep in mind that the extent to which the campaigns devoted to the different areas have been published varies, as does the quality of the excavations themselves. Moreover, these figures represent published finds from all archaeological strata. Objects from the surface layer, which came into being during the decay of the site and has been subject to extensive erosion, especially in the streets,\textsuperscript{94} may actually derive from other parts of the site than their findspot seems to indicate. Similarly, finds from levelling strata below the buildings of the last phase of Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida are not in their original spot of deposition either.

Nevertheless, it is clear that Mycenaean pottery has been found in all excavated parts of Ras Shamra and in the harbour town of the ancient city. This seems not to be completely true for Mycenaean figurines, which are absent in certain areas. However, the areas without figurines are mainly smaller trenches (RS TTE, RS SC and RS SW), a singular building (RS NNO) and the ambiguous findspot of RS PR/PS. The only larger trenches without figurines are the Quartier Nord Ouest and the Chantier C. In the case of the latter, which has yielded the comparatively small number of 9 Mycenaean sherds, it should be noted that it was here that treasure hunters have been active before 1914.\textsuperscript{95} The absence of Mycenaean figurines in RS NO appears to be related to the small number of published Aegean finds in general for this vast area. Most of the buildings in the north-western quarter were related to the royal palace to the south. From the palace itself, likewise, a remarkably small amount of Mycenaean pottery has been published. Of the six pieces reported, two derive from a levelling stratum below court III of the palace and cannot be taken in consideration.\textsuperscript{97} The stemmed chalice of catalogue no. 465 was found in association with a burial in the north-western part of the palace which is most likely unrelated to the palace itself.\textsuperscript{98} Only three finds of Mycenaean pottery, therefore, can be associated with the palace proper (cat. nos. 297, 429 and 488), of which one was made in the royal tombs.\textsuperscript{99} It needs to be noted that finds from the campaigns during which the palace was

\textsuperscript{89} RS Acr., RS PR, RS QR, RS NO, RS VB, RS SA, RS VS, RS CV, RS Ch. C can all be considered as such.

\textsuperscript{90} RS TTE and RS SC.

\textsuperscript{91} The residence of RS NNO and the large mansion of RS PS.

\textsuperscript{92} RS SW.

\textsuperscript{93} This is the case for the finds made in the square between the \textit{Palais Royal} and the \textit{Palais Sud} (RS PR/PS)

\textsuperscript{94} Callot 1994, 186.

\textsuperscript{95} Schaeffer 1956b, 113. The fact that Schaeffer in this report refers specifically to “céramique mycénienne de très bonne qualité” (p. 109) may indicate that more was found than that actually published in the first \textit{corpus céramique}.

\textsuperscript{96} Courtois 1979a, 1209; Callot (1986, 748-754) states that in the thirteenth century the western part of the \textit{Quartier Nord-Ouest} was part of the royal zone in the city, which, in an urbanistic sense, was separated from other areas. Before c. 1370-1360 BC this area was the site of the first palace, the \textit{Palais Nord}. In the period in between, during which the royal palace was constructed in several stages, the northern palace lay abandoned and was probably used as a quarry.

\textsuperscript{97} Catalogue nos. 509 and 1059; see Kuschke 1962, 264-265.

\textsuperscript{98} Schaeffer 1949, 180 (under no. 23) mentions that this burial was located at topographical point 2253, which corresponds with the north-western end of the outside wall of the palace, see Schaeffer 1962a, Dépliant 1. However, no tomb is indicated at this location.

\textsuperscript{99} Schaeffer 1951, 78: “nombreux fragments de beaux vases mycéniens points...”. As none of these have been published, this remark has been included as one entry in the catalogue (cat. no. 488).
excavated, from 1938 to 1955, have not been included in a *corpus céramique*. In fact, epigraphical tablets aside, not many objects from the palace have been published and the material record associated with the ruling élite and its administration is known only fragmentarily. However, we should also remember that Schaeffer had a special interest in Mycenaean ceramics. The paucity in catalogue II of Mycenaean finds from the palace at the very least indicates that there was not a concentration of this type of pottery in the palace; nor is it likely that the vessels that have been found were in any way extraordinary.

The presence of Mycenaean pottery in all excavated areas of Ras Shamra and at Minet el-Beida appears to indicate that this class of material, was in use in the whole city of Ugarit and not confined to people living in specific areas. A widespread distribution of Mycenaean pottery is also suggested by the recent excavations in the *Centre Ville* (Map 9). Mycenaean finds in houses A, B and C in this part of town were made in many rooms and courtyards, generally in single pieces and associated with local domestic objects.

The distribution of Mycenaean pottery can also be viewed from the perspective of the contexts in which it occurs. To a considerable extent (almost 44% of all catalogued finds) the context of the Mycenaean pottery cannot be reconstructed. This is probably partly caused by the number of finds made in the surface layer or levelling strata, while the methods of excavation, registration and publication may be to blame as well. The following table gives the number of finds in each of these contexts in Minet el-Beida and in the excavated areas of Ras Shamra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>unknown</th>
<th>Funerary</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Ritual</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minet el-Beida</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Acr.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS QR</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS CV</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Ch. C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS TTE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NNO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Pr/PS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS unknown</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS or MeB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2

These figures reveal that Mycenaean pottery at Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra occurs in different kind of contexts. The relatively high number of tomb finds (34% of the total) is

---

100 Saadé 1979, 43-44.
102 For example, in his inventory of finds from the latest floor level of the Ville Sud, Callot 1994, 224, 225 mentions only three Mycenaean finds: a pictorial krater (cat. no. 244) and two figurines (cat. nos. 1061, 1062).
103 The excavators before 1974 used a system of points topographiques: a point at which finds were made received a number and were triangulated from fixed points, while levels were indicated as depth from the surface of the tell; see Schaeffer 1962a, XVII. The surface of the tell in the excavated areas has, of course, disappeared, which makes it difficult to reconstruct the stratigraphy (cf. Callot 1994, 186); we may expect that the archaeological strata were not at a uniform depth all over a particular excavation trench. Moreover, very few maps with topographical points have been published, because of which the exact location of finds is impossible to determine.
probably due to the fact that this kind of context is the most easily recognised. In this respect it is typical that in most areas excavated before the 1970's a funerary context for the Mycenaean finds is dominant. Mycenaean pottery has been found in ritual contexts in Minet el-Beida, on the acropolis, and in the Centre Ville. No conclusions can be based, however, on the absence of Mycenaean finds in ritual contexts in other areas. Ritual practices in Ugarit seem to have taken place outside temples as well and buildings may have combined religious and more secular functions. Mycenaean artefacts have been discovered in contexts which are classified here as domestic, but have religious connotations as well. An example in point are the finds made in the Maison du prêtre Hurrite in RS SA.

These figures indicate that Mycenaean pottery was used in Ugarit and its harbour town in different kinds of circumstances. This appears to have been the case everywhere in the city, as the pottery is found in most areas in more than one type of context. The absence of funerary contexts for Mycenaean pottery in the recently excavated Centre Ville seems remarkable. However, this area has produced only two tombs, one of which was out of use during the Late Bronze Age; the second tomb was found virtually empty as a result of looting. The evidence so far does not suggest that Mycenaean pottery was used only in specific situations. This class of material seems to have been appropriate for domestic use and to have been included in religious and funerary ceremonies.

Up to this point, Mycenaean pottery has been considered as a general class of material. However, this class can be subdivided according to several criteria: chronological ceramic styles, types of vessel and decorative styles. The spatial and contextual distribution of each of these subclasses can be investigated, in order to see if there are any indications of restrictions in use.

The subdivision of the Late Helladic and Late Minoan pottery at Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra according to chronological ceramic styles is presented in Table 5.3 in four groups: Early (LHII-LHIIIA1), IIIA2, IIIA2-IIIB, and IIIIB. These four groups each comprise a number of more restrictive stylistic classifications, shown in Table VIII, which is presented in the tables section of this book.

The only vessel designated LHIIIa1-LHIIIa2 (cat. no. 088) has been included here with the group of IIIA2. The use of the terms LHIIIb1 and LHIIIb2 has been avoided on the grounds that this division is difficult to
not refer to a chronological group, but to those specimens which cannot be dated more accurately. Also important is the fact that the stylistic ceramic phases do not necessarily correspond to archaeological strata at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida. Although the stratigraphy of Ugarit Récent 3 (1365-1180 BC), apparently, points to three phases within this period, it has been impossible to correlate this stratigraphy with the chronology of the Aegean pottery on the basis of the publications. The figures which show the spatial distribution of the stylistic ceramic phases are presented in Table 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>early</th>
<th>IIIA2</th>
<th>IIIA2-IIIIB</th>
<th>IIIIB</th>
<th>undatable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minet el-Beida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Acr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS QR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VB</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS QC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Ch. C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS TTE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NNO</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PR/PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS or MeB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3

From these figures it is apparent that Aegean vessels from the early part of the Late Bronze Age are scarce at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida. Of the eight specimens listed here, one is Minoan (cat. no. 408: LMIIIA1) and another possibly so (cat. no. 161: LHIIA/LMIB). It is impossible to say much about the distribution of these early vessels. Although the figures point to a concentration in the harbour town and in the Ville Sud, the occurrence of a small handleless jar (FS 77) of LHIIIB-LHIIIA1 date in RS QR (cat. no. 207) indicates that such products were more widely distributed.

Vessels in LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB styles are widely distributed all over the site. The absence of LHIIIA2 sherds in RS SC may be attributed to the small size of this area. As regards the Quartier NO, the lack of LHIIIA2 finds should be related to the paucity of Mycenaean finds in general in this area. Of all excavated parts of Ras Shamra, the Ville Basse is the only one where more LHIIIA2 pots have been found than vessels in LHIIIB style. This may partly be

make in the eastern Mediterranean, where pottery from more peripheral areas of the Mycenaean world seems to gain in importance in the later phase of LHIIIB, see Sherratt 1980, 199. The terms early and late LHIIIB are used in cases where they apply.

114 In many places at Ras Shamra, three subsequent floor levels are attested of Ugarit Récent 3; see Courtois 1974, 100. According to Courtois these three layers are reflected in the deposition of the pottery.

115 Because the classification of the figurines is not as sharply chronologically defined as that of pottery (French 1971), they are not included here. Therefore, the sample presented in Table 5.3, consists of the 550 pots or sherds thereof.

116 Furumark 1941a, 610 (FS 164: 11) initially assigned the stirrup jar with catalogue no. 408 to LHIIIA1. Hankey (1979, 149: no. 10) later established its Minoan origin: LMIIIA1.

117 The vessel of which it is known only that it derives from Ras Shamra concerns catalogue no. 471. This alabastron was published by Stubbing 1951, 53, who stated that it had been found in a tomb together with Cypriot and local pottery. It is, considering the date of publication, likely that the alabastron was found in one of the campaigns before World War II: on the Acropole, RS Ch. C, RS VB or RS NO.

118 As stated above, paragraph 1, the Quartier Sud-Centre is located in the same area as the tomb of RS SW. This tomb has yielded LHIIIA2 pottery, albeit only one specimen (cat. no. 423).
explained by the observation that almost all Mycenaean finds in this area were made in tombs (see Table 5.2), which in general have produced a relatively high proportion of LHIIIA2 ware (see Table 5.4, below). The Centre Ville, on the contrary, shows a high proportion of LHIIIB pottery in comparison with the one specimen in LHIIIA2 style (cat. no. 464). This is explicable, as the research in this area has focused on the latest habitation level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>style</th>
<th>Funerary</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Ritual</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA2-IIIB</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIIB</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4

The contextual distribution of Mycenaean vessels in the various ceramic styles, is presented in Table 5.4, which shows clearly that all chronological styles have been found in all types of contexts. The only exception in this case is that no LHI-lHIIIA1 sherds have been found in a domestic context. This would be an important observation arguing against a domestic use of these early vessels. However, the total number of specimens seems too small to draw such a conclusion. Early Mycenaean finds have been made in ritual and settlement contexts. The find in a ritual context (cat. no. 129) concerns a LHIIIA1 conical rhyton from a sanctuary in Minet el-Beida.

Both finds in a settlement context (cat. nos. 161 and 408) were also made in the harbour town, on floors of buildings which cannot be specified. As far as differences in contextual distribution can be discerned between finds in LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB styles, a higher proportion of the later ceramic phase was found in a domestic context. This is, of course, explicable, as the end of LHIIIA2 dates long before the abandonment of Ugarit.

The question as to whether the chronological ceramic styles of the Mycenaean pottery correspond to the stratigraphical sequence of Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra is difficult to address without explicit reference to stratigraphy in the publications. The fact that a lower proportion of LHIIIA2 vessels was found in domestic contexts seems to suggest that these vessels were not in use during the final phase of Ugarit. However, two finds point to the possibility of a long use for ceramic vessels. The first of these concerns a fragment in LHIIA/LMIB style (cat. no. 161), which was found in Minet el-Beida in direct association with a cuneiform tablet. The ceramic style of this fragment points to a date between 1500 and 1450 BC according to traditional chronology. However, all cuneiform tablets are said to date from Ugarit Récent 3, e.g. after 1365 BC. A second case of a find made in a deposit that should be dated much later than its chronological style concerns a complete LHIIIA2 alabastron (cat. no. 464) which was found in a habitation level of the latest phase at Ugarit.

---

119 Schaeffer 1932a, 4. This sanctuary is referred to as R1 in Table IX.
120 Schaeffer 1932a, 5 (for no. 408); 1949, 226, no. 13 (for no. 161).
121 14 % of all reported IIIIB finds were found in a domestic context, compared to only 5 % of the IIIA2 finds.
122 The depth at which finds have been made is usually mentioned. See, however, note 103 for the problems involved in using this information.
123 Schaeffer 1949, 226: no. 13. Schaeffer mentions that the finds were made in Minet el-Beida in 1929 near tomb IV. The tablet is not mentioned by Saadé (1995, 214-215) in his overview of the texts found in the harbour town.
125 Van Soldt 1986, 57.
126 This date is given by Leonard 1994, 36: no. 393, most probably on the basis of the carefully executed N-pattern (FM 60:2) and the relatively slight concavity of the sides and convexity of the base (see fig. 5.2. on p. 76); cf. Mountjoy 1986, 73-74, 100. It must be stressed that these vessels are notoriously difficult to assign stylistically.
in house C of the Centre Ville (fig. 5.1 below). Although these examples might be the result of contextual intrusion, they may also point to the possibility that Aegean vessels were still in use in Ugarit and its harbour town long after their manufacture.

Mycenaean pottery can also be subdivided according to functional vessel types. Within the total repertoire of shapes, the functional groups distinguished in this research are: dinner vessels, storage vessels, ritual vessels and terra-cotta figurines (see Table II). The spatial distribution of Mycenaean vessels belonging to these functional categories is presented in Table 5.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>dinner</th>
<th>storage</th>
<th>rhyta</th>
<th>figurines</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minet el-Beida</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Acr.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS QR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS CV</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Ch.C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS TTE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NNO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PR/PS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS unknown</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS or MeB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5

These figures show that dinner vessels are somewhat more common than storage vessels in Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra. This pattern applies to most areas of Ras Shamra: of all the trenches covering a large area, only the Ville Basse shows a strong dominance of storage over dinner vessels. It is unlikely that this has to do with the high proportion of tomb finds in this area (Table 5.2). Minet el-Beida, RS Acr., RS Ch C. and to a lesser extent in the Ville Sud have also yielded many Mycenaean finds from tombs, but they include predominantly dinner vessels. A possible relation might exist with the observation made above that the Ville Basse is the only area that has produced more finds from the LHIIIA2 stylistic phase than from LHIIIB. From Table 5.6 (below) it can be deduced that the dominance of dinner vessels is most marked among finds from the latest stylistic ceramic phase, while among early finds and among those from LH/LMHIIA2 storage vessels are the more numerous.

In the Sud Acropole and the recently excavated Centre Ville the numbers of dinner and storage vessels are balanced. This is remarkable, because in both areas most finds by far are from the LHIIIB period (Table 5.3). A connection of this phenomenon with the rather low number of tomb finds from these areas is likely. The absence of storage vessels in the Palais Sud may also be noted. As far as the spatial distribution of rhyta and figurines is concerned, it is apparent that they are rather homogeneously distributed. All important areas have yielded

---

127 Yon, Gachet & Lombard 1987, 178-179. The vessel was found with another alabastron (cat. no. 463) underneath a staircase. Another possible example is a part of a LHIIIA2 rhyton (cat. no. 287), which was found in a domestic context in the maison à portique à base de colonne in the Quartier Résidentielle (Courtois & Courtois 1978, 308: no. 18). However, the depth of the find is not mentioned. The sherd of a LHIIIA2 mug (cat. no. 201), which was found at street level in the Ville Sud (Courtois & Courtois 1978, 292: no. 2) may have been deposited there long before the final days of Ugarit.

128 The dominance of storage vessels in the Ville Basse seems too strong to be explained completely by the less marked preponderance of vessels from LH/LMHIIIA2.
both categories, only the absence of rhyta in the Palais Sud, where there is a rather high proportion of figurines, may be of some significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ceramic phase</th>
<th>dinner</th>
<th>storage</th>
<th>rhyta</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA2-IIB</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIIB</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undatable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6**

Table 5.7 below presents the contextual distribution Mycenaean vessels belonging to the various ceramic functional categories. It is clear that storage vessels predominate in funerary contexts, while in domestic environments dinner vessels occur more often. It is, however, not possible to define restrictions of use of the different functional types on the basis of this observation, as all types have been found in all contexts. Moreover, the presence of equal numbers of dinner and storage vessels in the domestic contexts of the Centre Ville shows that both categories were used in similar circumstances. The fourteen rhyta which have been found in ritual contexts seem to indicate that this type of vessel had a predominantly ritual use. However, eleven of these rhyta derive from one and the same sanctuary: the sanctuaire aux rhytons in the Centre Ville. A significant number of rhyta have been found in contexts which were not clearly ritual and have been classified here as ‘domestic’. Figurines likewise do not seem to have been restricted to specific kinds of contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context</th>
<th>dinner</th>
<th>storage</th>
<th>rhyta</th>
<th>figurines</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funerary</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritual</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.7**

The observation made above that Mycenaean pottery was used everywhere in Ugarit and its harbour town and in different kind of circumstances appears to be valid for all functional vessel types and for figurines. The only differentiation which can be made on the basis of this section is that among the pottery of the earlier stylistic phases storage vessels predominate, while during LHIIIB dinner vessels occur more often. As noted earlier, there are no substantial differences between the spatial distribution of LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB ceramics. Therefore, we may conclude that the introduction of larger quantities of dinner vessels during LHIIIB is not connected to changes of the social groups who used the Mycenaean pottery.

A last subdivision of the Mycenaean pottery can be made according to decorative style or ware. The classification used here makes a distinction between coarse ware and fine ware. This latter group includes both plain vessels, and others with linear, patterned, pictorial or plastic decoration. The term ‘decorated’ is used when fine ware is concerned of which the type of decoration is unknown. Table 5.8 represents the spatial distribution of these wares in Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida. From this table it is immediately clear that undecorated Aegean

---

129 Figurines are excluded from this table.
130 Catalogue nos. 434, 436-445; Yon 1982, 15; 1987. Local and Cypriot rhyta were also found. This sanctuary is referred to as R2 in paragraph 5 and table IX.
131 The figurines are excluded from this section.
132 Undecorated coarse ware has not been reported from Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida. The decorated coarse ware is listed here in the column ‘d.c.w.’

---
The occurrence of such stirrup jars in the Sud Acropole of Ras Shamra and in RS CV shows that the use of these transport vessels was not limited to the harbour town.

### Table 5.8

Among the decorated fine ware, specimens with patterned decoration are dominant. This predominance of patterned decoration probably should be considered even more marked, as linear decorated sherds may have belonged to patterned (or pictorial) vessels. It is remarkable that the only important area presenting an exception to the predominance of patterned ware is the recently excavated Centre Ville. This calls into question the reliability of the figures in Table 5.8 for the areas which were excavated earlier. However, it also needs to be noted that the Centre Ville is the only important area from which tomb finds, which are generally more complete, are not reported. Moreover, this area has the highest proportion of sherds of which no illustrations are available to me and which have been designated as ‘decorated’.

Pictorial pottery has been found in all major areas of Ugarit and in its harbour town. Although a proportionally large number of this kind of pottery comes from the Sud Acropole, it does not seem to have been restricted to certain areas. The six pictorial vessels which come from the relatively small area of RS SC may indicate that this kind of pottery was particularly abundant among the inhabitants living there. The spatial distribution of pictorial motives is presented in Table 5.9 above. Most pictorial vessels show animals such as deer, stag, birds, etc. The second most frequent theme is the chariot scene, while scenes showing men engaged in other activities and bulls also occur. The fact that all of these motives have been

---

133 Leonard (1994, 127-128) mentions collar-necked jars and straight-sided alabastra as pot shapes to which such a lid could have belonged.

134 The catalogue numbers are: 408, 462, 474, 475, 477, 478. In four cases (cat. nos. 474-478) the decoration consists of curtailed cuttlefish (FM 53:14); in one case (cat. no. 408) of running spirals (FM 46). No illustration exists of no. 462.

135 Of certain Minoan origin are: catalogue nos. 408, 474, 475, 476. The specimens with nos. 477 and 478 are here designated as Helladic, but may rather be Minoan. See also note 71.

136 Five pictorial amphoroid kraters (cat. nos. 516, 551-554) were found in the so-called house of Ourtenu, indicating that this wealthy trader may have assembled this type of vessel, see Yon 1995, 440.

137 Apart from bulls, the following animals occur: octopus (11 x), birds (10 x), fish (10 x), stag (2 x), goat (2 x), deer (1 x), horse (1 x)
found in various areas in Ras Shamra and in Minet el-Beida seems to indicate that the iconography of the decoration did not determine the on-site distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>various animals</th>
<th>bulls</th>
<th>man</th>
<th>chariot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minet el-Beida</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Acr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS QR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS CV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Ch.C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS TTE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Sc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS SW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS NNO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS PR/PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS VS/CV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS or MeB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9

The final category of pottery to be considered are vessels with plastic decoration, in all cases zoomorphic rhyta. These vessels too have been found in most of the important areas of Ras Shamra and in Minet el-Beida. The Chantier C has produced a relatively large amount of such vessels, for which there is no apparent explanation. In contrast, zoomorphic vessels have not been reported from the Centre Ville. As the rhyta stylistically belong to the LHIIIA2, LHIIIA2-LHIIIB and LHIIIB phases, it is unlikely that their absence from RS CV is caused by the paucity of LHIIIA2 pottery in this area. Nor, as will be seen below, can this absence be related to the fact that most finds in this area are from domestic contexts. In any case, the occurrence of plastically decorated vessels in various areas indicates that their use was not spatially restricted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ware</th>
<th>funerary</th>
<th>domestic</th>
<th>ritual</th>
<th>settlement</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d.c.w</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain ware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patterned</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pictorial</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plastic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decorated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worn off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10

The contextual distribution of the decorative styles and wares is shown in Table 5.10. Of the six coarse ware stirrup jars in Ugarit, three have been found in tombs and one in a sanctuary. These contexts may be somewhat surprising in view of the alleged function of these vessels as utilitarian jars for bulk transportation of liquids. Even though the sample of

---

138 The animals attested are: hedgehog (8 x), animal head (7 x), and fish (3 x). In one case (cat. no. 172), a horse’s head is attached to the rim of a rhyton of possible local manufacture.

139 Tombs III and V in Minet el-Beida each yielded one coarse ware stirrup jar (cat. nos. 474 and 475 respectively), while tomb 4093 in the Sud Acropole also produced such a vessel (cat. no. 478).

140 The stirrup jar with catalogue no. 462 was found in the sanctuary in the Centre Ville. A similar context is possible for the vessel with catalogue no. 408, which was found in a deposit inside the enceinte in Minet el-Beida, which was designated as ritual by Schaeffer (1932a, 5) on the basis of many votive pits.

141 Haskell 1990.
six such vessels is rather small, it appears that they could be used at Ugarit and its harbour in funerary and religious ceremonies. The linear, patterned and pictorial pottery appears in all type of contexts. Neither of these categories seems to have been restricted to specific circumstances. With regard to the pictorial pottery, it is remarkable that it is more often reported from a domestic than from a funerary context. Although the high number of pictorial vessels from unknown context calls for caution, they do not appear to have had a primarily funerary function. Vessels with plastic decoration have been found in both funerary and domestic contexts, but not in religious or cultic circumstances. However, considering the likelihood of religious practices conducted outside sanctuaries, a ritual function for this vessel cannot be excluded on these grounds.

The spatial and contextual distribution of different types of Aegean pottery wares and decorative styles in Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida does not seem to indicate any restrictions in the use of the different categories. The predominance of fine ware with patterned decoration is clear and this class of pottery is present everywhere in all types of context. Likewise, vessels with pictorial and plastic decoration appear to have been present all over the city and to have been used in different kinds of situations. Even coarse ware transport stirrup jars were present in the capital city of Ugarit itself and their use seems to have gone beyond the purely functional.

The purpose of this section was to see if any restrictions in use can be discerned from the spatial and contextual distribution of Mycenaean pottery at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida. The answer to this question is mostly negative. Mycenaean pottery is present all over the site of Ras Shamra and in the harbour town. At the same time, substantially less use seems to have been made of such pottery in areas of Ugarit connected to the royal palace. In this respect it is of interest that these are the only areas in Ugarit which can be classified as specialised in an urbanistic sense: they served a specific group of people and functions. Nowhere else within the city has such spatial specialisation been attested. Another important observation made here is that most Mycenaean pots from the earlier stylistic are storage vessels, while among pottery of LHIIIB date dinner vessels are dominant. However, this difference cannot be related to the use of Mycenaean pottery by different social groups. The overall conclusion seems to be that Aegean vessels from all stylistic phases, presenting different functional types and decoration, was present all over Ugarit and in its harbour town and was used domestically, as well as in religious and funerary ceremonies. The picture emerging is that of Mycenaean pottery being rather common at Ugarit; it played a role in the every-day life of the inhabitants of the city and was used by many different inhabitants in the town.

Closed contexts: settlement
The organisation of urban space in ancient Ugarit reveals the lack of a masterplan. Apart from the royal zone in the west of Ras Shamra, the streets follow the irregularities of the terrain and are connected by narrow alleys. The insulae which are shaped by these streets are likewise irregular and of varying size. Recent research has revealed that these insulae constituted the basic architectural unit of urban Ugarit. Within such a block several houses, work areas, shops, etc. can be found. The number of actual houses within an insula may vary. With the growth of the urban population in the thirteenth century BC, many houseblocks were

---

142 As has been suggested for such vessels in Cyprus; see Dikaios 1969, 249; Vermeule & Karageorghis 1982, 8; Keswani 1989b, 58-69.
143 Callot 1986; Callot & Yon 1995, 161.
reorganised in order to fit more dwellings. It needs to be remarked that the earlier excavators considered the *insulae* to constitute single houses. The names they gave to the buildings, often on the basis of finds or texts, should not be taken literally.

Table IX lists all the non-funerary, closed contexts with Mycenaean pottery in Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida that can be abstracted from the many publications about the two sites. Of many of these deposits too little is known to analyse them sufficiently. The sixteen remaining closed contexts discussed here, can be classified into three groups: finds in houses (H), finds in ritual buildings (R) and finds in refuse contexts (G). Each of these find complexes will first be described in general. Then, the distribution of Mycenaean pottery within the complex will be investigated, as will the associations that are attached to the Mycenaean ceramics, on the basis of finds and the functions of spaces. A major problem faced by this analysis is the fact that many finds from Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida have never been published. This is especially true for the local pottery.

J.-Y. Monchambert has estimated that imported pottery, of which Aegean vessels are only a part, constitutes less than 1% of all the ceramics found at the sites. Local pottery, especially the coarse domestic wares, seems to have been abundant everywhere, but it is, paradoxically, almost non-existent in the publications. A second problem specifically concerns Minet el-Beida. A map of the excavated areas at this site has never appeared and, consequently, the structures in which the Mycenaean finds were made are only partly known.

**H1 Minet el-Beida: large habitation complex**

In 1934 a large building was found in the southern part of the harbour town. The building possessed a courtyard with a well and an oven. To the east were small adjoining rooms that were filled with domestic materials. In one of these rooms a Mycenaean figurine (cat. no. 1054) was found. This female figurine, of Psi basic type (LHIIA-LHIIIB), was associated with a stele with drilled hole and with a Cypriot wall bracket. A Syrian lamp was also present.

The figurine is the only Mycenaean find reported from this building. The presence of the wall bracket and the figurine led Schaeffer to believe that religious practices were conducted at a domestic shrine. It is by no means certain, however, that wall brackets were used exclusively in cultic activities.

The only observation that can be made in this case is that the Mycenaean figurine was part of an assemblage that consisted exclusively of locally made objects.

---

145 For example, house B in the northern part of the Centre Ville, see Yon, Lombard & Renisio 1987, 25. Reorganisations of space also seem to have occurred in the last phase of the Maison d’Albâtres; see Contenson et al. 1974, 7.

146 For example, Callot (1994, 186-188) has found no evidence for metalworking in the quartier des orfèvres in the Ville Sud.

147 A fourth group indicated in Table IX concerns a settlement context (S), which includes all finds made in streets or squares, which are not discussed here. In two cases (S1 and S2) the Mycenaean ceramics appear to have been found in a building, but this is not altogether clear. S1 is discussed below.


149 Schaeffer 1935, 169.

150 In the area of the seven vaulted tombs that had been explored in 1929; see Saadé 1994, 214.

151 Schaeffer refers to this object as an ‘incense burner’ and does not hypothesise about the location of its manufacture. Similar objects have been found elsewhere in the Mediterranean, for example in Tiryns, see Kilian 1988, 128 fig. 24; Knapp 1990, 122 note 56 (with further refs). The Ulu Burun wreck has also produced several of these ceramic items, see Bass 1986, 292. The majority of this type of objects, however, come from Cyprus; for a discussion of their distribution, chronology and function, see Caubet & Yon 1974. For other wall brackets at Ras Shamra, see Schaeffer 1949, 212-213, fig. 88. In one case, such an object is decorated with a deity (no. 16), while others have linear and floral decoration.

152 Most likely the wall bracket served as a lamp to be hung on a wall, see Brown & Catling 1980, 115-116.
G1 Minet el-Beida: pit in a house.

Next to a pit in a house in Minet el-Beida, eight sherds from amphoroid kraters (FS 53-55) were found which had been secondarily used: holes had been pierced through the centre of the sherds and their sides had been smoothed (fig. 5.1). Such esthèques have been found elsewhere in Minet el-Beida as well, some of them made from Syrian pottery. From Ras Shamra one comparable piece has been reported: the Mycenaean pictorial amphoroid krater fragment of catalogue no. 117. In the area of the finds in Minet el-Beida was another pit which yielded domestic pottery and a bull’s head rhyton.

It is remarkable that all these re-used fragments concern amphoroid kraters, some of which with pictorial decoration (fig. 5.1). This suggests that these vessels were deliberately chosen to be re-used. A second observation is that this deposit is the largest collection of esthèques in Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra. This suggests that they have been deliberately deposited. The nature of this deposition is impossible to assess and depends on the function of the re-used sherds and the (unknown) contents of the pit next to which they were found. The only observation that can be made on the basis of this assemblage is that here is an example of particular use of Mycenaean amphoroid kraters.

154 Schaeffer postulated that they might have been used as esthèques: a potter’s tool to scrape clay from vessels on the wheel that was apparently used in France during the 1930’s. It must be emphasised, however, that no other evidence for the activities of potters at Minet el-Beida has been published.
155 Schaeffer 1949, 232-233, nos. 2, 3 and 4 are examples of esthèques from local pottery. The sherd of catalogue no. 491 is also from an amphoroid krater and has been found elsewhere in the harbour town.
156 It is not known whether this is the one Mycenaean bull’s head rhyton from Minet el-Beida (cat. no. 126), or another vessel. Zoomorphic vessels are present among the local ceramic repertoire, see for example Schaeffer 1929, 287, fig. 2; 1949, 160-161, no. 22; 180-181, no. 12, but an actual bull’s head rhyton has, to my knowledge, not been reported.
157 For this reason, Schaeffer suspected that they were votive offerings; see Schaeffer 1949, 232.
In 1929, near vaulted tomb II, an area was discovered where the floor was covered with crushed murex shells, large quantities of coarse ware pottery and slag. In this floor, there were several pits of which the opening was covered with a stone slab with a hole in its centre; on the slab lay, like a funnel, the rim of a large jar. On top and around these pits were numerous fragments of Mycenaean figurines, of which nine have been published: five bovines (cat. nos. 1014, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1022), two female figurines, both of late Psi A type (cat. nos. 1015-1016) and two chariot figurines (cat. nos. 1015, 1016). Only one of the pits was excavated, yielding ceramic fragments and a tripod of basalt.

This deposit concerns the largest assemblage of Mycenaean figurines at Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra. Other Mycenaean pottery has not been reported from this area, nor have any other imported objects or local figurines. On the basis of the slag and "other signs of metal working," Schaeffer suspected that the area represented a metal workshop. It needs to be remarked, however, that an oven has not been reported and that slag occurs in Ras Shamra in habitation areas. In any case, this deposit presents another example of a group of specific Mycenaean objects which were used in particular circumstances. One observation to be made is that this deposit contained both zoomorphic and anthropomorphic figurines. This may indicate that the functions of these two categories of idols were similar.

Although the find contexts of many figurines from Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida are unknown, most of the figurines from the Centre Ville have been found dispersed, in houses among local materials. According to Monloup, this suggests that figurines were used in Ugarit mainly in the daily practice of cult and that their character should be considered magical rather than strictly religious. The exceptional presence of a group of Mycenaean figurines in this deposit may indicate that certain rites were practised in association with the activities in this area.

In 1931 an area was discovered with benches, on and around which ceramics had been deposited. Near these benches was a cistern in which several skeletons of newly born children were found. Adjacent to this area was a building of ashlar masonry in which stood an ovoid stone altar. At its base lay pebbles, weights and, a little further away, several rhyta, among which was one of Aegean type decorated with an octopus (cat. no. 129).

No other Mycenaean pottery has been reported from this area, and the rhyta found together with the Aegean specimen were of Syrian origin. The Mycenaean rhyton in this case has clear religious associations. It was used during local religious practices, together with other vessels of similar shape. This suggests that the imported vessel was not perceived as differing from the Syrian rhyta. It was its character as a rhyton rather than its Mycenaean origin that determined its use. As the Syrian rhyta were all undecorated, there are no indications that the octopus decoration of the Mycenaean vessel was important for the use that was made of it.

158 Schaeffer 1929, 290-291.
159 Schaeffer 1929, 290.
161 Monloup 1987, 303. Above (H1), we have seen that the figurine with catalogue no. 1054 was also found alone among local objects.
162 Monloup 1987, 313. Figurines of local and Cypriot manufacture have been found in the Centre Ville in similar circumstances. For the religious character of Mycenaean figurines in general, see French 1971, 107-108.
163 Schaeffer 1932a, 4.
164 Although no photographs of these benches were published, their description recalls the two benches in the central hall (room 36) of the sanctuary in the Centre Ville; see Mallet 1987, 220.
165 Schaeffer 1932a, planche III, 2.
In 1929 a building was partly excavated, of which the walls formed small rooms (cellae). In these rooms large quantities of ceramics were found, among which were the LHIIIB stemmed bowl of catalogue no. 116. Other ceramic finds include a Cypriot White Slip II bowl, local bowls, a cooking pot and a Cypriot wall bracket. Apart from these, several bronze figurines were discovered, of which two had been imported from Egypt.

No other Mycenaean finds have been reported from this building. The nature of the building is difficult to assess, but the large quantities of coarse ware pottery suggest that it was a house or a storage area. The presence of the Mycenaean stemmed bowl in this deposit indicates that Mycenaean pottery in Minet el-Beida was firmly embedded in the material culture of the harbour town.

From the area of the royal palace at Ras Shamra, six finds of Mycenaean pottery have been reported. Two of these (cat. nos. 509 and 1059) were found in a levelling stratum below court III and cannot be taken into consideration, while another (cat. no. 465) belongs to a burial unrelated to the palace. The findspot of the LHIIIA2 conical rhyton, decorated with an octopus (cat. no. 297), is unknown. To the remaining two specimens (cat. nos. 429 and 488), another might be added: the LHIIIB amphoroid krater of catalogue no. 175, which was found in the area of the western city gate (the forteresse) of the Quartier Nord-Ouest. This gate was rebuilt during the thirteenth century BC to serve the palace area exclusively.

As stated before, not too much should be made of the paucity of Mycenaean finds from the palace, since unpublished vessels from this area probably exist. However, it can be stated that it is not likely that there was a concentration of Mycenaean pots in the palace, nor is it likely that the Mycenaean repertoire was substantially different from that elsewhere at the site. Those Mycenaean pots that have been published, were not found together, but isolated. This may suggest that this type of pottery was widely distributed among the rooms and courtyards. An exception to this is catalogue no. 488, which concerns the report of several fragments of Mycenaean painted pottery found together in the royal tombs.

It is not known whether any Mycenaean finds were associated with the amphoroid krater from the entrance gate. The bowl of catalogue no. 429 was found in the southern archives: two rather small rooms south of the large courtyard number V. These rooms are called the international archives, because all texts found here concern diplomatic correspondence and treaties. More than 200 such tablets were found, written in eight different languages (Akkadian, Sumerian, Hurrite, Hittite, hieroglyphic Ugaritic, Egyptian and Cypro-Minoan). Apart from these texts, a great number of other objects were discovered in these rooms, among which were a Cypriot bowl (possibly a local imitation), local dinner vessels, alabaster vases, steatite weights, bronze clothing applications and a handle from a bronze vessel. This abundance of finds, together with the tablets, led Schaeffer to believe that the rooms were not only archives, but that artisans worked there as well.

Although this seems unlikely because of the absence of tools, the staircase in room 69 points to the existence of an upper floor or
terrace where activities not directly related to the archive might have taken place. It is likely
that the objects were part of the daily life in and around the archives.

It is, of course, of importance that Mycenaean pottery was found in association with these
international texts. However, the presence of the Mycenaean bowl in the archives is most easily
explained by supposing that it was part of the domestic inventory. Even though the objects
found in the archives show a certain sign of wealth (imports, metal vessels), this bowl appears
to be associated with the people working in the archive, rather than with the royal court itself.

H4 Quartier Résidentielle: Maison d’Albâtres

This large mansion adjacent to the royal palace, excavated in 1973, consists of more than fifty
rooms and courts and contains one tomb (see Map 10). The building as such occupies a whole
insula but is considered to have constituted one unit, as all the rooms communicate with one
another. However, in its last phase the south-eastern part of the building was isolated from the
rest by a blocking of passages. The building can be divided into four different parts (see fig. 3).
The rooms in the south-east, where the entrance to the funerary cellar is situated, are labelled
‘sacred’ by the excavators. The floors of this part of the house were rather empty. Mycenaean
pottery has not been attested here, nor has any been found in the pillaged tomb. In contrast,
the south-western part of the house, labelled as the domestic quarters, produced an abundance
of finds. Among them were three Mycenaean conical rhyta (cat. nos. 415, 416, 417) in room
BD, a hedgehog rhyton (cat. no. 418) in the hallway between rooms AW and BA and a locally
made amphoroid krater in room AX. Room BD in particular was rich in finds. Apart from the
Mycenaean rhyta, two of which were decorated with a bull (cat. nos. 415, 416), this room
produced sixty-seven other ceramic vessels of local and Egyptian manufacture, pearls, amulets
and a steatite statue. The northern part of the house is considered to have been the industrial
zone and can be divided in two. The upper part, around court AF, was probably devoted to oil
production as grinding stones and olive pits have been found there. No Mycenaean pottery has
been reported from this part of the building. The exact nature of the activities in the lower part
of the industrial zone cannot be determined, but Canaanite jars and a vessel from Egypt have
been found in room X, while room S yielded two alabaster vases and an elephant moulder, and
courtyard U a basin, a stone tripod, an alabaster jug and a Mycenaean LHIIIB shallow bowl
(cat. no. 421). The mansion has also produced a second shallow bowl (cat. no. 525), of which
the findspot is unknown. The excavators remark on two characteristics of this house: the total
absence of Cypriot imports and the abundance of objects with Egyptian associations.

As far as the distribution of the Mycenaean pottery within this building is concerned, it is to
be noted that four of the five vessels with known findspots were found close together in the
part of the house that was richest in finds. Moreover, it is remarkable that all these four vessels
are rhyta. The three conical rhyta among them were even found close together in a corner of
room BD. The association of these vessels with the wealthier part of the house contrasts with
the single shallow bowl in the rest of the house. This bowl, found in the basin in courtyard U,
together with a Canaanite jar, is associated with the more industrial part of the mansion. In this
case, there seems to be a difference in evaluation of two different categories of Mycenaean
pottery. The rhyta, especially those of conical type from room BD, were considered
appropriate to be included among objects of high value, while the shallow bowl was part of a
more mundane assemblage. It needs to be reminded that the location of this house next to the
palace, as well as its inventory suggest a high status for the owners. The evidence for a high
regard for Mycenaean rhyta in such an environment is of considerable importance. The fact

174 Contenson et al. 1974, 5-25.
175 The excavators, E. and J. Lagarce, suspect, on the basis of the number of finds with an Egyptian origin, that
it was an Egyptian posted in Ugarit for diplomatic reasons, who owned the Maison d’albâtres; see Contenson et
that two of these rhyta were pictorially decorated, while another was of hedgehog shape indicates that the decoration of such vessels was of consequence for their appreciation.

H5 Ville Basse: Maison au frittes

In 1935 in the western part of the lower town, north of the acropolis (chantier A), a house was discovered, of which the plan has never been published. There are two important things to note about this house. First of all, its tomb is one of the few at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida that had not been robbed. Secondly, a group of polychrome figurines in frit was discovered: two male figurines, a large part of a horse's head and parts of a chariot. Directly associated with this group were two hedgehog rhyta, one of Mycenaean origin (cat. no. 410) and another probably of local manufacture, imitating a Mycenaean type. Some distance away from this group, two other rhyta were found: a LHIIIB (late) conical rhyton of Mycenaean origin (cat. no. 147) decorated with fish, and a locally manufactured imitation of a conical rhyton. No further information is available on this house and its inventory, nor is it known whether other Mycenaean vessels have been found here. In the funerary cellar, tomb 13, six Mycenaean vases were found (cat. nos. 92-96, 514). These all fall stylistically in the LHIII A2 period and probably pre-date the deposit of the frit figurines.

Assuming that such figurines were not all too common, this deposit again testifies to rhyta being associated with valuable objects. In this case, the zoomorphic rhyta and the figurines were directly associated, while the conical rhyta were found together somewhat away. It may also be noted that no distinction seems to have been made between imported Mycenaean rhyta and local imitations.

H6: Sud Acropole: building with the Maison au prêtre Hurrite

This building, excavated in 1961 and possibly constituting more than one house, can be divided into three parts (Map 11). The northern part, which is described by Courtois as an 'average house of rather large dimensions', consisted of at least eight rooms, two courtyards and a cellar. In the central courtyard a staircase is present, indicating an upper floor or a terrace. Room 3, south of this courtyard, is a cellar, in which a stone basin and several pithoi and storage jars were found. In this cellar two LHIIIB conical rhyta (cat. nos. 288, 290) were also found. The room adjacent to this (room 4) produced a scale and bronze zoomorphic weights. The central part of the building consists of the so-called Cella and a room above the tomb. In the Cella, at depths varying from 1.5-4.5 meters, a great number of tablets with mainly literary texts were found, among them ten in the Hurrite language - an unusually large proportion. On the floor of the western part of the room, a stone libation tube was present, as well as a fragment of an LHIIIB conical rhyton (cat. no. 294). Below the floor, in a pit, more tablets

---

176 Schaeffer 1936, 138-139.
177 Schaeffer 1949, plate 37, upper. The rhyton itself is badly damaged and it is published without comments. As decoration and shape are atypical it is considered to be a local imitation of Aegean hedgehog rhyta. See also Leonard 1994, 95: no. 1437.
178 Schaeffer 1936, 115, fig. 8C.
179 Schaeffer 1936, 140-142.
180 This building consists of several parts (see fig. 4). The northern part is often referred to as a separate house, the Maison de Ben Agipsari; however, it communicates with the southern part through a door in the west; see Courtois 1979a, col. 1277; 1979b, 111-112. The central part, the Maison du prêtre Hurrite proper, consists of the Cella and the hallway and rooms directly to the south and east; see Schaeffer 1963a, 206-215; Courtois 1969, 91-119. The south-western part of the building is referred to as the Maison au textes Médico-magiques or the Maison de Lamastu; see Schaeffer 1966, 131-137, and is connected to both other buildings.
181 Courtois 1979a, col. 1277.
182 A tomb is indicated in the drawings, but never referred to in the publications. Its small dimensions suggest that it was of an earlier date; cf. Salles 1987, 173.
were found, as well as two bowls (one of gold, the other electrum), models of livers and lungs, a local pictorial mug, Cypriot White slip II pottery and a LHIIIIB stirrup jar (cat. no. 309). The funeral chamber to the east, tomb 3709, produced another LHIIIIB stirrup jar (cat. no. 289). Three other Mycenaean finds are reported from this part of the house, the contexts of which are unknown: a LHIIIA2 stirrup jar (cat. no. 247), a LHIIIA2 piriform jar (cat. no. 488) and a LHIIIIB bull’s head rhyton (cat. no. 289). The south-western part of the house possessed a paved area, from which a drain led to the exterior. Near this drain, a LHIIIIB pictorial amphoroid krater was found (cat. no. 314), as well as a text concerning grain transports. The southernmost room of this part of the building yielded more tablets, some concerning economical and legal affairs, several others of medical-magical or astrological nature.

The Mycenaean pottery seems rather dispersed through the building. The two conical rhyta, one of them pictorially decorated, found together in room 3 of the northern part of the house, are associated with storage facilities. On the basis of its inventory, the nature of this building is not immediately clear. The two archives contained documents of various types, including several examples of religious or magical content. The discovery of the liver models and the libation tube likewise point to religious practices. This house seems to be an example of the possibility that religious practices were not only conducted in temples, but also in other buildings.\footnote{Tarragon 1995, 209-210 implies that the distinction between religion and more profane domains was not as strongly marked as is the case in modern Christianity.}

If this was the case, the storage facilities of which the two rhyta were a part may have been connected to such practices.

The presence of a rhyton and a stirrup jar among the tablets in the Cella is difficult to interpret. The models of livers and lungs in this part of the building indicate that the archival function cannot be considered separate from religious activities. The association of the conical rhyton with the libation tube in this room indicates that the Mycenaean vessel was used for ritual purposes. Courtois considers the pit in the cella in which the stirrup jar was found as votive.\footnote{Courtois 1979a, col. 1270.} If this is indeed the case, the stirrup jar in the pit is also associated with religious activities. However, Schaeffer seems to think that the pit was part of a Middle Bronze Age tomb in which the objects fell after the floor of the Cella had cracked.\footnote{Schaeffer 1963a, 211.} In any case, the Mycenaean vases in this part of the building are associated with the various activities carried out in association with the archive. The isolated pictorial amphoroid krater found near the drain has no particular associations and may be related to domestic activities.

**H7: Centre Ville: House A**\footnote{Yon, Lombard, Renisio 1987, 27-60.}

House A is located in the north-western part of the Centre Ville and consists of four rooms and a courtyard (Map 9). During the rebuilding in the thirteenth century, these rooms were separated from those of House B, isolating house A into an autonomous unit. The house is described as average, with utilitarian functions. There were few provisions for drainage, and no entrance hall. A staircase indicates the existence of a second floor or terrace. The entrance from street 1038 was situated in room 1040, where the staircase, with a latrine underneath, was also placed. This room is described as a “pièce de passage”, rather than a residential or storage area. A LHIIIIB stirrup jar (cat. no. 448) and a Mycenaean fragment of unknown pot shape (cat. no. 447) were found on the floor of this room, associated with Cypriot pottery, local pithoi, jars, cups and bottles, stone tools and a bronze pin. In the north-east of room 1041, a domestic installation was discovered, near which lay a Mycenaean bovine figurine (cat. no. 1043) and an Egyptian scarab. This area is described as the kitchen, because of a stone basin, a drain through the northern wall and a quantity of coarse ware vessels. In this room...
were also found a LHIIIB stirrup jar (cat. no. 450), a krater fragment (cat. no. 451), Cypriot Base Ring II vessels, local jars, pithoi, cups and a tablet with a seal impression. In courtyard 1043 a fragment of a LHIIIB pictorial krater (cat. no. 452) was found, associated with a 'Rude' or 'Pastoral' style krater, local kraters, a cup and a Cypriot wall bracket. The southern part of the house is considered to have been a storage area. In the small room 1047 a Mycenaean krater (cat. no. 449) was found in association with Cypriot pottery, an abundance of local vessels and several bronze arrowheads.

The Mycenaean pottery is dispersed through house A: all rooms but 1046 contain one or more pieces of such pottery. This seems to indicate that this material was an integral part of the everyday life on the ground floor of this building. The associations of the Mycenaean pottery are mainly domestic, as can be seen from the finds in room 1040 and the krater and stirrup jar in room 1041. The installation 1028 with the figurine is considered to be part of the kitchen. Although such a context evokes domestic associations for the figurine as well, the presence of a scarab near the figurine may suggest that different activities were also conducted here. The three kraters in this house are all related to domestic activities. Interestingly, the pictorial krater fragment was found in the courtyard, together with similar local vessels and one in the 'Rude' or 'Pastoral' style. This suggests that this type of vessel had functions relating to activities in the courtyard. Moreover, it indicates that such Mycenaean vessels did not have a special status in comparison with similar local vessels or those imported from elsewhere.

**H8 Centre Ville: House B**

House B is situated directly east of House A, forming part of the same insula and originally belonging to the same house (Map 9). This building is considered to be of better quality than House A, as it is larger and possesses an entrance hall with a well (room 1067). East of this room, courtyard 1265 is situated, in which a worn-off fragment of an LHIIIB ring-based krater was found (cat. no. 454) in association with White Slip II pottery, local bowls and jars, a cylinder seal and a bottle of faience. At the eastern end of this courtyard, there was an annexe, room 1282, which produced a LHIIIB globular stirrup jar (cat. no. 455). South of the entrance hall lies room 1045, in which the dromos of a tomb starts. In this space, a Mycenaean linear decorated shallow cup (cat. no. 453) was found, in association with stone and bronze tools, a faience cylinder and local jars and cups. It is because of this inventory that Yon, Lombard and Renisio suspect that the main function of the room was for storage and work, although funerary rites probably were conducted here as well. The tomb itself, which was pillaged, has produced no Mycenaean pottery. West of this room were two small storage rooms. This function is clear from a double storage pit, features 1269 and 1270, which were dug into the southernmost room. In these pits, two LHIIIB stirrup jars were found (cat. nos. 529, 531) as well as two Mycenaean fragments (cat. nos. 532, 533). These were associated with Cypriot White Slip II pottery, Syrian plates and jugs, a faience pearl and stone tools and flint. The excavators were unable to discover any stratigraphy in these pits and suspected that they had been filled in one go, either to dispose of refuse or during the collapse of the house.

---

187 In room 1047 material could be identified that had collapsed from the floor above; see Yon, Lombard, Renisio 1987, 45. Among the reported finds (bronze axe, ivories, chalk plaque with a human figure), no Mycenaean pottery has been reported.

188 Bourdieu 1977, 114-124 describes how, among the Kabylia in Algeria, a multitude of rites are connected to ordinary activities such as ploughing, cooking, cleaning, etc.


190 Yon, Lombard & Renisio 1987, 78; see, also, Salles 1987, 132.

191 Yon, Caubet, Mallet 1982, 179. Cypriot White Slip II and Base Ring II vessels are considered to have been part of the tomb inventory, just as Syrian Red Lustrous bottles.

192 Calvet & Geyer 1987, 143-145.
Except for the specimens found in the storage pits, all Mycenaean vases have been found isolated from each other; all were associated with local materials and with Cypriot pottery. Interestingly, the occurrence of the ring-based krater in the courtyard can be compared to a similar context for a krater in House A. However, in house B no other kraters have been reported from the courtyard. The stirrup jar in the annexe and the shallow bowl in room 1045 indicate that Mycenaean storage, as well as dinner vessels were part of the daily life carried out in the house.193

H9 Centre Ville: House C194

House C is situated south of House B and consists of only five rooms (Map 9). The house came into being during the rebuilding of the insula in the thirteenth century when passages to adjacent rooms were blocked and an entrance to the street in the east was created. The house was relatively small and, as it is completely surrounded by other structures, light must have been a problem. It is for this reason that the excavators believe that many of the activities in the house will have been carried out on an upper floor, the existence of which is attested by a staircase. Two of the rooms on the ground floor, nos. 1048 and 1049, served as storage areas, while in room 1064 a well was present. Room 1066 was the entrance hall, where the staircase to the upper floor started. In a compartment underneath this staircase, two complete Mycenaean straight-sided alabastra (cat. nos. 463 and 464) were found, in association with a stone weight and some flints (fig. 5.2). This compartment served as a kind of closet or as a latrine.195 No other Mycenaean pottery has been reported from this house.196

![Fig. 5. 2 Mycenaean straight-sided alabastra from House C (cat. nos. 463, 464)](image)

The significance of the LHIII A2 alabastron (cat. no. 464) in a layer dating to the end of the city of Ugarit, has been commented upon above. The other alabastron has been assigned to LHIII A2-LHIII B. The room was created during the reconstruction of the building and it is clear from the report that these vases belong to the latest phase of the house. The fact that two straight-sided alabastra were found together is significant in itself. This pot shape (FS 94-95) is relatively rare in Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida: nine other specimens occur outside the Centre Ville, scattered over the site.197 In only one other case have two of these vases been found together: in tomb 2698 in the Ville Sud. In the Centre Ville, this pot shape occurs one

---

193 Yon, Lombard & Renisio 1987, 69 suspect that the people living in this house used the upper floors for habitation, while the ground floor was meant for storage and work.


195 Cf. house A, where, in room 1040, a toilet was located underneath a staircase.

196 However, of this house only preliminary reports have been published.

197 The contexts in which they occur are either unknown or they are found in tombs: catalogue nos. 9 and 52 come from tombs in Minet el-Beida, no. 307 from the Acropole, nos. 390 and 391 from tomb 2698 in RS VS, no. 95 from a tomb in the Ville Basse, no. 308 from RS TTE, no. 424 from the tomb in RS SW, while the findspot of catalogue no. 120 is unknown.
more time: on square 1051, right next to House C, the rim of such a vase (cat. no. 428) was found on street level. The occurrence of two of these vases in this obscure part of House C is remarkable and suggests that they served a special function.198

H10 Centre Ville: House E199

House E is situated south of house A and only four rooms have been excavated (Map 9). The house is described as ‘average’ by the excavators and, apparently, served domestic functions. The house was entered from street 1228 into the hallway 1209, where a staircase led to the upper floor or terrace. In this hallway, an oven or *tannour* was present. From there, one could continue to courtyard 1206, in which a LHIIIB jug (FS 128-129; catalogue no. 457) and a LHIIIB amphoroid krater (cat. no. 456) were found associated with local jars and cups, a bronze axe or chisel, stone tools and a local imitation of an LHIIIB piriform jar (FS 36).200 North of this courtyard, room 1050 was situated, which apparently had a domestic function; on its floor were found a LMIIIA-LMIIIB large stirrup jar with linear decoration (cat. no. 534), and a LHIIIB stirrup jar (cat. no. 530). This room also produced another LHIIIB stirrup jar, which might be of local manufacture (cat. no. 459) and a LHIIIB shallow cup (cat. no. 458), but these two vases might have fallen from the upper floor. For this reason it is impossible to determine which objects were associated with the Aegean stirrup jars that came from this room.

As only four rooms of this house have been excavated, it is difficult to review the distribution of the Aegean pottery. In comparison with house A, B and C, there seems to be a relative abundance of Aegean finds: the total of six imported specimens is only surpassed by the fully excavated house A. The LHIIIB jug and krater and the locally made piriform jar in courtyard 1206 can be associated with activities conducted in such a space. It may be noted that in this house, as in A and B, a krater is present in the courtyard. Although the jug might suggest that both of these vases were related to activities with fluids (water?), the presence of the stone tools and the bronze axe or chisel indicates that other activities also took place in this area. The association of these vases with a local imitation of Aegean ware suggests that imported vessels were not appreciated any more than such imitations. The same could be said of the appreciation of Mycenaean and Minoan ware: the two stirrup jars in room 1050 were found close together.

G2 Centre Ville: pit 1237201

In the east of the Centre Ville, a large pit was discovered (Map 9), which cut through several walls of the houses in this area. This indicates that the pit was dug when these houses were no longer in use, possibly during or immediately after the destruction of Ugarit. The pit was only partly excavated, but yielded a large number of finds: a whole range of local ceramics, Cypriot pottery, ivory duckboxes, alabaster vases, stone tools and a terra-cotta Astarte figurine. Among these finds, one Mycenaean pot has been reported: the stirrup jar of catalogue no. 510.

The contents of the pit constitute a cross-section of Ugaritic material record. The presence of a Mycenaean stirrup jar in this sample is of some significance, as it underlines the extent to which such vases were part of the material culture in the town.

198 The possibility of this room being the toilet and the suggestion by Leonard (1983, 241) that vases of this type may well have contained some kind of unguent, of course stirs the imagination!
In the south of the Centre Ville, a structure was excavated consisting of twelve rooms around the central room 36 (Map 12). This building has been interpreted as a sanctuary on the basis of the large size of room 36, the presence of an altar and benches in this room and the association of a number of rhyta with the building. Two floor levels have been discovered within the building, both dating from the last phase of the Late Bronze Age. The altar and benches in room 36 are associated with the latest level, niveau 2, and it is uncertain whether the building already had a religious function during its first phase. The altar itself, made of dressed blocks, was located near the eastern wall of room 36, while two benches flank the western and northern walls. A staircase points to the existence of an upper floor or terrace. Among the material belonging to level 2 in this room was a large quantity of Cypriot and Syrian pottery, as well as some fragments of Mycenaean pottery (cat. nos. 537-539). Fragments of amphoroid krater no. 527 were found on the same floor, while other pieces of the same vessel were dispersed throughout the south-eastern part of the building. On the lower level, the LHIIIB jug of catalogue no. 461 was found in this room, as well as a sherd with horizontal bands (cat. no. 540). In the north-east, the sanctuary opened up to the small room 47, in which Syrian and Cypriot pottery and an ivory duck box were found on level 2. The debris near the walls, produced the Mycenaean fragment of catalogue no. 541. Level 2 of room 52, directly east of room 36, yielded some stone tools, Syrian and Cypriot pottery, 3 fragments of a Mycenaean krater (cat. no. 542) and a Mycenaean conical rhyton (cat. no. 438). On the lower floor level a fragment with horizontal bands (cat. no. 543) was discovered. A concentration of Mycenaean pottery was found in room 77: 2 fragments of amphoroid kraters, (cat. no. 544 and 546), a small stirrup jar (cat. no. 547), a large stirrup jar (cat. no. 548), a straight-sided alabastron (cat. 549) and a fragment (cat. no. 545). Several Cypriot White Slip II bowls, as well as Syrian vases and a lamp were also found here on this level. The lower level, likewise, produced some fragments of an amphoroid krater (cat. no. 550) and two Mycenaean fragments of the same vase (cat. no. 486). South of this area, in room 78, two conical rhyta (cat. nos. 441, 445) were attested in level 2, with a large amount of local and Cypriot pottery. Level 1 produced a fragment of the amphoroid krater that had been found previously in room 77 (cat. no. 550) and a linear fragment (cat. 487). Room 79, the entrance hall from street 120, produced 2 fragments of Mycenaean pottery (cat. no. 535, 536) and a coarse ware stirrup jar (cat. no. 462), while somewhat to the north, in room 81, a Mycenaean bovine figurine (cat. no. 1045) was found. Finally, room 46, flanking street 35, yielded a Mycenaean conical rhyton (cat. no. 436).

Although four rhyta have been found in the building itself (none of which in central room 36), the name of the sanctuary derives especially from the scatter of rhyta around the building. According to Yon, these rhyta were dispersed after the building was abandoned and pillaged. Six Mycenaean conical rhyta (cat. nos. 434, 437, 439, 440, 442, 443) were found less than ten meters north of the sanctuary, while three Syrian rhyta were located in the same area. Another Mycenaean rhyton (cat. no. 444) was found directly east of the building, not far from a Syrian rhyton made of stone. Including the rhyta found in the sanctuary itself, fifteen such vessels are associated with the sanctuary, of which eleven are of Aegean manufacture.

---


203 Yon 1979, 15; 1987, 343. It has been suggested that this building was the place where a confrérie assembled rather than a temple in the classic sense; see Tarragon 1995, 206. This would explain its small size in comparison with the two temples on the acropolis and the absence of a courtyard with an altar suitable for animal sacrifices.

204 Yon 1987, 343.

205 Another conical rhyton (cat. no. 435) was found somewhat further to the east in the excavation trench of the Ville Sud.
In total, 33 units of Mycenaean pottery are associated with this building. Of these, eleven are conical rhyta, while there are 5 kraters, 2 stirrup jars, 1 small globular jug, 1 straight-sided alabastron and a figurine. From this we can deduce that conical rhyta served a specific function in this building. Moreover, the dominance of Mycenaean rhyta over Syrian products suggests that the imported types were favoured, though not exclusively so, to fulfil this function. Although it is tempting to associate these rhyta with rituals performed in the sanctuary, it also needs to be noted that none has been found in its central area where the altar was located. Only one of the rhyta associated with this building is decorated pictorially (cat. no. 445: octopus), which indicates that pictorial decoration was not of importance for the use that was made of the rhyta in the sanctuary. At first glance, the five krater fragments found in the building seem to suggest that this pot shape served a special function in the sanctuary as well. However, kraters are one of the most frequently occurring vessel types in Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida as a whole and the occurrence of the five specimens here is not different from other, non religious areas. None of these vessels is pictorially decorated. The occurrence of one bovine figurine in an annexe to the building does not suggest a special function of this type of object in the cult practised at the sanctuary.

The distribution of the Mycenaean pottery within the building shows a concentration in its south-eastern part. Apart from the six specimens found in room 36, the three rooms east of the hall, rooms 52, 77, 78, have yielded 15 units of this pottery. Moreover, three additional pieces have been found in the adjoining entrance hall 79. Other rooms in the sanctuary (for example rooms, 47, 65, 49, 66, 55) have yielded substantial quantities of Cypriot and Syrian wares, but reveal a relative paucity of Aegean pottery. Nevertheless, we may consider the Mycenaean pottery an integral part of the inventory of the sanctuary. Apart from the Mycenaean rhyta, the other Aegean vessels do not seem to have occupied a special status in the activities that took place in this building.

H 11 Petit Palais Sud

In several campaigns after its discovery in 1955, a large building was excavated directly south of the royal palace, which, on the basis of its size and the quality of the finds, was labelled the small, or southern, palace (Map 12). Cuneiform tablets found in this building mention a certain Yabninu, who probably was the owner of this large mansion at the time of the destruction of Ugarit. The building covers more than 1000 sqm. and contains 33 rooms, among which are at least five courtyards. There are two funeral cellars, one of which, Tombe I, is the largest in Ras Shamra. Even though both tombs had been pillaged, tomb 1 produced a rich inventory, which included several alabaster vases with the cartouche of pharaoh Ramses II. Mycenaean pottery has not been reported from either of the tombs. The mansion contained

206 The dominance of rhyta may partly be due to the fact that only for this shape the distribution outside the building itself has been studied. It is not known whether, for example, krater fragments have been found in the area of the sanctuary. In the case of twelve pieces of Mycenaean pottery the pot shape is indeterminable.

207 In total, 97 kraters have been found at Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra, which is 15.8 % of the total (612). The five specimens of the temple aux rhytons constitutes a similar proportion (15.2 %) of all the Mycenaean pottery found in this area (32).

208 A fragment of the amphoroid krater of catalogue no. 527 has also been found in the small room 55, which is likewise located here. Most fragments of this vase, however, come from room 36.

209 Schaeffer 1962b, 121-127; 1966, 133-4; Courtois 1979a, cols. 1235-1240.

210 Instead of a palace, it is more likely that this building is one of the large mansions which were in close proximity to, but isolated from, the palace; see Callot 1986, 746. Comparable mansions have been found in the north-west: the house of tomb 50, see Callot 1986, 744-746, and in the Quartier Nord-Nord-Ouest excavated by J. Margueron in 1973, see Margueron 1977, 168-179. The maison d’Albâtres might also be included among this group; see above (H 4).

211 Courtois 1990.
an archive: in courtyard 203 and room 204 a great number of cuneiform tablets were found, in most cases economical in nature. In total, twelve specimens of Mycenaean pottery can be associated with this house, including three figurines. However, from only a few vases the findspot within the house is certain. Directly east of the large tomb 1, in the centre of the building, there is a cellar, room 219, comparable in architecture with the Cella of the Maison du prêtre Hurrite. In this cellar a great number of storage jars were found, as well as a Mycenaean pictorial amphoroid krater, the famous Maître du Cheveaux dating to late LHIIIIB (cat. no. 402) and probably produced in the Dodecanese or on the Aegean coast of Anatolia.212 Directly south of this room, in the entrance from courtyard 217 to room 216, a Minoan amphoroid krater decorated with an octopus was situated (cat. no. 479), again amongst pithoi. A third amphoroid krater (cat. no. 358) was found in this house. Although the exact findspot of this Mycenaean krater is not known, it is reported to have come from the communs, which were located in the south-east of the building, near courtyard 230 and the kitchen 226. A LHIIIB deep bowl (cat. no. 214) likewise has been found in this area of the house. Of all other specimens of Mycenaean pottery (see Table IX) associated with this house the findspot is unknown.213 Only of the equid figurine (cat. no. 1029) it is certain that it has been found within the building itself; the other finds may have been made outside.

![Fig. 5.3 Amphoroid krater with pictorial decoration (cat. no. 402) from room 219 in the Palais Sud](image)

The distribution of the Mycenaean pottery in this mansion is difficult to assess, as the findspot of so many pieces of Mycenaean pottery is unknown. There seems to be a rather high proportion of Aegean kraters. This may be of some significance, as it indicates that this vessel type was especially appreciated by the inhabitants of the house. At the same time, it must be stressed that two of these kraters were found among storage pottery, while another was located in the area of the kitchen. This indicates that these vessels were not highly valued possessions, but used in the every day life in the mansion.

Interestingly, apart from the figurines and two fragments, all the Aegean vases coming from the Palais Sud are dinner vessels: four kraters, two kylikes, and a deep bowl. The size of the mansion and its proximity to the royal palace suggest a high status for the inhabitants of the house. This may indicate that Mycenaean dinner vessels were appreciated more highly by persons of high status than storage vases. However, without knowledge of the proportions of

212 Courtois 1973, 155-161.
213 All have been found in 1965, when the Palais Sud and the surrounding area were explored; see Saadé 1979, 46.
local and Cypriot pottery, we cannot assume that this was only the case for Mycenaean vessels. The presence of Mycenaean pottery in this mansion shows that this material was in use among a group of very high-ranking citizens of Ugarit. At the same time, there is little evidence that they were prestige products.

The first purpose of this section is to review if a differentiation can be made within the general class of Mycenaean pottery in its occurrence among social groups within the society of Ugarit. The contexts which have been reviewed here can be grouped according to their function and role in society. The royal palace (H3), as the seat of power and the administrative centre, is unique and constitutes a class of its own. The relative paucity of Aegean finds in the palace has been commented upon above. Moreover, the only Mycenaean vessel from the palace of which the context can be reconstructed, has been found in the archives and should be associated with scribes, rather than with the court. The amount of Mycenaean pottery published from the palace is too small to ascertain if specific functional or decorative types were more popular than others. It can only be observed that a pictorial conical rhyton (cat. no. 297) and two dinner vessels were present. In general, the evidence suggests that Mycenaean pottery of any functional type was not widely used in the royal palace.

The large mansions, such as the Maison d'Albâtres (H4) and the Palais Sud (H11), which are located near the palace and probably were owned by officials high in the hierarchy of the state,214 constitute a second contextual group. In contrast to the palace, Mycenaean pottery was used by the inhabitants of these houses. On the basis of their context, the rhyta in the Maison d'Albâtres appear to have been highly prized possessions. This cannot be stated for dinner vessels, which occur in both mansions in contexts that associate them with domestic activities. Figurines were present in the Palais Sud, but storage vessels were absent from both mansions. Recently, the house of the trader Ourtenu has been investigated, it yielded at least five pictorial kraters.215

The smaller houses in Ugarit and its harbour town, which served domestic functions, but in which industrial and commercial activities were carried out as well,216 constitute the third group, comprising H1, H2, H7-H10 and possibly also the Maison au frittes (H5). This type of house is the most abundant in Ras Shamra217 and the limited but constant occurrence of Mycenaean pottery in these houses testifies to the wide use of such vessels among the population of Ugarit. Dinner and storage vessels occur in the houses that have been discussed here, just as figurines. However, Aegean rhyta occur only in the context of the Maison au frittes (H5), of which it is not altogether certain that it belongs to this group.218

Buildings in which religious or cultic associations are very strong, can be considered a fourth group, including the 'temples' in Minet el-Beida (R1) and the Centre Ville (R2), as well as the complex with the maison au prêtre Hurrite. Dinner and storage vessels occur in these contexts and both types may have been used in the rituals which took place in such buildings. This type of context has produced a high number of Mycenaean rhyta, which indicates that this vessel type had religious connotations. This does not seem to be the case for figurines, of which only one occurs in the Temple au rhytons.

Buildings with a strong industrial or commercial character constitute a fifth group. However, only one context treated here can be considered to belong to this category: the area with signs of metalworking (S1) in Minet el-Beida, where a deposit of 9 figurines was found.

214 Callot 1986, 746.
217 Callot 1994, 201.
218 There is little information on this house. The presence of the polychrome figurines suggests a certain wealth, or even cultic associations for this building.
Perhaps, the industrial area of the Maison d'Albâtre (H4) should be included in this contextual group as well, showing that dinner vessels also occur in such areas.

The last contextual group are refuse contexts: G1 and G2 and possibly the pits of house B in the Centre Ville. Within two of these contexts, only storage vessels are present, while the third consists exclusively of reused amphoroid krater fragments.

It is clear that Mycenaean pottery, as a general class, was used by many social groups in the society of Ugarit and its harbour town, although substantially less so in the royal palace. However, there seems to be a differentiation with regard to vessel type. Mycenaean rhyta occur mainly in contexts with strong religious associations and in buildings that reveal wealth and high status: the palace and the maison d’Albâtres. In the case of the Maison au frittes, these vessels are likewise associated with cult or wealth. The size and selectivity of the sample reviewed here makes it difficult to detect a differentiation between dinner and storage vessels. However, it is of interest that no storage vessels have been reported from the two mansions and the palace. Such vessels do occur in the average houses and in buildings with religious or cultic associations, while they are dominant in refuse contexts. Figurines seem to occur in all kinds of contexts.

The second purpose of this paragraph is to review the extent to which Mycenaean pottery was particularised, i.e. circumstances in which Mycenaean vessels are found with clear indications that it was used for specific purposes for which it seems to have been deliberately chosen.\(^{219}\) In general, Mycenaean pottery in Ugarit does not seem to have been subject to such particularisation: the majority of Mycenaean vessels and figurines are found in contexts indicating that they were part of a material assemblage that included mainly local objects and a minority of imported items. Even though the fact that the pottery was imported may have contributed to its significance,\(^{220}\) it is clear that it was an integral part of the cosmopolitan material culture. Nevertheless, there are a few occasions in Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida which indicate that particularisation of Mycenaean pottery did occur.

The first of these concerns the reused amphoroid krater fragments, which were found next to pit G1 in Minet el-Beida. It seems clear that Mycenaean amphoroid krater sherds were deliberately chosen to fulfil the unknown purpose of these esthèques. Moreover, they seem to have been deliberately deposited near the pit. A second example of particularisation concerns the deposit of Mycenaean figurines in the industrial area S1 in Minet el-Beida. Mycenaean figurines are associated with the activities that were conducted here, whatever they may have been. A third example are the straight-sided alabastra that were found together in House C in the Centre Ville (H9). The presence of a third vessel of the same type in the courtyard adjacent to this house suggests that these vessels were of a specific significance in and around this house.

The most obvious example of particularisation concerns Mycenaean rhyta, which, as seen above, have been found in three cases (R1, R2 and H6) in buildings with strong religious or cultic associations. Although the find contexts makes use of these vessels in religious ceremonies likely, it needs to be emphasised that in two cases (R1 and R2) Syrian rhyta were found associated with the Mycenaean specimens. In the case of the Maison au prêtre Hurrite

---

\(^{219}\) Hugh-Jones 1992, 58-59 shows how western goods are put to a variety of uses by Amazonian Indians and provide opportunities for both technological and symbolical innovation. A case of particularisation can be seen in Kalavassos-Ayios Dhimitrios (site no. 96) on Cyprus, where a large quantity of Mycenaean dinner vessels were discovered in a pit in building X, while only isolated specimens of storage vessels were found elsewhere on the site; see South & Russell 1993, 303-310.

\(^{220}\) The fact that objects derive from exotic places, as well as the social significance of the involvement in intercultural exchange infers symbolic value upon commodities in many cultures; see, for example, Humphrey & Hugh-Jones 1992, 4; Strathern 1992, 177 (both with extensive bibliographies on the subject).
(H6) a Syrian libation tube was present. This suggests that it was the function as rhyton, rather than their Mycenaean origin which led to the particularisation of these vessels. This seems less true for the Maison d’Albâtres (H4) where such rhyta were found in a context which indicates that they were highly prized possessions. However, the deposit in the Maison au frites (H5) also has local imitations interspersed with original Mycenaean vessels.

A last possible example of particularisation concerns Mycenaean kraters, which have in several instances (H6, H7, H8, H10) been found in courtyards. Even though they have been found in many other contexts as well, this vessel type does seem to have an association with activities conducted in such outdoor domestic spaces. The presence of local and Cypriot kraters in the courtyard of House A (H7) indicates that here, too, it was their function rather than their origin which led to the possible particularisation.

Finally, it needs to be remarked that no contexts have been identified in which Mycenaean pottery seems to have been particularised on the ground of its pictorial or plastic decoration. Although the decoration on the vessels will certainly have been noticed, it does not seem to have been of consequence for their use and appreciation.

**Funerary contexts**

The excavations at Ugarit began in 1928 with the chance discovery of a vaulted tomb in Minet el-Beida containing Mycenaean, Cypriot and Canaanite pottery. Since then, six other tombs of similar type have been found in the harbour town, while Ras Shamra has produced more than thirty of such tombs. At both sites, these tombs are situated below the buildings. In some cases, the walls of the funerary cellars and those of the house above are structurally combined, which indicates construction in the same building phase. However, in other cases, there is evidence for the incorporation of older tombs in more recent structures. The funerary cellars consist of a vaulted chamber, to which a smaller room (ossuaire) may be added. In many tombs, pits dug in the floor have been found filled with bones, while niches in the walls have produced lamps and ceramics. The funerary chamber communicates with the building above through a short stepped dromos, which is covered by stone slabs. Often, the room in which the dromos starts is not the same as the one below which the funerary cellar is located. Architecturally, the vaulted tombs of Ugarit belong to a Syrian funerary tradition. In Ras Shamra itself vaulted tombs dating from the Middle Bronze Age have been found, which are somewhat smaller and do not possess a dromos. An Aegean origin for this type of tomb, as was suspected by Schaeffer, can be ruled out. The only parallel in the Aegean is tomb Rho in Grave Circle B at Mycenae, which is unique and suspected to be Syrian, or the result of Levantine influence. The tombs at Ugarit were used for many generations. A good example is tomb 53 in the Ville Basse: the lowest level of this tomb contained finds from the 17th and

---

221 The two pictorial rhyta found together in room BD of the Maison d’Albâtres (H4) and the two hedgehog rhyta in the Maison au frites may be exceptions to this pattern. However, as all these vessels concern rhyta, of which a particular use is certain, it is more likely that their shape is responsible for the particularisation.

222 Saadé 1995, 213.

223 Courtois 1979a, col. 1201 mentions that the funerary cellars at Ras Shamra “...sont au nombre d’un trentaine.” Two tombs have since then been discovered in the Centre Ville, see Salles 1987, 157. Another tomb has recently been discovered in the RS SC, see Yon 1997a, 97.

224 Callot 1994, 169.

225 Courtois 1979a, col. 1200.

226 Schaeffer 1936, 142; 1938, 248. Most of the Middle Bronze Age tombs have been found in the Ville Basse. In one of them, sherds from a MMI Kamara cup have been discovered; see Caubet 1982, 17.

227 Schaeffer 1939, 78-99.

16th century, while the upper level produced material from the 14th century, among which an LHIII A2 stirrup jar (cat. no. 199). Schaeffer suspected that each house in Ras Shamra possessed its own tomb. Recent research, however, has shown that many houses did not have a funerary cellar, especially in the latest phase of Ugarit, while some tombs cannot be associated with a single structure. Moreover, most tombs seem to have had independent access from the outside. The relationship between the deceased in the tombs and the houses to which they belong architecturally, therefore, is not altogether clear. Also, there is evidence that people were buried in other types of graves. In the western part of Minet el-Beida, two burials were excavated, which consisted of rectangular pits dug in bedrock, while from Ras Shamra there are two reports of inhumations of different type. It is a premise of funerary analysis that the social life of deceased persons is reflected and reinterpreted in mortuary practices, which can be recognised in the archaeological record of the burial. For the reasons outlined above, however, it is impossible to determine whether the vaulted tombs of Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida are related to one family or to a wider social group. Moreover, the long use of the cellars makes it impossible to assess which items of the tomb’s inventory were part of one and the same funerary ceremony. Finally, all but two tombs have been pillaged, which complicates matters even further.

Table X lists all the tombs in Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida in which Mycenaean pottery has been found. These tombs can be analysed on a number of points. First, the amount of Mycenaean pottery in the tombs will be discussed. This will reveal the extent to which Mycenaean ceramics were considered appropriate as a funerary gift. Moreover, it may show differences among tombs in this respect. Secondly, the variety of Aegean pot shapes will be reviewed, in order to see if specific vessel types were popular in funerary ceremonies. Finally, the variety of the tomb inventories associated with the Mycenaean pottery will be considered. This may establish whether differences in the repertoire of the Aegean ceramics among tombs can be related to the rest of the inventory.

Table X lists 38 graves from Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida which have produced Mycenaean pottery. All but two - the burial in the royal palace and the *enchytrismos* from the eastern end of the site - concern vaulted tombs. In Minet el-Beida a total of seven such tombs have been excavated. Of these, tomb I certainly contained Mycenaean pottery, as it was this grave which led to the beginning of archaeological research at Ugarit. However, as none of the finds of tomb I have been published, they are absent from the catalogue. From tomb II and tomb VII no Mycenaean pottery has been reported. Likewise, not all tombs at Ras Shamra, have

---

230 Schaeffer 1939a, 72, 78-79 figs. 69-71.
231 Schaeffer 1939a, 30; see, also, Courtois 1968, 20.
233 Schaeffer 1933, 99-100. Both burials produced finds dating from the 15th and 14th centuries BC.
234 Schaeffer 1949, 180 (under no. 11) speaks of a “...sépulture anciennement évacuée”; see also note 98. The only information about this burial is that a skull was found together with a Syrian bottle and a Mycenaean LHIIIIB chalice (cat. no., 465). The remains of a child were found buried in a large jar in the Trench Terrasse Est; see Courtois 1979a col. 1209. This burial also contained a Mycenaean stirrup jar: catalogue no. 469.
235 Binford 1971; Hodder 1982b, 141-146.
236 In the Ville Basse tomb 13 was found undisturbed; see Schaeffer 1936, 140-142, while in the Ville Sud tomb 4253 was intact; see L. Courtois, 1969, 120-137.
237 Due to the pillaging of tombs and the long use, only very marked differences between tombs can be considered of significance.
238 It must be remembered that of virtually none of the tombs the whole inventory has been published.
produced Mycenaean ceramics. Courtois estimates that some thirty vaulted funeral cellars have been found at Ras Shamra. Considering that a total of thirty-two tombs with Mycenaean pottery can be abstracted from the publications, it is clear that in a large majority of cases this material was part of the funerary inventory.

There are substantial differences between the tombs in the quantities of Mycenaean pottery that have been reported. It is clear that from some tombs not all the material has been published. The pillaging of the tombs may also have resulted in the loss of Mycenaean ceramics. Of the two tombs that have been found intact, tomb 13 in the Ville Basse produced 6 Aegean specimens, while tomb 4253 yielded two Mycenaean pots. These figures show that the numbers listed for most funerary cellars are not unrealistic: with the exception of tombs III, IV, V and VI in Minet el-Beida and tomb 2698 in the Ville Sud, the figures for most burials lie between one and eight Mycenaean pots. Considering the long time in which these tombs could be used and the number of burials, these figures indicate that, in general, Mycenaean pottery was only a minor item used during the funerary ceremonies.

Five tombs deviate from this pattern. In Minet el-Beida tomb III has produced eighteen pieces of Aegean ceramics, while from tomb IV nineteen, from tomb V fifteen and from tomb VI forty-three specimens of Aegean pottery have been published. At Ras Shamra, tomb 2698 in the Ville Sud has produced twenty-one Mycenaean vessels. The tombs at Minet el-Beida are exceptionally large in comparison with those at Ras Shamra and contained a rich and varied inventory. Nevertheless, it is clear that in these five tombs the associations with the Aegean are particularly strong.

Table XI lists the vessel shapes that occur in the tombs of Ugarit. The first observation to be made on the basis of this table, is that, in contrast with the general pattern at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida, storage vessels are more abundant in tombs than dinner vessels. This pattern is not completely consistent for all tombs: from seven burials more dinner than storage vessels have been published, while in six cases the proportions are equal. The predominance of storage vessels is almost entirely due to the number of stirrup jars found in tombs. Of the 38 tombs listed in Table X and XI, a large majority has produced such jars. In total, 123 stirrup jars have been reported from Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra, the majority of which from a funerary context.

Such is the case for the Late Bronze Age tomb in the Centre Ville; see Yon, Caubet, Mallet 1982, 179. Tombs 22 and 28 at the Ville Basse contained local and Cypriot, but no Aegean, pottery; see Schaeffer 1949, 162-163. From three tombs only local imitations of Mycenaean pottery have been reported; see Monchambert 1983, 36-37: no. 3, Margueron 1977, 178 (tomb at A6dNO); Courtois & Courtois 1978, 358: no. 1 (tomb 10), Schaeffer 1938, 319, fig. 47 (tomb 50).

In tomb VI in Minet el-Beida contained 282 Mycenaean pots and 35 Mycenaean figurines; see Courtois 1979a, col. 1283. However, only thirty-eight vessels and four figurines have been published.

In tomb 13 the remains of 44 individuals were recognised; see Vallois & Ferembach 1962, 566.

In tombs III and V from Minet el-Beida, as well as in tombs 1 and 5 or 6 in RS Acr., tomb 37 in RS Ch. C, tomb 4642 in RS QR and tomb 30 in RS VB, dinner vessels occur more often than storage vessels. Tombs 2, 4, 29 (RS Acr.), tomb 23 (RS Ch. C), tomb 4642 (RS QR) and tomb 449 (RS SA) each have produced one specimen of either category. These deviations from the general pattern for tombs are slight and too random to represent a difference in funerary practices. They might, in fact, to a large extent be caused by circumstances of publication.

Thirteen have been found in a domestic context, 3 in a ritual and 2 in a general settlement context. The context of 43 stirrup jars is unknown. The proportion of stirrup jars in tombs (33.8 % of all vases in a funerary context) is considerably higher than its proportion in general (20.1 % of all vases at both sites).
Another vessel type which often has a funerary context are bowls, of which twenty-nine have been published from tombs. More than half of all Mycenaean bowls at Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra come from a tomb, which suggests that funerary use was an important function for this dinner vessel. The same may be said for cups, of which twenty out of a total of thirty-two specimens in Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida have a funerary context. In the case of kraters, however, which also often occur in a funerary context, a larger amount has been found outside tombs, as is the case for piriform jars. For both vessel types a funerary use does not seem to have been a primary function. All other Mycenaean pot shapes and the figurines occur only to a limited degree in tombs.

Mycenaean pictorial vessels are not very common in the tombs at Ugarit. As is clear from Table 5.10, only a minority of this type of vases have been found in a funerary context. The large number of pictorial finds without a known context does argue for some caution, however. Only nine tombs listed in Table X have yielded Mycenaean pictorial pots, among which were kraters, bowls and a stemmed cup. The fact that these nine tombs are situated in various areas of Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida suggests that it was not a specific group among the population who included pictorial vessels in their funerary ritual. Only three tombs have produced more than one Mycenaean pot with pictorial decoration: tombs IV and VI in Minet el-Beida and tomb 2698 in the RS VB. Each of these tombs has produced many Mycenaean pots in general and the presence of pictorial pots probably is a result of an accumulation of Mycenaean vessels. As was also concluded for their use in settlement contexts, the pictorial decoration of Mycenaean pots does not seem to have been of consequence for their use in funerary practices.

There is clearly a pattern in the occurrence of the different Aegean vessel types in tombs. The pot shapes which have a high frequency in funerary contexts occur in the majority of tombs. Even vessel types that are not very current in this type of context, appear in more than one funerary cellar. Only the absence of a krater from tomb V in Minet el-Beida and that of a cup and a piriform jar in tomb IV of the harbour town can be considered as deviations from this pattern. This relative homogeneity in the presence of Aegean pot shapes in the tombs suggests that various groups in the society at Ugarit used the same type of Mycenaean pots in funerary practices.

There is clearly a pattern in the occurrence of the different Aegean vessel types in tombs. The pot shapes which have a high frequency in funerary contexts occur in the majority of tombs. Even vessel types that are not very current in this type of context, appear in more than one funerary cellar. Only the absence of a krater from tomb V in Minet el-Beida and that of a cup and a piriform jar in tomb IV of the harbour town can be considered as deviations from this pattern. This relative homogeneity in the presence of Aegean pot shapes in the tombs suggests that various groups in the society at Ugarit used the same type of Mycenaean pots in funerary practices.
their funerary practices. Figurines show an exception to this pattern, as they occur in only four funerary cellars: tomb III, IV and VI in Minet el-Beida and tomb 81 in the Ville Basse. Moreover, in these four cases, figurines are relatively abundant in comparison with the various Mycenaean vessel types. It appears, therefore, as if Mycenaean figurines played a special role in the funerary ceremonies for the owners of these four tombs. It may be of significance that three of these tombs are situated in Minet el-Beida and also constitute exceptions concerning the quantities of Mycenaean pottery that they produced (see above).

The fact that virtually all the funerary cellars in Ugarit and its harbour town have been pillaged makes it impossible to analyse the tombs in terms of their wealth in finds. The fragmentary and selective publication of the funerary inventories, likewise, prevents any classification according to their wealth. What is certain is that the presence of Mycenaean pottery is not a reliable indicator for the status of the people buried in the funeral cellar. Tomb 50, in the Quartier Nord Ouest, for example, had a rich and varied inventory, but did not contain Aegean ceramics. On the other hand, the tomb in the royal palace, the top of Ugaritic society, did contain Mycenaean wares. In general, local Syrian pottery was much more abundant in the tombs of Ras Shamra than imported wares. This is true for the two tombs that have been found undisturbed, as well as for most other tombs from which the inventory can be reconstructed. An exception to this rule appears to be tomb 2698 in the Ville Sud, from which only the Mycenaean pottery, a local imitation of a Mycenaean stirrup jar and a Cypriot White Slip II bowl have been reported. However, it is possible that in this case the Syrian pottery has been left out of the publication. Cypriot pottery seems to have been at least as abundant in most tombs as Mycenaean wares. In several cases Egyptian alabaster vases have been reported. Although the number of imports in most funerary cellars seem to be relatively small in comparison with local products, their occurrence in the majority of tombs indicates that they played a consistent role in Ugaritic funeral rites. The fact that Aegean pottery in funeral contexts almost always seems to be associated with other imports suggests similarities in appreciation.

With regard to their inventories, the tombs in Minet el-Beida constitute exceptional cases. Not only have they produced a wealth of finds, they are the only tombs in which Mycenaean pottery seems the most abundant class of material. The large tomb VI in Minet el-Beida, which contained 282 Aegean pots and thirty-five Mycenaean figurines, also produced eighty-six pieces of Cypriot pottery, twenty-six specimens of local manufacture and some Egyptian alabaster vases. A krater of so-called Late Grey Minyan Ware, probably of north-western Anatolian origin, was also discovered in this tomb, just as a great number of faience flasks. In the case of tomb VI in Minet el-Beida, only five of the thirty-five Mycenaean figurines found have been published; see Courtois 1979a, col. 1283. It is quite possible that a similar situation exists for the other tombs in the harbour town. Schaeffer 1938, 317-320. Schaeffer 1951, 7-8. Egyptian alabaster vases and an ivory pyxis were also part of the inventory. Tomb 13 contained 30 Syrian flasks, bowls and jugs, 4 Cypriot Base Ring II jugs, 1 Cypriot WSII bowl; see Schaeffer 1936, 121-123. Tomb 4253 produced 44 local vases and six Cypriot WSII bowls; see L. Courtois 1969, 128-129. See, for example, tomb 37 in the Chantier C, from which 7 local vases, 1 Cypriot White Slip II bowl and a Cypriot Base Ring II jug have been published: Schaeffer 1949, 164-165. From tomb 29 on the Acropole, a Syrian flask, lamp and dipper have been reported, but no Cypriot wares: Schaeffer 1949, 162-163. From tomb 22 on RS Acr. local and Cypriot pottery is known, while tomb 28 apparently produced only local wares: Schaeffer 1949, 162-163. Courtois & Courtois 1978, 342-345. Courtois 1979a, cols. 1283-1284; see, also, note 242.
From tomb III have been published eighteen specimens of Mycenaean pottery, eleven Cypriot and twenty-three local pots. This tomb also produced the famous ivory pyxis lid, which incorporates obvious Aegean artistic elements, but is probably of Levantine manufacture.

From tomb IV nineteen pieces of Aegean pottery are known, as are six Cypriot vases and ten local pots. Tomb V produced fifteen Aegean vessels. The amount of Cypriot pottery is unknown for tomb V, but three pieces of local pottery have been published.

According to Courtois, the tombs in Minet el-Beida distinguish themselves in the diversity of their inventories, in which a relatively large number of objects from the Aegean, Cyprus, Egypt and Anatolia are found. It appears that the owners of these tombs wished to express foreign relationships in general and with the Aegean in particular in their funerary ceremonies.

The first purpose of this section was to investigate if Aegean pottery was limited to specific groups of tombs. Even though it is impossible to classify the funeral cellars on the basis of their inventories, the answer to this question seems to be negative: Mycenaean pottery occurs in the majority of tombs at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida. These burials can be assigned to high-status groups within Ugaritic society (for example, the royal tomb), to buildings with religious associations (for example, tomb 3709 of the Maison au prêtre Hurrite), and to more average houses in the towns. The repertoire of pot shapes in funerary contexts is fairly homogeneous, with the exception of figurines. The occurrence of a small amount of Mycenaean pottery in virtually all funerary cellars of Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida reflects the situation in non-funerary contexts and testifies of the extent to which imported Mycenaean pottery was part of the local material culture.

A significant observation is that there is a group of tombs that possessed a substantially larger quantity of Mycenaean vessels. Within this group, three tombs, all in Minet el-Beida, are among the few that have produced Mycenaean idols. The funeral cellars in the harbour town possessed a large number of imports from other areas as well and they seem to express international relations in general. However, as far as can be deduced from the publications, the connections with the Aegean seem particularly strong. The fact that these tombs are located in the harbour town of Ugarit suggests that they were related to groups of people involved in shipping and transportation. With this hypothesis in mind, the owners of tomb 2698 in the Ville Sud, likewise, may have been involved in the same activities.

The second purpose of this section was to establish if certain vessel types were specifically intended for funerary use. Such a function has been attested for stirrup jars, bowls and cups. Each of these shapes has a more frequent occurrence in tombs than in non-funerary contexts. It must be stressed, however, that a funerary context is the most frequent for Mycenaean pottery in general. Moreover, each of these vessel types also occurs in different kinds of context. It cannot, therefore, be stated that these vessels were appreciated mainly for their funerary function. Rather, their specific functions in burial ceremonies may have resulted in a high occurrence of stirrup jars, bowls and cups in a funerary context.

263 Schaeffer 1949, 144-149.
264 Schaeffer 1929, 292; Kantor 1947, 89-90; Poursat 1977, 145.
265 Schaeffer 1949, 150-151.
266 Courtois 1979a, col. 1283-1284.
267 The occurrence of imports from other areas in tomb 2698 in the Ville Sud, can not be established since only the pottery has been (partly) published; see Courtois & Courtois 1978, 342-345. From tomb 81 in the Ville Basse, which is exceptional as the only one in Ras Shamra with Mycenaean idols, predominantly Syrian pottery, one Cypriot WSII bowl and three Mycenaean vases have been published; see Schaeffer 1949, 170-171. It is doubtful whether this tomb can be considered to express international relations.
268 See Table 5.2 above. Most likely this is caused by the fact that this kind of context is most easily recognised.
The role of Mycenaean pottery in the material culture of Ugarit

Mycenaean and Minoan ceramic vessels and Mycenaean figurines are the only imports at Ugarit which are of certain Aegean origin. Even though imports constitute only a small percentage of the total of finds made at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida, the occurrence of objects from many different area is a characteristic of the material culture in Ugarit and a sign of the cosmopolitan culture of the Levant in the LBA in general. Within such a material environment, ceramic vessels from the Aegean constitute only a small part of the total body of imported goods and cannot automatically be considered as highly valued on the basis of their exotic origin. Indeed, one of the conclusions of this chapter is that Mycenaean pottery was fairly common at Ugarit: it has been found in all excavated parts of Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida and it occurs in different type of contexts. Moreover, the analysis of closed deposits has revealed that Mycenaean pottery, even though a minor item from a quantitative point of view, was an integral part of the material culture at both sites.

This being said, some other observations have been made in this chapter that shed light on the appreciation of Mycenaean pottery. Aegean vessels dating to the earlier part of the Late Bronze Age (LHII-LHIIIA1), while scarce, have been found in several parts of Ras Shamra and in Minet el-Beida. This indicates that these vessels were not monopolised by one social group, but circulated internally. Among the pottery in LHIIIA2 style storage vessels occur more often than dinner vessels. This is in contrast to pottery in LHIIIB style, where the opposite is the case. This difference between the two periods does not seem to be connected with different social groups using the Mycenaean pottery: the spatial and contextual distribution of such pottery does not significantly change. If the contents of Mycenaean closed vessels were to a high degree responsible for their appreciation, one would expect to see a difference in spatial and contextual distribution upon the introduction of many open vessel types during LHIIIB. The fact that this is not the case suggests that Mycenaean pottery was appreciated for its character as fine ware and not only for the contents of the closed vessels.

A second observation concerns Mycenaean rhyta. It has been shown that they had specific uses in ritual ceremonies and were obviously highly valued. This contrasts with the other Aegean vessel types at the two sites and illustrates that Mycenaean pottery should not be considered a homogeneous class of material. In all cases where rhyta have been found in a ritual context (R1, H4, H5, H6, R2), local specimens of similar vessels were present as well. This indicates that it was the use of these vessels within the local cults of Ugarit which determined their high appreciation, rather than their Mycenaean origin. The occurrence of several kraters of Mycenaean, local and Cypriot origin in courtyard 1043 of House A in the Centre Ville (H7), as well as the presence of a Mycenaean jug and a local piriform jar and Minoan and Mycenaean stirrup jars in House E (H10) in the same area indicate that other vessel types too were appreciated mainly for their functional use. On this basis, we may safely assume that the popularity of Aegean stirrup jars in tombs can be ascribed to the role they and their contents served in funerary ceremonies.

The presence of Mycenaean pottery in tombs shows, in general, a fairly homogeneous pattern: almost all tombs have produced a few Mycenaean vessels, among which stirrup jars,
bowls, cups and kraters are the most frequent vessel types. Five tombs, however, deviate
substantially from this pattern and possess a far larger number of Mycenaean pottery, while
some of them also include Mycenaean figurines in their inventory. Most of these exceptional
tombs have produced a large number of objects imported from elsewhere as well. Apparently,
a minority of people in Ugarit and its harbour town chose to reflect international relations in
their funerary ceremonies. This phenomenon shows, firstly, that the import of Aegean pottery
was of some significance within the society of Ugarit. Secondly, it shows that such ceramic
objects were valuable enough to become part of a social strategy of display. It may be
stated, therefore, that, even if Mycenaean pottery was a fairly common element in Ugarit’s
material culture, it was not without value and its consumption was socially significant. This
point is exemplified by the coarse ware stirrup jars that have been found in funerary and ritual
contexts. The use of these vessels in burial and religious ceremonies testifies that such objects
were embodied with symbolic meanings going beyond the mere functional.

The observation that the Aegean pottery at Ugarit was not without value seems to be
confirmed by the fact that it was imitated. To catalogue II a list of thirty-four vessels is
appended which are of local manufacture, but inspired by Aegean prototypes. Moreover,
seven items included in the catalogue proper have a possible local origin. In some cases, the
pots in the appendix imitate Aegean examples in both shape and decoration, in other cases
aspects of Mycenaean pottery are adopted in vessels of non-Aegean type. In addition to
these ceramic imitations, two examples exist of finds in different material which were clearly
inspired by Aegean pottery. In the Ville Sud a conical rhyton made from electrum has been
discovered. This vessel - a clear imitation of a Mycenaean rhyton, at least in shape - was
found in a domestic context, associated with several Syrian bowls in gold and silver; it was
probably produced locally. In Minet el-Beida, a globular stirrup jar made from faience was
found during the first campaign in 1929.

All the local pottery of Aegean inspiration at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida seems to
imitate LHIII ware; vessels deriving from LHII pottery have not been found. This is
understandable in view of the small amount of early Mycenaean vessels occurring at Ugarit.
Another observation which can be made concerns the functional types of the locally produced

271 According to Appadurai 1986, 31-32 social actors can, even within a fixed value system, send social
messages through the manipulation of consumptive patterns. Thus, certain classes of objects can become part of
social strategies.
272 The fact that only a minority of the inhabitants of Ugarit chose to use Mycenaean pottery in such strategies,
perhaps may point to the existence of different regimes of value: situations where the same objects have
different social meaning for different social groups; see Appadurai 1986, 14-15.
273 According to Renfrew (1986, 148-149), the fact that objects are made to look like other products can be
interpreted as a sign that the original is regarded as of some value.
274 This appendix is not complete; it is entirely possible that more such vessels are found in Minet el-Beida and
Ras Shamra. Without chemical analyses it is impossible to determine whether these items were indeed
produced locally, or elsewhere outside the Aegean. However, Monchambert (1983, 27-29) seems to suggest that
Aegean imitations were produced at Ugarit.
275 See note 81.
276 For example, the vertical flask (FS 186) with catalogue no. 2016, the conical rhyton (FS 199) with catalogue
no. 2017 and the stirrup jar (FS 171-173) with catalogue no. 2025.
277 For example, the rhyton with catalogue no. 2019 and the alabastron with catalogue no. 2033. Monchambert
(1983, 29-31) shows that the Ugaritic potters innovated Canaanite pottery according to their own cultural
framework. The addition of foreign elements seem to have been part of such innovations.
278 Schaeffer 1966, 131.
279 Schaeffer 1929, pl. 52: no. 4. It is uncertain whether this specimen was produced in Ugarit itself. Imitations
of Mycenaean stirrup jars in faience are mostly known from Egypt; see Bell 1983; Hankey 1995a, 117, 123, pl.
23.
Aegean style pottery. Dinner and storage vessels, as well as rhyta are imitated, but figurines of Syrian manufacture that imitate Aegean types have not been published. Two vessels in the appendix of catalogue II can be considered as coarse ware, while two others may represent plain or monochrome examples. In addition, locally produced pots of Aegean type possess linear, patterned, pictorial and plastic decoration. It appears that imitation of Aegean ceramics was not confined to specific parts of the imported repertoire, but concerned all types of pottery.

Locally produced pottery of Mycenaean type was widely distributed in Ugarit: it occurs in most of the important excavated parts of Ras Shamra and in Minet el-Beida. Moreover, it has been found in domestic as well as in funerary contexts. It has been noted above that in several instances local imitations have been discovered in association with similar imported vessels. All this suggests that the appreciation of locally produced Aegean vessels was similar to that of original imports. This constitutes another indication that Aegean-style pots were valued mainly for their functional use, rather than for their exotic origin. This would be in accordance with the observation made by Albert Leonard Jr. that the most popular imported Mycenaean pot shapes - one-handled cups, shallow and deep bowls, kraters - reflect specific gaps in the Syro-Palestinian ceramic repertoire.

The final question to be addressed in this chapter concerns the social groups within the society of Ugarit that made use of the imported Aegean pottery. As we have seen, Mycenaean pottery pottery was used in the royal palace, but not to a greater extent than elsewhere in the town. The only Mycenaean find from the palace (H3) of which the context could be reconstructed, a Mycenaean bowl, is likely to have been associated with people working in the palace, rather than with the royal court itself. Mycenaean pottery seems to have been an integral part of the material surroundings of many urban inhabitants. It has been encountered in several of the large mansions in the vicinity of the palace, as well as in more modest habitations and in religious contexts. Moreover, the majority of tombs at Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra possessed such pottery. There does, however, seem to have been a differentiation with regard to vessel type: rhyta were limited to large mansions and religious buildings, while there is some, though not conclusive, evidence that the wealthier habitations at Ugarit made use mainly of Aegean dinner vessels, while both dinner and storage vessels occur in more modest dwellings.

The population of the city of Ugarit was socially stratified. Even so, there is evidence that the capital was inhabited by the upper social strata within the kingdom as a whole. No systematic field survey has been conducted in the territory of Ugarit and we cannot assess the occurrence of Mycenaean pottery in the villages and towns in the kingdom. Within the territory

---

280 Catalogue nos. 2002 and 2005. The publication of these vessels does not allow to determine if they were decorated.
281 Catalogue nos. 2003 and 2020. No. 2003 is the top of a stirrup jar with an incised sign on its handle; perhaps it should rather be classified as coarse ware. Moreover, it is possible that it was decorated. The rhyton with no. 2020 deviates substantially from Mycenaean types.
282 Of all larger excavated areas of Ras Shamra, RS PR, RS Acr. and RS Ch.C are the only ones absent from catalogue II.
283 Such is the case in the Maison au frittes (H5), in house E in the Centre Ville (H10), in tombs III and VI in Minet el-Beida (cat. nos. 2001 and 2005 respectively) and in tomb 2698 in the Ville Sud (cat. no. 2032).
284 There is some additional evidence that local imitations were not without value. In the house of tomb 50 in the Quartier Nord-Ouest, such a vessel was found associated with vases in gold and silver; see Schaeffer 1939a, 130. A deep bowl that was locally manufactured (cat. no. 2023) has been found in the large mansion of the Palais Sud, while a piriform jar (cat. no. 2010) and a vertical flask (cat. no. 2016) have been found in the mansion of RS NNO.
of Ugarit, Mycenaean pottery has been found at Ras el-Bassit (site no. 127),\textsuperscript{286} Ras Ibn Hani (site no. 130),\textsuperscript{287} Lattakia (site no. 131),\textsuperscript{288} Tell Sukas (site no. 132)\textsuperscript{289} and Tell Nahr al-'Arab (site no. 335).\textsuperscript{290} From three other sites which have been explored marginally in the territory of Ugarit, Qat’at ar-Rouss,\textsuperscript{291} Arab al-Moulk,\textsuperscript{292} and Tell Darouk,\textsuperscript{293} no Mycenaean pottery has been reported. Most of the sites which did produce Late Helladic ware are located near the coast and fulfilled functions as a harbours.\textsuperscript{294}

The picture that seems to emerge is that Mycenaean pottery was used mainly by the ‘people of the king’. This group of people, who lived in the capital and, possibly, in harbour towns, consisted mainly of specialists: priests, merchants and military personnel, as well as a multitude of artisans.\textsuperscript{295} The status of these groups within the social fabric of Ugaritic society varied. In some cases important posts and considerable wealth could be acquired. However, for butchers, bakers, carpenters, potters, palace servants and many other professional groups this was not the case. As a whole, this group constitutes a sub-elite in Ugaritic society, which was internally highly diversified. Imported Aegean ceramic ware seems to have served as a suitable means of expression for these groups of people.

\textsuperscript{286} Courbin 1986, 181-183, 187.
\textsuperscript{287} Lagarce et al. 1983; Bounni et al. 1979.
\textsuperscript{288} Hankey 1967, 113: site no. 6.
\textsuperscript{289} Pleug 1973, 6.
\textsuperscript{290} Schaeffer 1933, 126-127. A trial trench was dug at this site, four kilometres north of Ras Shamra, in 1933; Cypriot and Mycenaean pottery was found.
\textsuperscript{291} Forrer 1939, 113-125. A trial trench was dug here by E. Forrer in 1935.
\textsuperscript{292} Riis 1958-1959, 112-113. A trial trench was dug here by Paul Riis in 1958.
\textsuperscript{293} Riis 1960, 115-117. A trial trench was dug here by Paul Riis in 1959.
\textsuperscript{294} The site Tell Nahr al-'Arab is located a few kilometres inland, near a river, leading to the sea.
\textsuperscript{295} At least forty different professional groups have been recognised among the people of the king; see Liverani 1979, col. 1339-1341.
CHAPTER 6

Hazor

Introduction

Hazor is situated at the foot of the eastern ridge of the upper Galilee mountain range, in the northern Jordan valley, about sixteen kilometres north of Lake Tiberias and some seven kilometres west of the present-day course of the Jordan river. The site lies on a mound, known as Tell el-Qedeh, which consists of two parts (Map 14). In the south-east, the upper *tell* - or acropolis - rises about forty metres above the floor of the adjacent valley. To its north-west and separated from it by a small, but relatively deep valley, stretches the vast lower plateau. The foothills and plains surrounding the site provide good opportunities for agriculture and pastoralism. The site is located favourably with regard to ancient land-routes, its proximity to a ford in the Jordan river making it a key point on the routes from Palestine to Damascus and to the Beqaa valley in the north.  

The first archaeological interest in the site was taken by J.L. Porter, who not only described the mound and some of the visible remains on the surface, but tentatively suggested that Biblical Hazor had been located there. His ideas were forgotten however, and Tell el-Qedeh was re-identified with Hazor by John Garstang, who visited the site in 1926. In 1928 Garstang conducted excavations at Hazor, during which five soundings were made on the lower plateau, while seven trenches were dug on the acropolis. According to Garstang, the lower plateau served as a kind of fortified camp during the Late Bronze Age, while permanent structures were present only on the upper *tell*. In 1955 renewed excavations commenced, directed by Yigael Yadin of the Hebrew University at Jerusalem. Three campaigns were conducted under his direction up to 1958. In 1965, some soundings were made by Yadin and his team on the edges of the mound. In order to clarify various stratigraphical problems, a final campaign was held in 1968. Yadin’s campaigns have been fully published in the series *Hazor* (vols. I-V). Excavations have resumed at Hazor since 1990, led by Amnon Ben-Tor, as a joint project of the Berman centre for Biblical Archaeology at the Hebrew University and Complutense.

---

1 Yadin 1972, 14-15.
2 Garstang 1931, 183. See, however, Kühne (1973, 62 note 301) for doubts on the existence of a trade route from Hazor to Damascus.
3 Porter 1875, 414-415; 1881, 270.
4 Garstang 1927.
5 Yadin 1972, 19-22. The result of Garstang’s excavations were never published, although one of his books (Garstang 1931, 381-383) contains a short description of the work. In 1969 Garstang’s notebook came in the possession of Y. Yadin, who published a summary of it (1972, 18-22).
7 Because of its main sponsor, the campaigns are called the James A. Rothschild expedition. For an overview of the organisation of the campaigns, as well as for the methods employed, see Yadin 1972, 23-25.
8 Yadin 1972, 25. These soundings were carried out because construction works for a public building threatened the northern rampart of the eastern spur of the mound.
9 Yadin 1972, 25-26; Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 1.
The earliest structures at Hazor have been discovered on the higher tell only and date from the Early Bronze Age II period. In total three clear phases from the Early Bronze Age could be distinguished, as well as scanty remains of the MBI period. During the second phase of the Middle Bronze Age (circa 1900-1600 BC) Hazor developed into a substantial city, which encompassed the whole mound and included domestic structures, public and religious buildings, as well as graves, defensive works and elaborate systems for drainage and water provision. Egyptian execration texts, as well as documents from Mari testify of the importance of Hazor during MBII, with a special Babylonian ambassador from Hammurabi residing in the city. The remains of the first phase of the Late Bronze Age likewise testify of a prosperous town. Of particular importance are the remains of monumental temples and palatial structures from this phase. The LBI city is mentioned in Egyptian city-lists of subject towns, but it is difficult to establish whether Hazor was actually conquered. In comparison with the prosperity of the first phase of the Late Bronze Age, the remains from LBII appear less prosperous, with houses more irregularly built and at least two monumental temples abandoned. The Amarna letters, however, testify that Hazor was still important in this period, since its ruler addressed himself to pharaoh as ‘king’, possibly meaning that he was not subject to Egyptian rule. The last phase of the Late Bronze II period came to a violent end, after which only the upper tell was resettled. In the Early Iron Ages I and II (ca. 1200-700 BC) an Israelite settlement was situated here, including substantial fortifications, a palace-like monumental structure, as well as an impressive waterreservoir. Early in the seventh century BC an Assyrian citadel was founded on the acropolis. This citadel continued in the Persian period, probably accompanied by agricultural habitation, while the site seems to have acted as the location for an isolated fort during the third and second centuries BC. After this period the site does not seem to have been inhabited, but it is clear that the lower plateau has been used for agricultural purposes.

The stratigraphy at Hazor for the Late Bronze Age is extremely complex, especially with regard to correlating the various excavated areas (Map 14). In areas C, H and 210 three Late Bronze Age strata were discovered. These have been labelled stratum 2 (LBI), stratum 1B
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12 Yadin 1972, 119-120.
14 Yadin 1972, 1-6.
15 Yadin 1972, 6, 32, 39, 44-45, 49-5062, 79-83, 98-100, 102-104, 125-126. For approximate absolute dates, see Table I.
16 The lists have also been interpreted as constituting travel itineraries, see Bienkowski 1987, 54-55 (with references).
18 EA 227, see Yadin 1972, 7-9; Bienkowski 1987, 55. In another letter (EA 228), however, king ‘Abdi Tirshi calls himself the servant of pharaoh.
22 Yadin 1972, 194-196.
23 Yadin 1972, 196-197.
24 Yadin 1972, 37.
25 Yadin 1972, 32-37 (area C), 79-95 (area H); Yadin et al. 1989, 302 (area 210).
 Areas F and K showed a similar stratigraphy, but many places it was impossible to distinguish strata 1B and 1A. In areas D and E, the natural rock lay immediately below the surface and it was difficult to find an undisturbed stratigraphy. In the cisterns discovered in these areas, however, a distinction between layers from LBI, LBIIA and LBIIB could often be made. Three levels from the Late Bronze Age were also discovered in area BA on top of the acropolis, while in areas B, L and G two LBA phases could be distinguished.

Of considerable controversy has been the stratigraphical correlation between the upper and lower city. Because the Bronze Age layers at the upper tell were heavily damaged by levelling operations during the Iron Age, it was often difficult to distinguish a clear stratigraphy. In area A (Map 14) the Late Bronze Age strata were labelled by Yadin in Roman numerals: stratum XV (LBI), stratum XIV (LBIIA) and stratum XIII (LBIIB). This stratigraphy has been refined and partially corrected by R. Bonfil, using a system of Arabic numerals. According to her, stratum XV (Bonfil's phase 9A) should be dated early in LBI, while most of stratum XIV (phase 8) belongs to the later LBI period. The second phase of stratum XIV should be ascribed to LBIIA (phase 7B) and Yadin's stratum XIII (phase 7A) to the latest phase of the Bronze Age (LBIIB).

The excavators have been rather careful in assigning absolute dates to these levels. The Late Bronze Age I period (stratum 2/XV/9A-8) has generally been ascribed to the sixteenth and fifteenth century BC. For reasons unknown to me, the destructions which are evident at some parts of the site at the end of the Late Bronze Age II A period (stratum 1B/XIV/7B) have been correlated with the campaign of pharaoh Seti I, between 1303-1290 BC. The final destruction of the Late Bronze Age city (stratum 1A/XIII/7A) is supposed to be related to the Israelite conquest of the city, which is documented in the Bible. Because LHIIBB pottery occurs in the final Bronze Age strata, it has been suggested that the destruction was contemporary with those at Ugarit (site no. 128) and Alalakh (site no. 125), in the beginning of the twelfth century BC. In all the excavated trenches at Hazor (Map 14) remains from the Late Bronze Age have been discovered, indicating that the city covered the whole mound in this period. Even though it is difficult to ascertain because of the later disturbances on the higher part of the tell, the

---

26 Stratum 1A has also been referred as Late Bronze Age III (Yadin 1972). Here, the distinction is made between LBIIA and LBIIB, without implying that these phases represent separate cultural-historical periods. For an overview of the discussions surrounding the Late Bronze Age chronology of the southern Levant in general, see Leonard 1989, 6-7; Foucault-Forest 1996, 15.
27 Yadin et al. 1960, 128-129 (area F); Yadin et al. 1989, 186-187 (area K). The architect of the expedition, I. Dunayevsky, and the area supervisor, M. Dothan, believed that the city gate exposed in area K was destroyed at the end of phase IB and that phase 1A was not represented. Yadin, however, was of the conviction that the gate was destroyed at the end of stratum 1A.
28 Yadin et al. 1958, 99 (area D), 145 (area E).
29 Yadin et al. 1989, 128-130.
31 See, for example, the difference in opinion presented in Yadin et al. 1989.
33 Yadin 1972, 118.
34 In: Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 15-16.
36 Yadin 1972, 200.
37 Yadin 1972, 108.
39 Fritz 1973, 126. For the same reason, a date in the second half of the thirteenth century BC has been suggested by Yadin (1972, 45, 108-109), who followed Furumark in dating the end of LHIIBB around 1220 BC.
acropolis seems to have constituted a separate urban zone during the Late Bronze Age. It had its own entrance gate in area P\textsuperscript{40} and the discovery of a thick wall in area B suggests that the acropolis may have had its own defensive wall, at least in the Late Bronze I period.\textsuperscript{41} The higher and lower parts of the city were connected to each other by at least one staircase, part of which has been exposed in area M during the latest excavations.\textsuperscript{42}

Discoveries of temples and a palatial structure from the Late Bronze Age in area A indicate that this part of Hazor was an official area, designated for the royal court and for cult practices.\textsuperscript{43} In the adjacent area M, a significant religious structure from the Late Bronze Age has been discovered as well.\textsuperscript{44} In area B, where Bronze Age levels were reached in just a small part of the trench, a thick wall from the LBI period and a floor dating to LBII were exposed.\textsuperscript{45} Area L, which comprises the impressive Iron Age water reservoir, likewise yielded only a few Bronze Age walls and floors, probably of a domestic structure.\textsuperscript{46} A room from the Late Bronze Age with a buried pithos in area BA seems to belong to a similar building.\textsuperscript{47} It appears that not the whole acropolis was reserved for official buildings.

At the lower plateau, area F was the location of a monumental building, possibly of a religious nature, during LBI. Stratum 1, however, revealed at least four domestic structures.\textsuperscript{48} Similar structures of the same period were discovered in area C,\textsuperscript{49} while the walls and floors discovered in area 210 probably also belonged to such a building.\textsuperscript{50} These houses generally were large and consisted of a number of rooms grouped around at least one courtyard. This type of house, known mainly from sites in Syria and Lebanon such as Ugarit, has been interpreted as reflecting a social organisation with the extended family as the basic social unit.\textsuperscript{51} There is evidence, in particular from area C, that these houses were not just habitation structures, but the location for manufacturing activities as well.\textsuperscript{52} Other evidence for the activities of artisans within the enclosure of the lower city has been recovered in area D, where two kilns were discovered.\textsuperscript{53} Evidence for religious activities within the lower city comes from a monumental temple in area H,\textsuperscript{54} as well as from a temple set among domestic structures in area C.\textsuperscript{55} The lower city was fortified by earthen ramparts, consisting of a core of brick debris or beaten earth, which was strengthened by layers of soil.\textsuperscript{56} These ramparts had been built during the MBIIB period and were still in use during the Late Bronze Age.

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{Ben-Tor et al. 1997} Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 353-386.
\bibitem{Yadin et al. 1989} Yadin et al. 1989, 74-75. During Garstang’s excavations in 1928 a thick wall, probably of Bronze Age date, was discovered at two places between the higher \textit{tell} and the lower plateau, see Yadin 1972, 21.
\bibitem{Wolf 1996} Wolf 1996, 737.
\bibitem{Yadin 1972} Yadin 1972, 125-126, 128.
\bibitem{Ben-Tor 1995} Ben-Tor 1995, 12; Wolff 1996, 737.
\bibitem{Yadin et al. 1989} Yadin et al. 1989, 70.
\bibitem{Ben-Tor et al. 1997} Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 209-217
\bibitem{Yadin et al. 1989} Yadin et al. 1989, 130
\bibitem{Yadin et al. 1960} Yadin et al. 1960, 134-140; Daviau 1993, 244-252; Foucault-Forest 1996, 71-72.
\bibitem{Yadin 1972} Yadin 1972, 47-50.
\bibitem{Daviau 1993} Daviau 1993, 255.
\bibitem{Yadin et al. 1958} In the houses potter’s wheels were discovered, as well as implements to do with textile production, see Yadin et al. 76-77, 78; 1960, 98.
\bibitem{Yadin et al. 1958} Yadin et al. 1958, 116.
\bibitem{Yadin 1972} Yadin 1972, 79-95.
\bibitem{Yadin 1972} Yadin 1972, 67-74.
\bibitem{Yadin 1972} Yadin 1972, 51-57.
\end{thebibliography}
monumental city gates have been exposed, which were used from the Middle Bronze Age until the end of the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{57}

The material remains at Hazor, as well as the evidence for religious practices place the site firmly within the Canaanite culture of the Late Bronze Age Levant.\textsuperscript{58} Nevertheless, Hazor has been described as something of an enigma in the Late Bronze Age of the southern Levant.\textsuperscript{59}

With its roughly eighty-five hectares, all of which seems to have been inhabited, it is more than four times the size of the second largest settlement, Lachish (site no. 213). During the Late Bronze Age the settlement pattern in the southern Levant shifted from large urban centres which controlled vast areas, to a more dispersed settlement with smaller centres.\textsuperscript{60} Hazor is in its size reminiscent of the great centres of the Middle Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{61} In other aspects too, Hazor differs from contemporary cities to the south. Whereas during the Late Bronze Age most cities in the lowlands and valleys of the southern Levant shifted from multiple cave burials to the Egyptian practice of individual pit burials, the few burials at Hazor from the Late Bronze Age are of the former type.\textsuperscript{62} The domestic spaces of the central-court type at Hazor are closer in type to sites in the northern Levant than what appears to be typical at other Palestinian sites.\textsuperscript{63}

These differences between Hazor and contemporary urban sites in Palestine have been used to suggest that Hazor managed to stay relatively independent from Egyptian rule.\textsuperscript{64} The same may be concluded from the fact that the ruler of Hazor addresses himself to pharaoh Akhenaten with the title ‘king’ (EA 227). However, in other documents, such as EA 228, Hazor does appear to be under Egyptian influence. Perhaps it is best to view Hazor’s independence as relative. Moreover, the character of Egyptian rule was not the same in all places and may have varied in time.\textsuperscript{65}

From the Amarna tablets it is clear that Hazor possessed a royal court, which suggests that the organisation of this city-state may have resembled that of contemporary states in the Levant.\textsuperscript{66} The imports found at Hazor indicate that the city participated in international exchange. Objects have been found from Egypt, Mesopotamia and Syria, as well as from Cyprus and the Aegean.\textsuperscript{67} In comparison with other sites in the southern Levant, however, Egyptian imports are scarce, which may be due to the relative independence of Hazor. Moreover, a good number of the Syrian imports seem to have been antiques or heirlooms from an earlier period.\textsuperscript{68} The relative scarcity of Late Bronze Age imports which are archaeologically readily recognisable\textsuperscript{69} may be related to the possibility that the trade-route in

\textsuperscript{57} Yadin et al. 1989, 276-301 (area K); Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 353-386 (area P). The gate in area P was rebuild and used during the Iron Age as well.

\textsuperscript{58} Yadin 1972, 95, Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 89-98.

\textsuperscript{59} Gonen 1984, 66-68.

\textsuperscript{60} Gonen 1984, 63; Bunimowitz 1995, 320.

\textsuperscript{61} Gonen (1984, 66) estimates that Hazor accounts for almost forty percent of the total urban area of Palestine in the Late Bronze Age.

\textsuperscript{62} Bienkowski 1987, 52-53.

\textsuperscript{63} Daviau 1993, 255.

\textsuperscript{64} Bienkowski 1987.

\textsuperscript{65} Weinstein 1981; Leonard 1989, 19-20; Bryan 1996.

\textsuperscript{66} For general information on the economy of Late Bronze Age city states in the Levant, see Liverani 1987 (with many refs.). During the recent excavations cuneiform tablets have been discovered at Hazor, see Ben-Tor 1992; Horowitz & Schaffer 1992. The only tablet that has, so far, been published deals with the allocation of workers to fields and dates to the Middle Bronze Age. I am unaware of cuneiform tablets from Hazor dating to the Late Bronze Age.

\textsuperscript{67} Bienkowski 1987, 53-54; Beck 1989, 310-321; Goldwasser 1989, 339-345; see also below.

\textsuperscript{68} Beck 1989, 309.

\textsuperscript{69} It must be emphasised that no attempts have been made to identify imports at Hazor by scientific methods.
the direction of Damascus was not functioning during this period.\textsuperscript{70} Due to its geographical location, Hazor will have been involved primarily in the north-south overland trade, rather than in international maritime exchange.

**Quantity and quality of the data**

From the published excavations at Hazor, fifty-eight Mycenaean ceramic vessels and fragments can be isolated, which have been listed in catalogue III.\textsuperscript{71} None of these vessels or figurines has been subject to scientific provenance research and their place of manufacture cannot be established with certainty. In terms of shape and decoration the majority of the Mycenaean vessels at Hazor are fairly standard material. All the Mycenaean vessels are of pot shapes which occur more than five times in the Levant and Cyprus,\textsuperscript{72} and the decoration consists in all cases of a standard repertoire of linear and abstract designs.\textsuperscript{73} In addition, most vessels are of LHIIA2-LHIIIB manufacture, with only a deep bowl (FS 284: catalogue no. 11) being of secure LHIIIB2 date. I have argued in chapter 3 that a large part of the corpus of Mycenaean pottery in the eastern Mediterranean is likely to have been produced in the Peloponnese. In my view it is likely that this is also the case for the fairly standard repertoire of this pottery at Hazor. An exception should certainly be made for two Mycenaean stirrup jars (cat. nos. 24, 32) executed in the so-called Simple Style. A Cretan origin for this style has been suggested,\textsuperscript{74} while such pots were probably also produced in Cyprus during LCII.\textsuperscript{75}

It is very likely that the fifty-eight items in catalogue III are not all the Mycenaean finds made in Hazor. The campaigns led by Yadin in 1955-1958 and in 1968 have been fully published and we may assume that our data set is complete for these excavations. The material from the 1928 excavations has never been published, but in his notebook Garstang refers to the complete absence of Mycenaean pottery.\textsuperscript{76} The results of the renewed excavations of the 1990’s, however, are known only through a preliminary report and it is very likely that Mycenaean pottery was found in these excavations. During Yadin’s campaigns, Late Bronze Age remains were uncovered testifying of habitation and manufacturing activities, as well as of religious and official activities. In the latest excavations a Late Bronze palatial structure has been explored in area A.\textsuperscript{77} In earlier campaigns only a very small part of the same building has been excavated,\textsuperscript{78} from which Mycenaean pottery was not reported. The latest finds, therefore,

\textsuperscript{70} It has been suggested that during the Late Bronze Age Damascus was reached via a route south of Lake Tiberias; see Epstein & Goodman 1972, 244-250; Bieckowski 1987, 58.

\textsuperscript{71} This total exceeds Leonard’s (1994, 204-205) figure of fifty-four Mycenaean finds at Hazor. This is largely due to the fact that three finds (cat. nos. 51-53) have been published after the appearance of Leonard’s book. A fragment of doubtful Mycenaean origin (cat. no. 45) has been included by me, but was omitted by Leonard; see note 107.

\textsuperscript{72} Cf. Gilmour 1992, 115, table 1. In his table 1 there are twenty-nine vessel types (defined by Furumark Shapes) which occur more than five times in the Levant. Of these, twenty-four occur more than five times in Cyprus as well. All our vessels are among these twenty-four, with the exception of two kylikes (cat. nos. 6, 47) of FS 256-257. A number of forms related to such kylikes do occur more than five times in Cyprus and the Levant.

\textsuperscript{73} Leonard (1994) lists the following motives from Hazor: FM 9, FM 12, FM 19, FM 27, FM 32, FM 43, FM 44, FM 48, FM 51, FM 60, FM 64, FM 75. All these motifs are fairly common on Mycenaean vessels in the Levant; see Leonard 1994, 142-192.

\textsuperscript{74} Popham 1979, 187; Koehl & Yellin 1982, 273.

\textsuperscript{75} Sherratt 1980, 196-197 note 82; see also a simple Style stirrup jar from Tell es-Saidiyeh, which has been chemically analysed and is thought to have been produced in Cyprus: Leonard et al. 1993, 119.

\textsuperscript{76} Yadin 1975, 34.

\textsuperscript{77} Ben-Tor 1995, 12. This structure is reported to have been destroyed sometime in the thirteenth century BC.

\textsuperscript{78} Yadin et al. 1989, 14: building 389, which has been dated to the Late Bronze I period. It is uncertain whether it was still in use during LBII, see Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 109.
could provide contextual information for the Mycenaean pottery at Hazor different from that currently available.

Even though all the trenches together comprise almost 1.7 ha., this is only a small part of the complete surface of the vast site of Hazor (circa eighty-five ha., see Map 14). Since Mycenaean ceramics have been found in areas all over the mound, it is to be expected that much more of this pottery is still buried at the site. The areas excavated up until now include various elements from the Late Bronze Age city: houses, workshops, religious structures, defensive works, etc. This variety of contexts suggests that our data is representative of the Mycenaean pottery that is still uncovered in similar structures. As stated above, however, this is questionable with respect to Mycenaean finds made in a palatial context.

Of a different nature are depositional and post-depositional factors, which will also have influenced the data-set. In several places at the site the latest phase of the Late Bronze Age shows clear signs of destruction. Destructors have also been proposed for the end of stratum 1B in the lower city. If these destructions may indeed be related to acts of war, it is to be expected that these have left their mark on the material record of the town. Probably of more serious consequences have been activities at the site after the end of the Late Bronze Age. Even though the lower tell was not reoccupied after the final destruction of the Bronze Age city, substantial levelling operations took place on the higher tell during the Solomonic period. This seriously distorts our knowledge about the contexts of the Mycenaean pottery from this part of the site. Ploughing has caused considerable damage to the upper strata on the lower plateau, because of which the remains of phase 1A are less clear to us than those of the older strata. Finally, erosion too has distorted our knowledge of the material remains at Hazor. On the lower plateau, there are several places where bedrock reaches the surface, for example in areas D and E. The number of re-used cisterns and hewn-out caves indicate that activities of a special nature took place in these areas. Because erosion has been particularly extensive in areas D and E, our knowledge of these activities is limited. All such depositional and post-depositional factors will have influenced the circumstances in which Mycenaean pottery has been found, and the analysis and subsequent interpretation will have to take them into account.

The data presented in catalogue III can only be considered partly representative of all the Mycenaean pottery at Hazor. In particular, the lack of information about the palatial contexts, as well as the heavy disturbances in area A on the acropolis and the damage to areas D and E and stratum 1A should be taken into account in the interpretation of the on-site spatial and contextual distribution. Quantitative differences in the occurrence of Mycenaean pottery in the various excavated areas should be examined with regard to the extent to which they may be due to insufficient data.

The on-site distribution of Mycenaean pottery
Of the fifty-eight entries in Catalogue III, fifty-three represent pots or sherds thereof, while five (fragments of) figurines have been published. The excavated areas of Hazor with Late Bronze Age remains (Map 14) each have produced the amounts indicated in Table 6.1.

---

79 Yadin 1972, 37, 63, 87.
80 Yadin et al. 1960, 159; Kenyon 1973, 538. See, however, Bienkowski 1987, 51-52, who doubts a general destruction at the end of LBIIA (stratum 1B/XIV/7B)
81 At Ugarit, for example, attempts to hide objects have been identified; see Yon 1992b, 117-118.
83 Yadin 1972, 37.
84 Yadin et al. 1958, 99-100, 145-146.
85 Foucault-Forest 1996, 67-68.
86 In all tables the areas are listed according to size.
The various excavated areas of Hazor differ in size. Area A, for example comprises at least 2000 sq.m.,\(^87\) while area 210 is a trench of only 25 sq.m.\(^88\) Area L includes the impressive water reservoir from the Early Iron Age and only a few walls from the Late Bronze Age were exposed.\(^89\) In areas P and K multi-period city-gates have been excavated, with little other architectural remains.\(^90\) Bronze Age architecture has been discovered in area M, but only in the renewed - and as yet unpublished - excavations of the 1990's; the campaign in 1968 was limited to Iron Age levels.\(^91\) Excavations have also stopped at Iron Age levels in area B, where Bronze Age levels were only explored in a small part of the area.\(^92\) Since areas E and 210 are very small, the figures in Table 6.1 show that Mycenaean pottery has been found in all areas with substantial remains from the Late Bronze Age.

In considering the figures in Table 6.1, it must be remembered that unstratified finds, which may derive from other parts of the site, have been included. Even so, there is a concentration of Mycenaean pottery in area F, with twenty-five finds. This high figure is largely due to one tomb, which contained fourteen Mycenaean vessels.\(^93\) Even when these are discounted, the figure of eleven Mycenaean finds from settlement contexts in this area is higher than that for area A, the largest of the excavation trenches. To a lesser extent, a concentration of Mycenaean pottery is also visible in area D, where the number of finds is equal to that of area A, which is far larger. Again, one tomb is largely responsible for the concentration: four vessels were found associated with a burial in cistern 9027.\(^94\) The figure of six Mycenaean finds from settlement contexts in this area equals that of area C, which is substantially larger (Map 14). It may be of significance that both areas D and F have produced Mycenaean figurines as well, which, apart from a female figurine (cat. no. 1002) found at the surface, otherwise only occur in area H.

During the Late Bronze Age II area F was a habitation zone with at least four different houses (Map 15).\(^95\) Because area D was heavily eroded, an interpretation of the activities in

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>pots and sherds</th>
<th>figurines</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>area A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area 210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1

\(^{87}\) Up to 1969 ca. 1900 sq.m. were excavated in area A; see Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 52, Plan II.6. During the recent excavations this area has been greatly enlarged; see Ben-Tor 1994; 1995; 1996; also personal observation.

\(^{88}\) Yadin 1972, 47-50.

\(^{89}\) Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 209-217.

\(^{90}\) Yadin et al. 1989, 276-301 (area K); Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 353-386 (area P).

\(^{91}\) Yadin 1969, 5-7; Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 7; Wolf 1996, 737.

\(^{92}\) Yadin et al. 1989, 70.

\(^{93}\) Yadin et al. 1960, 150-151; tomb 8144-8145; catalogue nos. 16-28, 38

\(^{94}\) Yadin 1958, 139-140; catalogue nos. 8-12.

\(^{95}\) Daviau 1993, 244-252. Only at a few places could a distinction be made in this area between strata 1A and IB. The homogeneity of the local pottery in this area indicates that it remained fundamentally the same during
this area during the Late Bronze Age is difficult. Two Late Bronze Age kilns point to industrial activities, while Middle Bronze Age cisterns were re-used during the Late Bronze Age for burials and for storage and/or refuse activities. Both areas may be classified as average town quarters where the population of Hazor lived and worked. In contrast, a palace, temple and water reservoir were situated in area A, where a substantial amount of Mycenaean pottery has also been found. The occurrence of Mycenaean pottery in all these areas points to its use by inhabitants belonging to different social groups. Widespread use of Mycenaean ceramics is also suggested by its distribution in the houses in areas C and F, where it has been found in several rooms and courtyards interspersed with local domestic objects (Maps 15 and 16).

![Table 6.2](image)

The contextual distribution of the Mycenaean pottery in Hazor is presented in Table 6.2. Even though the find circumstances of a number of Mycenaean finds are not known, these figures reveal that Mycenaean pottery at Hazor occurs in different kind of contexts. In all areas where domestic structures have been excavated, Mycenaean pots and sherds were among the finds made, suggesting that everywhere in the town the inhabitants used such pottery in their houses. Late Bronze Age burials have been found in areas D and F only. All these graves yielded Mycenaean finds.

Not in all areas has Mycenaean pottery been reported from religious contexts. In strata 2, 1B and 1A of area C a small temple and associated courtyard was discovered, while the place of an LBI temple served as an open cult area during LBII in area F. Both sanctuaries were situated among habitation structures and Mycenaean pottery has not been reported from the whole of Late Bronze Age II, see Yadin et al. 1960, 128-130. During Late Bronze I (stratum 2), from which no Mycenaean finds in this area have been reported, a monumental structure - possibly a temple - was situated here, see Yadin 1972, 44-45, 98-100; Yadin et al. 1989, 150-164.

95 Yadin et al. (1958, 116) suspect that one of these kilns was for pottery, the other for metal.

96 Yadin et al. (1958, 119-122, 127-140).

97 Four cisterns (nos. 9017, 9024, 9027, 9028) in the area were used during the Late Bronze Age, see Yadin et al. 1958, 119-122, 127-140.

98 Yadin 1969, 3-5; 1972, 125-128; Wolff 1996, 735; Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 51-77. The temple in area A seems to have been built during LBI and was abandoned before (or early in) LBII, after which the area remained in use for cult activities, as is testified by a number of cult installations and shrines, see Yadin 1972, 127-128; Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 102-109. It is uncertain if the palace of building 389, built during LBI, was still in use in the LBII period, see Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 109. The water reservoir, which appears to have been built in the LBII period, seems to have continued in use during the whole Late Bronze Age and later, see Yadin 1972, 127; Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 75.

99 Late Bronze Age domestic structures have also been found in areas E and 210, which have not yielded any Mycenaean pottery, see Yadin 1972, 46-48, 50. The small size of these trenches have been commented upon above (p. 99).

100 Yadin et al. 1960, 97; Yadin 1972, 67-74.

101 Yadin et al. 1960, 132-133; Yadin 1972, 100-102. Even though the LBI religious building seems to have been out of use during LBII, the presence of an ashlar altar, as well as a wall with niches and a number of cult objects indicate that the location still served cultic purposes.
them. The sanctuaries in areas C and F differ significantly from their counterparts in areas A and H, which were larger and of more monumental character. Moreover, the area H temple was free-standing, while the area A temple was structurally separated from the surrounding buildings. Mycenaean pottery has been reported from these monumental temples, albeit in small numbers. By analogy with Meskène-Emar, it is quite possible that the monumental temples in areas A and H served the official cult which was related to the existing power structure in the city, while smaller shrines in habitation areas were used for daily religious practices. The attested difference between the two types of sanctuaries as regards the occurrence of Mycenaean pottery could indicate that the use of Mycenaean vessels in religious ceremonies was restricted to the official cult.

In any case, the figures in table 6.2 show that Mycenaean pottery was used at Hazor in different kinds of circumstances - domestic, religious and funerary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>early</th>
<th>LHIIB</th>
<th>LHIIB-LHIII</th>
<th>LHIIB</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>area A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area BA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 shows the spatial distribution of the Mycenaean chronological ceramic phases. It is clear that the few LHII-LHIIIAl vessels are not widely distributed. Apart from a fragment of a possible Mycenaean one-handled cup (FS 219) from area H (cat. no. 45), all LHII-LHIIIAl finds have been made in area A. A Mycenaean sherd from the same area (cat. no. 51) may possibly be assigned an LHIIB date. The restriction of Mycenaean vessels from this early period to a part of Hazor where a temple and palace were located indicates that such ceramics were not widely used among the inhabitants, but restricted to the social group associated with these official structures.

102 Ben-Tor et al. (1997, 89) comment on the architectural difference between the temples in area A and H on the one hand and that in area C on the other. The monumental character of the temples in areas A and H is emphasised by the use of orthostats.

103 Yadin 1972, 75 (area H); Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 86-87 (area A) The temple in area A is separated from neighbouring structures by a thick wall surrounding its courtyard.

104 Tarragon 1995, 209-210. See Van der Toorn (1995a, 48) for a distinction between official religion at the level of the state, clan cults at the level of clan relations within the urban community, and family cults connected to the family. In this respect, the proximity of the area A temple to a Late Bronze Age palace is noteworthy.

105 The five figurines are omitted from this table.

106 The entries in the catalogue which have been assigned an early stylistic phase are a LHIIB fragment (cat. no. 41), a LHIIB rounded alabastron (cat. no. 42) and two LHIIB-LHIIIAl one-handed cups (cat. nos. 45 and 53).

107 The drawing published in Yadin et al. 1961, Plate 269: no. 45 is confusing. Apparently, the in- and outside of one sherd are shown, but they are not of the same size. The text accompanying the drawing and that in the text volume (Yadin et al. 1989, 240) clearly refers to one find, which is confirmed by a single registration number. Yadin et al. (1989, 240) consider the possibility that the vessel is Mycenaean, but this is not specifically stated in the text accompanying the drawing, see Yadin et al. 1961, Plate 269: no. 45. The vessel has not been included by Leonard (1994) in his corpus of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant. The shape of the vessel (FS 219), the striped handle and the description of the fabric make it possible that this fragment is Mycenaean, see Mountjoy 1986, 44 fig 49, 62, fig. 72 (with references).

108 The decoration of this fragment consists of two horizontal bands, and a curved part of a floral (?) pattern, possibly a lily (FM 9) or argonaut (FM 22); cf. Mountjoy 1986, 44, fig. 49: no. 1.
The fact that many of the vessels from the later Late Helladic phases cannot be dated more specific than LHIIIA2-LHIIIB makes it difficult to compare the spatial distribution of these two ceramic phases. However, LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB vessels occur in most of the excavated areas with substantial remains of the Late Bronze Age. This suggests that such pottery was widely used in Hazor and not restricted to certain social groups.

The chronology of the Mycenaean pottery at Hazor should, of course, be related to the complex stratigraphy at the site, which is shown in Table 6.4.109

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stratum</th>
<th>early</th>
<th>LHIIA2</th>
<th>LHIIA2-LHIIIB</th>
<th>LHIIIB</th>
<th>unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBII</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBIII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unstratified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4

The stratigraphic location of the three finds in LHII-LHIIIA1 style from area A is unfortunately unknown. The sherd with cat. no. 51, which may possibly be assigned to an early stylistic phase, was found in a pit probably belonging to the first part of the Late Bronze Age.110 The only LHII-LHIIIA1 vessel which can with certainty be assigned to an LBI level is the cup from area H (cat. no. 45), of which the Mycenaean origin is uncertain. If this vessel is indeed an import from the Aegean, it would suggest that Mycenaean pottery started to arrive at Hazor already in the first phase of the Late Bronze Age. Even though none of the stylistically early vessels have been recovered from strata that were evidently later than their ceramic style, the many unstratified finds make it impossible to say whether LHII-LHIIIA1 vessels were still in use in an advanced stage of the Late Bronze Age.

Similar disappointing conclusions can be drawn for the second and third stratigraphical Late Bronze Age periods at Hazor. The large number of Mycenaean finds which cannot be dated more securely than LHIIIA2-LHIIIB prevents any statement on the longevity of use of Mycenaean vessels. Even though no finds of clear LHIIIA2 date have been found in the last Bronze Age stratum at Hazor, it is possible, because of the three LHIIIA2-LHIIIB vessels from phase 1A/XIII/7A, that such pottery was still in use during this period. The only observation to be made with certainty is that during all three Late Bronze stratigraphical periods, Mycenaean ceramics appear to have been present at Hazor. Because such pottery also seems to have been deposited in every period, we may assume that this material did not arrive at the town in one batch, but over a substantial length of time.111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>domestic</th>
<th>funerary</th>
<th>religious</th>
<th>settlement</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHIIIA2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHIIIA2-LHIIIB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHIIIB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5

109 It must be remembered that it is not possible to distinguish between LBIIA and LBIB in all excavated areas. Moreover, there is discussion about the dating of the strata in area A.

110 Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 25, 85. Pit no. 548 disturbed Middle Bronze Age levels and should, consequently be later. However, the pit is not mentioned in the discussion of stratum 8 (LBI) and a wall of this stratum is shown in the area where it is situated. Probably, the pit was dug before the building of the stratum 8 temple early in the Late Bronze I period (stratum 9A).

111 At the Amman airport site (site no. 189) the pottery possibly arrived in one, or only a few batches; see Hankey 1974, 142-143.
The contextual distribution of the chronological Mycenaean ceramic phases is presented in Table 6.5. Again, the uncertain stratification of most of the stylistically early vessels, as well as the unprecise dating of many of the later pots prevent a differentiation between the various chronological styles regarding their find context. The only observation to be made on the basis of Table 6.5 is that LHIIIA2 and LHIIB vessels were used in houses as well as in temples and tombs.

Mycenaean pottery can also be subdivided according to functional vessel types. At Hazor, no vessels such as rhyta or kernoi have been found. The class of ritual vessels, which are present at other sites, therefore, is absent in Table 6.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>dinner</th>
<th>storage</th>
<th>figurines</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>area A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6

It is clear from this table that Mycenaean storage vessels are much more abundant at Hazor than dinner vessels. Both categories of vessels are fairly widely distributed: they occur in most of the trenches with substantial remains from the Late Bronze Age. Above, I have commented upon the limited distribution of Mycenaean figurines. The absence of Mycenaean dinner vessels from area C seems remarkable, in view of the relatively wide distribution of such vases. This part of the city of Hazor has been interpreted as an area with manufacturing activities as well as storage and food preparation and consumption. At first glance, the absence of Mycenaean dinner vessels in such an environment seems to be in contrast to area F, which has produced three such vessels. However, only one of these (cat. no. 36) came from a domestic context, while two (cat. nos. 16, 17) were found in a tomb. In area D, two dinner vessels (cat. nos. 10, 11) likewise had a funerary context. As is also clear from Table 6.7 below, it seems that Mycenaean dinner vessels were not widely used in the domestic life of the inhabitants of Hazor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>dinner</th>
<th>storage</th>
<th>figurines</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>domestic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funerary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ritual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7

In view of the wide distribution of Mycenaean storage vessels at Hazor, it is of significance that such pottery is absent from area H. The three Mycenaean vessels from the area of the temple (cat. nos. 45-47) are all dinner vessels, while a figurine (cat. no. 1003) has been found there as well. From Table 6.7 it becomes clear that Mycenaean storage vessels are absent from religious contexts in general. To the two dinner vessels from such contexts may be added the cup of catalogue no. 45, which was found in the courtyard of the stratum 2 temple in area H.

---

112 Cf. Table II in the tables section of this book.
113 Daviau 1993, 223-243. Three potter’s wheels, loomweights and spindlewhorls constitute the main evidence for industrial activities. Shrine 6136 in the western part of the area was the focus of ritual activities.
and to which a general ‘settlement’ context has been assigned. In combination with the
evidence that Mycenaean dinner vessels were not widely used in domestic contexts, their
frequency in ritual contexts indicates that these vases were used for activities of a special
nature. From table 7 it is also clear that funerary ceremonies were among these activities.

Apart from their absence in clear cultic circumstances, Late Helladic storage vessels have
been found in all other types of context. Moreover, they occurred in all areas, except for area
H, which indicates that they were widely used among the inhabitants of Hazor. Mycenaean
figurines do not seem to have been used in funerary ceremonies. Their presence in domestic
contexts seems to indicate that these idols were used in the daily life of the inhabitants at
Hazor. The bovine figurine from the temple of area H (cat. no. 1003) suggests that these
objects possessed a ritual or magic significance.

It is difficult to establish with certainty whether the restriction of Mycenaean dinner vessels
to special activities applies to all periods at Hazor in which these vases were used. If the cup
of catalogue no 45 is indeed Mycenaean, its findspot in stratum 2 of temple H may point to
religious use of a Mycenaean dinner vessel already in the first phase of the Late Bronze Age,
even though it has been found in the courtyard, quite far from the actual temple. Other finds
from clear contexts dating to the first phase of the Late Bronze Age are unknown. In
stratum 1B of temple H, fragments of a Mycenaean bowl (cat. no. 46) were found in the main
cult hall. The only Mycenaean open vessel from a non-religious context of phase 1B is the base
of a stemmed cup (cat. no. 5) found in area D; it comes from an LBIIA level in the vicinity of
settlement structures. In the stratum 1A temple in area H a Mycenaean stemmed cup (cat.
no. 47) was found, while another stemmed cup (cat. no. 40) was recovered from the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>linear</th>
<th>patterned</th>
<th>decorated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>area A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8

Ceramic figurines of local manufacture have also been found in domestic contexts, for example in area C;
see Yadin et al. 1958, Plate 89 no. 15 (room 6117); 1960, Plate 127 no 14 (room 6235).
Yadin et al. 1989, 240. Locus 2174 is situated in the “open space” outside the LBI propylaeum.
A possible exception is the sherd of catalogue no. 51, found in a pit probably dug during LBI. However, the
fragment is too small for it to be assigned to a specific pot shape.
The fragment of catalogue no. 5 was found in grid square Q 16, which is in the area of room 9050 and wall
6 of the LBII period in subarea D2 (fig. 5). Nothing is known about the nature of this building and the
associated courtyards, see Yadin et al. 1958, 105, 107, Plate 182.
The temple in area A does not seem to have been in use during the last phase of the Late Bronze Age, see
Ben-Tor et al. 1997, 102-10. The area probably served religious functions after the abandonment of the temple,
see Yadin 1972, 127.
As stated above, the decoration of the Mycenaean vessels at Hazor can be considered fairly standard. As is evident from Table 6.8, pots with pictorial decoration are absent at Hazor, nor have zoomorphic vessels been discovered. Likewise, Mycenaean coarse or plain ware vessels are absent from this site. From the figures in Table 6.8 it is evident that most of the Mycenaean pots at Hazor are decorated with lines only. All excavated areas with substantial Late Bronze Age remains have produced vessels with linear and patterned decoration, which suggest that none of these types were restricted to specific social groups at Hazor. However, it is of interest that in areas A and H vessels with patterned decoration occur more often than linear decorated pots. As stated above, these areas are considered to have served special, official functions. The predominance in these areas of Mycenaean vessels with patterned decoration may indicate that such ceramics were considered more suitable for such special areas, while linear vessels were used by many inhabitants of the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>linear</th>
<th>patterned</th>
<th>decorated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funerary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9

A similar conclusion may be drawn from the figures in Table 6.9. The proportion of vessels with patterned decoration is higher for funerary contexts than for domestic contexts and for circumstances which have been labelled “settlement” in general. In contexts with clear religious associations, Mycenaean pots with patterned decoration are more frequent than vessels with linear decoration. The difference in use between linear and patterned vessels is most likely related to vessel type. Of the eighteen patterned Mycenaean pots, eight are dinner vessels, while only six are storage pots; there are four patterned fragments. This suggests that the relative restriction in the use of Mycenaean dinner vessels may, at least partly, be connected to their more elaborate decoration.

The purpose of this section was to see if any restrictions in use can be discerned from the spatial and contextual distribution of the Mycenaean pottery at Hazor. In general, the conclusion seems to be rather negative: Mycenaean ceramics appear to have been available to all social groups at Hazor. At closer inspection, however, a few important observations have been made. Firstly, even though Mycenaean vessels have been found in different kinds of context, their use in religious practices at Hazor seems to have been confined to the official

---

119 See p. 98, note 73.
120 Of the amphoroid krater of catalogue no. 10 only the rim was found. Since many of these vessels are pictorially decorated, it is possible that this was the case for this particular vase as well.
121 The term ‘decorated’ is used when the precise decoration is unknown to me.
122 The fragmentary nature of many of the Mycenaean finds argues for caution in this respect. Linear fragments may have belonged to vessels that were more elaborately decorated.
123 No doubt this is at least partly due to the fact that vessels from tombs are, in general, more complete than finds from settlement levels.
124 The sherd of doubtful Mycenaean manufacture (cat. no. 45) was found in the courtyard of the stratum 2 temple in area H and has been assigned a ‘settlement’ context. As stated in note 107 the drawing of this sherd in the publication is confusing. The cup seems to have been decorated with dots on the rim and a foliate band (?) (FM 64) on the outside. If the fragment is indeed Mycenaean, it may be another example of a patterned sherd from a religious context, even though found quite far from the actual temple.
125 This means that the majority of the dinner vessels had a patterned decoration, while the majority of the storage pots were decorated with lines only.
cult. Secondly, Mycenaean vessels from the first part of the Late Bronze Age were confined to an area where a temple and palace were located, and it seems that the use of these vessels was restricted to specific social groups. Thirdly, while Mycenaean storage pots appear to have been widely used in the daily life of the inhabitants of Hazor, dinner vessels, the majority of which possessed patterned decoration, were used mainly for activities of a special nature, such as religious and funerary ceremonies.

Closed contexts: settlement

Only a very small part of the total surface of the Late Bronze Age city of Hazor has been excavated. Little can be said about the city’s urban plan or the street layout. It is clear, however, that the site can be subdivided in two parts: the vast lower plateau in the north-east and the upper tell in the south-east (Map 14). Both parts were connected by at least one staircase, which has partly been exposed during the latest excavations. The central part of the upper tell, near areas A and M, seems to have been reserved during the Late Bronze Age for structures of a monumental character, suggesting that it was an area designated to official buildings, perhaps comparable to the royal zone at Ugarit (site no. 128). Not the whole acropolis, however, seems to have served for such official structures. On the lower tell, extensive areas of Late Bronze habitation have been excavated in areas C and F, while areas E, and 210 yielded similar structures. The domestic structures are generally quite large and consist of at least one courtyard around which a number of rooms are grouped. Houses appear to have been grouped in insulae, which were separated by narrow streets and public courtyards. Evidence for activities such as food processing and consumption, storage and craft production show that people did not only live in these houses. The urban layout of the city areas seems to have been rather flexible: various signs of rebuilding indicate that houses were frequently restructured to accommodate for changes in functions of rooms and buildings. Because of these frequent alterations it is often difficult to determine the exact limits of houses. The density of the habitation on the lower tell during the Late Bronze Age is unknown, but a substantial part of the plateau appears to have been settled. In areas where the relief made the terrain unsuitable for habitation, such as in area D, specialised activities to do with the use of cisterns and caves were practised.

In Table XII, which is presented separately in the tables section at the end of this thesis, all the non-funerary closed contexts which have produced Mycenaean pottery are listed. Of most of these nineteen find complexes, especially those in area A, too little is known to analyse them sufficiently. The eight situations which are investigated in detail in this section all are situated on the lower tell, and concern domestic contexts (H), a religious context (R) and a cistern (G).

H12 area F: House 8039, stratum 1 (Map 15)

As in the whole of area F, stratigraphical period 1A in house 8039 essentially represents a rebuilding and re-use of structures of the 1B period. In many instances it was impossible to

---

126 Wolf 1996, 737.
127 Yadin 1969, 3; 1972, 103.
128 Callot 1986, 753-754; Yon 1992a, 26-27; Callot & Yon 1995, 161; see also chapter 5.
129 For analyses of these areas, see Daviau 1993 and Foucault-Forest 1996, both with references.
130 Foucault-Forest 1996, 68, 72.
131 Daviau 1993, 2454-255.
133 Foucault-Forest 1996, 67-68. She suggest habitation in the caves of area D. However, only one small cave (9036) was in use during the Late Bronze Age, see Yadin 1958, plate 183.1
135 Yadin et al. 1960, 128-129.
distinguish the two phases, stratigraphically or ceramically. Therefore, the Mycenaean vessels from area F have all been assigned to the generic stratum 1.

Fig. 6.1 Stem of Mycenaean kylix (cat. no. 36) from room 8030

House 8039 could be entered either from the north-west or from the south-east. The north-western entrance opened up to courtyard 8042, which has been interpreted as an area for food preparation. Adjacent to this courtyard was the small room 8030, which has been interpreted as a storeroom and contained a fragment of a LHIIB Zygouries-type kylix (cat. no. 36: fig. 6.1), associated with a local bowl, a pithos, a jar and two jugs. South of courtyard 8042, a small passageway (8036) with a silo (8040) in its south-eastern corner led to courtyard 8037. In this passageway, near the silo, a LHIIB stirrup jar (cat. no. 32) was found. To the south-west of the passageway were two rooms (8029, 8041) of unknown purpose, with a paved floor. In courtyard 8037 a basalt slab and two benches were discovered. The top of a Mycenaean stirrup jar (cat. no. 34), two local pithoi and a clay button were found here as well. To the south-east, the largest courtyard (8039/8017) of the structure was located. Below this courtyard, tomb 8065 was situated, in which a LHIIB2 piriform jar (cat. no. 29) was found. The stratigraphy of the house indicates that tomb 8065 does not belong to the stratum 1 house, but to an earlier structure. From the central courtyard room 8015 could be entered, which lay at a lower level. In this room a LHIIB globular stirrup jar (cat. no. 35) was found, in association with a limestone disk, local jugs and a local stemmed cup. This inventory suggests that room 8015 served for habitation. From the central courtyard the south-eastern entrance, (8025) which was shared with the adjacent house 8068 (H13), could also be reached.

The Mycenaean pottery is rather widely dispersed through this house: in four rooms a single Mycenaean find has been made. The associations of the Mycenaean pottery in this house are habitation and storage. The storage associations for the Mycenaean kylix, which has a patterned decoration, are somewhat surprising, as I concluded above that Mycenaean open vessels at Hazor were mainly reserved for activities of a special nature. This particular kylix may have been in storage for such an occasion. In any case, the evidence points to the Mycenaean pottery being an integral part of the everyday life in the building.

136 Daviau (1993, 247) suspects instead, on the basis of an analysis of the finds, that this was a storeroom. Because of the paucity of the finds (only four) her statistical analysis is not valid. The original interpretation of the excavators is followed here.

137 Yadin et al. 1960, 141-142. The LHIIB2 date of the Mycenaean piriform jar does not conflict with this reasoning, if the house was built late during phase 1B.

138 The stirrup jar was found at the same level as the top of the foundation wall. Yadin, as well as the trench supervisor Jean Perrot, suspected that this was a floor level of phase 1A. Immanuel Dunayevsky, however, suggested that the foundation wall was deeper here than elsewhere because of the sloping of the terrain and that the stirrup jar should belong to the stratum IB phase; see the discussion in Yadin et al. 1960, 144.
H13 area F: house 8068, stratum 1

The northern part of house 8068 was situated on a steep slope and was heavily damaged by ploughing and erosion. The house was entered from the south-west. A vestibule, (8025) which was shared with house 8039 (H12) and possessed an oven, gave entrance to room 8024, in which two LHIIIB lentoid flasks (cat. nos. 31, 33) were found. They were associated with two local bowls, two jugs, a pithos and a basalt mortar. The room has been interpreted as an area for food preparation and storage. From this room the central courtyard 8068 could be reached, where very few finds were made. Such was also the case for the rooms adjoining the central courtyard.

Because of the heavy damage to the northern part of house 8068, it is difficult to assess the distribution of the Mycenaean pottery in this house. In comparison with house 8039 (H12), it may be of interest that two Mycenaean vessels were found together in a room. Both vessels are lentoid flasks, a type absent in the adjacent house. The two Mycenaean flasks are associated with items for food preparation and storage. From this, we may conclude that they served in the daily life of the inhabitants of this house.

Fig. 6.2 Fragment of Mycenaean figurine (cat. 1005) and bronze arrow head found together in courtyard 8139

H14 area F: house 8139, stratum 1

House 8139 was located on the lowest terrace of the area and was only partially excavated, because of which the entrance to the building cannot be reconstructed. A courtyard was discovered (8139), in which a Mycenaean female figurine (cat. no. 1005) was found, in association with a bronze arrow-head (fig. 6.2). To the south-west of this courtyard, in room 8133, a large silo was found in a corner. Another room (8135) possessed a large local krater, sixty-two centimetres in height, which was found set in the floor and has a counterpart in the ‘holiest of holiest’ of the stratum 1A temple in area H. Near the vessel from room 8135 was a cooking pot, also of unusual dimensions. North-west of courtyard 8139, in room 8137, a LHIIBI lentoid flask (cat. no. 30) was discovered in association with a basalt bowl. From this room it was only a short distance to the dromos of rock-cut tomb 8144-8145, which yielded a total of fourteen Mycenaean vessels. The relationship between building 8139 and this tomb is unclear, but both were in use at the same time.

140 Yadin et al. 1960, 140; Daviau 1993, 249.
141 Yadin (et al. 1960, 141) argue that the tomb served for multiple interments during the whole LBII period.
The inventory of this house is atypical for the domestic structures at Hazor. It may be that the structure was inhabited by members of a specific social group, or that it served special functions, possibly to do with the nearby tomb. The presence of Mycenaean pottery in this structure shows that it was suitable to be used in such atypical circumstances. The fact that a Mycenaean figurine was found in the central courtyard of this atypical building may indicate that such objects possessed a special significance at Hazor.

R3 area H: temple, strata 2, 1B, 1A (Map 17)
A temple was first built in area H during MB II (stratum 3), its plan resembling the stratum VII temple at Tell Atchana/Alalakh (site no. 125). The LBI temple of stratum 2 was identical to its Middle Bronze Age predecessor, even though it was completely newly built. Changes are visible in the courtyard in front of the temple, which slopes upward to the south-east. An elaborate *propylaeum* divided the square in two halves, thus creating a *temenos* in front of the temple which included several cult installations. Outside the *propylaeum*, where the pebbles of the floor of the courtyard were laid out in a decorative fashion, the LHIIB-LHIIIA1 cup (cat. no. 45) of which the Mycenaean origin is uncertain was found. The only other object reported from the same area (locus 2174) is a ceramic lamp.

The temple of stratum 2 was destroyed and a new structure was built during phase IB. It followed roughly the same plan as its predecessor, but an elaborate entrance hall (room 2128) was added. The courtyard in front of this entrance hall was completely reorganised, with a wall separating it from the outside. A basalt obelisk stood in the middle of this courtyard. The entrance hall gave access to the middle part of the temple, consisting of a central room flanked by two narrow corridors on the south-west and by a single room in the north-east. One of the narrow corridors may have served as a staircase leading to the roof. The ‘holiest of holiest’ of the temple was a large room with a niche in its rear wall. In the centre of the room two basalt pillar bases were found, between which there was a deep pit. Outside the pit, but still in the main cult room 2123 fragments of a Mycenaean bowl (cat. no. 46) were found, associated with local bowls and juglets, two ceramic anthropomorphic local figurines and a number of beads.

The stratum 1A temple was virtually the same building as its predecessor, reconstructed with several changes and additions after a destruction. No changes appear to have been made to the courtyard in front of the temple, although some of the IB cult-installations seem to have gone out of use. In the middle part of the temple the wall between the central and north-eastern rooms was removed. In the south-western part of the large room 2115, which was thus created, stood a long installation consisting of a concave basalt block, with a square basalt slab on top of it. In the north-eastern part of the same room stood a basalt table. In the vicinity of this table, on the floor, a Mycenaean bovine figurine (cat. no. 1003) was found, in association with two engraved plaques made of bone. Nearby, on the threshold of doorway 2114, a Mycenaean stemmed cup (cat. no. 47) and a stone bead were discovered. An important feature in the main cult room of the temple were the basalt othostats lining the bottom of the walls. These orthostats had probably been made in the LBI period and subsequently reused by the builders of the stratum 1A temple. Two newly made pillar bases were found on the floor in the main room, as were a great number of cult objects, among which were a basalt incense altar, basin and libation table, a basalt krater with a ‘Mycenaean-style’ running spiral carved on its upper part (fig. 6.3), figurines in bronze and stone, Mitannian-style cylinder seals and an Egyptian faience scarab with the cartouche of pharaoh Amenophis III. Many of these objects
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142 Daviau 1993, 249.
144 Yadin 1972, 75-79.
145 Yadin et al. 1961, Plate 122.4; Yadin 1972, 93.
appear to have been heirlooms from earlier phases of the temple. Apart from insight in the inventory of a monumental sanctuary in the thirteenth century BC, they provide clues to the deity worshipped here: most likely Hadad, the Canaanite storm god.¹⁴⁶

Fig. 6.3 Basalt krater with Aegean-type spiral from temple H, stratum 1A

The religious associations of the Mycenaean pottery in strata 1B and 1A are evident, but this is not the case for the one-handed cup found quite far away from the stratum 2 temple - if it actually is Mycenaean. The presence of the Mycenaean bowl in the central cult room of stratum 1B, together with some other ceremonial objects, suggest that the vessel served in the ceremonies that took place in the room. The same may be said of the Mycenaean finds from stratum 1A. Even though these do not come from the ‘holiest of holiest’, the presence of altar-like structures suggests that ceremonies were conducted in room 2115 as well. The fact that the Mycenaean dinner vessels and the figurine were considered suitable to serve in the temple sheds light on the appreciation of such imported ceramics at Hazor. In this respect, it is interesting to note that other imports - Syrian cylinder seals and an Egyptian scarab - have been found in the temples as well.

H15 area C: house 6063, stratum 1B¹⁴⁷ (Map 16)
In area C, the buildings of stratum 1B can be clearly distinguished from those of stratum 2, which were uncovered only in the south-eastern part. In contrast, only in the western part could strata 1A and 1B clearly be distinguished, sometimes by a meter of debris. In other loci phase 1A seems to have constituted a rebuilding of the phase 1B structures. All Mycenaean pottery in area C was said to derive from phase 1B layers. Houses 6063 and 6225 seem to have known two phases during phase 1B.¹⁴⁸ In the earlier period the two houses were connected to each other by openings in the wall which later separated them. All the Mycenaean pottery found in these houses appears to have been associated with the latest level of the 1B period.

House 6063 consists of central court 6215, around which five rooms were situated. The entrance from street 6045/6129 gave access to room 6063. In this room a variety of installations was found: a circular basalt stone, which may have served as the base for a wooden column, an oven and several installations of unhewn stone, some possibly serving as

¹⁴⁶ Yadin 1972, 95. It is unsure whether this god was worshipped in all phases of the temple; moreover, in Canaanite temples more than one deity may have been worshipped at the same time, see for example the temple at Beth Shean (site no. 178): James & McGovern 1993, 243-244.
the basis for a potter's wheel, which was also found. A Mycenaean straight-sided alabastron (cat. no. 1) and a Mycenaean piriform jar (cat. no. 2) were discovered in this room, in association with a pictorially decorated local storage jar, a pithos, a narrow-necked jar, three kraters, a cup, a bone whorl and a basalt grinder. On the basis of the variety of its inventory, room 6063 has been interpreted as serving multiple purposes, including industrial activities (pottery production) and food preparation. The adjacent room 6027/6032, possessed a paved floor, but was devoid of finds. According to Daviau clays for the manufacture of ceramics could be stored here. To the north-west, room 6063 opened up to courtyard 6215, which possessed a bench of unhewn stones, a pit and a large quantity of ceramic vessels. Various activities were probably conducted in this space. Adjacent to the courtyard in the north-east were three rooms, two of which (6217 and 6220) were storerooms,\(^{149}\) while the third yielded a carved bone only.

The two Mycenaean vessels from house 6063, were found together in the same room. This suggests that these storage vessels were associated specifically with the industrial and domestic activities in the room. Since habitation rooms have not been identified in this house and there are no signs of an upper storey, the structure appears to have been designated exclusively to storage and manufacturing activities. The two potter's wheels and the large quantity of ceramics found in house 6063 has led to the suggestion that pottery production was the most important activity; however it must be stressed that neither a kiln, nor wasters or misfirings have been reported from area C.\(^{150}\) The presence of the two Mycenaean vessels in the room with the clearest signs of industrial activities and their absence from any of the storerooms indicate that they were primarily associated with the industrial activities. This shows that these vessels were part of the daily activities in the house.

H16 area C: house 6225, stratum 1B\(^{151}\) (Map 16)

In the second phase of stratum 1B house 6225 was separated from house 6063 to the south-east. The former has not been fully excavated, but extended further to the north-west. Once separate, house 6225 could be entered from the external room 6248, which communicated with the public courtyard 6041.\(^{152}\) From entrance 6248, room 6226 was entered, in which a Mycenaean straight-sided alabastron (cat. no. 13) was found in association with local bowls, a baking tray and a stone disc.\(^{153}\) From here one could go to the central courtyard no. 6225, where a large variety of objects was found pertaining to food preparation and pottery production: apart from a Mycenaean straight-sided alabastron (cat. no. 14), two potter's wheels, a clay mask, a loom weight, a basalt bowl and mortar, a local krater, a cooking pot and a narrow-necked jar. North of this courtyard were two rooms (6262 and 6241), which were only partly excavated and from which hardly any finds have been reported. Two rooms to the east (6224 and 6236) also belonged to this house.

As house 6225 has not been completely excavated, it is difficult to discuss the internal distribution of the Mycenaean vessels. It may be noted that the two vessels were not found together, but in separate, albeit communicating, rooms. This suggests that the Mycenaean vessels were part of the daily activities in the house. The same may be concluded from the

\(^{149}\) A second potter's wheel was found in room 6217.

\(^{150}\) Possible additional evidence for pottery production in area C comes from house 6211 in the north-east, where ceramic vessels were found in a large variety and sometimes stacked in heaps, see Yadin 1972, 36. The pottery should properly be assigned to stratum 1A, but the house itself was built during the 1B phase.


\(^{152}\) Yadin (et al. 1960, 96) interprets room 6227 and 6248 as roofed, public passageways.

\(^{153}\) It is possible that none of these finds were found on the floor itself, as Yadin (et al. 1960, 102) reports this room as empty, although the locus is mentioned in the accompanying plates; see Yadin et al. 1960 Plates 117 nos. 3, 29, 123 nos. 10, 13.
associated finds, which suggest that Mycenaean pottery was used in connection with food preparation and the activities of artisans.

**H17 area C: house 6061, stratum 1B**

South of street 6129 is a small square building, which was entered from the public courtyard (6116) in front of shrine 6136. The entrance faced the shrine opposite the courtyard, which has led to the suggestion that both buildings were functionally related. The entrance gave access to room 6171, which possessed a silo in its north-western corner. From there room 6061 could be reached, which possessed benches along two walls and where a scarab, a local bowl and juglet were found. From there, one could go to room 6188, which also possessed a small silo or bin in its south-eastern corner. A Mycenaean straight-sided alabastron (cat. no. 15) was found in this room, in association with two hand-made local bowls. The peculiar architecture of this structure and the presence of several silos and stone shelves have led to its interpretation as a building for storage activities.

It is not uncommon for Bronze Age sanctuaries in the Levant to have an associated storeroom. The location of the entrance of house 6061 directly opposite the entrance of the shrine, as well as the presence of an Egyptian scarab may suggest a relation between the two buildings. If building 6061 indeed possessed religious associations, it may be of importance to note that the Mycenaean alabastron was found in room 6188, which has clear evidence for storage activities. The Mycenaean vessel seems primarily associated with the storage function rather than with the ceremonies conducted in the shrine.

**G3 area D: cistern 9017**

In area D four cisterns and a number of caves were discovered which had been hewn out the rock during the Middle Bronze II period. All of the cisterns were re-used during the Late Bronze Age. Some walls and floors in the area also date from the Late Bronze Age. In the south-west, cistern 9027 was re-used in the Late Bronze II period as a tomb; four Mycenaean vessels (cat. nos. 8-11) have been found in it. In the northern part, two LBII kilns point to industrial activities during that period. Just south-east of these kilns a cistern (9017), dating to the MBII period, was discovered. The re-use of this cistern during the Late Bronze II period may be associated with the activities around the kilns. A large amount of pottery was found in cistern 9017, among which local bowls formed the largest group. In addition, the cistern contained local kraters, cooking pots, jugs and juglets, pithoi, lamps and a number of decorated vessels. A zoomorphic vessel of local manufacture was also found, just as two Cypriot bowls, one of White Slip II ware, the other of Base Ring fabric. A Mycenaean straight-
sided alabastron (cat. no. 7) and a Mycenaean stemmed cup (cat. no. 6) were also found in cistern 9017.

Cistern 9017 has been interpreted as a kind of silo. This seems unlikely, because most of the ceramics found in it were dinner vessels.\textsuperscript{162} An interpretation of the cistern as a refuse pit seems more plausible. The fact that the Mycenaean vessels, as well as those of Cypriot origin, were discarded in the same manner as the local pottery could indicate that they were not regarded as different. However, the local ceramic repertoire from cistern 9017 is particularly varied and contains some unusual shapes and decorations. The Mycenaean pottery found here, among which a patterned kylix, is part of an atypical assemblage, which may have been used in specific circumstances. The kilns in the vicinity of the cistern point to the possibility that these circumstances were somehow related to industrial production.

The main purpose of this section was to review if a differentiation according to vessel type can be made with regard to the use of Mycenaean pottery among the population of Hazor. In this respect it is interesting to note that there is a difference between areas C and F in the presence of Mycenaean ceramic vessel types. Apart from the kylix found in house 8039 (H12) and the figurine in house 8139 (H14), all Mycenaean vessels from area F are narrow-mouthed container jars: three stirrup jars and three lentoid flasks. In contrast, all Mycenaean pots from area C are wide-mouthed storage vessels: four straight-sided alabastra and a piriform jar. It is unlikely that this spatial difference is caused by some local geographical phenomenon, since both types of vessels have been found in area D,\textsuperscript{163} while stirrup jars have been found in areas B and BA\textsuperscript{164} and area A produced two alabastra.\textsuperscript{165} Rather we should relate this spatial variation to the different functions of these areas in the society of Hazor. The Mycenaean vessels in area C all occur in structures which have yielded ample evidence for craft manufacture and associated storage.\textsuperscript{166} In area D, where a straight-sided alabastron was found in pit 9017 (G3), there were likewise indications of industrial activities. In the houses in area C which can be classified primarily as habitation structures (houses 6106, 6249), Mycenaean pottery has not been found.\textsuperscript{167} It seems, therefore, that Mycenaean wide-mouthed containers at Hazor were mainly associated with manufacturing activities, while narrow-mouthed storage vessels were primarily appreciated for their use in habitation areas. The cause of this variation is likely to be related to differences in the contents of these vessel types.\textsuperscript{168}

The differences in the spatial and contextual distribution of Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels have already been commented upon. The stemmed cup with patterned decoration which has been found in area D in cistern 9107 (G3) can be considered as additional evidence that such vases were endowed with a special significance at Hazor, since it was part of an atypical ceramic repertoire. The only Mycenaean open vessel which has been found in a regular domestic context is the kylix from house 8039 (H12).

In area D a stemmed cup (cat. no. 5) has been found as well, in close proximity to a Mycenaean female figurine (cat. 1001) a ceramic class which likewise appears to have had a special value at Hazor. This may indicate that activities of a special nature were conducted in
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\textsuperscript{162} The imports in the cistern and the fact that most of the local vessels were labelled as 're-used' (Yadin et al. 1958, 118) make it unlikely that products from the nearby kiln were stored here.  
\textsuperscript{163} Stirrup jar of catalogue no. 4 and straight-sided alabastron of catalogue no. 7  
\textsuperscript{164} Catalogue nos. 43 and 44 respectively  
\textsuperscript{165} Catalogue no. 39 (LHIII A2–LHIII B) and catalogue no. 42 (LHII B)  
\textsuperscript{166} Only for building 6061 (H17) is this not the case. However, this house is situated among industrial structures and, in any case, its possible religious associations sets it apart from the other structure in areas F and C.  
\textsuperscript{167} House 6249, see Daviau 1993, 237-238; House 6101, see Daviau 1993, 239.  
\textsuperscript{168} Leonard (1981, 94) concludes that stirrup jars may have contained oil or wine, while the wide-mouthed containers probably contained more viscous substances.
this area, but unfortunately the stratigraphical context is unknown for both of these finds. The figurine in house 8139 can be considered as additional evidence that such objects were endowed with a special significance at Hazor, since it was found in a building of unknown purpose with an wealthy inventory.

The second purpose of this section was to review the extent to which Mycenaean pottery was particularised, i.e. deliberately chosen for specific purposes. I have found no evidence for such particularisation of Mycenaean pottery at Hazor. The Mycenaean vessels and figurines have been found in contexts indicating that they were part of a material assemblage that included a variety of locally made objects and, in some cases, other imports. The fact that Mycenaean open pot shapes and figurines were considered appropriate to be used in ceremonies of a highly symbolic nature such as in temples, however, suggests that such pottery was not without value. The imported character of the Aegean vessels may have contributed to their significance at Hazor, but at the same time it is clear that they were an integral part of the local material culture.

**Funerary contexts**

Only three graves from the Late Bronze Age II period have been found in Hazor, all of which contained Mycenaean pottery. In area D, cistern 9027 was intentionally cleared out during the Late Bronze Age and an individual inhumation of a young woman was placed inside it, surrounded by ceramics. After depositing the body, the cistern seems to have been intentionally filled with over three meters of fill. In area F, below courtyard 8039, in a circular depression created by the collapse of an underground hall of the MBII period, an isolated inhumation of an adult male was found. As stated before, the stratigraphy in this area suggests that this tomb was built before the existence of house 8039. Also in area F, just northwest of building 8139 in area F, the rock-cut tomb 8144-8145 was discovered. An almost vertical shaft was cut out in the rock. From there, the builders of the caves had begun to work in a south-eastern direction (locus 8145), but after encountering a tunnel from the MB period, they had laid out an oval chamber south-west of the vertical shaft ( locus 8144). Bones were found in the funerary chamber, but these crumbled when touched by the excavators. The deposition of the inventory, however, indicated that the cave was used for multiple interments, probably spanning the entire duration of phase 1B.

These three graves are the only ones at Hazor which, on the basis of their pottery, can be related to stratum 1. In area F a number of graves from the Late Bronze I period (stratum 2) have been discovered, all in hewn-out caves. None of these tombs yielded Mycenaean pottery, which is in accordance with my conclusion that Mycenaean pottery in this period was not widely available to the inhabitants of Hazor. At the higher part of the tell no Late Bronze Age tombs have been discovered, nor have any been found in areas C, E, H, K or 210 on the lower plateau. Considering the dense habitation of the site during the Late Bronze Age, a cemetery is probably located elsewhere, either on the plateau or outside the fortifications.

The three tombs with Mycenaean pottery each have yielded different amounts of it. The grave in cistern 9027 in area D produced four Mycenaean vessels (cat. nos. 8-11), ranging in date
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169 Yadin et al. 1958, 138-140; Of the nearby cistern 9028 only the upper layer was explored, Yadin et al. 1958, 140. Since the uppermost fill of this cistern was similar to that of no. 9027, it is possible that a Late Bronze Age burial still is present below this stratum.
170 Yadin et al. 1960, 141-142.
171 Yadin et al. 1960, 140-141.
172 Yadin 1972, 44-45; Yadin et al. 1989, 156-158. A LBI tomb was also discovered in a MBII drainage channel in area F.
from LHIIIA2 late to LHIIIB2. The fact that vessels from such wide ranging periods were found together in a grave with a single interment indicates that the vessel dated to LHIIIA2 late (cat. no. 8) must have been at least half a century old at the time of its deposition. This suggests that Mycenaean pottery may have been in use for a long time at Hazor, or that it circulated a long time before reaching the city.

In area F, tomb 8065 yielded only one LHIIIA2 piriform jar (cat. no. 29). The funerary chamber 8144-8145 possessed a total of fourteen Mycenaean vessels (cat. nos. 16-28, 38), ranging in date from LHIIIA2 to LHIIIB. The concentration of Mycenaean vessels in tomb 8144-8145 may, at least partly, be explained by its long use. Whereas the two other graves possessed only single bodies, funerary cellar 8144-8145 was used for multiple interments. However, tomb 8144-8145 yielded a funerary inventory which was particularly varied in finds, also in comparison with settlement contexts. Although this tomb cannot really be compared to any other at Hazor, the quantity of Mycenaean pottery seems to be one aspect of burial practices that involved a number of special goods.

In terms of Mycenaean vessel types, the Mycenaean pottery from funerary contexts have yielded a varied repertoire, as can be deduced from table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb</th>
<th>Vessel Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Catalogue Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cistern 9027</td>
<td>Amphoroid krater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deep bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Straight-sided alabastron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 8065</td>
<td>Piriform jar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb 8144-8145</td>
<td>Shallow cup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Globular flask, horizontal type</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21, 22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lentoid flask</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stirrup jar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rounded alabastron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Straight-sided alabastron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10

The number of dinner vessels in the graves is relatively high in comparison with the finds in houses. Moreover, in both tombs which have yielded more than one Mycenaean pot dinner vessels were present, suggesting that it was not unusual to include such vases in funerary ceremonies. In addition, there are a number of pot shapes from the graves, which have not been found elsewhere on the site. This is the case for the amphoroid krater and the deep bowl from cistern 9027, as well as for the shallow cups and globular flasks from tomb 8144-8145. This suggests that these ceramic types were specifically chosen to be used in funerary ceremonies. However, none of the vessel types unique to Hazor occur in more than one tomb. In fact, only straight-sided alabastra, a type frequent in settlement contexts as well, are present in more than one funerary context. The low number of Late Bronze Age tombs at Hazor prevents any statement on the popularity of specific vessel types in funerary contexts. The most frequent vessel type in graves was the stirrup jar, of which six specimens occurred in funerary cave 8144-8145. The popularity of this vessel type in this tomb may reflect its widespread occurrence in area F in general.

173 Yadin et al. (1960, 141) show that the funerary cellar was used during the whole LBIIA period.

174 In particular, this tomb contained a large number of imports and metal vessels, see Yadin et al. 1960, 145-153.

175 See also above, p. 104-105.

176 Of seven Mycenaean finds (cat. nos. 3, 41, 48-52) the vessel type is unknown. It is possible that one of these finds are from vessel types otherwise known only from tombs.
Because of the low number of burials at Hazor from the LBII period, it is difficult to analyse these three funerary cellars in terms of the social status of the deceased. It is clear that the inventory of tomb 8144-8145 was richer than that of the two other graves. Apart from the large quantities of Mycenaean pottery, this tomb contained a large number of local bowls and chalices, jugs, cooking pots and lamps, as well as Cypriot White Slip II and Base Ring II vessels. In addition, a bronze dish and bottle were found, along with three bronze arrow heads, a chisel and three rings, as well as three scarabs, one of which carried the name of pharaoh Thutmosis IV, and a number of bone spindlewhorls. The inventories of the other two graves consisted exclusively of pottery. In tomb 8065 a number of local cups and bowls, jugs, juglets, a storage jar and a lamp were found, as well as three juglets of Cypriot Base Ring II ware. Cistern 9027 contained a local juglet and six jars, as well as one decorated storage jar and a Cypriot White Slip II bowl.

Even though the larger quantity of finds in funerary cave 8144-8145 may be related to the longer use of this tomb, the presence of a varied repertoire of metal, bone and stone objects indicates that the proprietors of this tomb expressed a greater material wealth in their funerary ceremony. This may also be indicated by the fact that this tomb was specially created for Late Bronze Age II burial ceremonies, while the other two burials took place in existing structures: a MBII cistern in the case of grave 9027 and a depression in the case of grave 9065. In terms of effort expenditure, this points to a higher status of the owners of tomb 8144-8145. Apart from the Mycenaean pottery, all three burials contained imports from other areas: a White Slip II bowl (Cyprus) in the case of cistern 9027, three Base Ring jugs (Cyprus) in the case of burial 8065, and three scarabs (Egypt), as well as Base Ring and White Slip vessels (Cyprus) for cave 8144-8145. This suggests that imports, among which was Mycenaean pottery, played a role in strategies of funerary display.

The first purpose of this section was to investigate if Aegean pottery was limited to specific tombs. The fact that all three burials from the LBII period contained Mycenaean pottery may suggest that it was common practice to include such vessels in funerary ceremonies. However, the number of tombs really is too small to state this with certainty. What can be observed is that imports in general and Mycenaean pottery in particular played a role in strategies of funerary display. This is important since it indicates that Mycenaean pottery was not without social significance.

The second purpose of this paragraph was to establish if certain vessel types were specifically meant for funerary use. A number of vessel types has been found in the tombs, which do not occur in settlement contexts. However, not enough tombs have been excavated to establish if a funerary use for these vessels was customary. The occurrence in tombs of Mycenaean vessel types which have not been found in settlement context does, in my view, indicate that specific, rare shapes were chosen to be used in funerary ceremonies. Again, this indicates that such pottery was not without value at Hazor.

The role of Mycenaean pottery in the material culture of Hazor
Mycenaean ceramic vessels and figurines are the only imports at Hazor of certain Aegean origin. In comparison with some large coastal centres in the southern Levant, imports which
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177 Yadin et al. 1960, 145-153.; a number of miniature vessels were also found.
178 These spindlewhorls are of the same small type as those found in Room 1 in the easternmost building at Deir 'Alla (see chapter 7) and should possibly be interpreted as beads.
179 Yadin et al. 1960, 152.
are archaeologically immediately recognisable are relatively scarce at Hazor. Nevertheless, Egyptian imports at Hazor constitute a varied repertoire of finds, deriving from various excavated areas: a number of scarabs, faience beads, and alabaster vessels have been found, as well as two ceramic bowls (possibly locally imitated) and an Egyptian-style bottle with red slipped exterior. In addition, a bronze bowl containing two cymbals of the same material finds its best parallels at Aniba (site no. 275) in Nubia. Objects from Syria and Mesopotamia are more limited in their distribution and variety: a large number of cylinder seals have been found in the stratum 1A temple in area H, but these were clearly centuries old. In stratum 1B of the same area a number of basalt statues were discovered, which appear to have been imported from Syria.

The most numerous imports at Hazor were Cypriot ceramic vessels, which have been discovered in all areas and arrived from the MBII period onwards. A fair number of these finds are bowls, either in the White Slip or in the Base Ring tradition. Base Ring juglets as well as a juglet in White Shaved ware (LBI) have also been found, just as a Cypriot zoomorphic vessel. It may be of significance that, at least in domestic contexts, these Cypriot vessels have not often been found in direct association with Mycenaean vessels. In the closed contexts (H12-17) investigated in detail in section 4, Cypriot vessels were never reported from the same rooms as the Mycenaean pots, although they were found in the same houses. In area BA a WSII bowl was found together with a Mycenaean stirrup jar (cat. no. 44) in a domestic context, while in area A a Mycenaean alabastron (cat. no. 39) was found together with WSII bowls on the pavement of a possible street. The spatial separation in domestic contexts of these two imported classes of ceramics seems to reflect the extent to which both classes were integrated in the local material culture: they are both found with local domestic pottery and utensils and were not set apart as imports. However, Mycenaean and Cypriot pottery have been discovered together in contexts of a special nature: in cistern 9017 (G3), and in all three Late Bronze Age tombs. This suggests that in specific occasions the foreign origin of these items could be emphasised by combining them with other imports and objects of a special significance.

It may be expected that in a material environment in which imports were not very abundant, objects from international exchange possessed some kind of social significance. A concentration of Mycenaean pottery has been observed in area F and, to a lesser extent, in area D. Such an unequal distribution pattern may be caused by social strategies resulting in unequal access to Mycenaean pottery by different social groups at Hazor. A number of observations

181 Bienkowski 1987, 51-52. It must be emphasised that research into the occurrence of regional imports employing scientific methods, such as that conducted at Deir ‘Alla (see chapter 7), has not been carried out for Hazor.
182 For example: Yadin et al. 1958, Plate 86 no. 22 (area C) Plate 89 no. 19 (area C), 1960, 153 (area C); Goldwasser 1997 (areas A and F).
183 For example: Yadin et al. 1958, Plate 161 no. 12 (area C), Plate 170 no. 12 (area D); Ben-Tor et al. 56-57 fig. II.18 no. 31 (area A).
184 For example: Yadin et al. 1960, 158 (area C).
186 Yadin et al. 1958, 83 (area C)
187 Yadin et al. 1958, 233 (area H)
188 Yadin et al. 1989a, 310-321.
189 Yadin et al. 1989b, 322-338.
190 Beck 1989, 117.
191 Yadin et al. 1960, 110 (area C)
193 Yadin et al. 1989, 130.
194 For the suitability of imports to serve in social strategies, see Appadurai 1986, 44; Strathern 1992.
have been made in this chapter suggesting that a differentiation within the general class of Late Helladic ceramics is necessary in this respect. The domestic contexts in area F mainly produced Mycenaean narrow-mouthed container vessels, while wide-mouthed containers in domestic contexts in area C were primarily associated with the activities of artisans. Because a similar distinction between areas C and F cannot be made for the locally manufactured pottery, it is possible that this disparity is caused by unequal access for various social groups to the Mycenaean vessel types. Late Helladic dinner vessels, often with patterned decoration, were not widely used in domestic contexts. However, in the monumental temple in area H, they are the most frequent Mycenaean type, which suggests that such an institution had wide access to these vessels. Finally, Mycenaean pots from the first part of the Late Bronze Age are concentrated in area A, where a temple and palace were located. This suggests that the social groups associated with these structures had exclusive access to Mycenaean pottery during this period. Even though Mycenaean pottery seems to have been used widely at Hazor, it appears to have been monopolised by one social group during the first part of the Late Bronze Age. The fact that in the later period various groups within the society of Hazor had unequal access to different parts of the Mycenaean repertoire indicates that the possession and use of these vessels was of social significance.

There are several other indications that Mycenaean pottery possessed a certain value at Hazor. Its occurrence in contexts with clear ritual associations, such as the temple in area H, shows that it was considered suitable to serve in ceremonies of a highly symbolical nature. Moreover, the varied repertoire of Mycenaean pots present in the three Late Bronze Age tombs suggests that these vessels, in association with other imports, were used in strategies of funerary display. In a few cases Mycenaean pottery has been discovered in atypical contexts, such as cistern 9017 (G3) in area D and house 8139 (H14) in area F, showing that this material could be associated with objects of special significance. At the same time, the wide distribution of Mycenaean ceramics, both on the site as a whole as within single structures, suggests that this class of material was an integral part of the material culture at Hazor during the second phase of the Late Bronze Age.

In view of its apparent value at Hazor and also in comparison with other sites in the Levant, it is remarkable that no obvious imitations of Mycenaean pottery of Syro-Palestine manufacture have been reported from Hazor. Elsewhere, such Levantine derivatives of Aegean pottery, mostly produced at the end of the thirteenth and in the twelfth centuries BC, testify of the extent to which these vessels had become part of the local material culture. Its absence at Hazor may partly be explained by the capabilities of the local potters, who apparently did no longer work on the fast wheel. However, Aegean style pottery made in the Levant also seems to have circulated in systems of regional exchange, and its absence at Hazor may indicate that the city was not heavily involved in such trade.

195 Cf. the tables 4.4-4.8 (area C) with table 4.9 (area F) given by Daviau (1993). In both areas there is a strong predominance of local bowls, while kraters, pithoi, narrow-necked jars, jugs and juglets are common as well.
196 The absence of scientific investigations of the fabrics argues for caution in this respect. The description of the fabrics accompanying the drawings are, however, fairly homogeneous: yellow to pink levigated, well-fired clay.
198 Bienkowski 1987, 51.
199 Killebrew 1998. Since the Aegean style pottery manufactured in the Levant seems to have circulated mainly at the very end of the thirteenth and in the twelfth centuries BC, its absence at Hazor may be a chronological phenomenon. The date of the destruction of the latest LBA stratum at Hazor has been placed in the beginning of the twelfth century BC mainly because LHIIIIB pottery did occur in this stratum, see Fritz 1973, 126. The stylistically latest Mycenaean vessel is a LHIIB2 deep bowl (cat. no. 11), which could well be from the second half of the thirteenth century.
The final question to be addressed in this chapter concerns the social groups within the society of Hazor that made use of the Mycenaean pottery. The abundance of this material in area A, where a palace and monumental temple were situated during the Late Bronze Age, indicates that the royal court, the existence of which is certain from the Amarna tablets, made use of these ceramics. At the very least the Mycenaean finds in this area attest to the use of Mycenaean pottery in official contexts. Indeed, Mycenaean vessels from the first part of the Late Bronze Age seem to have been used exclusively by high-level social groups. Mycenaean pottery, in particular dinner vessels, is also associated with groups involved in the performance of religious rites in the monumental temple H. The evidence from areas C and D indicates that artisans working in the city used Mycenaean storage vessels in their daily life, while the frequency of this material in area F testifies that it also occurred in habitation structures. It seems therefore that Mycenaean pottery was available to all social groups at Hazor, even though access to specific vessel types appears not to have been equal.

The extent of the territory controlled by Hazor is uncertain. A survey of the upper Jordan valley revealed no Late Bronze Age settlements in the central and northern parts of the region and only six sites in the southern part. No Mycenaean pottery was reported from any of these sites. The nearest site where such material has been found is Kinneret (site no. 230) on the north-western coast of Lake Tiberias. This site possessed its own defences during the Late Bronze Age and appears to have been the focal point for a rebellion against Egyptian rule in the seventh year of pharaoh Amenophis II. The relationship of Kinneret with Hazor is unclear. To the north, Tell Dan (site no. 158) has produced substantial amounts of Mycenaean pottery. This site, ancient Laish, is mentioned separately in the Egyptian list of cities destroyed by Thutmosis III and was most likely independent of Hazor. At Tell Dan, Mycenaean pottery has been found in domestic, as well as in funerary contexts. Beyond Tell Dan, Mycenaean finds have been reported from Khan Selim (site no. 157). Even more to the north, in the Beqaa valley, large quantities of Mycenaean pottery have been found at Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154). At this site Egyptian influences are stronger than at Hazor and the possibility of an Egyptian garrison at Kamid el-Loz has been raised.

The picture that seems to emerge is that Mycenaean pottery in the northern Jordan valley was used primarily by people living in urban communities. The paucity of Late Bronze Age sites in the countryside near Hazor may be the result of the agricultural population living in the city. The many silos discovered at Hazor, evidence of agricultural storage, would support such a view. It appears that Mycenaean pottery was used by all social strata in the society of Hazor. In different ways, this class of material provided a means of expression for various social groups.

200 No Mycenaean pottery has been reported from the small section of the palace (building 389) excavated by Yadin and his team, see Yadin et al. 1989, 23-24. This building was of LBI date and it is uncertain whether it was still in use in LBII. During the most recent excavations the rest of this building was explored, see Ben-Tor 1995, 12; Wolff 1996, 735-736. Publication of these discoveries should either confirm or deny the association of Mycenaean pottery with the royal court.

201 Epstein & Goodman 1972, 244-250; Bienkowski 1987, 54.

202 A single Mycenaean pot has been reported from this site by Hankey & Leonard 1989 (map). The site is absent from Leonard's (1994) gazetteer of sites in the Levant with Mycenaean pottery.

203 Gonen 1984, 65; Bienkowski 1987, 54 (with references).


205 Biran 1993, 326; Biran 1994a, 105-123; 1994b, 8.

206 Gregori & Palumbo 1986, 383; site no. 35. I have been unable to find any other information about this site.


208 Echt 1982; Bienkowski 1987, 59.

CHAPTER 7

Tell Deir ‘Alia

Introduction

Deir ‘Alia is the name of an artificial hill in the central Jordan valley, about 45 kilometres north-west of Amman and 60 kilometres north-east of Jerusalem. The tell is situated some five kilometres east of the Jordan river, near the place where the Zerqa river (biblical Jabbok) enters the Jordan valley. Several streams in the area have washed the salt out of the alluvial soils of the valley, which ensures reasonable agricultural possibilities, especially if irrigation is employed.¹ Twelve sites with Late Bronze Age remains have been identified in the near vicinity of the site, of which Tell Mazar and Tell es-Saidiyeh (site no. 186), three and twelve kilometres north-west of Deir ‘Alia respectively, have been excavated.² Even though the nature of most sites in the vicinity is unclear, their presence indicates the existence of an integrated network in the area, possibly centred around trading activities.³ In a wider geographical area, the central Jordan region and its connecting valleys and uplands possessed a number of Late Bronze Age towns, such as Shechem (site no. 182), Dothan (site no. 179), Beth Shean (site no. 178), Pella (site no. 185) and Sahab (site no. 190). The nature of settlement in the area should be seen in relation to the varying degrees of Egyptian interest in the trade routes through the Jordan valley and the Jordanian uplands.⁴

The first archaeological interest in Tell Deir ‘Alia was taken at the end of the nineteenth century by S. Merrill, who described the hill and identified it as the site of biblical Succoth.⁵ In 1942 a surface survey was conducted by Nelson Glueck in the context of his general archaeological exploration of eastern Palestine.⁶ The first excavations took place in 1960 by a Dutch expedition, headed by H.J. Franken of the University of Leiden, who would lead six campaigns to the site until 1976.⁷ The initial aim of the expedition was to study the transition from the Late Bronze to Early Iron Ages through a stratigraphic analysis of the ceramic material. A strategy of small, stepped trenches was employed.⁸ Geomorphological studies and a survey of the surrounding area to identify cemeteries belonging to the settlement were also carried out.⁹ The discovery of a Late Bronze Age building with a religious character warranted

² Franken 1969, 2; Van der Steen 1996, 53, 61-63.
⁴ Van der Kooij & Ibrahim 1989, 11; Franken 1992, 166. For the importance of Egyptian interests for the archaeology of the Late Bronze Age Levant in general, see Leonard 1989, 5; Falconer 1994, 326.
⁵ Merrill 1881, 388.
⁶ Glueck 1951, 308-310.
⁷ For an overview of the history of archaeological research at Deir ‘Alia, see Van der Kooij & Ibrahim 1989, 22-24.
⁸ Franken 1960, 386. For the theory and methodology of the excavations and the scientific approach to study of ceramics, as well as an analysis of the Iron Age pottery, see Franken 1969.
⁹ Franken 1960, 392-393. The search for a cemetery was halted when it became clear that the ancient valley floor is covered by thick alluvial deposits; see Franken 1992, 170.
full-scale excavations, which were carried out in 1964 and 1967.\textsuperscript{10} Excavations were continued in 1976-1979 by joint expeditions of the University of Leiden and the Department of Antiquities in Jordan, headed by Franken, G. van der Kooij and M. Ibrahim.\textsuperscript{11} The same institutions have excavated at the site in 1982, 1984, 1987, 1994,1996 and in 1998, together with the Yarmouk University of Irbid, Jordan.\textsuperscript{12} Apart from continuing work on the hill itself, trenches have been dug at the foot of the tell in the south-east and south-west.

The oldest finds at Deir ‘Alla date from the Chalcolitic period.\textsuperscript{13} The first true settlement at the site, however, seems to belong to the Middle Bronze Age, of which two phases have been excavated in trenches in the south-east (Map 19).\textsuperscript{14} At the end of the Middle Bronze Age the habitation area of the tell was enlarged through the deposition of soil on the natural shallow hill.\textsuperscript{15} Eight phases of the Late Bronze Age, labelled A to H, have been discovered on the northern slope of the tell (Map 19).\textsuperscript{16} The most extensive remains, those of phase E, were destroyed by an earthquake and subsequent fires sometime in the twelfth century BC.\textsuperscript{17} An attempt to rebuild was made immediately after the destruction, but this phase F was destroyed before it was finished.\textsuperscript{18} Two later phases of the Late Bronze Age (phases G and H) were laid out on a different plan.\textsuperscript{19} Four phases of the Late Bronze Age have been discovered at the south-western foot of the tell.\textsuperscript{20} During recent campaigns, Late Bronze Age remains have also been discovered in the eastern and north-western part of the site.\textsuperscript{21} The earliest habitation of the Iron Age followed immediately upon that of the Late Bronze Age, but the material record suggests that new groups of people had arrived at the site.\textsuperscript{22} Numerous post-holes dating to this phase point to the use of tents, which may imply that the site was inhabited only seasonally during Iron Age I. At the very end of the twelfth century BC, the site was again permanently settled (Iron Age IIA).\textsuperscript{23} Extensive remains from an agricultural community of the Iron Age IIB were discovered at the top of the tell.\textsuperscript{24} The famous Balaam text also belongs to this phase. The site remained inhabited during the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian periods, but was apparently abandoned before the Hellenistic age.\textsuperscript{25} A cemetery was located on the tell in the periods of the Ayyubids and Mamluks (12th-16th centuries AD). After this period, the hill remained uninhabited.
The remains of stratum E on the northern slope, in which all of the Mycenaean pottery has been found, cover an area of roughly 300 sq.m. (Map 20). The group of structures appear grouped around the *cella*, which was built on an artificial raised platform, roughly north-south orientated.  

Soundings in the *cella* determined that it had been rebuilt five times, with the first phase belonging to the sixteenth century BC. The thick mud-brick walls of the *cella* were on the north side buttressed by a stone structure. Two stone slabs in the *cella* served as bases for wooden columns, of which a burned fragment was retrieved. Adjacent to the *cella*, in the west, two rooms (nos. 7 and 8) were excavated, which have been interpreted as storerooms on the basis of their inventories. Directly north and west of these rooms a number of spaces (nos. 9-14) of unknown purpose were discovered. East of the *cella* was a courtyard, possibly roofed, if postholes in this area belong to this phase. On the other side of this courtyard, there was a building of which three rooms (nos. 4-6) have been excavated. This building has been interpreted as a treasury. Further east, a building was situated, of which three rooms could partly be recovered (nos. 1-3). On the basis of their inventories, these rooms have been interpreted as a shrine, a kitchen and a storeroom or pantry respectively.

In the two areas excavated in the south-west, buildings have been discovered of which the orientation deviates slightly from those of the Late Bronze Age structures on the northern slope of the tell. Phases III and IV of the northern area revealed a structure of at least four spaces, partly built with a stone foundation wall. In the two occupation phases of the southernmost trenches, a mud-brick structure was revealed, which contained evidence for metalworking: pieces of copper alloy and fragments of crucibles. The stratigraphy of the Late Bronze Age remains in the south-west has, so far, not been related to the discoveries on the northern slope. However, thick layers of burnt debris on the slopes in the south-western area may be connected to the destruction layer of phase E. Moreover, a clay tablet was found in the SW with the same unknown script as those found on the northern slope.

One of the problems connected to Merri’s identification of the site with Biblical Succoth is that nowhere in the Bible is mentioned that Succoth would possess a sanctuary. Other Biblical names, therefore, have been suggested for the site: Qadesh, Machir and Penuel. This part of Transjordan can be identified as ancient Gilead, a producer of agricultural products such as fruits and cattle, as well as oils and resin. These goods were traded, in particular with Egypt, via Palestine. The nearby Late Bronze Age town at Shechem (site no. 182) fulfilled an important role in this inter-regional trade network. Investigation of pottery fabrics shows that during the Late Bronze Age ceramics were imported into Deir ‘Alia from different areas in Jordan. This indicates that the site participated in (inter-)regional exchange networks. The prominence of the *cella* and the absence of a substantial city in the near vicinity of the site have
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27 Franken 1992, 10.
28 Franken 1992, 73-84, 163-165.
29 Franken 1992, 71-72, 163-165.
32 Ibrahim & Van der Kooij 1997, 105 figure 11.
34 Ibrahim & Van der Kooij 1997, 105.
38 Franken 1992, 178.
led to an interpretation of the site as a free-standing sanctuary, serving as a trading post. According to this hypothesis, the sanctuary was the focal point of trading activities, which provided divine protection and confirmation to the transactions. The recent discoveries in the south-west, with clear evidence of industrial activities, have shed doubts on the interpretation of the site as a free-standing sanctuary.

The analysis of the Late Bronze Age pottery at Deir ‘Alla established that the locally produced ceramic wares could only to a certain extent be related to contemporary pottery in Palestine. The ceramic repertoire has a largely independent character and may be characterised as Jordanian, rather than as true Palestinian. This indicates that the settlement was controlled by the population of Gilead, which practised agriculture in the plains and husbandry in the foothills near the site. Apart from the regional ceramic imports, other finds, such as the Mycenaean pottery, have their origins further afield. Three fragments of Cypriot White Slip II milkbowls have been discovered, while a fourth sherd is likewise labelled as Cypriot. A number of cylinder seals from northern Syria have been found, as well as a variety of objects from Egypt, such as seals, faience amulets, scarabs and a faience vessel. These objects probably should be interpreted as goods from international exchange networks, which had entered the regional system.

**Quantity and quality of the data**

In total, five Mycenaean vessels and one derivative of Syro-Palestinian manufacture have been published from Tell Deir ‘Alla (see catalogue IV). One of these five vessels (catalogue no. 2) may have a Minoan origin. Since none of the pots has been subject to scientific provenance research, the origin of the vessels cannot be established with certainty. However, in view of the provenances for Mycenaean pottery in Palestine in general, it is conceivable that most of the vessels at Deir ‘Alla were produced on the Peloponnese.

It is certain that these six examples constitute all the Aegean style pottery from the Late Bronze Age that has been found at Deir ‘Alla. The excavations of the Bronze Age levels on the northern slope have been fully published. Moreover, the special attention of the excavators for pottery makes it unlikely that any Mycenaean sherds have been thrown away or remained unnoticed. Some of the excavations in the south-western part of the site have been discussed in a preliminary report only. According to the excavators, Aegean style pottery has, so far, not been found in this part of the site. We can be certain, therefore, that our data-set for Deir ‘Alla is complete.

Only a small portion of the total surface of the tell (ca. 4 ha.) has been excavated (Map 19). Late Bronze Age remains have been attested only in an area of roughly 500 sq.m. In the
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41 Franken 1992, 152-162; Van der Kooij & Ibrahim 1989, 80. The independent character of the pottery industry in Transjordan during the late Bronze Age is also commented upon by Kafafi (1977, 464-465), who shows that several vessel types, such as amphoras, have an East Bank origin.
42 Franken 1992, 174-175.
43 Franken 1992, 131, 134 fig. 7-13 nos. 42-46. In addition, a WSII sherd was found in later levels; G. Van der Kooij, pers. com.
44 Van der Kooij & Ibrahim 1989, 80.
46 See chapter 3.
47 In the Iron Age I levels vessels of so-called Philistine ware have been found; see Franken 1969, 180-181 no. 4, 188-189 no. 52, 190-191 no. 4, 196-197 nos. 3, 5, 7, 245. These finds are not taken into consideration here.
49 The 1994 campaign has been reported upon by Ibrahim & Van der Kooij 1997; the 1996 and 1998 campaigns have, so far, not been published.
50 G. Van der Kooij, pers. comm.
excavations directly south of the *cella* area, Late Bronze Age layers have not been touched upon, although they may be present below the Iron Age strata.\(^{51}\) From the south-eastern area only Middle Bronze Age remains have been reported.\(^{52}\) The Late Bronze Age settlement does not appear to have covered the whole surface of the current *tell*.\(^{53}\) Nevertheless, it is possible, especially in view of the discovery of Late Bronze Age structures in the south-west, that buildings contemporary with those on the northern slope once stood elsewhere on the *tell*. The possibility that Mycenaean pottery is still buried at Deir ‘Alia cannot be ruled out.

Of more serious concern are depositional and post-depositional factors. The destruction of the buildings by an earthquake and subsequent fires have resulted in thick destruction deposits, which preserved many finds *in situ*.\(^{54}\) However, activities on the *tell* after the destruction, especially the digging of pits, have disturbed the destruction layer at several places.\(^{55}\) Erosion, in particular, has played an important role on the steep, barren hill. The northern part of most of the structures on the northern slope, including the rooms in which Mycenaean pottery has been found, has disappeared through erosion (see Map 20).\(^{56}\) In these cases, it is entirely possible that Mycenaean pottery has slid down the hill as well.\(^{57}\) However, as these rooms fulfilled specific functions, we may expect that the part of their inventories which is now missing was not of a completely different nature than the evidence we do have. In my opinion, the data-set may be considered representative of all the Mycenaean pottery that once was present at Deir ‘Alia.

The on-site distribution of Mycenaean pottery

The six entries in catalogue IV have been found in two buildings only: the easternmost structure with rooms 1-3 and the treasury adjacent to the courtyard (see Table 7.1 and Map 20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>building</th>
<th>room</th>
<th>amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easternmost building (H18)</td>
<td>room 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>room 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>room 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury (H19)</td>
<td>room 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>room 5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>room 6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1

It is remarkable, especially with such a low number of finds, that in each of these buildings more than one Mycenaean vessel has been found. This concentration of the Mycenaean finds indicates that these pots were not used everywhere at the site, but served special functions.

On the basis of the architecture and inventories, the excavators were able to assign different functions to the rooms.\(^{58}\) It is noteworthy that none of our vessels has been found in the *cella*, which yielded a number of luxury objects, such as cylinder seals, beads and alabaster and
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51 See note 10.
52 Van der Kooij & Ibrahim 1989, 76.
54 Franken 1992, 7-9.
55 Franken 1992, 8.
57 In this respect, it is interesting that the Cypriot vessels referred to above have been found on the slope directly north of Rooms 1-3 (P700) in which four Mycenaean vessels were found.
58 Franken 1992, 163-165.
faience vessels, some of which were imported from Egypt and Syria. Mycenaean pottery has not been found in the storerooms (Rooms 7 and 8) either, which served the cella. This indicates that Aegean vessels were not used during the ceremonies which were practised in the cella, nor were they offered as votives. The functions of Rooms 9 and 10 are not known. However, the nature of the pottery indicates that these were domestic quarters. If such an identification is correct, the absence of Mycenaean pottery in these rooms suggests that these ceramics were not part of domestic activities at the site. In the adjacent Rooms 11-14 hardly any finds were made, due to erosion.

The two buildings in the east are comparable to the cella in the presence of luxury objects. The building of Rooms 4-6 has been interpreted as a treasury, on the basis of the discovery of inscribed clay tablets, a great number of beads and alabaster and marble objects. Two Mycenaean vessels were also found here (cat. nos. 4 and 5). This treasury was connected to the cella by a courtyard and most likely was related to it. To the easternmost building a variety of functions have been assigned. Room 1, has been interpreted as a shrine and the presence of three Mycenaean vessels in this room could indicate that such ceramics did occur in cultic contexts, even if they have not been found in the cella itself. Room 2, in which one of our pots was discovered, has been interpreted as a kitchen, while Room 3 is referred to as a storeroom or pantry. In total, four of our vessels can be associated with the easternmost building. The relation of this structure with the cella and Treasury is difficult to assess, but the wealth of finds in this area suggests that it had some kind of official function. In any case, the distribution pattern of Mycenaean pottery at Deir 'Alla clearly shows that it was restricted to the wealthier, official areas.

Fig. 7.1 LHIIIA2 (?) stirrup jar (cat. no. 3) and LHIIIA2-LHIIIB flask (cat. no. 4) from phase E

From a stylistic point of view, the earliest Mycenaean vessel probably is the squat stirrup jar of cat. no. 3, which can be compared to similar vessels at Tell el-Amarna in Egypt and may be assigned a late LHIIIA2 date (fig. 7.1). The two horizontal flasks of cat. nos. 4 and 5 can be
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60 These rooms produced mainly kitchen pottery and a variety of utilitarian objects, see Franken 1992, 84-91.
63 Most likely, the tablets were written in a proto-Canaanite dialect, which cannot, as yet, be translated; see Knauf 1987, 14-16.
64 Franken 1992, 163-165.
65 Franken 1992, 164.
66 Hankey 1967, 131-132. Leonard (1994, 62 no. 761), however, assigns this vessel to LHIIIB.
assigned to LHIIIA2-LHIIIB1 (fig. 7.1), while the other three vessels are of LHIIIB types. All these vessels were in use at the time of destruction of phase E, which is dated by the cartouche of Queen Taousert after 1186 BC. If the stirrup jar indeed belongs to LHIIIA2, this means that it was more than a century old at the time of its deposition; the two flasks were at least half that age.

There may be several causes for the high age of these vessels. Firstly, they may have been exported from Greece when they were already old. Secondly, they may have been in circulation for a long time. Thirdly, they may have arrived at Deir ‘Ala when they were relatively new, and kept at the site for a long time as heirlooms or antiques. It is impossible to establish with certainty which of these possibilities apply in these particular cases. The occurrence of the LHIIIA2 stirrup jar in direct association with LHIIIB types suggests that the older vessel was not regarded as different, which could imply that it was already old upon its arrival at the site. However, it is also conceivable that Mycenaean vessels were highly valued at Deir ‘Ala and treated with care. In any case, as at other sites, these find points to the possibility that Aegean vessels remained in use long after their manufacture.

All the Mycenaean pots in Deir ‘Ala are storage vessels. The absence of dinner and ritual vessels at the site is noteworthy, as these types elsewhere constitute a significant proportion of the repertoire of Mycenaean ceramics. Within the general class of storage pottery, two vessel types are present at Deir ‘Ala: the globular flask (cat. nos. 4 and 5) and the stirrup jar (cat. nos. 1-3 and 6). The stirrup jar is generally considered as a container for (perfumed) oil, while the globular flask could also hold oil, as well as wine or other liquid substances. The spatial distribution of these two vessel types indicate restrictions of use to specific buildings at Deir ‘Ala: the flasks were found in the treasury, whereas all the stirrup jars occurred in the easternmost building (see Map 20). This spatial separation is contextual as well, because the two buildings have been assigned different functions. From this distribution pattern it is clear that Mycenaean vessels were restricted to specific functions.

The last subdivision of the Mycenaean pottery for which the spatial and contextual distribution will be investigated is that according to decorative styles or type of ware. All the Mycenaean vessels at Tell Deir ‘Ala are of fine, decorated ware. Only the LHIIIA2 squat stirrup jar of cat. no. 3 has a patterned decoration: five groups of multiple stem and tongue pattern on the shoulder (FM 19). The other vessels, including the imitation stirrup jar of cat. no. 2005, are decorated with bands and lines only. One patterned stirrup jar is too little to investigate if restrictions of use according to decoration of the Aegean-type vessels occurred at Deir ‘Ala. However, it may be of significance that only vessels with simple decoration arrived at the site.

The purpose of this section was to see if any restrictions in use can be discerned from the spatial and contextual distribution of Mycenaean pottery at Deir ‘Ala. The main conclusion seems to be that all Mycenaean pottery was restricted to the wealthier and official part of the settlement. It does not seem to have been used in the main cult activities at the site, nor to have been part of domestic life. A second observation is that the two vessel types occurring at Deir ‘Ala were restricted to different buildings. This indicates that they fulfilled specific functions.

---

69 See note 17.
71 Hankey 1967, 132.
73 Hankey 1967, 132.
Closed contexts

The organisation of space at Deir ‘Alla clearly indicates that the buildings were grouped around the *cella*, which was built on a raised platform. The *cella* and the rooms immediately to the west can be considered as one architectural complex, to which the treasury also belonged, as it was connected to the main building by a courtyard. Excavations between the Treasury and the easternmost building did not reveal any other Late Bronze Age structures, but the area was heavily damaged by later construction. The easternmost building appears to have been isolated from the main complex and it may be assumed that it fulfilled separate, special functions. The treasury and the easternmost building are comparable to the *cella* in the quantities of luxury objects and ceremonial pottery, from which we may conclude that both buildings served official, ceremonial functions. The abundance of utilitarian objects and ‘kitchen’ pottery in the eastern part of the site in comparison with the *cella*, however, suggests that the activities conducted here did not have an exclusively cultic character.

**Easternmost building (H18) (Map 20)**

The easternmost building was discovered accidentally during the campaign of 1961. It consists of three rooms, roughly east-west arranged, of which the northern walls have eroded away. At present, three rooms have been excavated, but there is evidence of another room east of Room 1. Room 1 was entered through a door in the southern wall, next to which a niche was made on the inside. Room 2 contained a mass of building debris and pottery, which had fallen on the floor. Lying across this room was a double line of stones, which may be interpreted as some kind of bench. On top of this bench, the skeletal remains of an adult were found, who had obviously been caught by the fallen debris. From this room, one could reach Room 3, which had a second doorway in its western wall. A small strip of original floor remained in this room.

The distribution of Mycenaean pottery within this building (Map 20) shows a concentration in Room 1, where three Mycenaean stirrup jars were found, associated with local dippers and bowls, a fenestrated pot, some cylinder seals and beads. Because this inventory compares well with that of the *cella*, this room has been interpreted as a space designated for ritual practices of some kind. The most numerous class of artefacts in the room, however, was a large number of ‘spindlewhorls’ made of bone. Such objects were not found in the *cella*. In Room 2, which has been interpreted as a kitchen, a Levantine derivative of a Mycenaean stirrup jar has been found, associated with many local bowls. Room 3 did not yield any Mycenaean pottery. Because the ceramic inventory of this room compared well to that of Rooms 7 and 8, Room 3 has been interpreted as a pantry or storeroom.

---

*74* Franken 1992, 21-22.

*75* Franken 1992, 51. These excavations consisted of a line of small test trenches between the Treasury and the easternmost building; not the whole area has been excavated.

*76* Franken tentatively assigns the label ‘ceremonial’ to all pottery classes, including the Mycenaean, which are not common at Deir ‘Alla; Franken 1992, 164-165.


*78* Franken 1992, 37.


*81* Franken 1992, 43-45.


*83* Franken (1992, 165) lists ten spindlewhorls from Room 1, which makes this the most numerous class of artefact in the room. The small size of these objects and the fact that they were made of bone suggests that they may have been used as beads rather than for spinning activities. Elsewhere at Deir ‘Alla, in Rooms 2, 7 and 8 these objects occurred only in one or two specimens per room.
The concentration of the Mycenaean stirrup jars in the room which was richest in finds indicates that these vessels were among the highly valued items used in this building. The spatial separation of the original Mycenaean vessels from the Levantine derivative, which may have been imported as well, suggests that the inhabitants were, at least to a degree, aware of the differences in origin of the vessels. The fact that the imitation stirrup jar was found in an archaeological context with far fewer luxury objects than that of the originals indicates that original Mycenaean vessels enjoyed a higher appreciation than regional derivatives.

Treasury (HI9) (Map 20)
The treasury consisted of at least three rooms, two of which (rooms 4 and 5) have been excavated (almost) completely. Room 6 extended further to the south. It is possible that the building included a fourth room, south of Room 4. Room 4 was entered from the south side and did not communicate with other rooms. The northern wall of Room 5 has disappeared through erosion. A small mud-brick bench extended from the eastern wall. This room must have been old at the time of the earthquake, because the courtyard levels outside the room, had accumulated sixty centimetres on its western side, after which a butress wall was built against the western wall of the room. Of Room 6 only a very small part was excavated.

The two Mycenaean flasks reported from this building, were both found in Room 5, where they were associated with local ceremonial and domestic pottery, some alabaster objects, three administrative tablets, three seals and a large number of beads. The fact that this room is considered old by the excavators relates well to the ceramic styles of the Mycenaean vessels (LHIIA2-LHIIIB1), which must have been at least fifty years old at the time of their deposition.

The rich inventory of Room 5 is paralleled by that of Room 4 and 6, which likewise have produced administrative tablets, ceremonial pottery, seals and beads. A functional differentiation between the rooms cannot be made and the significance of the concentration of the two vessels in Room 5 cannot be assessed. It is unfortunate that the clay tablets cannot be translated, but in any case they indicate that this building served an administrative purpose, either pertaining to the cult practised in the cella or to more civic activities. The presence of the two Mycenaean flasks in this material environment shows that they were highly valued.

The first purpose of this section was to review if a differentiation according to vessel type can be made with regard to the use of Mycenaean pottery among the population of Deir ‘Alla. The two buildings in which these pots have been found each served specific functions. Of the two, the treasury may be considered the richest, as is evident from the larger number of luxury objects found in the treasury. The high esteem for Mycenaean horizontal flasks may have been due to their contents. However, it must be emphasised that both flasks were at least fifty years old at the time of their deposition. It is likely that the vessels have been refilled many times.
times, either at Deir ‘Alla, or before their arrival at the site. This suggests that the pots themselves were highly appreciated as well. The easternmost building reveals a wide variety of functions. In comparison with the cella and the treasury, this building produced less ceremonial pottery and fewer luxury objects, although more than in the buildings west of the main cult hall. The context of the Aegean stirrup jars at Deir ‘Alla, therefore, bears not as much testimony to wealth than that of the flasks, which may suggest that these vessel types, or their contents, were not similarly appreciated.

In both contexts Mycenaean pottery seems to have been particularised, that is deliberately chosen for specific purposes. The morphology of Mycenaean flasks and stirrup jars indicates that these vessel types contained similar substances, most likely thin, pourable oil. The basis for the particularisation of these vessels, therefore, appears to have been the pot shape itself, as is clear from the spatial separation of the two vessel types. However, particularisation also seems to have occurred according to provenance, as is clear from the fact that the Levantine imitation of an Aegean stirrup jar was found in a different context than the original types. It has been concluded before that the original Mycenaean vessels were more highly esteemed than the imitation.

The role of Mycenaean pottery in the material culture of Deir ‘Alla
Mycenaean ceramic vessels are the only imports at Deir ‘Alla which can be identified as coming from the Aegean. Other imports at the site from far-away areas include a variety of Egyptian objects, Syrian cylinder seals and Cypriot ceramics. The spatial distribution of these finds at the tell is indicated in table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R5</th>
<th>R6</th>
<th>Cella</th>
<th>R7</th>
<th>R8</th>
<th>R9</th>
<th>R10</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypriot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X (P700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablets</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2

From this table it is clear that, of all imports, Egyptian objects are most widely distributed, as they have been found in many rooms, as well as in the south-western area. In contrast, the Syrian, Mycenaean and Cypriot finds are concentrated at a few findspots. In terms of quantity, the imports from Egypt far outnumber those from other regions. Moreover, the variety of objects is larger as well: beads, seals, scarabs, amulets and faience and alabaster vessels have been reported as Egyptian objects, while from Syria only cylinder seals have been discovered and from the Aegean and Cyprus only ceramic vessels. It seems that the relations of Late

---

90 See note 89. Apart from the Mycenaean pottery, Franken (1992, 164-165) lists eight ceremonial vessels from the Rooms 1-3, while thirteen luxury objects were found.


92 See note 44.

93 After Franken 1992; Ibrahim & Van der Kooij 1997. Only objects of which the imported character is certain are included in this table. The Syrian objects are all cylinder seals. More seals have been found, in particular in Room 4, which may have a North-Syrian origin (compare, for example, the antelopes on Franken (1992, 58-59 nos. 10-11 [R4] with Parker 1949, 16 no. 4 [Mitannian]). If so, R4 should be added to the table as a findspot of Syrian objects. For the sake of comparison, the findspots of the administrative tablets have been included.

94 Ibrahim & Van der Kooij (1997, 104 fig. 10.2) report an Egyptian seal impression on a possible jar stopper.
Bronze Age Deir ‘Alla with Egypt were particularly strong. This comparison with other imports suggests that the restricted use of Mycenaean vessels was comparable to other imports from far-away regions with which contact was infrequent. As was already suggested in reference to the difference in archaeological context between the original Aegean stirrup jars and the Levantine imitation, the origin of the vessels appears to have influenced their appreciation.

Investigation of the fabrics of the Levantine pottery found at Deir ‘Alia has established that a substantial proportion of the vessels can be considered regional imports. These regional imports have been found at many places at the site and can be considered as consistent elements in the material culture of Deir ‘Ala. The regional wares and the pottery that was locally produced include a large range of vessel types, among which small containers for liquids are represented as well. From a functional point of view, therefore, the Mycenaean pottery does not stand out in the total ceramic repertoire of Deir ‘Ala. From the perspective of the quality of the fabrics, however, the vessels produced in the Aegean are completely different. In the southern Levant, potters returned to using the slow wheel during the Late Bronze Age, whereas they had been using the fast wheel during the Middle Bronze Age. Towards the end of the Bronze Age, much of the art of potting was lost in the region of Deir ‘Ala: painted decoration over one or two slip layers was no longer practised and light-weight pots with thin walls were no longer produced. In such a ceramic environment, the Mycenaean stirrup jars and flasks represented high-quality ceramic products.

The causes of the deterioration in pottery manufacture in the Palestine can, in a technical sense, be related to a slowing down of the production process, probably due to changes in the organisation. The decline in the quality of local ceramics has been tentatively related to the influx of substantial quantities of Aegean and Cypriot ceramics by A. Leonard. The evidence of Deir ‘Ala does not support this hypothesis, because the number of imported vessels from these areas is very low indeed. Rather, the decline in pottery technology may be related to a changing role of pottery in the societies in Palestine during the Late Bronze Age, because of which there was no widespread use for fine wares. For a religious institution such as the sanctuary at Tell Deir ‘Ala, in which customs and traditions may have survived over a very long period, it may have become increasingly difficult to acquire fine ware vessels. The high value ascribed to the Mycenaean vessels at Deir ‘Ala should perhaps be seen in this light.

At the end of the thirteenth and in the twelfth centuries BC there was a substantial production of Aegean-type stirrup jars in the southern Levant. Four of such vessels discovered at nearby Tell es-Saidiyeh (site no. 186) were determined to have been produced locally, while another was imported from elsewhere, possibly Cyprus. Analyses of such vessels

---

95 Franken (1992, 105-114) distinguishes eight different wares, of which the groups C-H are definitely not produced locally, while this is possibly the case for group D.
97 Franken (1992, 164) reports twenty-one small jugs among the registered pottery. In addition, pilgrim flasks, one of which with pictorial decoration, have been found in Rooms 4 and 6 and in the cella, see Franken 1992, 55 no. 28; 29 no. 11; 64 nos. 10-11.
98 The Mycenaean vessels may also be functionally associated with narrow-mouthed, non-ceramic vessels, see Franken 1992, 58 no. 21, 64 no. 10 (faience); 58 no. 22 (glass), 64 no. 11 (alabaster).
100 Franken 1992, 152.
101 Franken 1992, 152.
103 Knapp et al. 1988, 89.
104 Soundings in the cella have determined that the first building phase of the temple should be dated in the first phase of the Late Bronze Age, which means that the building must have been in use for at least four centuries.
at Tell Nami (site no. 341) and Tell Miqne-Ekron (site no. 208) suggest that these vessels were involved in regional exchange. It is possible that the stirrup jar of Levantine manufacture discovered in Room 2 at Deir ‘Alla arrived at the site through such regional trade, the existence of which is certain from the research conducted on the local wares. However, it is also conceivable that the high value of the imported stirrup jars stimulated local potters at Deir ‘Alla to try and imitate them. In any case, the fact that Mycenaean stirrup jars were produced in this region testifies to the extent to which these vessels and their contents had become part of the material culture of the Levant at the end of the Late Bronze Age.

Despite the numerous imports, the material record of Deir ‘Alla shows that the settlement was under the control of population groups living in Transjordan. The abundance of Egyptian imports suggests that the site should be interpreted in the context of trade between Egypt and Gilead. The evidence from the regional pottery imports suggests that Deir ‘Alla was the focal point for a number of regional exchange networks. At such a point, products from Transjordan could be exchanged with regional traders from Palestine and Egypt. The Mycenaean, Cypriot and Syrian objects found at Deir ‘Alla can be interpreted as objects from international exchange networks, which had entered these regional systems. The find circumstances of the Mycenaean vessels show that they were restricted to the wealthiest part of the town. The Mycenaean pots at Deir ‘Alla, therefore, can be associated with local elites at a regional trade center.

A number of sites with Late Bronze Age remains have been identified on the East Bank of the Jordan river. The site nearest to Deir ‘Alla from which Mycenaean pottery has been reported is Tell es-Saidiyeh (site no. 186). The architecture and burial customs at this site indicates that it was under Egyptian control during the later part of the thirteenth and the earlier part of the twelfth century BC. In this respect, it may be compared to the site of Beth Shean (site no. 178) some 30 kilometres to the north, which was the location of an Egyptian military garrison. Mycenaean finds from Tell es-Saidiyeh derive from the tombs at the lower tell, as well as from the settlement remains of stratum XII at the upper tell. Evidence of Egyptian influence is also clear at Pella (site no. 185), where a so-called ‘Governor’s Residency’, as well as sarcophagi tombs have been found. Mycenaean pottery has been reported from the floor of the ‘Residency’, as well as from Late Bronze and early Iron Age layers elsewhere on the site. In addition, some Late Bronze Age tombs have produced such vessels.

---

107 Franken 1992, 174-175.  
108 Van der Steen 1996, 66; Franken (1992, 178-179), who interpreted the site as a free-standing sanctuary, goes so far as to suggest that it was founded through Egyptian initiative.  
111 Tubb 1990, 99-100, 105; 1997, 452-453. Remains of a so-called Egyptian Governor’s residence have been found, as well as pit burials.  
113 Hankey 1967, 129; Pritchard 1980, 4-5; Tubb 1990; 1997. Stratum XII is dated to the 12th century BC.  
114 Bourke 1997, 108; Yassine 1975, 60 note 11. On the Egyptian origin of ‘Governor’s Residencies’, see Orce 1984. According to Bryan (1996, 38), however, these buildings do not automatically imply an Egyptian andministrative presence, but may be the result of Egyptianising trends among the local population. In this respect, the assessment by Van der Steen (1996, 66) that Egypt appears not to have been able to control Pella is of significance.  
115 Bourke 1997, 108  
116 McNicoll et al. 1992, 67, 87 (area II); Bourke 1997, 108. Both vessels from the Late Bronze Age levels (p. 67) may be imitations.  
117 Hankey 1967, 128.
Further to the east, where Egyptian influence was less strong, Mycenaean pottery has been found in a sanctuary context at the Amman Airport site (site no. 189). Hankey estimates that a total of fifty to sixty Mycenaean pots were found at the Amman airport site.\textsuperscript{118} Even though the religious nature of the square building has been contested,\textsuperscript{119} the large number of imported objects and burned bone make it clear that the Mycenaean pottery was used in situations of a highly symbolical nature.\textsuperscript{120} Moreover, the fact that Mycenaean sherds in LHII style were found in this building which is thought to have been used for a short period in the thirteenth century BC only, suggests that the Mycenaean vessels were specially selected to be brought to the building.\textsuperscript{121} All this points to a special significance for Mycenaean ceramics, which is in agreement with the conclusions for this type of pottery found at Deir ‘Alla.

At other places in Transjordan, Mycenaean pottery has mainly been reported from funerary contexts. In Tell Irbid (site no. 184), Madaba (site no. 192) and Umm ad-Dananir (site no. 188) such ceramics were found in tombs.\textsuperscript{122} As for settlement contexts, Mycenaean vessels have been reported from Sahab (site no. 190) in association with a city wall, probably dating from the end of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{123} The evidence from Sahab, as well as from Deir ‘Alla, suggests that the paucity of Mycenaean finds from settlement contexts in Transjordan is due to the absence of large-scale excavations of settlement sites.\textsuperscript{124} It is as yet unclear whether the special significance of Mycenaean pottery evident from Deir ‘Alla can be paralleled at other settlements in Transjordan not under direct Egyptian control.

\textsuperscript{118} Hankey 1974, 133.
\textsuperscript{119} Fritz 1971; Herr (1983) argues for a function as a crematorium.
\textsuperscript{120} See Hankey 1995b for a summary of the small finds made at the temple; also McGovern 1992, 180.
\textsuperscript{121} Hankey 1974, 131; according to Van der Steen (1996, 57), the local pottery suggests a date in the transitional period from the Bronze to the Iron Age, e.g. in the twelfth century BC.
\textsuperscript{122} Dornemann 1982, 21 (Tell Irbid); Harding & Isserlin 1953, 32 (Madaba); McGovern 1986, 13-16; Koehl 1986, 194-198 (Umm ad-Dananir).
\textsuperscript{123} Ibrahim 1997, 451. At least some of these sherds appear to have been Levantine derivatives of Mycenaean ware.
\textsuperscript{124} Apart from Pella, Sahab, Deir ‘Alla and Tell es-Saidiyeh, Van der Steen (1996, 56-58) reports Late Bronze Age settlement remains at ‘Umeiri, Mabrak, Safut, and Rujm al-Henu. According to McGovern (1997, 179), the buildings at Mabrak and Rujm al-Henu are similar to those of the Amman Airport site and Umm ed-Dananir and may have performed similar functions. Possibly a town was situated on the Amman citadel as well; see McGovern 1997, 180.
CHAPTER 8

Cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant

Introduction
The detailed contextual analyses of the Mycenaean pottery at Ugarit, Hazor and Deir ‘Alla allows a comparison between these sites. In Table XIII the main conclusions reached for each of these three places are put together. The similarities and differences among the sites enable a discussion of the use and appreciation of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant in general. In this discussion, the evidence from other find spots of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant will be incorporated in order to check how representative the conclusions reached for Ugarit, Hazor and Deir ‘Alla are. Before discussing the social groups in the Levant who used Mycenaean pottery, their appreciation of different parts of this class of material and its social significance, I will briefly comment on the repertoire of Mycenaean pots and figurines itself.

Mycenaean repertoire
From Table XIII and especially from a comparison between catalogues II, III and IV, it becomes immediately clear that Ugarit has produced a wider repertoire of Mycenaean pottery than Hazor and Deir ‘Alla. The total of 616 Mycenaean sherds and figurines reported from Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida should probably be supplemented with an unknown amount of unpublished Mycenaean material. Such a large quantity of Mycenaean vessels is paralleled only at other coastal cities. From Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) some 700 Mycenaean finds have been reported. From excavations in a very limited area at Sarepta (site no. 150) produced some 130 Mycenaean finds, while a nearby tomb had earlier yielded another 67 Mycenaean vessels.

Apart from the larger quantity, the repertoire of Aegean pot shapes at Ugarit is more varied than that at Hazor and Deir ‘Alla. At Ugarit, the class of storage vessels comprises all the main vessel groups listed in Table II, while all groups of dinner vessels are represented as well. By comparison, storage vessels at Hazor comprise only three vessel groups, while dinner vessels are represented by five groups. At Deir ‘Alla only stirrup jars and horizontal flasks have been found. In addition, a far wider range of figurines has been found at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida than at Hazor, while figurines were absent at Deir ‘Alla. The category of ritual vessels, composed mainly of rhyta in conical or zoomorphic shape, is absent at Hazor and Deir ‘Alla.

---

1 Balensi 1980, 423, 490. All derive from levels V and IV. In addition, thirty-seven Minoan pieces are reported from this site, see Balensi 1980, 499-510.
2 Koehl 1985, 37-43; Anderson 1988, 267-274. Soundings X and Y together comprise less than 700 sq.m., see Khalifeh 1988, 356 Plate 2.
3 Baramki 1958, 129-142.
4 Cf. Table II. Apart from pithoi, all the storage and dinner vessel groups are present at Ugarit. In total, 35 different Mycenaean vessel forms occur at Ugarit.
5 Cf. Table II. Pithoi, jars and miscellaneous storage vessels are not represented at Hazor. In total, six forms of storage vessels are represented.
6 Cf. Table II. Kraters, narrow-necked jugs, cups and stemmed cups occur at Hazor, comprising five different Mycenaean forms of dinner vessels.
7 At Ugarit, group figurines and equid figurines have been found, as well as the more common female and bovine figurines, which also occurred at Hazor.
while well represented at Ugarit. The variety of Mycenaean vessel types at Ugarit is paralleled only at Tell Abu Hawam, where a similar range of storage and dinner vessels have been found, as well as a rhyta and Mycenaean figurines. Another similarity between these two sites is the predominance of dinner vessels. Ashdod (site no. 206), likewise a coastal settlement, is the only other site in the Levant with a majority of Mycenaean dinner vessels. At all other sites storage vessels are more frequent. Such is also the case at Sarepta, which has yielded a great quantity of stirrup jars in particular. A conical rhyton, a wide range of cups and bowls, as well as female, bovine and chariot figurines testify of the varied character of the Mycenaean repertoire at Sarepta.

It appears that the repertoire of Mycenaean vessels and figurines is generally larger and more varied at coastal centres than at inland sites. Such a distribution pattern has been explained by suggesting a model of the circulation of Mycenaean pottery involving 'ports of trade'. In this model, Mycenaean pottery arrived in the coastal towns, where a first choice was made of items which were to remain there. A more limited repertoire was then distributed to secondary centres, where a similar process took place. The repeated sequence of choice and further distribution in such a model would result in a diminishing of quantities and a narrowing of vessel types in the repertoire of Mycenaean pottery the further down the line of exchanges a site was incorporated in the system.

This model of 'ports of trade' would explain the large quantities and wide variety of Mycenaean pottery at Ugarit and Tell Abu Hawam. However, there are a number of situations relatively far away from the coast where a wide variety of Mycenaean vessels has also been found. Such is the case at the Amman airport site (site no. 189), where finds included an LHIII piriform jar, as well as a variety of dinner and storage vessels from the LHIII period. The Late Bronze Age temple at Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) produced thirteen specimens of Mycenaean pottery, among which were storage and dinner vessels, zoomorphic and conical rhyta, along with a female figurine. Two Mycenaean conical rhyta, a zoomorphic rhyton, as well as a score of dinner vessels and figurines were found in a building associated with ritual activities at Tell Sera' (site no. 216). At Hazor, the three graves from the Late Bronze Age yielded a more varied Mycenaean repertoire than that found in the settlement levels. A similar situation may be seen at Tell Dan (site no. 158), where the 'Mycenaean tomb' produced a rich collection of Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels.

---

8 Balensi 1980, 422-498. Among the Mycenaean storage vessels, all groups from Table II are represented at Tell Abu Hawam, comprising 10 vessel forms; see Balensi 1980, 427. Among dinner vessels almost all groups are represented in 17 forms; narrow-necked jugs and spouted cups and bowls are the only groups absent. Rhyta have been found in conical and zoomorphic shape (Balensi 1980, 440-441), while Tell Abu Hawam and Ugarit are the only sites in the Levant where ring-kernoi have been found; see Leonard 1994, 89. In comparison with Ugarit, Mycenaean figurines are infrequent at Tell Abu Hawam: only eleven have been reported, among which are eight Psi-type female figurines and three bovines (Balensi 1980, 471).

9 Balensi 1980, 498. As at Ugarit, the predominance of dinner vessels is due entirely to the large number of LHIII vessels of this type.

10 Leonard 1994, 203; Dothan & Porath 1996, 31-36, 48, 58. The figures provided by Leonard show that fragments from which the vessel type cannot be determined (23) constitute more than a third of the total (60) of Mycenaean finds at Ashdod, which argues for some caution in this respect.

11 Figures taken from Leonard 1994, 201-211.

12 Koehl (1985, 37-43) lists more than fifty stirrup jars.


14 Hankey 1974, 34 in particular

15 Hachmann 1980, 43, 84, 88, Tafels 5, 24-27; 1982, 33, Tafels 5, 6, 8.

16 Oren & Netzer 1974, 265.

17 Biran 1994a, 111-116. The Mycenaean finds from settlement levels at Tell Dan have not been fully published, because of which it is impossible to compare them with the funerary finds.
These examples indicate that sites situated far from the coast could have access to a wide range of Mycenaean vessels and figurines. The differences in the Mycenaean ceramic repertoires between large coastal cities such as Ugarit and Tell Abu Hawam on the one hand and inland sites such as Hazor on the other cannot solely be attributed to factors of availability. At Deir ' Alla, Mycenaean stirrup jars and flasks were found in contexts which attest to a high regard for these vessels. The same pottery types are quite common at Ugarit and Hazor, where they predominate in average domestic contexts. This suggests that the variability in the Mycenaean repertoire at Levantine sites is related to differences in the use and appreciation of this material. Such may also be inferred from the fact that varied deposits of Mycenaean pottery were found in temples at Tell Sera’, Kamid el-Loz and the Amman airport site, and in tombs at Hazor and Tell Dan. Each of these contexts represent situations of a high symbolical content.

A high regard for specific Mycenaean vessel types may, of course, be related to their availability, which is determined by the distribution of these types according to the ‘port of trade’ model. However, in many societies the flow of specific goods is closely related to existing power structures, because the effectiveness of specific material goods to serve in consumptive strategies which reproduce the identity of consumers is determined by dominant groups in society. The subject of access to a wide range of Mycenaean vessel types is, therefore, itself connected to the use and appreciation of these vessels in the places where they were acquired.

**Social groups to be associated with Mycenaean pottery**

The evidence from Ugarit and Hazor indicates that Mycenaean pottery, as a general class of material, was widely used by various social groups in these cities. At both sites Mycenaean pottery has been found in average houses as well as in structures testifying to a certain wealth. It also occurred in contexts indicating industrial activities at both sites. The Mycenaean pots and sherds found in settlement contexts at Ugarit and Hazor generally were interspersed with local artefacts and, in some cases, with objects imported from elsewhere. This indicates that Mycenaean vessels and figurines were used in the daily life of the inhabitants of the cities.

The widespread use of Mycenaean pottery among urban population groups is evident at other sites in the Levant as well. Many of the Mycenaean finds reported from Alalakh (site no. 125) cannot be ascribed to architectural structures with certainty, but at least some of them have been found in buildings meant for habitation. Indeed, in discussing levels Ia - Ic at Alalakh, Woolley states that “...it is certain that in all three phases Mycenaean pottery was freely used” and that “by this time it must have been cheap.” At Tell Sukas (site no. 132) more than fifty Mycenaean sherds were found in three habitation structures. At Sarepta (site no. 150) soundings in areas X and Y revealed Late Bronze Age domestic architecture and

---

19 The availability of material objects and their value have a circular relationship: objects may be valuable because they are scarce, but they may also be scarce because they are valuable; see Voutsaki 1995, 10.
20 At Ugarit the large mansions in the vicinity of the palace can be considered as wealthy structures, while at Hazor, house 8139 (H3) may be similarly interpreted.
21 Woolley (1955, 371-373) reports an LHIII A sherd decorated with an octopus from house 39B, three sherds found on the floor of a house in level II, a globular stirrup jar from another house in the same level, while a globular flask was discovered in a house which possessed a domestic pit in which three other pots of the same type were found.
22 Woolley 1955, 372.
23 Woolley 1955, 374.
industrial installations such as bins and basins.\textsuperscript{25} As stated above, these structures produced a large quantity of Mycenaean pottery.\textsuperscript{26} The structure from levels XVII-XIV at Tyre (site no. 151), likewise associated with domestic and industrial activities, yielded Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels, as well as a female and bovine figurine.\textsuperscript{27} J. Balensi's study of the finds made by R.W. Hamilton in the 1930's at Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) showed that Mycenaean pottery was widespread there too.\textsuperscript{28} In stratum V (phases V2–\textsuperscript{H}V) such pottery occurred in almost all structures, among which were residential houses and buildings testifying of industrial activities.\textsuperscript{29} The distribution of Mycenaean pottery at Megiddo (site no. 175) has recently been analysed by A. Leonard and E. Cline.\textsuperscript{30} In strata VIII-VIIA this material was concentrated in areas AA and CC, associated with a palace and with residential structures respectively.\textsuperscript{31} Even though such an unequal distribution pattern indicates that Mycenaean pottery was not used widely among the inhabitants of Megiddo, the finds from residential contexts as well as from a palace suggest that different social groups made use of these vessels. At Ashdod (site no. 206) Mycenaean cups, kylikes and stirrup jars were recovered from the stratum 2 structure in area B.\textsuperscript{32} On the basis of the presence of a courtyard, silo's, storage pits and three ovens, this structure may be interpreted as a domestic structure, possibly with industrial associations.\textsuperscript{33} From the small Late Bronze Age brick houses in area H at Ashdod Mycenaean pottery has also been reported.\textsuperscript{34} At Kamid el-Loz (site no 154) a domestic structure just north of the temple produced Mycenaean storage vessels.\textsuperscript{35} The domestic structures found in levels VIII and VII to the south-east of the temple at Beth Shean (site no. 178) produced eleven Mycenaean vessels, scattered about various rooms and associated with local pottery and a few imports.\textsuperscript{36} Other sites from which Mycenaean pottery has been reported from domestic contexts include Tell Dan (site no. 158),\textsuperscript{37} Pella (site no. 185)\textsuperscript{38} and Bethel (site no. 194).\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{25} Khalifeh 1981, 81 (area X); Anderson 1988, 82 (area Y).
\textsuperscript{26} Koehl 1985, 37-43; Anderson 1988, 267-274. The strata which produced the largest amount of Mycenaean pottery were stratum II in area X, which has been dated to approximately 1450-1350 BC (Khalifeh 1981, 81), and stratum G in area Y, dated to c. 1320-1290 BC (Anderson 1988, 82, 380).
\textsuperscript{27} Bikai 1978, 7-8, 56.
\textsuperscript{28} Balensi (1980, 315) states that, from a quantitative point of view, Mycenaean pottery is the most abundant class of material in the stratum V phases at Tell Abu Hawam. It must be acknowledged, however, that this remark is valid for the material stored by Hamilton only. It is not impossible that local pottery has been thrown away in the 1930's.
\textsuperscript{29} Balensi 1980, 25-250. Examples of domestic contexts with Mycenaean pottery are: complex 38-39 (Balensi 1980, 38-39), building 54b (Balensi 1980, 144), house 61 (Balensi 1980, 169-172). The so-called 'latrine' complex, a structure with many pits and small rooms dating to the very end of the Late Bronze Age, situated in the area of a citadel from a previous phase, may have been used for industrial activities, see Balensi 1980, 187-190.
\textsuperscript{30} Leonard & Cline 1998.
\textsuperscript{31} Leonard & Cline 1998, 3, 5, 6. This concentration is most marked during stratum VIIA, in which the majority of Mycenaean finds at Megiddo appear clustered around two buildings: palace 2041 in area AA and the residential building of locus 1817 in area CC, see Leonard and Cline 1998, 7-9.
\textsuperscript{32} Dothan & Freedman 1967, 96, fig. 21.
\textsuperscript{33} Stratum I in this area was almost entirely destroyed: only patches of floors and two storage pits could be related to it. Mycenaean bowls, a kylix, an amphoroid krater and a female figurine were associated with the scanty remains, see Dothan & Freedman 1967, 83.
\textsuperscript{34} Dothan 1993, 96.
\textsuperscript{35} Hachmann & Kuschke 1966, 56; Marfoe 1995, 156, fig. 101. A Mycenaean kylix was found in the area of this building.
\textsuperscript{36} Hankey 1993c. Stratum VIII yielded six Mycenaean finds from this residential area, while in stratum VII five Mycenaean vessels were found.
\textsuperscript{37} Biran 1994a, 120; 1994b, 8.
\textsuperscript{38} McNicoll et al. 1992, 67, 87 (area II); Bourke 1997, 108.
\textsuperscript{39} Kelso 1968, 28-31, Plate 37: nos. 11-14; only one of these vessels was found in a secure context.
Mycenaean pottery has also been reported in association with buildings testifying of a certain level of wealth. At Tell Batash (site no. 209) a large structure was excavated in levels VIII and VII, which has been interpreted as a patrician’s house, probably belonging to important land-owners in the Sorek valley. In the destruction layer of the level VII building, dated to thirteenth century BC, a LHIIIA2 straight-sided alabastron was found, in association with a Cypriot bull-vase, cylinder seals and scarabs. A building comparable to the one at Tell Batash has been excavated at nearby ‘Ain Shems (site no 210), from which Mycenaean pottery has also been reported. At Aphek (site no. 200), in stratum X13, which has been dated to the second half of the thirteenth century BC, a wealthy structure was built in the south-western corner of the area where a palace had stood previously. This building is the earliest example of a so-called ‘Governor’s residency’, a type of building, which has been associated with an Egyptian administrative presence in Palestine. A Mycenaean stirrup jar was found in this building, associated with local and Egyptian bowls, as well as with Cypriot White Slip II bowls.

At Ugarit, the ruling élite did make use of Mycenaean pottery; however not to a greater extent than other inhabitants of the city. Moreover, at least some of the Mycenaean vessels found in the royal palace should be associated with people working there, rather than with the court itself, as is evident from the context of a Mycenaean bowl found in the southern archives (H3). At Ras Ibn Hani (site no. 130) two large buildings have been excavated, which can be associated with the royal court of Ugarit. The largest of these buildings, the Palais Sud, was apparently cleared out before the end of the Late Bronze Age. Even though, as a result, very few finds were made, a fragment of a LHIIIIB amphoroid krater, as well as two Mycenaean sherds have been reported from this building. The second structure at Ras Ibn Hani, the Palais Nord, yielded a number of cuneiform tablets which made clear that the inhabitants had a kinship relationship with the royal family of Ugarit. The western part of this building served as a metal workshop, while in the eastern part habitation quarters were situated. In the courtyard between these two parts three fragment of Mycenaean stirrup jars were found, while a LHIIIIB amphoroid krater was discovered in one of the habitation quarters. The tomb associated with the Palais Nord, of the same architectural type as those found in the capital of Ugarit, produced a Mycenaean amphoroid krater, along with two stirrup jars, one of which was of the large, coarse ware variety (FS 164).

The Mycenaean vessels from the settlement levels of the two palaces at Ras Ibn Hani indicate that the social groups attached to these structures made use of such material. The
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40 Keim & Mazar 1995, 63-64.
43 Oren 1984, 49-50. The majority of ‘Governor’s Residencies’ date to the twelfth century BC. According to Bryan (1996, 38) these buildings do not necessarily imply an Egyptian administrative presence, but may be the result of Egyptianising trends among the local Canaanite population.
45 It should be remembered that the royal palace is not included in one of the corpora céramique. It is entirely possible that unpublished finds from palace areas include Mycenaean pottery.
47 Bounni, Lagarce & Saliby 1976, 275-276, fig. 26 nos. 2-4.
48 Lagarce, Bounni & Saliby 1983, 257. According to the tablets found in the Palais Nord, the building belonged to a queen, perhaps the mother of king Ammistamru II (1260-1230 BC).
49 Lagarce, Bounni & Saliby 1983, 277-278. Of particular importance is a mould for an oxhide ingot found in the Palais Nord.
50 Bounni et al. 1979, 240, fig 19 nos. 2-4.
51 Bounni et al. 1981, 293, fig. 53.
52 Toueir 1975.
presence of metal working facilities at the Palais Nord suggests that some of the Mycenaean pottery found in this structure may be associated with people working in the building, rather than with the inhabitants themselves. In comparison with other buildings at Ugarit, such as those in the recently excavated Centre Ville, the Mycenaean pottery reported from the palatial structures at Ras Ibn Hani is by no means abundant. Apparently, social groups associated with the royal palace did not make more extensive use of Mycenaean pottery than other groups in Ugaritic society. Such may also be concluded from the three Mycenaean finds from the tomb at Ras Ibn Hani. These may be compared to similar quantities in the majority of tombs at Ras Shamra, including those in the royal palace. Even though Mycenaean pottery, apparently, was considered suitable to be included in the funerary inventories of high level social groups, the quantities from these tombs are by no means extraordinary. The evidence from Ras Ibn Hani, therefore seems to confirm the conclusions for the royal palace of Ugarit itself.

At Alalakh (site no. 125) a LHIIIA piriform jar has been reported from room 16 in the palace uncovered in level V (Niqmepa’s palace). From the palace in level IV at this site, probably to be dated to the thirteenth century BC, no Mycenaean pottery has been published, but fragments of a piriform jar, a jug and two stirrup jars have been reported from the area of the palace in strata III-I. Because of the likelihood that many finds from Alalakh remain unpublished, the evidence of this site is difficult to interpret, and the only statement to be made is that here too Mycenaean pottery has some association with the ruling elite.

A succession of palaces from the beginning to the end of the Late Bronze Age was found at Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) in levels P1-P5. The so-called ‘Schatzhaus’ of the palace was actually a tomb from the first building phase, which during stratum P5 was restructured as a storage room. From the early phases of this structure a great many imports from various regions have been reported, among which was a LMB bridge-spouted jar. A fragment of a Mycenaean stirrup jar was discovered in the palace workshops. The only other Mycenaean find from a palatial context at Kamid el-Loz is a straight-sided alabastron, possibly of Levantine manufacture. In comparison with the temple excavated at Kamid el-Loz (see below) and with other settlement structures (see above), the quantity of Aegean finds from the palace area is relatively small. Moreover, the stirrup jar found in the area of the palace workshops indicates that this vessel was associated with artisans working at the palace rather than with the royal court itself. All this is in agreement with the evidence from Ugarit and Ras Ibn-Hani that social groups connected to the palace did have access to Mycenaean pottery, but did not make more extensive use of it than other urban social groups.

A palatial structure, building 2041, has also been excavated in levels VIII-VIIA at Megiddo (site no. 175). From the stratum VIII palace a LHIIIIB stirrup jar as well as a body sherd from an amphoroid krater dating to the same period have been reported. Four of the seven...
Mycenaean fragments from stratum VIIIB at Megiddo were found in palace 2041: a squat stirrup jar, a bovine figurine and a sherd of unidentifiable shape.\textsuperscript{64} Nine Mycenaean finds came from the stratum VII palace.\textsuperscript{65} Seven of these, four globular flasks, two stirrup jars and a stemmed cup, occurred in a small tripartite building connected to palace 2041 during this phase. Elsewhere in the building a globular flask and a sherd of unidentifiable shape were found. From this account it is clear that Mycenaean vessels were in use among the residents of palace 2041. The analysis by Leonard and Cline of the Mycenaean pottery at Megiddo shows that this was also the case for a few other buildings at this site.\textsuperscript{66}

At Hazor, finds from the recently excavated palace have not yet been published. The significant amounts of Mycenaean pottery reported from the area adjacent to the palace (area A), however, indicates that Mycenaean pottery was used by the social groups associated with official structures. This picture seems to be confirmed by the discussion above of Mycenaean pottery found in structures at other sites which can be associated with local ruling elites. At the same time, however, it is clear that at none of these sites Mycenaean pottery appears to be concentrated in the palaces. It may, therefore, be concluded that the ruling elites of the Levantine city-states did not make more extensive use of Mycenaean pottery than other social groups within the urban societies.

At Ugarit and Hazor Mycenaean pottery has been found in contexts which testify of religious practices. At Hazor, Mycenaean vessels - all of open pot shapes - were associated with temples of monumental character, while smaller religious structures discovered in habitation areas did not produce such material. This situation is not reflected at Ugarit, where a large number of Mycenaean vessels, in particular conical rhyta, were associated with the \textit{Temple au rhytons}. A sanctuary in Minet el-Beida yielded similar vessels.\textsuperscript{67}

At Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154), a large structure with two courtyards has been excavated, which has been interpreted as a temple dating to the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{68} A variety of Mycenaean open and closed vessels, conical and zoomorphic rhyta, as well as a female figurine have been found in this building, in association with cultic objects such as a group of snake figurines.\textsuperscript{69} At Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), a large number of Mycenaean dinner vessels, as well as some storage vessels, a zoomorphic rhyton and a kernos were found in the first deposit of temple 50, associated with Cypriot, Egyptian and local ceramics and with objects such as faience pearls, steatite cylinder seals and bronze knives.\textsuperscript{70} A later deposit in the same temple produced three LHIIIIB drinking vessels, likewise associated with Cypriot, Egyptian and local wares and with faience and bronze objects.\textsuperscript{71} In the level VII and VIII temple precinct at Beth

\begin{itemize}
\item[$\textsuperscript{64}$] Leonard & Cline 1998, 5.
\item[$\textsuperscript{65}$] Leonard & Cline 1998, 6-7.
\item[$\textsuperscript{66}$] For example in residential structures below locii 1817 and 1837 (stratum VIII), see Leonard & Cline 1998, 3; and locus 1817 itself in stratum VIIA (stratum VIIA), see Leonard & Cline 1998, 7.
\item[$\textsuperscript{67}$] No Mycenaean finds have been reported from the three monumental temples excavated at Ugarit. However, these buildings were all excavated during campaigns before 1940 and have not been fully published.
\item[$\textsuperscript{68}$] For a description of the architecture of this building and its stratigraphy, see Metzger 1991. The temple, which had three major construction phases between the beginning to the end of the Late Bronze Age, succeeded an MBA predecessor.
\item[$\textsuperscript{69}$] Hachmann 1980, 43, 84, 88, Tafels 24-26; 1982, 33. Tafels 5, 6, 8. In total, the Mycenaean repertoire from this building consists of 14 vases, some of them of Levantine manufacture, among which are three conical rhyta, two zoomorphic rhyta, four kylikes, a one-handled bowl, two piriform jars and two lentoid flasks.
\item[$\textsuperscript{70}$] Balensi 1980, 83-84. All the Mycenaean pottery in this deposit was in LHIIIIB2 style, on the basis of which the deposit has been dated to the LBIIA period.
\item[$\textsuperscript{71}$] Balensi 1980, 88-89. This phase has been dated to the thirteenth BC. In addition, a Mycenaean rhyton and female figurine were found in temple 30 - the stratum IV successor of temple 50 - in layers attributed to the transitional period from Bronze to Iron Age (twelfth century BC), see Balensi 1980, 68, 100.
\end{itemize}
Shean (site no. 178) a mixed Egyptian and Syro-Palestinian cult was practised.\textsuperscript{72} A total of seventeen Mycenaean vessels can be associated with this temple: thirteen storage and four dinner vessels.\textsuperscript{73} Of particular interest is a group of five vessels found below the floor of locus 1068 in association with Egyptian and Levantine cultic objects.\textsuperscript{74} This deposit has been interpreted as a foundation offering and it shows that Mycenaean pottery could be part of ceremonies of a highly symbolical nature. At Tell Mevorakh (site no. 172) a succession of temples from the Late Bronze Age were excavated on a small mound.\textsuperscript{75} Because no contemporary settlement was discovered, the building at Tell Mevorakh has been interpreted as an isolated sanctuary site.\textsuperscript{76} In stratum X of this building fourteen Mycenaean sherds were discovered, all from LHIIIA2 storage pots.\textsuperscript{77} It is uncertain whether the square building at Amman Airport site (site no. 189) can be interpreted as a temple.\textsuperscript{78} The nature of the archaeological material discovered in the square building, which included a large and varied body of Mycenaean pottery, however, indicates that activities of a symbolical nature were practised here.\textsuperscript{79} In the so-called ‘Fosse temple’ at Lachisch (site no. 213) a LHII one-handled cup was part of a group of objects discovered on a bench altar.\textsuperscript{80} A LHII goblet was found elsewhere in the temple area.\textsuperscript{81} In the central hall of the acropolis temple at the same site, a Mycenaean chariot krater was discovered.\textsuperscript{82} At Tell Sera’ (site no. 216) building 1118 has also been interpreted as a structure in which cultic activities were practised.\textsuperscript{83} On the floor of stratum X of this building, dated to the thirteenth century BC, two Mycenaean conical rhyta and a hedgehog rhyton were found together with a variety of Egyptian imports, Syrian cylinder seals and Cypriot vessels.\textsuperscript{84}

It is clear that Mycenaean pottery can be associated with Levantine cultic practices. The religious structures at Hazor, Kamid el-Loz, Beth Shean and Lachisch which have produced Mycenaean pottery can be classified as urban, monumental temples, to be related to the official religion at state level.\textsuperscript{85} Each of these temples is structurally separated from surrounding buildings and possesses at least one courtyard and a number of associated storage rooms. It may be expected that to these temples professional priests were attached, with whom the Mycenaean pottery can be associated.\textsuperscript{86} The same may be true for the temples at Tell Mevorakh and Amman, which were free-standing. The Temple au rhytons at Ugarit is an example of a structure in which cult was practised at a lower level of society. Building 1118 at Tell Sera’, to which a large silo was associated, as well as a number of refuse pits, may

\textsuperscript{72} James & McGovern 1993, 239-240.
\textsuperscript{73} Hankey 1993c
\textsuperscript{74} James & McGovern 1993, 7, 12; Hankey 1993c. The Mycenaean repertoire in this deposit consisted of a piriform jar, a small jug, a stirrup jar, a globular flask and a deep bowl.
\textsuperscript{75} Stern 1984.
\textsuperscript{76} Stern (1984, 7-8) calls it a road sanctuary.
\textsuperscript{77} Hankey 1984, 20. The range of Mycenaean vessels is as follows: piriform jar (8x), globular flask (4x), stirrup jar (2x).
\textsuperscript{79} Hankey 1974, 134.
\textsuperscript{80} Tufnell 1958, 211-212; Hankey 1981b, 109.
\textsuperscript{81} Kantor 1947, 36; Stubbings 1951, 56.
\textsuperscript{82} Ussishkin 1993, 901.
\textsuperscript{83} Oren 1993, 1331.
\textsuperscript{84} Oren & Netzer 1974, 265
\textsuperscript{85} For a distinction in the Late Bronze Age Levant between the official religion at state level, clan cults at the level of clan relations within the urban community and family cults connected to the family, see Van der Toorn 1995a, 48.
\textsuperscript{86} See, for example Tarragon (1995; with bibliography) for the existence of a professional class of priests.
possibly be interpreted as a shrine as well.\(^{87}\) These two examples show that Mycenaean vessels could also be used in religious practices of a less official nature. The evidence from Hazor, where smaller religious structures in habitation areas did not produce Mycenaean ceramics, however, indicates that this was not always the case.

This overview of Levantine sites with Mycenaean pottery appears to confirm the conclusions drawn in the chapters on Ugarit and Hazor. Mycenaean pottery was widely used by different social groups in the urban communities of the Levant. It was a fairly common class of material in a variety of urban domestic contexts and in a number of situations that can be associated with the activities of artisans. Structures which testify of a certain level of wealth have produced Mycenaean pottery as well. In several instances, Mycenaean pottery has been found in contexts which can be ascribed to ruling élites; however, these groups do not seem to have made more extensive use of this class of material than other social groups. Finally, Mycenaean pottery has been shown to have been used in cult practices at different levels in the urban societies.

The case of Deir ‘Alia, however, shows that not everywhere Mycenaean pottery was a common class of material used by different social strata. At this site, only a few Mycenaean vessels were found, which were restricted to the most wealthy part of the settlement. The special significance of such pottery at Deir ‘Alia may, in a different way, be reflected at the Amman Airport building. Large quantities of Mycenaean vessels were specially selected to be brought to the square structure.\(^{88}\) At a few other sites too, Mycenaean pottery has been found in small numbers in contexts which indicate that these vessels were highly appreciated. In the patrician’s residence at Tell Batash (site no. 209) a single straight-sided alabastron was found in an impressive dwelling and associated with a number of other imports.\(^{89}\) At the site of Aphek (site no. 200) all the Mycenaean finds were associated with the so-called ‘Governor’s Residency’ and with a tomb found nearby this impressive building.\(^{90}\) Likewise, the majority of the Mycenaean finds from settlement levels at Tell Sera’ (site no. 216) were found in association with structure 1118, which also produced Egyptian alabaster vases, cylinder seals and faience jewellery.\(^{91}\) Each of these sites is comparable with Deir ‘Alia in the sense that they constitute small regional centres, rather than large urban communities. Moreover, with the exception of Aphek, all of them are situated in the Palestine uplands which, like Transjordan, may be considered as more marginal areas, which during the Late Bronze Age remained relatively independent of Egyptian cultural influence.\(^{92}\)

Only a few systematic field surveys in the Levant have been published. A survey in the eastern part of the Wadi Arabah showed that Late Bronze Age sites were absent in this area.\(^{93}\) This was not the case in the Wadi el Hasâ, just south-east of the Dead sea, where three to five MBA-LBA sites were discovered, none with Mycenaean pottery.\(^{94}\) From the Kerak plateau in Jordan, 109 LBA sites were reported, most of which consisted of relatively small concentrations of sherds.\(^{95}\) At none of these sites imported wares were found.\(^{96}\) The Judaea,

\(^{87}\) Oren & Netzer (1974, 265) are in doubt whether to interpret the structure as a residential building or as a sanctuary.
\(^{88}\) Hankey 1974, 131.
\(^{89}\) Kelm & Mazar 1995, 63.
\(^{90}\) Kochavi 1981, 81; Beck & Kochavi 1985, 35.
\(^{91}\) Oren & Netzer 1974, 265; Oren 1993, 1331.
\(^{92}\) Bunimowitz 1995, 325; Gonen 1992, 32-36.
\(^{93}\) McDonald 1992, 71.
\(^{94}\) McDonald 1988, 155-170.
\(^{95}\) Miller 1991, 308-309.
\(^{96}\) Miller 1991, 189-190.
Samaria and Golan surveys in Israel did not yield any Mycenaean finds. A survey in the lower Galilee mountains, roughly the area between Hazor and Megiddo, resulted in only four Late Bronze Age sites, none of which with Mycenaean finds. During the regional project in the central Jezreel valley a few sites with small quantities of Mycenaean pottery were investigated, such as Tell Yoqne'am (site no. 166), Tell Qiri (site no. 136) and Tel Qasis (site no. 164). Each of these sites may be interpreted as a small regional centre. A number of smaller Late Bronze Age sites were identified in this region, which did not produce Mycenaean pottery.

It appears that a widespread use of Mycenaean pottery among different social groups is characteristic mainly for the urban culture of the Late Bronze Age Levant. At smaller regional centres these vessels appear to have been scarce, while they seem absent at rural sites. The evidence from Deir ‘Alla, Tell Batash and Aphek indicates that at smaller regional centres Mycenaean pottery was restricted to specific, wealthy social groups.

**Differentiation within the repertoire of Mycenaean pottery**

Mycenaean pottery in LHI-LHIII-A1 style, although not abundant, appears to have been restricted at Hazor to areas of an official nature. A similar restriction was not recognised at Ugarit, where such early pottery occurred in various contexts in three different excavated parts of the site. As was made clear in chapters 3 and 4, Minoan and Mycenaean pottery from the first part of the Late Bronze Age has been reported from twenty sites in the Levant, both on the coast and more inland. Even though this is less than one fifth of the number of sites in the Levant with Mycenaean pottery from all periods, it is noteworthy that vessels in LHI-LHIII-A1 have been found in all regions in the Levant. Such a distribution pattern indicates that, even though not numerous, this material was widely distributed and not spatially restricted in a regional sense.

The specific contexts of many of the early Aegean finds in the Levant is not known. Sherds in LHIIB-LHIII-A1 style from Ras el-Bassit (site no. 127) were found in a large structure from the second phase of the Late Bronze Age, indicating that these vessels may have been in use for a long time. A LHIIB semi-globular cup was found at Sarepta (site no. 150) in a settlement context belonging to period I, which has been dated to before 1450 BC. Four additional sherds in LHII style were found in levels belonging to period II (c. 1450-1350 BC). At Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154), a LMIB bridge-spouted jar has been found in the funerary chamber of the so-called ‘Schatzhaus’, in association with a number of other imports. At Tell Ta'anek (site no. 177) a LMIB spouted jug was discovered associated with large quantities of Cypriot and Canaanite ceramics in a cave deposit assigned to the LBI period. A LHIIA piriform jar, as well as a similar vessel in LHIIB-LHIII-A1 style and an
open vase from the same period have been reported from the airport site at Amman (site no. 189) in a level dated to the end of the thirteenth century at the very earliest.\textsuperscript{106} The LHII one-handed cup from Lachisch (site no. 213) was found in the vicinity of the altar in the ‘Fosse temple’, associated with local cultic objects and imports from other areas.\textsuperscript{107} In addition, a LHII goblet was discovered in the area of the temple.\textsuperscript{108}

An important conclusion from this overview of LHIII-LHIII A1 pottery in the Levant is that quite a large number of these vessels have been found in contexts which have been assigned a much later date. Such a situation also occurred at Minet el-Beida, where a fragment in LHIII A/LMIIIB style was discovered in association with a cuneiform tablet which cannot be earlier than 1365 BC. Even though in some cases this may be due to stratigraphical intrusion, in other cases, such as at the Amman airport building, it is evident that such pottery was still in use centuries after their manufacture. Three hypotheses may be formulated concerning the high age of these vessels. Firstly, they may have been exported when they were already old. Secondly they may have been in circulation for a very long time. Thirdly, they may have arrived at the place of their deposition when they were relatively new and kept for a long time as heirlooms or antiques. At the Amman airport building, which was used for a short period at the end of the thirteenth to the beginning of the twelfth centuries only,\textsuperscript{109} it is clear that the LHIII-LHIII A1 vessels must have arrived at the site when they were already old. To this site at least, the third hypothesis does not apply. On the other hand, the discovery of Aegean vases in contexts dating to the LBI period at Sarepta, Tell Ta’anek, Kamid el-Loz and Lachisch indicates that during this period pottery from the Aegean did arrive in the Levant, which argues against the first hypothesis.

Taking into account the wide distribution of the Mycenaean and Minoan vessels in early ceramic styles, it is most likely, in my opinion, that imported ceramic vessels could be in circulation for substantial periods of time. The LHIIIA2 stirrup jar in the easternmost building at Tell Deir ‘Alla, as well as the two LHIIIA2-LHIIIB1 flasks from the treasury at that site were all found in contexts dating to the beginning of the twelfth century only,\textsuperscript{109} it is clear that the LHIII-LHIII A1 vessels must have arrived at the site when they were already old. To this site at least, the third hypothesis does not apply. On the other hand, the discovery of Aegean vases in contexts dating to the LBI period at Sarepta, Tell Ta’anek, Kamid el-Loz and Lachisch indicates that during this period pottery from the Aegean did arrive in the Levant, which argues against the first hypothesis.

On the basis of anthropological research it has been postulated that objects in pre-monetary exchange often retain elements of their former owners.\textsuperscript{111} Depending on the status of the owners, such embodiments may superimpose prestige upon the objects. The likelihood that Aegean pottery could circulate for long periods means that these objects may have been endowed with such embodiments. It is therefore to be expected that these ceramics possessed a certain amount of prestige.

It is difficult to ascertain whether Aegean vessels in early ceramic styles were restricted to specific social groups, such as appears to be the case at Hazor. The LMIIIB jar from the

\textsuperscript{106} Hankey 1974, nos. 1, 2, 105. In addition, four Mycenaean finds (nos. 6, 7, 100, 106) are assigned by Hankey to LHIII A1-LHIII A2. For the date of the structure at the Amman Airport, see Hankey 1974, 131; Van der Steen 1996, 57.
\textsuperscript{107} Tufnell 1958, 211-212.
\textsuperscript{108} Kantor 1947, 36; Stubbings 1951, 56.
\textsuperscript{109} Hankey 1974, 131; Van der Steen 1996, 57.
\textsuperscript{111} See, for example, Gregory 1982, with extensive bibliography. Such notions are based on the works of Mauss (1954) and Malinowsky (1922) in particular. According to traditional views, the embodiment of former owners is characteristic only of objects involved in gift exchange, while it does not occur in relation to commodity barter. Recent anthropological research, however, has broken down the opposition between these two types of exchange, see, for example, Bloch & Parry 1989, 8-12. It is now generally recognised that commodity transactions can take place in the context of highly personalised relationships; see Stirrat 1989.
‘Schatzhaus’ tomb at Kamid el-Loz indicates that this vessel was used by the royal court, while the finds at Tell Ta’anek and Lachisch signify that such pottery could be included in wealthy inventories. The finds at Ras el-Bassit were made in the largest building of the site. The evidence from Ugarit, as well as from Sarepta, however, suggest that at these cities Aegean pottery in early stylistic phases was used by different urban social groups. The restriction of stylistically early Aegean vessels to official, high level contexts does not seem to be a uniform phenomenon in the Levant. Possibly, the length of time during which these vases circulated also plays a role in this respect.

At Hazor Mycenaean dinner vessels appear to have possessed a special significance in comparison with storage vessels. This phenomenon is not paralleled at Ugarit, where Mycenaean dinner vessels were widely distributed and have been discovered in a variety of contexts. However, at this site, there is some, though not conclusive, evidence that wealthier habitations made use mainly of Aegean dinner vessels, while both dinner and storage vessels occurred in more modest dwellings. This, too, may be taken as evidence that these classes of pottery were regarded differently in terms of use and appreciation. The significance in this respect of the Mycenaean storage vessels at Deir ‘Alla, obviously highly appreciated, has been commented upon above.

It is difficult to investigate whether a distinction between Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels was made in other places in the Levant. At Alalakh (site no. 125) a LHIIIA piriform jar was found in room 16 of Niqme-pa’s palace, indicating that a storage jar was used at the uppermost level of the urban society. From the Palais Sud at Ras Ibn Hani (site no 130) a pictorially decorated fragment of an amphoroid krater has been reported, while such a vessel was also found in room VII of the residential part of the Palais Nord. Stirrup jars have been reported from this building as well, although not from its habitation quarters. At Tell Sukas (site no. 132) Mycenaean kraters and a number of sherds from open pots of which the exact vessel type is uncertain have been reported from domestic contexts. These sherds were interspersed with fragments of Mycenaean storage vessels. The site of Sarepta (site no. 150) produced sixteen Mycenaean dinner vessels, a relatively small amount in comparison with the large number of storage vessels. Each of these sixteen finds was associated with domestic architecture and industrial installations such as bins and basins. The domestic and industrial structure excavated at Tyre (site no. 151) also produced dinner and storage vessels. A domestic building excavated at Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) produced a number of stirrup jars and two straight-sided alabastra, while a stemmed cup was also found in the area. In contrast, Mycenaean finds from the temple at this site produced kylikes, bowls and rhyta and only a few storage vessels. The two Mycenaean finds from the palace at Kamid el-Loz are both storage vessels. At Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) a large number of Mycenaean

112 The ‘Schatzhaus’ was situated in the palace and has been described as a royal grave, see Miron 1990; Adler 1994, 208-211.
113 Courbin 1986, 181. Nothing, however, is known about the functions of this building, nor is the stratigraphy of the finds altogether clear.
115 Bounni et al. 1979, 241.
118 Bikai 1978, 56, Plate 39 no. 20, Plate 43 nos. 30, 32-34, Plate 48 nos. 2, 3, Plate 50 no. 18, Plate 88 no. 5; Leonard 1994, 211.
121 Frisch, Mansfeld & Thiele 1985, 119, Tafel 30.4 no. 118. Marfoe 1995, 147, fig. 92 no. 4. The LMIB spouted jar from the ‘Schatzhaus’ is not taken into consideration here because it was found in a tomb.
dinner vessels were associated with the cult deposit in temple 50, indicating that such vessels could be part of religious ceremonies.\textsuperscript{122} However, similar vessels have been found in domestic contexts.\textsuperscript{123} Among the finds in the palatial building 2041 at Megiddo (site no. 175) were Mycenaean storage as well as dinner vessels, which was also the case in the residential area CC.\textsuperscript{124} A concentration of eight fragments of amphoroid kraters was found in locus 1817, a single room within a residential building in area CC.\textsuperscript{125} These krater fragments indicate that such vessels could be assembled by urban inhabitants. At Beth Shean (site no. 178) only one dinner vessel, an amphoroid krater, was found in the domestic quarters to the south-east of the temple, while four dinner vessels were found in the contemporary sanctuary.\textsuperscript{126} The structure in area B at Ashdod (site no. 206) yielded a large number of Mycenaean kylikes, cups, bowls and kraters, while relatively few storage vessels - all stirrup jars - were found there.\textsuperscript{127}

Above, I have argued that the variability in the repertoire of Mycenaean pottery was dependant on the appreciation of the vessels in the places where they were used, which, in turn, was related to the access different sites had to this class of material. In this respect, it is of interest to note that the restriction of Mycenaean dinner vessels to official contexts at Hazor seems to be paralleled at Kamid el-Loz and Beth Shean. Each of these three sites is situated relatively far away from the coast and was dependant on regional exchange for its supply of Mycenaean pottery. A difference in appreciation for Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels cannot be established for large coastal centres and for a regional centre such as Megiddo. However, such centres seem to have been able to restrict the flow of Mycenaean dinner vessels to inland sites. The high regard for dinner vessels attested at sites such as Hazor, Kamid el-Loz and Beth Shean seems to be the result of a strategy of restricted distribution. The case of Deir ‘Alla suggests that a similar process took place with respect to storage vessels which were distributed to sites in more marginal areas, such as the Palestine uplands and Transjordan.

In contrast to Ugarit, the sites of Hazor and Deir ‘Alla did not yield Mycenaean pictorial pottery. Elsewhere in the Levant, Mycenaean pictorial pottery does occur, even though no other site has yielded quantities comparable to those at Ugarit.\textsuperscript{128} Most of the sites which have produced Mycenaean pictorial pots can be considered as large urban centres, which received a substantial amount of Mycenaean pottery in general. Exceptions to this are a sherd decorated with a chariot from Ras el-Bassit (site no. 127), which was situated in the territory of Ugarit.\textsuperscript{129} Another exception is the fragment of a chariot krater that has been reported from Sahab (site no. 190) in Transjordan.\textsuperscript{130} It seems then, that Mycenaean pictorial pottery was not very abundant in the Levant and mainly restricted to coastal centres. Indeed inland centres such as Megiddo (site no. 175) or Beth Shean (site no. 178) have produced very few Mycenaean pots

\textsuperscript{122} Balensi 1980, 63.
\textsuperscript{123} See, for example the kylix found in the ‘latrine’ building; Balensi 1980, 188.
\textsuperscript{125} Leonard & Cline 1998, 7.
\textsuperscript{126} Hankey 1993c, 106-107: 1 shallow cup, 1 kylix, 1 bell krater, 1 deep bowl.
\textsuperscript{127} Dothan & Freedman 1967, 96 fig. 21; Dothan 1971, 80, fig. 35.
\textsuperscript{128} Leonard (1994) has listed the various Mycenaean decorative motifs and their presence in the Levant. If we focus on the man/human (FM1), the horse (FM 2) the bull (FM 3) and the chariot (FM 39), only Alalakh (site no. 125) and Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) have produced more than five Mycenaean pots with pictorial decoration: eight and five examples respectively. This is very little in comparison with the eighty-two Mycenaean pictorial pots reported from Ugarit (table 5.8).
\textsuperscript{129} Courbin 1986, 391 (not illustrated).
\textsuperscript{130} Ibrahim 1975, 78, Plate 34.3.
with pictorial decoration.\textsuperscript{131} The Syrian coastal area appears to be an exception, with relatively many of these type of vessels, at Ugarit and, very likely at Alalakh (site no. 125).\textsuperscript{132}

At Ugarit, the number of Mycenaean pictorial pots in funerary contexts was quite low and they occurred in different types of tombs. The presence of these type of pots in settlement levels at this site indicated that they were used widely among the urban population and were part of average domestic activities.\textsuperscript{133} On this basis, I concluded that Mycenaean pictorial pots did not have a particular cultural significance at Ugarit. The chariot krater from Tell Dan (site no. 158) was found in the so-called ‘Mycenaean tomb’, in which a varied body of goods were assembled.\textsuperscript{134} At the Amman airport (site no. 189), likewise, two chariot kraters were part of an exceptional body of Mycenaean pots and other objects.\textsuperscript{135} This shows that Mycenaean pictorial pots in these instances were subject to the practice of collecting together with other Mycenaean pots. Rather than to a special significance of Mycenaean pictorial pottery, the scarcity of these type of vessels in the Levant appears to be related to the strategies of restricted distribution of which all types of Mycenaean pottery were part.

Among the group of Mycenaean ritual vessels the conical rhyton is the most numerous find in the Levant. According to the figures provided by Leonard, this vessel type (FS 199) has been found at only eight sites.\textsuperscript{136} If functionally related shapes such as domestic funnels (FS 198), ostrich-egg rhyta (FS 201) and zoomorphic vases are taken into account, the figure of sites with Mycenaean rhyta grows to eleven.\textsuperscript{137} Even though found at a limited number of places, the area of distribution of Mycenaean rhyta is quite large, reaching as far east as Tell es-Salihye (site no. 155). In terms of quantity, however, there is a strong concentration of Mycenaean rhyta at Ugarit, where more than seventy percent of all such vessels in the Levant have been found.\textsuperscript{138} The contexts of these vessels at Ugarit clearly shows that this Mycenaean vessel type was highly regarded in that city.\textsuperscript{139}

At Tell Kazel (site no. 135) a Mycenaean rhyton was found in an unstratified position, but near a Late Bronze Age pebble floor and brick wall of a probable residential structure.\textsuperscript{140} At Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) a Mycenaean rhyton was discovered in the first deposit of

\textsuperscript{131} At Megiddo, a Mycenaean krater has been found, which probably showed a human being, while a few vessels with birds and octopi also occurred; see Leonard 1994, 143, 147, 157. At Beth Shean, only a few vessels decorated with a variety of animals have been found, see Leonard 1994, 46, 157.

\textsuperscript{132} Much of the Mycenaean pottery from Alalakh remains unpublished, J.H. Crouwel pers. com. For an overview of pictorial pottery from Alalakh, see Crouwel & Morris 1985.

\textsuperscript{133} See also Van Wijngaarden 1999c.

\textsuperscript{134} Biran 1970; Gunneweg et al. 1992.

\textsuperscript{135} Hankey 1974, 147-148.

\textsuperscript{136} According to Leonard (1994, 90-93; map 23), this vessel type occurs at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida (sites no. 128, 129), Tell Kazel (site no. 135), Sarepta (site no. 150), Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154), Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), Tell Sera’ (site no. 216) and Ashkelon (site no. 217).

\textsuperscript{137} Domestic funnels (FS 198) have only been found at Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), see Leonard 1994, 90. Ostrich-egg rhyta (FS 201) have been found at Ras Shamra (site no. 128), Minet el-Beida (site no. 129), Beth Shean (site no. 178) and Lachisch (site no. 213), see Leonard 1994, 93. Zoomorphic rhyta have been found at Ras Shamra (site no. 128), Minet el-Beida (site no. 129), Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154), Tell es-Salihye (site no. 155), Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) and Tell Sera’ (site no. 216), see Leonard 1994, 94-95.

\textsuperscript{138} Of the 62 conical rhyta reported by Leonard (1994, 90-93), 47 were discovered at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida. Two of the four ostrich-egg rhyta came from these sites as well, while 17 of the total of 26 zoomorphic vessels came from Ugarit. By comparison, Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) has produced six conical rhyta and six of bull’s head type, while two domestic funnels were also found (13 % of total). Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) produced four rhyta, Tell Sera’ (site no. 216) and Lachisch (site no. 213), each two and Sarepta (site no. 150), Tell Kazel (site no. 135), Ashkelon (site no. 217) and Tell es-Salihye (site no. 155) each one. Figures taken from Leonard 1994, 90-95.

\textsuperscript{139} Above, chapter 5; see also Van Wijngaarden 1999c.

\textsuperscript{140} Yon & Caubet 1990, 106 no. 25; Badre 1990, 68 (level 4)
temple 50, in association with a number of imports from other areas and objects such as seals and faience beads.\textsuperscript{141} Two more conical rhyta, as well as three of zoomorphic type have been reported as coming from the from the area of this temple.\textsuperscript{142} A conical rhyton was also found at Sarepta (site no. 150) in association with domestic architecture.\textsuperscript{143} A hedgehog rhyton, as well as three rhyta of conical type were found in the temple at Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154).\textsuperscript{144} Two of these were discovered in the vicinity of an altar and were associated with Levantine fenestrated pots of similar type as those found at Deir 'Ala.\textsuperscript{145} Finally, two Mycenaean conical rhyta and one in the shape of a hedgehog were found in Building 1118 at Tell Sera’ (site no. 216), where a number of Egyptian imports and objects such as cylinder seals and ivory inlays were also discovered.\textsuperscript{146}

From this overview it is clear that Mycenaean rhyta could be employed in local ritual practices. However, as at Ugarit, such vessels have been found in domestic contexts as well. It seems safe to assume that the high regard for these vessels, which was evident at Ugarit, is paralleled in other areas in the Levant. The widespread occurrence of rhyta in contexts which testify of cultic activities indicates that this high regard was due to the role these vessels could fulfil in Levantine ritual ceremonies. Libations of wine, honey, ghee and milk as part of ceremonies in which the gods were ritually fed had a long history in the Levant.\textsuperscript{147} The concentration of Mycenaean rhyta at Ugarit not only attests to the wealth of this city, but also to its ability to exert a preference for these vessels. The limited occurrence of rhyta elsewhere in the Levant suggests that they were employed in strategies of restricted regional distribution, as has also been suggested for Mycenaean dinner vessels and pictorial pottery.

The final class of Mycenaean pottery to be considered are terra-cotta figurines. According to the figures provided by Leonard, Mycenaean female figurines have been found at eighteen sites in the Levant.\textsuperscript{148} If bovine figurines and types such as chariots are included, the number of sites with Mycenaean figurines grows to twenty-two.\textsuperscript{149} The find places of Mycenaean figurines are widely distributed, including inland sites such as Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) and 'Ain Shems (site no. 210). In a quantitative sense, however, the distribution shows a marked concentration at Ugarit: nineteen female figurines (31.6 % of the total) and forty-five of bovine and other type (68 % of the total) have been found at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida. At Ugarit, these idols did not appear to have been restricted in any spatial or contextual sense. The case of the industrial area in Minet el-Beida (S1), where a large quantity of such figurines appeared to have been particularised, indicates that these objects could be endowed with some special

\textsuperscript{141} Balensi 1980, 92.
\textsuperscript{142} Balensi 1980, 441. The temple also produced a Mycenaean ring kernos.
\textsuperscript{143} Koehl (1985, 103) reports it as having been found in gridsquare II A9 at level 10. For this square and its stratigraphy, see Khalifeh 1988, 11-15.
\textsuperscript{144} Hachmann 1980, 84, 87, Tafel 24 nos. 1, 4; 1982, 33, Tafel 5 no. 3, Tafel 6 no. 1. One of the conical rhyta (1980, 87, Tafel 24 no. 1) may be a Levantine imitation of an Aegean type.
\textsuperscript{145} See Echt (1986) for these vessels and their cultic character.
\textsuperscript{146} Oren & Netzer 1974, 265.
\textsuperscript{147} Van der Toorn 1995b, 2053.
\textsuperscript{148} Leonard 1994, 137-138. Mycenaean female figurines have been found in Ras Shamra (site no. 128), Minet el-Beida (site no. 129), Tell Sukas (site no. 132), Byblos (site no. 144), Sidon (site no. 148), Sarepta (site no. 150), Tyre (site no. 151), Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154), Hazor (site no. 159), Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), Tell Ta’anek (site no. 177), Ashdod (site no. 206), 'Ain Shems (site no. 210), Lachisch (site no. 213) and Tell el-Hesi (site no. 219).
\textsuperscript{149} Leonard 1994, 138-141. Mycenaean zoomorphic figurines have been found in Ras Shamra (site no. 128), Minet el-Beida (site no. 129), Tell Sukas (site no. 132), Tell Kazel (site no. 135), Byblos (site no. 144), Sarepta (site no. 150), Tyre (site no. 151), Hazor (site no. 159), Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), Megiddo (site no. 175), Beth Shean (site 178) and 'Ain Shems (site no. 210). To this list, Tel Dan (site no. 158) should be added, see Biran 1994a, 119 no. 9.
meaning. The same is suggested by the fact that they occurred in four tombs only. In all of
these four cases more than a single Mycenaean figurine was found, from which I concluded
that they played a special role in the funerary ceremonies connected to these tombs. In general,
however, Mycenaean figurines at Ugarit have been discovered primarily in small quantities in
domestic contexts. At Hazor, where far less of these idols were found, they appeared to
possess special significance. A bovine figurine was discovered in the temple at area H, while a
female figurine came to light in house 8139 (H14).

At Tell Sukas (site no. 132), which was part of the kingdom of Ugarit, nineteen figurines
were discovered, all in domestic contexts. In funerary chamber 2 of necropolis K at Byblos
(site no. 144), a Mycenaean female figurine was found, while room 11 yielded a chariot
type. At Sarepta (site no. 150) three female figurines, four of bovine type, as well as three
chariot types were found in settlement levels. The domestic and industrial structure at Tyre
(site no. 151) yielded a female and a bovine figurine. A Psi-type female figurine was found in
room D of the temple at Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154). In comparison with the large
quantities of Mycenaean pottery present at Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), a relatively small
number of twelve figurines have been discovered at this site. One of these was found in
association with a conical rhyton in the cult deposit at temple 50. Palace 2041 at Megiddo
(site no. 175) produced a zoomorphic bovine figurine in stratum VIIB. A Phi-type figurine
was found on the remains of the stratum 1 floor in the residential building of area B at Ashdod
(site no. 206).

From this overview of the contexts of Mycenaean figurines in the Levant, it is clear that
these idols were employed in both domestic and industrial contexts, as well as in situations
which testify of ritual practices. The evidence from Ugarit that Mycenaean figurines could
occasionally serve special functions in a limited number of funerary ceremonies may be
paralleled at Byblos. It seems logical to interpret Mycenaean terra-cotta figurines as objects
which were used in daily cult practices, while they could occasionally also serve in activities of
a higher symbolical nature, such as in religious and funerary ceremonies. The marked
concentration of Mycenaean figurines at Ugarit testifies that this city was able to exert a
preference for these objects, as in the case of Mycenaean rhyta.

The appreciation of different Mycenaean vessel types does not appear to have been
homogeneous everywhere in the Late Bronze Age Levant. Aegean vessels in ceramic styles
dating to the first part of the Late Bronze Age could circulate for substantial periods of time.
The deposition of such vessels in contexts testifying of wealth and of religious ceremonies
suggests that such ancient vessels could be highly regarded. For the Late Bronze Age II
period, there is evidence that Mycenaean pottery was involved in strategies of restricted
regional distribution. As a result, vessel types which were widely used in domestic contexts at
some sites could be highly valued at other sites. Such restricted regional distribution also seems
to have operated with regard to Mycenaean conical and zoomorphic rhyta. Everywhere, these

150 Ploug 1973, Plate 2 nos. 31-39. Four fragments of female figurines were found, as well as five fragments of
bovine figurines. See also Leonard 1994, 138-140.
151 Salles 1980, 37, Plate 29.
152 Koehl 1985, 105-109.
153 Bikai 1978, Plate 43, no. 33, Plate 88 no. 7.
154 Hachmann 1980, 89, no. 23, Tafel 27 no. 6.
155 Balensi 1980, 471.
156 Balensi 1980, 93.
158 Dothan & Freedman 1967, 83. Very few remains were discovered of the stratum 1 building. An earlier
phase of the same structure - stratum 2 - has been interpreted as a residential complex associated with
industrial activities.
vessels appear to have been highly regarded. Mycenaean figurines may also have been part of such strategies of limited distribution.

The fact that Mycenaean rhyta have been found in contexts which testify of Levantine religious practices suggests that these vessels were an integral part of the material record surrounding cultic rites. Mycenaean figurines likewise appear to have been part of the local material culture. The widespread use of Mycenaean storage vessels also suggests that these imported pots were fully integrated into the local material culture at many urban sites. The desirability of Mycenaean pottery seems to derive from the functions it fulfilled in Levantine cultural practices. Because these functions may have varied among sites, these ceramic imports were suitable to be included in strategies of restricted regional distribution. Since the desire for and access to different parts of the Mycenaean ceramic repertoire were unequal, the appreciation of these vessels varied as well.\footnote{See Van Wijngaarden (1999c) on the relation between desirability, availability and value.}

**Funerary evidence**

The occurrence of Mycenaean vessel types in the tombs at Ugarit reflects the widespread use of this class of material among the urban population: almost all tombs produced a limited number of Mycenaean pots. Five tombs at Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra, however, deviate substantially from this pattern in the sense that they yielded large amounts of Mycenaean pottery - often including Mycenaean figurines - associated with many other imports. Even though only three tombs were excavated at Hazor, a similar situation was attested at this site: two graves possessed a few Mycenaean pots, while tomb 8144-8145 produced a large and varied quantity of this material. This phenomenon shows that for some groups within the urban societies of the Levant Mycenaean pottery was suitable to be included in funerary strategies of display, which is testimony of the social significance of this class of material.

Aegean pottery has been found in funerary contexts at a large number of Levantine sites. In the majority of cases only a limited number of Mycenaean vessels are found in the tombs, often accompanied by Cypriot and local ceramics. Such deposits have been discovered, for example, at Beirut (site no. 145),\footnote{Saidah 1993-1994; two chamber tombs containing eight and five Mycenaean vessels respectively.} Akko (site no. 160),\footnote{Ben-Arieh & Edelstein 1977, 1-8; five graves dug in sand, of which three contained one, six and five Mycenaean vessels respectively.} Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162),\footnote{Tell el-Far‘ah (north) (site no. 180).} Tell el-Far‘ah (south) (site no. 213),\footnote{Tell el-Far‘ah (south) (site no. 223).} Beirut (site no. 145),\footnote{McGovern 1986, 194-198; five stirrup jars were found in association with two robbed out burial caves dating to the Late Bronze Age.} Aphek (site no. 200), Lachisch, Umm ad-Dananir, and Tell el-Far‘ah (north) (site no. 180).\footnote{De Vaux 1951; of three Late Bronze Age tombs, one contained a LHIII A2 piriform jar.} The wide distribution of tombs with a limited number of Mycenaean finds appears to be a reflection of the widespread occurrence of this material in the Levant in general. However, as at Ugarit, there are a number of cases which testify to Mycenaean pottery possessing a special significance in funerary ceremonies.

\footnote{De Vaux 1951; of three Late Bronze Age tombs, one contained a LHIII A2 piriform jar.}
At Byblos (site no. 144) a necropolis has been discovered consisting of eleven chamber tombs hewn out in the rock. A total of sixty-five Mycenaean finds were made in this cemetery, dating from LHIIIA2 to LHIIIC. Among the Mycenaean finds were dinner and storage vessels; in particular, a large number of stirrup jars have been found. Seven of the twelve chambers produced relatively small amounts of Mycenaean pottery, varying from one to seven items. In room K11, however, forty-one Mycenaean finds were made, including a figurine. Even though the tombs were all heavily disturbed because of later use, the concentration of Mycenaean finds in room K11 may present a reflection of a situation similar to the funerary pattern at Ugarit and Hazor.

At Sarepta (site no. 150), only one tomb has been discovered: a circular cave hewn out in the natural rock. This cave produced a total of sixty-seven Mycenaean vases, some of them of Levantine manufacture. Among the Mycenaean finds in this tomb, stirrup jars constituted the majority. In addition, a number of lentoid flasks were found along with a cup and some bowls; a Mycenaean female figurine was also included in the funerary inventory. Apart from the ceramic material, the tomb produced a scarab and two faience amulets, probably imported from Egypt. The inventory of the funerary cave at Sarepta is comparable to that of the exceptional tombs at Minet el-Beida. This similarity does not only concern the presence of large quantities of Mycenaean pottery, but also the presence of Mycenaean figurines and imports from other Mediterranean areas.

The same may be said of the so-called ‘Mycenaean tomb’ at Tell Dan (site no. 158). This tomb, locus no. 387, had been dug under the floor of a Late Bronze Age residential structure into the earth layers of the northern rampart of the city. The walls of the tomb were corbelled to support a slab roof, which recalls the funerary cellars of Ugarit. Inside the tomb were the remains of some forty skeletons, apparently both male and female. A total of hundred and eight ceramic vessels were discovered in the tomb, of which some thirty were imported from Mycenaean Greece; four vases came from Cyprus. Among the Mycenaean pottery were stirrup and piriform jars, alabastra, flasks, bowls and an amphoroid krater with pictorial decoration. All have been assigned to late LHIIIA2, or to LHIIIB1. Apart from the Mycenaean and Cypriot imports, the tomb yielded a large variety of objects, such as alabaster vases, cosmetic boxes made of hippopotamus tusk, faience and glass vessels, a stone cylinder seal possibly imported from Cyprus and a scarab. In addition, numerous Levantine ceramic vessels were found, as well as bronze metal vessels and arms, spindlewhorls and gold and silver jewellery. Olive pits and the skeleton of a sheep may be testimony of funerary rites. The ‘Mycenaean’ tomb is the only funerary evidence from Late Bronze Age Tell Dan, because of which it is impossible to indicate whether it constitutes an atypical example.

The cemetery on the south-eastern slopes of the mound at Megiddo (site no. 175) was excavated in 1925-1930. Only eleven tombs containing Mycenaean pottery have been published. Most of these graves had only a few Mycenaean pots, varying from one to three

168 Salles 1980. These tombs date to the Bronze and Iron Ages and were re-used during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.
169 Salles 1980, 30-37. One figurine was also discovered.
171 Baramki 1958.
172 Biran 1994a, 111-116.
173 Neutron Activation Analysis on a number of Mycenaean vessels from the tomb, including the famous so-called ‘charioteer vase’, showed that they had been produced in the Argolid; see Gunneweg et al. 1992.
175 Guy & Engberg 1938.
176 Leonard & Cline 1998, 9-13. They list twelve graves with Mycenaean pottery; tomb 1101 has been omitted here, since it contained body sherds of a krater which has been classified as belonging to the “Rude or Pastoral” style from Cyprus by Hankey (1967, 126) and Leonard (1994, 29 no. 251).
specimens. Tomb 912, however, contained seven Mycenaean vases: one straight-sided alabastron, five small stirrup jar and one large, transport stirrup jar, all dating to the LHIIIA2 or LHIIIB periods. The cemetery at Megiddo had been heavily damaged because of later burials, and the publication of the excavations does present the full inventories of the Late Bronze Age graves. The difference between tomb 912 and the other tombs at Megiddo in terms of the quantity of Mycenaean pottery is much smaller than that attested for the tombs at Ugarit. It is only a possibility that tomb 912 constitutes an example of a tomb with a disproportionate number of Mycenaean vessels.

At Tell es-Saidiyeh (site no. 186) a total of fifteen Late Bronze Age graves were discovered on the lower tell. Most of these graves consisted of simple trenches cut into the earth, but four tombs (nos. 101, 102, 108, 117) were more elaborate: lined with mud-bricks and then roofed to form a true tomb. In two of these tombs (102, 117), the body had been placed on a stone bed. Of all the graves, only three have produced Mycenaean pottery. A single Mycenaean stirrup jar was found in the simple graves 107 and 109S. Tomb 117, one of the more elaborate graves, however, yielded four Mycenaean vases, among which were two stirrup jars, a straight-sided alabastron and a jug, all in LHIIIB style. In general, the inventories of the graves at Tell es-Saidiyeh reflected the ceramic repertoire of settlement levels, with a notable absence of cooking wares. The richest tomb (no. 101), however, possessed a number of objects in silver, electrum, carnelian, bronze and ivory. This tomb was situated in the centre of the necropolis. Close to tomb 101 were graves 102 and 117. This last grave was special because it was particularly rich in imported wares: apart from the four Mycenaean vessels, a Cypriot Base Ring jug, as well as an alabaster goblet and a faience bowl were found, probably imported from Egypt. Even though the quantities involved are far lower than at Ugarit, or even Hazor, tomb 117 is another case of unequal display of Mycenaean pottery in a funerary context. As is the case elsewhere, a number of imports from other regions were associated with the Mycenaean pottery from tomb 117. It may be of some importance that tomb 117, although special, was not the wealthiest grave.

Early in the twentieth century, large quantities of Mycenaean pottery were reported from extra-mural deposits termed the East Grotto and Tomb I at Ain ‘Shems (site no. 210). Even though very little is known of these deposits, they may constitute other examples of burials associated with large quantities of Mycenaean pottery.

This overview of Mycenaean pottery in funerary contexts in the Levant shows that the pattern established for Ugarit and Hazor is reflected on a regional scale: many tombs have produced only a few Mycenaean finds, while there are a number of cases in which large quantities of Mycenaean pottery were found in graves, usually associated with imports from other regions. Among the sites which have yielded only tombs with small amounts of Mycenaean pottery are Tell Abu Hawam and Lachisch; both sites produced large amounts of Mycenaean pottery in settlement levels. The unequal occurrence of Mycenaean pottery in tombs, therefore, appears not to be related to the availability of this material in different cities. Rather we may assume that among large groups of people, at many places, small quantities of

---

177 The figures given by Leonard and Cline (1998, 9-13) are: tomb 8: 1 LHIIIA2 globular flask; tomb 14: 1 LHIIIA-LHIIIB piriform jar; tomb 34: one LHIIIB stirrup jar; tomb 39: three LHIIIB stirrup jars; tomb 63: two LHIIIB stirrup jars; tomb 73: 1 LHIIIB shallow bowl and a LHIIIB stirrup jar; tomb 80: 1 LHIIIB stirrup jar; tomb 87: 3 LHIIIB stirrup jars; tomb 989: 2 LHIIIA2 stirrup jars; tomb “inside room 26”: 1 stirrup jar.


179 MacKenzie 1911, 61-72. These tombs have now been labelled as nos. 10 and 11 respectively, see Bunimowicz & Lederman 1993, 251.

180 Grant 1929, 163-204.
Mycenaean pottery were considered suitable to be included in funerary inventories. At various sites, widely distributed in the Levant, a minority among the inhabitants included larger numbers of Mycenaean vessels in tombs, often in association with other imports.

The five tombs at Ugarit which have produced large amounts of Mycenaean pottery were situated in the harbour town of Minet el-Beida and in the habitation quarter of the Ville Sud. Tomb 8144-8145 at Hazor, likewise, was situated in a habitation quarter, albeit possibly associated with building 8139, which possessed an atypical inventory. This shows that at both sites the people who included large quantities of Mycenaean pottery in their funerary ritual did not belong to the uppermost élites, but to more average urban social groups. Similar evidence comes from Tell es-Saidiyeh, where it was not the wealthiest tomb which included a larger quantity of Mycenaean pottery, but one associated with it. Apparently, only for specific urban social groups did Mycenaean pottery serve in strategies of funerary display.

The social significance of Mycenaean pottery, then, appears to have varied according to social group in the Levantine urban societies. Above, I concluded that the appreciation of Mycenaean pottery was largely dependent on the role these vessels could fulfil in local cultural practices. The exceptional tombs at Ugarit and Hazor, as well as those at Sarepta, Tell Dan and Tell es-Saidiyeh included a relatively large number of imports from other areas together with the Mycenaean pottery. It may be that for some groups in the urban societies of the Levant the imported character of these vessels was of importance. Whereas for most urban inhabitants the social significance of these vessels appears to have derived from the extent to which they were integrated in the local material culture, specific groups enhanced the imported nature of Mycenaean pottery by including them in larger quantities in funerary inventories and by associating them with other imports.

**Conclusions**

The investigation of the cultural context of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant does not present a homogeneous picture. There are differences in the repertoire of Mycenaean vessels between sites situated on the coast and along major trade routes on the one hand and those situated further away on the other. Such differences may partly be related to the availability of Mycenaean vessel types. The fact that the city of Ugarit could exert a preference for Mycenaean rhyta and figurines may be significant in this respect. A number of find situations at inland sites have yielded a wide variety of Mycenaean pots, which indicates that the differences in the Late Helladic repertoire among sites cannot solely be related to the availability of this material. Rather, we should relate this variation to the functions these pots fulfilled at various places.

As a general class of material, Mycenaean pottery seems to have been used by different social groups in the urban cultures of the Levant. Mycenaean pots have been found in average domestic contexts, as well as in find circumstances which attest to the activities of artisans. They also occurred in contexts which testify of a certain level of wealth, in contexts connected to groups involved in religious practices of official nature and in situations which can be assigned to local ruling élites. It is not the case, however, that high-level social groups made more extensive use of this class of ceramics. Rather, Mycenaean pottery was quite common in the sense that it was used by a many social groups. However, such a widespread use of Mycenaean pottery among different social strata appears to have been primarily a characteristic of larger urban sites. At sites such as Deir ‘Alla, which was a regional centre in a marginal area, Mycenaean pottery was restricted to high-level social groups and to specific situations.

---

181 It is likely that the suitability of small numbers of Mycenaean containers is related to the uses of oils in funerary practices, for which there is epigraphical evidence, see Kinet 1981, 146-147; Salles 1995, 176.
The appreciation of different parts of the Mycenaean repertoire varied among sites. The use of Mycenaean dinner vessels was restricted at sites located relatively far away from the coast such as Hazor, while this was not the case at a coastal trading centre such as Ugarit. The evidence deriving from Mycenaean figurines suggests that their appreciation originated primarily in their role in local cultural practices. The same can be said of Mycenaean rhyta, which were highly regarded everywhere. It is logical, then, to assume that the differences in appreciation of various parts of the Mycenaean repertoire are related to variations in the role of these vessels in the local material cultures. Because of the differences in appreciation of Mycenaean vessels, this class of material was suitable to be included in strategies of restricted regional distribution, of which the concentration of Mycenaean figurines and rhyta at Ugarit present an extreme example.

Funerary evidence indicates that the social significance of Mycenaean pottery was not the same for all groups within the urban societies. The majority of graves in the Levant include only small quantities of Mycenaean pots in their inventories. A limited number of tombs, widely distributed in different regions, produced a large amount of Mycenaean pottery, in several cases including Mycenaean figurines. In most of these exceptional tombs the Aegean material was associated with imports from other areas. Apparently, for some groups in the Levantine societies the imported character of the Mycenaean pottery was important, whereas for other groups the social significance derived primarily from the extent to which the vessels could be incorporated into local cultural practices. In this respect it is of interest to note that Mycenaean ceramic vessels could circulate for substantial periods of time, in some cases hundreds of years. The possibility that such vessels were endowed with symbolic meanings relating to former owners may have enhanced their cultural significance.
Conclusions

The investigation of the cultural context of Mycenaean pottery in the Late Bronze Age has provided a homogenized picture. These are differences in the usage and distribution of pottery types, which can be related to the availability of raw materials or to the social and economic context of the production and consumption of pottery. However, it is important to remember that Mycenaean pottery and figurines may vary significantly in this respect. A number of these chewing areas have yielded a wide variety of Mycenaean pottery types, indicating that the differences in the Late Helladic IIIC A pottery sites should not solely be related to the availability of raw materials. Instead, we should consider the variation in the function of these pottery vessels or contexts.

As a general class of material, Mycenaean pottery seems to have been used by different social groups in the various cultures of the Late Bronze Age. Mycenaean pottery has been found in various domestic contexts, as well as in funerary contexts which reflect the activities of those individuals. They also occurred in contexts which signify a certain level of wealth, as well as those connected to groups involved in religious practices of official nature and in situations which may be associated with local ritual or political events. It is not the case, however, that high-level social groups made more extensive use of this class of ceramic. Rather, Mycenaean pottery was quite common in the vases that were used by ordinary social groups. However, such a widespread use of Mycenaean pottery among different social strata appears to have been precisely a characteristic of larger urban sites. At sites such as Lerna, which was a regional centre in a larger area, Mycenaean pottery was restricted to high-level social groups and to specific situations.