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This chapter presents the Egyptian finds uncovered in Hazor to date, including Egyptian statuary, scarabs and Egyptian-type pottery. The section on the statuary consists of a detailed discussion of four Egyptian objects: two statues and two sphinxes. All other fragments belonging to unidentifiable Egyptian statues are presented below in table 15.1:5–17 (photos 15.9–15.11 on pp. 587–589). Two additional fragments, discovered by Yadin’s excavation in the 1950s, appear in table 15.1:18–19. The scarabs have been published elsewhere (Keel 2013) and hence are not discussed in any detail here. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the Egyptian pottery.1

EGYPTIAN STATUARY

Given Hazor’s location in northern Israel, the number of Egyptian statues and statuary fragments uncovered at the site (table 15.1) is surprising. To the two fragments uncovered by Yadin’s expedition in the 1950s (table 15.1:18–19; Hazor III–IV, pls. CCCXXIII:4–6), the renewed excavations have added 17 fragments of Egyptian statues, some clearly of a royal nature, some belonging to officials, and others — made of obsidian — most probably of sphinxes. Most pieces belong to different statues, although it is impossible to determine whether the tiny obsidian fragments (table 15.1:7–11; photo 15.10:3–7) belong to the same object or not.

All statues appear to have been deliberately smashed to pieces. Clear traces of intentional destruction are evident, for example, on the torso and skirt (table 15.1:5; photo 15.9:1): the arms, held close to either side of the torso, have been carefully chipped away. The royal head (table 15.1:3; photos 15.1–15.5) was also severed by means of a blow delivered from behind the neck (photo 15.5). The missing head and paws of the sphinx (table 15.1:1; fig. 15.4) also indicate deliberate mutilation.

The mutilation of hands (paws) and heads is a well-known practice in antiquity (Ben-Tor 2006). Canaanite statues suffered the same fate, as clearly seen in the large basalt statue (photo 14.1) found in the renewed excavations in the Building 7050 throneroom (chapter 14) and in some of the statues uncovered by Yadin’s expedition in the 1950s (table 15.1:18–19; Hazor III–IV, pl. CCCXXIII:4–6).

Of the 17 pieces uncovered in the renewed excavations, three (table 15.1:1,4,14) were found incorporated as building material in Iron Age walls. Two (table 15.1:7–8) were found in LB fills, and one (table 15.1:12) was found in a fill with mixed Iron and Bronze Age pottery. All other pieces were found in clear-cut LB contexts dating from the thirteenth century BCE, when Canaanite Hazor was finally destroyed. With the exception of the sphinx (table 15.1:2; photo 15.8; fig. 15.5), which dates from the Old Kingdom, and most probably of the head fragment (table 15.1:15; photo 15.11:11), apparently dating from the New Kingdom, it seems that all other fragmentary Egyptian statues found at Hazor (including the two found by Yadin’s excavations) can be dated to the Middle Kingdom of Egypt. Since MB Hazor had not yet been established at that time, how and when all these objects were brought to Hazor remains a matter of conjecture. They were all apparently still in use at the site during the Late Bronze Age.

1 The section on the royal head was written by S. Connor and D. Laboury; the section on the fragment of the statue of an official was written by M. Marée; the section on the sphinxes was written by D. Ben-Tor; and the section on the pottery was written by M. Martin. We are grateful to the following for identification of the material from which the objects were made: A. Katz, E. Sass, Y. Kolodny, O. Zlatkin, O. Tirosh, and A. Starinski (all from the Department. of Earth Science, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reg. No. (Basket)</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Dimensions (H, W, D in cm)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Elevations</th>
<th>Area and Context</th>
<th>Illustrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sphinx</td>
<td>14774</td>
<td>31/12/94</td>
<td>16 × 30 × 12</td>
<td>Diorite</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area A1: Iron Age wall</td>
<td>Fig. 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sphinx</td>
<td>78117</td>
<td>L.12-373</td>
<td>18 × 43 × 27</td>
<td>Gneiss</td>
<td>220.83–220.51</td>
<td>Area M: administrative palace; fill to W.13-308</td>
<td>Photo 15.8; fig. 15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Private statue</td>
<td>91047</td>
<td>W.07-206</td>
<td>14.5 × 11.5 × 8.5</td>
<td>Microgranite</td>
<td>232.28–231.99</td>
<td>Area A3: within Iron Age wall</td>
<td>Figs. 15.1–15.3; photos 15.6–15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Torso and skirt</td>
<td>14760</td>
<td>L. 1509</td>
<td>13.9 × 8.5 × 6.8</td>
<td>Gabro</td>
<td>230.11–07</td>
<td>Area A1: eastern courtyard</td>
<td>Photo 15.9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Torso and skirt</td>
<td>17844</td>
<td>L. 1763</td>
<td>15.5X7 × 3.9</td>
<td>Gabro</td>
<td>230.52</td>
<td>Area A1: Building 7050 throneroom</td>
<td>Photo 15.9:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Skirt</td>
<td>71248</td>
<td>L. 6620</td>
<td>2.6 × 3 × 0.8</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>218.94–76</td>
<td>Area M: fill below podium foundations</td>
<td>Photo 15.10:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skirt</td>
<td>71312</td>
<td>L. 6624</td>
<td>5.4 × 2.6 × 2.5</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>218.76–34</td>
<td>Area M: fill below podium foundations</td>
<td>Photo 15.10:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Leg (two glued parts)</td>
<td>17390+14166</td>
<td>L.1738+</td>
<td>2.4 × 2.1 × 4.1</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>One part: 231.03–230.94; second part: 230.27</td>
<td>Area A1: one part: Building 7050 throneroom, fill between W.1207 and orthostat row W.1212; second part: eastern courtyard, on top of steps leading up to main entrance of Building 7050</td>
<td>Photo 15.10:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>13678</td>
<td>L.1473</td>
<td>2.8 × 3.5 × 4.1</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>230.77–75</td>
<td>Area A1: eastern courtyard</td>
<td>Photo 15.10:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Leg (two glued parts)</td>
<td>14639+42069</td>
<td>L.1500+</td>
<td>2 × 2 × 2</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>231.43–230.90</td>
<td>Area A1: one part: eastern courtyard, steps leading up to entrance of Building 7050; second part: Building 7050</td>
<td>Photo 15.10:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>39492</td>
<td>L.5952</td>
<td>11.9 × 6.5 × 2.2</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>214.97</td>
<td>Area M: podium complex in locus containing Iron I pottery</td>
<td>Photo 15.10:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>52176</td>
<td>L.8296</td>
<td>3.8 × 2.9 × 3</td>
<td>Oligoclase Basalt</td>
<td>230.15</td>
<td>Area A4: eastern courtyard</td>
<td>Photo 15.10:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Reg. No. (Basket)</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Dimensions (H, W, D in cm)</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Elevations</td>
<td>Area and Context</td>
<td>Illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Feet of statue</td>
<td>91031</td>
<td>W.6511</td>
<td>8.3 × 14 × 13.5</td>
<td>Quartz–syenite</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area A3: within Iron Age wall W.6511</td>
<td>Photo 15.11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Head fragment (two glued parts)</td>
<td>78140</td>
<td>L.12-373</td>
<td>15 × 17 × 12</td>
<td>Bitumineous limestone</td>
<td>220.83–51</td>
<td>Area M: one part: administrative palace; fill next to W.13-308; second part: within W.12-317 (LB wall)</td>
<td>Photo 15.11:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wig</td>
<td>15227</td>
<td>L. 1654a</td>
<td>1.1 × 3.5 × 4.2</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>231.06–230.49</td>
<td>Area A1: Building 7050, entrance</td>
<td>Photo 15.11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>70875</td>
<td>W.3260</td>
<td>8 × 11 × 5.5</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>219.39</td>
<td>Podium complex, in secondary use</td>
<td>Photo 15.11:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Torso and skirt</td>
<td>6201/1</td>
<td>L.274</td>
<td>Graywacke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazor III–IV: pl. CCCXXIII:4–5</td>
<td>Photo 15.12:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>4239/1</td>
<td>L.240a</td>
<td>Graywacke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazor III–IV: pl. CCCXXIII:6</td>
<td>Photo 15.12:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Photo 15.1: Royal head: frontal view  
Photo 15.2: Royal head: right side  
Photo 15.3: Royal head: view from above  
Photo 15.4: Royal head: left side  
Photo 15.5: Royal head: rear view
Interestingly, no other part of the statuette to which it had originally belonged was recovered at the site. The cracks indicate that the nose had been broken and the head detached from the rest of the sculpture before being shattered. Although most of the broken edges are sharp, suggesting, along with the fact that the head could be reconstructed almost in full, that it had been broken close to where it was found, the helix — or outer rim — of the right ear shows more weathered fractures, suggesting multiple phases of damage.²

The sculpture is made with excellent craftsmanship out of a piece of graywacke, a metamorphic rock only quarried in the ancient Near East in Wadi Hammamat, a path in Egypt’s eastern desert between Qift (ancient Coptos) in the Nile Valley and Al-Qusayr on the Red Sea shore. This stone was used in ancient Egyptian art ever since the so-called Predynastic Period, at the very end of the prehistoric era (Klemm and Klemm 2008: 297–311); it therefore clearly points to an Egyptian provenance.

The person depicted wears a short, close-fitting curled cap-wig,¹ toppied by a uraeus, the solar cobra that rises above the forehead of Pharaoh in ancient Egyptian iconography⁴ (photo 15.3), thus identifying our character as a king of Egypt beyond any doubt. The thin, high and somewhat irregular stone projection behind the head suggests that the statuette, almost half life-size, was not free-standing, but was leaning against a dorsal panel or a back slab, possibly within a group sculpture, along with a divinity or a female consort (or even a doubled royal representation).³ Unfortunately, the present state of preservation of the head does not permit any further reconstruction of the original form and composition of the work.

Viewed from the front (photo 15.1), the face of the king appears oval, due to his rather full and fleshy cheeks. The eyes are large and elongated, with eyelids well curved around the pupil. The upper eyelid is rimmed while the lower one is not, and the eyebrow follows its curve, closer to the eye than to the lower limit of the wig on the forehead, and extending horizontally along the cosmetic line on the temple. The modelling of the cheeks is rather subtle, with a slight depression under the eyes and a well-defined, although not incised, nasobial fold. The mouth is wide, with fleshy and precisely outlined lips, and the chin is not particularly strong, almost receding. This physiognomy is derived from the official portrait of King Menkaure (also known as Mycerinus), from the late 4th Dynasty, and typifies, with very few variations, royal portraiture in ancient Egypt until the 6th Dynasty.⁷ This homogenization — or neutralization — of royal portraits during the second part of the Old Kingdom (i.e., during more than two centuries) hinders the precise identification of isolated heads such as the one under discussion; the rendering of these facial features on the piece from Hazor are characteristic of the 5th Dynasty, although it does not seem possible to determine with any certainty which king it depicts.⁷

The typology of the wig does not help us to narrow down the dating of the piece. The earliest preserved attestation of this close-fitting short headgear is provided by a life-size calcite head found in the funerary complex of Menkaure in Giza (MFA 09.203) — dated to the reign of Menkaure or to that of his direct successor, Shepseskaf — but it is particularly frequent in royal iconography of the 5th Dynasty, both in sculpture in the round and in relief. The treatment of the locks on the Hazor head is quite unique in the royal statuary of the times,⁸ but many close parallels are known in private sculpture from the entire Old Kingdom. The uraeus (photos 15.1, 15.3), which is not consistently present on such wigs and assumes various shapes, depending upon the headdress, is, in this case, particularly long and sinuous, although an exact parallel on a calcite statuette depicting the

² It is noteworthy that the same holds true for most of the Egyptian sculptures unearthed in ancient Near Eastern archaeological contexts. This begs the question whether those pieces perhaps reached the sites in question already in a fragmentary state.
³ Sometimes also interpreted as natural hair.
⁴ Although it is not absolutely systematic during the Old Kingdom, i.e. the period when this head was made; see below.
⁵ The slight irregularity of what is left of the negative space behind the head suggests that the sculptor was not equally at ease on both sides of the figure, which further hints at the presence of another character next to the king. Ancient Egyptian royal group statues have been conveniently gathered in the study of Seidel 1996 (for the Old Kingdom pieces, see pp. 5–58, pls. 1–20). According to the standards of Old Kingdom statuary, a large dorsal panel — eventually to be replaced by the traditional back-pillar — could also appear at the rear of a single depiction of the king (e.g., Hassan 1960: pl. 37 Cairo JE 72213; Khafra, 4th Dynasty; or Verner 1985: pls. 49–51 Cairo JE 98181; Raneferef, 5th Dynasty).
⁷ Verner 1985 and Sourouzian 2010: 77–83 both provide a very useful list of known pieces of 5th-Dynasty royal sculpture (including uncertain attributed fragments); see also Benešovská 2006. For a good stylistic parallel in two-dimensional representations of the time, see Brinkmann 2010 (relief from the pyramid temple of Sahura, detail of Cairo RT 6.12.24.9). The Hazor head compares favorably with most of those sculptures, despite a slightly more elongated face. One should note that five of the nine pharaohs of the 5th Dynasty are completely unattested in this corpus, which is, moreover, dominated (for almost half of its items) by the sculpture of the very ephemeral king Raneferef, only by chance of archaeological discoveries. In this context, it even seems impossible to suggest any probability for the attribution of the Hazor piece within the 5th Dynasty’s royal statuary.
⁸ It is nevertheless attested on a royal head with a slightly different — and bigger — wig in Berlin (SMPK 14396), which Russmann (1995: 117–118, pl. 43c–d) suggested dating to the 4th Dynasty. Another case is the fragment of the back of a similar wig uncovered in the funerary temple of Khafra in Guiza (Krauspe 1997: 19, pl. 9:1).
6th-Dynasty King Pepi II as a child displays a simplified version of the same wig (Cairo JE 50616). The design of the hood in Hazor’s example is particularly detailed, but again, with parallels in royal art of the Old Kingdom. 8

A key question elicited by such a piece is, of course, how it found its way to the level of the final destruction of Hazor, more than a millennium after its creation, where, indeed, it met its end. Although many hypothetical scenarios could be suggested, 9 no definite conclusion can be drawn. The history of the statue was surely quite complex, and the kingdom of Hazor must have been eager to use and display a prestige object connected to Egyptian royal imagery.

## A FRAGMENT OF THE STATUE OF AN EGYPTIAN OFFICIAL

M. Marée

The excavations at Tel Hazor brought to light an intriguing piece of Egyptian sculpture (table 15.1:4; figs. 15.1–15.3; photos 15.6–15.7). In 2013, the expedition unearthed part of a gneiss sphinx of King Menkaure of the 4th Dynasty (twenty-sixth century BCE; see below, section on Egyptian Sphinxes, table 15.1:2; photo 15.8; fig. 15.5). The new fragment, uncovered in secondary use in the core of an Iron Age wall (W.07-206), can be dated to the early 12th Dynasty. Carved out of microgranite, the statue represented a seated official. All that survives is a fragment 14 cm high — just over half the statue’s original height — including the cubic seat (8.5 cm wide and deep), the best preserved part of the man’s legs and a portion of his right hand. A lost extension at the base supported the owner’s feet and would have been 8.5 cm deep. The current maximum depth of the statue is 12.5 cm.

The man sits on a perfectly square seat, without back support. He was in a conventional upright pose with both hands resting on his lap. His left hand — which did not survive — originally lay flat, palm down, on the corresponding thigh. The partially surviving right hand also lies, palm down, on the corresponding thigh, but is clenched in a fist, holding a rolled-up kerschief. The legs and feet were bare, as was, undoubtedly, the torso. The official wears only a shendjyt kilt: a short pleated garment with a tapering front panel. Reserved for kings in the Old Kingdom, the shendjyt made its first sporadic appearance on private monuments during the First Intermediate Period. In early Middle Kingdom sculpture, it gained, quite suddenly, much wider popularity. This trend took off in the reign of Senwosret I (c. 1965–1920 BCE), the second ruler of the 12th Dynasty.

The overall design and style attribute it to the same ruler. Its maker closely followed a template for private sculpture that was adopted under Senwosret I and subsequently abandoned. Various features — the above-noted position of the hands, the choice of dress, the plain cubic seat without a raised back, and the general simplicity of the statue — were all frequently repeated together. 12 Better preserved statues of this type display a short bulbous wig arranged in vertical rows of curls, leaving the ears exposed. 13 This hairstyle also

---

9 Many examples, both in statuary and two-dimensional representations, appear in Johnson 1990.

10 For a somewhat comparable case, albeit in a Minoan context and within a shorter timespan, see the excellent analysis in Gill and Padgham 2005.

11 I am grateful to Amnon Ben-Tor for inviting me to comment on the object. Although I have not seen the original, the observations in this section were made possible by extensive photography and latex casts.

12 E.g., Aswan 1338 (Habachi 1985: 87–88, no. 60, pls. 142–143), 1339 (Habachi 1985: 32, no. 4, pls. 19–20); Aswan, Elephantine find no. K 258a (Bidoli 1973: 185–187; Junge 1987: 14, §2.3.1, pl. 3); Baltimore WAM 22.377 (Steindorff 1946: 22, no. 25, pl. 3; lower part lost, but certainly from a seated statue as it lacks a back pillar; contra Steindorff, who also misdated the statue to the 6th Dynasty); Boston MFA 14.724 (Revez 2002); Cairo CG 63, 409 and 464 (Borchardt 1911: 35–36, pl. 16; 1925: 20–21, pl. 67, and 55, pl. 77); a statue from Ezbet Rushdi (Adam 1959: 213, B, pls. 7 [A–B], 13 [B]); Leiden AEBB (Boeser 1910: 5, no. 40, pl. 21, fig. 13; Schneider and Raven 1981: 62–63, no. 39; the “royal” head and upright fist are incorrect modern restorations); London BM EA 1475 (Evans 1979: 111, fig.); Naples 983 (D’Errico and Pirelli 1989: 42, no. 1.4, pl. 2); New York MMA 07.231.8 (Petrie 1907: 13, pl. 10); 22.1.200 (Hayes 1953: 206, fig. 123); and a statue now in an American private collection (Wiese and Winterhalter 1998: 24–25, no. 23). Similar male figures also appear in group statues, still from the same reign, such as Baltimore WAM 22.112 (Steindorff 1946: 25–26, no. 37; pls. 12, 110) and Oxford E.1971 (Bourriau 1988: 20–21, no. 9).

13 Short wigs are confirmed for most of the statues cited in n. 12, even
dominates in other types of statues from the reign but they also differed in other ways from the 15th Dynasty; no direct parallels are confirmed for earlier statues, and only one, to the best of my knowledge, is known to postdate Senwosret’s reign. 16 Both the wigs and garments of private statues became longer under his successors. Several seated statues continued to feature the shendjyt kilt, now combined with shoulder-length wigs, but they also differed in other ways from the type exemplified by the Hazor statue. For example, many of these later statues have a fist that clasps the kerchief placed upright, not horizontally, or they show not one but both

those with headless torsos, as they never hear a trace of wigs reaching down to the shoulders. In one of the pieces — Baltimore WAM 22.112 — the wig covers part of the ears; the same holds true for a head auctioned by Christie’s in London on November 7, 2001 (see below, n. 14).

14 Examples of standing statues with this wig include Hildesheim 5527; Reiser-Hauslauer et al. 2001; wrongly dated to the 26th Dynasty); two statues from el-Lisht (Gautier and Jéquier 1902: 104, figs. 128, 130); one auctioned by Galerie Koller A.G. in Zürich on 19 October 1979 (Koller 1979: 20, lot 501); another sold by Drouot in Paris on 29 June 1994 (Drouot 1994; Fay 2003: 45–46); and yet another by Sotheby’s in New York on 5 December 2007 (Sotheby’s 2007: 20–23, lot 18). For a block statue, see Munich AS 7148 (Wildung 1981). Various heads with the same wig are stylistically dateable to the reign of Senwosret I, even though they were separated from their bodies, e.g., Baltimore WAM 22.394 (Steindorff 1946: 31, no. 63, pl. 11); Berlin 254 (Seipel 1992: 184–185, no. 56); Brooklyn 77.6 (Bleiberg 2008: 82, fig. 28); a head from Dahshur (Fakhry 1961: 22–23, no. 12, pl. 59A.1); some unpublished heads from el-Lisht, viz. New York MMA 15.3.121 (http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/?t=15.3.121), 15.3.165, ex. 15.3.568, ex 15.3.569; Manchester 9648 (unpublished); a head auctioned by Bonhams & Brooks in London on 8 November 2001 (Bonhams and Brooks 2001: 90, lot 319); another auctioned by Christie’s in London on 7 November 2001 (Christie’s 2001: 78, lot 389; wrongly dated to the 25th Dynasty); and yet another by Sotheby’s in New York on 11 December 2002 (Sotheby’s 2002: 102, lot 98).

15 See the royal head Leipzig 2906, presumably of Senwosret I (Krauspe 1997: 41–42, no. 91, pls. 30.2–31.2), and the ancestral statue of King Sahura dedicated by Senwosret I, Cairo CG 42004 (Legrain 1906: 3–4, pl. 2).

16 Stockholm MM 11236 (Lindblad 1986), made some 40 years after Senwosret I’s death, under Senwosret II.

17 E.g., Edinburgh A.1959.24 (Bourriaux 1988: 28, no. 18); Cairo CG 405 (Borchardt 1925: 17–18, pl. 66); and some limestone statues from Middle Egypt, e.g., Baltimore WAM 22.142 (Steindorff 1946: 24, no. 32, pls. 5, 110), Worcester (MA) 1938.9 (Dunham 1937) and Cairo JE 35145 (Maspero 1902: 95 and pl. right).

18 E.g., New York MMA 33.1.1 (Lansing 1933: 23–24, fig. 28), Stockholm NME 82 (Peterson 1970–71: no. VII, 6–8, figs. 1–4) and a statue auctioned by Christie’s in New York on 15 December 1993 (Christie’s 1993: front cover and 26–27, lot 45) from the reign of Amenemhat II (c. 1922–1878 BCE) or, in the last case, slightly later; Munich AS 5361+7211 (Fischer-Elfert and Grimm 2003: 60–76, pls. 12–23) from the reign of Senwosret II (c. 1880–1874 BCE); and Vienna AS 5786 (Jarol–Deckert 1987: 60–63) from the reign of Senwosret III (c. 1874–1855 BCE).

19 All examples of this appear to be from the second half of the 12th Dynasty, e.g., Karnak inv. no. A639 (Jacquet-Gordon 1999: 91–92, no. 50; wrongly dated to the 18th Dynasty); London UC 1472 (Page 1976: 110–111, no. 139); Asswan 1366 (Habachi 1985: 48–49, no. 17, pls. 50–57d), 1367 (Habachi 1985: 51, no. 21, pls. 61–67), 1377 (Habachi 1985: 52–53, no. 25, pls. 69–70), 1368 (Habachi 1985: 56, no. 28, pls. 81–86), 1375 (Habachi 1985: 57–58, no. 31, pls. 93–95). The last two examples are among the latest and might even be from the early years of the 13th Dynasty.

20 E.g., Baltimore WAM 22.60 (Steindorff 1946: 24, no. 33, pl. 6) and Cairo CG 481 (Borchardt 1925: 62–63, pl. 80). The raised back also occurs in many of the statues cited in nn. 18, 19.

21 Sitting statues with images of the sides of the seat are rare in the Middle Kingdom, contra Delange 1987: 75; n. 2. Examples are Geneva 26035 (Chapaz 1993; mid-12th Dynasty), Cairo JE 43093 (Ranké 1941: 165, 169–171, wrongly cited by Delange [1987: 75, n. 2] as ‘CGC 43093’; end of the 12th, or beginning of the 13th Dynasty), and Louvre E 14330 (Delange 1987: 72–75; late 13th Dynasty).
with the horizontal continuation. On this side, line 2 could not be added in a column to the left, as room was required for the woman’s figure and caption; consequently, line 2 had to go to the right, with the signs still facing to the right but now reading from left to right along the foot base. Thus, line 2 was written retrograde, with its hieroglyphs facing the end of the line, rather than — as convention would require — the beginning. Partially retrograde Egyptian texts are well
attested on offering tables, mostly from the 12th Dynasty, but on a statue this is, to the best of my knowledge, unique. In normalized left-to-right transcription, corrected for the noted oddity, the present text reads:

1. (1) htp dj nswt Skr nb Šnwtx prʳ-hrw (2) jhw ṣpdw [...]  
(1) An offering-that-the-king-gives of Sokar, the lord of Shenut; an invocation-offering of bread, beer, (2) beef and fowl [...].

Egyptian offering prayers such as this express the wish that offerings, brought on the king’s behest to certain deities, be next presented to a human beneficiary named at the end (here lost). In this case, the god in question is Sokar, the patron of the necropolis of Memphis, Egypt’s former capital just north of the new one, Ištjauiwy (founded by Senwosret I’s predecessor, Amenemhat I). Of particular interest in this text is Sokar’s epithet “lord of Shenut.” Textual references to Shenut, a locality whose name means “granary,” are rare and were not known from before the 19th Dynasty. The place, which is always mentioned in association with Sokar, was undoubtedly situated at Memphis. The current spelling of Šnwtx is not concluded, as one would expect from the parallels, by a city “determinative” to classify the word as the name of a town, but by an oval (combined with a space-filling stroke). The oval normally served as a determinative in words denoting things of that shape, including the noun ṣnw “enclosure, circuit.” However, by the 12th Dynasty that noun had become homophonous to Šnwtx “granary,” because the t-ending of feminine words was no longer pronounced. On the present statue, therefore, the ḥtp was evidently employed as a “phonetic determinative”, derived from a word of different meaning but similar sound. It is further noteworthy that this offering prayer lacks the word dj.f, “may he give”, before prʳ-hrw, “invocation-offering.” This was the rule prior to the 12th Dynasty and is still well attested under Senwosret I, but a fast-growing majority of monuments from subsequent reigns do include dj.f in their offering prayers. This observation adds further support to a dating of the statue in early, rather than late, 12th Dynasty. (A pre-12th-Dynasty date has already been ruled out above, on the basis of the statue’s style and typology.)

The woman shown on this side of the seat has long hair and wears a tight-fitting dress. Both arms hang down and the hands are clenched, the forward one holding a lotus flower. A hieroglyphic caption is arranged in four parts, enclosing the figure on all sides; its end must have run horizontally beneath her feet, but is lost. All the signs of this text face, correctly, to the right, like the woman herself. In normalized left-to-right transcription we read:

3. (3) jm³[h(y)yt] (4) Ptḥ-htp m³šᵗ-hrw (5) ms.t.n [...] (6) [...]  
(3) The rev[ered one], (4) Ptaḥhotep, vindicated, (5) born of [... (6) ...].

Ptaḥ was the chief god of Memphis. His name is interpreted here as part of the woman’s name, rather than reading the latter merely as “Hotep.” “Ptaḥ” is preceded by a lacuna, but we can safely rule out that it concluded a longer version of the jm³[h(y)yt] epithet: *jm³[h(y)yt hḥ] Ptaḥ, “rev[ered one near Ptaḥ].” In lines 9–10 of this statue and on additional statues of its type, all invocations of the gods of Memphis mention Ptaḥ-Sokar, or simply Sokar, but never just Ptaḥ. Furthermore, the reign of Senwosret I has not left us with

---

22 E.g., Amiens 94.3.17 (Perdu and Rickal 1994: 22, no. 7); Aswan 1114 (Habachi 1985: 32–33, no. 5, pl. 21a); Cairo CG 23017 (Kamal 1909: 15–16, pl. 9), 23028 (Kamal 1909: 23–24, pl. 12); Karnêrhu H 410 (Gamer-Wallert and Grieshammer 1992: 36 and 86–87, no. 7); Leiden AP 82 (Boeser 1910: 1 and pl. 1, no. 1) and L.XL 15 (Boeser 1913: 5 and pl. 3, no. 8); a table auctioned by Sotheby’s New York on 29 November 1989 (Sotheby’s 1989: lot 144A); two tables auctioned by Christie’s in New York on 9 December 2005 (Christie’s 2005: 23, lot 55) and 4 June 2008 (Christie’s 2008: 9, lot 3); two from Tell Basta (el-Sawi 1979: 155, pl. 2, and 157, pl. 3); another from Qau el-Kebir (Petrie 1930: 6, 12, pls. 7.2 and 10). Some examples from the 13th Dynasty are Birmingham 1969 W2956 (https://creativecloudfix.wordpress.com/2012/07/17/egyptian-exhibition/); Cairo JE 97601 (Soghor 1967: 25; collated from the original).

23 See the attestations of Shenut listed by Gauthier (1928: 140), and compare p. 141, listing some sources for a toponym Skr Jbwb-hd (25th Dynasty and later; Gauthier’s purported example from the 22nd Dynasty is, in fact, of Graeco-Roman date). The two toponyms may concern the same locality, as Jbwb-hd was a name of Memphis. However, plain Šnwtx has only been found associated with Sokar, not with other deities, while Skr Jbwb-hd has only been found associated with the triad of Amun-Ra, Mut and probably Khonsu-Ra-Harakhti (the last god only on a stele at Turu, where his damaged epithet is nb Šnt [...].) following Spiegelberg 1905: 221 and pl., not just nb Šnt, as suggested by Daressy 1911: 266; 1917: 127; Leitz 2002: 754).

24 See Gardiner 1957: 538, 28; Erman and Grapow 1930: 491.6–493.7.
25 On phonetic determinatives, see, e.g., Gardiner 1957: 50, §54; Grandet and Mathieu 1998: 40.
26 See Bennett 1941: 77–78; Obsomer 1993: 169.
27 Ranke 1935: 257, no. 22.
28 Of the statues listed in n. 12 above, seven invoke Ptaḥ-Sokar (Aswan 1338, 1339; Aswan, Elephantine find no. K 258a; Cairo CG 409; New York MMA 22.1.200; the statue in an American private collection; and Baltimore WAM 22.112) and one invokes just Sokar (Naples 983). Each time the context is a phrase about the owner being “revered near” (jm³ḥḥr) the god or, twice, about his receiving offerings from near the god (ḥtp dj nswt ḥḥ Ptaḥ-Skr on Aswan 1339, and ḥtp dj nswt ... <ḥḥr Ptaḥ-Skr on Aswan, Elephantine find no. K 258a).
any other private statues, stelae, reliefs, or offering tables that invoke just Ptah, whether this be in an extended jmḥḥ(t) epithet or in the offering prayer itself. Reading the woman’s name as Ptahhotep has, moreover, the advantage that this is in keeping with the fact that she was most likely the statue owner’s wife. The man shown on the other side of the seat was a priori most likely a son, and, to be sure, he is described (in line 11) as ms.n ptḥ [...], “born of Ptah[...]”. This renders it all but certain that both sides named the same Ptahhotep. To be sure, the name Ptahhotep is widely attested for men, but much less so for women. Ranke’s onomasticon of Egyptian proper names cites only one female example, dating from the New Kingdom.29 There are, however, indubitable examples of women called Ptahhotep from the 12th Dynasty itself.30

** Proper Left Side ** (figs. 15.2–15.3)

On the other side of the seat, to the statue owner’s left, the vertical part of the main text (line 7) began with the signs facing left, duly matching the orientation of the statue itself. But then the draughtsman changed his mind: halfway down the column, he reversed the orientation of his signs and their direction of reading, knowing that the horizontal conclusion of this text (line 8, now lost) was to read from right to left along the base. Instead of preserving the orientation of his signs by simply switching to retrograde writing, as on the other side of the seat, he switched from left-to-right writing (left-facing signs) to right-to-left writing (right-facing signs) after the conveniently symmetrical nb-sign. Thus, the signs that followed in line 8 would also naturally face the beginning — rather than the end — of that line. In normalized transcription, again correcting for the change in direction, the line reads:

7 (1) hḥt dj ms.n Ptḥ [ ... (8) ... ]
8 (7) ḫḥt dj nswt dj Wšr nb Ḏdw [... (8) ...]
9 (7) An offering—that-the-king-gives and that Osiris gives, the lord of Busiris, [... (8) ...].

The vertical orthography of *hḥt dj nswt*, “an offering that the king gives”, in line 1 is conventional and widely attested, but the spelling ḫḥṭ in line 7 is apparently unique: I know of no other examples of this throughout Egyptian history.31 Similarly, the repetition of the *dj-sign Dj* before Osiris’ name is apparently unparalleled; the repetition of *dj* or *ḥḥt dj* was common before the 11th Dynasty but abnormal thereafter, and the repeated word(s) would always follow, rather than precede, the god’s name.32 The present deviation was probably a scribal accident and makes no difference to the meaning of the *ḥḥt dj nswt* formula.33

Osiris was Egypt’s god of death and the afterlife. The epithet here used refers to one of his principal cult centers, the ancient town of Busiris (*Djedu*) in the Nile Delta. With this epithet he appears on monuments all over Egypt, so it constitutes no further clue as to the statue’s original site of dedication. More interesting, however, is the current spelling of the town’s name as *ḥḥ *[ ... d-d-d-w*]. The other examples I know from the 12th Dynasty all appear on objects from the reign of Senwosret I,34 which reinforces our earlier conclusion that the statue was made at that time.

The man shown standing on this side of the seat has short hair and wears a pointed kilt. His arms hang down, with clenched but empty hands. The hieroglyphic caption surrounds his figure on three sides, but all the signs face the wrong way: not leftward like the man, but to the right, except for the seated god in the name Ptah-Sokar. In normalized left-to-right transcription, corrected for sign orientation, the text reads:

9 (7) jmḥḥ[s] ḫr (10) Ptḥ-Skr [... (11) ms.n Pṯ [ -ḥḥt. ? ]
(9) The revered one near (10) Ptah-Sokar, [...] (11) born of Pṯḥ[hotep. ? ].

Unfortunately, the man’s name is lost. The suggested restoration of his mother’s name seems certain, as was argued above in the discussion of lines 3–6. Accordingly, the unknown subject of the statue is flanked on his right (the more important side) by his wife and here, on his left, by a son. The

---

29 Ranke 1935: 141, no. 5, referring to stele Hildesheim 378 (Ranke’s query is unnecessary; see Habachi 1954: 529).
30 Stelae Louvre C 288 = E 13059 (unpublished; collated from a photograph; and see Malek et al. 2007: 231–232 [803-031-098]) and Cairo CG 20654 (Lange and Schäfer 1902: pl. 50; 1908: 287–288; both the owner and his wife are called Ptahhotep).
31 Nor are any examples listed by Barta 1968, passim.
32 Barta 1968, passim.
33 I agree with the general analysis of the *ḥḥt dj nswt* prayer by Franke 2003: parallel to the king, the gods were always perceived as givers — secondary givers — of the offerings. This interpretation reflects a common practice: the reversion of offerings, first brought to the gods and then to human beneficiaries (represented through a statue or stele at a temple or nearby tomb).
34 Stele London BM EA 565 (Taylor and Strudwick 2005: 138–139) and various objects from Workshop 3 1996; 307–310 (see there for bibliography): stelae Cairo CG 20756, Munich ÄS 33, Louvre C 1 and C 3, to which add Cairo CG 20548 (Lange and Schäfer 1902: pl. 43; 1908: 175–177) and offering table CG 23028 (Kamal 1909: 23–24, pl. 12), both from the same workshop but missed by Freed.
mother’s name in line 11 was possibly followed by another sign or group of signs, such as a personal determinative or a funerary epithet; space for this was very limited, unless htp was written without the phonetic complements t and p.

From the inscriptions it is clear that the family represented in this statue came from Memphis: the owner’s wife has a name that honoured Ptah, the chief god of Memphis; one offering formula invokes Sokar, the Memphite funerary god, and identifies him as lord of Shenut, a place only of local fame; another phrase invokes the combination god Ptah-Sokar. In all probability, the statue was originally set up in a local temple, perhaps one for Sokar at Shenut itself, or at a tomb in the vicinity. Less obvious is how the statue left Egypt and ended up at Hazor. Its journey abroad certainly occurred at a much later time, most likely through non-Egyptian interference. Our prime suspects are the Hyksos rulers who controlled northern Egypt during the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries BCE, because they originated from Canaan and maintained close commercial and political relations with the region. The history of our statue resembles that of the Menkaure sphinx fragment also uncovered at Tel Hazor (see below). The text of that sculpture suggests that it once adorned a temple in the city of Heliopolis, some 32 km northeast of Memphis. It, too, left Egypt long after its creation, perhaps also in Hyksos times. We may safely assume that both the sphinx and our second Egyptian statue reached Canaan intact as valued curiosities. Their ultimate destruction would have happened at an even later date. It seems clear that reducing our statue to its current state required grim determination. The strangely irregular state of the underside could not have occurred in a single accident or blow. This reduces the likelihood that other portions of the statue might yet await discovery.

**EGYPTIAN SPHINXES**

D. Ben-Tor

*Fragmentary Sphinx of Amenemhat III*

This fragmentary statuette (table 15.1:1; fig. 15.4), made of diorite, consists of a sphinx’s body, the head and front paws of which were deliberately cut off in antiquity. Signs of mutilation are also visible on some areas of the chest, but parts of the lappets of the nemes — the striped royal...
The Hyksos, on the other hand, It is also the only fragment of a monumental Old Empire in Asia. However, the possibility the Canaanite city-states. and Babylon, but not with the subjugated minor rulers of the independent rulers of the kingdoms of Mitanni, Hatti, exchange gifts only with their political peers, namely, with this period indicate that the New Kingdom pharaohs would situation during the New Kingdom, when the Canaanite Levant (Weinstein 1974: 54–55; Ahrens 2011). Indeed, this found in late MB contexts in both the southern and northern sphinx may have arrived at the site as a tribute to a local temple during the Late Bronze Age, when Canaan was part of the Egyptian Empire in Asia. However, the possibility that it arrived there during the Hyksos period should not be ruled out, considering the Middle Kingdom Egyptian statues found in late MB contexts in both the southern and northern Levant (Weinstein 1974: 54–55; Ahrens 2011). Indeed, this possibility is supported by evidence pertaining to the political situation during the New Kingdom, when the Canaanite city-states were under Egyptian rule. Egyptian records of this period indicate that the New Kingdom pharaohs would exchange gifts only with their political peers, namely, with the independent rulers of the kingdoms of Mitanni, Hatti, and Babylon, but not with the subjugated minor rulers of the Canaanite city-states. The Hyksos, on the other hand, who usurped Middle Kingdom royal statues and plundered temples and tombs in the Fayum and Memphis regions under their control (Ahrens 2011: 22–27), were of Canaanite origin and could consider contemporary Canaanite rulers to be their peers. This may account for the Middle Kingdom royal and private statues found in late MB contexts in the Levant, where they may have been presented to local rulers or dedicated to local temples.

As aforementioned, signs of deliberate mutilation are evident on the sphinx. The deliberate removal of the head and forepaws is a common marker of statue mutilation, noted on other statues at Hazor and elsewhere in the ancient Near East (Ben-Tor 2006: 11–12). Given the many mutilated statues found in the destruction level of LB Hazor (Ben-Tor 2006: 5–8) it is reasonable to assume that the sphinx was mutilated by the perpetrators of the final destruction of the Canaanite city.

**Fragmentary Sphinx of Menkaure (Mycerinus)**

This fragmentary sculpture (table 15.1.2; photo 15.8; fig. 15.5) displays the front paws of an Egyptian sphinx flanking an engraved hieroglyphic inscription bearing the name of King Menkaure (m-n-ḥ3w rˁ, “eternal like the souls of Re”), enclosed in a cartouche, and the royal epithets mry b3w lwnw, “beloved of the Souls of Heliopolis”, and di ʿnh dl, “given life eternally”. The fragment is made of gneiss, a valuable and very hard dark stone, attested in Egyptian sculpture predominantly with royal and divine statues and used for a number of Old Kingdom royal statues (Grzymski 1999: 53). The measurements of the fragment suggest that the sphinx was originally c. 170 cm long; this, along with the valuable material, indicates a monumental product of a royal workshop in Egypt.

Menkaure, the fifth ruler of the 4th Dynasty, ruled Egypt for 28 years between c. 2532–2503 BCE and was one of the kings associated with the great pyramids at Giza; the small and latest of the three Giza pyramids was his burial place. The valley and mortuary temples related to his pyramid yielded a considerable number of statues depicting the king alone, as well as in the company of his queen or various deities (Arnold, Grzymski and Ziegler 1999: 269–276, cat. nos. 67–70). The inscriptions and stylistic features of the Hazor fragment clearly date it to the time of the Old Kingdom and argue for its most likely production during the reign of Menkaure. Surprisingly, it is the only known sphinx of this king, although this may be due to accident of survival. It is also the only fragment of a monumental Old Kingdom royal sculpture found in the Levant.

---

35 I am grateful to Marcel Marée for pointing this out to me (e-mail sent on 22 June 2015) and for sharing his thoughts on the subject with me.

36 I am grateful to Florence Friedman for drawing my attention to paw fragments from the king’s valley temple, which may belong to a sphinx.
Fig. 15.5: Sphinx of Menkaure (Mycerinus): frontal view

Photo 15.8: Sphinx of Menkaure (Mycerinus): top, rear and left side
Chapter 15

The epithet “beloved of the Souls of Heliopolis” engraved on the fragment suggests Heliopolis as the most plausible original location of the sphinx. The “Souls of Heliopolis” are documented in Egypt as one of the divine groups assisting the king in his ascent to heaven after his death, and they may represent the deified dead kings of the city (Žabkar 1968: 22–23; Sourouzian 1996: 751). A temple dedicated to the “Souls of Heliopolis” is mentioned on several royal statues from different periods (Fay 1996: pls. 65:e, 84:c; Sourouzian 1996: 751), and the Hazor sphinx may have been originally presented to this temple. It is noteworthy that the Hazor sphinx is the earliest known royal sculpture mentioning the “Souls of Heliopolis”.

An interesting feature of the Hazor sphinx is that its front paws are shaped like human hands rather than lion’s paws. This phenomenon, well attested on sphinxes of the New Kingdom, was noted on a few Old Kingdom examples of the 5th and 6th Dynasties (Fay 1996). The Hazor sphinx is the only 4th-Dynasty example known to date. Like other published Old Kingdom sphinxes with human hands, the fingernails of the Hazor sphinx, although positioned like human nails on the fingers, are pointed, resembling animal claws and reflecting the fusion of human and leonine features that typify this Egyptian sphinx.

The most intriguing question concerns the time and circumstances of this sphinx’s arrival at Hazor. The fragment was found in the destruction level of Canaanite Hazor, dated to the thirteenth century BCE. As the most extravagant Egyptian import ever to be found in a Canaanite city, the sphinx was probably a prestigious official gift. The probability of its arrival at Hazor during the reign of Menkaure is highly unlikely, given the complete absence of Old Kingdom objects of this scale in the Levant, even in the Lebanese coastal region, which enjoyed strong commercial and cultural contacts with Egypt at that time (Sowada 2009: 7–10, 128–141). It is even less likely for a monumental royal statue to have been brought to Hazor in the Old Kingdom, considering the minimal contacts between Egypt and southern Canaan in this period (Sowada 2009: 10–16).

We can therefore assume that the sphinx arrived at Hazor at a later period, when relations between Egypt and southern Canaan could account for a gift of this quality being presented to a Canaanite city-state. The most likely periods are the Middle Bronze Age IIIB, which corresponds to the Hyksos period in Egypt, and the Late Bronze Age, which corresponds to the New Kingdom. Hazor of the Middle Bronze Age IIIB was one of the largest and most important cities in southern Canaan. Since the Hyksos kings frequently usurped earlier royal monuments, it is plausible that one of them moved the sphinx from Heliopolis to Avaris (Sourouzian 1996: 745) and from there sent it to Hazor. It is, however, equally plausible that the sphinx was brought to Hazor during the New Kingdom, when Hazor was the largest city in southern Canaan — “the head of all those kingdoms” (Joshua 11:10). The distinguished status of the king of Hazor in the Late Bronze Age is evident in the Amarna letters, in which he is the only Levantine ruler referred to as “king” (Moran 1992: 288–289, EA 227). This period corresponds to that of the Egyptian Empire in Canaan, and the sphinx may have been sent as an official gift to the king of Hazor or, more likely, dedicated to a local temple at the site. The dedication of New Kingdom royal statues to Canaanite temples is attested at Beth Shean, where a locally made statue of Ramesses III was most probably dedicated to the temple of Level VI (James 1966: 35, fig. 81:3), and possibly also at Megiddo, where a bronze base of a royal statue of Ramesses VI, most probably imported from Egypt, was found in a secondary context (Breasted 1948: figs. 374–375).

Usurpation of royal statues is attested during most periods of Egyptian history; therefore, the fact that the sphinx bears the name of an Old Kingdom pharaoh does not preclude its having been sent as an official gift by a New Kingdom king, who may or may not have added his own names to other parts of the sphinx. It is unknown whether the sphinx was brought to Hazor from its original location at Heliopolis or after having been moved to another location by a later king.

Given the discovery of this mutilated sphinx in the destruction level of the LB city, it seems that like the sphinx of Amenemhat III and other statues bearing signs of mutilation, the sphinx of Menkaure was mutilated by the perpetrators of the final destruction of Canaanite Hazor.

37 This feature was observed by Dorothea Arnold, who examined photographs of the sphinx.

38 For the most likely importation of plundered and usurped statues to the Levant during the Hyksos period, see the above discussion of the sphinx of Amenemhat III.

39 The special status of Hazor in the Amarna letters is also evident in the greeting formulae opening his letters to the Pharaoh (Morris 2006: 182–186).
Photo 15.9: Fragments of Egyptian statues from the renewed excavations
Photo 15.10: Fragments of Egyptian statues from the renewed excavations
Photo 15.11: Fragments of Egyptian statues and offering table from the renewed excavations
SCARABS

The Egyptian scarabs and one bulla uncovered at Hazor were recently published by Othmar Keel (2013: 584–637) and hence are not presented here.

The MB and LB scarabs found in Yadin’s excavations are the following: nos. 34 and 39 (Area A); nos. 4–5 and 40 (Area B); no. 46 (Area BA); nos. 8–9 and 26–28 (Area C); nos. 10–20 (Area D); nos. 30–32, 47–54 and 58–59 (Area F); and nos. 61–62, 64–65 and 67–68 (Area H).

The MB and LB scarabs found by the renewed excavations are as follows: nos. 75–79, 85–86, 89 and 90 (bulla) (Area A); and nos. 84, 94–95, 102, 109, 111–112 and 117 (Area M).

EGYPTIAN POTTERY

M. Martin

Egyptian-style pottery is one of the testimonies to the New Kingdom Egyptian hegemony and involvement in LB Canaan (Martin 2011). Two groups of wares can be distinguished — imported Egyptian vessels and locally-manufactured vessels in Egyptian form. The latter account for the vast majority of the extant corpus and are generally referred to as Egyptian-style. They appear predominantly between the Late Bronze Age IIB and the Iron Age IA (the Ramesside period) at a number of key sites, identified as Egyptian strongholds, way stations and administrative centers (e.g., Beth Shean, Jaffa, Ashkelon, Deir el-Balah, Tel Sera‘ and Tell el-Far‘ah [South]). At these sites, Egyptian-style pottery was mass-produced, consisting of a variety of (low-prestige) household wares. As such, it is considered an ethnic marker, pointing to the physical presence of Egyptian administrative and military personnel. The combined evidence suggests that at these key sites, not only the users but also the creators of this pottery were Egyptians, or at least locals trained by Egyptian potters and thus intimately familiar with Egyptian modes of pottery production.

Smaller Egyptian collections were encountered at other sites, and their nature should be evaluated separately. A handful of Egyptian-type vessels was found at LB I–IIB Hazor. Four items uncovered in the Yadin excavations have been discussed in earlier publications: a red-slipped small and slender drop-shaped jar, uncovered in Stratum XV (LB I) in Area L (Garfinkel 1997: fig III.16:15; Martin 2011: 237, pl. 66:9, type JR1); a red-slipped flaring-rim plate with flattened base, from local phase B (LB II) in Area P (Mazar 1997: fig. V.1:25; Martin 2011: 237, pl. 66:10, type BL3b); and two rims of ledged-rim bowls from Stratum XV (LB I) in Area A, whose Egyptian inspiration is uncertain (Hazor III–IV: pl. CLVII:29,31; Martin 2011: 237, pl. 66:7–8, type BL5c).

A few additional vessels, uncovered in the ongoing excavations in Area A, are presented in this chapter. With the exception of one example (fig. 15.6:7; photo 15:13), retrieved
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket</th>
<th>Elevations</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Chapter 7 Illustrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>BL1a</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>L.1738</td>
<td>17354/52</td>
<td>231.03–230.94</td>
<td>Very light pinkish orange with white and dark grits</td>
<td>Figs. 7.1:21, 7.74:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>BL2a</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>L.1738</td>
<td>17341/131</td>
<td>231.17–03</td>
<td>Very light pinkish orange with white and dark grits</td>
<td>Fig. 7.74:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>BL2a</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>L.1738</td>
<td>17341/22</td>
<td>231.17–03</td>
<td>Very light orange-brown with white and dark grits</td>
<td>Figs. 7.2:14, 7.74:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>BL2a</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>L.1738</td>
<td>17362/20</td>
<td>230.94</td>
<td>Light orange-brown with white and dark grits</td>
<td>Fig. 7.74:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>BL2a</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>L.1764+</td>
<td>L.1738</td>
<td>17534/43+ and 17777/100</td>
<td>Very light pinkish brown with white, dark, and red grits</td>
<td>Fig. 7.74:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>BL3a</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>L.1738</td>
<td>17362/19</td>
<td>230.94</td>
<td>Light orange-brown with white and dark grits</td>
<td>Fig. 7.74:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>VIIIb</td>
<td>L.1856</td>
<td>18719</td>
<td>229.60–23</td>
<td>Pinkish orange ext., light pinkish brown int., with white and dark grits; red and black decoration, lotus motif</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>JR3/JR4</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>L.1574</td>
<td>14679/27</td>
<td>230.78–69</td>
<td>Pinkish orange with white and dark grits; red, black and blue decoration</td>
<td>Fig. 7.59:11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 15.6: Egyptian-type vessels at Hazor
from an Iron II context and probably a residual piece, all items stem from the LB Ceremonial Precinct destroyed in the Stratum XIII conflagration. The presentation of these vessels is followed by a short discussion of the function and significance of the combined Egyptian pottery assemblage and of its chronological setting.

THE ASSEMBLAGE

Simple Bowls

The vast majority of locally-made Egyptian-style assemblages in the LB southern Levant consist of simple flat- and round-based bowls of medium size and medium depth, with straight or curved walls and a plain or everted rim (types BL1a, BL2a and BL3a in Martin 2011). These form the backbone of New Kingdom ceramic assemblages in Egypt and appear mass-produced at Egyptian garrison centers in the LB IIB–Iron IA southern Levant. Unfortunately, it is often difficult to ascertain the Egyptian inspiration of these shapes when they occur outside Egypt. In particular, plain-rimmed examples have such a basic profile that their association with the Egyptian pottery tradition cannot be established on the basis of morphology alone. Given such ambiguity, additional parameters must be scrutinized to assess the possibility of a link with Egypt (for this classification problem, see Martin 2011: 23, 30). Technology and contextual evidence may provide the researcher with more persuasive arguments for an Egyptian association.

Simple bowls with a flat base are well attested at LB Hazor, occurring as early as the Late Bronze Age I (chapter 7, fig. 7.1:10–11 [SB4], 13–14 [SB5], Strata XV–XIII, LB I–IIB; for additional LB I examples, see Hazor III–IV: pl. CCLXI:1–12, Stratum 2). Given their early appearance at the site, long before Egyptian-type pottery appears in the southern Levant in large quantities (LB IIB), there is no compelling reason to associate these vessels with the Egyptian ceramic tradition. Indeed, most of the examples presented in chapter 7 tend to be heavier and more thick-walled than the generic Egyptian-style simple bowls found at sites such as Beth Shean. Moreover, the admixture of significant amounts of straw as temper — a hallmark of simple bowls in key Egyptian assemblages in the southern Levant (Martin 2011: 97–108) — was not observed in the paste of these vessels.

A small group of six bowls (fig. 15.6:1–6) seems to be an exception. These bowls all originated from the destruction debris in the throneroom of the Ceremonial Precinct (L.1738). They are lighter in weight and somewhat more akin to vessels classified as Egyptian-style elsewhere. One has a slightly rounded base (fig. 15.6:1), and another has a pronounced everted rim (fig. 15.6:6) — both features that suggest Egyptian inspiration. Note, however, that these examples were not tempered with straw.

To this small group we should probably add a red-slipped bowl uncovered by Yadin’s excavations in Area F (Hazor II: pl. CXLI:2, Stratum 1 [LB II]). These are the only vessels in the Hazor assemblage for which some degree of Egyptian inspiration is likely.

Carinated Bowl

The fragment shown in fig. 15.6:7 (photo 15.13) belongs to the upper part of a bowl, 22 cm in diameter, with walls slanting slightly outward above a simple carination. The rim is plain. A frieze below the rim bears a floral decoration, displaying part of a lotus flower, painted in red and black. Three petals and the tip of a fourth are preserved, outlined in black with a deep red fill. The flower is framed with two black horizontal lines running along the rim (exterior and interior) and carination. The nature of an additional, oblique and slightly curved black line to the left of the petals is not entirely clear, but it seems to be part of the flower’s rendering as well.

The sherd was retrieved from the floor makeup of an Iron II building (L.1856, Stratum VIIIb), located c. 1 m above

---

41 The classification problem arising in this case is exacerbated when it comes to sherd material.
42 A similar phenomenon was observed in Stratum X-14 (LB III/IIA) at Aphek (Martin, Gadot and Goren 2009: 365).
the southern portion of the LB Ceremonial Precinct. Its fabric — orange with dark grits (basalt) — is definitely not Egyptian. It differs from the Iron II wares at Hazor and is akin to the generic MB and LB fabrics uncovered there. We thus suggest that the vessel was locally manufactured at Hazor and is a residual piece from the LB structure below.

The shape and decoration of the sherd suggest an association with the New Kingdom Egyptian pottery tradition. Bowls with such a profile are well known in 18th–20th-Dynasty contexts in Egypt, where they typically appear in Nile silt. In the Egyptological jargon, such vessels are referred to as “carinated”, “restricted”, or “composite” bowls. They may have rounded, flat, disc, or ring bases. The “neck” above the carination may be straight, slightly slanted inward or outward or slightly concave. Egyptian comparanda tend to be larger than the item from Hazor, but smaller examples are attested as well. Significantly, this type has not hitherto been encountered in the south Levantine repertoire of Egyptian forms.

In morphological terms, Egyptian parallels can be cited from Qantir (Aston 1998: nos. 792, 1300; Stratum B3/2, 19th Dynasty; nos. 2367, 2416; Stratum B1, 20th Dynasty); Memphis/Kom Rabia (Bourriau 2010: fig. 50:7.3.1–2; Level IIIa, late 18th–19th Dynasties); Saqqara (Bourriau et al. 2005: 25, 28, fig. 9:67; tomb of Horemheb, late 18th Dynasty); Tell el-Amarna (Rose 2007: 66–67, 207–209, Type SD 10; Hope 1991: fig. 1c–e — both late 18th Dynasty); Thebes/Valley of the Kings (Aston, Aston and Brock 1998: pls. 17–21, nos. 165–194; tomb of Ramesses IV, 20th Dynasty); Deir el-Medineh (Nagel 1938: pls. III–V, type V; mainly Ramesside), Qurna (Guidotti and Silvano 2003: 134, no. 181; mortuary temple of Tuthmosis IV, mid-18th Dynasty); and Malkata (Hope 1989: 29, fig. 9a–c; Amenophis III, late 18th Dynasty). This form is also known in New Kingdom Nubia (Holthoer 1977: pl. 24, types CC2–CC3).

A fragmentary example from the tomb of Merneptah at Thebes is noteworthy (Aston, Aston and Brock 1998: 148 and pl. 6, no. 54). Of the same size as the item from Hazor, it was reconstructed with a pedestal base to form a chalice-like vessel.

Well visible, the area above the carination of such bowls provides a useful panel for decoration. The lotus — generally painted in blue — is well attested among the decorative themes in Egypt, either in the form of horizontally aligned petals or, occasionally, in the form of entire flowers, as depicted on the Hazor specimen. The above-mentioned vessel from the tomb of Merneptah at Thebes is an example of the former. Entire flowers appear on carinated bowls from Tell el-Amarna (Rose 2007: 67, 208, no. 212), Deir el-Medineh (Nagel 1938: pls. III: 057.3.1; pl. 593) and the tomb of Ramesses IV at Thebes (Aston, Aston and Brock 1998: pl. 18, no. 178).45

**Necked Ovoid Jar**

Fragments of the base and body of an ovoid Egyptian-type jar (photo 15.14; fig. 15.6:8) were found in the entrance porch of the Ceremonial Precinct (L.1574, Stratum XIII). Two-thirds of the vessel profile can be reconstructed in the drawing — from the rounded base to the beginning of the neck. The area of mid-body and shoulder is decorated with bands and lines in blue, black and red. Depending on the reconstruction of the neck, there are two viable candidates for the classification of the shape of this handleless jar: it is either a funnel-necked jar, i.e., a vessel with an ovoid body and a tall neck that diverges to resemble a funnel (Aston 1998: 188), or a short-necked ovoid jar, which — as the name suggests — has a short neck that may be straight or everted (Rose 2007: 100, 242, type SH 8.2).

Funnel-necked jars are one of the backbones of the New Kingdom pottery corpus, appearing in almost every collection from the mid–late 18th Dynasty to the end of the New Kingdom. Even though it appears in small quantities, this type forms an important component of locally produced Egyptian-style ceramic assemblages in the southern Levant (Martin 2011: 61–63, type JR4; see table 44 for Egyptian comparanda and table 45 for south Levantine occurrences). While in Egypt funnel-necked jars were already well attested in the advanced 18th Dynasty (LB IIA), in the southern Levant they do not appear in secure contexts before the 19th Dynasty (LB IIB). A large collection of such vessels comes from Beth Shean (Martin 2009: 449–451, type TJ76b).

Short-necked ovoid jars are also well known in New Kingdom Egypt. In the southern Levant they are, however, rare, appearing as individual examples at Deir el-Balah, Tell es-Sā’idiyyeh and Megiddo (Martin 2011: 60–61, type JR3; see table 42 for Egyptian comparanda and table 43 for south Levantine occurrences).

In light of the diverging popularity of the two candidates under review in the southern Levant, a classification as a funnel-necked jar would seem more likely. In New Kingdom Egyptian assemblages, short-necked ovoid jars may appear blue-painted (e.g., Rose 2007: 242, no. 407), but funnel-necked jars are perhaps the single most common type to receive such a decoration.

Microscopic inspection of a fresh break of the vessel excludes an Egyptian origin. The fabric does not bear a resemblance to any of the Egyptian Nile silt or Marl clay
wares of the Vienna system of classification (Nordström 1986; Nordström and Bourriau 1993: 168–182; see also Bietak 1991: 324–330). It could not be determined, however, whether the vessel is local to Hazor or was produced elsewhere in the Levant. In Egypt, both funnel-necked jars and short-necked ovoid jars are characteristic Nile silt shapes. Significantly, in the southern Levant it is generally the typical Nile silt forms that are locally reproduced, whereas typical Marl clay forms mostly appear as Egyptian imports (mainly transport containers) (Martin 2011: 91–108).

The painted decoration on the fragmentary jar consists of an equidistant arrangement of two pale blue bands (1 cm thick), both bordered by two black lines, with a red line in between. The painting was applied on an uncoated surface, probably before firing, with a brush and with the aid of a turning device (cf. Hope 1989: 7–8).

Blue-painted pottery is one of the most diagnostic ceramic products in New Kingdom Egypt (Hope 1991). It is the most elaborately decorated Egyptian ware, ornamented with a wide range of motifs and in various techniques. Within the blue-painted style, the combination of blue, red and black predominates. Blue-painted pottery was most popular in the late 18th Dynasty (reigns of Tutankhamun to Horemheb), when the elaboration of motifs reached its heyday. A vast assemblage of such decorated pottery was found at Tell el-Amarna (e.g., Rose 2007), possibly the largest quantity found at any single site. Thus, the names “Amarna Ware” and “Amarna Blue” have been coined, although these terms are somewhat misleading. In fact, blue-painted pottery was already manufactured in the mid-18th Dynasty, and

---

46 While petrographic analysis would be desirable, the vessel fragments have, unfortunately, been misplaced. One of the authors (Martin) handled them several years ago to observe the general fabric characteristics.

Blue-painted pottery is attested as early as the reign of Tuthmosis III, and was found in the mortuary temple of Tuthmosis IV at Qurna (Guidotti and Silvano 2003). By the reign of Amenophis III, it had become common, with a large collection retrieved at Malkata (Hope 1989: 7–9). Although declining in elaboration and quantity during the Ramesside period, blue-painted pottery still features prominently at sites such as Deir el-Medineh (Nagel 1938), Memphis (Bourriau 2010; Levels IIb–IIa) and Qantir (Aston 1998: 354–421; Stratum B3/2). The latest well-dated occurrences of this ware come from the tomb of Ramesses IV in the Valley of the Kings at Thebes (Aston, Aston and Brock 1998).

Although the common blue frit (“Egyptian blue”) — a synthetic pigment composed of various phases containing silica, copper and calcium — was sometimes used as pigment for blue-painted pottery, cobalt blue (cobalt aluminite spinell) was the preferred material (Hope 1989: 7–8, with references; 1991: 18; Lee and Quirke 2000: 108–111). Cobalt is rare in Egypt. There is no source in the Nile Valley itself, but a source has been reported from the Kharga Oasis. The Dakhla Oasis and the Eastern Desert have been suggested as other potential sources. Even a central European provenance has been taken into consideration. To the best of our knowledge, there are no sources for cobalt in the southern Levant.

While in Egypt the use of blue-painted pottery is not restricted to the upper echelons of society, 47 it may nevertheless be regarded as prestigious tableware. Its production was seemingly limited to the main urban centers — Amarna, the region of Thebes, Memphis/Saqqara and Qantir. These centers had connections with the royal court, either as habitation sites or as royal necropoleis (Hope 1989: 58; Aston 1998: 354). It has been suggested that this pottery was produced in the royal workshops. Its manufacture may well have been a specialized activity, the work of only a few potters. The use of a special blue pigment, not readily available and demonstrating a high level of technical competence, supports this possibility (Hope 1989: 8, 15, 17). Even at the above-mentioned locales, where blue-painted pottery appears in large quantities, it accounts for only a small percentage of the total pottery assemblage of the period (Hope 1989: 12; 1991: 17; Aston 1998: 354).

As noted above, at the height of its production in the late 18th Dynasty, the decorative styles of blue-painted pottery were manifold and elaborate, including floral, faunal, human, divine (representation of gods), hieroglyphic and abstract motifs (Hope 1991). Floral designs were the most common source for inspiration, and they appear on nearly all vessels of that period (most commonly lotus petals; cf. Rose 2007 for the Amarna corpus). By the early 19th Dynasty the fashion had changed. The use of elaborate motifs was largely abandoned, with decoration now limited almost entirely to simple bands and lines and the only floral motif still recurring more frequently being the pendant lotus (Bourriau and Aston 1985: 36; Hope 1989: 56; Aston 1998: 354–355).

The decoration on the Hazor jar is well in line with the Egyptian tradition. The use of thicker blue bands bordered by thinner black lines is ubiquitous, as is the combination with red lines. The specific sequence on the Hazor vessel frequently appears on Egyptian comparanda. On Egyptian Nile silt wares, blue-painted decoration is most commonly applied on a cream-coated surface, but painting on uncoated surfaces is known as well, albeit much more rarely (Hope 1989: 7; 1991: 21; Aston 1998: 354, 356). Although the rim and neck of the Hazor vessel are missing, the simple decoration on the extant portion strongly suggests a 19th-Dynasty date for the vessel; in the late 18th Dynasty the upper body of jars was the preferred location for elaborate motifs and a decoration solely with simple bands and lines is atypical (Hope 1991: 30, 36). 48 If we are indeed dealing with a funnel-necked jar, a 19th-Dynasty date is also corroborated by the vessel shape; this type does not appear in the southern Levant prior to the LB IIB (Martin 2011: 62).

Good comparanda for the decorative style on the vessel under review can be cited from 19th-Dynasty contexts at Qantir (Stratum B3/2 in Area Q I; Aston 1998: 354–421, nos. 1241–1487) and from 19th-Dynasty tombs at Deir el-Medineh (Nagel 1938: fig. 2:40 — Tomb 356; figs. 9:9–10, 10:14–15, 20:67 — Tomb 359) 49 and Saqqara (e.g., Aston 1997: 90–91, pls. 118–119 — Tomb 359). Good comparanda can also be cited from 19th-Dynasty tombs at Deir el-Balaḥ (Dothan 2008: 135, IMJ 82.2.602; 137, IMJ 82.2.664; Dothan and Brandl 2010: pl. 16:18; Gould 2010: fig. 2.2:9). Like the Hazor vessel, all bear a simple band and line decoration (blue and red, blue and black, or

47 At Malkata, for instance, it occurs in a wide range of contexts, from the royal palace to the mansions of the nobility to the workmen houses at Site J (Hope 1989: 15).


49 Tomb 356 dates from the reign of Ramesses II. Tomb 359 dates from the 20th Dynasty, yet was mixed with the contents of 19th-Dynasty Tomb 360 (cf. Aston 1998: 355).
blue only). The highlight of the small south Levantine collection is a polychrome decorated, fragmentary jar from an undated rubbish pit at Tell el-Ajjul (Petrie 1933: 13, pl. XLIV:77), featuring an elaborate arrangement of floral motifs in blue, red, white, black and yellow. At Tell el-Far‘ah (South), a sherd with bright blue and black bands on red slip was found below the courtyard of the Egyptian residency (Starkey and Harding 1932: 27, pl. LXIII:37A).

At Lachish, a rim fragment of a wide-necked vessel from Level P-2(?) (transitional LB IIA/IIB) bears traces of blue paint over a pink slip (Clamer 2004: fig. 20.8:5); the item was identified as an Egyptian import (Clamer 2004: 1167).

**DISCUSSION**

**Repertoire and Function**

The collection of Egyptian-type vessels uncovered at LB Hazor is very small and with little variety in shape. Combined with the previously published material, the repertoire includes a slender drop-shaped jar, a funnel-necked or short-necked ovoid jar, a carinated bowl, an everted-rim plate and probably a group of simple flat-based bowls. To these vessels one may add an unpublished flowerpot (type FP in Martin 2011), a base fragment of which was retrieved from the LB IIB destruction layer in Area M in the 2015 season.

This Egyptian collection clearly differs from a heavily Egyptianized site such as Beth Shean, both in size and variety of types, as well as technological traits, such as the absence of straw as temper. The absence of a sizeable assemblage of mass-produced daily household wares, such items as typical of the late 18th Dynasty (LB IIA), the simple linear decoration on this vessel is typically Ramesside (see above). The simple linear decoration on the Deir el-Balah examples dates these vessels to the Ramesside period. Moreover, note that none of four blue-painted vessels found at the site can be securely associated with Stratum IX.

The pigment on the Hazor vessel has not been analyzed. However, that if the blue pigment was indeed the rare cobalt blue, it was presumably sent from Egypt.

At first glance, the meager ceramic collection stands in contrast to the splendid assemblage of stone Aegyptiaca found at the site, among them numerous sphinx and statue fragments and an inscribed offering table (see above). Those Aegyptiaca can be classified as prestige goods. Unlike low-prestige, mass-produced household wares, such items cannot be used as markers to signal physical Egyptian presence (Martin 2011: 259–261). It is more likely that they arrived at Hazor as diplomatic gifts or via high level (royal?) exchange. The occasional appearance of Egyptian ceramic forms should probably be viewed in the same light. The occurrence of such vessels in the Ceremonial Precinct is one indication of this. Moreover, two of the Egyptian-type vessels display inherent status, i.e., the blue-painted jar and the (residual) lotus-decorated bowl, which can readily be characterized as tableware. While these are not gifts or trade items — as shown above, they were not imports from Egypt — their presence reflects exposure to Egyptian culture in terms of transfer of ideas. We should note, however, that if the blue pigment was indeed the rare cobalt blue, it was presumably sent from Egypt.

In sum, the seeming discrepancy between the pottery and other Aegyptiaca at Hazor highlights the notion that the site retained its status as a fairly independent Canaanite city-state during Egyptian hegemony over the country. Egyptian personnel were not stationed at the site, at least not in significant numbers (hence the absence of a mass-produced Egyptian-style household assemblage). Nevertheless, Hazor maintained strong diplomatic and probably commercial ties with Egypt. In general terms, this scenario can readily be deduced from the Amarna letters as well (Moran 1992: EA 148, 227, 228, 364).

**Chronology**

Two vessels from the destruction layer in the Ceremonial Precinct in Area A (Stratum XIII) provide some general chronological clues. The blue-painted jar (fig. 15.6:8; photo 15.14) dates from no earlier than the LB IIB. While atypical of the late 18th Dynasty (LB IIA), the simple linear decoration on this vessel is typically Ramesside (see above). If the vessel was a funnel-necked jar, a Ramesside date would also be corroborated by its shape. While in Egypt such forms were already popular in the mid–late 18th Dynasty, in the southern Levant they were not encountered in clean contexts prior to the LB IIB (Martin 2011: 62). The same case can be made for the flaring-rim bowl (fig. 15.6:6; Martin 2011: 37). In short, the dating of both these vessels is in keeping with the early–mid-13th-century BCE date of the great destruction at Hazor, a date supported by other finds.

---

50 Understanding blue-painted decoration as a late 18th-Dynasty hallmark, the vessels from Deir el-Balah were regarded as supportive evidence for the foundation of the site (Stratum IX) as early as the Amarna period (Brandl 2010: 72). Alternatively, a foundation of the site in the 19th Dynasty has been suggested (Killebrew, Goldberg and Rosen 2006; Martin 2011: 214–215). As noted above, blue-painted decoration continued well into the 19th and 20th Dynasties. In fact, the simple linear decoration on the Deir el-Balah examples dates these vessels to the Ramesside period. Moreover, note that none of four blue-painted vessels found at the site can be securely associated with Stratum IX.

51 The exemplar was briefly described by Amiran (1969: 187).

52 According to E.D. Oren (personal communication), Petrie’s reconstruction of the vessel shape is incorrect.

53 The sherd comes from Area ZZM, which was related to a group of rooms of Level Z.

54 The association of two large ledged-rim bowls with the Egyptian pottery tradition is not conclusive (see above).

55 The absence of certain key types, such as beer jars and large ovoid to tall neckless jars, is most significant (Martin 2011: 51–56, 64–66, 259).

56 The pigment on the Hazor vessel has not been analyzed.

57 The above-mentioned flowerpot fragment from the contemporaneous
Of further interest is the red-slipped flaring-rim plate from local phase B in Area P (Mazar 1997: fig. V.1:25; Martin 2011: 237, pl. 66:10), correlated with general Stratum 1B (and 2?) of the lower tel. While Stratum 1B was dated to the fourteenth century BCE by Yadin (1993: 595), this vessel suggests a thirteenth-century date. This is corroborated by the flaring rim (see above), the red slip (Martin 2011: 31–32, 38) and the shallow proportions of the vessel. One solution to this discrepancy would be to reassign its context to the later Stratum 1A. Another would be the ascription of Stratum 1B to the thirteenth century, an option suggested by Finkelstein (2005: 345–346), but not accepted by the present excavators.

CONCLUSIONS
A small assemblage of Egyptian-type vessels has been found at LB Hazor. In size, variety of types and overall nature this collection is unlike the telltale mass-produced Egyptian-style household assemblages at Egyptian garrison sites, way stations and administrative centers. Thus, the appearance of this assemblage at Hazor does not signal a physical Egyptian presence. Instead, it should be viewed against the backdrop of diplomatic and commercial ties between Hazor and Egypt in this period. Two of the vessels can be characterized as tableware and thus join other Aegyptiaca at the site as prestigious status items. Note that the appearance of Egyptian ceramic shapes at Hazor is not a result of trade per se, as the items were not imports from Egypt. A more indirect source of inspiration is therefore suggested.
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