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Approaching Levantine shores
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"...she (Europa) crossed the salty water [from her homeland to Crete,] overpowered by Zeus' wiles. ...he gave her a gift, [a golden necklace, which] Hephaestus, glorious craftsman, [himself had made] with expert mind, [a beautiful ornament,] bringing it to his father; and he received the gift [and gave it himself] to the daughter of illustrious Phoenix. ...long-ankled Europa .... [She bore sons] to Cronus' very strong son commanders of many men, [sovereign Minos] and just Rhadamanthys [and godly Sarpedon,] excellent and strong."1

Abstract

This article presents an interdisciplinary approach to the study of the foreign relations of Crete towards the Levant2 and beyond, from their first encounter to the end of the New Palace Period, with the main focus on the MM-LM I periods. The archaeological material indicates contacts during the EM II and from the MM I period onwards, whilst the textual evidence strongly indicates direct royal connections perhaps from the Old Palace Period or early New Palace Period, and furthermore offers a mythological remembrance of these contacts during the Late Bronze Age.

This article does not review the Western Asian imports in Crete as these have been extensively discussed by Cline3, Lambrou-Phillipson4 and recently by Colburn.5 Neither does it lend the place for substantial theoretical discussions of trade and its mechanisms.6

Introduction

The present contribution has been divided into four parts and follows a chronological path. This path is, however, not easy to stay on as there is “conflicting evidence for Mesopotamian chronology”7 as well as regional differences in the Levantine material.8

* Acknowledgements: First I would like to thank the Danish Institute at Athens and Erik Hallager for the opportunity to publish these results in the present volume. For references, reading of drafts, information or assistance in identifying objects, I would like to thank Lærke Andersen, Paul Åström, Christoph Bachhuber, Tine Bagh, Max Buchler, Jürgen Bär, Tristan Carter, Annie Caubet, Maurizio Del Freo, Manfred Dietrich, Jesper Eidsen, Don Evely, Pierre-Louis Gager, Martin Guggisberg, Michael Guichard, Birgitta Hallager, Erik Hallager, George Hinge, Finn Ove Hvidberg-Hansen, Philip Johnston, Jens Kamla, Jorrit Kelder, Carl Knappett, Robert Koehl, Al Leonard, Nicoletta Mornigliano, Sophie Stos-Gale, Walter Müller, Peter Warren, Assaf Yasur-Landau and Julien Zurbach.

2 The geographical definition of the “Levant” varies from author to author and there seems to be no consensus on any single definition. Definitions differ from the Mediterranean coastline of Syria, Lebanon, Israel and Palestine to a larger territory of Syria from the coast to the Euphrates, Lebanon, Israel, Palestine and Jordan to the inclusion of Iraq. The present contribution will use the term “Levant” for the region including Syria to the Euphrates, Lebanon, Israel, Palestine and Jordan. However, the Syrian city of Tell Hariri/Mari lies in the cultural sphere of Mesopotamia and will thus be included in the larger geographical term “Western Asia”.
3 Cline 1994 (reprinted and updated in 2009).
4 Lambrou-Phillipson 1990.
5 Colburn 2008.
6 This article is part of a PhD project (Univeristy of Aarhus) in which the theoretical and economic aspects of trade and exchange will be discussed further.
7 Hunger 2009, 140.
8 Cf. for instance Parr 2009 and Chapman 1989 & 1990; For an in depth discussion on chronological problems and synchronisation of cultures see Warburton 2009 and Bietak 2000; 2003; 2007a. A complicating factor when working with Levantine chronology is a lack of consensus about the period names applied. The MB period covers roughly 500 years and
A time table (Fig. 1) has been developed as a supplement to the text in an attempt to correlate data and to present an overview of the period. However, this table only represents a few of the many theories on chronology based on historical records and radiocarbon dates. Depending on which Aegean and Mesopotamian chronology one chooses to use, the political scenery shifts accordingly. Thus I have chosen, where relevant, to render the state of affairs if one applies both the "middle" and "low" Mesopotamian chronology.

The first three parts open with a brief historical overview of the periods in Western Asia and Egypt. Part 1 is devoted to the earliest phases of the Bronze Age and Part 2 to the Middle Bronze Age, and is accompanied by a catalogue of Minoica and the textual evidence from Western Asia. It seeks to collect a corpus of data on Cretan overseas contacts during the first half of the second millennium BC. Part 3 follows these contacts down to the Late Bronze Age and Part 4 sums up the conclusions drawn in the first three parts.

1. The Early Bronze Age (EB)

An overview

The southern part of the Levant was in close contact with Egypt during the periods preceding the EB II, but during the EB II-III these relations ceased almost entirely. From the EB II and onwards it ends around 1500 BC, depending on the chronology used. However, the use of a single relative Levantine chronology is not without difficulties when working with finds from so many sites and from a large geographical region.

9 Ben-Tor 1982, 3–9.

Fig. 1. Time Table. *1 Friedrich et al. 2006 (Eruption); Manning 1995, 1999–2006 (EM-MM); Manning 2009 (LM).

seems the northern focus of the Egyptians, shifted entirely to Byblos. The relationship between Egypt and Byblos was commenced and close already during Naqada I in the 4th millennium BC\textsuperscript{10} but the exact nature of the relationship eludes us.\textsuperscript{11}

The largest and most powerful coastal site in the southern Levant seems to have been Ashkelon.\textsuperscript{12} Further north, many city-states also flourished during the mid 3rd millennium, but the urbanisation process was effectively stopped by the expanding Akkadian Empire (based in South Mesopotamia) during the rule of Sargon and his grandson Naram-Sin. According to two Neo-Assyrian texts, Sargon of Akkad proclaimed himself ruler of the areas from the Gulf to the Mediterranean, which also included Crete and Cyprus.\textsuperscript{13} The archaeological material shows destruction layers in many Western Asian cities in this period (e.g. Ugarit, Ebla, Mari and Hama), which supports the claims of Sargon.\textsuperscript{14}

The Akkadian empire fell to the Guti, and made way for the Third Dynasty of Ur. In Egypt the First Intermediate Period was ended as the last kings of Dynasty 11 managed to reunite the Kingdom forming a long period of stability. During the final years of the 3rd millennium, many centres in the Levant collapsed\textsuperscript{15} and cities like Ugarit, Ashkelon and Byblos present a hiatus in the occupation of the site. Some centres, however, managed to escape destructions, one of which was Mari on the Euphrates.\textsuperscript{16}

First contact

The most recent research in human genetics shows evidence of Anatolian and Syro-Palestinian genes in the inhabitants of Bronze Age Crete.\textsuperscript{17} A similar pattern is seen in the first use of bread wheat, which spread from Anatolia, the Levant, Cyprus and over to Crete during the Neolithic period.\textsuperscript{18} Comparable conclusions have been deduced from the material culture of Neolithic Crete.\textsuperscript{19} Some scholars do indeed suggest that the Minoan language was of an Indo-European\textsuperscript{20} or Semitic\textsuperscript{21} origin, but at present there seems to be no consensus on the origin of either the language or the Minoan scripts.

It can be observed that 13% of the analysed copper, lead and silver artefacts from Egypt and the Levant from EB contexts are consistent with the

\textsuperscript{10} Chapman 2009, 6.
\textsuperscript{11} Chapman 2009, 2.
\textsuperscript{12} Ashkelon flourished during the EB I-III and MB II/MB IIA periods with an occupational hiatus during the EB IV/MB I period (Stager 2001, 634).
\textsuperscript{13} The two texts dated to the 1st millennium seem to be copies of the same original text describing the time of Sargon of Akkad (Horowitz 1998, 67: a Neo-Assyrian tablet VAT 8006 and a Late Babylonian tablet BM 64382+82955). The texts mention Sargon's empire as if it encompassed almost the entire known world, which also included Crete and Kaptara, the lands across the Upper Sea." (Horowitz 1998, 73, 72: lln 41 ‘‘a-na-kiš kap-ta-raḫ māšūši(kur.kur) eberti(ba-rí) [tarn] ti elūti(ān.ta)’’). The very late date of these two texts makes it hard to conclude anything about the knowledge of Crete during the reign of Sargon.
\textsuperscript{14} Akkermans & Schwartz 2003, 277–8. According to Chapman 2009, 4, the Akkadians conducted two raids on the Levant—by Sargon and Naram-Sin. While Sargon destroyed the sites in the north (e.g. Ugarit) Naram-Sin sieged both the cities of the north (e.g. Ugarit) and south as far as Byblos.
\textsuperscript{15} For references to theories on collapse, see Parr 2009; Akkermans & Schwartz 2003, 283–4; Cohen 2002, 14–6.
\textsuperscript{16} Akkermans & Schwartz 2003, 286.
\textsuperscript{17} King et al. 2008, 212.
\textsuperscript{18} King et al. 2008, 208, 210. However, these results do not apply to mainland Greece, where early gene flows seem to have Balkan roots (King et al. 2008, 208). Of further interest might also be the fact that the Egyptian gene cluster falls far from the Greek (King et al. 2008, 208–9). These facts might indicate that people crossed the Eastern Mediterranean from Cyprus and the Levant in search of land (?) and reached Crete from an eastern direction rather than a southern or northern one. Furthermore, another recent study of the gene spread of the Phoenicians in modern-day people shows a distinct Phoenician genetic footprint at old colonial sites such as Cyprus and Tunisia, and emphasizes the Cretan connection found by King et al. 2008 (Zalloua et al. 2008).
\textsuperscript{19} Colburn 2008, 204.
\textsuperscript{21} Gordon 1966, 38–9: Semitic; some of the early Byblian syllabic signs are similar to Minoan Linear signs. These signs are simple and might occur independently. Dunand compared the two scripts in 1945 and did not find the Cretan signs significantly linked to the Byblian signs. Best 1989, 36, 39, 42, 44 however argued for a Byblian ancestor of some Linear A signs. Best & Woudhuizen 1988: Linear A was Old Phoenician; Many but not all Byblian signs were adapted from the Egyptian hieroglyphic and hieratic scripts (Hoch 1990, 116), but the written language or dialect was Semitic (Hoch 1990, 115); Cf. also Best 1989, chapter 1 on the Minoan language.
Laurion ores. Only 7% of the Cretan EM copper originated from Wadi Araba and Iran; hence regional, primarily Cycladic, ores were favoured.

Tin bronze is found in Crete from EM I–II, but the tin source(s) still eludes us.

Branigan found that the earliest Levantine imports in Crete were from Byblos and were dated to the final stages of the 3rd Millennium. In a recent study on the Pre-Palatial Period in Crete, Colburn argues that the earliest objects of Near Eastern and Egyptian origin were imported during the EM II period and that these imports were of great importance to the social status of the Cretan elite during the Pre-Palatial Period.

We might also find a few traces of these EM contacts within the archaeological material from the Levant. A stone lid and its accompanying bowl from Byblos have been ascribed a possible EM/EM II origin and have been compared to the famous Mochlos and Ayia Triadha lids, both decorated with a lying dog and carved in one piece. The Byblos specimen, however, is decorated with a lying bull, which has been attached to the lid. More bowls or fragments of the same type of bowl were found in Byblos and were found to be Aegean or local in style. Whether the Byblos lid and bowls are proper Minoan imports is questionable, but the lids might demonstrate artistic inspiration.

Another piece worth mentioning is a spout from a possible EM “teapot”, likewise from Byblos. It has an attached eye and is decorated with red lines (Fig. 2). The piece has not been recognised as Minoan in any previous literature known to the present author, but it might be an Early Minoan import.
From the first occurrences of tin-bronze in the Aegean and the stratified Levantine imports in Crete as well as the possible EM import found in Byblos and the possibility of artistic inspiration, it seems contacts might have been initiated well before the turn of the 2nd millennium and perhaps during the EM II.

2. The Middle Bronze Age (MB)

An overview
At the beginning of the 2nd millennium BC, the 11th Dynasty of the Middle Kingdom reunited Egypt. Around the same time, the Amorites gradually became the ruling class of many cities throughout the Levant, bringing prosperity and stability to the region. The kingdom of Yamhad, centred in Aleppo, was ruled by Amorite kings and became the central power of Northern Syria for approximately two centuries until around 1600 BC (middle) or 1550 BC (low) (cf. below). Other contemporary centres and kingdoms of influence and power in Western Asia were Mari, Qatna, Hazor, Apum, Kabri, Ashkelon and Byblos. The kingdom of Yamhad might have stretched its territory to the Mediterranean and might have included Alalakh and Ugarit. This must have given the king of Yamhad control of the trade route from the boarders of Mari to the Mediterranean. Mari was a transit centre on the trade route which linked Mesopotamia and Iran with Syria. Qatna was likewise strategically placed on the trade routes North–South from Aleppo via Hama to Damascus and East–West from Mari crossing the Syrian Desert to the Mediterranean most probably via the Akkar Plain.

The largest and most powerful inland Kingdom of the Southern Levant was Hazor, which was also strategically situated at the crossroads of trade. Like Aleppo, Byblos and Qatna, Hazor was part of the world mentioned in the Mari texts. The rulers of Hazor and Ashkelon as well as the Asians at Byblos and Ashkelon were cursed in the Egyptian Execration Texts dating from the Middle Kingdom, which might be interpreted in the direction that they posed a threat to Egypt. The city of Mari was sacked by Hammurabi of Babylon during the reign of Zimri-Lim, around 1760/1757 BC (middle) or c. 1695 BC (low). Mari never regained its status and the transit centre of trade on the Euphrates was moved upstream to Terqa.

The texts from the Middle Kingdom in Egypt referred to the rulers of Byblos as princes, which might suggest subordination, but this remains unconfirmed. The ties between the Egyptian Middle Kingdom and the port town of Byblos were certainly strong, but these relations did not exclude trade between Byblos and Mari. In the south, on the coast, lay Ashkelon, which was superior (at least in size) to Ashdod and Ajul and had centres such as Gezer, Beth Shemesh, and Lachisch (from EB) in its hinterland. Kabri and Ashkelon seem to have been the central South Levantine sites during the MB II period.

According to the present excavators of Kabri, the city of Kabri thrived from the MB I period until its destruction around 1600 BC. During its heyday, a port at the small fortified site of Nahariya could have been in use by the rulers and traders of Kabri to conduct seaborne trade. Hazor lay 40 km east of Kabri, almost in a straight line, with no great mountains to cross. Towards the end of the 17th century BC (middle) or during the 16th century BC (low) the Hittite kings made campaigns into the Yamhad Kingdom.
which ended the heyday of Yamhad as they sacked both Alalakh\textsuperscript{47} and Aleppo.\textsuperscript{48} In fact, the Hittite army campaigned all the way to Babylon. It also seems that Ugarit and centres further south experienced some kind of decline for a short period around this time; however, centres like Ugarit,\textsuperscript{49} Byblos and Ashkelon soon regained their strength and resumed the urbanisation process, while a site like Kabri shows only few signs of activity during the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{50}

In Egypt, Dynasty 13 gradually lost control of the country, which paved the way for the Hyksos, who settled a dynasty in the eastern Nile Delta. This second interlude in the history of the unified Egyptian kingdom is known as the Second Intermediate Period.

\textit{Kaptara}\textsuperscript{51} in the Mari texts

Yahdun-Lim (Table 1)
The first contemporary Middle Bronze Age texts to mention Cretans and Cretan goods have been found in the vast archives of Mari. The archives contained more than 25,000 tablets, the majority of which are dated to the reign of Zimri-Lim, the last king of the city.\textsuperscript{52} However, the earliest texts in which Cretan objects are mentioned date, most possibly, to Yahdun-Lim, the father of Zimri-Lim, who reigned during the late 19\textsuperscript{th} (middle) or the mid 18\textsuperscript{th} century BC (low).

In Table 1 at least 3 pairs of Cretan shoes and six gold bowls of Cretan type were inventoried as possessions of Yahdun-Lim.

These nine objects might have reached Mari through gift exchange or middlemen, or they could have been acquired when Yahdun-Lim went on campaign to the Mediterranean coast. This campaign was described by Yahdun-Lim in the \textit{Foundation Inscription} from the Shamash temple at Mari where he, like Sargon before him, claimed to have subdued the lands as far as the coast of the Mediterranean Sea.

\begin{quote}
\textquote{Since the days of old, when god built Mari, no king residing in Mari had reached the sea. To the Cedar Mountain, and the Boxwood (Mountain), the great Mountains, they had not reached; they had not felled their trees. (But Yahdunlim, the son of Yaggidlim, the mighty king, a wild ox among kings, marched to the shore of the sea in irresistible strength. To the \textquote{Vast Sea}\textquotemark* he offered his great royal sacrifices, and his troops cleansed themselves with the water in the \textquote{Vast Sea}\textquotemark* .... He subdued the land on the shore of the \textquote{Vast Sea}.)}\textsuperscript{53} The \textquote{Boxwood Mountain} and the \textquote{Cedar Mountain}\textsuperscript{54} have been interpreted as being part of the Amanus range, which, according to Meiggs,\textsuperscript{55} the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{47} Alalakh was sacked by Hattushili I (middle: 1650–1620 or low: 1586–56)
\textsuperscript{48} Aleppo and Babylon was sacked by Murshili I (middle: 1620–1590 or low: 1556–26)
\textsuperscript{49} Yon 2006, 24.
\textsuperscript{50} Kempinski 2002, 5; Lehmann 2002, 74.
\textsuperscript{51} Literary and mural sources known from Egypt have been used to interpret \textit{Keftiu} as Crete. This interpretation was presented as early as in 1858 by Brugsch (Hall 1901–02, 163). This theory is now widely accepted (e.g. Vercoutter 1956; Wachsmann 1987; Haider 2001 480 n. 6). Opponents of this interpretation included Strange 1980, who interpreted Cyprus as \textit{Keftiu}. And Hall who in 1901–02 was inclined to think that the designation of \textit{Keftiu} covered the coastal areas from Crete to Cyprus. However, occasionally the term would have been used only for Crete (175). The correlation of \textit{Keftiu} with the Akkadian \textit{Kaptara} (Dossin 1939, 111) and the Biblical \textit{Kafir} is likewise accepted (e.g. Guichard 1993a, 1999, 2005). The primary Egyptian sources used in the interpretation, are the paintings from a few New Kingdom tombs at Thebes and a statue base from Amenhotep III's temple at Kom el-Hetan, which indicates the names of several Cretan Bronze Age sites of importance (Strange 1980, Text no. 3, 21–7; Haider 1988, 1–18). A few Egyptian texts which mention \textit{Keftiu} might be of earlier origin (The Admonitions of Ipu-wer/Leiden Papyrus 344 (Gardiner 1909) and Papyrus Ebers (Kislev \textit{et al}. 1993, 152). The surviving copy of the Leiden Papyrus 344 dates to the New Kingdom, but the original text has been interpreted as a poem from the First Intermediate Period, Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period or alternatively with no historical references (for references on dating cf. Wachsmann 1987, 123 n. 77; Strange 1980, 72 n. 393; references on its non-historical origin cf. Shupak 1997, 93).
\textsuperscript{52} The texts are published in the series \textit{Archives Royales de Mari (ARM)}, the latest volume of which is no. 31 by M. Guichard (2005).
\textsuperscript{53} Malamat 1992, 213. Cf. also this reference for a discussion about the religious importance of the Mediterranean Sea.
Mesopotamians preferred over the Lebanon Mountains. However, the cedars from Lebanon were famous in Egypt, and Mari was in contact with Byblos at least from the time of Zimri-Lim. Furthermore, when the mythical palace of the Ugaritic god Baal was built on Mount Sapan, cedars from Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon were used rather than the nearby Amanus woods. Likewise, the Old Babylonian version of “Gilgamesh and The Cedar Forest” refers to the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon mountains as the gathering place of the gods. It thus seems possible that Yahdun-Lim was referring to Lebanon as the “Cedar Mountain”, and perhaps he reached Byblos (and Ugarit?) as well as the Amanus (Boxwood) Mountains before returning to Mari.

Zimri-Lim (Table 2)
31 texts are numbered in Table 2, representing the known objects of Cretan style or manufacture in the possession of Zimri-Lim. Shoes/sandals/boots (?), leather belts, textile (?), weapons, gold and silver vases, and a replica of a Minoan boat are the objects described in the texts.

From year 3 of Zimri-Lim’s reign, objects of Cretan type had made their way to Mari. A leather cist or box (Text 1) was constructed for a Cretan weapon, which must have some value; however, no specifications for the weapon are given in the text. A few Cretan leather belts and footwear were also mentioned, but only once do we find a possible mention of Cretan textile in the dossiers (Text 3).

Texts 6–9 mention a Cretan mace decorated with lapis lazuli, a semi-precious stone, which was mined in Afghanistan. If the mace was of pure Cretan manufacture, the lapis might have been transported through Mari as unworked stone and then on to Crete, only to return to Mari as a finished product, but this cannot be verified. Nor is it possible to deduce whether the lapis lazuli was some kind of artificial blue composition or if the object was reworked and the lapis lazuli thus added in Mari.

The Cretan vessels of gold and silver in Texts 12–29 have been treated by Guichard. The exact number of objects is unknown since some of the objects have been listed in the archive more than once due to the administrative system (J. Eidem pers. comm. April 13, 2004). The fact that thousands of texts have not yet been published (J. Eidem, personal communication April 13, 2004.) also makes the actual number impossible to determine at this stage.

Guichard 1999, 170. The same weapon is mentioned in three texts; cf. notes on the texts in Table 2.

Cauvet 1998, 106; Colburn 2008, 208, Table 1, fig. 5, Table 3, Table 4: The first secure occurrence of lapis lazuli in Crete dates to the MM I or perhaps earlier during the EM.

Cauvet 1998, 106; Feldman 2006, 117; “lapis from the kiln”—blue glass, is known from the Late Bronze Age.


Cretan gold vessels appear for the first time during year 10 (Guichard 2005, 208) (Text 16). According to Guichard (2005, 208) the vase of Text 21 (line 7”) and Text 22 (line 23), year 11, was the same vase offered as a present to Hammurabi of Babylon. Five times Cretan vases occur decorated with some kind of motif. These vessels were of considerable weight of up to 80–90 shekels (Guichard 2005, 208 (roughly 666–750g (1 mina = 500 g)) (Text 18, line 2). In Text 28 a stand for a Cretan vase is mentioned, which indicates its inability to stand. Consequently the vase must have had a pointed foot (Guichard 2005, 208).

For the silver vases Guichard 2005, 208 stated that three bur-zi were more likely three sappum (different bowl types have been applied for the same three bowls, cf. text below for description of vase types) and were present in the treasury listed in a text of year 5 (Text 13) and later in year 9 (Text 14). In year 10, after the long journey to Ugarit, there were 4 Cretan silver vases in the king’s possession (Text 16). Guichard is however of the opinion that the fourth vase might not have been acquired on the long journey but was already in Zimri-Lim’s stock and was a sappum-shaped vase (Text 17). The four Cretan silver vessels were accounted for again in year 13 where they were specified as having a handle (Texts 24–26) (The reason for Guichard not mentioning Texts 24 and 26 is that he regards 25 and 26 to be copies of 24. The line mentioning the
number of vases is not quite clear since a number of the objects are mentioned more than once. Some of the vases were, however, specified as having a handle and some were decorated.

If we take a look at the vase types presented in the texts of Tables 1 and 2 it becomes quite clear that we are dealing with vessels mainly belonging to the act of pouring and drinking. As we shall see further below, these vase types correspond well, with the Cretan imports found in the Levant.

The Mariote vase types specified as Cretan in the published Mari texts:

- **Bur-zi/pursitum** = bowl
- **GAL** (Sumerian) = 𒊑 (Akkadian) = precious drinking vessel
- **Gillum** = hemispherical (drinking) bowl/cup
- **Kursalam** = basket
- **Sappum** = bowl for pouring water or wine in a religious context

According to Guichard, the Sumerian term “gal”, which was used for many of the vases at Mari, is still mysterious; however, “L’idéogramme gal apparaît dans les textes avec la signification de grandeur, en taille ou en nombre—dix mille. Il compose avec le terme d’«homme» le mot lugal qui veut dire roi”.

The possibility exists that the precious Cretan vases might be imitations made in the Levant. According to Guichard, it seems nevertheless improbable that Cretan imitations were made in Mari. For some reason, however, the vases were described as Cretan and were used in the diplomatic gift exchange between Mari, Babylon, Carchemish and Aleppo.

The court of Mari and possibly the king himself set out on a journey to Ugarit in the years 8–9 of Zimri-Lim. On this journey they brought, among other things, tin from Elam to give to the rulers of the Levant, and a small portion of this was also handed over to two Cretans in Ugarit (Text 30). Some of the Cretan objects in the dated tablets do not appear in the archives until after Zimri-Lim returned from Ugarit, so a number of these objects might have been presented as gifts to the king when he visited Ugarit.

The mention of a Cretan interpreter, chief of the Minoan traders in Ugarit, might be an indication of a Minoan trading post at Ugarit. Furthermore, since he received tin from Mari, he must have been very important. “The man of Crete” in the same text was assumed to be the king or prince of Crete. If this interpretation is true it might indicate a royal summit meeting staged in Ugarit between the courts of Crete and Mari. It would also seem reasonable to assume that they arranged the meeting beforehand. But why would it be relevant for these distant leaders to meet in person? Perhaps to consolidate good relations – but of what interest were good relations with Crete to Mari, on the Euphrates? To the Cretans, the steady supply in tin might seem a good explanation. However, Mari...
was not in control of the trade route beyond its own realm. The next link in the chain of trade was probably in the hands of the Yamhad Kingdom, Qatna and others (cf. MB overview, p. 13–4).

It thus seems more likely that the two courts had more business in Ugarit, as described below, but happened to have had the opportunity to meet, though it still seems rather remarkable that they found their way to Ugarit at the same time. As far as we know, Zimri-Lim only made the journey once, like his father before him.

The Cretan officials in Text 30 are mentioned along with the kings of at least Hazor and Qatna. It has also been proposed that the king of Yamhad joined Zimri-Lim on the last part of the journey to Ugarit. This might prove that many kings were present at Ugarit on this specific occasion. It thus seems more reasonable to think that Zimri-Lim’s business in Ugarit was to arrange royal summits with Levantine kings, perhaps to secure ties with them. This must indeed also have been an ideal opportunity for the Cretans to do the same and to secure the supply of tin with the King of Yamhad and Qatna and the supply of other stable goods, perhaps by promoting their own craftsmanship. The amount of diplomatic presents exchanged during these summits must have been very large. However, the amount of tin received by the Cretans was very small in comparison to what, for instance, the king of Hazor received from Mari, which was more than 25kg. Unfortunately, the tablet is incomplete as to the amount received by the Cretan prince, but it was probably between 650g and 5kg.

Whether the encounter was carefully planned or not, the Minoans nevertheless appear to have made an impression on the king of Mari, since he returned home and built a replica of a Minoan ship, presumably for a religious event (Text 31).

From the textual evidence presented in Tables 1 and 2, there is no evidence of Cretans who travelled as far inland as Mari, but their craftsmanship and reputation did.

We will now turn to the archaeological material from the Levant attesting to the presence of Minoans and Minoan goods in Western Asia.

**Minoica from the Levant and beyond (Catalogue)**

Cornerstones of the research on Minoica found in the Levant and dated to the MM-LM I period are Merrillees’ 2003 article on Kamares ware and various articles by Hankey, which focused primarily on LM/LH material. Hankey and Leonard collaborated on a corpus which collected material from the entire Bronze Age. Part of this work was published in 1992 when a map on Aegean objects in Egypt and the Levant appeared. At the same time, a gazetteer was announced as an accompaniment to the map, but to my knowledge no notes exist on this as yet unpublished gazetteer.

The present contribution does not aim to fill the gap left by the unpublished gazetteer, but the time seems ripe to present the published Minoica in a corpus and to investigate the archaeological evidence of Cretan MM-LM I connections shown from the Mari archives.

**Collecting Material**

When working with the material presented, it is important to keep some factors in mind which

---

85 As it might be observed in the Time Table (Fig. 1) if the “low” Babylonian chronology is employed this event took place during the Second Intermediate Period in Egypt which means some Levantine powers to a larger extent might have sought alliances and trading partners within the Yamhad Kingdom.


87 Cf. notes on Text 30; Guichard 1999, 168: “moins de cinq kilo”.

88 Guichard 1999, 168.

89 Merrillees 2003.


92 TAVO B 96 Gazetteer of Sites with Aegean Pottery in the Middle East by Vronwy Hankey and Al Leonard; According to Al Leonard (Pers. comm. 2008), Vronwy Hankey was responsible for the Minoan material. Jorrit Kelder, who has worked with Hankey’s notes in the British School at Athens, did not recover important records on the TAVO material. Pers. comm. September 2008.

93 Hankey and Leonard’s map from 1992 has been helpful to this study but has also opened up new questions. Thus some of the objects recorded in the map have not been verifiable.
might be significant to the traits emerging from the analyses. These factors include the life time of a given site, its degree of excavation in strata from the relevant period, and the proper identification of objects. Thus, several uncertainties make the number of catalogued Minoica far from definite. However, the intention is to show a reasonable picture of the period in collaboration with the textual evidence presented above.

The criteria used to select material for the corpus of Minoica are as follows.

1. The objects have been considered of Minoan origin by one or more scholars. In the cases where this origin has not been rejected due to classification errors, the objects have been included.

2. The contexts and/or stylistic dates should be placed within the period 2000–1500 BC. Objects which have been found in much later contexts than implied by the stylistic dates have been included since they might be “heirlooms”, late exports or found in secondary contexts.

3. Items with the attribution “Minoan” but without dates have been given the benefit of the doubt and are thus included.

Only 81 objects have been found to fit the given criteria. Of these, 22 were found in Byblos and 14 in Ugarit. Pottery accounts for the majority of the Minoica since 49 pieces have been catalogued. Apart from pottery, metal objects, stone vases, seals, frescoes and one graffito are included.

Ugarit was presented as Minoan by Amiet 1992, 190, no. 486 fig. 87. This was rejected by Müller: pers. comm. January 21, 2009. Cylinder seals were as far as we know not manufactured in Crete. Four terracotta bulls heads from Byblos were interpreted as Minoan by Money-Coutts 1936, 135–6 (published in Dunand: 1927, 97–8 pl. XXIV; 1939a, 254–5; 1937, pl. XXXII), however their stylistic traits cannot be placed within the known Minoan material (Guggisberg, pers. comm. February 2, 2009; Caubet, pers. comm. February 25, 2009). Dunand and Money-Coutts (Dunand: 1927, 97–8 pl. XXIV; 1939a, 254–5; 1937, pl. CXLVIII; Money-Coutts: 1936, 135–6) also implied that a terracotta torso of a human figure was Minoan. The style and (description of the) clay is local according to Caubet (pers. comm. February 25, 2009). Last but not least, an inscription found at Lachisch (Finkelberg et al. 1996, 195–207, fig. 1, 2; Ussishkin 2004, vol I, 67, 302, 311; Finkelberg et al. 2004, vol III, 1629–38, fig. 24.16; Finkelberg 1998) has been published as an intermediary script (Linear A-B) in the Eastern Mediterranean (Finkelberg 1998, 269). The limestone bowl with the inscription is of local origin and its context (LB IIIB) complicates its origin further. In addition Del Freo & Zurbach (pers. comm. February 21, 2009) find that the combination of signs and context makes Linear A unlikely.

Since the presented material has not been studied first-hand by the author, a number of specialists have been consulted to review some of the attributions and add alternative opinions. It must, however, be stressed that all the scholars’ comments are based on publication pictures of varying quality and the comments have thus been made with certain reservations.

The frescoes from Kabri (KB 02a-c) and Alalakh (Al 07a-d) are regarded as one import each. They have been given separate entries in the catalogue (a–e) due to the motifs and context; Cf. Niemeier & Niemeier 2002, 279–82 for discussion and references to the origin of the frescoes from Alalakh, Kabri and Dab’ā.

---

This is true for Pella, Hama, Ashdod and Amman pieces (Hankey 1974: only LH II sherds published, though she felt one of the LH II pieces had strong Minoan affinities). As mentioned in 1973 Hankey found LM IB/LH IIA pottery at Amman — it thus seems Hankey changed her mind towards one or more of the Amman pieces from 1973 to 1974 and again in 1992. The description of the Amman LH II piece is shown in brackets ( ) in the present catalogue description of Am 01 since this might be one of the uncertain number of Minoica pottery vases found in Amman. However, I have chosen not to depend on the LH II three-handled vase from Amman in the analyses below, as one of the 1–10 LM I-II pieces mentioned in the 1992 TAVO map by Hankey. With regards to Ashdod, sherds mentioned as LH IIA-B (by Dothan & Freedman 1967) were regarded the earliest Mycenaean imports at the site. These sherds are mentioned in brackets ( ) in the present catalogue description for Ad 01. If this (these) are the pieces meant by Hankey & Leonard in 1992 since this might be one of the uncertain number of catalogued Minoica far from definite.

3 Items with the attribution “Minoan” but without dates have been given the benefit of the doubt and are thus included.

---

The famous LM IB “Marseille ewer” was earlier inventoried as perhaps found in Tyre. A total rejection of Tyre was made by Merrillees & Evans 1980, 22, 23, who traced the ewer to Egypt. Likewise, a sherd from Hazor has been dismissed from petrographic analyses, cf. Hz 01. A cylinder seal found in
Fig. 3. Context dates by object - Levant. MB I/MB IIA: Ak 01; Bb 11–17, 21; Br 01; Nm 01; Sd 01; Ug 01–02, 04, 07–08. MB II/MB IIB: Kb 01–02e; Ug 03, 05, 11. MB IIIB/MIIIC: Al 07a–d. MB III/MB IIIC: Al 04; Hz 01; Hr 01. MB: Bb 02, 07–08. LB I: Al 01–02; Ta 01. LB II: Al 05–06; Am 02–04; As 01; Ug 10. LB: AS 02; KL 01; Ug 12–14. IR IIA: Lc 01. Unknown: Ad 01; Aj 01–02; Al 03; Am 01; AS 01; Bb 01, 03–06, 09–10, 18–20, 22; Gz 01–04; Hm 01; Hz 02–03; MB 01; Mc 01; Pl 01; Qt 01; Sk 01; Ug 06, 09; Uk 01–05.

**Objects of debatable origin**

Some of the catalogued items have been attributed an alternate place of origin than Crete by one or more scholars. There are altogether 31 numbers of debatable origin. Some of the alternative attributions might prove correct if the objects were re-studied, but until then, they have been kept in the catalogue. 13 of the 31 objects are pottery dated to either the LM I or the LH I or II periods. Most of these have been described by Hankey, who stated that this group of pottery “may be claimed Mycenaean or Minoan according to the academic bias of the beholder.”

> Hankey 1973, 107. She mentioned eight sites in the Levant (Alalakh, Ugarit, Byblos, Hazor, Ta’annek, Gezer, Ayul and Amman) where LM IB/LH IIA pottery was found. She was, however, not explicit about whether she thought all the early LB Aegean sherds found at these sites were of equally disputed origin.

The resumed excavations at Kabri have shown that the Kabri frescoes could be earlier than the Alalakh frescoes. This stands in contrast to Bietak’s recent interpretations of the paintings, since he believed the Alalakh paintings to be older.

The period after the turn of c.1500 BC, the Late

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB I/MB IIA</td>
<td>Ak 01; Bb 11–17, 21; Br 01; Nm 01; Sd 01; Ug 01–02, 04, 07–08.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB II/MB IIB</td>
<td>Kb 01–02e; Ug 03, 05, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB IIIB/MIIIC</td>
<td>Al 07a–d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB III/MB IIIC</td>
<td>Al 04; Hz 01; Hr 01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Bb 02, 07–08.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB I</td>
<td>Al 01–02; Ta 01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB II</td>
<td>Al 05–06; Am 02–04; As 01; Ug 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>AS 02; KL 01; Ug 12–14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR IIA</td>
<td>Lc 01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ad 01; Aj 01–02; Al 03; Am 01; AS 01; Bb 01, 03–06, 09–10, 18–20, 22; Gz 01–04; Hm 01; Hz 02–03; MB 01; Mc 01; Pl 01; Qt 01; Sk 01; Ug 06, 09; Uk 01–05.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-Palace Period: EM-MM IA: Bb 21–22; Gz 04. Old Palace Period: MM IB–MM IIB: Ak 01; Bb 01–04, 11–12, 15–16; Qt 01; Sd 01; Ug 01–06; Uk 02–03. New Palace Period: MM III-LM IB: Aj 01–02; Al 01–03, 07a-d; Am 02–04; As 01; Bb 09–10, 18–20; Gz 01–03; Hz 02–03; Kb 01–02e; Kl 01; Lc 01; Mc 01; Ta 01; Ug 09–10. Unknown: Ad 01; Al 04–06; Am 01; AS 01–02; Bb 05–09, 13–14, 17; Br 01; Hm 01; Hr 01; Hz 01; MB 01; PI 01; Sk 01; Ug 07–08, 11–14; Uk 01, 04–05.

Stylistic Dates (Fig. 4)

Figure 4 demonstrates the same pattern as that seen in Figure 3; many objects lack precise dates. However, 19 objects were dated to the Old Palace Period, but the majority – 28 Minoica – have been dated to the New Palace Period. Murals and perhaps stone vases are not found as imports before the New Palace Period. The Middle Minoan palatial Kamares ware has been recognised in 20 instances. In contrast, no certain LM IA pottery has been published, whereas possible LM IB pottery counts 10 specimens. The lack of firmly dated LM IA pottery does not necessarily indicate a break in contacts during this period; however, the only possible LM IA objects which have been dated are the murals from Kabri and Alalakh VII. LM IA pottery from these two sites in particular would be most welcome, and with the resumed excavations this will hopefully be possible.

The absolute chronology of the Levant as well as Crete is debated, and it can thus be quite difficult to explore the possible lifetime of an object from manufacture to deposition. However, a number of objects are provided with both useable context and stylistic dates. They are: Ak 01; Al 01–02; 07a-d; Am 02–04; As 01; Bb 11–12, 15–16, 21; Br 01; Hz 01; Kb 01–02e; Lc 01; Sd 01; Ta 01; Ug 01–05, 10.

The stone vases found at Amman, if indeed Minoan, are the only items which can be regarded as heirlooms. The remaining objects have comparable stylistic and context dates, like the Kabri paintings, if likewise Minoan, which are remarkable for their nature as a stable good.

---

101 Nm 01 has not been considered in this diagram due to its nature as a stable good.
very short lifetime, as they were dismantled during a renovation of the palace.\textsuperscript{103}

**Contexts (Fig. 5)**

Figure 5 shows 45 objects with usable information relating to their contexts. Some objects relate to royalty. Five fine ware fragments were unearthed in contexts surrounding the Levantine palaces of Gezer, Qatna and Ugarit. These contexts might all be secondary. However, Minoica have been found within the palace walls of Alalakh, Kabri and Ugarit, and seven additional objects were found in two royal tombs in Byblos and one in the royal tomb at Kāmid el-Lūz.

The objects with royal ties are primarily silver vases and murals, though one stone vase and two pottery pieces are also part of the collection. 12 objects were found in relation to sanctuaries. Among these were three possible LM I rhyta and an inscribed Minoan sherd, which had been deliberately cut away from the pithos and deposited in a sanctuary at Haror. Only 7 objects might be ascribed to an urban context. Among these are the many charred seeds found at Nami; however, the remaining pottery found in graves might also be assigned to a more mundane context.

**Distribution pattern (Fig. 6)**

More than half of the catalogued Minoica were found in Byblos, Ugarit and Alalakh. The presence of Minoica in Byblos and Ugarit can be explained by their function as centres of trade for long periods during the Bronze Age (cf. MB overview, p. 13–4). Ugarit might very well have functioned as gateway to Alalakh, which, like Ugarit, was part of the Yamhad Kingdom. The fairly large number of imports at Amman was explained by Hankey, who suggested that nomads in the area began to settle

---

\textsuperscript{103} Yasur-Landau & Cline 2008, 8; 2009, 3. Cf. Kb 02a-b, d-e.

---
and therefore built a temple and filled it with plunder acquired west of the Jordan River. However, this theory remains unconfirmed.

In Part 1, Byblos was introduced as possibly the first direct contact established by the Minoans with the Levant. The corpus of Minoica presented in the present part seems to confirm this theory, though the amount of objects is far from impressive. However, besides Byblos, Gezer produced a possible Pre-Palatial Period stone vase.

Most of the catalogued Minoica have been found at sites near the Mediterranean coast (Fig. 6). This is true for 48 objects from Minet el-Beidha to Ajul. Sites featuring MM-LM I objects as far inland as east of the Orontes and Jordan River are Hama, Qatna, Amman, Pella and Assur. Only 8 of the 81 objects in the catalogue were found at these sites. Of these, only the items from Qatna and perhaps Hama seem to belong to the Old Palace Period. Qatna was connected to the trade route from Mari to the Levantine coast. Furthermore, the king of Qatna was present at Ugarit at the same time as Zimri-Lim and might thus also have made acquaintance with Cretans during the late Old Palace Period or early New Palace Period, as it has been proposed above (p. 16–7).

A tentative conclusion to be drawn from the material presented would be that Byblos was chosen as a favourite port of call at least from EM II-MM IA(?). The EM II contacts might have been direct but perhaps reduced or broken during the late Old Kingdom and the First Intermediate Period in Egypt. This picture is paralleled in Crete by the Aegyptiaca recently studied and published by Phillips who found a break in contacts from the Old Kingdom to the late Dynasty 11 at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom.  

The Cretan connection to Byblos did not, however, seem to have ceased completely, but focus was broadened to include Ugarit during the late Old Palace Period. The texts from Mari concur with the Cretan presence in Ugarit during the MM IIB (middle) or MM III (low) period and it might even be hypothesised that this inclusion of Ugarit was founded on the trade routes maintained by Yamhad and Mari. Egypt was, at this point, ruled by Dynasty 13 which unifying power gradually crumpled. This might have strengthened the position of Yamhad and thus Ugarit in comparison to Byblos, which was traditionally closely tied to Egypt.

Later, during the New Palace Period, contacts were still kept with Ugarit, but one or more ports in the southern part of the Levant were also receiving Minoica from where the imports were distributed inland. Whether this might be seen in the light of the establishment of the Hyksos and later the 18th Dynasty in Egypt which might have reopened a southern connection is impossible to conclude from the presented material but chronologically it might be a possible factor. The Egyptian imports in Crete during the MM III-LM IA periods contemporary with the Second Intermediate Period and the early New Kingdom were few and of an earlier date whereas the LM IB destruction layers yielded the larger part of the Egyptian material. Western Asian imports in Crete during the LM I Period were, on the other hand, scarce.  

In comparison, the first Minoan imports in Cyprus turned up in Lapithos during the EM III-MM IA period, and Cypriote copper began to be imported into Crete from the EM II period. Cretan contacts with Cyprus were intensified during the New Palace Period.

The Middle Bronze Age in the Aegean has yielded only very few metal objects from secure contexts. Consequently, it is not possible to give a general picture of the metals trade during that period. During the New Palace Period, Laurion was dominant, but still 8% of the copper derived from Iran and Wadi Araba.

---

104 Hankey 1974, 142–3. Apart from the LM I objects, many Mycenaean vases were also found in the temple.
106 No objects found in Ugarit have been dated earlier than MM IIA or in earlier strata than MB I/MB IIA.
108 Cline 1994, Tables 19 and 31: 12 objects.
109 Sørensen 2008, 163–4, Table 2–3.
110 Stos-Gale & Gale 2003, 91; Stos-Gale 2001, Table 10.2.
111 Sørensen 2008, 157, 159.
112 Stos-Gale & Gale 2003, 93–94.
113 Stos-Gale 2001, fig. 10.2.

Gifts and commercial goods

The Mari texts refer to the knowledge of Cretan handicraft at least from the late 19th (middle) or mid 18th (low) century BC. From the early (middle) or late (low) 18th century, the Mariotes also knew Cretan people and were inspired to imitate Cretan workmanship. During the late 17th to early 16th century, Minoans possibly decorated palace walls in Kabri and Alalakh. These proofs of firsthand knowledge and use of Cretan styles and techniques all seem to have been part of an elaborate system of royal gift exchange in Western Asia.

The question arises of whether it is also possible to find proof of commercial trade in organic materials. One group of Minoica which can hardly be recognized in Levantine contexts is transport containers used for agricultural produce. Only two fragments from large coarse ware containers have been recognised (Ug 06 and Hr 01). Additionally, two sherds from a three-handled jar of semi-coarse ware were found in Hazor (Hz 02). Five alabastra might also have carried a liquid substance. However, the Lathyrus Clymenum seeds from Nāmi provide the best proof of trade in organic products.

The theory of Cretan trade in woollen textile can only be attested once, in Text 3 from Mari. Leather footwear and belts were also found in Mari. However, these objects were most likely acquired through gift exchange rather than commercial trade.

Most of the identified pots are cups or fragments hereof, counting at least 16 specimens. Four additional pieces might also derive from cups (Bb

114 On several occasions it has been noted that the clay of the pithos was found locally (Finkelberg 1998, 2004); however, in 1999 Day et al. published results pointing towards Crete.
115 Hankey 1970-71, 15–6: on the LM IB period. She stressed that “the Syrian textile industry was itself very important”, thus if Cretan textiles were exported “their success would have depended on quality”.

Approaching Levantine Shores
Three rhyta and the five bridge-spouted jars were also part of the imported Minoica. Cups, bowls, rhyta and bridge-spouted jars must have been brought to the Levant for their own sake, and were therefore not secondary to their content, since they do not seem to be obvious transport containers.

These open vase types lend themselves to the actions of pouring and drinking — i.e. to feasting and libation — and correspond well with the evidence presented in the Mari texts described above. The most striking factor of divergence is the material; clay versus precious metals. However, a few of the Minoica referred to in the Mari archive might find their silver and bronze counterparts in the finds from the royal Tombs I and II at Byblos (Bb 11–17). Metal vessels for pouring and drinking were likewise represented in the hands of the Keftiu people in the Tombs of The Nobles in Egypt.\(^6\) Furthermore, the Minoan imports found in Cyprus parallel this picture.\(^7\)

To sum up, metal vases, elaborated weapons and possibly murals were used in the system of royal gift exchange. Some fine ware vases ended up in graves and stone vases in sanctuaries; other pots were shattered and found in secondary contexts.

3. The Late Bronze Age (LB)

An overview

The decline in Amorite power in the Levant was followed by a period with no regional power\(-\)s. The new unified Kingdom of Egypt ruled by the 18th Dynasty expelled the Hyksos and thus ended the Second Intermediate Period. The new imperialistic 18th Dynasty campaigned in the southern part of the Levant and the Egyptians ultimately seem to have gained control of the entire Levantine coastline including the inland areas to the south of Qana. The Egyptian hegemony in the Levant lasted until the Hittites also wanted control of the Levant during the 14th century BC. However, the areas south of Qadesh remained subject to the Egyptians until the final years of the LB.\(^8\)

Kaptara in the Ugarit texts (Table 3)\(^9\)

The Crete and Cretans delineated in the Ugaritic texts are of a different character than that shown in the Mari tablets. The texts from Ugarit are dated to the 13th century BC and thus post-date the focal period of this contribution. However, the texts are important as they might be reflections of the MB contacts.

Texts 1–4 (Table 3) refer to the god of art, handicraft, architecture and engineering, Kothar-\(w\)-Khasis, and to his residence in Crete. Texts 1–3 belong to the mythological cycle of Ba’al and his toils to become supreme god of the world by slaying Yam–Nahar. He ultimately succeeds with the aid of Kothar-\(w\)-Khasis. Text 4 is a religious snake bite incantation.

Text 5 is a declaration by the king of Ugarit to free the merchant Sinaranu and his ships from taxes upon their return from Crete. The last three texts (6–8) are administrative lists which mention Cretans.

If we compare the texts from Mari and Ugarit, it is worth noting that while most Mari texts are concerned with objects of a certain shape or origin, in Ugarit, at least Texts 6–8, which are administrative documents, deal with people most likely present in the Ugaritic kingdom.

If we keep in mind that we are dealing with LB texts from a coastal centre of trade, the only Cretan people mentioned in the Mari archives are the delegates present at Ugarit at the same time as Zimri-Lim. This fact might indicate the only direct encounter between the two civilizations — at least during the reign of Zimri-Lim. The Cretan products in Yahdun-Lim's possession might derive from

---

\(^8\) Wachsmann, 1987, pl. XXIII, LIV (Seramut T. 71), pl. XX-VII-XXXII, LV (Useramun T. 131), pl. XXXIV-VII, LVI-II (Menchepetresonb T. 86), pl. XL-III, LVIII (Rechmire T. 100).

\(^9\) Sorensen 2008, 158.

\(^{10}\) Akkermans & Schwartz 2003, 329.

\(^{11}\) According to the standard collection of Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit (KTU) from 1976 (Dietrich, Loretz & Sanmartín, 1976, v.) 1341 texts written in Ugaritic were unearthed between 1929 and 1970. More texts have been found after 1970, and the corpus now counts over 1400 texts in Ugaritic, but texts in many other languages have also been found on the tell.

---

Annette Højen Sorensen
his campaign to the Mediterranean (cf. above p. 14)
or could have been gifts from other kings.

As has already been mentioned above (p. 17) on
the texts from Mari, the Cretan reputation rather
than the Cretans themselves travelled inland. Their
reputation as skilled craftsmen was not forgotten
by the close of the Middle Bronze Age; rather it
remained in the collective memory of the people
of the Levant, and ultimately the Cretans became
mythical. In an attempt to bring myth into reality
once again, we might look at the text KTU 1.2 IV:
11 and 18, which reads as follows: “Kothar fashions
the weapons, And he proclaims their names”.120
These were the weapons with which Ba’al defeated
Yam-Nahar. The weapons have been interpreted as
either two clubs121 or maces.122 Recalling the Mari
texts, at least one elaborately decorated Cretan mace
found its way into the palace of Zimri-Lim. Might
a specific Cretan mace of such exquisite handicraft
also have found its way into the mythical hands of
Ba’al? This is purely hypothetical, but it seems most
likely that the precious Cretan objects in Mari were
part of the material which gave Kothar from Crete
his reputation during the Late Bronze Age. Later,
in Greece, Kothar-wa-Khasis was transformed into
Hephaistos,123 whom we know as just as skilled as
Kothar-wa-Khasis.

4. Conclusions

Beginning in the EM II period, Crete had contacts
with the Levant, which can be observed in Crete
and the Levant; however, at present it is impossible
to say of what nature these early contacts were
and if they were direct. If so, it seems highly likely
that Crete initiated the contacts in search for natural
resources, and that the destination was Byblos.
The reason why Byblos became the Minoans’ first
Levantine contact might be due to the strong ties
between Byblos and Egypt. From the Egyptians,
the Minoans might have become acquainted with
the Levant.

The relations were interrupted but later resumed
and intensified over time, and perhaps from the late
Old Palace Period or early New Palace Period Cre-
tans took active part in the royal gift exchange of
Western Asia, which might have secured deliver-
ies. It was likewise during the Old Palace Period
that focus was broadened to include Ugarit, per-
haps a result of events in the Levant, where Yam-
bad came to hold a strong position of power and
trade and was on good terms with Mari, which
supplied tin to the region. The royal contacts dur-
during the late Old Palace Period/early New Palace
Period do not, however, exclude the possibility of
commercial trade, but there is no firm proof of its
existence. During the New Palace Period (possibly
LM IB) the foreign activities of the Minoans were
further spread out on the Levantine coast, with one
or more centres to the very south being incorpo-
rated in the foreign affairs of Crete. No contempo-
rary texts describe the nature of these contacts,
but in the later part of the Bronze Age, Ugaritic
commercial activities conducted with Crete were
described.

Throughout the MB-LB I periods, intermediaries
were most probably used to distribute Minoica
inland. The Cretans conducted their business in the
coastal emporia and did not travel inland. The only
possible exception might be the execution of mural
paintings in the palace of Alalakh.

The corpus presented includes only 81 objects
which might be of MM-LM I origin. It thus seems
reasonable to ask whether we are dealing with
direct contacts on a regular basis throughout this
500-year period of the MM-LM I. On the basis of
the archaeological and textual evidence presented,
it seems fair to make the tentative conclusion that
contacts were kept throughout the MM-LM I pe-
riods and that these relations were initiated dur-
ing preceding periods. The reputation of Minoan craftsmen went onto the palace walls and ultimately into the myths. Both the textual and archaeological evidence throughout the period point to the attire for feasting as the favoured Minoan manufactured items in the Levant, but a distinction seems clear in the presented material: pottery for the people and metals for the monarch.

The scale of the contacts is nevertheless hard to determine since much material must have disintegrated or have been melted down so that the metal could be reused. Another possibility is that much Minoan pottery was not recognised by previous excavators in the Levant.\textsuperscript{124} There seems to be no doubt, however, that to both civilisations, the mutual contacts were secondary to their regional network.

However, the refined and complex systems of interaction which were developed during the Early Bronze Age and increased during the Middle Bronze Age were the contacts which blazed the trail for the succeeding Mycenaens.

\textsuperscript{124} Cline 1999, 122–3, 2003, 174; MacGillivray 2003, 23, on Kamares ware: “could cause one to wonder if these fine decorated pieces in the Levant weren’t the tip of a less apparent ceramic ‘ice-berg.’”
### Table 1. Mari texts, Yahdun-Lim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translations/interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 341: 37</td>
<td>3 te-ni-i kuš-e-sir k[a-p-ta-r]-tum</td>
<td>3 (pairs of) shoes&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 420/ARM 31, 7: 4</td>
<td>6 gal gu-šu kap-ta-re-ū</td>
<td>6 hemispheric gold bowls&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1<sup>3</sup> The reign of Yahdun-Lim<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Guichard 1993a, 44: “de chaussures”.


<sup>3</sup> Tables 1 and 2 are largely based on Guichard 1999 and 2005, in which he republished some texts from earlier ARM volumes; only new fragments were added to many of the tablets.

<sup>4</sup> Guichard 2005, 208: most probably during his reign or at least pre Zimri-Lim; Guichard 1999, 169: 1815-1798 BC (middle).

### Table 2. Mari texts, Zimri-Lim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Transliteration&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Translations/interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11404 ARM 23, 104: 30</td>
<td>1 kuš na-ah-ba-at giš-tukul kap-ta-ri-im</td>
<td>Leather box for a weapon&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;, sack containing weapons&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARM 21, 342: 5-6</td>
<td>1 [KUŠ me-te-en] SUHUB, k[a-a] p-ta-re/-tum</td>
<td>1 (pair of) shoes&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;, 1 (pair) of sandals&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;, boots&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARM 22/2, 324 col. 2: 9</td>
<td>[x]x x ni ka-ap-[a]-ri-tum</td>
<td>Textile(?)&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guichard 1999, 170</td>
<td>Nêhehum</td>
<td>Leather belts&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 1264 + M.12643 + ARM 21, 252 ARM 25, 39: 10/ARM 31, 161: 32</td>
<td>[1 i-mi-tu (?)] zabar kap-ta-ri-[tum kù-GI gar-ra]</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;, 1 bronze lance&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.675&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt; ARM 25, 601: 10-13</td>
<td>1 š[i]tukul kap-ta-ri-ú mu-&lt;uh&gt;-ha-šu ù i-ši-is-sú-ú KÜ.GI uh-hu-uz mu-uh-šu ta-am-li na <em>za-gin</em></td>
<td>1 weapon covered with gold and inlaid with lapis lazuli&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Guichard 1999, 169-170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>2</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>3</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>4</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>5</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>6</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>7</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>8</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>9</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>10</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.

<sup>11</sup> Guichard 1999, 170: “Nêhehum”.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ARM 24/1, 98: 10</td>
<td>[xxxx]-ku ka-ap-ta-ra-yu mu-uh-ha-śu tam-li na₂-za-gin</td>
<td>Object^12, weapon with gold and lapis lazuli^13, mace^24</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 24/1, 98: 14</td>
<td>...ka-ap]-ta-ra-i[n[~za-gin?] gar-ra</td>
<td>Object with lapis lazuli^15</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dossin 1939, 112</td>
<td>١٠٢٣٨١٥٨٩١٦٩٨٢٧٤١٢٧</td>
<td>Weapon with gold and lapis lazuli^16, dagger^37, mace^18</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ARM 21, 231:3–5</td>
<td>]١٠١٣٨١٥٩٩</td>
<td>Wooden lance with gold^19</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 21, 231:15–16</td>
<td>١٠١٣٨١٥٩٩</td>
<td>1 weapon with gold and inlaid with lapis^20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dossin 1939, 111</td>
<td>ka-ta-pu-um ka-ap-ta-ra-ū</td>
<td>Small pair of tongs/fire tongs/tweezers^21, weapon^22, object^23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ARM 25, 610: 8–9</td>
<td>١٠١٣٨١٥٩٩</td>
<td>1 bronze dagger^24, bronze object^25</td>
<td>5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ARM 25, 347: rev. 2/ARM 31, 80: R.31</td>
<td>١٠١٣٨١٥٩٩</td>
<td>1 sā'-ap-pu kap-ta-ru-ū</td>
<td>1 goblet or cup^36, silver bowl^37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ARM 25, 393: 13/ARM 31, 85: 12</td>
<td>١٠١٣٨١٥٩٩</td>
<td>3 bur-zī kap-ta-ra-a-iu</td>
<td>3 vessels^28, 3 silver bowls^29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ARM 25, 522: côté/ARM 31, 156: côté 2*</td>
<td>١٠١٣٨١٥٩٩</td>
<td>3 gal kap-ta-[e-tum…]</td>
<td>3 vases^30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 25, 499: rev.16/ARM 31, 173: 44</td>
<td>١٠١٣٨١٥٩٩</td>
<td>1 gal kap-ta-ra-WA-tum kù-GI</td>
<td>1 gold vase^35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ARM 25, 513: rev.6/ARM 31, 258: rev.6</td>
<td>١٠١٣٨١٥٩٩</td>
<td>1 sā'-ap-pu-um r[ka-ap-ta]-ru-ū (...)</td>
<td>1^26, 1 silver bowl^37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ARM 25, 45: 2/ ARM 31, 184: 2</td>
<td>2 gal kap-ta-re-tim ša ú-sú-ur-tim ša la š[u-gu-n]im</td>
<td>2 silver vases&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt;; 2 gold vases&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 25, 45: 4/ ARM 31, 184: 4</td>
<td>ǔ 1 gal [k]ap-ta-ri-tim ša i-na &lt;qa&gt;- ap-li-tim pa-ap-pa-ar-&lt;hi&gt;-tum</td>
<td>1 silver vase&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;; 1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 31, 184: 10</td>
<td>[2 gal kap-ta-re (?)] -tim</td>
<td>2 vases&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 31, 184: rev. 4</td>
<td>1 gal kap-ta-ri-tum kù-GI ša su-gu-nim 2/3 ma-na [a 9 su] ki-lá-bi</td>
<td>1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ARM 25, 530: 2/ ARM 31, 185: 2-3</td>
<td>2 gal kap-ta-ri-tim ša ú-sú-ur-tim ša la su-gu-nim 1 ki-ra-di [ ] im</td>
<td>2 vases&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;, 2 bronze vases&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt;, 2 gold vases&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 31, 185: 4</td>
<td>rû&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt; [1 gal kap-ta-ri-tim ša i-na]a &lt;qa&gt;- ah-li-tim pa-&lt;ap&gt;-pa-[r-hi-tum]</td>
<td>1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ARM 31, 186:7</td>
<td>2 [gal kap-ta]-re-[tum</td>
<td>2 vases&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 25, 515: 8/ ARM 31, 186: rev. 9</td>
<td>1 gal kap-ta-ri-tum kù-GI 2/3 mana 9 su ki-lá-bi</td>
<td>1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ARM 31, 188: 1</td>
<td>rî&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt; [gal ka]p-ta-ri-tum ša ú-sú-ur-tim (?) kù-GI 1 ma-na x su ki-lá-bi</td>
<td>1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;50&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 25, 511: 6-7/ ARM 31, 188: 7&quot;</td>
<td>1 gal kap-ta-ri-tum kù-GI 2/3 mana 2 ½ su ki-lá-bi</td>
<td>1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;51&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ARM 25, 8/ ARM 25, 10: 14/ARM 31, 192: 23</td>
<td>[1] [gal k]ap-ta-ri-tum 2/3 ma-na 2 ½ š[u ki-lá-bi]</td>
<td>1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;52&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 25, 192: 27</td>
<td>[1] [gal k]ap-ta-ri-tum 1/3' ma-na 6 ½ su [ki-lá-bi]</td>
<td>1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;53&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ARM 31, 227: 6&quot;</td>
<td>1 gal kap-[ta-ri-tum...]</td>
<td>1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;54&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARM 25, 523: 12/ ARM 31, 227: 12&quot;</td>
<td>1 kap-ta-[r]i-tum kù-GI 2/3 ma-na 9 su</td>
<td>1 Caphtorian&lt;sup&gt;55&lt;/sup&gt;, vase&lt;sup&gt;56&lt;/sup&gt;, 1 gold vase&lt;sup&gt;57&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ARM 25, 526: 4/ ARM 31, 215: 5</td>
<td>4 gal kap-ta-ra-e-tum ša 1-âm su-gu-nu</td>
<td>4 vases&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;, 4 silver vases&lt;sup&gt;61&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27: The reign of Zimri-Lim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 gal</td>
<td>ka-ta-re-tum ša a-ram kū-ba-bar su-gu-ni {x}</td>
<td>4 silver vases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 gal</td>
<td>ka-an-nu ša ka-ap-ta-r[&lt;a-r]a-i-tim</td>
<td>Stand, 1 silver stand for a “Cretan”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 gold vase</td>
<td>1 gal [ka-ap-ta-r]a-i-tum ša mušen kū-G I</td>
<td>End of reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 silver stand for a “Cretan”</td>
<td>1 ka-an-um ša ka-&lt;a-p&gt;-ta-ri-tim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 gold vase</td>
<td>GAL ka-ta-ri-tum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ship built by Cretans, a ship in the Cretan style</td>
<td>1 x/3 ma-na an-na a-na ka-&lt;a-p&gt;-ta-ra-im 1/3 ma-na an-na a-na lū ta-ar-ga-ma-an-nim u[gi-la nga-r][k[a]] p-ta-na i-nu u-ga-ri-tim&lt;sup&gt;kl&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Un-dated (9–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ship built by Cretans</td>
<td>20 ma-na na₃ za-gi-id-r[u i-di-ia-tam am-hu-ur (vacat) i-nu-ma giš-ma tur ka-ap&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;-ta-ri-tam&lt;sup&gt;kl&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Late 10 or later</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Transliterations follow Guichard 2005, (ARM 31) where possible, since it is the latest volume with most joins published. For the remaining texts I have used the transliterations from other ARM vols, where these numbers could be traced. Unfortunately, the only ARM volumes with a concordance list between Mari text numbers and the publication numbers used in this work are ARM 23, 25 and 31.

2 Bardet et al. 1984, 102–3 mentions that gis-tukul in line 31 translates as “masses d’armes” i.e. maces. In commenting upon the Caphtorian gis-tukul he settles on calling it “une arme crétose”. Kāš means leather receptacle, he states, and nahbdām means box or cist; Cline 1994, 127 D.6.: “(with/for) a Caphtorian weapon”; Guichard 1999, 171: “d’un coffre particulier pour une arme crétose”.

3 Heltzer 1989, 14: “...a sack of ’Cretan weapons’


5 Heltzer 1989, 14: “1 (pair) of sandals šuhuppum in Cretan (style)”. Heltzer’s note 58 gives the transliteration for ARM 22/1, 324 col. 2: 9 and he thereby confuses this with ARM 22, 342, i.e. his notes 58 and 59 are reversed.


7 Kupper 1983, 503; Malamat 1998, 417: “textiles”. The text lists different textile objects. To associate the Cretan object with textile seems plausible for this reason; Dossin 1939, 111–2 speaks of a Cretan object or textile “dont le nom est perdu, k[a]-sc-ta-ri-tum”. This might refer to the present text; Heltzer 1989, 14, refers to Dossin.

8 Guichard 1999, 170: “des ceintures”.


11 Limet 1986, 183–4: “1 arme crétose, dont le sommet et le côté sont plaqués d’or, son sommet est sérit de lapis-lazuli”; Cline 1994, 126–127, D.5; Malamat 1998, 417; Text A.675* presents a problem. The number refers to another text, but the asterisk implies that a double numbering occurred when the text was registered. Text A.675 has been published in ARM 26/1, 259 and does not refer to Crete (J. Eidem, pers. comm. April 13, 15 2004).

12 Talon 1985, 60–1. Cf. note XVIII.


14 Heltzer 1989, 14: “A “Cretan mace” (?)”. In note 53 he states that ARM 24/1, 98: 10 is the same as Dossin 1939, 112, and quotes this.
Cline 1994, 126 D.3; Heltzer 1989, 14, n. 53: “— the same we read in line 14”.

Dossin 1939, 112: “une arme caftorite dont le sommet et la base sont sertis d’or, dont le sommet est incrusté de lapis-lazuli”;

Heltzer 1989, 14, n. 53: = 24, 98: 10; Bardet et al. 1984, 164 n. 10 refers to this text as being the same as A.675. Dossin’s text is kept in the present list since its identification in the ARM publications is not certain.

Maxwell-Hyslop 1970, 165; Malamat 1998, 416, cites Maxwell-Hyslop and agrees with the identification of the object as a dagger. Malamat produced a print error since A.675 is identified as ARM 25, 610: 10–3 (Mari text 11959). Both numbers are ascribed to the present text no. 8.

Talon 1985, 61, is commenting on his own publication of ARM 24/1, 98 and refers to the similarities between ARM 24/1, 98: 10, and Dossin’s transliteration of text no. 8: “Kaptappum la description de cet objet cretois est fort proche de celle d’une masse d’armes (Dossin 1939, 112): gis-tukul kap-ta-ra-mu-ha-su a u-ti-ti-is-su-ii ku-gi uh-hu-uz mu-uh-ha-su ta-an-li na-za-gin “une masse d’armes cretoise dont le sommet et la base sont plaques d’or (et) dont le sommet est incruste de lapis-lazuli”, “Faut-il restituer, i. 10, gis-tukul* ou i gii ka-ak-ku*”. Talon cites Dossin incorrectly in both the transliteration and the translation and makes Dossin determine the object as a mace. Guichard 1999, 170: “Une masse d’arme (designee par le generique simple kakkum) est mentionnee dans trois inventaires differents: “Son sommet et sa base sont plaques or; son sommet est incruste de lapis-lazuli.”

Un de trois documents precise que cet or ne recouvre qu’un tiers de l’objet.”

Durand 1983, 258–9: “1 lance cretoise en bois [...] plaquee or; confie a Yasim-Dagan”. According to J. Eidem Yasim-Dagan was some kind of Mari officer (pers. comm. April 13 2004); Heltzer 1989, 14; Cline 1994, 126, D.4.; Malamat 1998, 417, reverses the content of ARM 21, 231: 3–5 with 15–6 and turns the weapon in 15–6 into more. Guichard 1999, 170: “de lance...imittum...offerte par le roi de HaBium...placage en or.” In my personal correspondance with Guichard (April 21 2004), he said that “la lance de luxe venant de Hassum est a revoir, d’apres une collation effectuee en Syrie par J-M Durand (il n’y a donc pas d’objet de ce genre passant par l’Anatolie atteste comme je l’avais pense)”.


Dossin 1939, 111: “ZimriLimm envove a...le roi de la ville Ra-za-ma-a-du une ‘pinzette caftorite’.”

Bardet et al. 1983, 103 states that a Katappum belongs to the military equipment; Heltzer 1989, 14; Guichard 1999, 170 and n. 12 refers to the katappum as either “une masse d’arme” or “une sorte de ‘cimeterre’”. Furthermore, he states that this “Katappum transit par Mari avant de rejoindre l’amuretie d’un roi de Razama.”


Malamat 1998, 418: “...the Akkadian term designating the object eludes us”.

Malamat 1998, 417. Gives no text reference, but mentions the shape “Sappum”.

Guichard 2005, 78, 294, silver bowl; Guichard 1999, 174: this piece is mentioned several times in the archive and it is even stored in the palace treasury.

Limet 1986, 124. Without translation; Malamat 1998, 418, n. 22, states that bur-zi should be read pursitum “...referring to a cultic vessel”.

Guichard 2005, 208: “La forme “bur-zi kap-ta-ra-yu” se comprend mal car bur-zi est generalement feminine a Mari”, and the theory is that these 3 were not bur-zi but really sappum, a bowl type, 209: “argent + anse”, 263, 408; Guichard 1999, 173, “3 pursitum (une terme courant pour “bol”),...”. Guichard 1999, 174, the contents of these were “de l’huile ou de la saipronaire”; Guichard 1999, 173 mentions that the 3 bowls in this text were mentioned again later on but this time only as “3 cretoises”, cf. next text.

Guichard 2005, 208: These vases are identical to the 3 bur-zi above. The present text was written when Zimrr-Limm was preparing his journey West, 209: “argent + anse”, 455; Limet 1986, 165–6. The text is not translated.


Malamat 1998, 417 mentions that both pottery vases and vases of precious metals were listed in the Mari archives, but he does not elaborate on the material of the vases or the following Cretan vases; According to Bardet et al. 1984, 457–75, Sasso 1984, 250, and Villard 1986, 392, Zimri-Limm executed his journey to Ugarit during the last 2 months of his 8th year and the first months of the 9th year of his reign.


Guichard 2005, 294, silver bowl, 530; Guichard, pers. comm. April 21 2004: silver and with a handle.

Limet 1986, 15: “8 mine 8 [sicles ] d’argent; 2 vases cretois, avec gravures, sans [anse(?)]; 1 kirıdu et 1 vase cretois a la base

63 Limet 1986, 164. Without translation; Malamat 1998, 417, states that the reference is in line 8, and he does not mention the material from which the vase was made; Guichard 1999, 173: “...pesant 2/3 mine 2 ½ sicles”;

64 Guichard 2005, 209: “or + (anse)”, “1 gal kap-ta-ri-tum (2/3 ma-na 2 ½ su)”. The weight specification differs but the material is mentioned as gold.

65 Guichard 2005, 209: “or + (anse)”, 490: According to the text the vase was intended as a present to Hammurabi, king of Babylon, but came to Mari from Karkemish; Guichard 1999, 173: “...deux ont été offerts par le roi de Carkemish: le premier est d’or pourvu d’une anse, pesant 2/3 mine x sicle”. Since the publication of ARM 25/Limet 1986 many new joins have been found to the published texts. Such joins are visible in the text presented.

66 Guichard 2005, 209: “or + sans anse + motif”.

67 Cline 1994, 128, D.12; Dossin 1939, 112; Heltzer 1989, 14. This vase could be one of the other presented texts, but since no ARM no. or inventory no. is given I have not been able to trace this text.


Annette Hojen Sørensen
that the Mariotes saw Crete as ruled by one prince or king, which made his name superfluous. "Une mine \( x \) tiers d'étain pour l'Homme de Crète; un tiers d'étain pour l'interprète, chef des marchands crétois"; Durand 1990 40, n. 3.


Villard 1986, 402: "lorsque les Crétois ont construit une barque", note 106: "i-nu-ma giš-má tur / ka-pi-ta-ri-' ju'k' / i-pu-šu." He states that the text was dated to the 8th month of the 9th year of Zimri-Lim’s reign.

Guichard 1993a, 44: "20 mines (= 10 kilo) de lapis-lazuli: j’ai reçu d’Iddiyatum, lorsqu’on fait la barque crétoise"; Guichard 2005, 163, also with translation, some months after the kings return to Mari; Guichard 1999, 168; Malamat 1998, 418; Caubet 1998, 108.


---

### Table 3. Ugarit texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translations/interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | RS 3.63/Louvre AO 16.628 + 16.639/A 2739 + 2737/CTA 3, F col. VI : 14/KTU 1.3 VI: 14–15 | 'il kkh špṭ ksu šth | To Kaphtor the throne that he sits on
For Kaphtor, the throne where he sits |
| 2  | AO 16.643, RS 3.361/CTA 1 KTU 1.1 III: 1 KTU 1.1 III: 18 | [...]pṭ* ksu* [.tbth h]kpt. ars nhlṭh | [Kaphtor] is the throne of his sitting
[Kaphtor] is indeed far, O Gods |
| 3  | AO 16.640 + 16.640 bis, RS 3.346/CTA 2 KTU 1.2 III : 2 | kpṭ* l ṛ* ḥ* q̣* [-i] / *[m. hkpt.]rhq | [Kaphtor] |
| 4  | RS 24.244 KTU 1.100: 45–46 | špš um ql bl ’m ktr w hss kpṭrh | Take my message to Kothar-wa-Khasis to Kapta |
| 5  | RS 16.238: 9–11 | [t] elep-šu za-ka-at [š]um-ma iš-šu maššaṭ-ri [?] | His ship is exempt when it arrives from Crete

---

**Approaching Levantine Shores** 33
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DO 4810/RS 18.80/PRU 5.78</th>
<th>bn apn krtý</th>
<th>Apn, son of the/a Cretan¹²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KTU 4.371: 17–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 34.122</td>
<td>krtý []</td>
<td>².¹³ A Cretan¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTU 4.760: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO 5031/RS 19.44/PRU 5.117</td>
<td>krtý 1 ildy* [ ]</td>
<td>A Cretan¹⁵ receive servants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTU 4.617: 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTU 4.617: 39</td>
<td>krtý 1</td>
<td>A Cretan¹⁶ receive servants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Follows KTU.
² Virolleaud 1937, 138; Virolleaud 1938, V AB, F, 14; Caquot et al. 1974, 99, 178; Cunchillos et al. 2003, 351.
⁴ Smith 1994, 159, 156: “Lines 1–6 are reconstructed from 1.3 VI 12–25, 155: [kptr]*, ks[u.žthk. hktpt. 'arr.n hlthf].”
⁵ Dietrich et al. 1976, 3, note 1.1 III (1): “z. 1–5 = KTU 1.3 VI 12–24”.
⁶ Smith 1994, 160, 156: “'atm.bsm.w'anf[snt.kptf]”, 158: Lines “17–21a are reconstructed on basis of 1.3 IV 32–6. See also the poorly preserved version in 1.2 III 2–3”.
⁷ According to Dietrich et al. 1976, note 1.1 III (5) the reconstruction of kptr made on grounds of the following hkpt in line 19 – corresponding to KTU 1.3 VI.
⁸ Dietrich et al. 1976, 7 note 1.2 III (1): Reconstructed on grounds of KTU 1.1 III; Smith 1994, 211: “'ktpr.l.rh.q'n.ks'[ilm.hkpt.lrhqf]”. Lines 2–3 are reconstructed on basis of 1.3 IV 32–6. See also the poorly preserved version in 1.2 III 2–3”.
¹⁰ Heltzer 1988, 12; the merchant Sinaranu is exempted from paying taxes.
¹² Dietrich 2007, 74: the texts are concerned with the first month of the year; Gordon 1965, Text 2078, 17–18, § 1314 in his Glossary; Virolleaud 1965, 104. The text lists men from the town of Ris.
¹³ Bordreuil 1975, 22–3: “La première ligne est pratiquement illisible. La forme du t est inhabituelle mais elle est connue par ailleurs.”
¹⁴ Dietrich 2007, 74; a list that might mention a Cretan.
¹⁵ Dietrich 2007, 74; servants are being appointed to a Cretan; Virolleaud 1965, 140. Found in the little palace; Gordon 1965, Text 2117, the text deals with personnel and their quotas.
¹⁶ Dietrich 2007, 74; servants are being appointed to a Cretan.
Catalogue of MM-LM I objects found in the Levant and beyond

All measurements are given in cm unless otherwise stated.

Abbreviations
Deco: Decoration
Exc: Excavated
Exc. no.: Excavation number
Ext: Exterior
H: Height
Imi: Imitation
Imp: Import
Int: Interior
Inv. no.: Inventory number
L: Length
T: Thickness
W: Width
Ø: Diameter

Ashdod

Ad 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: —.
Group: Pottery.
Description: —.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
Context: —.
Context date: —.
Stylistic date: LM I—II.
Comments: Hankey & Leonard: 2–10 pieces indicated; (Dothan & Freedman: A few pieces from the stratum of Myc. pottery. The described piece is dated LH IIA-B, B 161/5. Rim sherd, bowl with handle attachment, deco: red; Stratum 3, locus 521, large building, LB II, early). Impossible to verify if these are the pieces indicated by Hankey & Leonard.
References: Hankey & Leonard 1992, map 4/5; (Dothan & Fredmann 1967, 76, fig. 18.14, pl. XIV.1)

Ajjul

Aj 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: LZ9.1032.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Alabastron, body sherd, deco: large rosette.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
Context: Building S of palace.
Context date: —.
Stylistic date: LM IB/LH II.
Comments: Hankey & Leonard: LM IB or LH II; Petrie: Egyptian.

Ashkelon

Ak 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: —.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares cup, rim, deco: “wavy-line”.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
Context: Moat Deposit, Gate 1 Phase 14/Gate 2 Phase 13.
Stylistic date: MM III.
Comments: The piece(s) has(-ve) not been verified.
References: Hankey 1973, 104.

References:

Alalakh

Al 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: ATP/48/16.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Body sherd, deco: red spiral.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
Context: Level V, temple ruins.
Context date: —.
Stylistic date: MM III.
Comments: Åström: 1550–1435 BC. According to Albright’s chronology; Woolley: 1595–1447 BC.

Al 02
Inv. no./exc. no.: ATP47/50.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Alabastron, sherd, deco: marine style.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
Context: Level VI, disturbed stratum.
Context date: Betancourt & Weinstein: destroyed around 16. cent. BC.
Stylistic date: LM IB/LH IIA.
Comments: —.

Al 03
Inv. no./exc. no.: —.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Alabastron, fragments, deco: rosette and curved floral motif.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
AI 04

Inv. no./exc. no.: AT/47/82.
Group: Stone vase.
Description: Lamp, stemmed, fragmented, base and bowl same Ø.
Material: Basalt.

AI 05

Inv. no./exc. no.: BM GR, 1950.1–25.1. AT/39/280
Group: Stone vase.
Description: Stone lamp, unfinished, 12 wick holes.
Material: Brownish-red lime stone with white inclusions (Woolley: Marble).
Context: House 39/C, rubbish pit, between NW wall of room 16 and SW wall of main building.
Context date: LB IIB/Early Level II period (c. 1350 bc).
Stylistic date: MM III-LM IIIA.
Comments: Hankey: LM I; Sparks: Aegean craftsman in Alalakh or shipped unfinished?

AI 06

Inv. no./exc. no.: AT/38/146.

AI 07a

Inv. no./exc. no.: AM no. 1957.35.
Group: Mural.
Description: 15 fragments of creme coloured grass blown by the wind, red background. “Buon fresco” and details in “al secco”.
Material: Lime plaster painted with inorganic colours.
Measurements: 25 x 20. T intonaco max: 0.1.
Context: Yarimlim’s palace: Level VII, storeroom 13, fallen from room 4 – “Great salon” SW part.
Context date: MB III/MB IIC or late MB II/MB IIB.
Stylistic date: LM I/Aegean.

AI 07c

Inv. no./exc. no.: AM no. 1957.38 & 1957.39.
Group: Mural.
Description: 1957.38: Purple-brown triangles on red background, ending in a wavy line against white ground. Above this red again red background and green-grey ladder pattern; 1957.39: Red background with 2 narrow and 1 broad white line. “Buon fresco” with details “al secco”.
Material: Lime plaster painted with inorganic colours.
Measurements: 1957.38: 54 x 30.5 cm, 1957.39: 27 x 70, T. intonaco max: 0.1.
Context: Yarimlim’s palace: Level VII, storeroom 13, fallen from room 4 – “Great salon”.
Context date: MB III/MB IIC or late MB II/MB IIB.
Stylistic date: LM I/Aegean.
Comments: Woolley: Tree trunk and part of the tree top. Niemeier 1998

AI treatments

Al 07d
Inv. no./exc. no.: AM. Group: Mural.
Description: Plastered and painted basalt orthostats, deco: creamy yellow, brown and black marbling, above: representation of architecture. “Buon fresco” with details “al secco”.
Material: Lime plaster painted with inorganic colours.
Measurements: –.
Context: Yarimlim’s palace: Level VII, room 5 = chamber of audience Context date: MB III/MB IIC or late MB II/MB IIB. Stylistic date: c. LM 1A/Aegean.

Amman
Am 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Pottery.
Description: –.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: –.
Context date: –.
Stylistic date: LM I–II.

Am 02
Inv. no./exc. no.: AM (1980.308–10); Amman Archaeological Museum / S 44.
Group: Stone vase.
Description: Neck, rhyton, Warren Type B I; Koehl Type II HL O void. Material: Cretan limestone.
Measurements: H: 2.7; Ø: 6.6; W rim: 2.3; H of reconstructed rhyton: 20.
Context: Temple. Context date: LB II.
Stylistic date: LM I/Local.

Am 03
Inv. no./exc. no.: AM (1980.308–10); Amman Archaeological Museum / S 45.
Group: Stone vase.
Description: Neck, rhyton, Warren Type B I; Koehl Type II HL O void. Material: Cretan limestone.
Measurements: H: 2; Ø: 6.4; W rim: 2.
Context: Temple. Context date: LB II.
Stylistic date: LM I/Local.
Comments: Sparks: local chariot fitting.

Am 04
Inv. no./exc. no.: S 49.
Group: Stone vase.
Description: Stand, small, concave. Material: Cretan limestone.
Measurements: H: 2.5; Ø: upper 2.6; Ø: lower 3.8.
Context: Temple. Context date: LB II.
Stylistic date: LM I/Egyptian.
Comments: Sparks: Egyptian. References: Hankey 1973, 104; Hankey 1974, 175, fig. 3.49, pl. XXXIV D; Sparks 2007, 11–2, fig. 20.1, 329, no. 610.

Assur
As 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: BM 116360 / Assur S 20176.
Group: Misc.
Description: Rhyton, top; Koehl Type II HL O void. Material: Faience, frit.
Context: Ishtar temple, Room 5 below mud filling, coordinates eB7III. Context date: LB IIB, late.
Stylistic date: LM I(?).

Ain Shems/Beth Shemesh
AS 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares, sherd, dark red clay, deco: matt white geometric band on black-purple slip. Material: Clay.
Byblos

Bb 01

Inv. no./exc. no.: 4170.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Cup or bowl, deep, handleless, deco: red slip, white cross-
ing lines and stylized trees and dots in three superimposed zones.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: Levée XXI (4–4.2 m depth), level II, N of paving, room XXIII.
Stylistic date: –.
Stylistic date: MM I(B).
Comments: Byblos exc. In layers of 20 cm – no natural stratigraphy;
Schaeffer: MM I – earliest imported Cretan vase in the Levant; Mer-
rillees: MM IB.
References: Schaeffer 1948, 66, fig. 74, 1; Dunand 1937, pl. CLXIV nos. 4170 & 1939a, 311 no. 4170; Betancourt 1998, 6; Smith 1965, fig. 20d;

Bb 02

Inv. no./exc. no.: Museum of the American University at Beirut case 14 no. 17 no. 55. 121.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares, bridge-spouted jar, intact, finely levigated red clay, deco: floral, white and red.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: H: 14.4, Ø: 15.5.
Context: Tomb.
Stylistic date: –.
Stylistic date: MM I-IIIB.
Comments: –.
References: Cadogan 1983, 514, n. 111, 121; Merrillees 2003, 132, fig. 5.

Bb 03

Inv. no./exc. no.: Beirut National Museum no. B 3375.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares cup, rim, “egg-shell” ware, hemispherical; clay: fine, buff; deco: white and orange-red.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: Ø: 13.5.
Context: –.
Stylistic date: MM IIA.
Comments: –.
References: Cadogan 1983, 514, n.111; Merrillees 2003, 132, fig. 4.

Bb 04

Inv. no./exc. no.: Beirut National Museum B 3406.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares cup, base, deco: white.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: –.
Stylistic date: –.
Stylistic date: MM IIB.

Bb 05

Inv. no./exc. no.: 2986, Beirut National Museum, missing.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares, sherds, bridge-
spout. 7 sherds found, among these 1 handle and 1 spout. These sherds
derived acc. to Dunand (Schaeffer and Smith) from 2 vases (this and the
next number); Dunand’s reconstruction with 6 of 7 sherds.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: Temple (?), Levée X.
Stylistic date: –.
Stylistic date: MM I-IIIA.
Comments: From all 7 sherds one
reconstruction was made (Smith fig. 19, Betacourt pl. IIB). Mentioned as
Mycenean by Dunand; This and the
next no. are conceived as one jar by
Kemp & Merrillees and Betancourt;
Lambrou-Phillipson and Kemp &
Merrillees: MM I; Betancourt: MM
II; MacGillivray: MM IB-early MM
IIIA; Cadogan: MM IIA.
References: Lambrou-Phillipson 1990,
69; Smith 1965, 13, fig.19; Cadogan
1983, 514; Schaeffer 1948, 66–67,
fig. 74,2–4; Betancourt 1998, 6 pl.
IIB; Kemp & Merrillees 1980, 274;
Dunand 1939a, 191, no. 2986; 1937,
pl. CLXXXVII, no. 2986; Merrillees
2003, 131–2; MacGillivray 1998,
106; Cadogan 1983, 514.
Stylistic date: MM I-IIIA early.
Comments: From all 7 sherds one reconstruction was made (Smith 1965, fig. 19, Betancourt pl. IIb). Mentioned as Mycenaean by Dunand; This and the former no. are conceived as one jar by Kemp & Merrillees and Betancourt; Lambrou-Phillipson and Kemp & Merrillees: MM I; Betancourt: MM II; MacGillivray: MM IB-early MM IIIA.

Bb 07
Inv. no./exc. no.: Beirut National Museum.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares cup, strap handle.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: Niveau II.
Context date: MB I/IIA-II/IIB.
Stylistic date: MM.
Comments: Exc. in 1939; unpublished; Merrillees: exc. in 1938.

Bb 08
Inv. no./exc. no.: Beirut National Museum.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares cup, strap handle.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: Niveau II.
Context date: MB I/IIA-II/IIB.
Stylistic date: MM.
Comments: Exc. in 1939; unpublished; Merrillees: exc. in 1938.

Bb 09
Inv. no./exc. no.: 6549.
Group: Pottery.
Description: 3 sherds, deco: “ogival canopy”, Palace style.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: T: 0.5.
Context: Tranchée 67, bordering the sea and the “zone quadrillé”.
Stylistic date: –.
Stylistic date: LM IB/LH IIA.
Comments: Dunand & Stubbings: Mycenaean.
References: Dunand 1939a, 6549; 1937, pl. CLXXVII; Stubbings 1951, 53–4, fig. 10a–c; Hankey 1973, 107.

Bb 10
Inv. no./exc. no.: 1575.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Sherd, closed shape, deco: Marine style.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: Temple, Levée II, 28.80–28.60 m.
Stylistic date: –.
Stylistic date: LM IB/LH IIA.
Comments: By Dunand not recognized as Aegean.
References: Moutjoy 1984, 217, fig. 27; Dunand 1927, 106, no. 1575, pl. CLXXXVII; Stubbings 1951, 54, fig. 10d; Leonard 1994, 129, no. 1923; Hankey 1973, 107.

Bb 11
Inv. no./exc. no.: Beirut National Museum.
Group: Metal vase.
Description: Bowl, fragmented with spiral deco. in 2 bands.
Material: Silver.
Measurements: O: c. 15.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA, Ammenemhet III.
Stylistic date: MM IB-MM IIB/Anatolian/(Local) imi.
Comments: Davis: not Minoan – more likely Anatolian. Potter: Mycenaean; MacGillivray: MM IIB; Cadogan: MM IB/MM II or imi., c. 1800–1790 BC.
References: Virolleaud 1922, 284, figs. 4–5, no. 11 and pl. LXIV; Cadogan 1983, 514; Schaeffer 1948, fig. 63M; Montet 1928, 191–2, no. 748; 1929, pl. CXI, 748; Davis 1977, 83–5; fig. 64; Potter 1922, 298–300; Kantor 1947, 20; Buchholz 1999, fig. 101a; MacGillivray 1998, 105–6.

Bb 12
Inv. no./exc. no.: Beirut National Museum.
Group: Metal vase.
Description: Bowl, 13 fragments, deco: spirals in repoussé.
Material: Silver.
Measurements: –.
Context: Tomb II (Ypchemouabi, son of Abishemu), near Tomb I, Djebail rock SW of castle.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA, Ammenemhet III–IV.
Stylistic date: MM IB/MM II/Anatolian/(Local) imi.
Comments: Davis: Possible imi. of the bowl in Tomb I and regards Anatolia as the most probable origin of the original; Cadogan: imp or imi.

Bb 13
Inv. no./exc. no.: Beirut Museum, 17309.
Group: Metal vase.
Description: Jug with high foot, int. repairs, channeled body, long spout and high looped handle.
Material: Silver.
Measurements: H: 14; O: 15.6.
Context: Limestone sarcophagus in Tomb I (Abishemu), Djebail rock SW of castle.
Context date: MB I/MB II A, Ammenemhet III.
Stylistic date: Minoan?/Anatolian/(Local) imi.
Comments: Davis: not Minoan – more likely Anatolian. Potter: Mycenaean; Montet: local; Higgins: Minoan or imi.; MacGillivray: not
central Crete.

References: Virolleaud 1922, 282 figs. 4–5 no.10 and pl. LXIV; Schaeffer 1948, 65, fig. 63; Montet 1929, pl. CXI, 746; Davis 1977, 79–83, fig. 60; Pottier 1922, 300–1; Kantor 1947, 20; Montet 1928, 189–90, no. 746; MacGillivray 1998, 105–6; Warren 1980, 105; Higgins 1967, 40; Caubet 1998, 85, fig. in text p. 83.

**Bb 14**

**Inv. no./exc. no.:** Beirut National Museum.

**Group:** Metal vase.

**Description:** Jug, very similar to jug from Tomb I, though larger and with lid and sieve.

**Material:** Silver.

**Measurements:** H: 17.1.

**Context:** Tomb II (Ypchemouabi, son of Abishemu), near Tomb I, Djebail rock SW of castle.

**Context date:** MB I/MB IIA, Ammenemhet III–IV.

**Stylistic date:** Minoan?/(Local) imi.

**Comments:** Davis: Later than the silver jug from Tomb I and possibly a local copy of it.; Monter: Local; Higgins: Minoan or local imi.

**References:** Schaeffer 1948, fig. 63; Montet 1928, 190–1 no. 747; 1929, pl. CXII 747; Davis 1977, 79–83, fig. 59 & 61; Kantor 1947, 20; Warren 1980, 105; Higgins 1967, 40.

**Bb 15**

**Inv. no./exc. no.:** Beirut National Museum.

**Group:** Metal vase.

**Description:** Cup, semiglobular/hemispherical, smooth with out-turned rim.

**Material:** Bronze.

**Measurements:** Ø: 7.

**Context:** Limestone sarcophagus in Tomb I (Abishemu), in pot no. 7, Djebail rock SW of castle.

**Context date:** MB I/MB IIA, Ammenemhet III.

**Stylistic date:** MM IB/MM II/imi?

**Comments:** Cadogan MM IB or MM II imp. or inspiration.

**References:** Cadogan 1983, 514; Virolleaud 1922, 279 fig. 2+2bis (Only one of this and the former no. is depicted – uncertain which).

**Bb 16**

**Inv. no./exc. no.:** Beirut National Museum.

**Group:** Metal vase.

**Description:** Cup, hemispherical, smooth, out-turned rim.

**Material:** Bronze.

**Measurements:** Ø: 7.

**Context:** Limestone sarcophagus in Tomb I (Abishem), in pot no. 7, Djebail rock SW of castle.

**Context date:** MB I/MB IIA, Ammenemhet III.

**Stylistic date:** MM IB/MM II/imi?

**Comments:** Cadogan MM IB or MM II imp. or inspiration.

**References:** Cadogan 1983, 514; Virolleaud 1922, 279, fig. 2+2bis (Only one of this and the former no. is depicted – uncertain which).

**Bb 17**

**Inv. no./exc. no.:** Beirut National Museum.

**Group:** Metal vase.

**Description:** Jug, hole in body.

**Material:** Bronze.

**Measurements:** H: 35.

**Context:** Limestone sarcophagus in Tomb I (Abishem), Djebail rock SW of castle.

**Context date:** MB I/MB IIA, Ammenemhet III.

**Stylistic date:** Minoan/Aegean.

**Comments:** Evans: Minoan.

**References:** Virolleaud 1922, 288, pi. CL; Kantor 1947, 20, n. 29; Warren 1969, 17; Sparks 2007, 11, 280, no. 8.

**Bb 18**

**Inv. no./exc. no.:** Beirut National Museum No. 12179.

**Group:** Seal.

**Description:** Lentoid, very worn, deco: goat or stag.

**Material:** Steatite.

**Measurements:** Ø: 1.6.

**Context:** Levée I, temple area, square 3.

**Context date:** —.

**Stylistic date:** LM I.

**Comments:** Not recognised as Minoan by Dunand. According to Müller: probably LM I lentoid of a soft stone. Attributions with reservation made from Dunands old publication.

**References:** Dunand 1939a, 91, no. 1332; 1937 pi. CXXVII; Miiller 1932; 1937, pl. XXXI; Müller pers. comm. January 2009.

**Bb 19**

**Inv. no./exc. no.:** Beirut Museum No. 2498.

**Group:** Stone vase.

**Description:** Bowl, hemispherical, deco: floral relief, Warren's blossom bowl.

**Material:** Steatite.

**Measurements:** H: 4.5.

**Context:** 1.2 m. depth in the middle of trench 63.

**Context date:** —.

**Stylistic date:** End MM III–LM I.

**Comments:** —.

**References:** Dunand 1939a, 418 no. 6498 and 1937 pl. CL; Kantor 1947, 20, n. 29; Warren 1969, 17; Sparks 2007, 11, 280, no. 8.

**Bb 20**

**Inv. no./exc. no.:** Exc. no. 15596.

**Group:** Stone vase.

**Description:** Lamp with two wick holes.

**Material:** Green stone, schist/"gabbro".

**Measurements:** H: 8.8; Ø: 14.

**Context:** Rectangle 12/16, depth: 24.60–24.40, Levée XVIII.

**Context date:** —.

**Stylistic date:** LM I.

**Comments:** Dunand indicates this might be a lamp but did not recognize it as Minoan.

**References:** Dunand 1958, 783, no. 15596; Dunand 1950, pl. CCV; Hankey 1973, 104; Warren pers. comm. May 2008; Sparks 2007, 279 no. 3.

**Bb 21**

**Inv. no./exc. no.:** —.

**Group:** Misc.

**Description:** Scraper, concave sides and convex cutting edge, 2 holes preserved.

**Material:** Bronze.

Annette Højen Sorensen
Measurements: L: c. 5.5, W: 3.9, T: 0.2.
Context: –.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA.
Stylistic date: EM III-MM IA.
Comments: Branigan: The scraper, a pyxis lid (cf. Main text 1, p. 12–3) and a votive agrimi horn (Bb 22) are the earliest Cretan exports to the Levant; Lambrou-Phillipson: context: MB I.

References: Branigan 1967, 120, ill. 2.5; 1970, 43, 7; Betancourt 1998, 6, pl. 11c; Lambrou-Phillipson 1990, 69; Dunand 1939a, 254, no. 3707 fig. 222.

Bb 22
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Misc.
Description: Votive agrimi horn.
Material: Bronze or copper.
Measurements: –.
Context: –.
Context date: –.
Stylistic date: EM III - MM IA.
Comments: Branigan: This piece, the scraper (Bb 21) and a pyxis lid (cf. main text 1, p. 12-3) are the earliest Cretan exports; the piece has not been verified.


Beirut
Br 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: Beirut National Museum no. F.620. Exc. No. 45.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares cup, stemmed double base, intact, “egg shell” ware, deco: polychrome.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: Uncertain, mended (H: 15, Ø: 23).
Context: Karji cemetery, Grotte 4, chambre 1/Tomb 1.
Stylistic date: MM IIA-MM IIIA.
Comments: MacGillivray: MM IIb/early MM IIIA.

Gz 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Cup, body, deco: ext. figure eight shield and rosette, “Alternating style”.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: Near the palace in II 28.
Context date: Macalister: 2nd Semitic period (2nd intermediate period up to and including 18. Dyn.).
Stylistic date: LM IB/LH II.

Gz 02
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Cup, rim and body, base missing, deco: ext. running spiral.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: –.
Context date: –.
Stylistic date: LM IA or B(?).
Comments: –.

Gz 03
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Rim sherd, deco: wavy line, floral.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: –.
Context date: –.
Stylistic date: MM.
Comments: The piece has not been verified.

Hama
Hm 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Pottery.
Description: –.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: –.
Context date: –.
Stylistic date: MM.
Comments: –.
References: –.

Haror
Hr 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: Inv. no. 20984.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Body sherd, large vessel
(pithos?), graffito made pre-firing, 3 logogrammes. From the right: fig, textile + TE and bulls head. Because of the date either Hieroglyphs or Linear A. Sherd deliberately removed from pithos.

Material: Clay.

Measurements: T: 1.4, ext. dimension 10 x 10.

Context: Area K, locus 8038 upper floor – phase K4a, sanctuary.

Context date: MB III/MB IIB

Stylistic date: Minoan.

Comments: Oren et al.: NAA and petrographic analysis showed non-Cretan or Israelic clay; Day et al: More refined micropalaeontologic analysis points to Crete and maybe even the area around Pyrgos on the S coast.


Hazor

Hz 01

Inv. no./exc. no.: Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem reg.no. C 778/20 (Acc. to Yadin et al. 1960, no. C 718/10) and C 370/18.

Group: Pottery.

Description: Kamares, open shape, 2 joining sherds, deco: greyish-black slip, white spirals int. and ext.

Material: Clay.

Measurements: T: 0.8.

Context: Area C, lower town, Locus 6206, Stratum 3.

Context date: End MB III/MB IIC.

Stylistic date: MM IIB or MM IIIA.

Comments: Dothan et al.: Petrographic analysis points to Crete. Another sherd C370/17 is dismissed as Cretan from the petrographic analysis.

Merrillees: Its Cretan origin is questioned by Cadogan and Betancourt; Wålberg: Classical Kamares.


Hz 02

Inv. no./exc. no.: A 6470/1.

Group: Pottery.

Description: 2 sherds, perhaps three-handled jar, deco: dark on light, lily.

Material: Clay.

Measurements: –.

Context: Area A, Locus I. 20. (225.00), unstratified.

Stylistic date: LM IB/LH IIA.

Comments: Yadin: Mycenean.

References: Yadin, Mycenean.

Lime plaster painted with inorganic colours.

Measurements: –.

Context: Palace: Area D, Fill in doorway between rooms 611 & 607, room 740 and fill in corridor 698, outside palace on wall/road 2129.

Kb 02a

Inv. no./exc. no.: –.

Group: Mural.

Description: Fragments of a miniature frieze with houses, ships, swallow and other details. “Buon fresco” with details “al secco”.

Material: Lime plaster painted with inorganic colours.

Measurements: –.

Context: Palace: Area N of Room 740, behind wall 673, loci 2027 & 2033, destruction debris.

Kb 02b

Inv. no./exc. no.: –.

Group: Mural.

Description: 45 wall plaster fragments, coloured, 1 with string impression.

Material: Plaster, possibly painted.

Measurements: –.

Context: Palace, Area N of Room 740, behind wall 673, loci 2027 & 2033, destruction debris.

Kb 02c

Inv. no./exc. no.: –.

Group: Mural.

Description: Floor, deco: Grid made of red string impressed lines. Marbling and floral motifs. Colours: red, yellow, brown, grey, blue and black. “Buon fresco”.

Material: Lime plaster painted with inorganic colours.

Measurements: 10,3 x 10.3. In all over
Kâmid el-Lôz

KL 01
Inv no./exc. no.: 670
(KL78:1204).

Group: Pottery.

Description: Bridge-spouted jar, fragmented.

Material: Clay.

Measurements: —.


Context date: c.1480–1340 bc/LB.

Stylistic date: LM IB.

Comments: Livelyquist: Eight sherds excavated in 1978 (handle and body sherds) have been identified as the missing original sherds from a partly restored bridge-spouted jar bought on the art market.

References: Miron 1990, Abb. 82-3; Livelyquist 1994, 107–208, figs. 33–34, pl. 16.

Lachish

Le 01
Inv no./exc. no.: 31194 (List no. 131).

Group: Pottery.

Description: Alabastron, tall, sherd, deco: Marine style, octopus.

Material: Clay.

Measurements: —.

Context: Area GE 1, Locus 4585, domestic remains just N of inner City Gate, room(?); 4168; Fills of IV floor.

Context date: IR-II A.

Stylistic date: LM IB/LH II A.

Comments: —.


Nami

Nm 01
Inv no./exc. no.: —.

Group: Misc.

Description: Lathyrus Clymenum, 259 seeds in and outside 4 storage jars on floor.

Material: Charred seeds.

Measurements: —.

Context: Storeroom C1 and courtyard C2.

Context date: MB I/MB II A; No later than 1750 bc.

Stylistic date: Aegean/ Perhaps Cre- tan.

Comments: Kislev et al: Lathyrus Cly- menum is not indigenous to the Near East but in the Aegean (and further west). The present specimens show most resemblance with modern Cre-
tan specimens. Earliest Aegean finds:
West House, Akrotiri, LM IA and
LM II house at Knossos.
 References: Kislev, Artzy & Marcus

Pella
PI 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Pottery.
Description: –.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: –.
Context date: –.
Stylistic date: LM I–II.
Comments: Uncertain number of objects – between 1 and 10; The pieces
have not been verified.
 References: Hankey & Leonard 1992,
map 4/5.

Qatna
Qt 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares cup, rim, deco: white and red.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: N side of palace hill/cliff.
Context date: du Mesnil du Buisson:
around 15th cent. bc; Ward: Stratum
temporary with MB I/MB IIA
in Ugarit.
Stylistic date: MM IIA/B.
Comments: Merrillees and MacGillivray: no context is recorded in the
report. Cadogan & Ward: MM IIA;
Walberg: Classical Kamares; MacGillivray:
MM IIB.
 References: Cadogan 1983, 514;
Äström 1961–62, 146; Smith 1965,
14, fig. 20c; du Mesnil du Buisson
1926, 325, fig. 41; Schaeffer 1948,
117, fig. 102; Walberg 1987a, 70;
Ward 1971, 78; Merrillees 2003,
131; MacGillivray 1998, 106.

Sidon
Sd 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: S 3011.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Cup, Kamares, intact,
MacGillivray: Tall rimmed angular/
carinated cup, deco: white and or-
ange.
Material: Clay.
Context: Animal bone deposit next
to warrior tomb 23.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA, early.
Stylistic date: MM IIA.
Comments: MacGillivray: Origin:
Mesara.
 References: Doumet-Serhal 2003, 12–
3; 2008, 21, 33, figs. 32, 34, fig. 33; MacGillivray 2003, 20–4;

Sukas
Sk 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: –.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Bridge-spouted jar, 4
shards, among these a large handle
fragment, deco: spiral.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: Depot 1 destruction layer.
Context date: LB I/Tutmosis III’s 23rd
reg. year.
Stylistic date: LM IB/LH I.
Comments: Leonard: Chemical analy-
sis showed central Crete or Pelopon-
nese as point of origin; Manning
LM IIA; von Beckerath 1997 and
Kitchen 2000: 1456 bc; Warren &
Hankey: Some scholars do not think
the city was sacked by Thutmosis III.
 References: Warren & Hankey 1989,
116, 142 figs. 6–7; Hankey 1993,
106, no. 39; Ström 1982, 370; Buch-
holz 1974, 416; Betancourt & Wein-
stein 1976, 338; Leonard 1994, 195
LM#12, n. 208; Hankey & Leon-
ard 1998, 32; Manning 2007, 122;
Hankey 1973, 107, 109; Lapp 1967,
32–3, fig. 23; Sørensen 2009, fig. 3.

Ugarit
Ug 01
Inv. no./exc. no.: Louvre, Storeroom
no. AO 13149.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares cup, almost in-
tact, deco: very corroded.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: –.
Context: Necropolis between Ba’al
and Dagan temples.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA/UM2.
Stylistic date: MM IIA.
Comments: –.
 References: Saltz 1977, 55; Schaeffer
1948, 22, pl. XII,25; 1939b, 22, 54;
1949, pl. XVI,25; Kemp & Mer-
 rillees 1980, 274; Kantor 1947, 18;
Karageorghis 1965, 203, n. 3; Mer-
 rillees 2003, 128, fig. 1, pl. 1a.

Ug 02
Inv. no./exc. no.: Louvre, Ras Shamra
hall inv. no. AO 20365/Inv.no.
11.573 EC 2347.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares cup, intact, “egg
shell” ware, deco: Ivy, circulating the
cup.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: Ø: 12, H: 6.5.
Context: Dromos of tomb 86 in 6.77
m. depth.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA/UM 2.
Stylistic date: MM IIA.
Comments: Saltz: Problematic con-
text, no other published finds from
same context; MacGillivray suggests
the cup has been painted over in LM
IA, generations after manufacture.
 References: Schaeffer 1939b, 22; 1949,
256, fig. 109 and pl. XXXVIII; 1939a,
279–80; Schaeffer 1962, xxxi; Saltz
1977, 54; Kemp & Mer rillees 1980,
274; Smith 1945, 4–5; Buchholz 1974,
400; Merrillees 2003, 130–1, pl. 1b;
Siebenmorgen 2000, 319, no. 305;
MacGillivray 1998, 106.
Ug 03
Inv. no./exc. no.: AM no. 1938.581.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Cup, hemispherical, rim sherd.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
Context: Ossuary below Tomb 36?
Context date: MB II/MB IIB.
Stylistic date: MM IIA.
Comments: Merrillees: this sherd might derive from the ossuary under tomb 36 (same deposit as Ug 05) and thus be inv. No. 1.536 in Vallois & Ferembach.

Ug 04
Inv. no./exc. no.: Unknown.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Bridge-spouted jar, spout fragment.
Material: Clay.
Context: Southern acropolis, topographical point 3739.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA/UM 2.
Stylistic date: MM II (A?)/Local imi.?
Comments: Merrillees: maybe local imi.
References: Courtois 1978, 218–9, fig. 8,2; Merrillees 2003, 131.

Ug 05
Inv. no./exc. no.: Louvre inv. no. AO 25554/Inv. No. 8843.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares, rim, “eggshell” ware, deco: floral.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: O: 10; Merrillees O 14.5.
Context: Tomb 36, ossuary below clay floor.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA/UM 2.
Stylistic date: MM IIA/B.
Comments: Vallois & Ferembach: 1962, 567: hints that two Kamares ware sherd were found here (nos. 8.843 and 1.536); Schaeffer only mentions one cup sherd from this context; MacGillivray: MM IIB.

Ug 06
Inv. no./exc. no.: Louvre R.S. 62.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares, sherd, hand-made, large closed vessel, burnished, clay: coarse, gritty, deco: red-brown and white.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: T: 0.95.
Context: Southern Acropolis.
Context date: —.
Stylistic date: MM IIB.
Comments: —.
References: Merrillees 2003, 131, pl. 1c.

Ug 07
Inv. no./exc. no.: —.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares, rim, “eggshell” ware.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
Context: Palace Garden stratum 2.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA/UM 2.
Stylistic date: (MM).
Comments: Kuschke does not mention if this or the former no. stems from the same vase.
References: Kuschke 1962, pl. III, 6; Merrillees 2003, 131.

Ug 08
Inv. no./exc. no.: —.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Kamares, rim, “eggshell” ware.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: O: 10.
Context: Palace Garden stratum 2.
Context date: MB I/MB IIA/UM 2.
Stylistic date: (MM).
Comments: Kuschke does not mention if this or the former no. stems from the same vase.
References: Kuschke 1962, pl. III, 5; Merrillees 2003, 131.

Ug 09
Inv. no./exc. no.: —.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Base, deco: Marine Style.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
Context: Near Tomb IV, 5 cm depth.
Context date: —.
Stylistic date: LM IB/LH IIA.
Comments: Schaeffer: Myceanean, found near cuneiform tablet; Leonard lists the piece as found in Minet el-Beida.

Ug 10
Inv. no./exc. no.: RS 1933.
Group: Pottery.
Description: Sherd, deco: dark brown zig-zag pattern, dots.
Material: Clay.
Measurements: —.
Context: Grave 5.
Context date: LB II/UR 3.
Stylistic date: LM I?
Comments: Schaeffer did not recognize this piece as Minoan; Kemp & Merrillees 1980 counts the sherd as “possible” LM I vase; Schaeffer: UM 3 = 1365–1200 bc.
References: Schaeffer 1949, 136–7, fig. 50.1; Lambrou-Phillipson 1990, 70; Kemp & Merrillees 1980, 275.

Ug 11
Inv. no./exc. no.: Louvre 84 A O 410, RS 8.538.
Group: Stone vase.
Description: Cup (lamp?) with long handle, deco: 4 grooves below rim.
Material: Chlorite.
Measurements: H: 4; L: 7.5.
Context: Acropolis, trench slope, 2°–3° niveau.
Context date: MB II/MB IIB.
Stylistic date: Minoan.
Comments: Sparks: Cup: EM II-MM I, lamp: MM-LM I; Caubet: Not recognized as foreign.
References: Sparks 2007, fig. 1.3, 11, 279, no. 6; Caubet 1991, 209, pl. I.7, VIII.1.

**Ug 12**

**Inv. no./exc. no.**: 83.5156.

**Group**: Stone vase.

**Description**: Conical base(?) fragment, ridge at narrow end, deco: incised chevrons.

**Material**: Chlorite.

**Measurements**: L: 3.4; Max. Ø: 1.9; Ø ridge: 1.6.

**Context**: Rue 35 (next to “Temple aux Rhytons”).

**Context date**: LB.

**Stylistic date**: Minoan?

**Comments**: Sparks: miniature or model vessel. Origin: ?

**References**: Eliott 1991, 52, fig. 15.7-8; Sparks 2007, fig. 1.6, 11, 280, no. 10.

**Ug 13**

**Inv. no./exc. no.**: RS 1–31.[014] Louvre 85 AO 742.

**Group**: Stone vase.

**Description**: Jar, globular, fragment, shoulder, deco: spirals.

**Material**: Chlorite.

**Measurements**: H: 2.9, Ø: 3.5.

**Context**: «Sanctuaire à l’est» (?).

**Context date**: LB.

**Stylistic date**: Minoan?

**Comments**: –.

**References**: Caubet 1991, 241, pl. XII.12; Sparks 2007, fig. 1.5, 11, 280, no. 9.

**Ug 14**

**Inv. no./exc. no.**: RS 15.257 Damascus?

**Group**: Stone vase.

**Description**: Vase(?), fragments, deco: vertical spirals.

**Material**: Diorite.

**Measurements**: H: 21.

**Context**: Royal Palace, Area 45, topographical point 149, 0.7 m and 167 at 2.4 m.

**Context date**: LB/UR.

**Stylistic date**: Minoan?

**Comments**: Caubet compares the piece to 16.022 which is compared to the lamp 2.041, but she has not seen the piece. Pers. comm. May 20 2008.


**Unknown**

**Uk 01**

**Inv. no./exc. no.**: Beirut National Museum, B 16728/ 11/3 N3 XXVII.

**Group**: Pottery.

**Description**: Kamares, Vapheio cup, strap handle, fragmented, “egg shell” ware, flat base, deco: spiral.

**Material**: Clay.

**Measurements**: (H: 7, Ø: 10) uncertain – mended.

**Context**: Kharji tomb area/?

**Context date**: –.

**Stylistic date**: MM.

**Comments**: Buchholz 1974, 400; Strom 1982, 370 mention one intact cup from Byblos in the Beirut National Museum with the incorrect nr. 11/3/13/XXVII; Merrillees: This cup has been counted as from either Beirut or Byblos by different scholars. B 16728 and 11/3 N3 XX-VII is actually one and the same cup of uncertain origin.

**References**: Saidah 1993-94, pi. 17, 2a-c; Merrillees 2003, 132, figs. 6–7; Cadogan 1983, 514, n. 111.

**Uk 02**

**Inv. no./exc. no.**: BM 1956.6–30.2.

**Group**: Seal.


**Material**: Pale green jasper or marble.

**Measurements**: –.

**Context**: –.

**Context date**: –.

**Stylistic date**: MM IIA.

**Comments**: –.

**References**: Kenna 1965, no. 56, pi. 4; Lambrou-Phillipson 1990, 278; Buchholz 1974, 436.

**Uk 03**

**Inv. no./exc. no.**: Maritime Museum Haifa.

**Group**: Seal.

**Description**: Prism, deco: ship.

**Material**: –.

**Measurements**: –.

**Context**: –.

**Context date**: –.

**Stylistic date**: MM II.

**Comments**: Müller: the seal might have been found at Byblos.

**References**: Basch 1987, 102, D4, 121; Müller pers. comm. January 2009.

**Uk 04**

**Inv. no./exc. no.**: AM no. 1890.106.

**Group**: Seal.

**Description**: Prism, 3-sided, deco: a. calf + plough(?), b. separated in four spaces each depicting a shell, c. hard to identify – like a.

**Material**: Dark green or black steatite.

**Measurements**: L: 1.4, W: 1.2; 1.0; 1, Ø. String hole: 0.25.

**Context**: –.

**Context date**: –.

**Stylistic date**: MM.

**Comments**: Mentioned by Lambrou-Phillipson as Syrian(? import to the Aegean.

**References**: Kenna 1960, 96, no. 56, pl. 4; Lambrou-Phillipson 1990, 278; Buchholz 1974, 436.

**Uk 05**

**Inv. no./exc. no.**: AM no. 1889.660.

**Group**: Seal.

**Description**: Signet, deco: palm branch and 2 other signs. Acc. to Kenna: possibly gilded.

**Material**: Bronze.

**Measurements**: H: 1.5, Ø. Stamp surface: 1, Ø. String hole: 0.2

**Context**: –.

**Context date**: –.

**Stylistic date**: MM.

**Comments**: –.

**References**: Kenna 1960, 104, no. 116 pl. 6.
Bibliography

Akkermans, P.M.M.G. & G.M. Schwartz 2003
The archaeology of Syria. From complex hunter-gatherers to early urban societies (ca. 16,000–300 BC.), Cambridge.

Amiet, P. 1992
Corpus des cylindres de Ras Shamra-Ougarit II: Scœaux-cylindres en hémathie et pierres diverses, (Ras Shamra-Ougarit IX (RSO)). Paris.

Andrae, W. 1935
Die jungeren Ischtar-Tempel in Assur, (WVDG 58), Leipzig.

Åström, P. 1961–1962
‘Remarks on Middle Minoan chronology’ in Proceedings of the first International Cretological Congress, CretChron 1-5, 137–50.

Åström, P. 1972

Bagh, T. 2002
‘Painted pottery at the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age: Levantine Painted Ware’, in The Middle Bronze Age in the Levant, M. Bietak (ed.), Wien, 89–101.

Baramki, D. 1967
The Archaeological Museum of the American University of Beirut, Beirut.

Baramki, D. 1973
‘A tomb of the Early and Middle Bronze Age at Byblos’, BmusBeyr 26, 27–30.

Bardet, G., F. Ioannès, B. Lafent, D. Soubeiran & P. Villard 1984
Archives administratives de Mari. (Archives Royale de Mari 23 (ARM)), Paris.

Basch, L. 1987
Le musée imaginaire de la marine antique, Athens.

Beckerath, J.von 1997
Chronologie des Pharonischen Ägypten, Mainz am Rhein.

Ben-Tor, A. 1982
‘The relations between Egypt and the land of Canaan during the third millennium B.C.’, The journal of Jewish studies, 3–18.

Best, J. 1989

Best, J. & F. Woudhuizen 1988
Ancient scripts in Crete and Cyprus, Leiden.

Betancourt, P.P. 1998

Betancourt, P. P. & G.A. Weinstein 1976

Bevan, A. 2007
Stone vessels and values in the Bronze Age Mediterranean, Cambridge.

Bietak, M. (ed.) 2000

Bietak, M. (ed.) 2002
The Middle Bronze Age in the Levant, Wien.

Bietak, M. (ed.) 2003

Bietak, M. (ed.) 2007a

Bietak, M. 2007b

Bietak, M., K. Kopetzky, L.E. Stager & R. Voss 2009
‘Synchronisation of stratigraphies: Ashkelon and Tell el-Dab’a’, Ägypten und Levante 18, 49–60.

Bordreuil, P. 1975
Bordreuil, P. & D. Pardee 2004
Manuel d’ougaritique, Paris.

Branigan, K. 1966
‘Byblite daggers in Cyprus and Crete’, AJA 70, 123–6.

Branigan, K. 1967
‘Further light on prehistoric relations between Crete and Byblos’, AJA 71, 117–21.

Branigan, K. 1970
The foundations of palatial Crete, London.

Buchholz, H.G. 1974

Buchholz, H.G. 1999
Ugarit, Zypern und Agais; AOAT 261, Münster.

Cadogan, G 1983
‘Early and Middle Minoan chronology’, AJA 87, 507–19.

Caquot, A., M. Sznycer & A. Herdner 1974
Textes Ougaritiques, Tome I, Mythes et legends, Paris.

Caquot, A. & J.-M. de Tarragon 1989

Caubet, A. 1991

Caubet, A. 1998

Chapman, R.L. 1989

Chapman, R.L. 1990

Chapman, R.L. 2009

Cline, E. 1994
Sailing the wine-dark sea, Oxford.

Cline, E. 1995

Cline, E.H. 1999
‘The nature of the economic relations of Crete with Egypt and the Near East during the Bronze Age,” in From Minoan farmers to Roman traders: sidelights on the economy of ancient Crete, A. Chaniotis (ed.), Munich, 115–43.

Cline, E.H. 2003

Cohen, S.L. 2002
Canaanites, chronologies, and connections. The relationship of Middle Bronze IIA Canaan to Middle Kingdom Egypt, Winona Lake.

Colburn, C.S. 2008

Courtois, J.-C. & L. 1978

A concordance of Ugaritic words, New Jersey.

Davis, E.N. 1977
The Vaphio cups and Aegean gold and silver ware, New York & London.

Day, P.M., E.D. Oren, L. Joyner & P.S. Quinn, 1999

Dietrich, M. 2007

Dietrich, M., O. Loretz & J. Sanmartin 1976
Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, (AOAT 24,1), Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Dietrich, M. & Loretz, O. 2000
Studien zu den Ugaritischen Texten I, (AOAT 269,1,) Münster.
Dossin, G. 1939  
‘Les archives économiques de palais de Mari’,  *Syria* 20, 97–113.

Dothan, M. & D.N. Freedman 1967  
*Ashdod I. The first season of excavations 1962*, Jerusalem.

‘Kamares ware at Hazor’,  *IEJ* 50, 1–2, 1–15.

Doumet-Serhal, C. 2003  

Doumet-Serhal, C. 2008  
‘The British Museum excavation at Sidon: markers for the chronology of the Early and Middle Bronze Age in Lebanon’, in *The Bronze Age in the Lebanon*, M. Bietak & E. Czerny (eds.), Wien, 11–44.

Dunand, M. 1927  
‘La cinquième campagne des fouilles de Byblos’,  *Syria* 8, 93–104.

Dunand, M. 1937  

Dunand, M. 1939a  

Dunand, M. 1939b  
‘Chronique’,  *BmusBeyr* 3, 77–85.


Durand, J.-M. 1990  

Duran, J.-M. 1990  

Elliot, C. 1991  

Evans, A. 1928  

Evans, A. 1935  
*The palace of Minos*, vol. IV, London.

Evely, D. (curator) 1999  
*Fresco: a passport into the past: Minoan Crete through the eyes of Mark Cameron*, Athens.

Feldman, M.H. 2006  

Finkelberg, M. 1998  

Finkelberg, M., A. Uchitel & D. Ussishkin 1996  
‘A Linear A inscription from Tel Lachish’,  *Tel Aviv* 23, 2, 195–207.

Finkelberg, M., A. Uchitel & D. Ussishkin, 2004  

Fischer, P.  

Friedrich, W. L., B. Kromer, M. Friedrich, J. Heneneier, T. Pfeiffer, & S. Talamo 2006  

Furumark, A. 1972  
*Mycenaean pottery*, Stockholm.

Gardiner, A.H. 1909  
*The admonitions of an Egyptian sage*, Leipzig.

Gibson, J.C.L. 1999  

Gillis, C., R. Clayton, E. Pernicka & N. Gale 2003  

Gordon, C.H. 1965  

Gordon, C.H. 1966  
*Ugarit and Minoan Crete*, New York.

Grant, E. & G.E. Wright 1938  

Gray, J. 1966  
‘Hazor’,  *Vetus Testamentum*, 16.1, 26–52.

Guichard, M. 1993a  
Guichard, M. 1993b

Guichard, M. 1999

Guichard, M. 2005
La vaiselle de luxe des wis Mari: matériaux pour le dictionnaire de Babyloniens de Paris, tome 2. (Archives Royales de Mari XXXI (ARM)), Paris.

Haider, P.W. 1988
Griechenland-Nordafrika, Darmstadt.

Haider, P.W. 2001

Hall, H.R. 1901–02

Hall, H.R. 1928a
The civilization of Greece in the Bronze Age, London.

Hall, H.R. 1928b
‘Minoan faience in Mesopotamia’, JHS XLVIII, 64–74.

Hankey, V. 1967
‘Mycenaean pottery in the Middle East: notes on finds since 1951’, BSA 62, 107–47.

Hankey, V. 1970–71

Hankey, V. 1973

Hankey, V. 1974
‘A Late Bronze Age temple at Amman: II. Vases and objects made of stone’, Levant VI, 160–78.

Hankey, V. 1981

Hankey, V. 1993

Hankey, V. 1995

Hankey, V. 1999

Hankey, V. 1993

Heltzer, M. 1988

Heltzer, M. 1989

Herzog, Z., G. Rapp Jr. & O. Negbi (eds.) 1989
Excavations at Tel Michal, Israel, Tel Aviv.

Higgins, R. 1967
Minoan and Mycenaen Art, London.

Hoch, J.E. 1990

Hood, S. 2000

Hornung, E., R. Krauss & D.A. Warburton (eds.) 2006
Ancient Egyptian chronology. (Handbook of Oriental Studies 1:83), Leiden.

Horowitz, W. 1998
Mesopotamian cosmic geography, Winona Lake.

Hunger, H. 2009
Hurwit, J.M. 1994

Josephson Hesse, K. 2008
Contacts and trade at Late Bronze Age Hazor: aspects of intercultural relationships and identity in the Eastern Mediterranean, Doctoral Dissertation in Archaeology, Umeå University.

Kalogeropoulos, K. 2005

Kantor, H. 1947

Karageorghis, V. 1965

Kemp, B.J. & Merrillees, R.S. 1980
Minoan pottery in second millennium Egypt, Mainz am Rhein.

Kempinski, A. 1993
‘The Middle Bronze Age in Northern Israel, local and external synchronisms’, Agypten und Levante III, Wien, 69–73.

Kempinski, A. 1997

Kempinski, A. 2002
Tel Kabri. The 1986–1993 excavation seasons, Tel Aviv.

‘Excavations at Kabri, preliminary report of 1989 season’, Tel Aviv, XVI–XXI.


Kenna, V.E.G. 1960
Cretan seals with a catalogue of the Minoan gems in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

Kenna, V.E.G. 1965
Die englischen Museen, CMS VII, Berlin.


Kislev, M.E., M. Artzy & E. Marcus, 1993
‘Import of an Aegean food plant to a Middle Bronze IIA coastal site in Israel’, Levant 25, 145–54.

Kitchen, K.A. 1966

Kitchen, K.A. 2000

Klengel, H. 1992

Koehl, R. 2006
Aegean Bronze Age rhyta, Philadelphia.

Kupper, J.-R. 1983
Documents administratifs de la salle 135 du Palais de Mari. (Archives Royales de Mari XXII/2), Paris.

Kuschke, A. 1962

Lapp, P.W. 1967

Lambrou-Phillipson, C. 1990
Hellenorientalia, Göteborg.

Lauffray, J. 2008
Fouilles de Byblos, Tome VI, Beirut.

Lehmann, G. 2002

Lmet, H. 1986
Textes administratifs relatifs aux métaux. (Archives Royale de Mari, XXV), Paris.

Leonard, A. 1994
An index to the Late Bronze Age Aegean pottery from Syria-Palestine, SIMA CXIV, Jonsered.

Lilyquist, C. 1994

Macalister, R.A.S. 1912

MacGillivray, J. A. 1998
Knossos: pottery groups of the Old...
MacGillivray, J. A. 2003
‘A Middle Minoan cup from Sidon’, Archaeology & History in Lebanon 18, 20–4.

MacGillivray, J. A. 2004

MacGillivray, J. A. 2008

Mackenzie, D. 1911

Malamat, A. 1960
‘The head of all those kingdoms’, JBL, 79.1, 12–9.

Malamat, A. 1992

Malamat, A. 1998

Manning, S. 1995
The absolute chronology of the Aegean Early Bronze Age, Sheffield.

Manning, S. 1999–2006
The Thera (Santorini) volcanic eruption and the absolute chronology of the Aegean Bronze Age, http://www.arts.cornell.edu/Classics/Faculty/SManning_files/testoftime.pdf, accessed 19052009

Manning, S. 2007

Manning, S. 2009
‘Beyond the Santorini eruption: some notes on dating the Late Minoan IB period on Crete, and implications for Cretan-Egyptian relations in the 15th century BC (and especially LM II)’, in Warburton 2009, 207–26.

Maxwell-Hyslop, K.R. 1970
‘An illustration to a Mari inventory?’, Iraq 32.2, 165–6.

Meiggs, R. 1982
Trees and timber in the ancient world, Oxford.

Merrillees, R. 2003
‘The first appearances of Kamares Ware in the Levant’, Agypten und Levante XIII, 127–42.

Merrillees, R. & J. Evans 1980

du Mesnil du Buisson, R. 1926

Miron, R. 1990

Money-Coutts, M. 1936

Montet, P. 1921–22

Montet, P. 1928

Montet, P. 1929

Morris, S.P. 1992
Daidalos and the origins of Greek art, Princeton.

Mountjoy, P.A. 1984

Niemeier, W.-D. 1990
‘New archaeological evidence for a 17th century date of the “Minoan Eruption” from Israel (Tel Kabri Western Galilee)’, in TAW III, 3, 120–6.

Niemeier, W.-D. 1991

Niemeier, W.-D. 1993

Niemeier, W.-D. 1995a


Pendlebury, J.D.S. 1939 The Archaeology of Cretet, London.


Ploug, G. 1973 Sukas II. The Aegean, Corinthian and Eastern Greek pottery and terracottas, København.


Approaching Levantine Shores 53
Smith, S. 1945
'Middle Minoan I-II and Babylonian chronology', *AJA* 49,1–24.

Smith, W.S. 1965

Sparks, R.T. 2007
*Stone vessels in the Levant*, Leidschendam.

Stager, L.E. 2001

Stager, L. E. 2002
'The MB IIA ceramic sequence at Tel Ashkelon and its implications for the "Port Power" model of trade', in *The Middle Bronze Age in the Levant*, M. Bietak (ed.), Wien, 353–62.

Stoß-Gale, Z.A. 2001

Stoß-Gale, Z.A. & N.H. Gale 2003

Strange, J. 1980

Strom, I. 1966
*Grækenlands forhistoriske kulturer*, vol. I, København.

Strom, I. 1982
*Grækenlands forhistoriske kulturer*, vol. II, København.

Stubbings, F.E. 1951
*Mycenaean pottery from the Levant*, Cambridge.

Sørensen, A.H. 2008

Sørensen, A.H. 2009

Sørensen, A.H. & W.L. Friedrich 2009
'Time Table', in Warburton 2009, front end paper.

Talon, P. 1985

Thalman, J.P. 2006

Virolleaud, C. 1937

Virolleaud, C. 1938

Virolleaud, C. 1965

Wachsmann, S. 1987
*Aegaeans in Theban tombs*, Leuven.

Walberg, G. 1987
'Middle Minoan chronology: relative and absolute', in *High, middle or low?,* P. Åström (ed.), Part 1, 67–73, Göteborg.

*Time’s up! Dating the Minoan eruption of Santorini. Acts of the Minoan Eruption Chronology Workshop*,
Sandbjerg November 2007 initiated by Jan Heinemeier & Walter L. Friedrich, (Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 10), Athens.

Ward, W.A. 1971

Warnock, P. & M. Pendleton 1991

Warren, P. 1969
*Minoan stone vases*, Cambridge.

Warren, P. 1980

Warren, P. & V. Hankey 1989
*Aegean Bronze Age chronology*, Bristol.

Wolff, S.R. 1991
‘Archaeology in Israel’, *AJA* 95, 505–6.

Woolley, L. 1955

Woudhuizen, F. 1989


‘Middle Bronze Age settlement patterns in the Western Galilee, Israel’, *JEA* 33/1, 59–83.

Yasur-Landau, A. & E. Cline 2009