The 20,000 cuneiform tablets found in the ruins of the palace at Mari, located on the Middle Euphrates, provide a wealth of evidence for social, political, and economic history in the 18th century B.C.E. This article focuses on the documents that shed light on the connections between Mari and Minoan Crete. The texts include inventories of Minoan luxury goods, many of which were obtained when King Zimri-Lim of Mari journeyed to Ugarit, on the Mediterranean coast. Two historical nuggets of considerable significance emerge from the present study. In addition, this article for the first time suggests artifactual analogues for the Mariote mentions of items from Crete.

Mari

In the summer of 1765 B.C.E., King Zimri-Lim of Mari, accompanied by a retinue of thousands, spent a month on the Mediterranean coast, the guest of the ruler of Ugarit. His journey had begun several months earlier for military, political, and religious reasons, taking him upriver from Mari to halfway up the Khabur. From there he went westward to rejoin the Euphrates before heading overland to Aleppo, where his father-in-law Yarim-Lim reigned. Then, rather than returning home, he pressed on to the sea (Fig. 1).

Zimri-Lim had been king for nearly a decade, having finally managed to regain his ancestral regency (Box 1). Once upon the throne, Zimri-Lim put the finishing touches to a splendid palace that boasted 260 rooms, extensive wall paintings, and even a statue plumbed for running water. Steady publication of the approximately 20,000 tablets found since 1933 in the palace archives, coupled with continuing archaeological investigations, have revealed a wealth of information about Mari, especially just prior to its destruction in 1760 B.C.E., when Hammurabi, King of Babylon, turned on his former ally Zimri-Lim to further his own imperial ambitions.
Of interest to many are the insights these texts have provided into Mari’s foreign connections. While Zimri-Lim’s acquisition of Cretan items and contact with Minoans at the port of Ugarit have received notice by others, newly edited texts have greatly enlarged and refined the corpus previously available to non-specialists, meriting the updated list provided in the Appendix (1-35). In addition, the present study aims for the first time to give Aegean artifactual shape, however impressionistic, to the Mari documents mentioning goods and people from the place they called Kaptara (biblical Caphtor).

Minoan Crete

From an Aegeanist perspective, text 1 is particularly noteworthy, for it appears to include two very significant nuggets of historical import. One sheds new and unexpected light on the rulership of Crete at the time of Zimri-Lim, while the other involves the nature of the language spoken on Minoan Crete. Both are discussed further below, in “The Minoans and Zimri-Lim at Ugarit.”

In Minoan Crete of the 18th century B.C.E., the first palaces and elite residences were flourishing at Knossos, Phaistos, Mallia, and other sites (Box 2). A hallmark of this Protopalatial period was Kamares ware, named for the cave site where it was initially identified. These luxury, polychrome vessels
feature light-on-dark motifs in dazzling, cerebral patterns, as well as three-dimensional appliqués and sophisticated slip manipulations (Fig. 2). Valued for its artistry and/or its contents, Kamares ware was widely distributed to the Greek mainland, Egypt, and the Levant. Egyptian potters attempted imitations, usually quite obvious pastiches.

Another overseas sign of the Minoans is the presence of Linear A, the script used during the Protopalatial and Neopalatial periods to write their still-undeciphered language. Minoan exports sometimes went out in containers marked with labels or other inscriptions. At Tell Haror in the Negev Desert, a sherd with a Linear A graffito seems to have been regarded as a curiosity, for it was brought to the temple. Linear A texts also appear to have been written abroad by native speakers of Minoan, installed in what may be Cretan colonies or outposts, as at Miletus.

The Minoans and Zimri-Lim at Ugarit

When Zimri-Lim arrived at Ugarit, its port of Mahadou (modern Minet el-Beida) was thriving, for it was one of the finest ancient harbors along the Levantine coast. There, enterprising merchants worked for the king of Ugarit and themselves, dealing in metals and other raw materials, above all the tin they regularly shipped across the Mediterranean. From a slightly later period, the Ugarit archives of four of these traders reveal that they controlled much of the supply chain too, for example the strings of pack animals needed, and they may have had interests in the port’s metal recycling furnaces.

During his month’s sojourn, Zimri-Lim must have gone down to the busy quays on various occasions. If the day was clear, someone may have pointed...
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out Cyprus on the horizon. The king surely saw quantities of the tin he had brought in his baggage being readied for delivery to that island and beyond. In Zimri-Lim’s special travel chests were over 400 kilos of tin, which he was then getting from Elam.

A Mari record (1) of certain tin transactions at Ugarit includes two entries that are of potentially great consequence for deepening our understanding of Minoan Crete. First, we read that over one and \( \frac{x}{3} \) mina of tin were given for the “Man of Crete.” Aegeanists have taken him to be simply “a Minoan.” Since, however, the Mariotes used in at least one other text the phrase “Man of X,” the standard Mesopotamian way to refer to a ruler, this person must be none other than the ruler of Crete at the time. But if the Mariotes knew that Crete had a pre-eminent, male ruler, why did they not name him?

The text’s next entry suggests an answer to this question, for there we learn that the interpreter, who was the head or representative of the Cretan merchants in Ugarit, received \( \frac{1}{3} \) mina of tin. This tells us that whatever language the Minoans spoke, it required a translator who also spoke one or more of the Near Eastern languages in common use. This competence points to the existence of a well-established, linguistically savvy, Minoan trading mission at Ugarit.

Like the Man of Crete, the interpreter is anonymous. Given that the rest of this text does mention people by name, all of them etymologically Semitic, this strongly implies that the Mariote scribe found the Minoans to have unfamiliar appellations, perhaps long or complicated, which he decided not to attempt. Can we presume from this that the Minoan language was not in the Semitic family?

Aegeanists have long sought “the missing ruler,” a figure conspicuously absent from Minoan imagery. Thanks to this Mari text, at last we catch a glimpse of him. In 1765 B.C.E., Protopalatial Crete had a male ruler, whose overarching authority was widely recognized, and surely emanated from the throne room at Knossos. When his fleet of merchant ships called at the port of Ugarit, an able Minoan representative was on hand, ready to interpret. If Zimri-Lim personally chose any Cretan articles, perhaps the translator’s recompense in tin was for services rendered to the king himself.

Luxury Wares

Gold and silver vessels comprise most of the Mariote luxury wares from Crete, some plain, others with handles or figurative decoration (2-22). By the time these were made, Minoan metallurgists had developed a “refined
tradition of craftsmanship” that would continue for several centuries. Attributes of Minoan gold and silver may be seen in such features as their three-dimensional embellishment, predilection for combinations with other metals, fusion-coated gilding and silver-plating, and cold-hammered inlaying. Minoan gold and silver vessels were exported to the Greek mainland, Cyprus, and beyond; their makers traveled as well, to produce wares for new clientele.

Current research and experimental projects have illuminated several goldworking methods invented or adopted/adapted by Aegean craftsmen. These include granulation (adhesion of minute beads), anticlastic shaping (synchronous convex and concave curvatures), and so-called gold embroidery (mosaics of twisted wire). One awaits definitive laboratory tests on the black matrix that held pictorial and geometric inlays of gold, silver, and electrum, seen especially on blades and vases. If it is true niello, a sulfide compound made by heating, as opposed to black patinated bronze, the technique may have originated in the Levant, for the earliest extant examples are found in the rock-cut Royal Tombs of late 19th/early 18th century Byblos.

As for the Aegean’s silver and gold sources, lead isotope analysis indicates that the silver came from Lavrion in Attica, Siphnos in the Cyclades, and the Carpathians in Transylvania. The origin of the gold is more elusive. While it is generally assumed to have been Egypt, sources in northern Greece, Bulgaria, and Transylvania may have been exploited. In any event, there was sufficient precious metal to make over thirteen kilo’s worth of gold objects in Mycenae’s Shaft Graves III, IV, and V alone, not to mention the graves’ thirty-plus silver items. There seems no reason to doubt that similar quantities could have been produced earlier, in Protopalatial Crete, which puts Zimri-Lim’s relatively small number of “Caphtorite” vessels in perspective.

Unfortunately, no gold or silver pieces contemporaneous with Zimri-Lim’s reign have been found on Crete, with one exception. This is a silver four-lobed kantharos (a pedestaled drinking cup with vertical strap handles) from House Tomb I at Gournia. Its many Kamares ware analogues provide an idea of what we are missing, particularly because their lustrous black surfaces would seem to imitate tarnished silver. From prior centuries, we have just a few surviving Minoan vessels in precious metals, among them a small silver cup with rows of granulation, found in Tomb VI at Mochlos.

There may be some Protopalatial silver in foreign contexts, although the evidence is fraught with problems. The Tôd Treasure, for example, discovered in 1936 in a temple south of Luxor, is a cache of hundreds of silver, gold, and
lapis lazuli items buried in copper-alloy chests inscribed with the name of the 12th Dynasty king Amenemhat II (c. 1919-1885 B.C.E.). Whether or not any of the silver vessels are Minoan and made during that pharaoh’s reign has been a matter of considerable discussion. In addition, various scholars have raised concerns about the date of the deposit, but heirloom use of the chests seems a less tenable scenario. As for the four silver vessels found in the Royal Tombs at Byblos (see above), while one or more of them have sometimes been termed Minoan, the attribution appears unlikely on stylistic and technical grounds.

Countering our lack of Minoan comparanda from Zimri-Lim’s time is the continuity of metallurgical and other craft traditions in the Aegean. Given this, we are probably not too far off the mark in suggesting the following for a sense of what the Mari king’s Cretan wares were like. For our purposes, the most helpful texts (2-7) add a few words of explicit description to the otherwise laconic listings.

Let us begin with the “four Cretan cups with one handle each” (2). This specificity points to their being unusual and new to the Mariotes. The most plausible candidate for the type is the spool-handled “Vapheio cup,” named after the gold pair with repoussé bull tableaux, found in 1888 in a burial pit within a tholos tomb near Sparta (Fig. 3). The spool is formed by a vertical cylinder whose top and bottom flare as they join horizontal strips fastened to the rim and wall on one side only of a slightly tapering, straight-sided cup. While the earliest extant example comes from the Tôd Treasure (see above), later “Vapheio cups” in gold, silver, bronze, stone, and clay are known from Crete and the Greek mainland. They also went to Egypt, for we see them being carried by the Aegean emissaries painted in several Theban tombs belonging to mid-18th Dynasty officials.

From Aleppo, Zimri-Lim brought home several Cretan gold vessels, among them one with floral decoration “in its middle” (5). Other occurrences of the term for “middle” justify our picturing some sort of petaloid or leafy design encircling a goblet’s waist. Shaft Graves III and IV at Mycenae contained two examples of this. Both are thought to be Minoan-
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made, each with a frieze of rosettes worked in repoussé around their bowls. On the gold Shaft Grave IV cup, its double-petaled rosettes originally had lapis inlays, matching the foot, as well as an overlay of a white substance setting off the rosettes (Fig. 4). The silver Shaft Grave III goblet has single-petaled rosettes covered in gold foil. We should note, though, that the Mariote scribe added a puzzling remark about weight, which seems too light for a cup of my suggested type. Did Zimri-Lim’s vessel perhaps have a detachable flower, on the order of the Kamares ware floral appliqués?35

Also in Aleppo, the king received a basketlike vessel (6). In this instance of the use of this term, the Mariote scribe may have been seeking to describe the wickerwork effect produced by ribbing, fluting, arcading, or banding, as seen on silver and gold vessels from Shaft Grave Circle B at Mycenae and elsewhere (Fig. 5). Similar works attesting to Aegean interest in rendering basketry in other media include the many ceramic pieces discovered in Protopalatial Quartier Mu at Mallia.36

Zimri-Lim’s heavy gold bird-cup (7) was acquired at Aleppo too. The bird decoration calls to mind the Minoan-made silver goblet from Chamber Tomb 10 at Midea, with its five repoussé birds flying in quatrefoils, or the gold “Cup of Nestor” from Shaft Grave IV, whose spools are topped by small birds with outstretched wings.37 If Zimri-Lim’s cup had only the head of a bird, not the whole body, the avian embellishment may have been on the rim. There are possible models...
in a set of four gold goblets from the Acropolis Treasure at Mycenae, perhaps an ancient robber’s hoard stolen from Shaft Grave Circle A, whose handles are dog heads, their mouths closed on the rim, or in the rock crystal duck-dish from Circle B, its head turned to rest its bill on the rim.38

The silver vase-stand (15, see also 20) may have supported Cretan rhyta (ritual vessels with dual orifices), the quintessential Aegean product, made in a wide range of materials and shapes, including theriomorphic.39 The Mariotes seem to have had a taste for rhyta, some of them maybe from Crete.40

Weapons

Zimri-Lim’s scribes listed Cretan weapons among his possessions, usually adding qualifiers about their materials and noting that they had gold, lapis, and carnelian inlays (23-30). Here, in seeking comparanda, we are fortunate in having a sizable corpus of Aegean swords, daggers, knives, and other weapons, from the Protopalatial period on. Initial studies of this material developed typologies based on blade length, midrib profile, tang and shoulder shape, and number and kinds of rivets; recent analyses have emphasized iconographic issues, metallurgical techniques, and wider cultural significance.41

The finest parallels from Zimri-Lim’s time derive from the palace at Mallia, which was a major metallurgical center during the Protopalatial period.42 One of the daggers found there was fitted with a gold-covered hilt whose interstices doubtless once held inlays of lapis, faience, carnelian, or similar. Its pommel, now missing, had a gold guard with relief circles.43 The most elaborate guard belonged to a sword and depicts an acrobat in repoussé, tumbling in a great curve about the gold roundel.44 Two other swords were recovered, one with an ivory pommel and the other with a faceted, rock crystal pommel and traces of gold overlay on its hilt.45

Other luxury weapons were among the grave goods in the Protopalatial burials in the collective tombs of the Mesara Plain.46 These include a dagger whose gold-covered hilt is ornamented with delicately wrought, curvilinear meanders (Fig. 6). On the shoulder below the rivets, a frontal feline mask was worked into the gold, its prominent eyes originally filled with inlays.47 In listing the Cretan weapon in 23, the scribe used the term katappum, a Mesopotamian arms type whose defining feature was its “eyes” of gold or silver.48 Was the Mariote inventorying a Minoan piece like the Mesara dagger, and so he thought of a katappum?

Although limited in quantity, the extant Protopalatial weapons fit well
the Mari records, in terms of their materials and elaboration. Unlike the case with the vessels, we do not need to look to subsequent periods for parallels, but since the weapons from the Mycenaean world emerged from Minoan forerunners, they afford a sense of what is absent from the archaeological record.49

Elite mainland burials were astoundingly rich in weapons. The Shaft Graves at Mycenae, for instance, contained over 120, two-thirds of them swords, thirty of which have geometric and figurative decoration along their midribs, inlaid on a black ground in silver, gold, and electrum. Following earlier traditions, metallic adornment of midribs and other parts was also achieved by pressing silver or gold foil over prepared bases and “embroidering” tiny gold wires, as well as by using engraving, repoussé, and cloisonné techniques.50

The Mariote scribes catalogued a leather case associated with a Cretan weapon (30). This is likely its sheath or scabbard, fragmentary specimens of which were found with some Shaft Grave daggers and swords.51 These were made of wood or leather, or of wood covered with leather or linen, with gold-foil overlays bearing geometric motifs in repoussé. The detailed carving in a contemporaneous shell cameo from the Throne Room at Knossos shows how a dagger looked in such a sheath, together with its belt or baldric.52 Tempting though it may be to see the sheathed dagger with lapis-blue pommel in a Mari fresco as one of the Cretan weapons, its shape and features point to a Near Eastern pedigree.53

Leather and Textiles

In addition to the blade case, Zimri-Lim obtained other Cretan leather goods in the form of at least three pairs of thick-soled boots or sandals, one pair of which Bahdi-Lim, governor of Mari province, took to Babylon, along with

Figure 6. Dagger from a Mesara tomb, L 25.8 cm (after Lila Marangou, ed., Minoan and Greek Civilization from the Mitsotakis Collection [Athens: Goulandris Foundation, 1982], 259). Reproduced by permission of the Ephorate of Antiquities, Chania Archaeological Museum, Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports.
various garments (31). For reasons unspecified, they came back to Mari. With no extant Aegean footgear, we have mainly pictorial evidence to go on for what constituted “Caphtorite” style.\textsuperscript{54} It is difficult to tell if they were all true boots, or if some were sandals or open shoes with bands wrapped around the leg to mid-calf height, or if they were worn with socks. The only surviving Bronze Age socks were found in the tomb of Tutankhamun, with indentations in their soles and vamps for the front sandal strap.\textsuperscript{55} Most of the pharaoh’s sandals were so lavishly spangled with gemstones, gold, and other materials that it is not surprising that his socks were of plain linen.

In contrast, the Minoan and Mycenaean emissaries pictured in the mid-18th Dynasty Theban tombs wear leg coverings that are vividly colored and patterned.\textsuperscript{56} Their designs could have been woven into textiles as socks, or painted or tooled on leather as boots. If Zimri-Lim’s Cretan pairs had polychrome, Kamares-style decoration, they must have been rather striking and elegant.\textsuperscript{57} And if Hammurabi rejected a pair, does this reveal something of the king’s aesthetic sensibilities? Or perhaps the footgear was simply never rendered, had Hammurabi been away from court when the Mariotes were at Babylon.

As for textiles, a Minoan belt found its way to Mari (34). One visualizes here the faience models of double rolled belts from Knossos, with their intricate floral and geometric motifs.\textsuperscript{58} The entry immediately above it lists a textile of a type often used for festival garments for women, and many kinds of headgear, scarves, and other apparel are enumerated elsewhere on the tablet.\textsuperscript{59} Some of these may likewise have come from Crete, although not scribally tagged as such.

Throughout the Bronze Age world, the Aegean was renowned for its patterned, fine textiles, which played an important role in the Minoan and Mycenaean economy.\textsuperscript{60} The few surviving fragments of cloth, fringes, and tassels confirm the reliability of the numerous Aegean depictions of woven goods with intricate designs and vibrant color combinations. Painted renditions of these garments, hangings, and floor coverings regularly decorated Egyptian tombs (just as they doubtless did elite residences), from the Middle Kingdom on.\textsuperscript{61}

At Mari, did any of the palace frescoes reflect them?\textsuperscript{62} The running spiral borders around the podium in Room 64, along the bottom of the Investiture scene in Court 106, and on a frieze in Court 31 may (or may not) attest to Aegean woven inspiration.\textsuperscript{63} Opinion also varies as to more general Aegean influence on the stone imitations painted on certain dados and especially on
that same podium. In its panels of light-on-dark faux marbling, some detect
the hand of resident Minoan artisans (as later at several sites in the Levant
and Egyptian Delta), while others see no need to look beyond the Near East.64

A Minoan Boat

We are on firmer ground, so to speak, in the matter of the Minoan boat. Soon
after Zimri-Lim’s return from the coast, Mukannishum, his chief of stocks,
received twenty minas of lapis lazuli from Iddiyatum, a leading merchant,
for the making of a small Cretan boat (35). Unfortunately, the text does not
tell us any further particulars about the boat, nor how and where it was to
be built and used. If it was intended to be put in the water, its likely berth
was in the port, yet undiscovered, on the straight, wide canal linking Mari
with the Euphrates.65

What features of the Minoan ship(s) docked in the harbor of Ugarit
impressed Zimri-Lim so deeply that he desired his own version? Here, it
may be instructive to look first at the elements that Egyptians thought most
identified “Keftiu boats,” that is, ships with Aegean home ports, or vessels
they associated primarily with Aegean mariners. Half a dozen 18th Dynasty
Theban tomb murals show them with intricate hull decoration, as well as
large cabins amidships, whose sides are either hung with Aegean-patterned
textiles or painted in imitation of them.66

Our best Aegean source is the miniature fresco frieze in the West House at
Thera, with its richly adorned and outfitted fleet.67 Many of those boats have
a stern structure, its lower half screened by bull’s hides attached to wooden
frames. In each sits a person, with just his head visible. Carved lions and
g Griffins crouch behind, looking aft. Every hull is differently decorated, as
are the masts and bowsprits. Other evidence from Crete and the mainland
supports my contention that the Thera fresco describes and commemorates a
nautical festival, in which stern structures and boat emblems were deployed
ceremonially as geopolitical signifiers.

What was Mukannishum’s sizable chunk of lapis for?68 The Minoans and
Mycenaeans certainly worked with small quantities of lapis, especially in
combination with gold and carnelian, but when substantial blue was needed,
as for boat adornment, they must have turned to faience and other artificial
materials, or to painted wood, given the distance lapis had to travel from
Afghanistan to the Aegean.69 With more than enough of this exotic stone
at their disposal, the Mariote craftsmen could liberally inlay their boat,
whatever its size.
Two final points, both highly speculative. The first involves the king's participation in the festival of Ishtar held near Mari. During the ritual, he is said to sit on a boatman's seat of wood and leather or hide. Might we conjecture that for an enactment following his sojourn in Ugarit, Zimri-Lim had this made à la Crétoise, modeled on a stern structure he saw there?

The second turns on a Syrian-style hematite cylinder seal of the Old Babylonian period, acquired by the British Museum in 1856. In the central image, a god holds the rod and ring devices, seated in a boat whose prow and stern end anthropomorphically. The hull is decorated with closely set geometric designs. This feature finds no ready Near Eastern parallels, but it does appear in Aegean glyptic, as we might expect. While the British Museum seal's iconography, style, and date put it within a Mariote sphere, we can come no closer than that, owing to its lack of provenance and the inscription's non-localized names of the owner and his personal deities. Nevertheless, one wonders if there might be a hint of Minoan hull adornment in this unusual detail.

When the Minoans sailed home to Crete and presented Zimri-Lim's tin to their ruler, what did they say about the king of Mari? Thanks to a humble Mariote record of metal transactions, for the first time we glimpse this Man of Crete and catch a whisper of a non-Semitic language being spoken at Knossos.

Afterword: History Begins in Sumer?

As the eminent Sumerologist Samuel Noah Kramer demonstrated in his well-known book of this title, the world's earliest historical records come from southern Mesopotamia, and stand at the head of an ancient Near Eastern tradition that was to last for three millennia. I have added the question mark as a signal for historians of other times and places that, nevertheless, much is missing, or unevenly represented. We can follow, for instance, the entrepreneurial dealings of a husband and wife as they navigated the changing political realities of the day, but we still cannot pinpoint the location of Agade, the newly built capital of the first empire in history, into which their own city of Umma was absorbed, all this over 4000 years ago. In the case of the present inquiry, were it not for the excavation and publication of the texts treated here, written on clay tablets and thus fortuitously preserved when
the Mari palace archives were burned by Hammurabi, we would have no information whatever about the connections between Mari and the Minoans. Far from being discouraged, the student of the ancient Near East and Aegean welcomes opportunities such as these documents afford, to shed fresh light on the past and to deepen understanding of the history that is our common human heritage.

______________________________

Appendix

Since precious goods were regularly inventoried at Mari, either to be kept or to be sent to others, some of the Cretan items appear more than once in the archives. It can, however, be difficult to be confident of duplication. In the interests of providing streamlined citations for non-specialists, references are given to the most recent edition of a text, with the following abbreviations used here and in the endnotes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARM</th>
<th>Archives Royales de Mari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


1. (x+) 1 x/3 mina tin [= more than 666.6 g] for the Man of Crete. 1/3 mina tin [= 166 g] for the interpreter, head/representative of the Cretan [merchant]s in Ugarit ARM 23 556:28-31
2. 4 Cretan cups with one handle each ARM 31 214:22 (note: these appear also in the near duplicate inventories ARM 31 215:5’ and ARM 31 216:5’)
3. 2 Cretan (gold) cups with imagery, [handle]less ARM 31 184:2
4. 2 Cretan (gold) cups with imagery, handleless
   ARM 25 530:2
5. 1 Cretan (gold) cup with floral (decoration) in its middle, weighing 20 shekels
   [= 166.6 g], handleless ARM 31 184:4-5
6. [ ] Cretan basketlike vase
   ARM 31 177:rev. 11’
7. 1 [Cre]tan gold bird-cup, weighing 1 mina 13 ½ shekels [= 612.4 g]
   ARM 31 237:9-10
8. 1 Cre[tan] cup ... brought by Aplah[anda]
   ARM 31 227:6” (note: Aplahanda was king of Carchemish)
9. 1 Cret[an gold cup, weighing 2/3 mina 9 shekels] [= 408.17 g]
   ARM 31 227:12” (see also 16)
10. 1 Cretan [gold cup] with [imagery, weighing x mina x shekels]
    ARM 31 188:1’
11. 4 Cretan [silver] cups, weighing [2? minas] 7 shekels [= 1 kg 58.3 g
    ARM 31 173:21
12. [1] Cretan (gold) cup, weighing 2/3 mina 2 ½ shekels [= 354 g], sent to Hammurabi,
    king of Babylon
    ARM 31 192:23’ (see also 17)
13. [1] Cretan (gold) [cup, weighing] 1/3 mina 6 ½ shekels [= 220.7 g], brought by
    Aplahanda, given to Atamrum, king of Andarig
    ARM 31 192:27”
14. 6 Cretan gold rounded cups, weighing 2 minas 4 shekels [= 1.33 kg]
    ARM 31 7:4’-5’ (note: this list appears to be from the time of Yahdun-Lim)
15. 1 Cretan (silver) vase-stand
    ARM 31 237:rev. 14’ (see also 20)
16. 1 Cretan gold cup, weighing 2/3 mina 9 shekels [= 408.17 g]
    ARM 25 515:rev. 8 (see also 9)
17. 1 Cretan gold cup, weighing 2/3 mina, 2 ½ shekels [= 354 g]
    ARM 31 188:7” (see also 12)
18. 3 Cretan bowls
    ARM 31 85:12
19. 3 Cretan cups
    ARM 31 156:C.i 2 *
20. [1] Cretan (silver?) vase-stand
    ARM 31 235:11 (see also 15)
21. 1 Cretan bowl
    ARM 31 258:rev. 6’
22. 1 Cretan gold cup
    ARM 31 173:44.
23. 1 Cretan katappum weapon Zimri-Lim sends to Sharraya of Razama (note: loyal
    vassal)
    ARM 30 M.15115:8’-10’
ARM 31 161:32
25. [1] Cretan [bronze?] lance overlaid with gold
   ARM 21 231:3
26. 1 Cretan wooden weapon, decorated? with? gold, inlaid with lapis lazuli
   ARM 21 231:15-16
27. 1 Cretan weapon, its top and base overlaid with gold, its top inlaid with lapis lazuli
   ARM 32 A.675bis + M.7060:12-15
28. [1] Cretan [weapon?], its top inlaid with lapis lazuli, [ ], and carnelian, its base overlaid with gold…
   ARM 32 XXIV 98:10'-11', compare also 14'
29. 1 Cretan bronze dagger, its handle made of [ ]
   ARM 32 M.11959:8-9
30. 1 leather case of a Cretan weapon
   ARM 23 104:30'
31. 1 (pair) of Cretan [leather boots/sandals] with thick soles, which (together with various garments) Bahdi-Lim took to Hammurabi, king of Babylon, but which they brought back here
   ARM 21 342:5-12 (note: Bahdi-Lim was governor of Mari province; see also 32, 33)
32. 1 (pair) of Cretan leather boots/sandals with thick soles
   ARM 32 M.12668, col. iv:47' (see also 31, 33)
33. 3 (pairs) of Cretan leather boots/sandals with thick soles
   ARM 32 A.3543:22'-23' (see also 31, 32)
34. [1] Cretan belt
   ARM 30 XXII 324:col. ii.13
35. I received 20 minas [= 10 kg] of lapis lazuli from Iddiyatum when they made the small Cretan boat (sealed by Mukannishum)
   Guichard 1993 (note: Iddiyatum was a leading merchant; Mukannishum was chief of stores at Mari).

Notes

* For Assyriological guidance, I am very grateful to Benjamin R. Foster, Dominique Charpin, and Nele Ziegler. Nancy R. Thomas kindly gave the manuscript the benefit of her careful reading and expertise in Minoan and Mycenaean luxury goods. Peter W. Johnson and Alberto Urcia generously assisted with graphic design matters. At a dinner in Paris some years ago, Michaël Guichard was the first to encourage me to bring an Aegeanist's perspective to Mari's Cretan corpus.
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