PHILISTOR

Studies in Honor of Costis Davaras
In Greek the word φιλίστωρ (philistor) means the lover of learning, of history, the person who constantly seeks new knowledge.

The characterization of philistor fits the personality of Costis Davaras because he has always tried to expand his knowledge horizons and has never limited himself solely to his fields of specialization. His entire life is full of diverse activities, philosophical self-reflection, and sociopolitical interests.
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During his undergraduate years, he took a degree at the Palmer Technical School in Athens as a wireless operator of the Merchant Marine in order to be able to travel, which he actually did for a short time, visiting various countries. This, among other features of his character, shows his inquisitive spirit.
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Davaras’ excavations in the region included the tholos tomb at Maleme, a tholos tomb at Apodoulou, and the rich peak sanctuary of Vrysinas overlooking the Rethymnon area. His main care in this new post was the legal protection of the numerous archaeological sites of West Crete, which, until then, were not officially listed as such and thus “ignored” by the State. It should be noted that the “Palace of Minos” at Knossos and a narrow zone around it, under the auspices of the British School at Athens, was the only legally defined archaeological site on Crete before that time. By specific order of the Ministry he also tried, alas in vain, to protect the Venetian–Ottoman old towns of Chania and Rethymnon and even received serious threats on his life in his office by a furious fishmonger. It was during this period that he married his beloved Dione, a Baroque harpsichordist and his life companion ever since. In 1966 he went to the Sorbonne University in Paris for his Ph.D. under the supervision of Pierre Demargne, Henri van Effenterre, and Jean Deshayes. His two-volume typewritten dissertation was a study on the Minoan-Mycenaean Double Axe, including a corpus of all then-extant axes in corpore—the functional ones, the votives, and the representations in painting. The subject was examined mainly from a religious point of view. Davaras managed to show that the functional double axe was definitely a tool and not a weapon, as even today many scholars continue to believe it was a weapon. The dissertation was not published, as this was not required by the French Law, pending the collection of photographs for publication in the German Series Prähistorische Bronzefunde, a work that would, by agreement with H. Müller-Karpe, also include the pottery. However, the future reserved much adversity for him and his family.

After his return to Greece in 1970, and during the dictatorship of the Colonels, he was not allowed to go back to Crete, his second home and place of archaeological interests. Instead, he was transferred to Sparta, in Laconia, as well as to Mystras, as an “acting” Epimeletes of Byzantine Antiquities. There he managed to officially establish and define the ancient town of Sparta for the first time as an archaeological site. Additionally, he organized, again for the first time, the extensive archives of Mystras. It should be noted that Davaras protected with strict rules the Medieval town of Monemvasia. A year later he was again transferred, this time to Patras for six months, under the Ephor Photios Petsas, who was also in disfavor.

At his insistence, he managed to return to Crete. This time he was appointed as a newly promoted Ephor in East Crete (Nomos Lasithiou and Malia). By necessity, East Crete had also been “promoted” to an Ephorate, the now well-known 24th Ephorate of Antiquities. There he managed to officially establish and define the ancient town of Sparta for the first time as an archaeological site. Additionally, he organized, again for the first time, the extensive archives of Mystras. It also should be noted that Davaras protected with strict rules the Medieval town of Monemvasia. A year later he was again transferred, this time to Patras for six months, under the Ephor Photios Petsas, who was also in disfavor.

At his insistence, he managed to return to Crete. This time he was appointed as a newly promoted Ephor in East Crete (Nomos Lasithiou and Malia). By necessity, East Crete had also been “promoted” to an Ephorate, the now well-known 24th Ephorate of Antiquities. This is the only reason why Crete has three Ephorates, and not two or four.

As a matter of fact Davaras was the first and last Ephor of this Ephorate, for the title of “Ephor of Antiquities,” the oldest title in Greece (since 1830), was later abolished by the newly elected administration that advocated “the equality of all civil servants” with titles such as “Director of Antiquities” and so forth. However, the title of Ephoria paradoxically remained. Characteristically, all administrations that followed until today did not reinstate the title of the Ephor, as archaeologists have obviously been “the black sheep” of the state apparatus, above pressures and other concomitant evils.

When Costis Davaras became the head of the new Ephorate in Hagios Nikolaos, its state was
the Early Minoan I Cycladic cemetery at Hagia Photia, near Siteia, with no assistants, architects, photographers, or other assistants, but with armed workers watching it at night. This excavation is now partly published in collaboration with his close friend Prof. Philip Betancourt.

Among Davaras’s other important excavations were those of several Minoan peak sanctuaries in various stages of plundering, including Traostalos, Petsophas (re-excavated), Prinias Zou, Modi, and others. The re-excavation of the oval house at Chamaizi was also crucial, as he was able to clarify its function. It was neither a peak sanctuary, as usually believed, nor oval because of lack of space. The early burial cave of Hagios Charalambos Gerontomouri on the plateau of Lasithi, with its rich finds—especially seals and a great number of human skulls, some of them showing signs of trepanation, the earliest in Greece—is also included among Davaras’s field work. This excavation was later continued with Phil Betancourt as co-director. Other less important excavations include Minoan and later tombs and cemeteries (especially the one at Krya in Siteia) as well as a number of Hellenistic and later houses at Hagios Nikolaos and Ierapetra.

Last but not least in his long list of fieldwork comes the important excavation of the Late Minoan I “cult villa” at Makrygialos on the southern coast. According to his view, this building is unique insofar that it closely imitates the Minoan palaces on a very small scale. He gave the edifice this strange name because of its rich religious elements, although he later thought that it should rather be named a “mini palace,” as it is actually a real miniature of a Minoan palace in several of its architectural features. In fact, its central court has the dimensions and orientation of the palace at Petras on the opposite north coast. He does not consider it as a simple “country mansion” aping its superiors. Instead, he believes that, exactly because of its close resemblance, its functions would have been similar to those of the palaces, especially regarding religion. Hence, it was initially dubbed a “cult villa.” He has raised the question whether the edifice at Makrygialos could perhaps help us better understand the main function of the palaces, which it so closely mirrors.

It is true that Davaras is very happy and proud that he had the opportunity to re-open East Crete embryonic, with the telephone on the floor. He had to organize everything ex nihilo. He considered it his duty to begin the legal protection of the numerous and highly important archaeological sites of East Crete, as he had done in West Crete. This was, indeed, an onerous and difficult task, as the protected areas (Zones A and B) had to be accurately defined on the map. At the same time this was a very delicate enterprise as these areas were not supposed to be excessively large and beyond the rule of “pan metron Ariston.” The trouble was that these new measures went hand-in-hand with the beginning of the touristic development of the island. Thus, a reaction to this novel legality was to be expected.

For instance, Davaras managed to stop the demolition of the Venetian fortress of Spinalonga (albeit outside his official jurisdiction), the spolia of which were being taken and imbedded as decoration in the “grand hotels” then under construction. Unfortunately, he did not manage to bring about the conviction in court of a serious perpetrator of bulldozing part of the Minoan town of Palaikastro, who was actually a school teacher! Again regarding Spinalonga, Davaras managed, despite the serious threats he received, to avert the construction there of a base for torpedo boats, which the administration of the Colonels wished to build. Fortunately, finally they realized the enormity of it and constructed the base near Cavo Sidero. Some years later, after the Colonels were gone, the dismal fate of another small island was also averted: the Air Force wished to make the beautiful, subtropical Chryssi to the south of Ierapetra a target area for bombing. Fortunately, the Ministry of Defense gave up this enterprise, persuaded by Davaras’s personal arguments.

After some time he was again transferred to Komotini in Thrace, but he never went there as he was then suspended from his duties. He was reinstated after the happy end of an adventure in a court of justice.

As an Ephor in Hagios Nikolaos Davaras installed a new provisional exhibition at the Museum, and he conducted many rescue excavations under very difficult conditions, some of which, alas, came too late. In any case, the volume of new material collected was so enormous that it would take several archaeological lives to be properly published. Perhaps the most important of these excavations was the exploration of part of the Early Minoan I Cycladic cemetery at Hagia Photia, near Siteia, with no assistants, architects, photographers, or other assistants, but with armed workers watching it at night. This excavation is now partly published in collaboration with his close friend Prof. Philip Betancourt.
to the excavations of American archaeologists. This was done under the form of a *synergasia* as a co-director. These excavations took place at Pseira and Mochlos for several campaigns, in collaboration with his eminent colleagues and friends Phil Betancourt and Jeffrey Soles.

These excavations, with extraordinary results, funded with grants from several sources, including the Institute for Aegean Prehistory (INSTAP) founded by Malcolm Wiener, the great benefactor of this branch of archaeology, are being published by the INSTAP Academic Press in a rhythm and perfection unthinkable for Greece. Thus, Davaras is quite proud of his official archaeological contribution to these projects. Many eminent scholars involved in Minoan archaeology have, on different occasions, praised his role in these projects.

It should be mentioned that the very last official paper out of several thousands Davaras signed as an Ephor was the one that founded, from the Greek side, the INSTAP Study Center for East Crete at Pacheia Ammos, a center that astounds and dazzles every visiting Greek archaeologist.

He has always been happy and proud that he has been the instigator of the new British excavations at Palaikastro, a site that was then seriously endangered by developers, both local and foreign. The new excavations have not only been extremely successful, but they stopped pending threats—at least for the time being. The Cavo Sidero area, property of the Toplou monastery north of Palaikastro, seemed at this time to be safe, and so no special measures were taken.

Another side of Davaras’s character may be traced through an interesting event. In an unusual way he was able to contribute financially to the great Greek excavations of Zakros. He refused the offer of a Mexican millionaire to re-open the excavation of the famous Diktaian Cave, which must certainly still contain many treasures in its bowels. Instead, he persuaded the gentleman to support the Palace of Zakros project.

As tourism developed by leaps and bounds at the shores of Crete, it was unavoidable that woes were yet to come. In 1985, as he continued to press to save archaeological sites in the face of mounting pressure from building, Davaras was once more suspended from his duties as an Ephor for East Crete for five long years. He was ordered to go to Herakleion to the “Archaeological Institute of Crete,” which until then did not exist. He has confessed that he was personally grateful to the Minister of Culture Melina Merkouri, who graciously allowed him to stay in the Hagios Nikolaos Museum in “suspended animation,” as he humorously states. As a measure of clemency he stayed there to supervise its exhibition and cleanliness.

In 1990, under the new “Coalition Administration,” Davaras was re-instated in his duties as an Ephor, but as he says, “he had lost his mood” for the Archaeological Service and turned to a new challenge, the University of Athens. In 1993 he was elected Associate Professor of Minoan Archaeology and later Full Professor. There he concentrated on his new duties, a real heaven in comparison to the past, as he usually says. He retired as Professor Emeritus in 2000. To quote his own words, “now I have more time for carefree, less stressful research.”

Now his ardent wish and vision is to see in the European Union commission a new member: a Commissioner for Cultural Heritage who would cover a most important area, until now sadly unprotected and badly needed for Greece.

Davaras has received many academic and other distinctions. He is Member for Life of the Archaeological Society at Athens; Honorary Member of the Historical and Archaeological Society of Crete in Chania; Honorary Citizen of the Municipality of Ierapetra; Korrespondierendes Mitglied des Deutsches Archäologischen Instituts, Berlin; Chevalier dans l’Ordre des Arts et Lettres de la République Française; Member of the Editorial Board of the periodical *Kadmos*, Berlin; and General Editor of the periodical *Cretan Studies*, Amsterdam. Finally, he has received an Honorary Diploma from the University of Tehran for the protection of the endangered remaining mosques on Crete.

Indicative of Costis’s vividness, creativity, and overall devotion to a better future for Greece is his very recent participation in the newly formed party of Greek Ecologists, of which he is an active member. Costis is one of the last noblemen in the Greek and international archaeological family and will always remain “young at heart.” From the depth of my heart, I wish him all the best in every aspect of his life. He still has much to offer us.
Bibliography of Costis Davaras
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# List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASCSA</td>
<td>American School of Classical Studies at Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm</td>
<td>centimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dia.</td>
<td>diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dim.</td>
<td>dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Early Minoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Early Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAF</td>
<td>folded-arm figurine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr</td>
<td>gram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>Herakleion Archaeological Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNM</td>
<td>Hagios Nikolaos Archaeological Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Hagia Triada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg</td>
<td>kilogram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>kilometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Late Cycladic or Late Cypriot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>Late Helladic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Late Minoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN</td>
<td>Late Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m asl</td>
<td>meters above sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACFA</td>
<td>macroscopic ceramic fabric analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max.</td>
<td>maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>Minoan Hall System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Middle Minoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Middle Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNI</td>
<td>minimum number of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers. comm.</td>
<td>personal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers. obs.</td>
<td>personal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Archaeological Museum of Rethymnon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question of origin of the clay chest-shaped sarcophagi or larnakes of the Late Minoan (LM) III period was a subject of early interest to scholars (Rutkowski 1968, 219–220 nn. 4–6, with earlier bibliography; a good, quite recent discussion is included in Evangelou 2009). Initially, the scarcity of burial places on LM I Crete led some scholars to dissociate the reappearance in the island of clay larnakes from an old tradition where individuality was sought for some burials through the use of clay containers (Branigan 1970, 177; Muhly 1996, 210). Arthur Evans first looked for the origins of the clay chest-shaped LM larnakes in cultural areas outside the Aegean, proposing Egypt as the most likely candidate (Evans 1904, 8; 1921–1935, I, 126, 586).

According to one widely accepted view, the principal morphological features of the clay chest-shaped coffins originated from wooden prototypes (Bosanquet 1901–1902, 299; Hood 1956, 86–87; Pini 1968, 54, 57; Rutkowski 1968, 223; Watrous 1991, 285; Merousis 2000, 50 n. 171; that the existence of wooden larnakes is confirmed by a funeral scene depicted on a clay coffin from Tanagra, see Spyropoulos 1974, 20–21). These prototypes comprise the creation of rectangular inset panels on the exterior, the presence of four or six legs (these being the equivalent of vertical timbers extending to the ground and forming a strong frame), and the adoption of a lid type in a saddle-like or truncated pyramidal form. Excavation data confirm that wooden coffins were actually used for burial in the wider district of Knossos at least as early as the LM II period (for a full discussion and bibliography, see Hägg and Sieurin 1982, 180–182 nn. 44–53, table 1, lower part; also, Watrous 1991, 186; Muhly 1996, 208–209 nn. 47–65; Merousis 2000, 49–50 nn. 171, 172). By contrast, a terminus post quem of LM IIIA:1 has been proposed for the appearance in the island

The identification of wooden funerary containers in early Mycenaean tombs (Persson 1943, 41, 40; Åkerström 1978, 60–73; Hägg and Sieurin 1982, 178–180 nn. 10–39, with earlier bibliography; cf. also Muhly 1996, 206–208 nn. 37–44) led to the hypothesis that the chest-shaped larnax was invented—and first used—in the Helladic area, only to be introduced to Crete, together with the burial customs connected with it, when mainlanders first settled in the Knossos area in the LM II period (Hägg and Sieurin 1982, 185–186). Apart from the fact that burials in coffins, at least those made of clay, never became popular on the mainland (Muhly 1992, 164 n. 431; Merousis 2000, 53; for a slightly different view, see Dimakopoulou 1987, 73–75), recent finds of the Middle Minoan (MM) III–LM I period from Poros, Herakleion (Dimopoulou 1999, 35), prove that wooden chests were already in use on Crete before the appearance on the island of other burial customs considered Mycenaean in origin.

Having ascertained that the first chest-shaped coffins were made of wood—a material unsuitable for use in graves given their sensitivity to the very humid conditions—the question arose as to whether these objects initially had been made to be used in domestic contexts for storing goods (Evans 1904, 8; Xanthoudides 1904, 11–12; Hood 1956, 86; Mavriyannaki 1972, 115; Åkerström 1978, 58; Betancourt 1985, 161–162). Since traces of such chests had yet to be identified in such contexts (contra Marinatos 1959, 44, referring to some specimens, whose form remains unknown since they are unpublished to date), this possible function was investigated outside the Aegean. Thus, once again it was suggested that the form of LM wooden coffins originated in Egypt where richly decorated chests had been used during the Eighteenth Dynasty for the storage of clothes and other valuable goods (Watrous 1991, 287).

This brief summary of views on the matter highlights how important it is to identify specimens of the type under discussion in earlier excavation contexts in Crete. The material which is briefly presented below comes from two tombs of the MM period, investigated by N. Platon in a location called “Pezoules Kephala,” at Zakros, Siteia (Platon 1967, 190–194; full publication of the finds from the Pezoules tombs, part of which are presented here, will appear in Platon, forthcoming).

The Form of the Tombs and the Method of Burial

The tombs under discussion were two built structures of the type called “bone enclosures” or “ossuaries” (Bosanquet 1901–1902, 292, fig. 5; Pini 1968, 8, including bibliography with references to specific sites; Branigan 1988, 154–160), identified by chance on the southwestern slope of the coastal Zakros Valley, located a short distance from the Minoan settlement. The tombs were set on two small terraces formed amid the limestone rocks. Their walls consisted of one or two rows of unworked stones of various sizes, placed according to their width. The western and larger Tomb A comprised three compartments—A, B, and Γ (Soles 1992, 195, fig. 77). Two of them (A and B) initially communicated through an opening, which was found blocked with earth, bones, and stones. No entrance to the tomb was identified.

Tomb B was only comprised of a single, almost rectangular compartment (Soles 1992, 200, fig. 78). The burial layer, consisting of stones, bones, and pottery fragments in great disorder, lay directly on top of the sloping rock, penetrating even into its natural crevices—a fact that proves there had never been any form of artificial floor. Similar to Tomb A, excavation was unable to identify an entrance to the structure.

Both structures contained the remains of several successive, mainly secondary, burials. The original interments were few and may represent the last burials before the abandonment of the tombs. Two of the primary burials, one from each tomb, were found inside small clay larnakes (Fig. 18.1). In one instance, in Area B of Tomb A, the larnax, apart from containing the larger part of the last burial, also held two skulls clearly belonging to secondary interments (Fig. 18.2; Platon 1967, 191, pl. 167:a, b). The last burial was accompanied by a clay jug. On the other hand, nothing accompanied the original
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Figure 18.1. The interior of the larnax of Tomb B, with an almost intact interment.

Figure 18.2. The larnax of Tomb A as found.

Figure 18.3. Bottom pieces of a chest-shaped larnax.

Figure 18.4. Section showing lip and bottom of a chest-shaped larnax. Scale 1:3.
The Clay Larnakes and Their Dating

Six clay sarcophagi have been identified from the material of both tombs, and of these, only two have been restored (one each from Tomb A and Tomb B). Five were chest-shaped with six low, truncated conical legs placed either at the corners of the underside or slightly inward from its edges (Figs. 18.3, 18.5). One of the larnakes has an ovoid shape and is also fitted with six similar legs.

The lengths of the chest-shaped specimens range from 76–80 cm, and their widths are 34.5–39 cm. All had slightly curved sides and rounded corners. In one case, there is a projecting frame along the side edges. The long sides of the coffins have three pairs of holes placed slightly below the rim. In the bottom of the restored larnax from Tomb A, three more holes have been preserved.

The material from the tombs also comprises fragments of four clay lids, belonging to two types: one was ovoid in shape and slightly domed (Fig. 18.6), and another lid was pyramidal with two long and two short sides (Platon 1967, 191). The ovoid lids have two horizontal handles placed at either end. They would probably have had similar handles along the long sides. The corners of the lids are again rounded and pierced with holes. On the pyramidal lids, the long sides each have at least two vertical handles, while the short ones each have a horizontal handle and smaller holes placed over them and on the rounded corners.

The clay used for the larnakes and lids varies from brownish to reddish and from pink to orange, with abundant dark inclusions. Their surfaces are covered in a slip, the color of which also varies from yellowish to buff and from pink to orange.

Because of the absence of parallels from the two earlier Minoan periods (cf. Rutkowski 1968, 220–222; with the probable exception of two small four-legged larnakes from Phourni, Archanes; Sakellarakis and Sakellaraki 1997, 476, fig. 461), the Pezoules larnakes cannot be dated typologically. In spite of that, we must accept that the completely preserved coffins at least represent the last phase of the tombs’ use, since they contained two of the few undisturbed burials. Consequently, their dating should be contemporary with that of the latest pottery found in the contexts (Platon 1999, 675 includes a short discussion on the chronology of the tombs assemblages).

The pottery comprises a limited range of shapes and decorative motifs with parallels for the most part dating to the MM IIA and IIB periods. The most frequently occurring shapes are different kinds of jugs
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(Platon 1967, pl. 169:a), among which was a baggy type of jug and carinated, rounded, and cylindrical one-handed cups (Platon 1967, pl. 168:b, c, d) and various types of handleless cups (Platon 1967, pl. 168:a), not including the tall tumbler. Despite the fact that most of these various types belong to the MM II period, a number of the closed vessels have profiles that are enhanced by slight alternating convex and concave lines—a feature that is often attributed to the MM III phase (cf. Walberg 1983, 14, 16, 17, 18). Likewise, certain types of handled and handleless cups have parallels that have sometimes been assigned to the same period. As far as decoration is concerned, the repertoire, executed principally in the “light-on-dark” technique, comprises pendent arcs, twisted motifs with spirals, branches with stylized leaves, and motifs imitating various stones. Nevertheless, the most significant evidence, at least for defining the latest use of the tombs, is the complete absence of the stone motif with white disk-shaped spots on a dark ground, as well as the tortoise-shell ripple ornament so typical of the MM III period (Platon 1999, 675).

The dating of the jug found in the restored larnax of Tomb A does not contradict the above observations. The jug has a rather slender body with a profile that is slightly concave above its base (Fig. 18.7; cf. Walberg 1983, pl. 13:114). The shape is found in a MM II jug from Phaistos (Pernier 1935, 259, fig. 142), as well as in a hydria from the same site, again dated to the MM II period (Levi and Carinci 1988, 50–51, pl. 25:f). To the right of the lower part of the handle, the Pezoules jug has an incised X-shaped sign. Similar signs occur on jugs from the MM IB–IIA context of Kalyvomouri Zakros (Platon 1999, 674), as well as on vases from Quartier Mu at Malia that date to the end of the MM II period (Olivier 1996, 159).

Based on the above, the last Pezoules burials, including those in the two preserved larnakes, should be dated to the end of MM IIB, or, at the latest, to the very beginning of the MM III phase. It should be emphasized here that out of a total of 185 restored vases, as well as among the fragmentary material, no trace of later use of the tombs was identified.
The Significance of the Finds

In spite of such an early date, the Pezoules larnakes present some morphological features that have been considered as typical of Postpalatial chest-shaped coffins (Rutkowski 1968, 223; Watrous 1991, 285). The first is the existence of legs. The Pezoules larnakes have six truncated conical feet, usually placed slightly inward from the edge of the underside. Two four-legged chest-shaped larnakes of the MM I and II periods have been brought to light in the Phourni Archanes cemetery (Sakellarakis and Sakellaraki 1997, 476, fig. 461). The LM III examples have either four, or more rarely, six feet placed at each corner. The restored larnax from Pezoules Tomb A is closer to the late examples, since its six legs are placed at each corner and in the middle of the long sides, in line with the edge of the underside (compare, e.g., some LM IIIA larnakes from Armenoi, or the well-known sarcophagus from Episkopi Ierapetra; see Tzedakis 1971, figs. 5, 6; Betancourt 1985, pl. 27:A; Platonos 2008). The position of the feet on the Pezoules larnakes weakens the argument for simple imitation of a feature occurring in domestic furniture, since it would make them less visible or even invisible. Their presence seems to be more related to a functional demand of funerary nature, such as transportation of the object from the place of manufacture to the tomb, or even in the funeral of the dead (Muhly 1992, 169 n. 448).

The above-mentioned larnax from Tomb A presents one more feature that is often found in the later sarcophagi: a protruding band that frames the edges of the long sides of the larnax to form a large panel (Fig. 18.8). In this case, the addition of such a frame obviously is not for decorative or functional reasons; rather, it betrays the influence of some wooden prototypes where it would have served a structural purpose. Thus, it seems possible that, in tandem with the clay larnakes, wooden ones were also in use, which might explain why their remains are not so often preserved (or recognized?) in more tombs.

A third feature shared between the Pezoules and LM III larnakes is the presence of pairs of holes located slightly below the rim of the containers (cf. Michailidou-Pappa 1972, 335–337). The existence of similar corresponding holes on the lids of the Zakros specimens, in combination with the absence of handles that could play a similar role (cf. Xanthoudides 1904, 12), confirms that they were used for binding the two sections of larnakes together. On the other hand, the presence of holes in the bottom of one of the restored Pezoules specimens supports the possibility that these chests had always been destined for funerary use, the perforations having been made in order to drain the liquids produced by the decomposition of the bodies (Michailidou-Pappa 1972, 334).

Finally, the presence of lids with a truncated pyramidal form presages the prevalence of this specific type for LM III larnakes. The parallel use of the flat or slightly domed “ceramic” type indicates a transitional stage, when the traditional MM type coexisted with the new one that would later become prevalent.

In conclusion, most of the features of the LM III clay chest-shaped larnakes occur also in the examples from Pezoules Zakros, which are safely dated around the end of the MM II period. This conclusion conflicts with some of the following views regarding the origin of the type:

1. That the type was introduced to Crete by the Mycenaean when they settled on the island during the LM II period, and that it represents a Helladic creation originally made of wood (Hågg and Sieurin 1982, 185–186). The clay Pezoules specimens are much earlier, and their morphology suggests the simultaneous use of wooden examples in Crete.
2. That the type imitates Egyptian furniture of the Eighteenth Dynasty (Watrous 1991, 287). The beginning of this dynasty is placed in the third quarter of the 16th century (for the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty, see, e.g., Warren 2006, 306), while the end of the MM II period in Crete is around the end of the 18th century B.C. (cf. Betancourt 1985, 68; Warren and Hankey 1989, 135, 169).

3. That the first LM coffins were nothing other than wooden chests used for storing goods inside the house (cf. Evans 1904, 8; Xanthoudides 1904, 12; Hood 1956, 86; Mavriyannaki 1972, 115; Åkerström 1978, 58; Betancourt 1985, 161–162). Although LM I clay larnakes have not yet been identified with certainty (Merousis 2000, 51 n. 167), their probable wooden counterparts appear to have a much longer funerary use than we previously believed. On the other hand, their domestic use has not yet been confirmed by excavation data.

In contrast to these views, the finds from Pezoules add one more link to the almost unbreakable chain of a long surviving tradition (Marinatos 1930–1931, 155; Rutkowski 1968, 220–222; Mavriyannaki 1972, 113–115; Sakellarakis and Sakellarakis 1997, 473–477) where closed vessels of various types and made of various materials formed the final, individual resting place for certain deceased people who were distinguished from the masses (Branigan 1970, 177; Muhly 1992, 168; 1996, 210).
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