UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Cultural biographies of Cretan storage jars (pithoi)

From antiquity to postmodernity

Ximeri, S.

Publication date
2021

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Ximeri, S. (2021). *Cultural biographies of Cretan storage jars (pithoi): From antiquity to postmodernity*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:11 Nov 2026

CHAPTER 5. POST-DEPOSITION LIVES AND TRAVELS OF SELECT ANCIENT CRETAN PITHOI (END OF THE 19TH – BEGINNING OF THE 20TH C. AD)

'*Here at a place called τά πιθάρια are the remains of Mykênæan walls and passage (where great pots, Pithoi, were found)...'*

Arthur Evans's diary, entry of March, 21, 1894 (cited in J. Evans 1943, 311)

The previous Chapters revealed a motley range of elements which have been variously accredited to ancient and modern Cretan pithoi. For example, discussions on the ethnoarchaeology and Greek *laographia* (Chapter 2) and the reuse of Cretan pithoi during antiquity (Chapter 4) brought to view the special place of these vessels in the ancient and early modern history of the island as objects often linking Cretans to their ancestors. Moreover, discussion on the consumption of EIA-Archaic pithoi (Chapter 3) elucidated the ways in which these vessels were used to express ideologies; I also touched upon a persistent scholarly attention paid to pithoi as objects unequivocally tied to the functions of the – yet archaeologically equivocal – Cretan *andreion.* Observations of this sort lend themselves for a fresh approach to the Cretan pithos because they reveal that this characteristic type of pottery falls on a space-time continuum composed of seemingly diverse features. In this Chapter, I bring these features together to explore how ancient Cretan pithoi transformed into a unique type of cultural artefact with the potency to perform ideological and political functions in the modern period.

As a case-study, I tract the post-excavation lives of select Minoan pithoi in the early modern history of Crete. I unravel the stories of twelve Minoan pithoi unearthed at end of the 19th century by Minos Kalokairinos, the first excavator of Knossos. I reconstruct this episode, set during a turbulent political period, to elucidate the diachronic place of pithoi in the culture of Crete and to illustrate the ways in which they came to play a role as instruments of local, national and European politics. Furthermore, I trace the historical roots of the ongoing archaeological discussion which repeatedly links storage jars with the physical remains of the Cretan *andreia*.

The methodology of this Chapter is informed by two main theoretical approaches: firstly, that of the biography of objects as explained in Chapter 1.3. and

secondly, that of a self-reflexive, critical historicization of Cretan archaeology described in the following section.

5.1. Archaeology, politics and ideologies

The historiography of archaeology, particularly with respect to its relationship with the socio-political conditions of each period, has become a popular theme in the last years. Current discussions are mainly centred on matters of archaeological practice, heritage, and the fragility of the European project which faces crises such as economic austerity, refugee crises, Brexit and the Greek bailout (Plantzos 2015; Hamilakis 2016a; 2016b; Gardner and Harrison 2017; Popa 2019). Though majorly related to current politics and political crises, this school of thought is not recent. Its foundations can be traced back in the 1970s and the 1980s, right around the time Edward Said (1978) published his profoundly influential book on '*Orientalism'*. His work promoted post-colonial writings on the history of archaeological research as it vehemently criticized westernized perceptions of 'the East' and formed the basis for more self-reflexive approaches on the appropriation of archaeology. Nearly a decade after the first edition of *Orientalism*, Don Fowler (1987) picked up on Said's polemic against western attitudes to the East and used three different case-studies from Mexico, Britain, and China to show that the appropriation of the past is a cross-cultural and diachronic phenomenon, for the discipline, he said, 'has been immersed in, and conditioned by, the economic, political, and governmental institutions of nation states' (ibid. 241).

While the project of the European Union steadily formed, the 1990s were particularly fruitful for considerations regarding the role of archaeology in politics and nationalism (Atkinson et al. 1996; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 1996; Gathercole and Lowenthal 1994; Jones 1997; Graves-Brown et al. 1996). From then on, archaeology was acknowledged as the means to offer grand narratives with the power to shape the present and the future of Europe as well as the ideology of its nations. Scholars lead historiographical researches which articulated the discipline's strong influence in times of political instability and cultural identity crises, especially in countries such as Israel, Syria and Turkey, the regions of the former Yugoslavia and the Balkans, Albania, North Macedonia, and of course, Greece (Brown 1994; Silberman 1995; Gori 2012; Ó Ríagáin and Popa 2012).

Specifically, literature concerning the nationalist, colonialist and imperial discourses of archaeology in the Greek world is rich and can be said to constitute a sub-discipline on its own (Herzfeld 1982; 2003; Hamilakis and Yalouri 1996; Friedman 1992; Peckham 2001; Alexandri 2002; Hamilakis 2006; 2016; Hamilakis and Momigliano 2006; Tziovas 2014a). Such strong interest in the history of Greek archaeology and its (mis)appropriation is tied to the fact that Greece's past has held a dual role in the politics of Greece and Europe since the beginning of the 19th c. AD: firstly, it has been appropriated for the formation of a European identity as well as a means for strengthening the 'westerness' of newly founded nation-states of Europe; secondly, it has been employed for the formation of a national identity for the modern Greek *ethnos.* The history of Cretan archaeology is a branch developed from such critical reviews on the politics of culture.

Although in general, Greek history and antiquities are known to have been used by local and foreign agents as a means to trace Europe's roots in Greece and as a vehicle towards reaching the 'modernity' of Europe (Plantzos 2014; Tziovas 2014b, esp. 2-4), the case of Cretan archaeology is somewhat special in this sense: because the discovery of the Minoan civilization became synonymous with the discovery of the earliest European civilization, the Minoans quickly became entangled in grand narratives of regional, national and international identities, reflecting aspects of a constructed past, present and future of Cretans, Greeks and Europeans (Hamilakis 2002; Preziosi 2002; McEnroe 2002; Papadopoulos 2005; Hamilakis and Momigliano 2006; D'Agata 2010; Varouchakis 2017).

The special place of Cretan archaeology in European narratives is rooted in the cultural and ideological politics of the 19th c. Just as ancient Greek literature, philosophy and architecture had done during the Renaissance, the first archaeological explorations were an opportunity for Europe as a continent and for European nations individually to seek their historical roots and to prove their superiority against the Oriental East. From the 19th c., nationalism and colonialism were strong ideological currents that prevailed across Europe. This had a direct impact both in the political agendas of European nations as well as in the discipline of archaeology. From the mid-19th c. onwards, the newly introduced concept of pre-history coupled with Charles Darwin's theory on the *Origin of Species*, crystallized the idea of a linear trajectory of human history. Henceforth, civilizations were thought of as a product of an evolutionary process which gradually developed from 'primitive' to 'advanced'

and from 'savage' to 'civilized' stages of complexity[205]. The ideological and theoretical underpinnings of this narrative became solidified in the archaeological quests of the time, with inquiries ranging from matters of race and ethnological affinities to the historicity of Homeric epics and Greece's 'heroic past' (Fotiadis 2016, esp. 111-113).

Flinders Petrie's excavations in Egypt, which started in 1882, brought to light a new sophisticated civilization which was dated to a period long before Homer's time. But, as this civilization flourished on African soil, it did not quite fit in with the narrative of Europe's total domination over other continents[206]. A decade before the excavations in Egypt, Heinrich Schliemann, led by his fascination for the Homeric poems was determined to discover the mythical cities of Troy, Ithaca and Mycenae. In 1871, he started excavations in Hissarlik, Turkey and in 1873 he announced that he had uncovered the city of Priam, concluding that Homer's Troy existed and that the Iliad was in fact based on historical events (Schliemann 1874, 305). Though Schliemann's archaeological practices and interpretations of his findings were met with scepticism by some[207], his discoveries were welcomed with great enthusiasm by many of his peers and the general public, for he made sure to popularize them via the press (Flouda 2019, esp. 14-15). Three years later, Schliemann begun his excavations at Mycenae in search of King Agamemnon's home. His diggings there proved to be spectacularly rich, triggering the excitement of the art world. At the same time, the finds added once more to the supposed historicity the Homeric poems and Homeric heroes. The implications of his excavations there were far-reaching, well beyond the discipline of history and archaeology, with a heavy impact on philosophy and psychoanalysis[208].

It was only two years after Schliemann's discoveries at Mycenae and under such socio-political and ideological circumstances, when Minos Kalokairinos, a Cretan upper-class merchant and polymath embarked on a similar journey, in search of the home and the legendary city of his namesake, King Minos.

---

[205] See, for example, essays on *'the Evolution of Culture'* by Pitt-Rivers, as published in Myres 1906.
[206] On the discoveries of Flinders Petrie as an influence to Eurocentric perceptions, see commentary in Shoep 2018, 7-8, fn. 31-33.
[207] See criticisms in Duchêne and Leggatt 1996, and in Easton 1998.
[208] For example, Nietzsche theorized on the concept of morality by presupposing a historical truth of the Homeric heroes, and Freud postulated that Mycenaean civilization was rooted unconsciously deep within every European (Gere 2006, 8; 2009, 35-37).

5.2. Case-study: cultural biographies of twelve Minoan pithoi from Knossos

In the winter of 1878-1879, Kalokairinos begun excavations at the site of Knossos, then locally known as '*tou Tseleve he Kephala'* (from the Turkish *Çelebi*, meaning wealthy landowner or *bey*, and the Greek *kephala*, meaning hillock) (Hood and Taylor 1981, 1). His excavations started in December of 1878 and ended in April of 1879[209]. They were conducted at Kalokairinos' own expenses (750 French francs) with a workforce of 20 men, of which the foreman was the local schoolmaster Christos Papaoulakis (Haussoullier 1880, 124-125; Spanakis 1960, 279; Aposkitou 1979, 82, 87). Some of his trial trenches hit upon part of what was later identified as the Third Magazine of the West Wing at the Palace of Knossos, bringing to light twelve fully preserved pithoi and 365 pots and pottery fragments (Hood 1987, 86; Spanakis 1960, 279). As Crete was subject to Ottoman law, all antiquities could be transferred to the Imperial Museum in Constantinople and so Kalokairinos' excavations were abruptly brought to an end. This end, however, was the beginning for the early modern cultural biographies of the pithoi. Because the excavations were conducted during intense political circumstances and constitutional crises, these vessels formed the arena for archaeological, colonial and political activities in Crete and beyond.

5.2.1. Crete at the end of the 19th - beginning of the 20th c. AD

While European nations searched the roots of their most ancient past in Greece, Cretans struggled to establish their own place in Greek history and culture. Thus, when viewed against the historical and political backdrop of his explorations,

[209] There is slight confusion in the existing literature regarding the exact dates of the excavations. This confusion is caused, I believe, by the fact that Kalokairinos himself mentioned in his French manuscript (originally written in the 1890s) that excavations started in 1877 (Kopaka 1989/1990, 19, 20). This date was repeated by Ernst Fabricius (1886, 140), in his report which made note of Kalokarinos' diggings. Kalokairinos, however, also mentioned in the *Cretan Archaeological Journal* published in 1906, that his trials started in 1878 (Kopaka 1989/1990, 45, 49). Photiades Pasha who intervened for the discontinuation of Kalokairinos' excavations, was appointed as a General Commander in December 1878. We may therefore deduce that excavations in fact started in December 1878 (Aposkitou 1979, 82; Hood 1987, 88; Kopaka 1989/90, fn. 6). As for the month the excavations ceased, Kalokairinos is reported to have paused for a few days in February 1879 due to unfavourable weather conditions and to have returned for a few weeks in April of the same year (MacGillivray 2000, 93).

Kalokairinos' excavations and his pithoi acquire island-wide politically, ideologically and symbolically charged values.

The transition from the 19th to the 20th c. marked fundamental changes for Crete as the island passed from the Ottoman rule to a regime of semi-independence under the protection of the Great Powers (Britain, France, Italy and Russia) in 1899, prior to its official unification with Greece in December 1913 (Carabott 2006, 41-42). This longed-for independence and the unification of Crete with Greece was the result of a spell of turmoil and a series of political assertions. While Greece gained its independence from the Ottomans in 1832, and as the protocol of London (agreed by the Allied Powers in 1830), officialised the establishment of the Kingdom of Greece, Crete was ceded to Egypt and in 1840 it was returned to Turkey. The movement of Greek independence, in which the Cretans themselves actively participated, and the rise of nationalism which swept across Greece and Europe, did not leave the Christian Cretans unaffected. They continued to seek their independence as well as unification with Greece. The particularities of the island's political and ideological conditions at that time have been aptly summarized by Kallivretakis (2009, 15-16): Crete, he writes, was 'a region that was geographically demarcated by its character (an island), a population that was for the most part homogenous with respect to its language (Greek), religion (Orthodox Christian) and its clear consciousness of belonging to a particular national group that already existed as an independent state a few dozen miles away'[210]. These goals were the integral driving forces which fuelled successive and bloody uprisings of the Christian-Cretan population against the Ottoman Empire.

The first large revolt, also known as the Great Cretan Revolution, was that of 1866-1869 (Andriotis 2004). Although it was brutally suppressed, it led to the constitutional settlement of October 1878, known as the Pact of Chalepa. The pact, which was basically the enforcement of the unimplemented Organic Statute of 1868, resulted in an elected Cretan Assembly, of which the Christian John Photiades (Photiades Pasha) was appointed as Governor General. This agreement granted important privileges to Christian Cretans, including the right to establish literary

[210] Indeed, although until the first two quarters of the 19th c. AD, Cretan Muslims constituted more than 40% of the population, from the 1830s onwards this percentage steadily declined, leading to a loss of the Cretan Muslims' economic and political privileges to the newly formed 'Christian middle class with nationalist aspirations' (Barchard 2011, 7).

societies and printing presses (Kallivretakis 2009, 22-23). Ultimately, the Chalepa Pact was a hallmark in the modern cultural history of Crete. Not only did it guarantee a degree of self-government, but it also legitimized the – already but informally established since 1875 – literary and scientific group of 'Association of Friends of Education' of Heraklion, otherwise known as the '*Philekpaideutikos* Syllogos' or, simply as '*The Syllogos'*.

The Syllogos played a major part in the beginnings of Cretan archaeology. Amongst its main aims was the intensification of relationships with similar cultural groups in Greece (such as the Archaeological Society of Athens), as well as to protect Cretan education and culture through the establishment of a library and of the first Archaeological Museum of Crete (Hirst 1887, 230-231; Brown 1993, 36; Detorakis 2003; Genova 2019, 228-236). Minos Kalokairinos would become the treasurer of the *Syllogos* only a few months after his excavations at Knossos (Detorakis 2003, 267). But the most prominent personality of the *Syllogos* was Iossif Chatzidakis, a medical doctor and antiquarian, who became the *Syllogos'* president in 1883. Chatzidakis was also an advocate of the Cretan-Greek nationalism movement, thus his role was crucial for the excavations in Crete. He often acted as a mediator between the *Syllogos* and the foreign archaeological missions by facilitating and/or participating in their explorations (McEnroe 2002, 64-66; Detorakis 2003, 276-293; Genova 2019, 56-69, 228-241). And so, under Chatzidakis' presidency, the *Syllogos* quickly became a form of an official department for the antiquities of the island.

The decade that followed the Chalepa Pact granted the island with seemingly peaceful governance but the political tension did not cease completely as the Turkish authorities often violated the terms of the agreement. After political disputes between the two prevailing Cretan parties, a new revolt broke out in 1889. The revolt proved to be unsuccessful for Christian Cretans as, according to a later source, it also gave a pretext for the Sultan to institute a government of military character (Ion 1910, 277). By that time, Crete's governmental, constitutional and ideological limbo, known as the *Cretan Question,* had become a central issue in the agenda of Europe's Great Powers. After their intervention, the culminated tension reached its peak in 1896, when Cretan Christians revolted again against the Ottomans, leading to one of the bloodiest insurrections in the modern history of Crete on September 6th 1898 (or, August 25th of the same year, according to the old calendar) which became known as 'the Massacre of Candia' *('Η σφαγή του Ηρακλείου'*) (fig. 117). Crete was established

as an independent state in 1898. Prince George, son of King Constantine of Greece, an enthusiast of archaeological explorations himself (Boyd 1901, 125), was called to serve as the High Commissioner of the Cretan State (Andriotis 1998). In the years that followed and until the official union with Greece in December 1913, Crete remained in this political and governmental limbo; 'an island suspended between East and the West' (McEnroe 2002, 61) (fig. 118).

The course that the history of archaeology would take throughout this turbulent period was conditioned and defined by such intense political circumstances. Cretan antiquities were more than artefacts of an ancient, hitherto undiscovered, civilization: 'Crete', as Hamilakis put it, 'situated amidst the East and the West, populated by both Christian-Cretans and Muslim-Cretans, became the land where Europe's past and present, racial and religious identity, were at stake' (Hamilakis 2006, 147). Moreover, on a local level, antiquities from Cretan soil carried a strong emotional power for the islanders: they acted as a means to renounce any cultural affiliations of Ottoman character and therefore to strengthen the idea of an independent Crete. Archaeology was the powerhouse for the Cretans to define themselves and to find the roots of their national and regional identity. Therefore, archaeological artefacts became the fuel to stress the cultural, historical and linguistic bonds of Cretans with motherland Greece. Against these socio-political and ideological conditions, the first finds of Minos Kalokairinos on Crete, the pithoi, were more than just evidence for a highly cultured ancient and European civilization. They became the means to promote the goal of Unification (*Enosis)* while on a European level, they promised plenty of opportunities for excavations on unchartered territories, for the materialization of personal aspirations, and, ultimately, for the promotion of political and cultural agendas.

Before examining how the Minoan pithoi excavated by Kalokairinos acquired the most profound characteristics of such political and cultural ideologies, it is worth to take into account pre-existing conditions at the site of Knossos, presented briefly below.

5.2.2. Knossos before Kalokairinos

Before Kalokairinos' explorations, ancient Knossos belonged to the realm of mythology, existing mostly as a legendary city. Yet, the names

Knosos/Knossos/Konosos or Gnossus/Gnosos/Gnossos had survived as toponyms of the area almost for ever, it seemed[211]. In addition to surviving toponyms, ancient Greek and Latin texts made reference of Minos' powerful reign in Knossos[212]. These texts, together with surviving legends of the maze-like construction, the *Labyrinth*, and awe-inspiring tales of the monstrous *Minotaur*, stimulated the imagination locals and attracted the first amateur antiquarians and travellers in Crete. This interest was intense throughout the period under which Crete was part of the Republic of Venice (1205-1669), and so the first travellers in search of the Labyrinth and Knossos were Italians, including Cristoforo Buondelmonti, Francensco Barozzi and Onorio Belli[213].

The fall of Crete to Ottoman rule in 1669 put a sudden halt to such ventures, but the legend of Minos continued to thrive. As mentioned, the late 18th c. was a period during which a new stream of ideological thoughts and perceptions on the past were formed, giving rise to a new wave of intellectually restless minds including groups of travellers and scholars. Between 1823 and 1829 Karl Hoeck, a German professor of Classical Philology at the University of Gottingen and secretary of the Royal Library, published his three volume book entitled *'Kreta'.* Hoeck would be the first to coin the term 'Minoan' as a reference to a distinctive chronological period of the Cretan civilization[214]. In his first volume, Hoeck pondered '*where should the Labyrinth be?' ('Wo sollte das Labyrinth sich befinden?')* and connected it to Knossos*: 'nur in die Sagen von Knosos ist der dädalische Kunstbau verflochen'* (Hoeck 1823, 59). A few years later, in 1833, Robert Pashley, a distinguished mathematician and classicist, travelled in Crete to visit the area known as Makry-Teichos (Long-Wall). By that time, the area was also identified amongst locals as *Knossos* due to the commonly found Roman coins which bore the inscription '*Knos*' or '*Knosion*' (Gere 2009, 64). Pashley's writings, in his famous book '*Travels in Crete',* are suggestive of a travellers' impression on the site and the myths revolving around Knossos:

---

[211] For a detailed literature on the toponyms of Knossos until the 19th c. see Kopaka 2004; see also Vasilakis 2004 for toponyms (at least 70) used for the wider area of Knossos.
[212] Hom. *Il*. 2. 646, 18.591; Hom. *Od.* 19.178; Strab. 10.476. 7-8; Plin. *De Nat*. 4.12.59.
[213] For a history of the site as traveller's attraction before the 19th century, see Hood and Smyth 1981, 1; D'Agata 2010, 62- 65.
[214] The name 'Minoan', however, was in use since the 18th c. as a direct translation of the Greek μινώϊος and the Latin minus, meaning 'related to King Minos'. On the history of the term, see Karadimas and Momigliano 2004.

'The forms of the mythical labyrinth, as exhibited on the coins of Cnossos, are naturally varied, since they represent not a material edifice, but a work of the imagination. [...] The mythological celebrity and historical importance of Cnossos, demand a more careful and minute attention that can be bestowed on them in a mere book of travels.' (Pashley 1837, 208-209).

More than half a century later, the discoveries in Egypt, Troy and Mycenae further stimulated antiquarians' fascination for the ancient city of Knossos. But it was no coincidence that a local named after the King Minos, would be the first to begin excavations at the site in 1878. An avid reader of Homer, Herodotus and Strabo, and a man actively involved in local politics, Kalokairinos sought proof of his forefathers' glorious past and Crete's distinguished place within the Greek nation:

'I wanted to revive the prehistoric civilization of the island of Crete, which had, according to the Iliad and the Odyssey, one hundred or ninety cities, the most famous of which was Knossos' (Kalokairinos, cited in Kopaka 1989/90, 18; translated from French by the author).

The twelve Minoan pithoi Kalokairinos excavated were then reborn, starting a new life-cycle in modernity; and they had such a profound impact, that another name would be added to the many toponyms of Knossos; the Kephala hill was thus known as *Ta Pitharia* (Evans 1943, 311-313; Hood 1981, 30, fn. 13; Papadopoulos 2005, 95; Gere 2009, 64).

5.3. Minos Kalokairinos, the excavations at Knossos and the pithoi

Minos Kalokairinos (1843-1907) was born in Candia, modern Heraklion (fig. 119). He was the youngest son of Andreas Kalokairinos and Mariora Krasaki, and member of the well-established Kalokairinos family which originated from the island of Kythera. After completing his school studies at the island of Syros, Minos went on to study Law at the University of Athens, but due to his father's illness he was forced to quit a year later and accompany him to Paris. When his father died, in 1864, Minos returned to Crete together with his brother Lysimachos to take over the family business. In 1871 he founded his own successful business company of soap manufacture and wine. In time, Kalokairinos proved himself a worthy heir of the family name as he managed to grow his business and to extend his merchant activities. Beyond his managing and trading skills, Kalokairinos was also a devoted Cretan patriot who was actively involved in the cultural and political affairs of the

island. A year after the Chalepa Pact, the importance of which I have discussed above, Kalokairinos was appointed as vice consul for the Spanish consulate and as a dragoman (a local interpreter and an intermediate) to the British vice consul who was his brother Lysimachos (Spanakis 1960, 295-300; Kopaka 1989/1990, 7-11). His restless spirit and passion for letters sustained him throughout his lifetime, despite his demanding business and political activities and in the face of the family tragedies he suffered (i.e. the bankruptcy of his business in 1895, the murder of his brother, Lysimachos, and his son, Andreas, during the events of 1898). At the age of 58 and after five unfruitful attempts, he returned to Law School and managed to complete and submit his thesis on *'The Legal System of the King of Crete, Minos' ('Νομοθεσία τοῦ Βασιλέως τῆς Κρήτης Μίνωος,περί ἀκοσμίας ἐν τῷ Συντάγματι')* (Kalokairinos 1901). During the last two years of his life, in 1906-1907, he published the *Cretan Archaeological Journal (Κρητική Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς)* which featured 13 issues. A few months before his death, he was a candidate for the Cretan Parliament. Kalokarinos' posts, his successful name as a businessman, and his prestigious family name, gave him an influential status during pressing political circumstances. At the age of 35, he availed himself of the benefits of the Chalepa Pact and three months after it was signed, he began his excavations at the Kephala hill.

Overall, sources on these excavations and the pithoi in particular are extremely poor, fragmented or largely inaccessible. Part of them is comprised by the excavation reports Kalokairinos compiled himself which, however, were written and published several years after the actual digging. In addition to his doctoral thesis, there are two manuscripts discovered and published as transcripts by Katerina Kopaka (1989/1990) in the form of one running text: first, a French manuscript, called '*Fouilles a Cnossos Faites Par Minos Kalokarinos'* which also includes a section entitled '*Guide de L'Antique Ville de Gnossos, Rapport des Fouilles faites á Cnossos en Avril 1877 par Minos A. Calocairinos qui a découvert Le Palais Royal ou Le Megaron du Roi Minos et Le Fameux Labyrinthe situe prés de Cnossos dans le bois sacre de Jupiter'*. The former manuscript was compiled in 1896[215], at the request of the French archaeologist Charles Clermont-Ganneau, and it was addressed in 1900 in

[215] Note that this particular manuscript was written a year after his bankruptcy, attesting to his remarkable everlasting devotion to the archaeology of Crete despite his economic and personal misfortunes.

honour of Prince George for his title as a High Commissioner of Crete, and the latter was written in April 1900. A second, more detailed article, was published in the series of issues written in the last decade of the 19th century; these were republished in 1906 at the *Cretan Archaeological Journal (Κρητική Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς)* of which, as mentioned, Minos Kalokairinos was the founder and director. Issues in the Journal include descriptions of the area of Knossos, the reasons which led Kalokairinos to initiate his excavations, a report of his excavations and part of his correspondence regarding the pithoi and their donations. In 2010, a new, third manuscript written by Kalokairinos came to light, now on display at the Historical Museum of Crete[216]. The manuscript was written in 1904 and it is entitled '*Guide to the Ancient City of Knossos*' *('Οδηγός δια την Αρχαίαν πόλιν Κνωσσόν*').

Thanks to Kalokairinos' openness and eagerness to promote further investigations at Knossos, some additional information about his soundings is preserved by accounts of those who were shown to the site or were invited to his family mansion where he kept part of the excavated material. Amongst them were Thomas Sandwith, the British Consul at Chania and an enthusiast of Cretan archaeology (see below), the American diplomat, historian, and photographer, William Stillman (1881, 41-49), and archaeologists Lucio Mariani (1896), Bernard Haussoullier (1880), Ernst Fabricius (1886), John Myres (Brown 1986, 41), Clermont-Ganneau (1901, 44), and Frederico Halbherr (1893, 110) who was also a close friend of Kalokairinos; and of course, Arthur Evans (Hutchinson 1947, 454; Kopaka 1989/1990, 39).

Because of this fragmentary information, the details of Kalokairinos' excavations have been part of scholarly discussions, as archaeologists have tried to reconstruct the original picture of the West Wing of Knossos before Evans' diggings and to reach conclusions regarding the final date of the destruction of the Palace. Most note-worthily, Jan Driessen (1990, esp. 14-49) compiled a thorough discussion on the topic and provided a succinct summary of places Kalokairinos' trials may have disturbed or affected the stratigraphy. Accordingly: '(1) the Third Magazine, (2) the

[216] This manuscript is currently being studied by Kopaka, to whom I am deeply grateful for sharing information at her disposal. Some information from this manuscript, which apparently also includes details on the pithoi, is mentioned by Kopaka (2015). Her paper was published at around the same time I was conducting research for the present chapter, thus, some of the evidence presented here is also available in her paper of 2015.

Corridor of the House Tablets; (3-4) two different parts of West Facade; (5) a part of the north area of the Antechamber to the Throne Room; (6) the entrance to the South Terrace Basements; (7) the south part of the Long Corridor as well as some of the entrances leading into the Magazines, and (8) a small part of West Court perhaps close to where the West Entrance is situated. In addition, he may have revealed (9) parts of other Magazines and (10) other parts of the Long Corridor. The disturbance in (11) the Central Court, (12) some of the other Magazines, and (13) the area of the South Propylaeum may be either by Kalokairinos or by Kephala landowners' (ibid. 49)[217].

Notwithstanding their importance, the details of Kalokairinos' diggings at Knossos fall outside the scope of this study. What can be ascertained is that pithoi were found in the complex which later became known as the Third Magazine, at the central part of the West Wing; this is also verified by Evans' and Stillman's reports (Evans 1889-1890, 4; 1935, 621; Stillman 1881, 41, 48). We also know, based on Kalokairinos post-excavation notes, that pithoi were found in one of the four rooms he excavated, namely in what he called *'room A'*, for which he gave detailed account in the *Cretan Archaeological Journal* (Kopaka 1989/1990, 44). The pots were arranged in two rows of six, three of which still preserved remains of carbonized beans and lentils. Kalokairinos described them as follows:

'*their height ranged from 1.05m to 1.25m, their diameter, at the wider point near the middle ranged from 0.60m. to 0.80m; they preserved two series of four handles, four beneath the rim and four on the lower part near the base. Rounded lips with a rim diameter of [averagely?] 0.50m., 0.60m. 0.45m. Their decoration consisted of geometric patterns of Mycenaean Art*' (ibid. 44; translated by the author).

Next to Kalokairinos' writings, Fabricius' description of the pithoi is the most informative and near-contemporary source. In their majority, he noted, they were very well-preserved; the tallest were ca. 0.95-1.30m high, and the shortest ranged between 0.65-0.82m; their wall thickness was 0.02-0.03m. The number of upper handles comprised invariably of three or four: five pithoi had as many lower

[217] It has been particularly challenging to identify the exact locales of Kalokairinos' excavations and further confusion is caused by Ernst Fabricius' publication, which made note of twelve different but in close proximity exploratory trenches: *'Auf der Kuppe ist der Boden an zwölf verschiedenen, nahe beieinander gelegenen Stellen durchschnittlich 2 Meter tief aufgegraben worden'* (Fabricius 1886, 136). On the extent of Kalokairinos' excavations, see also Hood and Taylor 1981, 18; Hood 1987, 86.

handles as upper, whilst in the case of the seven remaining three- and four- handled pithoi, there were only two handles attached at the lower part. Only one of the twelve pithos was plain (‘*ganz schmucklos’*), while the rest had decoration of horizontal raised bands around the belly. In two specimens, these bands were plain, and on the rest of the pithoi, the bands were in snake-shaped patterns. The most common of incised motives across these bands consisted of oblique lines and herringbone patterns (Fabricius 1886, 144-145). Fabricius also noted the similarities of these Minoan pithoi with the early modern Cretan *pitharia*, but went on to further discern differences in some of their technical characteristics, such as the handles at the lower part of the vessel, which he believed to be absent from modern pithoi (ibid. 146).

Until recently, Kalokairinos’ excavations at Knossos and his dedication to Cretan archaeology had been largely underappreciated and so information on the pithoi remained fragmentary for several decades after his excavations. With the exceptions mentioned above, very few of his contemporaries or near-contemporaries ever made references to his work[218]. With respect to Kalokairinos’ successor, Arthur Evans, we know that he visited Heraklion on the 15th of March 1894 while he was still a keeper at Oxford. He met with Kalokairinos and he was shown to his collection. Four days later, they visited Knossos together and the following day, they went to the museum of the *Philekpaideutikos Syllogos* where Evans discussed the details about acquiring the land at Knossos with the president, Chatzidakis (Hutchinson 1947, 454; Kopaka 1989/1990, 39). In his later publications from the excavations at Knossos,

---

[218] For example, in the book of 1907 entitled *‘The discoveries in Crete and their bearing on the history of ancient civilization*’ Ronald Burrows, a professor of Greek in the University College at Cardiff, produced a publication with the intention to communicate the discoveries on Crete to a wider audience (Burrows 1907). In the preface of his book, Burrows expressed his gratitude and admiration to the three archaeologists who have conducted excavations in Crete, namely Arthur Evans, Duncan Mackenzie and Robert Carr Bosanquet; he further noted that ‘*Crete has been fortunate in its excavators, to whatever nationality they have belonged’* (ibid. ix). Although he made special reference to the fascinating discoveries at Knossos and its pithoi as ‘*rows of huge Aladdin’s jars’* which ‘*once they held the oil or wine of King Minos’* (ibid. 3), he failed to include the Cretan, Minos Kalokairinos, in the list of those who brought the prehistoric past of Knossos to life. In the decades that followed, Kalokairinos’ role continued to be undervalued. For example, Michael Woods, an English historian and well-known broadcaster who studied the archaeological adventures and the legends of Troy, wrote about Schliemann, Evans and Kalokairinos: *‘No more than Schliemann at Troy was Evans the ‘discoverer’ of Knossos; he was not even the first excavator. In fact the specific site had been identified by the 1860s at the latest, and trial excavations were made there in December 1878 by the Heraklion merchant Minos Kalokairinos;* (Woods 1998, 96; originally published in 1985). But Wood diminished Kalokairinos’ participation as a mere ‘pleasing’ fact: *‘We should be grateful that Evans and not Kalokairinos was able to dig the site, for the Cretan was not a professional excavator: his was a messy dig as far as Evans was concerned.[...] But it is pleasing that a Cretan played his part in the search* (Woods 1998, 98).

Evans made very brief notes about the work of his predecessor; as far as he was concerned, Kalokairinos' excavation was just the sketchy effort of 'a native gentleman of Candia' (Evans 1889-1900, 4; 1894, 281). On one occasion, Kalokarinos' trials are referred to as part of 'promiscuous digs':

'The Third Magazine that underlies the Upper Magazine D, and a small adjoining area of the Long Corridor, as well as the opening of the passage leading thence to the Pillar Rooms, had been the scene of a promiscuous dig in search of ancient object at the hands of a native explorer. In the course of this, twelve large pithoi were extracted, and near them were found carbonized beans and, till lately at least, imported from Alexandria' (Evans 1935, 621)[219].

Some of Kalokairinos' compatriots, however, have tried to restore him to his rightful place in Cretan history and archaeology, thus bringing to light more evidence about his excavations at Knossos. Some thirty years after his death, it was his son Odysseus, who first tried to revive his fathers' legacy by publishing an inscrutable small booklet called '*Η Μινωϊκή κλεὶς ἢ τ' ανάκτορα τοῦ νομοθέτου Μίνωος της Κνωσσού' (the Minoan city or the palace of the lawgiver Minos of Knossos)*[220] (Kalokairinos 1939). This includes an account of his father's investigations at Knossos and apparently some quotes from his diary; but Odysseus' notes are given in a very questionable manner, in an odd and confusing melange of archaeological reality, mythology and historical interpretation[221].

It is particularly during the last two decades that Greek and international scholars have come to recognize that Kalokairinos' contribution has not been properly acknowledged[222], with some also paying specific attention to his excavations and the

---

[219] Elsewhere, in his diary, Evans writes about his arrival on Crete; after purchasing a number of antiquities by locals, he noted Kalokairinos' vision about Knossos: *'M. Minos Kalokairinos the brother of our Vice Consul has a small collection of pottery from Knossos, with very good Mycenaean designs... he has views as to his remote ancestors'* (cited in J. Evans 1943, 310- 311).

[220] The manuscript is available at the Library of the Greek Parliament.

[221] Two decades after Odysseus's manuscript, the great Cretan scholar Stergios Spanakis also paid tribute to Kalokairinos. As we read in the biography of the Kalokairinos family: *'[w]hat will always however honour the memory of Minos, was his love for Archaeology. [...] he first discovered part of the palace of Minos...*' (Spanakis 1960, 297; translated by the author).

[222] Since the early 2000s, scholars have increasingly begun to commend on Kalokairinos' undervalued or marginalized accomplishments. For example, Papadopoulos (2005), who explored the modern history of Knossos, commented on Kalokairinos' forgotten legacy: '*When Evans finally begun his excavations at Knossos, Kalokairinos's name and legacy were relegated to virtual obscurity, especially for the public, and Evans quickly assumed the mantle of excavator and, in many contexts, discoverer of Knossos. What began as an act of early 20th century British colonialism became enshrined in textbooks, whereas Kalokairinos continues to be largely overlooked'* (ibid. 96-97). Also, in her history and the

findings. In addition to the works of Driessen (1990) and Kopaka (1989/1990, 1992; 2004; 2015; 2017), Kotsonas (2016a) has identified several of Kalokarinos' unknown or lost Greek and Roman findings, including inscriptions and sculptures, as well as another lot of hitherto unprovenanced antiquities which were exported to Athens, Egypt and elsewhere in western Europe. Most recently, a PhD dissertation by Amy Genova provides useful insights on the political networks of Cretan archaeology during the late 19th – early 20th c., also including valuable information about Kalokairinos, the excavations and his political-ideological affiliations (Genova 2019, esp. 190-212).

5.4. Interpretations of the pithoi by Kalokairinos and his contemporaries

Though Kalokairinos' excavations only lasted a few weeks, his pithoi were enough to spark an international interest in Knossos and to prompt discussions considering their use in antiquity. The interpretations that followed his excavations provide revealing insights into two main points of historical interest: firstly, on how findings were generally interpreted based on prevailing scholarly discussions of the time, that is, from the viewpoint of classical antiquity. Secondly, on how pithoi and storage practices in particular, from the very first excavations made on the island, generated discussions regarding the political organization of Cretan cities, especially with regards to the Cretan *andreia*.

Classical antiquity and ancient writers such as Plato who described the Laws of Minos[223] were deeply embedded in Kalokairinos' and his contemporaries'

---

metahistory of the Knossian Palace, Anna Lucia D'Agata (2010) acknowledged that *'[i]n the history of the discovery of Knossos, Kalokairinos's excavations were not able to attain the importance they merited...'* (ibid. 66). Moreover, Kopaka, who has actively participated in restoring his proper place in the history of Cretan archaeology, wrote that '*The* '*magician' [of Knossos], Minos Kalokairinos,* has been *'consigned to oblivion'* but it was he who '*propitiated past myths, by giving substance to the prehistoric monuments of the great ancient Cretan metropolis, in which he believed in.'* (Kopaka 2004, 510; translated by the author). She also dedicated the publication of Kalokairinos' manuscript to his memory with the purpose to rescue '*from oblivion the portrait of the man who visualized and boldly contributed to the realization of a grandiose vision...'* (Kopaka 1989/1990, 5; translated by the author). Kotsonas (2016a, 319) concluded his paper on Kalokairinos' Greek and Roman findings by noting the excavator's belated recognition: '*The pioneering role of Minos Kalokairinos in the discovery of the palace of Knossos and the study of Cretan prehistory was acknowledged by scholarship only after a century of oblivion. However, the chronological breadth of the work of the Cretan scholar and his contribution to the study of the topography and monuments of Greek and Roman Knossos remained unappreciated for four more decades'*.

[223] Plat. Laws 1.624; see also Chapter 4.1.2., fn. 156.

understanding of antiquity. These ancient readings surfaced in the interpretation of Kalokairinos' excavations in general but also on the 'pithos room', where the series of pithoi were found. The predisposition to project understandings based on texts from the historical period back onto pre-historic finds resulted in time being collapsed so that the two concepts often merged together in a nebulous historical narrative. One example of this confusion is Kalokairinos' interpretation of the Knossos complex overall, in which he argued for the palace's resemblance to the Acropolis and the Athenian Parthenon (Kopaka 1989/1990, 53). The comparison to the most emblematic architectural unit of – independent – Greece is telling for the integral political and ideological desire to underline the continuity of the Greek past and its bonds with the Cretan history. Yet this tendency was not limited to Kalokairinos' writings; rather, it reflects a wider national ideological stream of the time, for, as McEnroe (2002, 65) writes, 'connections between the Minoans and classical Greece helped to cement the modern connection with the Mainland - the scholarly equivalent of the Enosis (Unionist) movement'.

All in all, the pithoi became a central point of reference for the understanding of Knossos. Just as with the modern archaeological literature and ongoing discussions about the organization of the Archaic Cretan cities (see Chapter 3.1), the pithoi and storage facilities at the palace of Knossos gave opportunities for revealing the public and communal organization of this – then unknown – prehistoric city. At the heart of the matter was the relationship between pithoi and the institution of Cretan *andreia*. Kalokairinos was familiar with the ancient sources which make note of this custom (see Chapter 3.1.2) and particularly keen to identify the institution of *andreion* at Knossos[224].

At the west facade of what Kalokairinos called 'the Royal Palace', he uncovered four rooms (Rooms A, B, Γ and Δ). 'Room A' (12x6m), which contained the pithoi, had a plastered floor made from finely sawn slabs (ca. 1x0.60x0.0015m.

[224] Kalokairinos, like some of his contemporaries, was heavily influenced by the ancient texts on the *andreia* for his interpretation of Knossos. He quoted Strabo (10.4.16) in the introduction to his French manuscript (Kopaka 1989/1990, 17), and in the *Cretan Archaeological Journal* he specifically mentioned that his constant readings of ancient writers, including of Strabo, inspired him to start excavations at Knossos in the first place (ibid. 26). Eventually, in his short thesis on '*The laws of Minos*', he mentioned ancient sources in a segment entitled: *'Μίνως, Son of Zeus and Europa brother of Rhadamanthus King and legislator of Crete. New Classical Dictionary by Wil. Smith'* (Kalokairinos 1901, 8). The title of this segment is suggestive for it underlines the cultural links between Minos, Crete and Europe.

each). Close to the pithoi, he found three pouring vessels partly-sunk in the floor which had been carefully placed within the room (‘*τρία δοχεῖα ὑπόγεια ὑπό τό ἔδαφος τῆς αἰθούσης’).* He was confident that these were placed in such a manner so that the honey stored in them would not trickle out. For him, there was no doubt that these stored the honey consumed during the Cretan *syssitia (‘Ούδεμία άαμφιβολία ὅτι ἐν αυτοῖς ἐφυλάττετο τό μέλι τό διά τό συσσίτιον χρήσιμον’*) (Kopaka 1989/1990, 44). Three of the twelve pithoi, he noted, were filled with remains of beans and legumes and two smaller vessels which he found in the same room were interpreted as the cooking pots in which the beans and legumes were prepared and cooked for the communal meals (‘*τά ὁποῖα πιθανῶς ἐχρησίμευον πρός ὄπτησιν τῶν κυάμων και φακῶν κατά τό συσσίτιον*’) (ibid. 44). All the evidence, and especially the existence of pithoi, pointed Kalokairinos to the conclusion that ‘room A’ was the storeroom of the *andreion* of Knossos, next to which, in ‘room B’, the *hestiatorion* (the banqueting hall) was built. Based on Plato’s views on the *syssitia* which suggested the extension of the practice to women in separate rooms[225], the secluded (yet empty of findings) ‘room C’ adjacent to ‘room A’, was interpreted as a women’s dining hall (Kopaka 1989/1990, 46). The inscribed clay tablets, which he also claimed to have discovered in ‘room D’[226], were to him further evidence of this Cretan custom. The tablets were inscribed with vertical and horizontal lines (‘*τά Μινῶα γράμματα*’) which, Kalokairinos believed, were the notes of the Knossian citizens who listed their contributions to the *syssitia* as well as the rules and regulations by which the Knossian *andreia* were run (ibid. 45).

Kalokairinos devoted a section of the *Cretan Archaeological Journal* to what he named ‘The royal pithos of the Palaces’ (*Ο βασιλικός πίθος των Ανακτόρων*). He there described one fully preserved pithos and the fragments of a second one found in ‘room D’ of ‘the Royal Palace’[227]. Decoration of the preserved pithos, which was

---

[225] Pl. *Laws* 7.806e: *‘Ξυσσίτια δε κατασκευασμένα εἴη χωρὶς μὲν τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἐγγὺς δ' ἐχόμενα τὰ τῶν αὐτοῖς οἰκείων, παίδων τε ἅμα θηλειῶν καὶ τῶν μητέρων αὐταῖς’.*

[226] In the *Cretan Archaeological Journal* Kalokairinos made reference to more than one tablet he found at Knossos. Yet, only one of them, presumably found by Kalokairinos, has been published by Kopaka (1992, 383, n.1). It is unknown what became of the rest of the tablets and it is peculiar that, as Driessen pointed out (1990, 42), no scholar taken to see his findings made any notes of tablets. Moreover, Haussoullier specifically stated that Kalokairinos’ excavation did not yield any inscriptions (Haussoullier 1880, 125).

[227] Dimensions of the fully preserved pithos, as given by Kalokairinos: 0.80m height, 0.30m rim diameter, 0.40m max. diameter, 0.20m base diameter; four handles near the rim and two handles near the base (Kopaka 1989/1990, 58).

found next to figurines of the 'Cretan Goddess Britomartys', consisted of five wavy bands with incised geometric patterns. For Kalokairinos, the wavy bands were meant to resemble ripples of honey being poured ('*σχήματα παριστώντα τὰς ἐν τῷ πίθῳ διακυμάνσεις τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐγκεχυμένου ρευστοῦ'*) and the pithos served as a container for the honey to be used for the preparations of sweet bread (the placenta) offered to the Goddess ('*ἀναμφιβόλως ἐχρησίμευεν πρὸς ἐναπόθεσιν ἐν αὐτῷ μέλιτος, δι' οὗ κατασκεύαζον τούς πλακοῦντας, πέμματα ἅ πρὸς θυσίαν τῇ Κρητικῇ Θεᾷ Βριτομάρτει προσέφεραν'*). The content of the second (fragmented) pithos found next to it consisted of carbonized barley and it was destined, according to the excavator, to be processed into flour for the making of the sweet bread. Kalokairinos further supported his speculation based on a text of the 17th century Dutch scholar and antiquarian, Johannes van Meurs (Meursius)[228]. Accordingly:

'Regarding the wide use of honey at the Andreia and of its great availability at the Knossian Palaces, we are informed by Jioannis Meursius [...] that the son of King Minos the 1st, Glaucus, after having disappeared was found dead inside a pithos full of honey...' (Kopaka 1980/1990, 58; translated by the author).

The speculation, or rather, the belief of Kalokairinos that 'room D' was used for offerings to the Cretan Goddess is symptomatic of the prevailing confusion regarding the Knossian Palace of prehistory and the *andreion* of the historical period. The Cretan excavator was probably not the first one to understand storage vessels in the context of the *andreia* and the socio-political organization of Knossos. Federico Halbherr, the 'Patriarch of Cretan Excavation', as christened by the second excavator of Knossos (Evans 1935, ix), discovered the famous inscriptions of the Laws of Gortyn in 1884. The inscription provided direct and indirect evidence of the political organization of the ancient cities, such as the existence of the *hetaireiai* (the groups of upper-class men who joined the communal meals) (Willetts 1967, 11). Having gained considerable reputation as a scholar, Halbherr was a very close friend of the two main protagonists of the archaeological affairs on the island, namely Evans (Momigliano 2002) and Chatzidakis (Sakellarakis 1998, 138-139; La Rosa 2000), and he also

[228] Original segment in Meursius (1675, 127): *'Glaucus, in mellis dolio periit'.*

maintained warm relationships with Kalokairinos[229]. During his first years on Crete, Halbherr was shown to Kalokairinos' finds by the excavator himself and in 1893, three years before Kalokairinos wrote his French manuscript, Halbherr recollected his encounter with Kalokairinos and his impression of the pithoi:

'Some years ago a wealthy Greek of Candia, Signor Minos Kalokairinós, Spanish vice-consul, made some trial diggings in different points of the mound, when he came across several walks of unknown destination, and in one particular place found gathered together a number of large pithoi. Some of there were full of remnants of grain. Their ornamentation was of a very elementary kind, consisting chiefly of spiral transverse bands, but of a sufficiently archaic character [...]' (Halbherr 1893, 110)

A fervent investigator of Cretan inscriptions and with a personal interest in Knossos[230], Halbherr was keen to identify the *andreion* in Knossos and focused on the pithoi which were, as he believed, probably used to store grain, wine or oil, consumed in the *andreia*:

'The largeness of the building makes me think that it must have been one of the chief public edifices of the city, and the large jars for storing grain, wine, or oil remind us of the Andreion in which the citizens of Crete used to come together for their public meals or syssitia, to which also were invited any distinguished persons who happened to be visiting their city. No edifice of this kind has as yet been discovered in Crete, while the extant inscriptions of many cities of the island make

[229] The friendship of Halbherr with Kalokairinos and the intimate relationship of Halbherr with Kalokairinos' niece, Skevo, who disappeared in the turmoil of 1898, is captured in Rhea Galananaki's imaginary but historically based novel '*Ο αιώνας των λαβυρίνθων' ('The century of the Labyrinths'*) (Galanaki 2002; for which see Kopaka 2017). Halbherr is also portrayed in the historical novel by Viktoria Papadatou (2003) whose mother, Aristea Krimba, was the sister of Styliani and Skevo, all daughters of Lysimachos Kalokairinos.

[230] Halbherr ultimately pursued the rights and conducted an excavation in what is now identified as the Roman and early Christian city of Knossos, shortly after his arrival on the island during October - November 1885 (Morgan 2009). Several years later, in 1901, he would grant permission to his compatriot, Luigi Savignoni, to publish 27 fragments of Cretan pithoi recovered during his explorations at Prinias, Aghios Elias at Aphrati, Knossos and Praisos (Savignoni 1901).

frequent mention of them. Hence it is of great importance that this particular excavation should not be neglected' (Halbherr 1893, 110-111)[231].

Evans would take into account Halbherr's interpretation of the '*Pitharia*'. One year after this report by Halbherr and six years before he would begin the first systematic excavations at Knossos, Evans (1984, 281) commended this mention in his report: *'Professor Halbherr recalls the Andreion in which the citizens of Crete used to meet together for their public meals or syssitia. Whether Labyrinth, Palace, or Andreion, it is evident that the prehistoric building, as yet so imperfectly known to us, belongs to the great age of Mycenae..'.*

Evidently, by the time Evans arrived on Crete, most of the aspiring diggers were convinced that in Kephala lay the Knossian a*ndreion*. As Iossif Chatzidakis, the president of the *Syllogos,* recollected:

'*Sir Arthur Evans asked mainly for Knossos. Knossos had been previously visited by many archaeologists. In their majority, they believed that the ruins of Kephala belonged to an Andreion. In 1878, Minos Kalokairinos initiated excavations at the site and he discovered some Minoan pithoi and other contemporary pottery'* (Chatzidakis 1931, 23; translated by the author)[232].

The excavations of Evans at the Palace of Knossos established that this was a prehistoric building complex and lent its identification with an *andreion* obsolete. However, the archaeological quest for the physical remains of the Cretan *andreion* persists to this day, as do hypotheses on the continuity of *andreia* from the Minoan to the later periods[233]. So much so, that Whitley ascribes a kind of archaeological fixation on the matter, for, as he writes, 'it sometimes seems that any large public building in Crete is interpreted as *andreion'* (Whitley 2018b, 237). As I surveyed in Chapter 3 (3.1, esp. fn. 86-91), pithoi remain one of the most telling objects for the identification of an *andreion*. This shows that the ideas of Kalokairinos and his

---

[231] Haussoullier, another witness of Kalokairinos' excavations, was also impressed by the pottery and the pithoi of Knossos, which, contrary to the rather uninteresting ('*communes et sans intérêt'*) pottery found in Rhodovani in southwest Crete, seemed very promising indeed: *'les vases et les fragments découverts par M. Kalokairinos a Knossos remontent, a n'en pas douter, a une antiquité très-reculée: ils offrent des analogies évidentes avec les vases de Santorin, de Rhodes, de Mycènes et de Spata'* (Haussoullier 1880, 125). Yet Haussoullier was more cautious in his interpretation of the pottery, as he restricted himself to note that it points to an earlier period, not necessarily connected to an *andreion*.

[232] The original, Greek text by Chatzidakis (1931, 23) is as follows: *'Ο sir Arthur Evans ἐζήτησε την Κνωσόν κυρίως. Την Κνωσόν εἶχον ἐπισκεφθῆ καὶ προηγουμένως πολλοί αρχαιολόγοι. Οὶ περισσότεροι τούτων ἐπίστευαν ὃτι τά ἐρήπεια τῆς Κεφάλας ἀνῆκον εἰς Ἀνδρείον.'*

[233] See, for example, discussion in Borgna 2004 for a putative *andreion* at Phaistos.

contemporaries started with the baby steps of Cretan archaeology more than 130 ago, and that pithoi continue to dominate archaeological interpretations ever since[234].

5.5. The politics behind the pithoi

Kalokairinos quickly realized the importance of his overall findings, but he kept his focus on the pithoi and their symbolism: standing almost intact, imposing in size and decoration, they were the material manifestation of Crete's most ancient and glorious past. Thus, it would not take long after the abrupt end of his excavations brought about by Photiades Pasha to initiate his donations of pithoi to museums in Europe and Greece. In line with the spirit of his compatriots, who pled for the unification of the island with Greece, and aware of the influence of the Great Powers in the politics of Crete, Kalokairinos chose to use his influential status and the pithoi to facilitate two aims: first to attract archaeological interest to the island and second, to use this interest for the promotion of the goal of *Enosis.* Of the twelve pithoi excavated, one was sent to the British Museum in London, one to the Museo Pigorini in Rome, two to the Louvre, and one to the National Archaeological Museum in Athens. Lastly, three pithoi became among the first pieces of the collection of the Archaeological Museum of Crete. The remaining pieces, kept in his personal collection, were lost during the uprisings of 1898.

5.5.1. *'Charin Ethikon Logon' ('For the Sake of National Purposes')*

In his text published at the *Cretan Archaeological Journal* Kalokairinos made a special reference to a particular pithos. It was the most beautiful of all, initially destined to be sent to the free capital of Greece:

'but the most beautiful pithos, of which I fortunately preserve a photographic image[235], was lost during the fires of 25th August 1898 - and which I reserve for future publication [...] This pithos bears decoration arranged in five friezes of bands with inscribed zigzag patterns. Its height was 0.80m., diameter, at the middle of its height 0.40m., diameter, at the rim, 0.30m., close to the rim four handles and close to the

[234] Kotsonas 2016a, 320: 'Suffice it to say that the current discourse over the archaeology of the Cretan *andreion* can be traced back to the writings of Minos Kalokairinos [...] who considered that the monumental complex he unearthed was a Bronze Age palace as much as a Classical *andreion*'.

[235] Kalokairinos (as cited in Kopaka 1989/1990, 44) mentioned that the photograph of this pithos, together with his portrait, was taken in 1893, at the request of his friend, the Swedish archaeologist Sam Wide.

base two more handles. The loss of this pithos, during the troubles, saddens me deeply, for I wished it was at the Museum of Athens, as an indication of the Cretan artistry' (Kalokairinos, as cited in Kopaka 1989/1990, 44-45; translated by the author).

The *'fires of the 25th of August*' refer to the great revolt of the local population against the Ottoman authorities in 1898. This date not only marks one of the bloodiest revolts in the modern history of Heraklion, but also a day of personal tragedy for Kalokairinos and his family. During the great massacre, his brother, Lysimachos, was decapitated, his first son, Andreas, was murdered, and his niece, Skevo, disappeared. His mansion was set on fire destroying his personal collection of antiquities, amongst which was the pithos mentioned in his report (the Kalokairinos mansion which replaced the one destroyed in 1898 is now the oldest wing of the Historical Museum of Heraklion).

We know, however, that a total of five pithoi – later destroyed in the fires – were meant to be sent to Athens 'for the sake of national purposes' ('Χάριν Ἐθνικῶν λόγων'). Kalokairinos' notes concerning their unsuccessful transportation are indicative of his intentions, the importance attributed to them, and the sentimental value the pithoi carried:

'For the sake of National purposes, I intended to give my whole collection to the Athens Central Museum, for the marriage of Prince Constantine, under the patronage of His Majesty. In the year 1895, during my sojourn in Athens, I asked Mr. Prime Minister of Greece, the late Th. P. Deligiannis, via his Member of Parliament, Mr. Kalousis of Kythera, to assist in the transfer of my finds through the Greek vice Consul of Heraklion; the finds, together with the abovementioned artefacts, consisted of 5 pithoi, one of which, the smallest, was a masterpiece of art' (Kalokairinos, as cited in Kopaka 1989/1990, 41; translated by the author).

In a footnote of his French manuscript, Kalokarinos also speaks of these pithoi 'as the most precious of his collection' ('*les pièces les plus précieuses de ma collection, au Musée d'Athènes, pendant les fêtes de mariage de Son Altesse Le Prince Héritier de Grèce')* (Kalokairinos, as cited in Kopaka 1989/1990, 25).

Nearly all the pithoi and accompanying objects never reached their destination. Kalokairinos claimed that their unfortunate fate was due to the political turmoil and insurmountable obstacles projected by the Cretan Assembly which prevented their transportation *('ἕνεκα τῶν ἀνυπερβλήτων κωλυμάτων, τά ὁποῖα ἡ τότε*

Διοίκησις παρανέβαλε') (ibid. 41). The artefacts were kept in Kalokairinos' residence, thereby suffering the consequences of its destruction two years later.

Shortly earlier, in 1887, one of these pieces made it to the Athenian Museum (fig. 120). The pithos had been first sent by Kalokairinos to Prince Constantine, later King of Greece, as a gift for his coming-of-age ceremony. Kalokairinos' correspondence with Heinrich Schliemann is particularly informative regarding the donation to the Greek museum, as well as Schliemann's intentions to dig at Knossos. The German archaeologist wrote to Kalokairinos in 1889 in order to acquire information on buying the property at the Kephala Hill (which he believed to be available for a very low price), and to complete Kalokairinos' excavations within one week and a workforce of 100 men. In the opening of his letter, he informs Kalokairinos that he had asked for information on the pithos via the German classicist and Lord Chamberlain to the King, Otto Lüders. Schliemann assured Kalokairinos that:

'His Majesty, owes you a great debt of gratitude for your gift [i.e. the pithos] *by which He sets great store and which is now displayed at the Central Museum of Athens, at the disposal of scholars to study the pithos and benefit from it'* (Kopaka 1989/1990, 39; translated by the author).

Eventually, Prince Constantine sent the pithos to the Archaeological Museum of Athens, where is it still on display. Hood (1987, 91) suggested that the vessel illustrated by Fabricius (1886, pl. IV) appears to be the same with the one gifted by Kalokairinos to the National Museum in Athens. This is because a similar pithos is cited by Collignon and Couve in a catalogue of 1902, including the painted vases of the Louvre's catalogue with reference to Fabricius (Collignon and Couve 1902, 4; number 19; inv. no 1160). The decorative patterns, however, and the description given by Fabricius, do not seem to match completely:

'La vase est décoré de six rubans larges, en relief, faisant le tour du vase; l'intervalle entre deux rubans est rempli par un large ruban ondulé, également en relief. Les rubans, droits ou ondulés, sont décorés de gros points incisés' (ibid. 4).

From the description, this particular pithos appears to be identical to the one gifted to the British Museum in London in 1884 (see below). However, the discrepancy between the date of Fabricius' publication on the one hand (1886) and the date of donation to the London museum on the other (1884) raises a slight problem as to its identification. Fabricius makes no reference to the pithos illustrated being sent

anywhere; rather he noteδ that the illustration he provided is of a copy produced by Gilliéron (Fabricius 1886, 136)[236]. This may explain the confusion about which pithos is actually illustrated by Fabricius and which one was sent to Athens.

Three of the Knossian jars remained in their hometown. Only a few months after the excavations were stopped, Kalokairinos gave them to the then newly found Archaeological Museum of Crete, of which he was also the treasurer (fig. 121)[237]. The pots would constitute part of the first main collection of the Museum. The remaining pithoi were sent to museums abroad.

5.5.2. Pithoi sent abroad: international politics and the start of a thrilling archaeological race

The first pithos to leave Kalokairinos' collection was sent to the British Museum in London in 1884, where it is still on display in the corridor to the Mycenaean room along with other Cretan antiquities[238] (fig. 122). The details of the donation to the museum became known more than a century later, when Sinclair Hood (1987) published the transcripts of four letters written by the British consul, Thomas Sandwith, in the period between 1870 and 1885[239]. Three of these letters, written between 1879 and 1884, were addressed to Charles Newton, then Keeper of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum; the fourth letter, written in 1884, was sent to Alexander Murray, assistant to Newton and later his successor. As well as information on the pithos, these letters are revealing for the role of Kalokairinos' pithoi in the beginnings of the archaeological race towards more excavation at Knossos.

Sandwith wrote the first letter to Newton just after Kalokairinos' work, in April 1879, reporting with great excitement about the findings there, making special note to the pithoi and urging Newton to visit the site in order to start excavations:

---

[236] Gilliéron is known to have produced a number of drawings and copies of ancient Cretan vases. One of them is a copy of the pithos now exhibited at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in New York (accession number: 29.111). It is mentioned as a copy of the pithos now in Athens.

[237] Kopaka (1989/1990, fn. 54) gives the inventory numbers of the pithoi at the Heraklion museum: 1174, 1175, 1176. One of this pithos was also identified by Christakis (2005), with an inv. n. HM 24889, as included in his study of Minoan Cretan pithoi.

[238] Inv. n. 1884, 0807.1

[239] The local press at Heraklion reported the visit at Knossos of the British consul, who accompanied Photiades Pasha in April 1879, soon after Kalokairinos' excavations were stopped (Aposkitou 1979, 83).

'it is very desirable that you should pay Crete a visit. I am especially desirous that you should obtain a look of the ruins of Gnossos which are likely to repay excavations [...] Excavations have recently been undertaken on the site of Gnossos by the dragoman of our Vice Consulate in Candia, but the Authorities soon put a stop to his work. He opened a large chamber containing some 20 jars ranged in rows [...] I took a rough sketch of two of the large jars which I inclose [sic][240] [...] The place looked as if it was a store for oil or wine. One small jar was found full of peas – like green peas, entirely charred' (Hood 1987, 87).

The postscript of this first letter reveals the accumulated political tension of the time though, circumstantially, favourable for the British:

'There could be not a better opportunity of excavating than now before Crete passes out of Turkish hands, in case you think Gnossos a good field for the purpose' (ibid. 88).

Sandwith's second letter to Newton, written a year later, further highlights the vivid interest that Kalokairinos' finds triggered, shortly after his excavations. Most revealing too, is the reference to the interest by the French School of Antiquities at Athens, who wished to continue the excavations '*on the condition of leaving to the authorities of the island whatever antiquities they may discover, reserving to themselves the privilege of publishing a report of their finds'* (ibid. 90).

The donation of the pithos to the Museum in London is reported in Sandwith's third letter to Newton, written in April 1884. From this, we learn that the jar received a royal treatment: it was transferred by the flagship of the Duke of Ellington, aptly named *HMS Minotaur*. Carefully secured, the pithos made its way from Candia to Chania, and from Suda Bay to the port of London.

Sandwith's fourth letter, this time to Murray, was written a few months later, in June 1884. Part of his text essentially characterizes the purposes of the donation and the aim the pithos was meant to fulfil. Sandwith was granted permission by the *Syllogos* to acquire the pithos, despite its members being '*very jealous of any antiquities leaving the island*'; however, the former reassured them that *'by allowing this curious relic of their ancient city to be displayed in our national collection, it*

[240] Dirk Booms, curator of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum has kindly informed me that unfortunately, these sketches are not to be found anymore in the archives of the Museum.

would interest archaeologists in Cretan pottery which was so little known' (Hood 1987, 93). In the same letter, Sandwith also urged Murray to send a written note of gratitude to Minos Kalokairinos, '*for he will be immensely proud of showing his friends an official document from so distinguished a body as the Trustees of the British Museum'* (ibid. 93). Kalokairinos received this letter of thanks in July of the same year (Kopaka 1989/1990, 39).

Fuelled by Kalokairinos' donations, the archaeological race at Knossos becomes ever more evident in this final letter by Sandwith. This time, it is not the French but the German interest shown by Schliemann, who appears to be *'anxious to excavate in Crete';* thankfully for the British, however, the Cretan Assembly would not grant Schliemann the permission to dig for as long as the Turkish troops remained on the island '*any antiquities found by Schliemann would of course be deposited, the military authorities, in the event of disturbances arising, would not scruple to carry off all such spoil to Constantinople'* (Hood 1987, 93).

At the same year of the donation to the British Museum, another smaller pithos was sent to Rome, in the museum referred to by Kalokairinos as the 'Italian Museum in Rome' *('το εν Ρώμη Ιταλικόν Μουσείον')* (Kopaka 1989/1990, 39). It is assumed that vessel was donated to Museum Pigorini of Rome, as Hood (1987, 91, n. 32) identified it with the one included in Maurizio Borda's catalogue of the Museum Pigorini (Borda 1946, 106; 17; inv.n. 65507; table XXX). Indeed, although the vase is noted to be perhaps from Aghia Triada or Phaistos, Borda mentions the similarities it bears with those discovered at the Palace of Knossos[241].

Kalokairinos also reports his intention to send one of the pithoi to the National Museum in Madrid but the actual donation remains unidentified (Kopaka 2015, 146, fn. 7).

The final pithos mentioned by Kalokarinos as transported abroad was one sent to Louvre in 1895 or 1896, via Clermont-Ganneau who had visited Knossos in 1895 (Clermont-Ganneau 1901, 43; Driessen 2001, 115), and who also delivered a number of other ancient objects from Crete to the French Museum (Pottier 1922, 21, n.A489; Sporn 2012, 206; Kotsonas 2016a, 309, fn. 27-28). Kalokairinos wrote that he donated the pithos via Clermont-Ganneau to the Louvre in 1895, for which he

[241] It is also possible that the pithos mentioned by Borda is the one referred to as 'plain/undecorated' by Fabricius (1886, 145).

received a letter of thanks by the French archaeologist himself (Kopaka 1989/1990, 39-40). Several years after the donation, in January 11th 1901, Clermont-Ganneau addressed to the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* and reported that Kalokairinos, a strong, intelligent Cretan with a predestined name *('un Cretois fort intelligent, répondant au nom prédestiné de Minos Calocherinos')* had allowed him to study his collection of antiquities from Knossos and that he had let him choose the objects Clermont-Ganneau considered most interesting to be donated to the Louvre (Clermont-Ganneau 1901, 43). However, there is no mention on whether the pithos sent to Paris was selected by Clermont-Ganneau or by Kalokairinos.

Hood and Kopaka identified not one, but two Knossian pithoi sent to the Louvre by Kalokarinos (Hood 1987, 91, esp. fn. 30; Kopaka 2015, 146-147) (fig. 123). Indeed, the museum has several pithos fragments and two complete Knossian pithoi, one acquired in 1896 by the Clermont-Ganneau mission (Pottier 1922, inv. n. CA 924; nos. 1,2, pl. 1-2) and another one, acquired in 1887, that is catalogued as *'Trouvé a Cnossos'* (ibid. inv.n. CA 113, nos. 3-4, pl. 3-4). The pithos acquired in 1887, however, does not tally with Kalokairinos' notes, for these do not include any reference to a second pithos being sent to Paris other than the one sent in 1896 via the French mission (Kopaka 1989/1990, 39-40). In addition, none of the 12 pithoi described by Fabricius looks to correspond with the one delivered to the museum in 1887 (CA 113) insofar the handles are concerned. More specifically, Fabricius mentioned that *'The number of upper handles comprised invariably of three or four; five pithoi had as many lower handles as upper, whilst, in the case of the seven remaining three- and four- handled pithoi, there were only two handles attached at the lower part'* (Fabricius 1888, 146; translated by the author). This description is not in correspondence with pithos CA 113 of the Louvre, for the latter does not carry (or seem to preserve traces of) any handles on the lower part. It is peculiar that a second Knossian pithos found its way to the French museum after Kalokairinos' excavations. If that was the case, this raises the question as to why, if Kalokairinos had donated more than one piece to the Louvre, he omitted to mention it in his later report, in which he made references to the individual pithoi sent overseas.

Notwithstanding the inconsistencies amongst the various sources regarding the number of pieces given to the French museum, it is clear that Kalokairinos maintained warm relations with the French who had already shown a great interest in

continuing his excavations. This interest is also attested by some later notes of the excavator himself, who appeared particularly keen in collaborating with them:

'*Mr. Haussoullier, member of the French School at Athens, published in the Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique of 1880-1882, with my permission, a short report of my finds. [...] The publications of these reports triggered the strong interest of the French School at Athens, which agreed together with the abovementioned owner of the Kephala* [i.e. Zekiris Bey Ibrahim Ephentakis] *to continue the excavations. But the then Administration did not grant permission'* (Kopaka 1989/1990, 37; translated by the author).

Indeed, Haussoullier was the first one to be invited by Kalokairinos to visit the site (Driessen 1990, 26), and he published the abovementioned article in 1900 at the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*. The same paper was featured, almost unchanged, in Dumont and Chaplain's *'Les Céramiques de la Grèce propre',* under the suggestive sub-heading *'Le plus anciennes céramiques'* (Dumont and Chaplain 1888, 64-66). The paper(s) make extensive references to Kalokairinos' pithoi:

'Au mois de décembre 1878, M. Minos Kalokairinos commença des fouilles près du village de Machriteichos, dans un endroit nomme Képhala, sur l'emplacement de l'ancienne ville de Knossos. Les travaux, interrompus vers la fin du mois de février 1879, ne mirent au jour aucune inscription: on ne découvrit que quelques vases et des fragments de poteries qu'il importe de signaler' (Haussoullier 1900, 125).

As a persistent characteristic attributed to Cretan pithoi, Haussoullier's lengthy postscript mentions the resemblance of the ancient pithoi to the modern pitharia still used by the 'Greek peasants' ('*Prés de ces jarres, absolument semblables a celles ou les paysans grec d'aujourd hui mettent leur provision d'huile, on a trouve des fèves et des pos carbonises',* ibid. 127 ; see also Chapter 2).

Regardless of the small number of vases published in this paper by Haussoullier, the evidence from Kalokairinos' excavations and especially the pithoi was convincing enough to point to a 'more ancient period' on the island of Crete: '*Si peu nombreux que soient les vases de Knossos, ils n'en forment pas moins un groupe nouveau, appartenant a cette époque très-ancienne dont les traves se sont retrouvées sur d'autres point du monde grec: dans les iles voisines de la Crète'* (ibid. 127).

Kalokairinos finds and particularly the donations of his pithoi managed to rouse an immense interest for further explorations. Fabricius, a German pioneer of

Cretan archaeology himself, introduced his 1886 report on Cretan antiquities with a bold introductory statement, noting that, among all the excavations undertaken in Crete, their importance is not to be compared with that of the finds that came to light from the excavations of Minos Kalokairinos:

'Unter allen in den letzten Jahrzehnten auf Kreta unternommenen Ausgrabungen, von denen mir Kunde geworden ist, nehmen sowohl nach Ausdehnung wie nach Zahl und Bedeutung der Funde die erste Stelle diejenigen des Herrn Minos Kalokarinos ein, eines angesehenen Kaufmannes von Iraclio (Candia), der im Jahre 1877[242] *mehrere Wochen land auf dem Iraclio benachbarten Stadtgebiet von Knossos Grabungen nach Altertümern hat vornehmen lassen'* (Fabricius 1886, 135).

In turn, this publication by Fabricius and mentions of the pithoi provoked the interest of his correspondent and fellow countryman, Schliemann, who was eager to explore Knossos. Schliemann was in fact shown the finds by Kalokairinos himself, during a visit in the latter's mansion and a tour at Knossos[243]. After his visit, on 22 May 1886, the ambitious German archaeologist wrote a letter to his friend, Max Müller, saying:

'I would like to conclude my life's work with a great undertaking in the to me familiar field of Homeric geography, that is to say, with the excavation of the prehistoric palace of Knossos'. To which Müller, replied that *'Crete is a perfect rookery of nations, and there, if anywhere, you ought to find the first attempts at writing, as adapted to Western wants'* (cited in Wood 1998, 85).

In the 1899 letter Schliemann wrote to Kalokairinos, the former asked about 'what became of the variously decorated pithos' ('*τι ἀπεγένετο ὃ ποκίλως κατακεκοσμημένος ἓξ ὀπτῆς γῆς πίθος)* which Minos had sent to Prince Constantine of Greece as a gift, further informing Kalokairinos about his plans to buy the land at Kephala (Kopaka 1989/1990, 39). Schliemann's thwarted expectations and regrets for his failed attempt to dig at Knossos became widely known in the last months of his life, when he admitted that *'I hoped to discover the original home of Mycenean civilization* (Wood 1988, 85).

Of course, Schliemann was not the only one interested in excavating at Knossos. The pithoi found by Kalokairinos spoke of a prosperous and highly

[242] As mentioned, Fabricius erroneously mentioned the excavations to have started in 1877.
[243] On Schliemann and Knossos, see Hood 1992; Traill 1995, 228, 252-255, 264.

developed civilization that was buried at Knossos. Soon after his donations, one of the greatest archaeological races, known as the 'Battle of Knossos', would begin[244]. Archaeologists from USA, Italy, France, Germany and Great Britain, all struggled for permission to excavate at the site, with Evans eventually triumphing and beginning excavations for the British in 1900, almost two decades after Kalokairinos. Within these decades, the ideas concerning the discoveries in Crete spread rapidly and as Europe entered the 20th century, it became known that Crete held the key to tracing Europe's most ancient past. Thus, as well as satisfying personal ambitions, the excavations at Knossos fulfilled the vision of a continent for it was finally proved that it was '*in Greek lands where civilization put forth its earliest blossoms...'* (Evans 1894, 271).

As for Kalokairinos himself, we will never know exactly how he felt during the last decade of his life, upon learning the news of Evans' discoveries at Knossos from 1900 onwards. By the time Evans had started digging, Kalokairinos had already suffered major personal and economic losses. We know, however, that Kalokairinos filed a lawsuit against Evans on June 1907 accusing him, amongst other transgressions, for illegally exporting antiquities unearthed at Knossos[245]. This suggests that the Cretan might have held a lasting resentment against his British successor, perhaps related to his underappreciated role at Knossos. But it seems that, despite his broken morale, Minos Kalokairinos wanted his name carved on the throne of his namesake King. It was only a month after Evan's excavations and soon after he announced that he had found the earliest European civilization that he drafted his '*Guide to the Ancient City of Knossos',* having his name placed in the title as the first excavator of the Megaron of King Minos and the famous labyrinth.

Eventually, Kalokairinos has been granted his posthumous promotion as the efforts to restore his passionate dedication and contribution in the archaeology of Crete have born fruit. This is reflected in the relative archaeological literature of the past two decades mentioned earlier. Moreover, in 2017, Kalokairinos featured as the first excavator of Knossos in the Greek documentary series entitled 'Those who dared' (*Αυτοί που τόλμησαν*), written and directed by Giorgos Kordellas. Finally, on

[244] The quest for the excavations at Knossos is also known as '*La Bataille de Cnossos'* (Driessen 2001), *the Cretan Quest* (Huxley 2001) or as the '*Battle of Knossos'* (Brown 1986).
[245] The manuscripts of Kalokairinos' lawsuit against Evans are included and discussed in Genova's PhD dissertation (Genova 2019, 212-221, fig. 40, appendices 6 and 7).

March 2nd 2019, more than 140 years after his diggings, Kalokairinos' bust was placed at the archaeological site of Knossos, in an official ceremony organized by a team of locals and officials of the city of Heraklion. Close to that of his British colleague, his is the first the visitor now encounters (fig. 124).

As for the importance and the symbolisms attached to Kalokairinos' pithoi, these have been most exquisitely encapsulated in the lecture delivered by Gerald Cadogan in November 12th 2011, on the occasion of the British Museum *Knossos Day*. In his lecture, entitled 'Minoan Distance: Knossos from modernism to post-modernism', Cadogan, urged his colleagues to *'go and see Kalokairinos' pithos. The pithos here in the British Museum is packed, like all pithoi, with economic and social history, and shows that archaeological, Minoan Knossos has been part of London consciousness already for over 130 years'*[246].

Conclusion

Integrating the cultural biographies of objects in the context of critical and introspective historicization of Greek archaeology, this study explored the early modern cultural biographies of twelve Minoan pithoi excavated at Knossos in 1878 by Minos Kalokairinos. The excavations were conducted during intense political and ideological circumstances of the late 19th – early 20th c., when Europe experienced the birth-pangs of nationalism and when Crete faced constitutional crises as the islanders yearned for the unification with Greece. Under such socio-political contexts, Kalokairinos' pithoi turned into instruments of political influence via their subsequent donations in the museums of Greece and Europe.

On the one hand, the pithoi acquired a fundamentally European social and ideological character in the context of international politics, also igniting a thrilling archaeological race towards the discovery of Knossos. On the other hand, they came to assume a strictly local role by becoming a metonym for archaeology and culture in Crete, thereby stimulating notions of an unbroken local history, a present past and a tangible link between modern Cretans with their Minoan ancestors. In the meantime, these pithoi were interpreted by Kalokairinos and contemporaries and near-

[246] The audio recording of his lecture has been uploaded online by the BSA: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ekZ2RgVIT74. A paper similar to this lecture has been published in Cadogan 2004.

contemporaries as evidence of the hitherto unidentified EIA-Archaic Cretan *andreion*, becoming entrenched in an archaeological quest which continues to this day.

The present case-study showed how Minoan pithoi became vested with complex cultural biographies and they acquired multiple ideological and political roles as they resurfaced in the early modern period. As I discuss in the following Chapter, these roles have been customarily assigned to Cretan pithoi of all periods, including Archaic decorated pithoi; and they influence their perception even in the most recent of times.