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Biography of Costis Davaras

Eleni Mantzourani

Costis Davaras was born in Athens on the 19th of March in 1933. He grew up in a highly intellectual environment. His mother, Julia, came from an old family of Cephallonia and was awarded the Ouranis Prize for Literature. Costis graduated from the high school of Plaka, located just below the Acropolis. The window of his room overlooked Hadrian’s Gate. He studied Archaeology at the Universities of Vienna, Munich, and mainly Athens, from which he received his first degree in 1956. His professors of archaeology, indeed all of them outstanding scholars, were Ernst Buschor in Munich and Spyridon Marinatos, Georgios Mylonas, Nikolaos Kontoleon, and Anastasios Orlandos in Athens.

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.

He continued his postgraduate studies as a bursar of the German State in Munich. His Professors were Ernst Homann-Wedeking for Archaeology and Hans Wolfgang Müller for Egyptology. He served in the Greek Army as an interpreter and translator for several NATO languages.

Before entering the Greek Archaeological Service he served, for a short time, as an assistant to the Ephor Markellos Mitsos in the Epigraphical Museum in Athens and Ioannis Threpsiades in the excavations at Athens and the Temple of Artemis at Aulis in Boeotia. Davaras entered the Archaeological Service in 1960 after examinations, which, unfortunately, were later abolished for some decades, indeed a heavy blow in meritocracy. His first position as Epimeletes was in Herakleion under Nikolaos Platon and later under Stylianos Alexiou, both well-known scholars and excellent tutors. At that time, those three men were the only archaeologists serving on Crete.
He was an assistant to Platon in several of his excavations all over Crete, including the peak sanctuary at Kophinas and the palace of Zakros. He also conducted his own excavations, including tholos tomb II at Apesokari and the important caves of Skoteino near Knossos and Eileithyia at Inatos. A second campaign, in collaboration with Nikolaos Platon, was undertaken at Eileithyia. He also brought to light several Minoan chamber tombs and a Geometric tomb at Knossos.

In 1964 he was transferred to Athens as Epimeletes of Attica and Boeotia. There he excavated the Geometric cemetery of Anavysos and the Thesmophorion of Eretria, later turned over for publication to Ingrid Metzger of the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece. During this period he was the first Greek archaeologist to be trained by the Navy in underwater archaeology. He even directed a research team below the temple of Poseidon at Sounion in order to locate fallen blocks and part of its sculpture.

At his own insistence he was re-posted to Crete in 1965, this time as Head of the Archaeological Service for West Crete (Chania–Rethymnon) with Yiannis Tzedakis as his assistant.

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 1968 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 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. 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.

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
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 re-instated 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.

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
PHILISTOR: STUDIES IN HONOR OF COSTIS DAVARAS

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.
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ASCSA  American School of Classical Studies at Athens

km  kilometer

L.  length

LBA  Late Bronze Age

LC  Late Cycladic or Late Cypriot

LH  Late Helladic

LM  Late Minoan

LN  Late Neolithic

m asl  meters above sea level

m  meter

MACFA  macroscopic ceramic fabric analysis

max.  maximum

MHS  Minoan Hall System

MM  Middle Minoan

MN  Middle Neolithic
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dia.  diameter
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EBA  Early Bronze Age

EM  Early Minoan

EN  Early Neolithic

FAF  folded-arm figurine

gr  gram

h.  height

HM  Herakleion Archaeological Museum

HNM  Hagios Nikolaos Archaeological Museum

HTR  Hagia Triada

kg  kilogram
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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A small clay model (Figs. 17.1, 17.2) of what seems to be a boat was found during recent excavations at the settlement of Kephala Petras, near Siteia. The site has two major phases of occupation: the earlier dates to the very end of the Final Neolithic (FN), the FN IV phase, and the later dates to the very beginning of the Early Bronze Age (EBA), Early Minoan (EM) IA (Papadatos 2008; Papadatos et al., forthcoming). The boat model was found on the bedrock in an open area immediately outside the southwestern corner of the EM IA building complex (Papadatos 2008, fig. 15.3). It was not found in situ but in a secondary deposit, lying directly on the bedrock. However, the associated pottery and the stratigraphy of the area clearly suggest a dating to the EM IA phase, which is reinforced also by pottery typology. More specifically, the model is made of semicoarse reddish-brown clay with a surface fired to a grayish-black color. In terms of fabric, surface treatment, and visual appearance, it belongs to the Dark Gray Burnished ware, the most common locally made ware, dating to the EM IA phase (Papadatos 2008; Papadatos et al., forthcoming).

Nearly one-third of the model is preserved. It is an oval shape with a pointed end, and the side walls have an outward inclination. The preserved terminal is angular and slightly raised above the level of the gunwale line, but it is not clear whether it represents the bow or the stern of the boat. The base is flat, probably depicting the boat afloat (Brodie 2006, 210). The quality of production is quite meticulous and the appearance identical to the finest pottery of the site. The maximum preserved length is 6.9 cm, and the width is 5.9 cm; the maximum height is 3.1 cm, and the minimum is 2.8 cm. If restored, the total length would be approximately 18–20 cm and the width approximately 7–8 cm.
In general, boat models constitute a rare category of finds in the Early Bronze Age Aegean. A complete catalog was provided over 25 years ago by C. Davaras in his article on the Mitsotakis Collection model (Davaras 1984). Of the 45 specimens, only 11 are dated to the EBA or the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age (MBA; Davaras 1984, 59–60). Six of them were found on Crete—at Mochlos, Palaikastro, Christos, Traostalos, Myrtos Pyrgos, and one is now housed in the Mitsotakis Collection. The rest come from the Cyclades: one stone model from Phylakopi and four lead models from Naxos. The authenticity of the latter, however, has been seriously challenged and should be treated with caution (Sherratt 2000, 102, 106). More recent additions to Davaras’s small corpus, apart from the Kephala Petras specimen, are one model from Markiani Amorgos (Brodie 2006, 210–211), two from Mochlos (Soles 2004, 5, fig. 7; this vol., Ch. 21), two from Troy (Marangou 2001, figs. 10, 11), and one from Thermi (Marangou 2001, figs. 12, 13). The recently found Mochlos models show that another “possible” model from the same site, found by Seager and discussed by Davaras (1984, n. 5) but not included in his catalog, is indeed a boat model and not horns of consecration, as suggested by some scholars in the past (Vagnetti and Belli 1978, 137, pl. VIII:7). Thus, a new revised corpus of boat models would include 11 specimens from Crete (4 from Mochlos and 1 each from Palaikastro, Christos, Traostalos, Myrtos Pyrgos, the Mitsotakis Collection, and Kephala Petras), 2 from the Cyclades (Phylakopi and Markiani), and 3 from the northeast Aegean (2 from Troy and 1 from Thermi). The rarity of boat models from the Cyclades comes in contrast to a relatively large corpus of two-dimensional depictions, which includes the incised longboats on the Chalandriani frying pans (Coleman 1985, fig. 5) and the rock carvings from Korphi t’Aroniou on Naxos (Doumas 1965, fig. 4) and Strophilas on Andros (Televantou 2008, figs. 6.8, 6.10).

With the exception of the Phylakopi model, which is made of stone, all the others are made of terracotta. In terms of context, most have been found in settlements, with the exception of one model coming from the Traostalos peak sanctuary and two from funerary contexts (the Christos and Mitsotakis Collection specimens). The Kephala Petras specimen is the earliest, dating to the beginning of EBA 1. The Markiani and Thermi models are a little later,
AN EARLY MINOAN BOAT MODEL FROM KEPHALA PETRAS, SITEIA

dating to the end of EBA 1 or the beginning of EBA 2; the Palaikastro and Mochlos models date to EBA 2, while the rest (Christos, Mitsotakis Collection, Myrtos Pyrgos, and Traostalos) date to the end of the EBA or the beginning of the MBA. The Phylakopi and Troy models are not securely dated, but they seem to fall within the confines of the EBA.

On the basis of the available iconographic evidence (whether two- or three-dimensional), it is traditionally accepted that during the Neolithic and the earlier part of the EBA, seafaring was carried out by simple dugout logboats (Basch 1991; Marangou 1991, 2001). These boats were seaworthy, but their traveling range and floating capabilities were rather limited. The situation is considered to change in the EBA 2 period, when large longboats suitable for long-range maritime activity appeared. These longboats were either made entirely of wooden planks (Basch 1991; Broodbank 1989, 329) or were extended dugouts, having dugout keel and wash strakes added to their sides (Johnston 1985, 6). The depictions on frying pans indicate that they were powered by a large number of paddlers. The building of such boats, the mobilization of the paddlers, and the undertaking of long-range maritime travel was a difficult and demanding task, one requiring a certain degree of social complexity, the agency of leaders, and the development of important maritime centers (Broodbank 1989; 2000, 211–222). On this basis, their appearance is often considered as part of the International Spirit phenomenon and the intense inter-regional interaction of the EBA 2 Aegean (Renfrew 1972, 451–455). However, rock-carved depictions of such longboats were recently found in the FN settlement of Strophilas on Andros (Televantou 2008, figs. 6.8, 6.10). These reinforce the idea that the corresponding shipbuilding technology existed since the end of the Neolithic. It is only their iconography that became so prominent in the EBA 2 period, for reasons related to changes in the cultural and social significance of maritime activity rather than to technological innovation (Broodbank 2000, 256).

In contrast to their increased capabilities for long-range seafaring, longboats had very poor cargo capacity, especially with a full crew at open sea. It is rather difficult to imagine that they functioned as transport vessels; it is more likely that they were used as special-purpose prestige crafts (Broodbank 2000, 96–102). Other more mundane activities, such as transportation, fishing, and commuting, had to be fulfilled by other type(s) of vessels. Of particular importance is the Palaikastro model, which is the only existing three-dimensional representation with typical longboat features such as one high end and one low end with a spur-like projection. It appears,
however, to depict a small craft rather than a large longboat (Johnston 1985, 7). This shows that these features were not exclusive to longboats but may have existed also on smaller crafts powered by only a few paddlers.

On the basis of shape and analogies, the Kephala Petras model certainly does not represent anything like the longboats. The preserved end, whether bow or stern, is very different not only compared to longboats but also to other models that are close in space and time, such as those from Mochlos and Palaikastro. Moreover, the length/width ratio is rather low, around 3:1, compared to that of the longboats, which was probably around 10:1. It lies between the Mochlos and Palaikastro specimens (5.5:1 and 4.5:1 respectively) and the Markiani model (2:1).

Concerning the means of manufacture, the model itself does not offer much evidence. It seems most probable that dugout logships, skin boats, or coracles were used in the beginning of the EBA. However, as discussed above, the rock carvings of Strofilas indicate that the technology of building a ship entirely or almost entirely with wooden planks probably existed as early as the FN period. The Markiani and Troy models, which have been identified as simple dugout logboats (Brodie 2006; Marangou 2001, 742), have a rounded section, and their walls have an inward inclination that reflects the section of the tree trunk from which they were formed (Greenhill 1976, 134; Marangou 1991, pl. II:f). Moreover, these models have rounded terminals and the transition from the bottom to the sides is smooth, features that are also regarded typical for simple dugout logboats. In contrast, the Kephala Petras model walls have an outward inclination, the terminal is pointed, and the angle between the sides and the bottom is sharp. For this reason it seems probable that the Kephala Petras model is closer to the Mochlos, Palaikastro, and Thermi specimens, which are considered as extended dugouts—i.e., boats with dugout keel and wash strakes added to the sides in order to increase the freeboard (Johnston 1985, 6–7; Marangou 2001, 743–744). A boat of this structure would require some sort of thwart, but this may have originally existed in the missing part of the Kephala Petras model.

The final issue to be discussed is the function of the boat that corresponds to the Kephala Petras model. Even if it is not an accurate representation, it seems clear that it corresponds to a boat suitable for transportation due to its wide keel. If it belongs to the advanced type of the extended dugout, its floating capabilities exceed the limitations of the simple dugouts allowing travel to the open sea, though not without taking into serious consideration the weather and the sea conditions.

All these are admittedly highly hypothetical, but the archaeological evidence from the site of Kephala Petras may give additional support. The entire chipped stone assemblage of the settlement is composed of Melian obsidian. It could derive from a small number of exhausted cores, corresponding only to a small number of interspersed and sporadic arrival episodes (D’Annibale 2008, 193). The prevalence of Melian obsidian and the non-utilization of waste products, particularly in the EM IA phase, may suggest that shortages of obsidian were not considered imminent. The typological and petrographic study of the pottery showed that approximately 10% of the FN ceramic assemblage and a smaller percentage of the EM I assemblage was imported from outside Crete, probably from the Cyclades (Papadatos et al., forthcoming). The site also produced limited but indisputable evidence for copper smelting in the form of copper ores and slag (Papadatos 2007; Catapotis, Bassiakos, and Papadatos 2011). The provenance of the raw material remains uncertain, but it is most probably off-island.

The evidence above suggests that Kephala Petras imported goods and raw materials from off-island sources, probably from the Cyclades. It is difficult to reconstruct the intensity, frequency, and scale of this maritime activity, but it could be suggested that boats suitable for transportation, like the one modeled in clay, played a significant role. The rarity of boat representations in such an early period may suggest that maritime activity has not yet acquired the symbolic, social, and cultural importance seen in the later phases of the EBA. On this basis, the Kephala Petras boat model seems to belong to a crucial formative phase during which maritime activity increased in significance but had not been transformed yet into a restricted domain related to high-status individuals and/or communities.
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