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Abstract

This paper explores some parallels between the long-used house tomb at Myrtos-Pyrgos (Pyrgos II–IV; EM III/MM IA–LM I) on the south coast of Crete and the tombs in the Pre- and Proto-palatial cemetery at Petras, which is at least two days’ journey away on the north coast. It is most unlikely that there was any sort of special relationship between the two sites, but apparent similarities — and dissimilarities — in how they coped with death should contribute to our understanding of both of them.

I focus on Pyrgos, while always looking towards Petras. Topics will include briefly: the placing of the Tomb in relation to the settlement and the river plain below; its monumental nature; the possibility (or not) of more tombs; the history of its use; the question of primary or secondary burials; differences between the human depositions in the Tomb chamber and the ossuaries; and changes over time in the types of goods deposited — where an unexpected parallel with Petras House Tomb 2 is found in the many early Protopalatial plates (shallow bowls) that had been deposited in a side-chamber.

Finally, I shall review the ideological significance of the Tomb, and give a quick summary of its use in Pyrgos IV (LM I).

This paper explores any similarities or differences between the Tomb, a house tomb, at Myrtos-Pyrgos and the house tombs at Kephala–Petras that may advance our explanations of both sites. We must keep in mind, however, that any analogies or contrasts are likely to be generic, and specific connections are less likely, as the sites are up to two days’ walk from each other. Pendlebury gives 8.5 hours from Siteia to Gournia and 2.5 from Pacheia Ammos to Ierapetra.¹ From there to Myrtos along the coast used to be about two hours, as Mariani reported in 1895.²

Luckily, there are some similarities, which is why I am here; and we shall see some differences. But first I must stress that all remarks about the Tomb are provisional, until the volume in the forthcoming Myrtos-Pyrgos series is ready. It will also cover the evidence for occupation in the Pyrgos 0, I and II periods.

---

¹ Pendlebury 1939, 9-11.
² Mariani 1895, 155.

My warmest thanks to Metaxia Tsipopoulou for inviting me, and for an excellent, constructive conference.
In comparing the two sites, we can start at a blatant difference. The Pyrgos Tomb stands alone (Fig. 1). It is not part of an extended cemetery like Kephala-Petras. The Pyrgos hill may, of course, hold other tombs — even house tombs — under the eroded debris that covered its slopes; but we have not found them, while the monumental character and, perhaps, the positioning of the Tomb may let us imagine that it was unique at Pyrgos. If this was the case, the implied big difference between Petras and Pyrgos must reflect different social needs: the Petras cemetery seems to have been for the use of all, or most, of its community, the Pyrgos tomb just for a sparse elite. This would reduce the value of comparing Pyrgos with Petras, except that the main comparisons at Pyrgos are with the superior House Tomb 2 at Petras (henceforth Tomb 2).

Sound evidence supports the view that the Pyrgos Tomb was for the elite, indirectly in Pyrgos II (of EM III/MM IA to MM IIA) from the siting and arrangement of the Tomb complex, and directly in Pyrgos III (MM IIB) and IV (solely or mainly LM I) from the burials in the Tomb chamber and offerings in it or fallen into it. As I have discussed this, and other features of the Tomb, in the more recent papers cited in n. 3, what follows is a summary, focussed however on analogies with Petras.

Like Tomb 2, the Tomb (Fig. 2) was placed in a conspicuous spot, at the west corner of the settlement and yet where it would have been seen by people working in the fields below in the Myrtos river valley or travelling through Myrtos by land. In the settlement, it was the destination of a stepped way (Steps 8) that came down the hill (Fig. 3), probably

---


4 Tsipopoulou 2012b; 2012d; this volume, “Documenting Sociopolitical Changes”.

5 Tsipopoulou 2012b; 2012d.
from a gathering place of cosmological importance on the top of the hill (which could have been the Courtyard there), and passed through the settlement to join (at Steps 9) a paved processional way (Street VI) laid out on a terrace built over the debris of the destruction by fire that ended the EM II Pyrgos I settlement. The Street is 15 m long, and 20 m to the Tomb door.

Street VI led first to a small Forecourt (Space 100), where a restricted number of people could have gathered (the rest could have watched from nearby) outside the north entrance of the Tomb Chamber (Room 105), with access also to an ossuary (Ossuary 2/Room 104) next to the Chamber.

The east side of the Forecourt had a low stone bench or offering platform (Fig. 4); Tomb 2 had many. Where the Street and the Forecourt met was a stone with cupules (Fig. 5) — and there was another in much the same position when the Forecourt was re-laid towards the end of the Pyrgos II period. At Petras there were no such cupule-stones. The Street continued to the Chamber door. Here there would have been steps down from the Forecourt level, and there were more steps inside the door. In all it is a drop of about 2 m. But the vital details had vanished before we started — and we shall never know.

The Chamber, an irregular 5 x 3 m, has a stout central pier, still 1.10 m high, to support an upper floor or the roof, a feature that may derive from the Π-shaped central piers of the later houses at nearby EM II Fournou Koryfi. EM II Pyrgos may well have had them too: the cultures are identical.

Sharing a party-wall with the Chamber was another ossuary (Ossuary 1/Space 106), a small oval pit containing a pithos, and packed with skulls set against the pithos and other bones. A door socket in situ nearby shows access between the Ossuary and the Chamber.

The Tomb buildings and ceremonial approaches were built in EM III/MM IA at the start of the Pyrgos II period, when the site was re-inhabited following a break after the EM IIB destruction. The complex sits on and in burnt mud bricks and other debris of the destruction.

A likely foundation deposit below the Forecourt, with a combination of East Cretan EM III and poly-

---

6 Cadogan 2011b. For the Π-shaped piers of Fournou Koryfi, see now Shaw forthcoming.
7 Cadogan 1978, 73-4, fig. 9.
8 It may be that they were linked to the former life of Pyrgos, in the way that the EH IIB/III Tumulus at Argive Lerna was built over the House of the Tiles.
9 Cadogan 2011c, 108-9, figs. 5.5-5.6.
chrome Central Cretan-style (and more Knossian than Phaistian) MM IA pottery,\textsuperscript{10} exemplifies the fluctuating regional character of Pyrgos.\textsuperscript{11} At Petras House Tomb 2 had two distinct phases. The earlier one is dated MM IA, and the burials, including one of the very few primary ones, were deposited in a large pit cut into the bedrock.\textsuperscript{12} Culturally, Pyrgos was a frontier-site for much, if not all, of its long life. In Pyrgos I it seems to have marched with eastern Crete. In Pyrgos II central Cretan culture met eastern Cretan culture here, with links in pottery as far as Palaikastro — but more significant was the eastern type of tomb architecture. Pyrgos III saw an intimate relationship with Malia,\textsuperscript{13} and the rest of the Lasithi-Mirabello region (as far as Chamaizi, I believe); in Pyrgos IV (LM I) the links reverted to Knossos. In (late) Hellenistic times its frontier role revived with the erection of a (frontier-) shrine of Hermes and Aphrodite to mark the western boundary of Hierapytana;\textsuperscript{14} and in Venetian times, and later and, perhaps, earlier too, the Myrtos valley was the boundary between the provinces of Siteia and Candia.\textsuperscript{15}

There are no burials in the Chamber from the time of the original use (Pyrgos IIb) of the Street and Tomb, but there were plenty of dead in Ossuaries 1 and 2. In later Pyrgos II, which continued into MM IB and IIA (paralleling Petras), the evidence of use comes not so much from burials (although some may date to Pyrgos IIc–d) as from the funerary equipment: lots of flaring bowls had been stacked (Fig. 6), with some lamps, on a plastered bench at the back of Ossuary 2. At Petras, the benches in HT2 were external, but not plastered; HT10, MM II has a large external plastered bench.\textsuperscript{16} If there was not already an upper floor in Ossuary 2, one was probably inserted at this time when the Forecourt outside was raised 30 cm in a refurbishment of the Tomb. This can be linked to new gravel yards, with hearths, spread over the paving of Street VI, perhaps after disuse for some years, perhaps following violent storms and mud flows when the easiest thing was just to lay out a new space over the debris. Either way, the changes
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**Fig. 4.** Forecourt: cupule stone. Photo G. Cadogan.

**Fig. 5.** Ossuary 2: some of the bowls and a lamp as found. Photo G. Cadogan.
show that the Tomb continued as an integral part of the life of the settlement.

The first semi-extended burials extant in the chamber are of Pyrgos III date: six men, who were given coarse ware jars from Malia, which were found upright in position next to them.\(^{17}\)

In MM III Pyrgos seems abandoned: the evidence includes the lack of burials in the Chamber, and rain-washed mud that had accumulated over the basal MM IIB burial level. Bits of charcoal and lime suggest fumigation (and/or cooking), and white-washing (or burying in lime), which may mark the first steps to making the Tomb fit to use again, as happened in Pyrgos IV (LM I). The new burial level was around 50 cm higher than before. This would have reduced the height of the Chamber — and meant that, whether walking alive or laid out dead, one was literally on top of the Protopalatial (Pyrgos III) forebears who, for the first time in the history of the Tomb, had not been removed for re-deposition.\(^{18}\)

The new level received fewer burials than were in the level below: three male trunks, but parts of four or more men in all. Two of the three skeletons were, one could say, enhanced, notably one young man who was given an older skull at an odd angle — perhaps it was his father’s. There is no evidence for any female burials in the Chamber. More than 1000 pots had cascaded down over them from the room on the floor above (which probably had shelving), as well as daggers, stone vessels (at least two of them antiques), triton (Charonia) shells, and chlorite drill-guides,\(^{20}\) suggesting that Pyrgos had a select group of stone vessel makers. (Making stone vessels is not surprising as the Myrtos area has some of the best serpentine sources in Crete.) But the men were also hunters, in view of the goat or agrimi horns and dogs’ paws in the Tomb,\(^{21}\) and they were tall. Six of them, from both the Pyrgos III and the Pyrgos IV burial levels, averaged 1.69 m in height (as against 1.58 m in the Knossos Ailias cemetery),\(^{22}\) and had good signs of longevity.\(^{23}\) Finally, in interpreting this male elite, there may be a further piece of evidence to be extrapolated from Renaissance iconography: in his picture Neptune and Amphitrite (1516), Jan Gossaert paints a triton shell to cover/hide Neptune’s penis (although the scrotum and testicles are still partly visible).\(^{24}\) Could it be that the triton shell, several of which were among the goods fallen into the Chamber, had a specific male significance in Late Bronze Age Crete?

How does the Pyrgos Tomb help interpret the Petras cemetery? Apart from the big difference of its appearing to be an \(\acute{a}pax\), and without discussing the general point that it is another instance of the distinctive burial architecture of eastern Crete, I think we see the following similarities.

1. The Pyrgos Tomb was set so as to be both of the settlement and yet just outside it: a liminal position relating it to, and at the same time separating it from, the very first use or occupation of the hill in Pyrgos 0 (FN IV–EM I) and in EM II, while helping bestow the power through memory (whether real or imagined or both) of age and ancestry — as happened at Petras. For both sites we have no idea of the local ‘political’ history
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that influenced the decisions on where to site the burial grounds, but we can be sure there was some, as well as an indubitable spirit of place. Finally, it became clear at this Symposium how at Petras, as at Pyrgos, the new burial ground was sited over EM II buildings.25

2. Although on the west side and just below the top of the hill, it was still in a prominent position, a landmark emphasising authority and, I expect, ownership for a considerable distance around. Likewise, Kephala-Petras was a prominent site on a hill: its Greek toponym underlines that prominence.

3. In Pre- and Proto-palatial times the history of the two burial grounds is in general similar, and certainly some (perhaps all) of the burial practices were. Both burial grounds start at a time of consolidation (probably nucleation at Pyrgos) and would have been part of that process. And both the Pyrgos Tomb and Petras House Tomb 2 were monumental, Pyrgos as part of a grand design, but Tomb 2 stands out against the others. The Pyrgos Tomb had an upper floor and both tombs had gathering places, if for a limited number at Pyrgos (unless attendees were made to move on to allow access to others: the receiving line approach), and low platforms.

The platforms were probably for offerings, if to benefit the living. (I recall a memorial service beside the grave [of Michalis Vrentzos] at the Analipsi church by the Idaian Cave, when the low cover of the tomb became a table for food, drink and cigarettes.)26 By the late Prepalatial, the rites involved producing food that needed plates or bowls, such as soup or stew (and earlier we see a lot of cups, at least at Pyrgos), and there were lamps — which could mean ceremonies at night, or just that the tombs were dark. At both sites the bowls and lamps were stored to use another time.

4. The bones at both places show some evidence for family units among the dead. At Pyrgos it is a matter of recurring prominent jaws.27 I am also struck by the males in Tomb 2 as a parallel for our males.

5. Since these are both burial places that were created in important locations at a time of civic resettlement and were then used for two or three centuries (not counting the LM I use of Pyrgos), I think we can see in both: the power of place and the power of ancestry linked to a naturally conservative view of life, and all deployed through the powerful symbolism of funerary rituals by the elite at Pyrgos and as represented in Petras Tomb 2 to maintain, among other things, the fact of their being in charge and, more than likely, the actual owners of the land. That the dead in the Chamber at Pyrgos are males makes it easier to accept some such scenario, at any rate by the end of the Protopalatial period. In Petras Tomb 2 on the other hand, there were also women, children and babies.

6. The refurbishment at Pyrgos in or by MM IIA may also be linked to a chain of important events, which Metaxia Tsipopoulou highlighted at the first Petras Symposium, both at Petras, with the building of the Palace overlapping the last uses of the Kephala cemetery (and a symbolic transference of power and ceremonial from the dead to the living), and elsewhere in the island with major works on the palaces or construction of Quartier Mu at Malia and, even at Pyrgos in MM IIA or IIB the construction of a Central Building with defence works and two remarkable cisterns. All the same, we have to keep in mind that, almost as if in league with some of the tholos tombs of south central Crete (and perhaps as yet one more piece of

---
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27 Musgrave 2015, 89.
evidence of its frontier position), the Pyrgos Tomb does stand as a monument on its own, unlike the Petras cemetery. Furthermore, it was still in use in LM I, a time when few burials are seen anywhere in Crete, and not at Petras, although the LM IB jug and cup from the Rock Shelter\textsuperscript{28} are a sign that, if not worship, at least awareness of what had been there before had not vanished altogether, recurring again in LM III, as David Rupp showed us.\textsuperscript{29}

Both sites then offer a very long-lived sense of place and connection which, if it was at times interrupted, as must have happened, would all the same pop up again, to remind us of the inextinguishable diachronic values of life in Crete. As for the late Prepalatial and earlier Protopalatial, we have plenty of affinities between the two sites. I am sure that anyone making the two days’ journey between them would have found much that was familiar when she or he reached the other end.

\textsuperscript{28} Tsipopoulou 2012b, 125-6, fig. 12.
\textsuperscript{29} Rupp this volume.
Discussion

Platon: Did I understand correctly, the upper floor was used as a shrine?
Cadogan: I do not know. It seems that they deposited these 1000+ vases, and also the stone vases etc. at the upper floor, during LM I, but the truth is that we do not have any evidence about what was happening there in the earlier periods, in MM IIB as well as in the MM IIA. We know that there were all these dishes but for what purpose, or whether there was a shrine we do not know, although it should not be excluded.
Platon: In this case we might have a parallel with the Temple Tomb?
Cadogan: There is undoubtedly a parallel with the Temple Tomb, also for the tradition of its use.
Muhly: There must have been a real feeling that it was important to reoccupy the site, after the destruction in MM IIB. But when they came back things must have been a total mess. It must have taken them a long time to clean it up.
Cadogan: They did not only clean it up; they also built the Country House. One feels as if a Knossian master mason has been set down to put that there. And of course the importance of its position for the lines of communication must have played an important role. We know very well that the road goes through Viannos and comes down to the sea, at Myrtos. And also of course the route goes up through the river valley to the mountains. This is why it has always been such a global position and this is what we think is reflected in the changes of the material culture, especially the pottery, over the different periods, it is fluctuating because of the geoposition. But, incidentally, I am delighted to see the excavator of the tomb, and after that I found it pretty difficult and I was thinking I was not going to do much archaeology again, but here is Robin Barber, whom I have not spotted before, he was a trench supervisor, and he was a demanding undertaker.
Palyvou: Can I return to the issue of the upper floor?
Cadogan: Yes
Palyvou: I see the νυσομετρικές καμπύλες, and, if I understand them correctly, the wall at the corner must be high. I mean if the road was shorter and the building was more to the right, it would fit better to the νυσομετρικές καμπύλες. As I see it now, it looks more like a basement and ground floor, not like a ground floor and an upper floor.
Cadogan: You mean the Chamber?
Palyvou: Yes.
Cadogan: It is a semi-basement. There is quite a drop. Yes, you are right, and the unfortunate thing is that that bit of the wall washed away and there has been, I would not say illegal, but irregular excavation before we began which is precisely why you get a break in the architecture. It is easy enough to see this line carrying up straight on to the step, but there is a break in the architecture right there. Yes, it was semi-basement.

Palyvou: How you would approach it then?
Cadogan: You would then go first to the upper floor.
Palyvou: You would not see it then as an upper floor, not as a 2-story building from the road.
Cadogan: You would see it from down below as a 2-story building.
Palyvou: From down below, yes.

Greek Abstract

Σύγκριση και αντίθεση: Το ταφικό κτίριο στον Πύργο Μύρτου
Η παρούσα ανακοίνωση ερευνά μερικά παράλληλα μεταξύ του μακρύτερου ταφικού κτηρίου του Πύργου Μύρτου (Πύργος ΙΙ–ΙV. ΠΜ ΙΙ/ΜΜ ΙΑ–ΥΜ I) στη νότια ακτή της Κρήτης και των τάφων του Προανακτορικού – Παλαιοανακτορικού νεκροταφείου του Πετρά, το οποίο απέχει τουλάχιστον δύο ημέρων δρόμοι προς τη βόρεια ακτή. Είναι απίθανο ότι υπήρχε οποιαδήποτε ειδική σχέση μεταξύ των δύο χώρων, αλλά εμφανίζονται διαφορές — και διαφορές — ως προς το πώς αντιμετώπισαν το θάνατο συνεισφέρουν στην κατανόηση μας και των δύο.

Εστιάζω στον Πύργο, ενώ παράλληλα κοιτάζω και προς τον Πετρά. Τα θέματα περιλαμβάνουν εν συντομία: – Την θέση του Τάφου σε σχέση με τον οικισμό και την κοιλάδα του ποταμού παρακάτω. – Την μνημειώδη φύση του. – Την πιθανότητα ύπαρξης (ή μη) άλλων τάφων. – Την ιστορία της χρήσης του. – Το θέμα των πρωτογενών και δευτερογενών ταφών. – Διαφορές μεταξύ των ταφικών αποθέσεων στον θάλαμο του Τάφου και στα οστεοφυλάκια. – Αλλαγές διαχρονικά στους τύπους των οστεοφυλάκια – όπου υπάρχει ένα απρόόμοιο παράλληλο με το Ταφικό Κτίριο 2 του Πετρά στα πολλά ρηχά πινάκια που είχαν αποτεθεί σε ένα πλευρικό διωμάτιο.

Τέλος, κάνω επισκόπηση της ιδεολογικής σημασίας του Τάφου και δίνω σύνοψη της χρήσης του στη φάση Πύργος IV (ΥΜ I).