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### Abbreviations

#### Archaeological periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Early Helladic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Early Minoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Final Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>Late Helladic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Late Minoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN</td>
<td>Late Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Middle Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Middle Helladic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Middle Minoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Middle Neolithic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTSOU</td>
<td>Petras Rock Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ-palace</td>
<td>Stratigraphical trenches of the palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.S.L.</td>
<td>Above Sea Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diam.</td>
<td>diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr</td>
<td>gram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg</td>
<td>kilogram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wt</td>
<td>weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lt</td>
<td>liter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>Mean Measure of Divergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNI</td>
<td>Minimum Number of Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISP</td>
<td>Number of Identifiable Specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Archaeological Museum, Siteia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>volume</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form of the English language for the native speakers (British or American) was the author's choice. For the non-native speakers the American form was used.
### Bibliographic Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAA</th>
<th>Archaiologika Analekta Athinon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ActaPalaeobot</td>
<td>Acta Palaiobotanica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA</td>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJPA</td>
<td>American Journal of Physical Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>American Journal of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmJHumBiol</td>
<td>American Journal of Human Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnnMathStat</td>
<td>Annals of Mathematical Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Archaeological Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arachne</td>
<td>(on-line access to the CMS, with corrected information and enhanced illustrations) [<a href="http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/drupal/?q=de/node/access">http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/drupal/?q=de/node/access</a> date March 2016.](<a href="http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/drupal/?q=de/node/access">http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/drupal/?q=de/node/access</a> date March 2016.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchDelt</td>
<td>Archaeologikon Deltion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchEph</td>
<td>Archaeologike Ephemeris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAtene</td>
<td>Annuario della Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAR-IS</td>
<td>British Archaeological Reports, International Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCH</td>
<td>Bulletin se correspondance hellénique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICS</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>Annual of the British School at Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Corpus der minoischen und mykenischen Siegel, Berlin 1964-2000, Mainz 2002-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CretChron</td>
<td>Kretika Chronika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EtCret</td>
<td>Études Créroises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAS</td>
<td>Journal of Archaeological Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMA</td>
<td>Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentro</td>
<td>Kentro: The Newsletter of the INSTAP Study Center for East Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Monumenti Antichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJA</td>
<td>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakt</td>
<td>Praktika tes en Athenai Archaeologikes Etaireias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMA</td>
<td>Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEA</td>
<td>Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Cadogan, G. 2013a. "Myrtos and Malia: Middle Minoan ‘entente cordiale’? Or unitary state?", Creta Antica 14, 105-121.


seSSing specialisation in Prepalatial Cretan ceramic
production”, in TEXNH. Craftsmen, Craftswomen and
Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of
the 6th International Aegean Conference/6e Rencontre
egéenne internationale, Philadelphia, Temple Univer-
sity, 18-21 April 1996, Aegaeum 16, R. Laffineur & P.P.
Betancourt (eds.), Liege, 275-289.

Delvin, J.B. & N.P. Herrmann 2008. "Bone color as
an interpretative tool of the depositional history of
archaeological remains", in The Analysis of Burned
Human Remains, C.W. Schmidt & S.A. Symes (eds.),
New York, 109-128.

Demargne, P. 1945. Fouilles exécutées à Mallia. Ex-
ploration des nécropoles (1921-1933), EtCret 7, Paris.

Demargne, P. & H.G. De Santerre 1953. Fouilles
exécutées à Mallia: exploration des maisons et quartiers
d’habitation (1921-1948), EtCret 9, Paris.

Dessenne, A. 1957. Le Sphinx. Étude iconographique I.
Des origines à la fin du second millénaire, Paris.

Detournay, B., J.-C. Poursat & F. Vandenabeele
1980. Fouilles exécutées à Mallia: le Quartier Mu. II,
Vases de pierre et de métal, vannerie, figurines et reliefs
d’appliqué, éléments de parure et de décoration, armes,
sceaux et empreintes, EtCret 26, Paris.

Dierckx, H.M.C. 2012. “Size does matter: the signi-
ficance of obsidian microliths and querns at the Petras
cemetery”, in Petras, Siteia – 25 years of excavations and
studies. Acts of a two-day conference held at the Danish
Institute at Athens, 9-10 October 2010, M. Tsipopoulou
(ed.), Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens
16, Athens, 171-178.

Dimopoulou-Rethemiotaki, N. 2005. The Archaeo-
logical Museum of Herakleion, EFG Eurobank Ergasias
S.A. & John S. Latsis Public Benefit Foundation, Athens.

Doonan, R.C.P., P.M. Day & N. Dimopoulou-Rethe-
miotaki 2007. “Lame excuses for emerging complexity
in Early Bronze Age Crete: the metallurgical finds from
Poros Katsambas and their context”, in Metallurgy in the
Early Bronze Age Aegean, P.M. Day & R.C.P. Doon-

Doumas, C. 1977. Early Bronze Age Burial Habits in
the Cyclades (SIMA XLVIII), Gothenburg.

dence from the graves”, in THANATOS. Les coutumes
funéraires en Égée à l’âge du bronze: Actes du colloque
de Liège (21-23 avril 1986), Aegaeum 1, R. Laffineur

as Major Actors,” in Political Economies of the Aegean
Bronze Age Papers from the Langford Conference, Flor-
da State University, Tallahassee, 22-24 February 2007,

Duckworth, W.H.L. 1903. “Excavations at Palaikastro
II.11: Human Remains at Hagios Nikolaos”, BSA 9,
350-355.

Duday, H. 2006. “L’archéothanatologie ou l’archéologie
de la mort”, in Social Archaeology of Funerary Remains,
R. Gowland & C. Knüsel (eds.), Studies in Funerary
Archaeology, Oxford, 30-56.

Duday, H. 2009. The Archaeology of the Dead. Lectures
in Archaeothanatology, Studies in Funerary Archaeol-
ogy, Oxford.

Duday, H. & M. Guillon 2006. “Understanding the
circumstances of decomposition when the body is
skeletonized”, in Forensic Anthropology and Medicine.
Complementary Sciences. From Recovery to Cause of


Goodison, L. 2009. “Gender, Body and the Minoans: Contemporary and Prehistoric Perceptions”, in *FYLO. Engendering Prehistoric ‘Stratigraphies’ in the Aegean*


Hamilakis, Y. 1998. “Eating the dead: mortuary feasting and the politics of memory in the Aegean Bronze Age societies”, in Cemetery and society in the Aegean
Bronze Age, K. Branigan (ed.), Sheffield Studies in Archaeology 1, Sheffield, 115-132.


Hankey, V. 1986. "Pyrgos: the communal tomb in Pyrgos IV (Late Minoan I)", BICS 33, 135-137.


Hutton, P.H. 1993. History as an Art of Memory, Hanover.


Irish, J.D. 2006. “Who were the ancient Egyptians? Dental affinities among Neolithic through Postdysnatic peoples”, *AJPA* 129, 529-543.


Isaakidou, V. in press. “Kamilari Cemetery. The animal remains”, in *La Necropoli di tombe a tholos di Kamilari (Phaistos)*, L. Girella & I. Caloi (eds.).


Knappett, C., M. Pomadère, A. Gardeisen, T. Gomrée, T. Theodoropoulou & P. Westlake, with M.E. Alberti, H. Procopiou, V. Thomas & E. Morero in press. Deux dépôts MM IIA dans le secteur Pi de Malia, BCH.


Margaritis, E. forthcoming a. "Seeds for food, seeds for crafts? The Archaeobotanical remains of the site of Pefka at P. Ammos".

Margaritis, E. forthcoming b. "The plant remains from Late Minoan Mochlos".


Marinatos, S. 1929. "Πρωτομινωικός τάφος παρά το χωρίον Κράσι Πεδιάδος", *ArchDelt* 12, 102-141.


Moutafi, I. 2015. Towards a social bioarchaeology of the Mycenaean period: A multidisciplinary analysis of funerary remains from the Late Helladic chamber tomb cemetery of Voudeni, Achaea, Greece, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sheffield.


Panagiotopoulos, D. forthcoming. “Μινωική Κοιμάσα: Ανασυνθέτοντας την ιστορία ενός μεθώριου κέντρου της νότιας Κρήτης”.


Petruso, K. M. 1992. KEOS, Results of Excavations Conducted by the University of Cincinnati under the Auspices of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens VIII. Ayia Irini: The Balance Weights. An Analysis of Weight Measurement in Prehistoric Crete and the Cycladic Islands, Philipp von Zabern, Mainz on Rhine.


Platon, L. forthcoming. "Πεζούλε Κεφάλα Ζάκρου. Δύο τάφοι της εποχής των πρώτων μινωικών


Platon, N. 1974. Ζάκρος, το νέον μινωϊκόν ανάκτορον, Η εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, Αρχαίοι Τόποι και Μουσεία της Ελλάδας 5, Αθήναι.


Works Cited


Works Cited


Triantaphyllou, S. in press. “Managing with death in Prepalatial Crete: The evidence of the human remains”, in From the Foundations to the Legacy of Minoan So-


Triantaphyllou, S. & L. Girella. in press. "Η συ/uni03BCβολή τη/uni03C2 έλετη/uni03C2 των ανθρώπινων οστώ στην ερευνη του θολωτού τάφου στο Κα/uni03BCηλάρι στην πεδιάδα Μεσαρά/uni03C2, ν. Ηρακλείου" , Πεπράγ/uni03BCένα ΙΑ΄/uni0394ιεθνού/uni03C2 Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου, Ρέθυ/uni03BCνο 21-27 Οκτωβρίου 2011.


Histoire de l’art et archéologie de la Grèce antique, University of Texas, Austin, Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory, 473-479.


Valamoti, S.M. 2009. “Σπόροι για τους νεκρούς; Αρχαιοβοτανικά δεδομένα από τη Μαυροπηγή Κοζάνης, θέση Φυλλοτσαϊρι”, Αρχαιολογικό Έργο στην Άνω Μακεδονία 1, 245-256.


sion during stone vase drilling in Bronze Age Crete", *Wear* 263, 48-56.


**Vavouranakis, G. 2014.** "Funerary Pithoi in Bronze Age Crete: Their Introduction and Significance at the Threshold of Minoan Palatial Society", *AJA* 118, 197-222.


**Walberg, G. 1983.** *Provincial Middle Minoan Pottery*, Mainz am Rhein.


Final remarks:
Some comments on the Pre- and Proto-palatial cemetery and the Late Minoan IIIC settlement of Petras Kephala

Donald C. Haggis

As an archaeological site and complex multi-stage program of research, it is frankly difficult to overstate the importance of Metaxia Tsipopoulou’s excavations at Petras. In studies of Minoan Crete, we tend rather reductively to define distinct sociopolitical spheres of palace, peak, town, cemetery, port and countryside (villa and farmstead), notwithstanding the complex and highly variable chronological, spatial and cultural patterns implicated by the data. Petras is no exception. The site and region have produced remarkable evidence of each of these systemic contexts spanning some three millennia; and even though this level of complexity and continuity is not unusual for Minoan palatial sites, it is the analytical scale and stratigraphic clarity of the interrelating components that make Petras a compelling test case for exploring some of the most basic and vexing questions of Minoan settlement and society, not only for the Siteia valley and eastern Crete, but for the island as a whole.

Although we think in terms of material or ceramic regionalism – east Crete is thought to have been variously influenced by Malia or Knossos – the observable processes suggested by the Petras data are frankly surprising, and by analogy, could help us to re-examine some traditional problems in Minoan archaeology, and resituate east Crete in shaping ideas of normative societal structures. In terms of the focus of the present collection of papers, the late Prepalatial and Protopalatial cemetery on the Kephala hill, Petras should stand out as a singular and critical dataset and conceptual base line for reconsidering the form, function and sociopolitical context of the Minoan mortuary landscape. Indeed the participants have engaged these questions, and my purpose here is not to review or critique the individual contributions, but to reflect on the implications of this data and some of the perspectives and lines of thought presented in this volume.
The various studies in this volume emphasize the implications of two analytical frames of reference (or interpretive axes). The first is the synchronic structure of the cemetery itself, by Early Minoan IB – Middle Minoan IIA (and B), which should inform our broad conceptualization of Prepalatial and Protopalatial cemeteries in east Crete. We recognize that there are differences of tomb and cemetery types in the period, though this formal diversity correlates archaeologically to specific culture-regions and periods, as well as actual cultural dynamics, if not also to context-specific systemic conditions and practices. The Kephala cemetery is probably not unique – indeed Mochlos and Sissi may give us glimpses of a roughly similar organization of space and activities. So while we can find a generally similar tendency of architectural and material elaboration elsewhere, Petras does give us for the first time a well-preserved, well-excavated and finely-dated picture of a complex cemetery and associated ritual landscape, connected to both a settlement and palace. It will no doubt stimulate new perspectives, reorient discussions of the artifact of the so-called east-Cretan “House Tomb,” the sociopolitical and highly ritualized arena of the cemetery and its relationship to the development of palace societies on the island.

The second analytical frame is the diachronic; the temporal axes of vertical and horizontal stratigraphy, which provide chronological reference points, helping us relate the cemetery to other installations and activities at Petras and in the broader region – indeed establishing contextual correlates for understanding forms, practices and developments in east Crete and elsewhere on the island. But the importance of the resolution provided by the stratigraphic detail at Petras lies in visualizing diachronic processes. These are the different temporalities of human behavior within and around the tombs; and engagement with the buildings, the site and the broader region. In general, we can identify ritual or ritualized references to human and natural topography and to different temporalities (or time depths): the construction of the cemetery as a spatial and material reference to Early Minoan settlement and cemetery remains, both in the placement of the earliest tombs and in the construction of the house-tomb type; the complex manipulation of burials, stone tools, stone vases and plant remains; and ultimately a lingering MM IB–IIB ritual reference to the cemetery itself.

The critical phase change now elucidated by these excavations, is clearly EM III – or variously EM III–MM IA, or late Prepalatial. The implications of this stratigraphic horizon are worth considering. Although we generally acknowledge the house tomb as a Prepalatial type, Papadatos, in his important survey, provides some chronological resolution on the distribution in eastern Crete, emphasizing the widespread or normative use of the Rock Shelter in EM I–II (perhaps a type fossil, or cultural koine of sorts, continuing into Protopalatial), with variations of some distinction and social importance, such as the tholos tomb and cycladicizing rock-cut cist or chamber, and eventually house tombs (such as at Linares) by EM IIB. The 2015 campaign showed that Petras itself had become a cemetery by EM II. It is also extremely interesting that there is evidence for destruction and/or abandonment of EM II house tombs, in view of a reconstruction of the cemetery in the following EM III phase. My early views on settlement structure in Prepalatial (reviewed in part by Knappett and Ichim) were elaborated at the Sheffield round table in 2010. The normative pattern indicated by intensive surveys across the island would
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favor more than one Prepalatial aggregate by EM II at Petras. Thus two small settlements rather than a single nucleus on the lower hill are what one should probably expect.

Papadatos’ work is supplemented by Vavouranakis’ assertion that there was an intensification of funerary investment in the late Prepalatial period, which I think is not only right, but also coterminous with an uptick of ritual at peak sanctuaries. Thus, I cannot see a clear and easy structural opposition or polarization of “cemetery” and “peak”, or even “cemetery” and “palace” for that matter, as strictly competing ritual extremes of social integration: that is, the peak and palace as broadly inclusive, corporate and regional integrating institutions that weakened or controverted the intrinsically local (even household) kinship associations expressed in the cemetery. As Vavouranakis indicates, surely it is more complex than this.

Regarding peaks and palaces, we are still faced with material and architectural chronologies, depositional practices and systemic functions which are simply not coterminous or coextensive archaeologically, though we still comfortably acquiesce to the tyranny of our own nomenclature that implicitly defines palace, cemetery and peak, their diachronic changes and contributing social groups. The same is evidently true of cemeteries, where we are still inclined to see various configurations of burials and tombs as correlates of nuclear families, conforming to our vaguely-construed and ethnographic perception of the death experience, and worse, the tyranny of analytical archaeology: quantification and demographics. We imagine an unattainable whole, a demographic and material totality that yet defies the reality of sampling, and even the randomness and potential of human behavior and cultural process. That is, we have failed to model discontinuity as an intrinsic characteristic of cultural production and the human experience, as well as a result of our archeological methods. For Crete, this still means stem families expressing distinctions of status in the tomb, and leading inexorably to the development of elite regional power structures by the first palace period, which were eventually subsumed by a central palatial authority that co-opted the ritual syntax of both cemeteries and peaks.

That the late Prepalatial period constitutes a significant phase transition, few would doubt from a stratigraphic perspective, though I would not characterize the situation in east Crete in typical pejoratives of sociopolitical disturbance or turbulence per se. It is certainly a period of widespread reorganization, including changes in settlement structure following the stratigraphic discontinuities in EM IIB. Nor would I qualify the burnt destructions or abandonments in EM IIB as necessarily an indication of catastrophic societal collapse. There is, however, a change by EM III. We might see settlement nucleation on various scales; the construction of a number of settlement aggregates with fortifications; changes in ceramic production; the formalization if not the foundation of rituals at peak sanctuaries; the evident expansion of the House tomb type; and more generally the codification of various forms of material and symbolic expression that constitute Minoan cultural production.

The results of Nodarou’s study of ceramic fabrics from contexts spanning the Prepalatial and Proto-palatial emphasize an important dimension of this phase transition. Changes in clays and standardization of fabrics are remarkable indications of a shift in manufacturing. We observed this same trend (macroscopically) at Gournia in the late Prepalatial, though the fabric-ware correlation was much less standardized – Nodarou’s comment on the granitic-dioritic Fabric 5 echoes our findings of the lack of coherent fabric-ware standardization in EM III–MM IA. Nodarou’s longer view, however, points
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out the longevity of the new fabrics, and suggests that whatever processes stimulated the stylistic diversity of the Lakkos had no apparent effect on the potting recipes being used. The results of her study support my impressionistic characterization of the MM IB assemblage, in which shapes appear to be rooted in a late Prepalatial potting tradition; indeed even the decorative elaboration (especially in white-on-dark and rough-burnished wares) may be a deliberate reference to and interpretation of a Prepalatial past. In my view, real change in forms does not appear until MM IIA.

Were Minoans conceiving social identities, affiliations and relationships to the landscape differently in EM III–MM IA, from how they had in EM II? Probably not, but there is evidence for changes in how they organized and expressed those relationships, and I think that these changes affected the extent and form of regional integration that we see in the archaeological record. Thus, what constitutes continuity (or development) in Minoan society and culture may have to do with an underlying social mechanism – perhaps ritual structure – that required a conscious and constant material rendering of that continuity or the idea of continuity. That is to say, archaeologically identifiable changes or innovations may be seen as a complex material reference to the past: a conscious interpretation or constructed link to a material or physical landscape that at any point in time may lie just within or beyond one’s immediate experiential memory or historical consciousness. Papadatos’ chronological survey of tomb types emphasizes both the shift in emphasis to the house tomb in EM III, but also the deliberate lingering of burials in rock shelters – especially secondary treatments – such as at Kephala, Hagios Antonios, Hagios Charalambos and Kavousi–Evraika, in some cases well into the Protopalatial period. Even though we normally construe a return to rock shelters as a “continuity” of use, it may mask a more complex process of referencing the past, or indeed the use of the physical and mortuary landscape as political negotiation of social identities in a period of culture change.

Along these lines, in Vavouranakis’ paper, he comments on Soles’ use of the term “organic architecture” to describe the interaction between human and natural landscapes (in this case the use of bedrock outcrops as part of tomb design). Vavouranakis adds to this, drawing an important distinction between human engagement with natural and anthropogenic (material or artifactual) topography. Vavouranakis’ use of Soles’ term is I think evocative of the Minoan tendency to refer to the constant, the static and the unchanging continuum of the landscape as a past-as-present. I have modeled this aspect of cultural production as static, experientially constant or conceptually eternal, and fundamentally integrative; it is quintessentially Minoan, and is related not only to social realities but also to a Minoan world view. Thus, one way of thinking about the house tomb cemetery at Petras is as a material reference to and re-creation of a Prepalatial universe; an indigenous, if not autochthonous culture; static in form; integrative and internalizing in its burial methods; unchanging in the perception and cognitive experience of the participants; and reaffirmed in the establishment and consistent demarcation of burial and ritual zones.

Like the mortuary landscape, the essential settlement structure of Middle Minoan eastern Crete – at least until MM IIB – is patterned on complex networks of social interaction essentially established in the Prepalatial period. Knappett and Ichim’s paper makes this clear. The betweenness centrality that they model for the periods shows a persistent emphasis on inland loci, and the multiplicity or replication of places suggests degrees of centrality. And
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while we may not know precisely what this means, it could indicate resistance to large-scale nucleation and hierarchical structures, and the replication of a potentially large number of dispersed settlement clusters interacting in a variety of ways, and constructing multiple, lateral and heterarchical communication corridors – but also potentially operating over considerable distances.\textsuperscript{15} I also think that until we understand the social mechanisms that governed or permitted the longevity and resilience of such a settlement structure, we will never really understand Minoan society.

According to Tsipopoulou, House Tombs 3, 4 and 5 were EM III constructions, with House Tomb 1 added on the north side of this cluster in MM IB, separated from House Tomb 5 by a corridor. This is vitally important information that should lead us to consider the mortuary response to this EM III phase transition elsewhere in east Crete and on the island. We discover in the data not only a foundation date for this tomb type, as a cultural artifact, but the diachronic structuring of cemeteries, which hitherto we have examined only in small or isolated parts, with vaguely construed chronologies.

Tombs 3, 4, and 5 thus form a central core of building, the earliest on the ridge, establishing the basic form and structure of the cemetery. It is also significant that they were built directly on top of EM II buildings (the remains of an earlier settlement?), still visible in the landscape. It is relevant that Cacademic describes similar phasing at Myrtos-Pyrgos, where the tomb was constructed in the late Prepalatial, along with the paved street and forecourt that were laid in part directly on top of EM II destruction debris – and it may be ritually important that this EM II burnt debris was preserved. Petras is of course larger and the situation more complicated, though it may not necessarily be more complex in ritual behavior than Pyrgos. We are simply afforded more samples and more detail. What is important at Petras is that the scale and size of the samples allow us more room as it were to explore diverse behaviors, with which we may now interpret smaller and less well-preserved samples elsewhere.

In addition to this central core of early house tombs we also should consider Rooms 2 and 3 of House Tomb 2, which contained MM IA burials. In the case of Room 3, an MM IA pit extended below the floor and foundations of the room, thus antedating the construction of the room or the tomb itself. So although there is an EM III phase change with the establishment of the first house tombs, it may also be worthwhile to examine the spatial extent of a late Prepalatial horizon, and its residual visibility across the cemetery. By residuality, I mean indications and implications of process: the manipulation, displacement, destruction, replacement, cycling and caching of both bodies and objects that represent residues or palimpsests of chronologically early activities surviving for specific reasons in later contexts. This is hard to do, but the size, scale, longevity and diversity of depositional contexts at Petras suggest the possibility. The discussion here of architecture and stratigraphy,\textsuperscript{16} burials,\textsuperscript{17} stone tools,\textsuperscript{18} stone vases\textsuperscript{19} and plants\textsuperscript{20} emphasizes the multi-temporality of the material remains. For one example, the majority of the stone vases recovered cluster chronologically in EM III–MM IA,\textsuperscript{21} regardless of their MM IB or IIA depositional context.

Of course, our tendency to establish the chronology of the tombs as discrete architectural forms, or static artifacts or installations with chronologically-specific and fixed foundations and limited periods of use, may generate narratives that distort our percep-
tion of process. Indeed we face the usual problems of the limitations of our own datasets and the way we traditionally use them: abandonment, disuse and rebuilding fundamentally impede or hopelessly complicate our perception of a linear temporality. Thus, it might be better not to think of these buildings as planned or finished architectural forms or “types” at all – that is, as “tomb architecture” – but rather as multi-temporal spaces, undergoing continual but controlled change. What the House tombs are at any given point in time (and our limited chronology and vertical stratigraphy), is the manifestation of a complex history of ritual and burial practices: a collection of residues or material memories carried from EM III until MM IIA, and into MM IIB with the continuation of ritual activity in the ceremonial areas.

Rooms were added to buildings, though space may have been controlled and constrained, with wall placement negotiated by neighboring tombs and ceremonial areas. Pits were dug; burials were vertically and horizontally layered; and walls were inserted in order to subdivide earlier rooms lying on top of earlier burials. Platon observes similar spatial and material transformations at Pezoules Kephala at Zakros, where Tomb A was originally a roofed structure, and after its collapse (or destruction/deconstruction?) it was reused as an unroofed enclosure for secondary burials along with Tomb B. At both Pezoules and at Petras we see continual processes of engagement with the physical and built landscape. We may comprehend them as discrete foundation, construction or rebuilding events that in turn we can correlate with use surfaces and specific ceramic dates or phases, but I wonder what our coarse field methods are not allowing us to see: spaces formed and structured as the accumulation of residues resulting from a number of continual if not continuous activities. The same might also be said of the process of burial and secondary treatment of the dead.

The buildings were thus intensively manipulated – constructed and deconstructed – not unlike the artifacts and the burials that they contained. Bodies, stone tools, stone vases, metals and ceramic vessels were deposited, fragmented and reorganized and reconstituted in a variety of ways that need further study. It suffices to say that with Kephala we may eventually be able to document and model for the first time a range of practices constituting funerary and mortuary rituals in the period. I suspect though that we will need to revise our conceptualization of the cemetery and tomb, and create some new definitions of these places and practices, and of course come up with new nomenclature to define processes as opposed to installations or events.

As Triantaphyllou has pointed out, our limited terminology and reductive conceptualization of “primary” and “secondary” burial practices need considerable refinement, revision and elaboration. In House Tomb 5 she can identify the semi-articulation of a body, individual segments of articulated body parts and mixed comingled remains, along with intentional burning (thermal alterations), presumably outside the tomb, and animal gnawing and collateral fragmentation. So while primary inhumations are known in the cemetery, the intensity and variation of notional “secondary” practices presents a very complex picture of regular engagement with the buildings, artifacts and bodies. Reengagement with basic formation theory would be of considerable use here, and the bioarchaeological work may allow us to define specific patterns or perhaps even stages of the rituals of skeletal manipulation, and thus insights into the long-term primary processes and meanings of burial, deconstruction and reconstitution as social practices. As Relaki and Tsoraki suggest, the patterns of intentional destruction of stone vases (and the rendering of parts representative of a whole) may be analogous to aspects of the treatment of human and plant remains.  

Querns were also systematically destroyed, broken in half (ritually killed) and cached, and in some

22 Margaritis this volume,
cases whole tools may have been placed as “pillows” for individuals. Querns were also built into the fabric of the walls of the house tombs themselves. The practice of using querns as wall stones has been noticed in Prepalatial settlement contexts as well, but not yet systematically studied or even adequately documented. Myrtos-Phournou Koriphi is the best known case, where Warren identified a number of specific contexts. In light of this new evidence from the Petras house tombs, a re-examination of the practice in EM settlements seems important, and perhaps especially at Phournou Koriphi, given what we know of the site’s architectural phasing, and the patterns of transformation, disuse and abandonment of domestic spaces. Moreover, recent contextual studies of ground-stone assemblages in pre-abandonment Neolithic contexts reconstruct ritual deposition informed by the intrinsic meanings, functions and symbolic potency of querns. The careful manipulation and placement of these objects suggest that they retained and transmitted material memories of practices and experiences that were vital to the household, and its occupants, history and social identity.

The Kephala excavations have thus exposed activities that constitute both horizontal and vertical stratification in burial, funerary and post-funerary practices; these are identifiable physical transformations that extend to the architecture as well. The stratigraphic evidence reveals not only chronological phases, but details of temporal processes; that is, residues and palimpsests of various kinds of human engagement with the dead as well as the physical spaces and material structures that constitute the tombs themselves and what they were meant to reproduce.

So what does the Kephala-Petras cemetery represent? I suppose that no one would doubt the cultural significance of the house-tomb type – that it was designed to reproduce in miniature form the appearance of a domestic or residential unit, and by extension, to articulate the physical presence and identity of kinship groups or affiliations. Furthermore, the extra-funerary or post-funerary ritual functions of cemeteries in Minoan Crete, though still not fully understood, have been documented at sites such as Myrtos–Pyrgos and Gournia, and especially in Mesara, in the context of discussion of ceramic consumption: commensality as ritualized engagement within and between communities, centering on the cemetery as a liminal locus of space and time, in which participation and interaction expressed intergenerational connections with the place, and particularly the social unit of the household, whatever that might have meant.

What is unique at Kephala is that there are a number of these units, as well as a number of architecturally definable ritual spaces. Not only has the “house” been reproduced, but also an abstract or conceptual “settlement” of sorts, complete with streets and courtyards. Tsipopoulou points out the careful organization of this space, and what is more, the ritualized patterns of communication and access. The distinctly different orientations of tomb entrances and courtyards articulate areas for different activities and probably different groups of people at different times. Corridors leading to burial and to open-air rituals in courts were integrated but distinctly different and could suggest differences in the occasion of participation, as well as the range, number and status of the participants. Moreover, within the two ceremonial areas the differences in access, circulation, use of benches (and bench types) and even systemic assemblages give us yet another level of social structuring or stratification.
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The narrowly-controlled access from the south—from the settlement and palace—to the southern courtyard (Ceremonial Area 1), the use of south/southwest facing benches of House Tomb 2, and the eastern peribolos wall are particularly interesting. According to the excavator, the arrangement creates, on approach, an initial focus on House Tomb 2 and the adjacent court, a gateway into the complex, affording the tomb a special function or status. I would add that this tomb also opens to the north, not to the east or west, and thus faces House Tomb 3 and the earliest tombs and perhaps the locus of the earliest visible EM II remains.

The overall design of the cemetery is remarkable. Two separate courts, with evidently different ritual practices or functions; façades (and possibly a tripartite shrine); architectural horns of consecration; benches; modular construction; controlled access, processional routes, and communication patterns; and the two pantries (Rooms 7 and 8) containing stored drinking and dining wares (and directly accessible from the Ceremonial Area 1) should all invite conceptual comparison with contemporary palaces. Not to overemphasize the analogy—my point here is merely that the normal practices and exigencies of the use of the cemetery may have created spaces, use patterns, architectural forms and symbols that would have been comprehensible and meaningful to participants in a variety of ritual or ritualized contexts, and transferable between settlements, cemeteries and palaces.

As a synchronic artifact in any period of its use, I suspect that Kephala was not meant to be a facsimile of a Prepalatial settlement at all, or even a binary model or reflection of contemporary occupation at Petras itself, but rather a conceptual Prepalatial settlement. The location of the first tombs was carefully selected for its historical topography. It was situated directly below the FN and EM I settlement on the slope of the peak, and built directly on top of standing or visible EM II remains. We cannot know if the original tomb builders had direct kinship associations with these earlier structures, ancestral memory of the place or even an historical consciousness or concept of linear time. But I do think that the material memories trapped in the physical terrain allowed them to perceive its ancestral importance, its deep time and perhaps even chthonic significance and power. Vavouranakis again engages precisely this concept by observing a trend of materialization or material elaborations of space–time relationships in MM I–II, and an “emphasis on the re-creation of material entities”. Drawing on Hamilakis’ discussion of funerary rituals as a means of promoting the idea of indigenism in late Prepalatial central Crete,26 he presents a compelling survey of instances of the interaction between human actors and past material remains, something he sees as critical in shaping the Protopalatial cultural landscape.

Thus the structuring of cemetery space with its narrow corridors, courtyards and benches, and the deliberate insertion of ground-stone tools within the structural elements, are features readily recognizable at EM sites such as Phournou Koriphi. Specific material references to EM settlement architecture may also be found at Pyrgos, where Cadogan implies a connection between the central pier in the main burial chamber and a similar structural element at Phournou Koriphi. I would add that the Pyrgos tomb has a stone-paved forecourt with a kernos, features that also appear at the settlement of Vasiliki by EM IIA. Thus, the builders at Kephala may have sought to create a timeless and indigenous “settlement”, with specific spatial and material references to a Prepalatial past.

The house tomb divisions suggest that the burying groups at Kephala were probably, though not certainly, families. Without knowing what constituted the social configuration or affiliation of the groups, I would be hesitant to limit their size and social scope to individual nuclear families, regardless of the re-
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constructed rates of deposition. Furthermore, Tsi-
popoulou has commented on the lack of significant
material differentiation between the tombs – though
House Tomb 2 has a distinctive location, exterior
benches, access patterns, pantries for use in the Cer-
emonial Area and a concentration of seals. Thus, it is
highly unlikely that we are seeing either a large and
stratified segment of Petras’s MM I–II population or
even necessarily “elite” families. Though I do won-
der if we are not seeing the tombs that belonged to
the “original families” of Petras; burials of individu-
als who claimed descent from the original FN–EM
II settlements and cemetery at Kephala. Thus, the
stratification or distinction of its population – that
is, those afforded the privilege, custom or obliga-
tion of burial at this site – may well have had to do
with special social functions and historical identi-
ties of individuals and specific families, and perhaps
membership of groups that could conceivably have
crosscut simple divisions of wealth or biological lin-
eage. Such configurations could have been kinship
based, but could also have relied on quasi-kinship,
ancestral, tribal, cultic or other sodalities or affilia-
tions with connections to specific households and
formal roles in the community.

By MM IB, we should probably assume that at
least some of the burying population or the par-
ticipants of rituals that produced the deposits in the
ceremonial areas were the same people contribut-
ing to the Lakkos deposit on the lower hill below
the later palace. I have suggested elsewhere that the
pottery styles present in the Lakkos reflect feasting
activities of different social groupings using sets of
differently-formed and -decorated vessels that acted
as visual markers of roles or identities. Such con-
centration and diversity of ware groups and such
visible stylistic distinctions are not, however, at all
consistent with the Kephala assemblages. Indeed we
might imagine that either we have different groups
or different rituals that were played out in the two

locations, thus requiring a different assortment of
MM IB drinking and dining equipment.

If we are to tease out a connection between the
cemetery and the Lakkos, I would reconsider the
degree of homogeneity in the MM IB assemblage
in both tombs and ceremonial areas, if we could
isolate and define it. Ceremonial Area 2 is of course
something different altogether: it is decidedly more
diverse and complex (materially and stylistically)
than Ceremonial Area 1 and the tomb assemblages.
In Ceremonial Area 1, however, I can see clearly
light-on-dark ware, monochrome and what I call
rough-burnished or dark/red washed ware (round
or proto-carinated; and conical cups). While some
of the rough-burnished (dark/red washed) ware
conical cups could conceivably be MM IA, they are
common forms in the Lakkos and belong to MM IB.

The visibility of light-on-dark ware in the Ceremo-
nial Area 1 assemblage – carinated cups, tumblers,
plates, jugs, and tripod vessels – may be important.
It might be worth assessing, if not quantifying, its
presence among the other pots, such as mono-
chrome carinated and conical cups, and the rough-
burnished or dark/red washed ware examples. The
latter, constituting the least elaborate wares in the
Lakkos, seem to have a more limited range of shapes,
though fruitstands and kernoi might suggest some
special significance.

Obviously it may be difficult to sort out wares by
periods – the ceremonial areas and tombs were used
over a long period of time, and residues of activi-
ties, as well as actual vessels from earlier periods,
could have been integrated into rituals as late as MM
IIA or even IIB. I also suspect that a number of the
monochrome forms are probably MM IIA. That said,
the limited range of wares and vessel types strictly
contemporary with the Lakkos in MM IB could
show a much more limited and perhaps controlled
use of pottery, with light- on-dark ware emerging
as the predominant and the most elaborate ware
group. In Ceremonial Area 1 at least, it may not be
until MM IIA that we see clearly the introduction of
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polychrome, associated with specific MM II shapes such as kantharoi and hemispherical (ogival) cups.

A qualitative hierarchy of forms in the Ceremonial Area – such as Knappett has modeled so nicely for Deposit A in Early Magazine A at Knossos – is probably not forthcoming in Ceremonial Area 1. But correlating contemporaneous wares in both the tombs and in the ceremonial areas may give us some insight on the dynamics of stylistic interaction and perhaps the constituents that formed the MM IB assemblages of the Lakkos deposit, the tombs and the ceremonial areas. These are of course three distinct and contemporary ritual arenas, so it might be worth pursuing. For some MM IB examples, House Tomb 1, Room 6 may show a limited range of light-on-dark and rough-burnished or washed wares; similarly the contemporary House Tomb 2, Room 1 has light-on-dark and monochrome carinated cups. These spaces and burial activities in MM IB may reflect the same limited range of wares apparent in Ceremonial Area 1. House Tomb 4, however, is more complicated and the assemblage does not seem to fit the pattern: it has dark-on-light, plain and washed wares, but also a small banded polychrome round cup.

So, I do not mean to suggest at this point that the users of light-on-dark ware represent an exclusive or dominant authority or functionary within the rituals of burial or extra-funerary cult. But the prevalence or visibility of light-on-dark ware in these contexts (tombs, Ceremonial Area 1, and the Lakkos), together with the fact that it is produced in a local Petras fabric, and is one of the most distinctive and characteristic wares of MM IB in eastern Crete, may encourage us to look for its specific placement in the tombs – single carinated cups? – located in association with individual burials, perhaps as a special rite of offering at the time of interment or other secondary burial event. To conclude, I would say that if the tombs at Kephala represent certain families claiming lineage from Prepalatial ancestry, the dominant presence of certain ware groups in MM IB, such as light-on-dark ware, could reflect their continuing presence and perhaps control of rituals and inclusion in the cemetery.

The final chapter of Kephala-Petras's archaeology is Late Minoan IIIC, where David Rupp introduces a fascinating range of activities that he reconstructs from a series of buildings, installations and deposits that had been constructed on part of the earlier cemetery. Following the LM IIIB abandonment on the lower hill, occupation evidently shifted to Kephala. Settlement discontinuity, though still difficult to visualize in cultural or demographic terms, is commonplace on Crete in LM IIIC, so its appearance at Petras comes as no real surprise. What is surprising, however, is the close proximity of the shift in settlement from the lower hill to the Kephala hill next door – and what is more, the intriguing contexts that indicate the special functions of the new buildings.

We normally postulate chronological gap and even demographic change in the LM IIIB to IIIC transition, making it frankly difficult, at least in east Crete, to discern the origins or purpose of a new and dynamic settlement structure. But in the case of Petras, we do not need to have a gap. It is possible (if not even likely) that this new settlement site was selected precisely because of the local occupants' memory and continuous cognizance of the meaning or importance of Pre- and Proto-palatial remains. Rupp's suggestion that Kephala was a "place of memory" locating the inhabitants in a deeply-layered historical landscape, constructed beside and on top of the material memories of ancestors, is persuasive and should encourage us to re-examine other LM IIIC settlements in this light. This deep material past perhaps needed little reconstruction, considering the continuity and residual activities enacted, preserved or acknowledged into the Neopalatial and Postpalatial periods.

The establishment of LM IIIC settlements on Protopalatial sites has been documented before and is thus not unusual. Vronda is not only a good example, but also there is clear evidence there that
the LM IIIC builders incorporated Protopalatial spaces, a kernos or cupule stone and an open area or courtyard into the construction of the special-function Building A-B. Indeed, the Kavousi excavators suggest a dining function for the building, with structured deposits of drinking and dining debris in rooms B4 and B7 echoing the contents of the two pits at Kephala-Petras (Lakkos A and B).

As Rupp makes clear, the LM IIIC settlement at Petras purposefully respected the main areas of the Minoan cemetery and ceremonial areas, with the exception of specific buildings, installations and deposits that had ritual or ceremonial functions. These were constructed directly on top of and indeed incorporated parts of the central area of the earlier buildings. Building 1, the Square Platform, with its adjacent hearth, and the Open Area served to focus and to centralize rituals that involved intensive feasting, the remains of which were cached and deposited in two pits, north and south of the complex. The buildings actively used earlier architecture – the Square Platform even parts of the Neopalatial ashlar – and the associated activities may have functioned to anchor this settlement (and perhaps a principal functionary in the Rectangular Building) to a deep settlement history and mythologized origins, thus legitimizing the settlement and social structure through ritual practices that claimed indigenism and connections to the place and ancestral past.

We have long recognized the potential complexity and diversity of specialized collective activities, both ritual and feasting, within LM IIIC settlements. Karphi demonstrates the most diffuse and variable behaviors, while the Mirabello sites (e.g., Vronda, Chalasmenos and Vasiliki) appear to have more differentiated or structured practices within bench sanctuaries and separate feasting halls (so-called chieftain’s houses). A compelling analog for Petras is probably Sybrita, where the Thronos Kephala excavations have produced an unusual array of buildings, cooking installations and pits, documenting continuous use of the spaces for concentrated and collective feasting from LM IIIC to Protogeometric. The distinctive EPG krater in Building 3 at Thronos recalls the careful placement of a closed-style krater on the entrance platform of Building 1 at Petras. Among all these contexts there are of course considerable differences in details of form and context, but in my mind they reflect essential functional similarities. That said, the Petras data provides yet more new forms, features and practices to consider, and indeed new evidence of ritual commensality in LM IIIC.

29 Cf. Vavouranakis this volume.
30 Klein & Glowacki 2009; Tsipopoulou 2009; Gaignerot-Driessen 2014.
31 D’Agata 2012.