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### Abbreviations

#### Archaeological periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</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>Acronym</th>
<th>Abbreviation</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>

### Petras Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>House Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lakkos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Petras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSK</td>
<td>Petras Cemetery</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.
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Abstract

The two tombs excavated by Nikolaos Platon in 1967 at Zakros-Pezoules Kephala are known in the bibliography, first through the preliminary report published by the excavator in *Praktika* and subsequently through the synthetic study on the so-called “House Tombs” written by Jeffery Soles. It is interesting to note that the two scholars differ significantly in their understanding of the form of the constructions as well as the burial customs: the excavator saw in them “bone enclosures” i.e., low built spaces full of soil, where the burials took place in carelessly dug pits, while Soles suggested that they were roofed rooms, and the bodies were deposited in them either through the roofs, or through doorways that were not preserved.

New plans, the in situ study of the architectural remains as well as the scrunity of the excavation notebooks and other archival material lead to an interpretative suggestion that combines both earlier – apparently diverging – ideas: Tomb A was built first and was initially a roofed room. Later, during the Middle Minoan period and following a possible collapse of the superstructure, the tomb was partially reconstructed, and continued to be used in the form of a bone enclosure. During this second phase Tomb B, constructed from the beginning as an unroofed low *peribolos*, was used for the first time.

It seems that the remodeling of Tomb A was connected with a complete cleaning of its earlier contents and this does not allow for a reconstruction of the burial practices in the first – roofed – phase. Some of the areas were apparently modelled from the beginning to be used exclusively for secondary burials and they contained bones and grave goods. On the other hand the use of the main room for primary burials is supported by the analogous use of the successive constructions, the bone enclosures. Possible primary burials were identified in both enclosures, one in A, in a complete *larnax*, and two in B, the first in a *larnax* and the second directly in the soil, at the northwestern part of the building. Furthermore, at least one pithos was probably used as a burial container, although it was not connected with a primary burial.

The pottery accompanying the burials offers important evidence: serving and drinking vessels represented the vast majority, indicating a prominent practice. Two explanations are possible: a) these vessels represented grave offerings either for the primary or the secondary burials, or b) they were used by the living during burial ceremonies, connected either with primary or secondary burials, and subsequently deposited in the tombs.
The form of the Early-Middle Minoan tombs in the Petras cemetery, as well as the burial behavior in the frame of their unction, were both topics examined during the first meeting on the excavations at the site, and were studied in further detail in this Symposium. The comparative examination of two, more or less contemporary, built tombs located on neighboring Zakros is considered to contribute to the better understanding of the more specific features of the burial structures belonging to this period, as well as to the way of treating the dead in two undoubtedly flourishing contemporary societies of easternmost Crete.

The Zakros tombs were excavated by Nikolaos Platon in 1967, at a location called Pezoules Kephala, on the slope extended to the southwest of the Minoan settlement and a short distance from it. To date, they were known in the bibliography mainly due to the preliminary report published by the excavator in the *Praktika tis Archaeologikis Etaireias*¹ and, secondly, from the synthetic work by Jeffrey Soles on the so-called House tombs.² Nevertheless, the views expressed by the two scholars on the form of the structures, as well as the burial behavior, differ essentially. Platon “saw” on them low built enclosures filled with earth, in the interior of which the burials were put, in roughly excavated pits.³ On the other side, Soles included them in his category of house-like structures, considering that the bodies of the dead were put in roofed burial chambers either via normally shaped entrances, or, in the cases in which these are obviously absent, from the roof, probably with the assistance of movable ladders.⁴

The recent study of the archival records and archaeological material from the tombs of Zakros in view of their inclusion in the forthcoming first volume of the final publication of the site offers some new evidence, and revives the above discussion.⁵ What follows below is a brief presentation of the topography and the architecture of the two structures.

The distance between the two Zakros tombs is around 15 m⁶ and they have been constructed on two small natural terraces, shaped among limestone rocks. For their construction, roughly cut limestone blocks of various sizes had been used, placed without special care but shaping walls consisting of one or two rows of stones in width. Tomb A comprised three areas, named by the first three capital letters

---

¹ Platon 1967, 190-194.
² Soles 1992, 195-201. More specific references to the ceramic finds from Pezoules are included in the synthetic works on the Middle Minoan pottery by S. Andreou & G. Walberg. Andreou 1978, 101-102; Walberg 1983, 134. A. Zois deals with the find more generally, but what he really does is criticize the way the data was presented in the preliminary excavator’s report. Zois 1991, 52-58.
³ Platon 1967, 191.
⁴ Soles 1992, 198.
⁵ Platon forthcoming.
⁶ N. Platon estimated, incorrectly, this distance as 60 m. Platon 1967, 193.
of the Greek alphabet (Figs. 1, 2). In the wall separating Areas A and B an opening was identified,\(^7\) which according to the excavation notebook was found roughly blocked by earth, stones and bones. The main entrance to the tomb was not identified. Tomb B is smaller and it comprises a single, roughly rectangular, space (Fig. 3). It seems clear that, at least here, an artificially made floor did not exist. Further, in this case also, an entrance could not be identified.\(^8\)

Looking now at the excavation notebook, in Area A of the larger and more compound Tomb A, the surface stratum was comprised of stones (some of which gave the impression that they formed small enclosures), disturbed bones and pieces of clay larnakes. A bit lower than the preserved height of the surrounding walls, the filling consisted of fallen stones, human bones and small clay pots. Below were two successive layers, not easily discernible from each other. The lower of them contained a greater number of bones, found in a dense, disorderly mixture (Figs. 4, 5). It seems that one small bathtub larnax, as well as two burials found to the east of it, probably in situ, also belonged to this lower layer.\(^9\)

In Area B of the same tomb, the higher layer of the fill was found devoid of human skeletal remains or other finds, with the exception of an almost completely preserved clay larnax, the rim of which was found only some centimeters below the surface.\(^10\) The larnax contained the greater part of a human skeleton, two more skulls and one beaked jug. One large piece of the lid of the larnax was found beside it, in a lower level. Below this layer, the filling consisted of whitish hard earth and contained skulls and other bones in great disorder, together with some sporadic clay and stone finds (Figs. 4, 6). A number of clusters of skull were observed in a low level beside the preserved burial larnax, close to the south separating wall, as well as on the northeast corner of the chamber. The burial stratum, apart from bones and grave gifts, contained fragments of at least three more larnakes and a burial pithos.\(^11\)

---

\(^7\) Platon 1967, 190.
\(^8\) Platon 1967, 193.
\(^10\) Platon 1967, 191.
Finally, the stratigraphy of the small-sized Area Γ appears to be similar to that of Area B (Figs. 4, 5) in that the higher level of the filling did not contain bones, but only fragments of clay larnakes and pots. In a slightly deeper layer, it contained human bones in two successive layers, with a small number of clay pots and a stone vase.\(^{12}\)

Furthermore, in Tomb B, human remains, pieces of larnakes and grave gifts appeared almost from the surface of the ancient filling. On a high level, on the northwestern corner of the tomb, a group of nine clay vessels were found. The remaining finds, including most of the human remains, were found here and there, in various levels and places in the main burial stratum, which extended into the fissures of the natural rock (Fig. 7). The human bones, as in Tomb A, were found in disorder,\(^{13}\) although, once more, some skull accumulations were observed along the south wall, around the only clay larnax preserved, as well as beside the lower part of the vertical rock, which constitutes the western limit of the tomb. The larnax contained one undisturbed

---

burial, without any accompanying grave gifts.\textsuperscript{14} One more burial in contracted position was identified on the northern part of the tomb, just to the south of the spot where the small group of the intact clay vases reported above was found.\textsuperscript{15}

On the basis of the above evidence, it becomes clear that the untried inclusion of the two tombs in a single category would constitute a methodological error. The similarity of the structures today is possibly misleading, since low rectangular built enclosures and also rectangular roofed chambers could produce similar structural remains. It should also be noted that their vicinity does not exclude the co-existence of two completely different architectural types. As a consequence, it is necessary to study the data from each tomb separately and only afterwards should one consider whether the results could be used together for the reconstruction of the history of the burial site.

Starting again from Tomb A, the data supporting the hypothesis of burial enclosures are as follows:

1. No entrance to the tomb has been identified. Soles’ suggestion that the entrance would probably be on the destroyed southeast side of Area

\textsuperscript{14} Platon 1967, 193.
\textsuperscript{15} N. Platon erroneously refers to two burials. Platon 1967, 193.
A cannot be confirmed or rejected on the basis of the extant data. Moreover, the doorway between Area A and B was found blocked. This suggests either that burial Chamber B had been sealed at least during the last period of the tomb’s use – something which has not been confirmed by the dating of the last vases found in it – or that access to the closed chambers B and Γ was made via the tomb’s roof. However, in this case a separate entrance for each chamber would be necessary, while access to the small and narrow Area A would be difficult, if not impossible.

2. Some of the walls of the tomb were completely unsuitable for supporting a superstructure (Fig. 8).

3. At least during the last phase of the use of the tomb, a wall almost on surface constituted the eastern limit of Area A. The burials and the finds also extended to the east of it, in a stratum undoubtedly connected with the burial layer of Area A.

4. Finds started to come to light in the filling almost from the preserved top of the surrounding walls. This would exclude any possibility of circulation in the interior of the tomb, unless one accepted that the burial layers were successive and they remained undisturbed from the new burials. However, in this case, one would expect a chronological stratification of the finds, something which their typological and stylistic analysis did not confirm.

5. Bones and finds were found mixed, completely disturbed, in piles, in different levels, especially in Area A and Γ no accumulation of skulls or other bones could be observed and no original burial could be identified. Finally, the study of the skeletal material showed that some bone fragments belonging to the same skeletons were found dispersed in these two areas.

6. The pieces of the preserved larnax of Area B had remained in situ, in spite of the external side pressures (Fig. 9). This suggests that the larnax was already filled with earth when the tomb went out of use.

On the other side, the data from Tomb A supporting the roofed burial chambers hypothesis could be summarized as follows:

---

16 Soles 1992, 197.
17 Soles 1992, 197.
18 Contra to Soles 1992, 198.
19 Becker forthcoming.
1. The presence of a confirmed doorway between Areas A and B. In addition, the loose binding among the straight, main, and the curved part of the wall separating Areas A and Γ makes the existence of another communication door in the interior of the tomb possible, at least as regards its original structure.

2. The probable existence of a floor in all the areas, and, moreover, in the same level. This would not make any sense if we were dealing with structures used only for interments in pits.

3. The relatively good quality of construction and the large width of the walls exceeds the needs of an enclosure. Moreover, the vertical rock was dressed with a stone structure, something which would be superfluous if an unroofed space were to be enclosed.

4. The existence of a burial layer just above the floor, which appears to be extend to all the spaces, as well as in the door entrance between Areas A and B. The same burial layer appears to have extended also beyond the later eastern side of Area A.

5. The finding in the burial layers of only a few vessels dated to an earlier period, suggesting that the tomb had been cleared out, at least once. Such a cleaning would not make any sense if the tomb had been used exclusively for burials in simple pits.

Passing now to Tomb B, the data supporting the enclosure hypothesis are as follows:

1. The form of the tomb is very simple, comprising only one square area, without any obvious entrance.

2. Most of the walls are built only of one row of stones, have rough surfaces, which makes them unsuitable for supporting any kind of superstructure.

3. The height of the rock forming the west side of the tomb is just 1.10 m, excluding the possibility that its top surface was used as the base of a roof.

4. The existence of a man-made floor in the tomb was not confirmed. The natural rock remained

---

20 Platon 1967, 190.

21 Such as the teapot depicted in pl. 169b, which accompanies the preliminary excavation report. Platon 1967, pl. 169b.

22 Platon 1967, 193.

unworked and sloped strongly from the west to the east (Fig. 10).

5. The vessels and bones were found mixed, in various points and depths of the filling, from the upper level down to the bedrock (Fig. 11). In one case at least, pieces of the same stone vase have been collected from different spots and levels of the filling. The discovery of finds extending even into the fissures of the sloping bedrock confirms the absence of any artificially shaped floor.24

6. The single (almost) undisturbed burial, apart from that inside the preserved clay chest, was identified on a high level of the filling.

On the basis of the above data, we could make the following concluding remarks:

a) Tomb A: the plan of the structure and some of the excavation data support the hypothesis of roofed chambers. On the other hand, most of the excavation data support the low enclosures hypothesis.

b) Tomb B: all the data support its use in the form of a low enclosure, in the interior of which the interments were inserted into pits dug in the filling, either free or placed into clay receptacles.

At this point, the classification made by Richard Seager in the context of his publication of the Mochlos cemetery offers significant, although unexpected, help.25 A critical point in this classification is the distinction between chamber tombs and burial enclosures, in spite of the fact that he himself notes the great similarity in the top plans of the two architectural types. Especially interesting is Seager’s observation that the type of the enclosure became popular in this site during the MM period, while that of the chamber tomb is considered exclusively as an Early Minoan type.26

In the light of the above observations, a new hypothesis on the form and history of the Zakros tombs could be proposed. According to it, Tomb A was built first, and initially had the form of a house, probably bearing a light roof made of perishable materials. Later, during the MM period and probably after the collapse of its roof, the tomb was reused as an open enclosure, while its eastern limits were replaced by roughly placed blocks. During this phase, the door between spaces A and B, and probably another between A and Γ, was roughly blocked. During the last phase of the tomb’s function, Area B was the one principally used for primary burials, free or inside clay larnakes. In the same period, Tomb B was built, having a very simple plan and construction. Here, the burials were also placed into larnakes or in pits dug in the earth filling, accompanied by rough accumulations of grave offerings and bones. The pottery confirms that both tombs were abandoned almost simultaneously, around the end of the MM IIB, or, at the latest, at the very beginning of the MM III period.27

Since it appears that the final reformation of Tomb A was accompanied by a general cleaning of its interior, the conclusions on the burial behavior of the users during the period in which it had the form of a roofed structure are very few. The small Area Γ appears to have been formed from the beginning in order to be used for secondary burials and the preservation of older grave offerings. On the other hand, the use of the main chamber B for primary burials is supported by its similar use during the later period in which the tomb functioned as an enclosure.

When they were turned into enclosures, the Pezoules tombs were used both for primary and for secondary interments. Nevertheless, the confirmed primary burials are few:28 two of them were identi-
fied in the interior of the two completely preserved clay larnakes, one in each tomb. The burial was placed into the earth, probably after the digging of a pit in the already extant burial stratum. Regarding the larnax of Area B in Tomb A, the last burial had been accompanied by a clay jug and two more skulls belonging to earlier interments. Consequently, it appears that when an intact larnax existed already in the tomb it was reused, after the partial or complete removal of the older interments placed in it. In such cases, the skulls and probably some selected bones were often kept in the same chest together with the new burial, or they were placed into the same pit but around it.

That the same space had been repeatedly used for primary burials is also confirmed by the presence of more fragments of larnakes, and also of pithoi, used as burial receptacles. Moreover, the use of wooden burial chests should not be excluded, if one judges from the form of one of the intact clay larnakes, which appears to have had a prototype made of wood. The burial of the larnax of Tomb B was not accompanied by grave goods and the dead was placed in a contracted position, with his head turned to the west and one hand folded in his breast. At least one more primary interment, laid on the ground, with the dead also placed in a contracted position, was identified on the northeast corner of the same tomb. A small group of clay vessels, mostly jugs and cups, appears to be connected with this last interment.

The continuous disturbances of the burial stratum by the digging of pits for new interments and the consequent secondary treatment of the older skeleton remains made the correlating of the movable finds with particular burials almost impossible. Nevertheless, the types of the vases which accompanied the burials can be indicative for their use or meaning. Serving and drinking vessels are represented in a larger proportion than other categories of pots. In consequence, it should be considered either that these vases were offered to the dead together, for covering one of the most basic needs in the afterlife, or that the two above reported types were used simultaneously in drinking ceremonies taking place in the tombs in honor of the dead. The first hypothesis is supported by the ratio of the estimated number of dead and the number of the clay vases found in the two tombs (81:190 = around 2.34 vases per person, which could represent one serving and one or two drinking vessels). On the other hand, this hypothesis is contradicted by the existence of only a few other types of vessels in the tombs, which could not cover satisfactorily the remaining needs of the dead (i.e. the preservation or consumption of solid food).

Nevertheless, the relative commonness and the repeated types of the pots which accompanied the burials suggests that most of them were made exclusively to be used in specific ceremonies taking place in the cemetery in honor of the dead. Their deposition afterwards beside the dead suggests the devotion of the consecrated vessels to them, something that is certainly related to the belief in an afterlife. Consequently, the offering of the vases could have a twofold meaning: on the one side it could constitute a symbolic action connected with the preceding ceremony, and on the other side it could be considered as a gift to the dead, which would be useful to them in their new residence. Other symbolic offerings to the dead with the same meaning were probably placed into some relatively common stone vessels or in conical cups, some of which would certainly contain solid foods in small quantities.

---

30 Platon 2012, 166, fig. 18.8.
31 Cf. Branigan 1970a, 93. The meaning especially of the cups in burial contexts is discussed also by Soles, who finally inclines to accept a twofold use, distinguishing however two chronologically discerned phases in the treatment of the dead. Soles 1992, 249-251.
As regards the secondary burials, the excavation data do not permit safe conclusions to be drawn – that is, if they were also accompanied by similar ceremonially actions or, at least, by simple offerings. Nevertheless, the concentration of a great number of conical cups, together with “milk-jugs”, in Area A of Tomb A should be mentioned. Since primary interments have not been found in this particular space, one could connect the concentration of vessels belonging to these two types with some secondary burials. However, such a hypothesis cannot be confirmed, since the cups at least often accompany primary interments as well.

Finally, it should be made clear that the detailed presentation of the architectural and excavation data from the tombs at Pezoules Kephala in Zakros does not aspire to answer questions relating to the corpus of the rectangular built burial structures of Early and Middle Minoan Crete. On the contrary, its purpose was to point out that the classification of seemingly similar forms in a single category present serious problems, even if these forms occur in the same architectural context. What does not change in any case are the beliefs and ideas of the humans concerning life and death. In consequence, the understanding of the latter is more significant than any classification based exclusively on the form. The form changes from place to place, from time to time and from case to case, in order to serve each time the main aim of the people better: that is, to bridge the chasm between Death and Life, approaching in this way the world of the Invisible or, else, the Supernatural.
Discussion

Sotirakopoulou: What you said, Lefteris Platon, was very interesting. I would like to ask you about the pottery, as we face similar problems in the Early Cycladic period. Do you believe that your vases were made exclusively for funerary use? We established that for some of our pottery, because some of the vases were of very inferior quality. Can you prove something similar for your material? On the other hand, the Cycladic marble vessels were actually used in real life as they have many wear signs.

Platon: This is a good question. The vases belong to very few types and are all very similar. I doubt that they were used in real life; they might have been made only for funerary use. Our pottery is in general very repetitive; the shapes are carinated cups, jugs, cups, conical cups and one-handled cups, and the decorations are very similar, as if indicating mass production. Of course it is not easy to decide about wear marks on pottery. The so-called milk-jugs were found all together and it is possible that they were connected to secondary burials; they might also have been produced as a group, for a special occasion. As for the stones vessels I do not believe they were produced exclusively for funerary use, and I did not say that. The production of a stone vessel is a time consuming procedure, although I must admit that most of them are made of a common material, serpentine, with only one exception, and there is also another beautiful stone vase, but I do not have a picture here. At Zakros in general, including the settlement, serpentine was the material used for stone vases. Only the palace imported stone vases that were made of rare materials.

Sotirakopoulou: Have you observed any wear signs on your stone vessels?
Platon: Not particularly.

Tsipopoulou: Were these two tombs connected to a peripheral settlement?
Platon: I am almost certain that they served the main settlement of Kato Zakros.

Tsipopoulou: The main Protopalatial settlement?
Platon: Yes, they are situated close enough to it. I did not have time to elaborate on the other finds, but I can tell you there were some necklaces, made of glass-paste and semi-precious stones, and at least three seals in the tombs. Let me now return to what Mrs. Philippa-Touchais said earlier: at the same time there were also burials in caves, such as at Mavro Avlaki, a very interesting case, because it looks unsuit-
able for burials. The quality of the ceramic finds is not great there either, and in the cave no seals were found. Mavro Avlaki is very close to Zakros and it cannot have served a different community. Also the pottery types are very similar. These are issues that need further study. Furthermore, now that I have seen Petras, and I can make a comparison with Zakros, I think that, regarding the kind and the size of the social unit buried (a topic discussed yesterday), the number of burials (around eighty preserved, probably a hundred in total) seems to be very small – this number is produced by two nuclear families over two hundred years – to support the idea that these two tombs constitute the cemetery of the whole Protopalatial Zakros settlement. There must have been additional tombs, maybe also at Pezoules, because there are other small platforms; the whole area has not been completely investigated. Since we see that there were also burials in the caves, I cannot say that our tombs correspond to those at Petras; our sample is very small.

Philippa-Touchais: I was wondering about Mavro Avlaki: Who were the people buried there? What sort of families buried their dead there? Did they actually live at Zakros? Furthermore, why did certain families use Mavro Avlaki to the south, while others used Pezoules to the north? Maybe people who used Mavro Avlaki lived nearby, and they cultivated the land or were shepherds? Maybe they lived in a secondary settlement? It is interesting to note that shepherds still live there today. In any case there is a differentiation which must have a social significance.

Platon: I agree. I cannot say where they lived, but since they used Mavro Avlaki, which is not easily accessible, they must have had a connection with this particular area. Yet I cannot see them as a separate community. The Zakros bay is a limited area and I do not believe that it was able to support different communities. I would rather think there was one community with some small peripheral units. It cannot be excluded that some people had special occupations, like agriculture and animal husbandry, and they chose to bury their dead in the cave.

Papadatos: Just an idea, as a contribution to the discussion, and continuing your argument, Lefteris Platon, it might be related not just to agriculture, but also to land ownership, as we know that burials could act as a claim over land. As an example – and I am not trying to make an analogy – in modern times, on the island of Anaphi, the secondary burials are deposited in small ossuaries that are situated in the fields. One can see these ossuaries everywhere, go into the fields, take pictures and see the bones – it seems a bit macabre, but apparently this practice is related to the ownership of the particular fields.

Platon: I do not exclude the possibility. Furthermore as Mavro Avlaki is a coastal place there might have been fishermen.

Tsipopoulou: A small comment: since bone enclosures were used for burial in Crete diachronically, down to the 7th century BC, I believe there are no extensive cemeteries with bone enclosures, except maybe in the case of Shoungaras, and I am not sure how many tombs there were. Usually one finds no more than two or three bone enclosures together, as for instance in the Early Iron Age, at Vrokastro or Dreros.
Platon: This is a pertinent observation. Here we also have the issue of the form of these tombs, which I tried to define; one could have been a house tomb but not the other.

Palyvou: About the important issue of whether it is possible from the plan to understand with certainty the superstructure, I must admit, it is not always possible. I will say something that might help the discussion. When a building with a roof is to be constructed, even the simplest person knows which direction the beams need to go. When you have an elongated form, as a rule the beams go horizontally, so the long walls are the supporting ones and they have to be well built; the other walls even if they are not so strong will not fall. In the periods that concern us here, and also in vernacular architecture in general, a beam has to be about 2.20-2.50 m. If you have these dimensions, there are many possibilities that there was a roof originally.

Platon: My problem is not the roof, but rather the superstructure.

Tsipopoulou: Excuse me, but on the plan they look much nicer than in reality.

Platon: True!

Palyvou: The wall you showed was not supportive, so it was not relevant for the superstructure either.

Platon: In order to have a roof one needs a superstructure. I do not know how these structures were built above the foundations. I cannot see these large boulders as supporting a superstructure – for the other walls yes, they might have. This is why I suggested that in the latest phase the use of the space had changed, especially since on the surface at the eastern part of Area A there was a row of stones, subsequently removed by the excavator, as the earlier burial deposit continued below them. So, these boulders might have been a later addition, and they do not belong to the original structure. This can justify the shape of Tomb A. As for Tomb B, things are even worse; I believe it is not possible that these single rows of stones, unworked and with rough upper surfaces (even the bedrock is left untouched in certain points), supported a superstructure and a roof. I see this as highly improbable. Also the bedrock to the west, which could have supported, in theory, a superstructure, is very low. In conclusion I do not accept – for Tomb B – Soles’ interpretation, and as for Tomb A, there is evidence for, as well as against.

Palyvou: I am talking in general, things are not so simple: a wall can be thin and without well-built stones, and the support system can be hidden in the corners or in vertical elements that are no longer preserved. So we need to be cautious.

Platon: I am not so much concerned about the roof, as the weight could not have been very significant. My question is whether there was the possibility that a superstructure was constructed on top of these stones, even with mudbricks.

Tsipopoulou: The presence of the larnakes puzzles me. They must have been quite heavy, and to deposit them in a tomb lacking a door would be possible only if there was no roof.

Platon: This is a good point.
Greek abstract

Πεζούλες Κεφάλας Ζάκρου, Ι. Μορφή των τάφων και ταφική συμπεριφορά

Οι δύο τάφοι που ερευνήθηκαν από τον Ν. Πλάτωνα το 1967 στη θέση “Πεζούλε Κεφάλα” είναι βιβλιογραφικά γνωστοί, κυρίως στην ανασκαφική έκθεση που δημοσιέυσε ο ίδιος στα Πρακτικά της Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας και, κατά δεύτερο λόγο, από το συνθετικό έργο του J. Soles. Ωστόσο, οι απόψεις των δύο ερευνητών ως προς τη μορφή των κατασκευών, αλλά και γενικότερα την ταφική συμπεριφορά, διαφέρουν σημαντικά: ο πρώτος είδε σε αυτές ταφικά περιφράγματα, δηλαδή χαμηλούς κτιστούς περιβόλους γεμάτους χώμα μέσα στα οποία γίνονταν οι ταφές σε προχέρους λάκκους, ενώ ο δεύτερος υποστήριζε ότι πρόκειται για στεγασμένους θαλάμους, με τους νεκρούς να τοποθετούνται στο εσωτερικό τους είτε από την οροφή, είτε από εισόδους που υποθετικά βρίσκονταν σε κατεστραμμένα σημεία των περιμετρικών τοίχων.

Η νέα αποτύπωση και επιτόπια παρατήρηση των αρχιτεκτονικών λειψάνων, σε συνδυασμό με την ενδελεχή μελέτη των ανασκαφικών ημερολογιών και του λοιπού αρχειακού υλικού, οδηγούν σε ιδία πρόταση που συνδυάζει δύο, φαινομενικά διισταντενές, απόψεις: Ο τάφος Α κατασκευάσθηκε πρώτος και αρχικά είχε τη μορφή στεγασμένου θαλάμου. Αργότερα, και διαρκούς μεσογεικό περιόδου, ετά μετά από εκάστοτε κατάρρευση του είτε από ενδεχόμενη κατάρρευση του είτε από ενδεχόμενη κατάρρευση της ανωτάτης του, επανακατασκευάσθηκε και χρησιμοποιήθηκε για τη μορφή ταφικού περιφράγματος. Τότε, χρησιμοποιήθηκε για πρώτη φορά και ο τάφος Β, που από την αρχή κατασκευάσθηκε με τη μορφή χαμηλού περιβόλου.

Εφόσον φαίνεται πως η τελική διαμόρφωση του τάφου Α συνδυάσθηκε με έναν γενικό καθαρισμό στο εσωτερικό του, ελάχιστα συπερήφανα να εξαχθούν σχετικά με την ταφική συμπεριφορά κατά την περίοδο της διαμόρφωσης του ως στεγασμένου θαλάμου. Ορισμένοι χώροι φαίνεται ότι είχαν διαμορφωθεί εξαρχής για να χρησιμοποιηθούν αποκλειστικά για διαφύλαξη οστών και κτερισμάτων από ανακομιδές. Επιπλέον, η χρήση του κυρίως θαλάμου και για πρωτογενείς ταφές υποστηρίζεται από την ανάλογη χρήση των διάδοχων του κατασκευών στη συμπεριφορά των τάφων. Πιθανότατα ταφές εντοπίσθηκαν και στα δύο περιφράγματα: μία στο Α, σε ακέραντα σωζόμενη σαρκοφάγο, και δύο στο Β, η μία σε λάρνακα και η δεύτερη ελεύθερη, στο ΒΔ τμήμα της κατασκευής.

Τέλος, οι τύποι των πήλινων αγγείων που συνόδευαν τα ταφές είναι ενδεικτικοί για τη σημασία τους. Σε πολύ μεγαλύτερες αναλογίες από τα υπόλοιπα σχήματα, εμφανίζονται τα προχυτικά αγγεία και τα αγγεία πόσης. Έτσι,να περιείχε πρωτογενή ταφή, αφού δεν έγινε δυνατό να υποστηριχθούν με αυτόν τον τρόπο.