

## FROM 'PARTY' TO 'RITUAL' TO 'RUIN' IN MINOAN CRETE: THE SPATIAL CONTEXT OF FEASTING\*

This paper takes a diachronic look at 'feasting.' It examines the character of and access to gathering areas, here characterized as the spaces of convergence where people could interact and the main arenas contributing to social reproduction<sup>1</sup> essential to Minoan society. The focus here is not so much on the reasons of their interaction, although it is assumed that ritualized communal dining very much like the later Cretan *syssitia* was of prime importance and hence that there was great continuity between the Bronze and Iron Age.

Starting with James Walter Graham's paper in 1961 'The Minoan Banquet Hall,'<sup>2</sup> Cretan palaces have frequently been considered as areas for feasting. Indeed, the presence of large storage areas and the changes observed between the Protopalatial and Neopalatial period were interpreted by Jennifer Moody at the 'Function of the Minoan Palaces Conference' as suggesting increased competition and a tendency towards restriction and exclusion.<sup>3</sup> The aim of this paper is primarily to identify changes in the way 'users' of Minoan buildings interacted, by using space syntax theory – an analytical method which translates a standard architectural plan into a specific graph which allows a qualitative and quantitative approach to spatial configuration.<sup>4</sup> This methodology can be applied to any architectural structure that is sufficiently preserved and has the potential to highlight spatial characteristics which would otherwise remain less obvious or even hidden. The term 'users' refers to both residents and visitors of Minoan buildings. Residents are those whose identity as individuals is embedded in the spatial layout of a building and who therefore have some degree of control of space and a privileged access to it. 'Visitors,' on the other hand, are those who lack control over a particular building. Their access to space is usually temporary, subordinated to the control by the residents and their social identity generally manifests itself collectively. Teachers, doctors, priests, wardens, and householders can be considered residents, while pupils, patients, congregations, prisoners, and guests are visitors.<sup>5</sup> Iconographical evidence and differentiated material culture suggests that

\* The authors acknowledge the Belgian F.R.S.-F.N.R.S for a grant allowing them to participate in the Melbourne meeting. Ideas presented here developed thanks to a close collaboration within the Topography of Power of Minoan Crete research group at the UCL (INC@-CEMA). We especially thank Carl Knappett for his critical eye and Louise Hitchcock for her hospitality. In this paper, illustrations are limited to the essential. Nevertheless, to allow a better understanding of some spatial concepts, the data produced by Q. Letesson in his doctoral dissertation (j-graphs, visual maps and quantitative elements) may be consulted on the following website with the permission of the author (<http://www.fltr.ucl.ac.be/FLTR/ARKE/letesson/index.html>).

1 T. CUNNINGHAM, "Variations on a Theme: Divergence in Settlement Patterns and Spatial Organization in the Far East of Crete during the Proto- and Neopalatial Periods," in K. BRANIGAN (ed.), *Urbanism in the Aegean Bronze Age* (2001) 84: "If social production is about the survival, growth and maintenance of individuals within a society, social reproduction is about the perpetuation of the ideological basis for defining that society."

2 J.W. GRAHAM, "The Minoan Banquet Hall," *AJA* 65 (1961) 165-172.

3 J. MOODY, "The Minoan Palace as a Prestige Artifact," in R. HÄGG and N. MARINATOS (eds), *The Function of Minoan Palaces, Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 10-16 June, 1984* (1987) 235-240.

4 B. HILLIER and J. HANSON, *The Social Logic of Space* (1984); B. HILLIER, *Space is the Machine* (1996); J. HANSON, *Decoding Homes and Houses* (1998).

5 HILLIER (*supra* n. 4) 251; In Space Syntax theory, a building materializes a physical interface between outside and inside as well as a social interface between inhabitants and visitors: "A building may therefore be defined abstractly as a certain ordering of categories, to which is added a certain system of controls, the two conjointly constructing an interface between the inhabitants of the social knowledge embedded in the categories and the visitors whose relations with them are controlled by the building. All buildings, of whatever kind, have this abstract structure in common: a building type typically takes these fundamental relations and, by varying the syntactic parameters and the interface between them, bends the fundamental model in one direction or another, depending on the nature of the categories and relations to be constructed by the ordering of space."

both residents and visitors of Minoan buildings probably corresponded to heterogenic groups of people, based on differences in status, gender, ritual experience and age.

From Early Minoan times – if not earlier,<sup>6</sup> – open air gathering places, whether near tombs or within settlements, played a decisive role in the social dynamics of Bronze Age Crete. One could even claim that Minoan social organization globally tended to express and define itself as well as put itself into question in spatial contexts favorable for gatherings.<sup>7</sup> Afterwards, although outside gathering places remained important, other types of spaces for co-presence became more important, with, during the Neopalatial period, a heterogeneity, ranging from, on the one hand, external areas such as the clearly circumscribed Central Court of the ‘palaces’ over the Plateia of some settlements, to some rather shapeless, non distinct open area between houses. And, on the other hand, a whole range of internal gathering areas such as banquet halls, Minoan Halls, rooms with central column and hearth, etc. How can this variety of gathering places be explained? Do they imply different levels of practices, allowing different (and selected?) audiences to take part in a variety of actions? And if so, are they part of the same cultural dramaturgy or theaters of different plays? By approaching some of these arenas through a spatial analysis, this paper tries to underline some peculiarities of social space and communal activities in the Neopalatial period.

The title of the paper “From ‘Party’ to ‘Ritual’ to ‘Ruin’” needs explanation within such a spatial study. In fact, ‘feasts’ can take different forms: they can be a banquet, an event implying dancing and singing, a religious ceremony or festival etc. Whatever their nature, they can be ephemeral, spontaneous and random, or frequent, programmed and highly structured, or any of these combinations. It is therefore preferable to distinguish between a ‘party’ and a ‘ritual’ to distinguish between a non-structured and a structured event. A party, according to Hillier, “is a short-model event. Its object is morphogenetic: the generation of new relational patterns by maximising the randomness of encounter through spatial proximity and movement” whereas a “ritual is a set of behaviours in which all sequences and all relations are specified by rules – that is, it is a long-model event. Of its nature, a ritual eliminates the random. Its object is to conserve and re-express its form.”<sup>8</sup> The contrast ‘random short-model event’ with ‘a non-random long-model event’ has serious implications as to spatial organization since space can bring people together in more or less constrained ways, or even keep them apart. We will try to argue that, before the Neopalatial, encounters were more likely to be ‘parties,’ whereas during the Neopalatial, these developed into ‘rituals.’

Thus, the Neopalatial built environment might be investigated to detect to what degree movement and occupation were randomly distributed or not. Scholars have noted the rich variety in Minoan architecture of this period, where plans, construction techniques and decoration are concerned. A more detailed analysis of the spatial syntax, however, shows a number of topological recurrences. This means that there is repetition among the different buildings not only of the way spatial layout is organized, but also how the outside and the inside of a building relate, that the choices for potential circulation networks recur and that certain types of rooms or transitional spaces are characterized by a structural redundancy, impossible to distinguish by a simple visual inspection of standard plans. These features are so often repeated between Minoan buildings that they allow us to recognize a genotype – an underlying set of principles

---

HILLIER and HANSON (*supra* n. 4) 147, “In moving from outside to inside, we move from the arena of encounter probabilities to a domain of social knowledge, in the sense that what is realized in every interior is already a certain mode of organizing experience, and a certain way of representing in space the idiosyncrasis of a cultural identity.” HILLIER and HANSON (*supra* n. 4) 144-145.

6 P. TOMKINS, “The Genesis of the Palace at Knossos,” in I. SCHOEP, P. TOMKINS and J. DRIESSEN (eds), *Back to the Beginning. Reassessing Social, Economic and Political Complexity in the Early and Middle Bronze Age on Crete. Proceedings of the Conference held in Leuven, 1-2 February 2008* (forthcoming); S. TODARO, “Craft production and social practice at Prepalatial Phaistos: the background to the first palace,” in SCHOEP, TOMKINS and DRIESSEN (*op. cit.*).

7 J. DRIESSEN, “The Central Court of the Palace at Knossos,” in G. CADOGAN, E. HATZAKI and A. VASILAKIS (eds), *Knossos: Palace, City, State. Proceedings of the Conference in Herakleion organised by the British School at Athens and the 23<sup>rd</sup> Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities of Herakleion, in November 2000, for the Centenary of Sir Arthur Evans’s Excavations at Knossos* (2004) 75-82.

8 HILLIER (*supra* n. 4) 244-245.

– that permeates the Minoan built environment forming a continuum between houses and palaces.<sup>9</sup> Firstly, the Minoan architectural configuration will be examined in general and then the focus will be on the palaces.

Most of the Neopalatial buildings have one or more areas which may be termed ‘external transition spaces,’ that is to say a space – like a vestibule, a corridor etc. – which forms a kind of liminal zone between the exterior world and the internal arrangement of the buildings. A transition space has a dual nature: it can generate accessibility and contributes to establish a spatial connection but, at the same time, it has the potential to divide space, separating activities and/or people.<sup>10</sup> Often, one of these elementary functions is more developed than the other, e.g. a vestibule allows access to a building but its main feature is to create a clearer boundary between inside and outside. A corridor, however, an internal transition space, forms a limit between several rooms and its main function is to ensure the efficiency of the circulation between them. The considerable use of external transition space in Neopalatial architecture suggests a growing concern about undesirable intrusions.<sup>11</sup> This may not only imply an attempt to reduce the permeability of the building, but also acts as an efficient signal, a way of underlining the shift from the external world to the internal domain. Thus, even if the Minoan ‘vestibule’ does not show the same formal regularity as at Akrotiri, it is nonetheless a basic component of the Neopalatial built environment. Moreover, in terms of form, external transition spaces often create a bent axis approach (dogleg corridor/vestibule). Such an approach tends to constrain movement and thus contributes to reinforce the efficiency of the external transition space.<sup>12</sup>

The very existence of such external transition spaces underlines the fact that the contacts between the inside and outside of Minoan buildings were potentially so frequent and/or necessary that they needed to be tightly monitored. Indeed they suggest frequent, planned encounters that formed integral parts of the social dynamics, tightly controlled and channeled through space. Protopalatial structures mostly lack such spaces because encounters were mostly between residents only. Add to this that Neopalatial buildings (such as palaces and major constructions such as Malia Zeta Alpha, Knossos Royal Villa etc.)<sup>13</sup> often had more than one entrance and most of them were in fact either preceded or followed by external spaces of transition (porches, vestibules, corridors, ...), the indications that different categories of visitors frequented the interior of structures become even more persuasive.

Such transitional spaces often lead to a room of which the integration was extremely high. This means that the room was highly connected with the other spaces of the building (as well as generally with the exterior) and, by extension, from which every single other room of the building could easily be reached. Generally, such rooms also present a high visual controllability, meaning that they may be easily visually dominated, or kept under surveillance. These spaces mostly form the very core of the buildings in which they are found, they articulate the circulations towards the other rooms and offer a particularly well adapted framework for the encounters among residents and the hosting of ‘visitors.’ Such spaces are labeled ‘poles of convergence’, partly because most of the trajectories that crisscross a building have to pass

9 For a detailed application of Space Syntax theory on Minoan architecture see Q. LETESSON, *Du phénotype au génotype : analyse de la syntaxe spatiale en architecture minoenne (MM IIIB-MR IB)* (PhD thesis, Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve, 2007).

10 HANSON (*supra* n. 4) 285: “Transitions have the effect of insulating spaces from one another as effectively as building walls and the ‘social distance’ which is built into transitions that engineer separations can be appreciated as ‘felt space’ just as much as where the separations are literally built into the bricks and mortar of the house.”

11 This may be linked to a Space Syntax concept called ‘transpatial solidarity.’ HILLIER and HANSON (*supra* n. 4) 145: “A solidarity will be transpatial to the extent that it [...] emphasizes the discreteness of the interior by strong control of the boundary. [...] The essence of a transpatial solidarity lies in the local reproduction of a structure recognizably identical to that of other members of the group. Such a solidarity requires the segregating effect of the boundary to preserve interior structure from uncontrolled incursion. Solidarity means in this case the reproduction of an identical pattern by individuals who remain spatially separated from each other, as well as from the surrounding world.” Online illustrations: fig. 42-43, 58-59, 180-181 and 259-260.

12 Online illustrations: fig. 77, 197, 403 and 443.

13 Online illustrations: fig. 64-66 and 187-188.

through them.<sup>14</sup> This could imply that they represent rooms to which people (or a selection of specific people) had equal access and equal rights. They were spaces fit for local interactions depending on spatial proximity, activities occurring at the same place by a gathering of people in space, such as a communal meal, a particular ritual performance, or the hosting of visitors. In Minoan studies, such 'poles of convergence' have usually been labeled as hosting/reception zones or more simply as the 'functional center' of a building.<sup>15</sup> From a syntactical point of view, their essential feature is that they formed the main internal arena for encounters and co-presence in Neopalatial architecture.<sup>16</sup> This becomes the more evident when comparing them with other spaces that were not accessible for all the members of the residential group and obviously even less for potential visitors, or with spaces that were more closely associated with particular activities to the exclusion of others, such as storerooms, workshops etc (Pl. XXXIVa). In terms of space syntax analysis, the latter usually develop themselves in tree-like and linear arrangements, a type of spatial configuration which easily frames, distinguishes and articulates circulations and categories of people and activities in a pattern of avoidance or controlled encounter.

The fact that Neopalatial architecture shows a close link between poles of convergence and the exterior via one or more external transition space(s) – a characteristic absent from Pre- and Protopalatial architecture – seems to imply that there was a real need to create gathering spaces within buildings and no longer only in the open air. This may suggest that the internal sphere had started to affirm its control on a reality – the communal gatherings – which was, till then, almost exclusively associated with the exterior world. In Pre- and Protopalatial Crete, houses mostly follow an agglutinative configuration whereas in Neopalatial Crete the massive introduction of internal spaces of transition created articulated plans, that categorised people and their activities more strictly and efficiently, hence eventually also reflecting within the spaces identified as poles of convergence the rise of more 'ritualised' encounters (Pl. XXXIVb). The articulation hence resulted in a spatial segmentation which is often considered as concomitant with socio-political complexity, related to age, gender, status or other differentiations. It is the socio-political complexity which dictated the architectural arrangement and the architectural arrangement which reciprocally materialised, perpetuated and intensified the socio-political complexity, up to a degree that could eventually have precipitated the disintegration of societal cohesion.

Minoan palaces are strange buildings, still eluding us after more than a hundred years of study. Where their space syntax is concerned, they form complex ringy systems which means that their spaces are primarily linked in loops and not only in linear sequences. Their configuration is extremely intricate and there are multiple connections between the different spaces within the buildings (Pl. XXXV).<sup>17</sup> This loop configuration is also shared by a series of important domestic constructions such as, for example, the Royal Villa and the Little Palace at Knossos, the villas at Nirou Chani and Vathypetro or Houses Zeta Alpha and Beta in Malia to name just a few.<sup>18</sup> Even if each palace has its own particularities and despite a variety of formal

- 14 In a ringy j-graph, a 'pole of convergence' is a cell which is on a dominant position on a ring or through which several rings pass. In a tree-like configuration, a 'pole of convergence' is generally formed by a symmetrical disposition of cells subordinated to a pivotal space (LETESSON [*supra* n. 8] 544). Examples in online illustrations: room 17 in fig. 197-198, 203 and 205d; room 10 in fig. 338-340 and 342d.
- 15 Very frequently the particular function of such spaces is difficult to assess and it is quite possible that they were essentially multi-functional, notably because everybody could relatively easily get access to them (see for example J.W. SHAW and M. SHAW [eds], *Kommos I. The Kommos Region and Houses of the Minoan Town. Part 2. The Minoan Hilltop and Hillside Houses* [1996] 366-367). Online illustrations: room 17 in fig. 304, 307, 315 and 317d.
- 16 The 'poles of convergence' illustrate perfectly the concept of 'spatial solidarity.' HILLIER and HANSON (*supra* n. 4) 145: "[...] a spatial solidarity [...] builds links with other members of the group not by analogy or isolation – as transpatial solidarity does – but by contiguity and encounter. [...] Encounters have to be generated, not limited, and this implies the weakening of restrictions at and within the boundary. A spatial solidarity would be undermined, not strengthened, by isolation."
- 17 For plans and j-graphs of the palaces, see also online illustrations: fig. 146-148, 245-247, 250, 259-260, 354-357, 409-410 and 492-495.
- 18 Online illustrations: fig. 64-66, 92-93, 134-135, 116-118, 187-188 and 197-198.

aspects, they not only share a similar architectural vocabulary, expressed in lay-out and design, but especially a series of common syntactic features.

First of all, all palaces are characterized by a strong permeability, meaning that the exterior has close connections with the interior. This does not mean that one could easily reach every single space within the palaces from the exterior, only that no single internal space was very remote from it, that each room could be accessed after a limited number of transitions. Considering the total numbers of their internal spaces, this is particularly remarkable.

Furthermore, every single entrance of the palaces is closely associated with an external transition space, perhaps not always a proper vestibule but nevertheless always forming a clear boundary signal between the internal and the exterior world, as e.g. the stepped ramp forming the north-east entrance of the palace of Zakros or the corridors forming the south and south-east entrances in Malia.<sup>19</sup>

A third characteristic is that transition spaces are systematically established within the same area of all palaces, at the boundary between inside and outside (vestibule and external transition spaces), around the Central Court (porch and porticoes) or in direct relation with it (corridors and passages linking it to the different wings), but also in the storage zones.

Moreover, in each palace, the spaces around the Central Court were highly connected both to the court in a loop system and to each other whereas more within the building at a distance from the Central Court, the spaces essentially formed tree-like linear sequences. Space syntax analysts consider that loop systems are often associated with encounters between residents or between residents and visitors, whereas tree-like sequences tend to categorize, articulate and frame people (mainly residents) and their respective behaviors, i.e. private, gender-related or specialized activities.<sup>20</sup>

What is also surprising is that in all palaces similar spaces show similar degrees of spatial connections (i.e. of integration value).<sup>21</sup> There is in fact a hierarchical order starting with the Central Court – as the space with most connections – over the Minoan Hall to finally the Lustral Basins – as the most segregated space with only a single connection.<sup>22</sup>

A final feature is the observation that at least one of these external transition spaces directly leads to the Central Court, undoubtedly the pole of convergence of the palaces. It really is the central node of the palatial syntax, it articulates (directly or indirectly) most of the circulations occurring within the building. The court mediates between interior and exterior, between residents or between residents and visitors.

All this underlines the fact that the Central Court had a strong potential as a privileged theatre of encounter and co-presence. These courts undoubtedly formed, within the palaces, the framework of a strong spatial solidarity and were a powerful pole of convergence. Thus, the main space of the palaces – in terms of size, syntax and symbolic outcome – was a gathering place and this seems corroborated by the little iconographic evidence we have. As Palyvou noted: “un-built space can be even more important than the built space.”<sup>23</sup>

Finally, if one considers the program or spatial dimension of the organisation of the palaces and the way it materialises the relations between the users – residents and visitors –, known as the interface, it can be claimed that Minoan palaces have a ‘strong program’,<sup>24</sup> i.e.

19 C. PALYVOU, “Outdoor space in Minoan architecture: ‘community and privacy’,” in CADOGAN, HATZAKI and VASILIKIS (*supra* n. 7) 215: “The town may penetrate symbolically the palace, exhibiting a feeling of intimacy, but the controlled access to the Central Court demonstrates the limits of this intimacy.” The Central Court thus corresponds to what Palyvou called ‘semi public space’ (C. PALYVOU, “Central Courts: The Supremacy of the Void”, in J. DRIESSEN, I. SCHOEP and R. LAFFINEUR [eds], *Monuments of Minoan. Rethinking the Minoan Palaces, of the International Workshop ‘Crete of the hundred Palaces?’*, Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve, 14-15 December 2001, *Aegaeum* 23 [2002] 167; PALYVOU [*op. cit.*] 215-216). Put in another way, peripheral/external transition spaces clearly marked the existence of a transpatial solidarity (and thus of a mediation, a control of the access) between the exterior and the interior of the palaces.

20 HILLIER and HANSON (*supra* n. 4) 166-167.

21 Such common patterns are called ‘inequality genotypes’ in Space Syntax (HILLIER [*supra* n. 4] 36-37, 249).

22 Online illustration: fig. 680.

23 PALYVOU (*supra* n. 19) 215.

24 HILLIER (*supra* n. 4) 249-255. See also HILLIER (*supra* n. 4) 241-244 for the link between the concept of strong/long model and the ‘modèle mécanique’ developed by Lévi-Strauss.

there is a set of invariable features recurring in the different buildings that generate a pattern of movement and occupation within the building, either encouraging, channelling, constraining or blocking encounters. In other words, the spatial configuration of such type of building ensures that each interface takes place appropriately and that every other possible encounter is constrained or even canceled. This regularity of configuration is a materialization of specific prescriptions (functional, social, ritual or other) and undoubtedly a consequence of the fact that different categories of people had to use the same space in well-defined relations. Such kind of program is very often linked to large public buildings and the strength of the program ensures that the different categories of people proceed according to appropriated relations or, on the contrary, avoid each other when necessary. Everything is programmed in advance to structure the needed interfaces and to inhibit undesirable encounters.

Neopalatial architectural vocabulary – whether in palaces or domestic constructions – hence illustrates a clear evolution towards an increasingly more articulated spatial environment and concomitant social relations and cultural performances becoming more and more structured, programmed and strictly translated within an architectural framework that started to lead a life of its own.

If gatherings taking place in the open were indeed the driving force of Minoan social dynamics, promoting cohesion and integration, the proliferation during Late Minoan I of internal poles of convergence – courts, Minoan Halls and all other kinds of co-presence enhancing spaces – should perhaps be seen as attempts to control these gatherings. Here the distinction between ‘parties’ and ‘ritual’ comes to the fore. The codification witnessed by Neopalatial architecture betrays a strong concern for standardized behavior, and a development to more structured sequences of actions and encounters.

There can be no doubt that communal meals formed one of the core ingredients of these gatherings as shown by studies by Tomkins, Todaro, Day and Wilson, Moody, Privitera, Girella and Macdonald and Knappett<sup>25</sup> – first in the open but progressively more and more within specific spaces. The longevity of these commensal activities as well as their locus-boundness represent perhaps the strongest indications that the gatherings remained very much anchored in the community. Once laid out in the Final Neolithic period, even the relatively modest size and simple elaboration of these gathering places would have transformed the space of the communities where they were laid out.<sup>26</sup>

Federico Halbherr, when visiting the remains found by Kalokairinos in the winter of 1878 at Knossos, remarked: ‘*The largeness of the building makes me think that it must have been one of the chief public edifices of the city, and the large jars for storing grain, wine or oil remind us of the Andreion in which the citizens of Crete used to come together for their public meals or syssitia, to which also were invited any distinguished persons who happened to be visiting their city.*’<sup>27</sup> Perhaps the great Italian scholar was right – but during the Neopalatial period, the impact of the architectural elaboration and heterogeneity of poles of convergence reached such proportions that it may eventually have transformed their original essence of communality into an ever increasing tendency towards categorization and segmentation. The original integration-enhancing actions that, for centuries, had consolidated Minoan society and maintained cohesion, fomented into an eventual melt-down of the social system. Only the ruins remained afterwards, but these too would eventually be re-appropriated for similar activities.

Quentin LETESSON and Jan DRIESSEN

- 25 TOMKINS (*supra* n. 6); TODARO (*supra* n. 6); P.M. DAY and D.E. WILSON, “Landscapes of Memory, Craft and Power in Pre-Palatial and Proto-Palatial Knossos,” in Y. HAMILAKIS (ed.), *Labyrinth Revisited. Rethinking ‘Minoan’ Archaeology* (2002) 143-166; J. MOODY, “The Minoan Palace as Prestige Object,” in HÄGG and MARINATOS (*supra* n. 3) 235-241; S. PRIVITERA, “The rython-hoard as evidence for feasting in neopalatial Crete: the case of Gournia,” *Creta Antica* 6 (2005) 187-198; L. GIRELLA, “Forms of commensal politics in Neopalatial Crete,” *Creta Antica* 8 (2007) 135-168; C.F. MACDONALD and C.J. KNAPPETT, *Knossos: Protopalatial Deposits in Early Magazine A and the South-West Houses* (2007).
- 26 R.A. JOYCE and M.W. LOVE, “Ideology, material culture, and daily practice in Pre-Classic Mesoamerica: A Pacific Coast perspective,” in D.C. GROVE and R.A. JOYCE (eds), *Social Patterns in Pre-Classic Mesoamerica* (1999) 127-153.
- 27 F. HALBHERR, “Researches in Crete. VIII. Cnossos,” *The Antiquary* (28 sept. 1893) 111.

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Pl. XXXIVa Building 5 – Palaikastro – Plan and j-graph.  
Pl. XXXIVb Houses Zeta Alpha and Delta Alpha – Malia – Survival of the agglutinative mode VS  
proper articulated mode.  
Pl. XXXV Palace – Phaistos – Plan and j-graph.



