

intensive elaboration, taking sides with history, anthropology, ethnography and other human sciences.

Architectural thought has followed its own course through time. For much of the 20th century it was under the hegemony of the Modern Movement. Many other movements have followed since, all of which seem to hold tight to the triadic basis of *function-form-structure*. In the last decades they have been simply changing position of priority according to the movement employing them. Of the three constituents of architecture, Structure is perhaps the easiest to assess, Form is deceptively easy to speak about and Function is the most elusive of them all.

A final question is how the interpretations of Minoan architecture affect site presentation. The question has two sides: the message and the recipient. Today the recipient is a heterogeneous hoard of people who visit the place briefly. More than just visitors, they are the new users of the place and their presence affects the site greatly, and their needs have to be counterbalanced with those of the monument.

So things are changing: archaeology may no longer be one man's vision; but the polyphony of an interdisciplinary collective work will need even stronger individual visions to succeed.

ISOLATION OR INTERACTION? PUTTING THE EARLY NEOLITHIC COMMUNITY AT KNOSSOS IN CONTEXT

PETER TOMKINS

First noted, by Arthur Evans, as early as 1901, the Knossos Neolithic, as subsequently defined by Furness and Evans, remains, a century later, the most significant Early Neolithic (EN) sequence on Crete (ca 6400-ca 5000 BC). Outside Knossos excavation and extensive/intensive survey has produced possible evidence of EN occupation at no more than six other sites, none of which constitute a continuous sequence. The principal consequence of this has been the development of a notable Knosso-centric bias to current theories for EN Crete, which emphasize the isolation of Knossos not only from the rest of the Aegean, but also from the rest of the island. These theories emphasize three important factors: empty EN landscape; ceramic isolation; demographic and subsistence self-sufficiency.

Regarding demographic self-sufficiency, estimates of maximum site and population size for the Aceramic and Early Neolithic rely on John Evans's 1971 reconstruction of how the Neolithic settlement grew in size from Aceramic Neolithic to Late Neolithic. However these figures represent the maximum area and hence population for the *end* of each phase, they *do not* indicate how quickly demographic viability was actually reached during EN I. By comparing data for site size in Aceramic (0.25 ha); EN Ia, when mudbrick was in use (ca 0.5 ha); and EN Ib, when pisé was used (ca 2.0 ha), a more accurate assessment of site growth during the EN I phase is possible. In addition study by the author of ceramics from sounding X, combined with John Evans's original observations of its stratigraphy, strongly suggest that part if not all of the area of the Aceramic settlement may have been abandoned at least for the duration of the EN Ia period, i.e. until after ca 6000 BC, and may have been free from

settlement until at least the end of EN I. Thus a figure of ca 0.25-0.35 ha may be more appropriate for EN Ia, which in turn suggests that there was little significant growth at the site for at least a millennium (i.e. from ca 7000 to ca 6000 BC) and that a demographically viable population figure was not reached until some point in EN Ib. These data thus suggest that during this period Knossos was not demographically self-sufficient and thereby seem indirectly to indicate the existence of other settlements with which Knossos was in contact.

The largest current obstacle to the interaction hypothesis is the familiar picture of ceramic isolation. Here results from my combined stylistic petrographic research (supported by a grant from the NERC) into ceramic production and consumption at EN Knossos are pertinent. Petrographic study has revealed the existence of a large number of fabrics at Knossos: several fabrics compatible with a local provenance; others compatible with sources elsewhere on Crete, but not within a 5-7 km range of Knossos; still others may have origins off the island.

Although there is a rich variation in the paste recipes used in pottery production, what is most striking is the consistency with which many of these recipes are reproduced. Often these paste recipes relate closely to stylistic groupings based on form and finish. In other words, certain shapes and certain forms of decoration are *specific* to certain fabrics. This correlation between fabric, form and finish strongly suggests that these groupings correspond to different traditions of production. Finally it should be emphasized that each production tradition produces a wide range of comparable vessels, open and closed, coarse and fine. Different pastes do *not* appear to have been used to produce functionally different vessels, such as cooking pots or storage vessels.

The most economical explanation for the presence at EN Knossos of so many different paste/production traditions, assessable via the combination of petrographic, stylistic and frequency data, is that EN pottery production was not simply confined to Knossos, but rather took place at different places within the Cretan landscape; the clearest examples of this being vessels produced in a granodiorite fabric, which must have its origins in the Bay of Mirabello.

Taken in conjunction with the demographic data, these results strongly suggest that the EN Cretan landscape was not empty. Rather Knossos, perhaps from the very beginning of the settlement, was one of several permanent small-scale farming communities distributed around the island: far from existing in *isolation* as previously thought, Knossos was in fact *interacting* with different communities. Furthermore it would seem that from the very beginnings of their use on Crete, ceramic vessels were being exchanged and were moving between different communities, within an extensive social network. Within this network ceramic vessels may have had different lives, may have acquired different biographies and may have travelled along very different paths, prior to their final deposition on the Kephala Hill at Knossos.