

**Evans, Mackenzie, and the history
of the Palace at Knossos***

At Knossos Mackenzie seems again to have performed the duties that we would now designate as those of the site supervisor. But the exact nature of his responsibilities, the limits of his authority and the personal relationship between him and Evans are something of an enigma. The problem has important scientific implications in view of the controversy that has developed since 1962 about the dependability of some aspects of Evans's publications. The conundrum, in short, concerns the exact roles that the two men played in the gradual evolution of theories from the moment of discovery of crucial evidence until the final arguments and conclusions appeared in definitive publications. (W.A. McDonald and C.G. Thomas, *Progress into the past: the rediscovery of Mycenaean civilisation* [2nd ed., Bloomington and Indiana 1990] 119).

... Evans in an eloquent passage towards the end of his first report for the year 1900 makes it quite clear that he regarded the pithoi in the South Propylaion (B) as belonging to the same fire-destroyed palace as the pithoi in the West Magazines (C) and the Linear B tablets. This rather suggests that it was Mackenzie and not Evans who evolved the theory of the 'Reoccupation' in the first instance. If so, he convinced Evans. (Sinclair Hood, "Last palace" and "reoccupation" at Knossos', *Kadmos* iv [1965] 18)

Duncan Mackenzie (1861-1934) is usually remembered as Sir Arthur Evans' loyal assistant or 'site supervisor' and author of the 'Day-books of the excavations at Knossos'—the only continuous and systematic record of the excavations of this site. Little attention has been paid to his contribution to Minoan and Aegean scholarship, largely because he published very little, but also because, as Evans's employee, he was destined to remain in the background.¹ However, his unpublished 'Day-books of the excavations at Knossos' and his cor-

* I should like to thank Sinclair Hood and Jeremy Johns for reading a draft of this note and encouraging me to publish it; Alistair Bain Mackenzie, for allowing me to use and quote from his uncle's letters; Michael Vickers, the Visitors of the Ashmolean Museum and the Evans Trust for allowing me to study and quote from Mackenzie's 'Day-books' and Evans's 'Notebooks' of the excavations at Knossos. All quotations from Mackenzie's 1900 'Day-book' refer to the inked version.

¹ See, e.g., S. Horwitz, *The find of a lifetime* (London 1981) 105: 'Hired as an assistant, Mackenzie was destined to remain in second place...'. D. Levi, *Festós e la civiltà minoica I* (Rome 1976) 8: '...unico archeologo di professione, esperto e accurato durante tutti gli anni delle spettacolari scoperte del Palazzo minoico...'. Colin Renfrew, in his introduction to his transcription of Mackenzie's 'Day-books of the excavations at Phylakopi' describes them as 'outstanding examples of systematic archaeological reasoning, produced at a time when scientific principles of excavation had not yet been established. Duncan Mackenzie was one of the very first scientific workers in the Aegean, and his Day-books have therefore a considerable historical value, which I believe would alone warrant their duplication'. Copies of this transcription are in the libraries of the British School at Athens, the Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge, and the University of Cincinnati. There is no com-

pendence with Evans show that crucial ideas or interpretations of the archaeology of Knossos did originate from Mackenzie. These sources provide much evidence upon the complex relationship between the two scholars, and show how Mackenzie's influence upon Evans ranged from pottery analysis and classification, to stratigraphy and architecture, to Minoan religion, and to racial and anthropological issues typical of much of nineteenth- and early twentieth century archaeology.

This note is concerned with one particularly revealing document, a letter from Mackenzie to Evans of 1901, now kept in the Evans Archive of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, which clarifies the 'enigma' of Mackenzie's relationship with Evans and his role in the 'evolution of theories' about Knossos (the full text is printed below). It is just one example of how Mackenzie influenced Evans, but it is important because it concerns the history of Knossos, and, consequently, the history of the whole Aegean, particularly in the Late Bronze Age. This letter demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that it was Mackenzie 'who evolved the theory of the "Reoccupation" in the first instance', as suggested by Hood in 1965.

The letter, dated 5th February 1901, was sent by Mackenzie to Evans from Rome, where he normally resided between 1900 and 1910 when not at Knossos or engaged in other archaeological activities. The letter consists of two parts: the main text and a long 'Post Scriptum'. The structure of the letter itself is intriguing. The main text deals with practical matters such as photography of site and finds, problems with Cretan workmen, Mackenzie's salary, his precarious financial situation (and dependence on Evans), accommodation in Crete, etc. Particularly touching is the passage in which Mackenzie reports that one of the workmen had been wrongly accused of theft: 'There is one thing I have on my conscience about Themistocles. The twelve tins of Asparagus were found and he was most seriously anxious that you should know.'² But the letter contains some fundamental observations of an archaeological character, which have significant implications for the history of Knossos and of Aegean scholarship. These are confined to the 'Post Scriptum', almost as if Mackenzie had been diffident to criticise Evans.

In this 'Post Scriptum', Mackenzie outlined the main phases in the history of the Palace at Knossos as summarised below:

1. A 'Kamarais' Palace, (Old Palace phase).
2. A 'Mycenaean Palace' (Neopalatial phase).
3. A period of 'decline' ('reoccupation' phase).³

plete transcription of the 'Day-books of the excavations at Knossos'. N. Momigliano, 'Duncan Mackenzie: a cautious Kanny Highlander', in C. Morris (ed.), *Klados: essays in honour of J.N. Coldstream* (London 1994) 163-70, is a short biographical note containing a bibliography of published works by Mackenzie.

² We can trace the history of the twelve tins of asparagus one year back. The invoice from the Junior Army and Navy Stores listing the twelve tins, dated 9 February 1900, is still kept among the Evans Archive papers in the Ashmolean Museum.

³ Mackenzie also mentions a much later phase represented by structural remains over part of the West Magazines, probably what was later identified as a Greek temple (S. Hood and W. Taylor, *The Bronze Age palace at Knossos* [London 1981] no. 62, with references).

The opening phrase of the 'Post Scriptum' ('As regards the question ...') suggests that Mackenzie is answering a query from Evans, which in turn must have been prompted by a previous letter from Mackenzie, now lost, in which he must have pointed out a discrepancy between his and Evans's views of the main phases in the history of the Palace.⁴ Although not stated explicitly, the discrepancy clearly concerned the existence of a phase of 'decline', i.e. the 'reoccupation'. As Hood pointed out in 1965, in his 'Day-book of the excavations at Knossos' for 1900, Mackenzie had clearly foreshadowed the 'reoccupation' theory, describing a 'somewhat later floor-level' which belonged 'to a period when the palace was no longer inhabited as such'. Evans, on the contrary, in the report published in the *Annual of the British School at Athens* gives the clear impression that the building which he had excavated during the first season was destroyed at one time and showed no sign of later use.⁵ The discrepancy between these two views is clarified and underlined by Mackenzie's letter.⁶

This letter, together with Mackenzie's 'Day-book' for 1900, demonstrates that it was he who first envisaged the 'reoccupation', and—more important—he who first had the idea that this was of non-palatial and decadent character. It is this idea—expressed explicitly for the first time in the letter published here—that has the greatest historical implications. For if the reoccupation represented a period of decadence, it followed that the Linear B tablets could not be assigned to this phase. If Mackenzie had based his interpretation precisely upon the observation that no tablets were found associated with the latest stratigraphical levels, then one of the most hotly debated problems in Aegean archaeology would have never arisen. But this is not the case. From Mackenzie's 1900 'Day-book' and from his letter of February 1900 we can see that his 'non-palatial' interpretation was based essentially upon observations concerning later structures in the West Magazines (where indeed tablets were found in 1900),⁷ in the North West Portico,⁸ and in

⁴ Indeed, another passage in the main text ('About the proposal ... I made to you in my letter before last ...') shows that this letter was preceded by at least two which are now, unfortunately, lost, probably written between September 1900 and January 1901.

⁵ S. Hood, "Last palace" and "Reoccupation" at Knossos', *Kadmos* iv (1965) 17-18. Cf. Mackenzie's 1900 'Day-book', *passim* (especially entries for Thursday 5 April, Friday 13 April) and A.J. Evans, 'Knossos. I. The Palace', *BSA* vi (1899-1900) 3-70, especially 63-66. See also E. Hallager, *The Mycenaean palace at Knossos. Evidence for final destruction in the III B period* (Stockholm 1977) 15-16.

⁶ Although Mackenzie did not use the word 'reoccupation' itself in his 1900 'Day-book', nor in the letter published here, it is clear that this is what he meant.

⁷ See Mackenzie's 1901 letter: 'the wall going across the long corridor between the 2nd and 3rd galleries...'. '2nd and 3rd' is likely to be a mistake for '3rd and 4th galleries', for this must be a reference to the wall described in Mackenzie's 1900 'Day-12 book' (27 April) as follows (my italics): 'The gallery—3—opening out W from this, where several fragments of inscription tablets were previously found has a doorway 2.29 wide and the N jamb of the gallery has just appeared behind a later wall which had been apparently built up for dwelling purposes and in order to close up the wide passage N-wards, at a time when the palace must have already fallen into ruins but previous to the erection of the wall which appear next the

the South Propylaeum.⁹ After the second excavation season, the purely subjective notion that the pottery later called LM III A and B was somewhat decadent was added to the 'reoccupation' theory.¹⁰ It appears that Mackenzie found it difficult to accept that the Linear B tablets, the most explicit symbols of high civilisation, could be associated with a phase in the life of the palace which, because of its architecture and pottery, he perceived as a 'period of decline'. One wonders whether the problem of the date of the Linear B tablets from Knossos does not originate in part precisely from Mackenzie's desire to separate the tablets from a phase that he considered decadent.

We may or may not agree with Mackenzie's interpretation of the non-palatial character of the reoccupation.¹¹ It is not the aim of this note to argue for or against this view, nor to trace the various stages in the evolution of the 'reoccupation' theory, but simply to show that it was Mackenzie who first provided a clear description of the main phases of the history of the Palace at Knossos, and who proposed an interpretation of the character of the 'reoccupation' which has important implications for the history of the whole Aegean in the Late Bronze Age.

It is both fascinating and terrifying to see in Mackenzie's letter the main stages of the history of Knossos already crystallised in outline by February 1901, after a single season of excavation. From the moment in which Mackenzie convinced Evans of the 'reoccupation' and of its non-palatial character, until the late 1950s-early 1960s, no scholar challenged this reconstruction of the

surface above the walls of 1, 2, 3, 5 [The Greek Temple: see n. 3 above]. Mackenzie's 1900 'Day-book' also provides a sketch of the wall blocking the long Corridor (entry for 18 April, sketch no. 26), reproduced in Hallager (n. 6) 36 fig. 19. Evans in his 1900 'Notebook' also refers to a wall between Magazines 3 and 4 (quoted in Hallager, *ibid.*).

⁸ The 'N Propylaea' in Mackenzie's letter. The later structures must be the wall which blocked the eastern door-jambs on the south side of the North West Portico, and the wall to the west of the door-jambs: see Mackenzie's 1900 'Day-book', entries for 23 and 26 May and sketches no. 60 and 62; A.J. Evans, *BSA* vi (1899-1900) 46 and *The Palace Minos* III (London 1930) 37 note 1. See also J. Raison, *Le palais du second millénaire à Knossos I: le quartier nord* (Paris 1988), chp. V, especially 193-196, with quotations from Mackenzie's 'Day-book'.

⁹ For the South Propylaeum see Mackenzie's 1900 'Day-book' (5 April): 'It is important to notice that the bases of the pithoi 3, 4, 5 came about .30 [m.] higher than the level of the adjacent cement-flooring. Also wall 4 is quite clearly later construction. The pithoi taken in connection with this wall and in this position so near the important looking column-bases would seem to belong to a period when the palace was no longer inhabited as such.' See also Hood and Taylor (n. 3) no. 32, with references. It is well known that in his 1900 'Daybook' Mackenzie described a few areas where Linear B tablets were found associated with pottery later assigned to the 'reoccupation': see, e.g. L.R. Palmer, 'The find places of the Knossos tablets' in L.R. Palmer and J. Boardman, *On the Knossos tablets* (Oxford 1963) 115-16, and 121 (North Entrance Passage).

¹⁰ Hallager (n. 5) 16; Hood (n. 5) 18 and especially 28-32; M.R. Popham, 'The Palace of Knossos: its destruction and reoccupation reconsidered', *Kadmos* v (1966) 21.

¹¹ As pointed out by Hood (n. 5) 27, some of the problems with the reoccupation theory 'would be removed if it could be assumed that the "reoccupation" was "palatial" in character'.

history of the Palace at Knossos, which is still accepted by many scholars.¹²

134 Via Monte Giordano,

Rome.
5th Feb. 1901.

Dear Evans,

I write you once more before leaving. As regards Papadakis I had it in my mind to mention to you, in the last letter I should write before leaving, that he spoke to me before I left Crete asking me to recommend his services to you. He also told me he could do all the photographing we required provided there were lenses for general views and for details. He says he knows how to photograph potsherds etc. from above, having, indeed, he says, done all that sort of thing for the Greek Archaeological Society. I shall make a search for him at once on arriving in Crete. While we are on photographing might I suggest that you should also take a Kodak with the largest size of plate for taking instant- pictures of bits of excavations such as might illustrate interesting stages in operations, and might I also suggest that I should be free to use such Kodak.

Another thing I should like taken would be the day-book of last year's excavation. I shall have much to add to it from time to time in the way of notes which can be written on the blank right-hand pages.

There is one thing I have on my conscience about Themistocles. The twelve tins of Asparagus were found and he was most seriously anxious that you should know.

I shall at once look out for suitable houses on my arrival at Candia for you to select from when you come yourself. The house where the things are will do me quite well on my arrival.

About the proposal for more work I made to you in my letter before last I quite agree with what you say about the unremunerative character of much archaeological work. I, however, did not look at the matter at all from that point of view, and in view of the expenses you have had already in connection with Knossos I only feel that if it were possible I should much rather give my services for nothing. As it is I should be perfectly content if I were able to subsist without difficulties for the whole of the period between excavations. If there were work I should not expect to be paid at the same rate as at Knossos where I at present have £15 a month and expenses. I have not liked to mention any sum yet £10 a month for four extra months' work, without any expenses of course, would be sufficient and would not be a grievous addition to what I receive already provided there is a generous response to your appeal for funds.

I must say when I think of those I am only sorry I cannot contribute anything instead of bothering you thus.

One great difficulty of working at Knossos is the extreme unhealthiness of the district. Study of the

building would mean that. As [*sic*] much as possible must be done before the bad season comes on.

Hoping to meet you soon in Crete, I am,

very truly yours,
Duncan Mackenzie

As regards the question of periods at Knossos I must say that from the time evidence was forthcoming I always believed:-

(1) that the main constructions such as the 'Council-chamber', the 'Procession-corridor' and the Magazines belonged, as construction, to the last Mycenaean period, the decorations belonging to the same general period as the walls and the evidence of the pottery—in every case Mycenaean where the evidence could be tested through the presence of underlying pavements or well-marked floor-levels—fully confirming the same general conclusion. Holding to this fact as central it seemed to me:-

(2) that there was evidence of later Mycenaean occupation represented by the existence of the pithoi with their raised floor-level and the adjacent wall in the S portico, the wall going across the long corridor between the 2nd and 3rd galleries and the structures superimposed upon the low doorjambes of the N propylaea. A second period of much later occupation seems to be represented by the 'free stone' doorjambes near the surface forming superstructures to the gypsum doorjambes of the galleries 1 and 2. But as these constructions are as yet very obscure they may be as evidence for the present be [*sic*] left out of account.

In the course of the season it became more and more clear that the structures belonging to the main building represented by the Magazines, the 'Council Chamber' and the 'Procession-corridor' gave evidence of a reuse of blocks from a previous building. Of these blocks one in the long corridor, I think, and one in the S wall of the 'bath' has signs. Other reused blocks are apparent in the E wall of the S portico in the substructures between the column-base of the same portico and elsewhere. It seemed to me

(3) that these blocks, and the previous building indicated by them must represent the 'Kamarais' palace of Knossos. In agreement with this view is the discovery we made of Kamarais ware beneath the floor-level of the Mycenaean palace. The typical large 'Kamarais' vase with small ones inside it was found below the floor-level of the 2nd gallery and although this magazine had no pavement, the vase itself was broken away all round the shoulder either simply through its proximity to the floor-level or through the levelling process connected with the laying out of the ground-plan of the Mycenaean palace.

We have then in chronological order evidence of I. A 'Kamarais' palace of which we have found occasional gypsum blocks sometimes with signs reused in later construction as well as corresponding 'Kamarais' ware underneath the Mycenaean floorlevel but as yet no trace of construction in situ which could be identified as belonging to this 'Kamarais' palace. Much of this 'Kamarais' construction must have disappeared when the area was levelled out for the

¹² In *BSA* xi (1904-5) 16 and in the first volume of *Scripta Minoa* (1909) 53-5, Evans maintained that Linear B continued to be used in the 'reoccupation' period, but he retracted this statement quite emphatically in *Palace of Minos* iv (1935) 737-8.

foundations and floors of the Mycenaean palace, for in the 'clay area' N of the S portico we find Mycenaean construction immediately above Neolithic deposit. It must be born in mind, however, that we have as yet excavated very little beneath the Mycenaean floor-level. This previous building would correspond to the 'Kamarais' palace at Phaestos.

II. A Mycenaean palace with 'Council Chamber', magazines and 'Procession-corridor'. The construction has almost everywhere on its gypsum blocks signs like the 'Kamarais' ones, but the construction itself, apart from the occasional *reuse* of 'Kamarais' blocks, is Mycenaean, by which I mean that it belongs to the same general period as the typical Mycenaean ware found in the Magazines and elsewhere.

III. Later constructions belonging to the periods of decline.

It has to be noticed in favour of my views

(1) That the 'Kamarais' ware was found not on but below the Mycenaean floor-level.

(2) That pictographic signs like those of Phaestos were, as a matter of fact, found at Knossos on bed blocks built into Mycenaean construction. These signs must accordingly be earlier, factually, than those on the fresh gypsum blocks of the Mycenaean construction. On the other hand these latter signs do not require to indicate a 'Kamarais' period for the walls since similar signs occur on pictographic inscriptions contemporarily with those of the great 'linear' class. Both classes of inscriptions are in turn contemporary with the Mycenaean ware of the magazines.

D.M.K.

NICOLETTA MOMIGLIANO
Balliol College, Oxford/University of Bradford

Piglets again*

In a note to volume cxi of this journal,¹ I observed that the word δελφάκιον, although a diminutive, did not at all periods describe a piglet. In the classical period, it seems to have meant a small but not necessarily immature pig; in Hellenistic Delos and in Egypt, a pig full-grown or nearly so, apparently synonymous with the non-diminutive δέλφαξ; then by the first post-Christian century the term δελφάκιον came indeed to mean 'piglet', a meaning previously expressed by χοῖρος.

I was not able to give a certain meaning either for δέλφαξ or for δελφάκιον, and my difficulty was complicated by the fact that other words referred to piglets (χοῖροι), sows (ῥες), and boars (κάπροι). I did, however, make two suggestions: a δελφάκιον was either 'an adolescent, if the term is properly applied to swine',

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the twenty-third annual convention of the Society for the Promotion of Classical Studies in Israel held in Be'er Sheva on May 26, 1994.

¹ 'When is a Piglet not a Piglet?', *JHS* cxi (1991), 208-9.

or else a castrated animal. It appears, thanks to the helpful correspondence of Professor Dwora Gilula of the Hebrew University, Professor W. Clarysse of Leuven and Dr David Bain of Manchester, that there is more to be said on the subject, and a better reason can now be suggested for the changes in meaning.

Before we can speak of a δελφάκιον, we shall have to define its parent word, δέλφαξ. A δέλφαξ is surely not a castrated anything at all. Athenaeus collected a number of examples of this word both in the masculine and in the feminine,² and indeed etymologists both ancient and modern have suggested that it is derived from the word δελφός, 'uterus',³ which would make the feminine meaning the original one. This etymology should now be abandoned,⁴ but it is certain that a δέλφαξ can be feminine, and hence cannot be castrated.

What is a δέλφαξ? Despite my hesitancy, it does indeed appear to be an adolescent. Aristophanes of Byzantium, as Eustathius quoted him, was quite clear:

τῶν σῶν οἱ μὲν τέλειοι καὶ ἐνόρχαι κάπροι· οἱ δὲ πονεὺς αὐτῶν σιάλοι· ἡ δὲ θήλεια σὺς μόνον. Ἰππῶναξ δὲ [fr.103.11 West] γρόμφιν λέγει, εἶτε καθόλου πᾶσαν ὕν δηλῶν, εἶτε τὴν παλαιὰν τῆ ἡλικία. τὰ δὲ νέα, δέλφακες μὲν τὰ πεπηγῶτα πως ἦδη τοῖς σώμασι, τὰ δὲ ἐτι ἀπαλὰ καὶ ἐνικμα χοῖροι.⁵

For Aristophanes the grammarian, a pig was a δέλφαξ when it had 'already become somewhat firm⁶ in [its] body'. Some moderns⁷ have taken sexual maturity to be the dividing line between χοῖρος and δέλφαξ, and the

² Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* ix 374 d-375 b and xiv 656 f-657 a.

³ *Ibid.*, ix 375 a; cf. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* i (Paris 1968) 261, and H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* i (Heidelberg 1960-1970) 362.

⁴ The root of δέλφαξ is certainly the Indo-European *g^oelbh-*, *g^oolbh-*, which is also the root of the English calf (so correctly E. Klein, *A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English language* i [Amsterdam 1966] 223). The semantic field with which this root is associated appears to include other forms of swollen flesh besides the womb. The calf of the leg, *pace* Klein *ibid.*, is from the same root: cf. O.J. Sadovszky, 'The reconstruction of IE *pisko and the extension of its semantic sphere', *Journal of Indo-European Studies* i (1973) 81-100, for the surprising but well-attested semantic connection between the calf of the leg and fish roe. Suetonius, *Galba* 3.1 tells us that the Gauls called a very fat person (*praepinguis*) *galba*, and this, too, will have come from the same root: so E. Partridge, *Origins: a short etymological dictionary of modern English* (London 1958) 71, who writes that 'the basic idea in IE is app(arently) a "swelling of the body"'. This being the case, it needs no special explanation why a pig of either sex should be called δέλφαξ, a 'swell'. I owe this note to the learned comments of Dr. Daniel Gershenson and Professor David Weissert; my thanks to both.

⁵ A. Nauck, *Aristophanis Byzantii, Grammatici Alexandrini, Fragmenta* (Halle 1848, reprinted Hildesheim 1963), chapter IV (Λέξεις), fragment III, 101-2, quoting Eustathius' comment on Hom. *Od.* xiv 80-2, = Ar. Byz. fr. 169 Slater.

⁶ See *LSJ* s.v. πηγνυμι III, from Aelian and Galen.

⁷ Chantraine (n. 3): 'il désigne une jeune bête, mais apte à la reproduction', G.P. Shipp, *Modern Greek evidence for the ancient Greek vocabulary* (Sydney 1979) 209 follows him: 'a young but sexually mature animal.'