

COPY

Worcester College,

Oxford

June 10 1964

Dear Roberts,

Professor E.L. Bennett has sent me a copy of a communication which he has submitted to the Delegates relating to On the Knossos Tablets, which in a forthcoming review he proposes to stigmatize as a disservice to scholarship. His reason for sending me a copy was doubtless so that I could make comments on it.

We must be grateful to Bennett for the immense amount of care and trouble which he has taken in checking the readings against the microfilms, but I would submit with respect that the evidence he offers suggests the opposite conclusion to the one he seeks to justify. In fact he provides his own refutation by admitting that the majority (I would say 'overwhelming majority') of the errors will not conceivably alter the sense of the passages in which they occur.

This conclusion is borne out by my detailed analysis of his data annexed to this letter. The corrigenda are with few exceptions quite trivial. As far as I can see, the ~~practical~~ result in real terms is to shift some fragments of tablet some 30 cm to the west. It may be that Bennett will produce a more considerable change in the archaeological picture relating to the find-places of the tablets, and it would be right and proper to invite him to indicate the minority of significant changes. Meanwhile, so far from sharing Bennett's "distress", I am much relieved to find that the great amount of new archaeological information contained in these documents has been made available to scholars so rapidly with so little distortion. It may put matters in their proper proportion if I point out that Evans's sole 'decisive stratigraphy' has turned out to ~~inxx~~ be an assemblage of tablets and pots from different parts of the palace. Pending Bennett's reply, now that he has taken such effective steps to draw attention to such blemishes as "burned" for "burnt" and "enclosed" for "inclosed", you may be disposed to share my view that

COPY

there is no prima facie case for a new edition.

I have no comments, of course, to make on his strictures of the Delegates' policy, but I cannot see what scholarly purpose is served by circulating extracts without my permission from my private correspondence.

Yours sincerely,

L. N. Palmer

We must be grateful to Bennett for the immense amount of care and trouble which he has taken in checking the readings against the microfilms, but I would submit with respect that the evidence he offers suggests the opposite conclusion to the one he seeks to justify. In fact he provides his own refutation by admitting that the majority (I would say 'overwhelming majority') of the errors will not conceivably alter the sense of the passages in which they occur. This conclusion is borne out by my detailed analysis of his data annexed to this letter. The corrigenda are with few exceptions quite trivial. As far as I can see, the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ result in real terms is to shift some fragments of tablet some 30 cm to the west. It may be that Bennett will produce a more considerable change in the archaeological picture relating to the find-places of the tablets, and it would be right and proper to invite him to indicate the minority of significant changes. Meanwhile, so far from sharing Bennett's "distress", I am much relieved to find that the great amount of new archaeological information contained in these documents has been made available to scholars so rapidly with so little distortion. It may put matters in their proper proportion if I point out that Evans's sole 'decisive stratigraphy' has turned out to know be an assemblage of tablets and pots from different parts of the palace. Pending Bennett's reply, now that he has taken such effective steps to draw attention to such blemishes as "burnt" for "burnt" and "enclosed" for "inclosed", you may be disposed to share my view that