SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE SUGGESTIVE TABLET H 6

§ 1. Whether from a methodological point of view the transliteration of Linear A text by applying the phonetic values of corresponding symbols of the Linear B script is permissible is still a non-settled issue. In *Documents* already one finds the warning that reshuffling of phonetic values might have occurred in the creation of the latter script[1]. Also the results obtained by the application of that method are contradictory[2], which may hold it in suspense. However, if the theory of Schachermeyr[3], supported by Hooker[4], on the Minoan creation of the Linear B script, which obviously has its merits, is accepted, the likelihood of identity of the phonetic values of the symbols in both scripts is increased.

Anyhow, no other method for the transliteration of the texts written in the Linear A script is available or would, for that matter, be conceivable. Analysis of sign-pedigrees and the phonetic association of the pictographic or semantic meanings of the symbols[5] has convinced the author that, with proper caution applied, the method, or rather the assumption on which it rests, is permissible.

It would not be appropriate not to mention here the convincing review of the issue by Meriggi in the Sundwall Festschrift, *Minoica,* 1958, pp. 232-45. The contradictory results, referred to above, do not suggest otherwise as the material thus employed has nearly always been removed from its context and it may be said that the relevancy of the method applies solely if and when

---

1 M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek,* Cambridge 1959, p. 39.

2 Cf. L. R. Palmer, *Mycenaeans and Minoans*[2], London 1965, pp. 327 ff.; C. H. Gordon, *Evidence for the Minoan Language,* Vetnor 1966.

3 F. Schachermeyr, *Saeculum* 10, 1959, pp. 48-72.

4 J. T. Hooker, *Europa,* Grumach Festschrift, 1967, p. 139.

5 As derived from (frequent) Egyptian prototypes; cf. Arthur J. Evans, *Scripta Minoa* I, Oxford 1909, pp. 238-42.

no doubt exists as to the context. It is submitted that this is the case with the text of HT 6a.

§ 2. The text following the transcription given by Brice[6] may be transliterated as follows:

HT 6a

1)	*kata datara te*	
2)	FIGS	15
3)	*pitaja*	24
4)	*ru/ja*	2/5
5)	*ma*-L 3	10
6)	L 4 - ra_2diha	2
7)	$kapak^we$	$6^3/_4$
8)	dak^wera	11
9)	k^wepita	$22^3/_4$
10)	FIGS	$16^1/_4$

The following initial observations may be made:

i) Face *b* of the tablet is written in a different hand; in all probability it consists of a number of names of persons or localities followed by numerals, not connected with those on face *a* (the total is larger). As the enumeration of face *a* starts and ends with FIGS, it might be supposed that the account of face *b* deals with that commodity.

ii) In entry (3) the first symbol, L 56, has been transliterated by *pi* according to Gordon[7]; it is indeed most close to **39, pi*.

iii) Entry (4) has a monogram with *ru* written over *ja*.

iv) I have transliterated L 61, as *ha*, as a likely cognate of **25*[8].

v) For *pi* in entry (9) see under (ii) above.

vi) The fractions are given as established by the author[9].

---

6 W. C. Brice, *Inscriptions in the Minoan Linear Script of Class A*, Oxford 1961.

7 *Op. cit.*, Pl. XI, after G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Am. d. Sc. Arch. d. Ath.* 30-32 (N. S. 14-16) 1952-54, pp. 7-21, G. P. Goold and M. Pope, *The Cretan Linear Script*, Cape Town 1955.

8 Gordon, *op. cit.*, *né*, following A. Furumark, *D. Arch. Inst.*, 1956, rejected by Meriggi, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

9 *Kadmos* 9, 1971, pp. 35-51.

§ 3. The text is characterized by the symbol L 92, *te* in the heading, a so-called transaction sign[10]. It appears in a rather large number of texts dealing with commodities[11].

Obviously the concept rendered by the notation is obscure (contribution?), but the real point of interest is that it precedes accounts of commodities. Consequently, it follows that HT 6a also deals with commodities, as is indicated in the text itself, entries (2) and (10).

It would be inexplicable if the other entries represented anything else. Moreover, the heading of the text starts with *kapa*, an expression also found in a Linear B text[12] where it refers to olives, and is taken to be connected with Greek καρπός[13]. This association is for the present issue strengthened by the reference to the commodity *kapak^{w}e* in entry (7), in which *-k^{w}e* is not the conjunction, as it would make the entry senseless. Hooker[14] has reflected on the abnormal behaviour of the enclitic syllable in the Linear B texts, and suggested that in those cases it is a relic from Linear A[15].

§ 4. The expression *kapa* also occurs in the texts of HT 8b, 94b and 102. As HT 8 deals with the commodity olive-oil, characterized by the ligature *KI*, it is reasonable to see in the subsequent entries, inclusive of *kapa*, names, either anthroponymes or toponymes. Its function on HT 94 is different; here it is used as a subheading of a list of different sorts of labourers who have to be paid according to the subsequent account[16]. Its interpretation is as yet obscure, but the context is different from that of HT 6,

---

10 J. L. Myres, *Minos* 1, 1951, pp. 26-30.

11 HT 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 26, 40, 42, 44, 51, 52, 62, 67, 91, 92, 116, 133. Its function in HT 51, 62 is unclear, but as usual it appears in the heading of the account; HT 52 has *sama.te* as a separate entry. It needs to be noted that *sama* also occurs on face *b* of HT 6, and consequently it was not necessary to repeat the notation there as it appeared already in the heading of the obverse.

12 PY Un 138.5.

13 Cf. Palmer, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, 1963, p. 424.

14 *IF* 73, 1968, pp. 67-86.

15 Conversely, Cr IV 5 has *kumina.k^{w}e*, barley, in which *k^{w}e* may have been in the position of the conjunction.

16 Cf. the author «Numerical Fractions in the Minoan Linear Script A, II The Measurement of dry commodities and their use in the payment of Minoan labour», to appear in *Kadmos* 11:1, 1972.

so that it should represent a different concept as well. (See section 11 below).

As to HT 102 a more detailed discussion is required. This text may be transliterated as follows:

HT 102

1)	*kapa*		
2)	*sara*$_2$	WHEAT	976
3)	*pa*$_2$*ni*	WHEAT+*PA*	33
4)	*no*-L 122	WHEAT+*PA*	33
5)	*diwena*		10
6)	*ma*-L 3		3
7)	L 28 - *noka*		5
8)	*kuro* (= total)		1060

The following observations seem pertinent:

i) Three entries record amounts of wheat; the expression preceding the ideogram refers to the particular «transaction» of the commodity[17]. As the ideogram does not appear from entry (5) onwards, the logical implication thereof seems to be that the words refer to other commodities; otherwise the ideogram should have been repeated. Moreover, this follows from the fact that the reader would not have known whether the entries referred to wheat in general or to the particular variety[18] labelled WHEAT+*PA*.

ii) This conclusion is supported by the fact that the entry (6) lists *ma*-L 3, also occurring on HT 6a in a fruit context.

iii) The fact that an enumeration of volumes of wheat and of other commodities can be summed up, as done in entry (8), indicates that *kapa* has a wider meaning than «fruit» which, considered from the angle of καρπός, is etymolo-

---

17 For the function of the notation *sara*$_2$, cf. the author's paper mentioned in Note 16).

18 The fact that in the case of the ideogram, Lc 9, WHEAT+*PA*, there is no possibility of reading WHEAT + fraction symbol, (LM 20), follows from the last entry.

gically correct. However, quite a different interpretation seems more attractive. (See further section 11).

iv) It may be considered somewhat strange that a total (*kuro*) would have been established for a variety of different commodities. However, such a total represents an amount of commodities measured by volume, and a considerable volume at that. According to the author's calculations as to the size of the Minoan unit for measuring dry capacity the recorded total amounts to over one hundred cubic metres, or nearly 3200 bushels. Storage and/or transport of such a volume may have required special consideration, which may explain that a total was added.

§ 5. *Kaporu* occurs as a name on HT 115a. It is possible that the partly obliterated words *kapa*[..] on HT 140 and *ka*[..]*k^we* on HT 105, 140, refer to the same concepts as *kapa* itself.

§ 6. As to the function of the enclitic particle *k^we* on entry (7) after the entry *kapa*, its use in similar fashion is attested a number of times. In these cases the particle is attached to commodity ideograms. HT 28 shows WHEAT+*K^wE*, Lc 3, without being followed by the FIG ideogram on face *b*, after having dealt with both wheat and figs on face *a*. HT 18 has in two subsequent lists WHEAT+*K^wE*, 20 and WHEAT 10, figs 10.

Similarly HT 121 has first OIL + *DI* + *K^wE*, Lc 28[19], and subsequently entries for oil, (unligatured) and an unknown commodity, represented by L′ 2. Analysis of HT 28 in particular[20] has led the author to assuming that the notation -*k^we* expresses the concept of similarity or equivalency[21]. Applied to the entry (4) this would seem to mean that after various «fruits» have been recorded, the account continues with quoting «equivalent fruits $6^3/_4$».

§ 7. In entry (9) *k^we* precedes *pita*, whereas (3) has *pitaja* (see section 9 below). Appearing in one and the same context

---

19 OIL+*DI*, L 16, refers to a species of oil.

20 This will be reported in the series «Numerical Fractions in the Minoan Linear A Script, III The Measurement of Liquids, to appear in *Kadmos* 11:2, 1972.

21 For a possible convention, cf. next section.

it is difficult to dissociate these two expressions. The prothetic position is also found in the commodity ideogram Lc'6, compounded as $K^{w}E$ + L 71 + 1/5. In view of the convention to litigate the wheat ideogram with the symbols for numerical fractions, indicating amounts of wheat to be measured in sub-units of the main unit used for measurement of dry capacity[22], the symbol Lc'6 may be understood as $K^{w}E$+CEREAL[23] measured in one fifth units. In this connection the question may be raised whether proclitic use indicates «similar», or, applied to our text, «*kapa* equivalent» in entry (7) and «similar *pita*» in entry (9). In both cases the reference should have a meaning with respect to the preceding entry.

§ 8. A clue to the possible translation of the denominators listed may be rendered by entry (6), preceding the notation of «*kapa* equivalents». The initial symbol is a hapax and (cf. figure 1) it looks like a beetroot. On both counts it is most economical to consider it to represent a commodity. The combination of commodity symbol and written word to specify the former is well attested through «FIGS, *kikina*» in HT 28. The beetroot ideogram is followed by the expression *ra$_2$diha*. It seems difficult to overlook the association with Greek ῥίζα *^{w}ra̯dja*.

Obviously, when applying the Mycenaean rules of orthography to the Greek word, one should expect *wiriza*, not *ra$_2$diha*, but we are presently dealing with a text that precedes the Pylos tablets by more than three centuries. Consequently it seems more to the point to wonder in which manner the original *^{w}ra^{a}d-i̯a* or any subsequent form should have been written, assuming that the Mycenaean spelling rules would apply to the Linear A script as well. Starting from the consideration that all commodities in the texts should have been pronounced according to the plural form, it may be noted that in *^{w}ra^{a}di̯ai* there are three orthographical problems to be solved:

i) The writing of the initial group, taking into account the tendency of the Indo-European laryngeal to be coloured

---

22 Cf. the author, «Numerical Fractions», II, *op. cit.*

23 That L 71 represents a cereal is also indicated pictographically; the most likely candidate would be millet (*granicum italicum*).

and then ushered by the «helle Färbung» (Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 352) of the subsequent cluster. To write *wiri-* would involve anticipation of phonetic development. Any spelling with initial *wa*, e.g. *wara-*, $wara_2$- or $wara_3$-[24], to be pronounced *wra-*, *wrja-* and *wrai-* respectively, would have served to indicate *a*, as distinct from the coloured laryngeal, which at a certain stage might have been a phoneme like /^{i}ə/. The script had no symbol in the digamma series to accommodate such phoneme; both *wi* and *wa* would have disturbed the balance. It seems, however, not excluded that one has to look for such a phoneme as basic to the palatalized liquid suggested for ra_2[25].

ii) The central cluster could not have been represented by *za* or *zi*[26]. These could only have come into consideration when the originally distinct phonemes /*kj*/, /$g^{w}j$/, etcetera, /*dj*/ and /*tj*/ had already developed their common sibilant character /^{t}*ss*/, which according to Ruijgh[27] should have been the case in the epoch of the Pylos tablets, and at that time the hesitation between *k* and *z* indicates that said process was still not finalized. The well-established *z*-series in the Minoan Linear script[28] may represent a variety of different complex phonemes, or just one thereof, although we do not know which. Anyhow, if we write /*i̯e*/ we should adhere to *di* for d^{i} as well.

iii) With respect to the asper in the last syllable, it is to be appreciated that the preceding *i*, as ultimate ζ demonstrates, should have been in a position «à cheval» as we

---

24 A Linear A cognate of **33*, ra_3, has not been found, but its possible existence may be assumed as the crocus-symbol appeared in the hieroglyphic script (no. 88a, cf. Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 213).

25 As to the possibility that the Minoan orthographic convention did not in general indicate initial *w* before the liquid, it may be relevant that there is no single case attested that could have rendered such cluster.

26 C. J. Ruijgh, *Etudes du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam 1967, § 355, proposes **85* as a candidate for *zi*; the pig's head symbol may be found in L 49 f, which, if so, should be considered a syllabaric sign, as distinct from the olive ideogram L 49.

27 *Op. cit.*, §§ 24-26.

28 L 37 = *za*; L 16 (also L 13?) = *ze*; L 101 = *z-*.

have maintained in the foregoing. Consequently it was already attached to the preceding *d*, regardless of the exact pronunciation of the complex. It is of some interest to compare the Mycenaean orthography of *di-wi-ja*[29], which (cf. *di-u-ja*) is one of the rare cases in which the preceding vocal was repeated (cf. *wa-na-ka*), and therefore stood for *diw-ja*. In the present case, however, we may have *^{w}riədi-ai*, in which the suffix *-ja* had already disintegrated and the second element thereof formed a complex with the plural case suffix. It is submitted that the notation ' might have served to indicate this disintegration; spelling with *a* instead of *ha* could on the basis of *di-wi-ja* be read as *^{w}r^{i}əda*. Obviously, spelling with final *-ja* would have indicated the suffix as intact.

It seems that between the original form, for which, due to the laryngeal, no appropriate orthography could have been applied, and the classic *wiriza*, our *ra$_2$diha* represents a homogeneous intermediate phase.

As to the meaning of the denominator it could be said that the entire entry would have a tautological character. However, in Latin we know the expression *orchades et radii* for round and long-shaped olives. It seems therefore not excluded that we shall have to read «carrots, long species», (cf. ῥαδίξ).

In view of what has been said in Sections 6 and 7, the next entry could be construed as «fruits» (referring both to the heading and to the preceding entry), «equivalent», possibly a sort of differently shaped carrots (see section 11 for *kapa*).

§ 9. Going presently to entry (3) «*pitaja*, 24», it should be appreciated that the preceding entry has «FIGS 15», and that the ending in *-aja*, in case the word should represent Mycenaean Greek, may be understood as an adjective in *-asjos* (Schw., *Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 467) derived from a noun in *-as*, or *-os* (cf. ὀύδας, οὐδαῖος, ὁδος, ὁδαῖος).

Such a construction would involve that entry (3) also deals with figs, but of a more defined type or source. If the word had

---

[29] Cf. Ruijgh, *op. cit.*, § 108.

been written *putaja* instead, the adjective would be a derivative of φύτας, from the verbal stem φυτ-, and could be translated as «of the young (fig)-trees».

The texts written in the Linear B script have exclusively the vocal *u*, not *i*[30]; the latter form is equally possible on the basis of φιτύω, next to φυτεύω.

§ 10. The context necessitates the assumption that the various entries are representing the plural nominative case. As entry (9) has *k*^{w}*epita* (cf. section 7 above), this should hold here as well, which suggests that we are confronted with the plural nom. neuter of *phyton*, corresponding to Mycenaean *pu-ta*[31]. Here one is tempted to read «similar crops», referring to the preceding entry. (For «similar» see section 6 above).

§ 11. Similarly the expressions *kapa* and *datara* in entry (1) and *kapak*^{w}*e* in entry (7) might be so construed. As to the first, it occurs as a descriptive term for olives on PY Un 138.5, and also, in which case it has been rendered as Σκάφα, on KN E 71[32].

Also the first occurrence has been thus connected[33], which seems a bit far-fetched in that particular case (olives «for pressing»). It is submitted that in both scripts the term has two functions, *σκαφας, «digger,» (= σκαφεύς) and a noun indicating fruit of different sorts, but with a common characteristic. As such we would suggest *καρφον = «dry (dried) or ripe fruit» (cf. κάρφος, Nic. Th 893, ripe fruit), with a possible distinction of «dried» as opposite to *po-qa* in the Pylos case, and «ripe» as being more appropriate for HT 6a[34].

«Diggers» as a heading for the list of labourers in HT 94b would fit the context.

The second word in the heading, *datara*, might be read δαίτρα[35] nom. p. n. of δαίτρον, which (Δ 262) has the significance

---

30 Cf. *pu-ta*, n. pl. φυτόν (KN Gv 864.3); *pu-ta-ri-ja*, φυταλιά, (KN E 849.1).

31 KN Gv 864.3.

32 Cf. C. J. Ruijgh, *op. cit.*, § 194.

33 Cf. *Documents*, p. 221.

34 Also κάρφη (Xen. *An* 1.5.10 = hay) could come into consideration.

35 Cf. V. Georgiev, *Les deux langues des inscriptions crétoises en linéaire A*, Sofia 1963, p. 68.

of «allocated measure». Here it seems, in view of the subsequent «transaction sign», (cf. section 3 above), to implicate a connection with the entries of commodities and could therefore be rendered by «individual measures». The entire heading could then tentatively be read «ripe fruits - individual measures - contributed»

HT 116 is headed by the expression *dataro.te*, and it would be difficult not to accept a close relation to HT 6, *datara.te*. However, the system of recording is different; in the case of HT 116 various distinct notations precede a series of commodities, indicated by their ideograms. Such notations must indicate beneficiaries or sources, or, just as likely, specific transactions. It seems therefore not excluded that in HT 116 *dataro* represents a concept different from that of *datara*, although from the same root. In this connection *datare*, an anthroponym on HT 88 may be quoted, which suggests the equation between a noun *dat-aros* and an adjective *dat-arēs* (δατέομαι). Finally HT 123 shows a series of entries, including *datu* which resembles δαιτύς (X 496).

Obviously, it is also possible to reject the reading *datara* as *daitra* on account of the expressions just quoted. Peruzzi, in a study of HT 31 (*Minoica*, pp. 232-45) has suggested that the duplets in *-u*, and *-ara* reflect a typical Minoan element (*sup(u)*, *supa$_3$r(u)*, etcetera).

However, it seems less easy to place our *datare*, *dataro* in the context of *datu*, *datara* according to such hypothesis, apart from the orthographical anomaly to write final *u* in the polysyllabaric form.

§ 12. Entry (4) showing the monogram *ru|ja* presents the particular difficulty that we have no inkling as to whether we should read the Linear A monogram upwards or downwards. We even do not know whether any such convention did exist or whether monograms were compounded in the easiest manner of notation. With this reservation, and taking into account the entire context, the entry may present us with a Minoan form of Greek ῥοια, «pomegranate», Cypr. ῥυδία. Ruijgh[36] considers *ro-ja* (KN X 5959) as obscure, Palmer[37] reads ῥοίσκοι in PY Va 482[38].

---

[36] *Op. cit.*, § 234.

[37] *Interpretation*, p. 368.

[38] *Rudeha* (PY Ub 1318.3) has been held (cf. Ruijgh, *op. cit.*, § 203, Palmer, *op. cit.*,

§ 13. In entry (5) one finds «*ma*-L 3» (for the latter sign, cf. figure 1), which after figs and perhaps pomegranates may represent another kind of tree-fruit. The same word occurs in the following texts, HT 97 & HT 102a. The latter has been considered in Section 4 above, in which it was suggested that like in the case of our present text it represented an agricultural product. Its transcription in HT 97 is dubious, but if correct it would seem to refer to a labour denominator[39].

The fact that L 3 occurs in the context of our tablet, in which no abbreviations occur, indicates that it is a syllabaric symbol. It is tempting to read *mala*, plural of μῆλον. This would necessitate the assumption that the Linear A script had a separate series, as distinct from *ra*, *re*, etcetera, to represent *l*-, and consequently that the symbol *ra* in entries (1) and (8) should be read as such and distinct from *la*[40]. As to the absence of such series in the Linear B syllabary an interesting and suggestive theory was presented by Lejeune[41] in that the Minoan phoneme /*l*/ resembled Greek *d*[42], causing the latter to write Greek words with initial *l*- by making use of the *r*-series instead. Linear A should then comprise distinct series for *d*-, /*l*/- and *r*-.

The known alternative Greek spellings with *d* and *l* for inherited words seem to indicate that Greeks making use of the Minoan script had the choice, but this being contrary to establishing an orthographic convention did away with the ambiguous /*l*/- series[43].

§ 14. Now we arrive at the expression *dak^{w}era* on entry (8). In conformity with the foregoing this should be considered to

---

p. 453) to perhaps represent an adjective describing a (red) colour. It seems equally possible to speculate about an adjective derivation in *-ehos* from *rudos* next to ῥυδία [Λυδεός, Λυδός, Λυδία].

39 Cf. Also HT 85a.

40 Cypriot *lo* and *ro* correspond to L 22 and L 81′ respectively; if the distinction should apply in Linear A, the word *dataro* (section 11) could represent *daitalo-* (cf. δαιταλεύς).

41 M. Lejeune, *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne* I, Paris 1958, p. 327.

42 Cf. Mycenaean *da-pu$_2$-ri-to-jo*, KN Gg 702.2, L. R. Palmer, *BICS* 2, 1955, p. 40.

43 It would have been equally possible and more rational to write *d* for /*l*/ and to reserve the /*l*/ series for *l*-. Original absence of distinction between *l* and *r* might be due to Egyptian influence on the syllabary (cf. Evans, *Scripta Minoa* I, 1909 pp. 236-42).

represent either an f. plur. or n. plur. of a noun, denominator for a species of «fruit». Morphologically it is parallelled by Greek τέφρα, (Umbr. *tefra*, Schw. I, p. 327), *tek^{w}(e)sra*. It is difficult to connect the concepts of heat and burn with that of horticultural produce, except in the doubtful case of the substrate-word δάφνη. The entry occurs in the section of the text in which a change from tree-fruits to field-fruits may be detected. Admitting the obscurity of the etymological and semasiological connection, the (Thessalian) words for «parsnip»[44] (*Pastinaca sativa*), δαυχνα, δαῦκος, δαυχμός are suggestive. The variety of suffixes in this case may explain the other form in *dak^{w}era*, (*dak^{w}esrai*). See, however, Section 18.

§ 15. The text ends with a reference to figs, which seems somewhat odd; it may legitimately be wondered why the scribe did not join the amount to the figs of entry (2), since there is no indication that we are confronted with two different species (cf. the «FIGS. *kikina*» on HT 28).

It remains possible that in making his account he came, in the end, to a second and separate delivery of figs, but the amounts, about forty-five and fifty bushels, are such that he could hardly have overlooked the second lot.

Another possibility must not be excluded.

The previous entry (9) lists «similar crops, $22^{3}/_{4}$» (nearly 70 bushels), which may refer to a mixed lot of fruit, including an amount of figs, and for that reason in the last entry he may have recorded the final total amount of figs as the sum of the fifteen already listed in entry (2) and the amount of figs (in that case $1^{1}/_{4}$ = almost four bushels) contained in the mixed lot.

§ 16. The author fully appreciates that the above interpretation of the text of HT 6 is beset with a number of difficulties and uncertainties as have been indicated specifically. Nevertheless he feels that this interpretation may be of some interest as it deals with a single, homogeneous and undamaged text and the result seems to be a coherent account, which, due to the paucity of the

---

[44] Parsnips have a high content of starch, which during storage in cold weather will be converted almost completely in sugar. The association with «ripe fruit» may therefore apply in this case, too.

texts and their contents and, as seen from our point of view, the bad habit of the Minoan scribes to use a kind of shorthand, seems to be exceptional.

It is with the reservation due in such a case that the following reading of the text is presented:

HT 6a

ripe fruits, individual measures,	contributed
figs	45 bushels
of the young (fig) trees	70 »
pomegranates	$1^1/_5$ »
apples	30 »
carrots, long species	6 »
equivalent dry fruits	20 »
parsnips	33 »
similar crops	70 »
(of which figs	4 »)
(which makes) figs	49 »

It may be noted that the respective amounts of the commodities are not out of line with what may be expected; especially the small amount of pomegranates tallies very well.

§ 17. Although the tentative interpretation of HT 6 as here presented may suggest the existence of proto-Greek elements in the Linear A texts, it is by no means the author's intention to intimate that the majority of these texts could be analysed in similar fashion. It seems, on the contrary, that HT 6 is rather an exceptional case in that it lacks the characteristics of the majority of the texts, the abundant use of ideograms and abbreviations. The function of the particle *k^{w}e* is, like in some Linear B texts[45], distinct from that in Greek. On the other hand it may represent the conjunction[46] in the notation *kumina, k^{w}e,* «barley» on Cr IV, 5.

---

45 Cf. J. T. Hooker, *op. cit.*

46 F. Schachermeyr, *Die minoische Kultur des alten Kretas*, Stuttgart 1964, p. 265, rejected Furumark's interpretation as the enclitic conjunction (*Berl. Vortr.*, 1956, p. 25); however, in this particular case it seems to have been overlooked that spic-

Linear B is a mixture of Greek and non-Greek; it seems therefore not excluded that the Linear A text may ultimately disclose a similar jargon with rather more Aegean elements and, perhaps, spiced with some Semitic bookkeeping terms[47] and loan-words for the more rare commodities. In fact, what makes linguistic analysis so difficult is the abundant use of ideograms for commodities, which, if spelled, would have provided a sound basis therefor.

§ 18. E. Peruzzi[48] has also construed HT 6 a as a record of agricultural commodities. His transcription differs in some details from the one given by Brice. With respect to his suggestion that entry 8 has no numerals and in consequence should be considered a (sub)heading, it appears that such alternative transliteration needs to be retained for consideration as it is by no means certain that the alleged numerals are real, instead the tablet may show punctuations, like in the main heading. In that case, (cf. section 14 above) *dak^{w}era* could represent a bookkeeping expression preceding the last two entries which we have translated as «similar crops $22^{3}/_{4}$ (which makes a total of) figs $16^{1}/_{4}$» (cf. section 15 above).

The notation *dak^{w}era* also appears as heading in the texts of HT 57a and HT 120 but none of the texts offers sufficient evidence as to the precise function of that notation and only the method of etymological interpretation remains applicable which in the circumstances can hardly surpass conjecture[49].

The transliteration of the last sign in entry 9 as *po*[50] instead of $^{3}/_{4}$, which led Peruzzi to assume a word spelled *poni*, I cannot accept since the extra stroke of Lm 8 is clearly visible.

---

ing of cereals, such perhaps as cakes or porridge, with cumin and caraway, has survived over the ages till present times, and that, although barley was recorded by its ideogram as distinct from spelling the denomination in the Minoan language, when reading the notation a conjunction would make sense.

47 Like *kuro*; Gordon, *op. cit.*, 27; *kl* = all.; however cf. E. Peruzzi, *Le iscrizioni minoiche*, Firenze 1960, p. 118 on **ger-*, to collect.

48 *Minos* 8, 1963, pp. 7-14.

49 Cf. J. Raison, *Kadmos* 1, 1962, p. 50.

50 Although it is tempting to read δὴ πάλαι (cf. πάλαι δή, S. Ph. 806 as against δήποτ, Aisch. *Ag.* 577).

This in its turno weakens the case of equating L4-*ra*$_2$*di*-L61 with Myc. *ko-ri-a*$_2$*-da-no*, based upon the latter's concurrence with *po-ni-ki-jo* (e.g. in KN Ga 418).

L 3		*MA*	L 61		*HA*
L 4		BEETROOT	Lc 32		*RU/JA*
L 56		*PI*			

Figure 1: Special characters on HT 6a.

The Hague DANIEL A. WAS
President Kennedylaan 21