

39 Causewayside
Cambridge

7 March 1956

Dear Bennett,

Many thanks for your letter and the copy of the Mycenae publication. I sympathise with you about the unreliable way in which news circulates; I sometimes feel the same. Michael told me about the KN fragment. He had a letter from Platon, with a drawing which he transcribes:

da-wi-jo a-pu-do-si po-∟

e-pu₂-no / po-ni-ki-jo ∟

pu₂ a little uncertain. MV proposes to number it Og9000; at this rate we shall soon have used up all the 4-figure numbers for KN. It was found near the pine-trees at the NW of the Palace.

I have decided to include in my commentary on Mycenae Tablets all the old ones, since you have transliterated them. This will not make it unduly long, but will refer to the discussions of Palmer, Meriggi, Carratelli and others. I have quite a lot of new ideas, of my own or Michael's, too to bring forward.

One or two points on readings. Aul02.5 should read ko-no-pu₂-du-ro-qe. Ge604.5 I am unable to agree that pu-ke is the same as pu₂-ke, despite the different hands. pu-ke-o in Ge603.2 must by the analogy of all the other names on that tablet be nominative; so he could not have a dative pu-ke. It is clear that the scribe has made a mess of this whole entry; what we need is pu-ke-(o o)-pe-ro, which would be the ordinary dative of an o-stem. Of course this is conjecture, and you had best keep the text unchanged, but I intend to propose this in the commentary. Ge603.1. I am now more attracted to your reading; and I think I have found a conjectural restoration of the broken word. Read da-ra-(pa) mi-ta-qe = drabē mintha q^{ue}. Sp^αβγ is another of the names of plants used as condiments, said to be Arabian mustard. True it doesn't appear before Dioscorides, but this hardly weighs with me any more. What I do not understand is why this commodity is counted (like ko-no) and not weighed or measured. Ge604.5. Suggest you leave the discussion to me. I am fairly convinced your reading is preferable, even though it is an unexampled variant; but I will mention the alternative. Ge604.1. I am tempted to regard ke-e-pe as yet another scribal metathesis; ke-pe-e would at least look more like a dative. But the only Greek declension which fits is the neuter in -os! Oell1.5. Would you say two or one signs lost before o-ta? I suspect eonta, or possibly a compound apeonta, pareonta?

I have my revised commentary and translation ready; it has only to be typed and checked, so I hope to send it off in a week or a little more. Hope this won't delay you.

Yours,

John Chadwick