

18. 2. 1963

Dear Mr. Dine,

I want to thank you most heartily for your kind letter and your most interesting article. I must needs tell you that it appears to me an important step to the understanding of the Cretan and the Eleanite script. I believe it is a consequent continuation of your former articles in Kadmos I and Ryl., though it is put on a larger basis. Of particular importance seems to me your statement p. 8, that there is no rigid distinction between signs which stand separately and those in groups, which is fitting to my own ideas in Ryl. 2.

As far as I can do after the first perusal of the manuscript I would like to suggest the following alterations: First a request as editor of Kadmos,

As you know we agreed, when we formed the team of the editors, to follow a strictly neutral line and to avoid every kind of polemics. This I would be glad if we could omit the names of Ventris & Chadwick p. 12 and 14. On p. 12 it seems to me easy the more so since the "fundamental step" was not done by V.-Ch., but by A. E. Kobel. Therefore I suggest: "was the fund. step in the analysis of linear B by Alice E. Kobel."

p. 14m: The words "deduced" - for linear B' may be ²⁾
omitted without difficulty. For the end of the
paragraph I suggest: "In particular none of these theories
has advanced until now a satisfactory explanation of
the ligatured signs and their striking frequency in
Linear A, which must have a essential connection with
the nature of the script; ³⁾ or something like that.
Concerning the facts I suggest the following alterations:

p. 7 Lindwall's "poppy-head" (L 42) must be altered
in "corn-sign", "barley-sign" or something like that (cf.
the correspondence to your first article and your own
text p. 42)

p. 10 m: The first, who promoted the theory of "hellanumen"
was not Pyrie, but Evans (PHE p. 752), but it is
quite possible that Lindwall or someone else
made the suggestion even before him.

Next sentence: duplication of signs to denote the
dualis or pluralis can be observed also in scripts,
which are mixed of ideographic and phonetic
character, as for example the Egyptian script (look
for that Gardiner, Grammar and Chapt. III, lines -

purely syllabic writing ... however, & in scripts like the anc. Eg. which employ both ide & phon
char. ... may

[2 p. 72f. with literature). Therefore the sentence must be altered.

p. below: "but - small relevance," I would like you to soft down. Perhaps: "of smaller relevance than in phonetic scripts where the meaning of the words depends on the order of the values."

Almost it would alter the emphasis of what was argued, phonetic writing it should change the entire meaning.

p. 11 entry: "is dedit" etc. Such suggestions seem to make me dangerous as long as we know nothing exactly about the content of the tablets. I suggest omission.

p. below: The same is valid for: "he spoke thus"; spoke he: Here, too, I would recommend condensation.

p. 12 m: I would stress upon the fact, that one may speak of "prefixes, infixes and suffixes" only in the graphic sense and not in the linguistic point of view, as long as we do not know the very nature of the script.

p. 14 on top: Grundwall did not come to the conclusion that the script was basically ideographic, but

only to the opinion, that there could be some ideographic elements even within the sign groups. On the other hand he assumes a certain amount of phonetic signs - and has tried a phonetic description in quite a few of his papers - f.i. An attempt at assigning phonetic values etc., AJA 52, 1648, 311 ff. I don't mention this only for historical reasons - and not in order to claim the other idea for myself.

perhaps I would propose: But if so there is until now no apparent way of distinguishing them. In any case, since the scripts are basically ideographic, the phonetic elements can be rare only and of subordinate importance.

At last I want to thank you very much for the other letters and the explanation of the Carian story. What you suggest for my answer to Chadwick is very convincing. I thought it better to go more into the details, but I think you will agree with the enclosed copy which you may keep. The

original letter by Chadwick I ask you to return.

Thanks for the fortunate news of a new acquisition of K and A! I would be glad to have it for my collection.

As to the question of the continuation of the 'Hittite' series the decision, of course, rests with the Rylands Library. As to the proposals, we could make, I think the series would gain weight if we could include other authors well recommended in the field of script history. But I think it advisable to postpone this suggestion, until both our next publications have appeared and the series has got more profile. Otherwise there is danger that it could lose its character. These reflections are the more valid with respect to the suggested book which should have a homogeneous character. As to the Edinburgh Meeting I presume that Beattie will have his own ideas of publication. Besides that, I could imagine that some of the lectures will go more

6

into details of the Venetian-translation and interpretation of the texts than into questions of script structure in our sense.

I regret very much that you have got no answer from the Pitt-Rivers Museum, but I am glad to learn, that you have other plans for the London School of Oriental and African Studies, where we could contact more easily than now.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely

Frankfort