

Dear Bill,

No, I can't do it.

On his page 4, he'd obviously have so much more fun if he would admit HT 103.  $2/3$  as  $6\frac{1}{2}$  and  $104.\frac{1}{2}$  as  $45\frac{1}{2}$  - because then he would have exactly 7 times ~~xxx~~  $6.5 = 45.5$ . He must persistently stay with his  $1/4$ .

His page 3 note b)... He wants pa-ro not te-ro. But surely Raison and Pope are right to call it 539. GORILA goes on, not very well, to speculate on the origin of the apparent composite sign. Was "(Index II) is a mighty bad reference. in Index pp 200-201 there is no reference to a 92-22 (which would be te-ro). But on p. 272 there is a hypothetical analysis of 539 into "92+B" I think 22/ro and B are different things. If he doesn't, this is another of his hypotheses, and he ought to produce a parallel among other composite signs, bot for the shape, of the whole, the shape of the elements, and the syntax of the composition. But I don't think that matters very much.

His page 3 note c)... is outrageous. He should have a note with something like this in it....

The value of  $1/4$  for J, suggested by Was in Kadmos X) will not yield a correct addition in HT 104, as the text is given in GORILA. Was therefore suggests that the J in line ~~XX~~ 1-2 is a correct reading, but that the Jdotted in line 2-3 is incomplete. This suggestion is maintained in spite of the evidence of the drawing in Pugliese Carratelli p. 574 which seems to indicate that the space beneath the doubtful or even hypothetical Jdotted is uninscribed. On the other hand, the photographs in PugC in Brice in GORILA all suggest the area is in a terrible state, and the drawing in GORILA also suggest the surface in a terrible state. ]][[ I would have to look at the thing itself to be sure about that surface, but I would think that by reasons of space it is going to be pretty difficult to get in a [E] to make a proper JE for his  $3/4$ ] . I ~~xxxx~~ I suspect that Godart and Olivier put down Jdotted thinking that the form of the J was doubtful - there's nothing much more than the v ertical - and that if they thought a JE was possible that they might have written Jdotted[ . But I cannot guess what they had in mind. And it could be said that they were working from a prejudice, expecting  $J = 1/2$ , finding a trace which could both fit a J and make the sum pan out. - But Was here must point out that this is not the first time he has done this:

E.g. HT 13 line 2. GORILA shows 5][[. This is interpretable as allowing the original text to have had 5 strokes and J alone, or 6strokes and J alone, or 5 strokes and Jandafraction, or 6 strokes and Jandafraction. He conjectures that it was 6 JE. A reasonable conjecture. line 4, however, GORILA shows 18dotted, and in the drawing up above this is made clear to be 17sure plus the 1dotted, where, by ordinary arrangement the seventh of seven or eight should be. But it is a crowded place. But GORILA shows no possibility of a fractional sign. I see none, either in the three photographs, nor in the drawing of Pugliese Carratelli. In anycase he must say ~~that in line~~ the value  $1/4$  for J will not yield a correct addition in HT 13, as the text is given in GORILA. In fact, no value for J will.

E.g. HT 8. In addition to the problems about what to add to get which sum, there is also the problem that the value for  $1/4$  for J will not yield a correct addition in HT 8, ~~with~~ as the text is given in GORILA, without speculation about the meaning of the apparently repeated J on face b lines 4/5



E.g. HT 9a. He must point out that the value for  $1/4$  for J will not yield a correct addition in HT 9a, as the text is given in GORILA, in fact no value for J will, without speculation about the maning of the apparently intrusive number 1 in the last line.

Thus in fact he must point out that the value  $1/4$  is supported by the GORILA text of no one of the texts in which a summation is expected because of the presence of 98-22, or ~~otherwise~~ otherwise suspected.

Ah, I've omited 123 a dna b.

But perhaps it makes a bit of id difference which 123 we're talking about, his version in X Kadmos or XX. Since he does as his first sentence of "Minoan Taxation" claim that Kadmos XX is a firm basis for this one. For 123(a)[90]the second column - he follows the same text both times, though you think in XX 94 that it is necessary to point out where he reads his sign E. His values for E and A and H (his a, g, h) are not yielded by GORILA's values if they are read without dots, but are perhaps within the limits of the readings. I think, for myself, that Was is here following the right readings, though there are still some bits of doubt.

123a(103-22) In X he wisely refrains from comment. But he unwisely comments in XX. He does not follow GORILA, and his values do not fit GORILA's text. He follows BRICE, almost, not quite. He adds a second batch of hatching at the very end, to indicate a lost fractional sign. That is, he follows Brice on p. 95, but he really follows on p. 93 without acknowledgement another fellow Bennett. He surely doesn't get his "(2  $1/4$  +)" from Brice, who wisely puts down 1[. You will see in AJA 54 p. 208,

$2 \frac{1}{2}$   
[ $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ]<sup>b</sup>  
 $3/4$   
 $3/4$   
 $6[1/2]$ <sup>e</sup>

which in his terms ~~xxxxxx~~ comes out as  $2 \frac{1}{4}$  - which is why he cannot take the last line straight over. and why he must invent in line ii the  $2 \frac{1}{4} +$  -- his two  $1/4$  and  $2 \frac{3}{4}$  will add up to 6. Though he says, p. 93, 6 at least, the addition of the + + shows that he feels more is necessary.

But in using my wild guesses as his text basis, he neglected the notes b, c, e. "b This number is supplied by the general proportions apparent in the table. . .

"e. the  $1/2$  is supplied to conform with the value explained under b. "

I had more than 6, because I was following general proportions. He though he needed more than 6 because I thought I needed more than 6. ~~xxxx~~ But his change of values brought him down to 6 even, so he added the two plusses. Pure speculation on my part about what Was thought. Neverthe less he is ignoring the very reasonable doubt that GORILA makes clear. On the tablet itself, there is plenty of room for extra fractional signs in the last line. In line 4 there is not.

123b. Here he changes his readings, or rather restricts them. He did allow in X for different readings after 'b-du' and after 'ku-ro' ~~xxx~~ changing in tandem to keep his equations equated. Here he must follow the very clear photo of 20 after 98-22, so he dots the 10, and adds a note. But his values for JE JL A EF and his ghost fraction are not supported by the summations in the GORILA text.

Parenthesis - If he just wants to say that he has been piling up one hypothesis upon another and ignoring the doubts about the readings which might pertain to his hypotheses, that's not too bad. But on XX p. 96 he calls a small dash (9) "likely palimpsest". Whether or not a thing is really palimpsest can only be told by a combination of good photograph and autopsy. It may be suggested perhaps by a good reproduction of a photograph. The Photo in GORILA is not of sufficient quality to suggest. I wonder if he means "palimpsest"



On the other hand his note at the same place about the overlooked longer and clearer vertical stroke under the three-sign-group is sensible, and he might even be right about its interpretation.

Back to the summations. His final readings show up on p. 101 XX.. Here, it is good that he admits that scribes can make mistakes, but he chooses a rather advantageous place to find it, and must add an interpretation for the 20, to say that it really should have been 30 - because of the values he is intending to illustrate. But the text then cannot support his values. Has any text yet? 123a90, if it does not support, at least does not conflict.

You will remember also that this MS does depend upon the relationships of Was's Minoan Medimnos and Metretes. I really think you would do well to ~~see~~ wait to see whether he can review and defend the methods by which he got those relationships, and whether they depend upon bad texts or good. I fear my answer is still NO, I do not think this is a contribution to Linear A.

I sort of hoped I could find some way to suggest modifications to turn it into something innocuous, so that I could defend myself against the suspicion that I was becoming, as Was wrote me, an ennemi personnel to him. But I can't do that without rewriting all of his articles. And I just don't have the imagination to overlook such doubtful evidence as he does.

Best wishes,

24 June 1983.

