Hoa Hakananai'a and other potential Linear and cult art in the southern hemisphere

By Linear and cult art I mean the set of artistic techniques and motifs discussed in The Problem with Linear B (https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:20833/). They might be summarised as:

- multiple, compound images, suggested by selective use of various incisions, colouration and natural formations, where relevant, of the substrate;
- repeating motifs revolving around the fertility cycle in the natural and human world.

The Problem contained only one example of such art in the southern hemisphere, from Blombos cave in South Africa (Section 9). Here I want to begin to show how it might be evidenced more widely in native or aboriginal art from Polynesia, broadly defined, and Australia. As ever, doing so necessarily consumes a great deal of space, so I shall limit the illustrations to only one or two further examples. Plainly, the proposition raises difficult issues, some of which I have already tried to address by way of context and conclusions at various points in Sections 8-10 of The Problem. I shall not repeat any of that here. I leave some additional general discussion to the conclusions of this paper.

Easter Island - Hoa Hakananai'a

Wikipedia provides background on this famous, if not entirely typical moai statue now in the British Museum. The photo I have used below is of the upper "rear" side by James Miles and Hembo Pagi - own work, CC BY-SA 4.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=35244145. Interpretation of its engraved and other art work is, so far as I know, currently based entirely on its perceived correlation to the little that is known of "native" life and beliefs predating the purported "western" discovery of Easter Island in the 18th century.

Some of that analysis may be valid. However, it suffers from the same sort of presumptive distortion that has affected the viewing of Linear tablets and other art in the western world. If one lays aside such prejudice for a moment, it becomes possible to see that the statue may contain other recognisable and visually compelling images.
The eyes, lips and chin line of the left-profiled maiden are carefully formed and positioned, even though more than one chin line, and hence profile, may be suggested. Such multiplicity is characteristic of Linear and cult art, though not uniquely. Whether one also perceives the potential relevance of hair tresses and pendant ear-ring may be more subjective, but they are cosmetically appropriate and effective, and in proportion and perspective.

Again, it seems to be typical of Linear and cult art that the same interventions can be used to suggest multiple, often closely related images. So here the carefully delineated eyes may also be seen as suggestive of a right-profiled, possibly female visage, with similar but not identical hair and ornament, an effect probably even more compelling from a slightly different angle of view than that offered by the photograph.

One might object that in and of themselves such images are not indicative of Linear or cult art. In fact, the suggestion of figures from the left and right sides carrying similar items is one of its hallmarks (see O KO KO WO and PE RA KO KO WO in Section 6 of *The Problem*.) The presence of typical motifs is suggested by a closer and different viewing of the same area. Here the minute but precise location of dot indentation, as well as probably natural rock colouration, serves to suggest
the left-eye in the just glimpsed face of a seated woman viewed almost from behind, so that we also see the back of the upper half of her head and falling hair (red). Opposite her is the over-sized right-profiled face of a swaddled babe who may be seated, right leg and shoe down (turquoise), the image characteristic of similar babes in particularly Dutch or Flemish late medieval or renaissance art. But the surface is also worked to suggest at least one other baby’s face and larger body in the same area (yellow). Possibly also a right-profiled kerchiefed female (green).
The left edge is replete with suggested images of "carrying" figures, the basic motif of Linear and cult art (O KO KO WO in Section 6 of *The Problem*). One left-profiled figure (red "a" above) carries one "vessel" (turquoise) one way round - its rounded bottom also indented to suggest a down-pointing pig - the other the other way about, probably in his left hand, but he also incorporates smaller left-profiles (e.g. yellow "b"). Another face, maybe child, looks out from his chest (green). Further right a small, leaning right-profiled figure (brown, a pictorial Linear "WO") may carry a ladder which starts from the larger figure (red). The frontal face conveyed by incision and colouration (yellow "X") is only one among suggested images including a bird head (purple, with heavy incision for the beak line) and, indeed, a bird man (red "Y") with turned head, seemingly incorporated in the bird so that his arms merge with its folded wings (not fully highlighted).

Further below on the statue's same side, incisions of varying depth are deployed to evoke more than one image of a right or front-profiled rabbit (e.g. turquoise) and superimposed stork, crane or other bird head and bill (red). The same images are suggested on different scales. So there may be another rabbit to claim another suggested ear (yellow), and certainly a larger right-profiled heron or crow or frigate bird (green), with diagnostic eye pupil and beak. Unfortunately, it takes just too much space to illustrate the possibilities, and any elucidation is also impeded by what appears to be the sheer proliferation of images on the piece.

So far, all the Easter Island statues and rock glyphs that I have been able to view photographically illustrate the same awareness, even mastery, of Linear and cult art. It may be entirely coincidence, but its presence also fits conceptually, as a kind of conceptual art (other examples on pages 86 and 141 of *The Problem*). For example, a row of *moai* or single *moai* looking out or in from the sea line "pun" on the basic motif and its two other common associates: O KO KO WO, TE RE O WA, PE RA KO KO WO; ὁλκος κορ(ϝ)ων or ὀγκος κορ(ϝ)ος τηλε όραι πελαγος χωρουν or τελει όαν πελαγος χωρου, holkos korwn, or onkos koros thle horai pelagos khwrou, or, telei oan pelagous khwrou, a band of "kouroi", or a massive kouros, sees afar the moving sea, or, makes the

1 In *The Problem* I sometimes conflated storks and cranes, but it makes no difference to the analysis or argument. For most of us they display in the same way, as do some other birds. We know little from written sources about the terminology of Greek mystery and fertility cults, or even sometimes common parlance, what "πελαργος" might have been thought to embrace. It also seems likely that KO WO, kor(ϝ)os, "κορ(ϝ)ος" denoted "corvid", but it is currently impossible to prove, or for that matter which corvids corvus/ "κορ(ϝ)ος might have been taken to signify, by virtue of similar colour or beak shape. Some conflation or confusion still appears to be reflected in current usage or translation, for example, of the French "corbeau".
edge of sea-land. The Easter Island bird man is a PE RA KO KO WO, πελαγοὺς or πελαργος κορ(φ)ος, "kouros" of the sea, or "stork kouros". Moving a statue on end with ropes corresponds here (as elsewhere in the world) to ὀγκος κορ(φ)ος τελει αἰωραν, πελαργος χωρων, onkos koros telei aiwran pelargos khwrwn, a huge kouros makes oscillation going [as a] stork, or stork-like.

Similarly with the Easter Island rongo-rongo tablets. So in the example below², the use of the "moulding" as well as incisions to suggest a left-profiled rabbit or hare, particularly ears, eye, nose and tail, but the use also of the colour of the wood (or staining) to create more than one suggestion of a large beaked bird (turquoise).

The incisions that apparently help to form the perceived script signs are also used with great precision to suggest other images. So, first below, the more-or-less frontal outline of a possibly bicorn-hatted man (green), whose eyes, chin and nose are finely delineated (though maybe in more than one representation), behind and above the suggested frontal outline of what seems to be a boy's face, conveyed largely by his right cheek or jaw line and right eye (red). Beneath them both may be more than one suggestion of gun or cannon, created by lines as well as colouration.

Highlighted further below, the left edge of the tablet is populated by multiple suggestions of right-profiled figures (e.g. red, blue, purple), the smallest shown here (red) apparently carrying a child (its face suggested from more than one perspective, green or yellow) and maybe pig (where there is again more than one suggestion, purple and brown, the latter pointing left). Erotic imagery probably abounds (e.g. turquoise), as commonly in Linear and cult art.
Hiva Oa, (French) Marquesas Islands, *tiki* statue

The single statue below is my extract from a photograph by American, CC BY-SA 3.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=7353242. *Tiki* (and cognate) statues across the Polynesian islands reportedly reflect beliefs concerning the origin of humanity, including procreative activity. Again, related representations may indeed be found on *tiki* statues, including some in the photograph. However, so are the characteristic techniques and motifs of Linear and cult art, often deployed realistically and naturalistically.

One such illustration is the large right-profiled song bird at the base (red), which exploits natural colour and other features of the rock. Typically of Linear and cult art, the image may be broken down into immediately adjacent suggestions of birds (not highlighted). Other bird imagery includes a largely frontal stork, crane or heron (yellow) that may or may not be visualised with outstretched wings or with raised and fanned tail plumage. The suggestion of a frontal owl (there is more than one in the same area) is aided, in particular, by a diagnostic right ear (purple), that of chicks arrayed opposite conveyed largely by beaks and eyes (also purple).

Beneath the song bird the incisions delineate the delicate features of a cat, fox, or civet (green, the latter not I think native to the islands), maybe with adjacent pig or bird nests (not highlighted).

The eyes, nose and facial outline of the mainly frontal human (turquoise) are also precise, though some detail and possibly the purpose or activity of the individual is lost in the lighting or moss.

Plainly the condition of an object can impede or impair identification of imagery, but it is a false assumption to infer that moss, lichen and other growths are always and only misleading. In some cases (as some UK megaliths) their presence accentuates underlying incisions (low relief) and possibly deliberate colouration (chemicals). In this case (and the adjacent *tiki* in the original photograph), the moss appears to have been partly and deliberately removed. That may be "just" for tourism, but it might indicate a deeper awareness of the artistry of the objects. It is also worth viewing the photo with a partially dimmed screen to see additional effects of the white.

The statue has also been shaped overall and variously incised to suggest the frontal face (red) of a woman squatting on her haunches, knees and shins towards us. She holds one or more vessels (purple). Within her right knee is the frontal face of a pig (yellow), within her left, the right profile of
a standing child (green), both reliant on incision, light and deep, and the colour of the rock. Whilst the effect is precise (her left eye, mouth and hair lines) and naturalistic, other incisions are made to suggest more than one face or perspective (turquoise, blue), which in turn suggest different motifs (including the erotic), but both those and the techniques are typical of Linear and cult art.

Linear and cult art abounds in suggested and suggestive images of female buttocks and genitalia. So does the tiki. The rock seems to have been shaped and incised to suggest a woman (red) bending over in front of the viewer, its left side protruding slightly to reflect the side of her head (at x), her left knee bent on the ground, the left calf muscle and sole of foot extending towards us, the cleft between the thighs explicit (z). But her head may also be visualised as tilted similarly to the left but higher up (yellow).

As if to underline the intent, several clock faces are suggested on the left thigh (blue, turquoise), and whilst the moss may be misleading, the underlying contours suggest the frontal image of a bear (green) and possibly cub (purple) positioned immediately over the genitals. The images are typical of the TE RE O WA theme of Linear and cult art (see Section 6 of The Problem). The erotic imagery may also be viewed as the inverse of the frontal image highlighted above, as well as complementary to the image of the stork or crane (see PE RA KO KO WO in the same Section 6).
But it would be wrong to leave the impression that the statue reflects only Linear or "western" art. For the incisions have also been deployed to suggest several images of (also non-native) kangaroo or wallaby.

Thus the frontal image of a mother (red), possibly with tiny joey below (yellow), both of whom may be engaged in boxing. Another kangaroo is left-profiled on the right side (turquoise), possibly with front paws raised. The eyes and ears of both representations are particularly diagnostic.

The kangaroo or wallaby might be regarded as a novel, but vivid exemplar of Linear art’s verbal and visual play: O KO KO WO, okhos kor(w) ou, ὀχος κορ(ή)ου, child carrier or holder; TE RE O WA, telei aiwran, τελεί αἰώραν makes oscillations, describing its zig-zag or bounding jump; PE RA KO KO WO, sphairaιs or speiraιs ankhou khwrwn, or ankhwη koiλον, σφαιραίς ορ σπειραίς ἀγχου χωρών ορ ἀγχων κοιλον, going with boxing gloves close, or pressing the abdomen with gloves.

Again, it may only be coincidence, in fact there can be no doubt that it is, but the Polynesian language appears to generate some words whose sounds, though not of course meanings, correspond to key sounds in the formulaic phrases of Linear and cult art. Examples might include “hoa” and "oa", and their similarity to O-WA, as discussed under TE RE O WA in Section 6 of The Problem. Another illustration might be the island cult centre Raiatea, RE (J)Α TE (J)Α, Ρεια Θεα, Rheia Thea, the goddess Rhea (for "E" as "AI" see the conclusions to Section 6 of The Problem).

Such associations would be entirely fanciful. The cult site is not Rhea’s, and the languages concerned are not related, except ultimately perhaps, like all human languages, in the far distant past. But that would be to miss the potential point. Linear and cult art appears to be about homonymic word (as well as image) play, and there is every reason why that facility might have extended to embrace other languages, a practice congenial, one might imagine, to both parties. A rough analogy might be the well-known “Not Angles, but angels” attributed to Pope Gregory.

However, even if such (false) acoustic association did take place, it might be wrong to privilege Greek as being the original to which other languages relate. And the date of any transmission or transmissions, either way, remains problematic.
Australian aboriginal art - charcoal drawing of kangaroos in Heathcote National Park, New South Wales.

To illustrate the possible presence of Linear and cult art I use a photograph by Clytemnestra - own work, CC BY-SA 3.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=7816671.
Although there may be additional or alternative interpretations, I think it fair to say that the rock art in question is primarily seen, by "western" eyes", as representing multiple, maybe superimposed images of kangaroos. Even so, they are not particularly easy to discern. I have highlighted one or two left-profiled candidates (red above). The roos are no easier or more convincing to see than a right-profiled figure from the left (blue) carrying vessels (yellow), pig or pigs (purple, green) and clambering child (turquoise), the basic motif (O KO KO WO) of Linear and cult art.

I shall return to this "original" rotation shortly, but the presence of art forms that, to us, appear inconsistent with what we think of as aboriginal or native art is more immediately obvious if the photograph is rotated 90 degrees left. Incisions and colouration convey a maybe hooded woman's frontal visage. As an image it is, by effect and construction, at least as coherent and cogent as the kangaroos. But although it is compelling, it is also typical (though again perhaps not uniquely so) of Linear and cult art in that the image is suggested, not fixed, in particular it appears to shape-shift as the viewer's eye focuses on other incisions that may be taken as suggestive of other eyes. Nor is it the only image. I have highlighted one or two others (green, yellow).

Although "faces in clouds" effects are visible on any natural or random surface, this is a surface where there plainly have been deliberate artistic interventions, and, in artistic terms, I see no rational basis to privilege perceived "aboriginal" forms at the expense of naturalistic or Linear and cult ones, even though it may appear difficult to understand their presence.

All the more so because similarly precise and compelling naturalistic or realistic forms may also be discerned when the original photo is rotated by 180 degrees (as below). Aside from the sheer power of the overall image of a partially right-profiled female (red), its presence is demonstrably attributable to the care and precision with which her eye, nose and cheek lines have been delineated. I think it is as impossible as impossible can get in art that the effect can be accidental.
What the profiled woman - who may be reclining, legs stretched suggestively away from us - looks onto would take longer to explicate, is partly out of shot, and is also multiple and complex, but includes probably a recumbent frontal digging dog rather than pig (turquoise), with outstretched paws, a handsome male visage (yellow), and also more than one swelling male member (purple x).
To revert to the photograph’s original orientation, the artistic interventions suggest many other motifs familiar from Linear and cult art, and I will highlight only some with minimal explanation.

So below a left-profiled stalking stork, crane, heron or similar (red), with maybe others suggested, though close scrutiny offers more graphically precise images of fish swimming in a stream (turquoise, the bird’s target).
A left-profiled woman (red) from the right pours out a vessel (turquoise) in which is suggested a frontal child face (purple), whilst another deliberately bulbous vessel (green) is topped by more than one suggestion of a pig (yellow). A much larger pig recedes from us (blue).

At the pig’s posterior or tail, colouration serves to suggest more than one swallow (turquoise, green, red above), plus a butterfly (yellow). The imagery plays and puns with homonyms of O KO KO WO, TE RE O WA, PE RA KO KO WO (see Section 6 of The Problem).
Colour and natural formation also serve to suggest a partially right-profiled bending woman's torso and thighs (blue above). Other art work suggests another eroticised view of a scantily clad female torso (red below), genitals confronted by a rampant phallus (purple), and pig (green) highlighting the positional relevance. There appears to be the distinct suggestion of another, larger, naked torso, in one perspective moving past us, split-legged, to the bottom right corner (turquoise), but the surface interventions, possibly conveying rather similar torso motion images, are both multiple and faint.

Conclusions

There appear to be many other examples of similar art from Australia and the Polynesian islands. There are caveats surrounding its identification and interpretation as Linear and cult art, some of which I have set out at the beginning of Section 8 of The Problem. For example, aside perhaps from pictorial enactment of the basic motif (O KO KO WO), I have so far seen no convincing evidence of Linear signage. The Easter Islanders developed their own script, which may or may not be functional, in whole or part, but whose incisions certainly seem devised to contribute to the projection of complex images.

However, to focus on the - I think largely unrecognised - naturalistic images that I have proposed here, they appear at least as convincing as the more localised, ethnic or abstract interpretations of the art work that are often attributed to some or all of its component parts (the bird man, kangaroos etc). That does not mean such interpretations may not also be true.

It might nonetheless be inferred that such naturalistic or realistic imagery - including images of objects and species non-native to the regions concerned - can only be explained as the product either directly of "western" artists or of native or aboriginal peoples influenced by western art and culture, in either case perpetrated within the last 300 years or so.

The proposition may have validity. Each example requires detailed examination of both the art and the dating evidence. However, I think it faces several general difficulties.

Certainly, 300 years is ample time for a tradition of art to become established. However, the sheer volume of the work seems to make it unlikely that it can have been produced in so short a time. Not only is it widespread in areas, in particular of Australia, where it is implausible that late
western art penetrated at all or to such degree, individual rock art sites demonstrate the same multiple layers of naturalistic or complex "Linear and cult" art, many now almost imperceptible, that can only reflect not just a few, but many hundreds or even thousands of years of tradition. It is also, of course, true, that, again particularly in Australia, aboriginal artists have long depicted "western" artefacts, such as sailing ships. However, it is remarkable that they have continued to add imagery, including some more modern imagery, to rock art sites that are otherwise, and I think rightly, thought to be seriously old. Some such sites appear to share the characteristics of Linear and cult art, yet aboriginal artists also appear to have updated the art work, even in very recent years, with images that continue to contribute to Linear and cult art effects. In other words, they appear to be aware of its underlying existence and signification.

For a long time, native and aboriginal art - almost throughout the world - was either ignored entirely or dismissed as, in various ways, primitive. In more recent years, indigenous art has been seen as product of genuine cultures and traditions, with its own aesthetic and other attributes and values. Welcome as that is, such recognition is still - maybe - only partial or prejudicial. In general, native and aboriginal art has been seen as capable only of art forms appropriate to the stage of development of the perceived culture from which it springs, as circumscribed by its own immediate environment. One consequence is that the art concerned is often interpreted as being in some way only "functional", relating to hunting or travel, for example. Where verifiable by indigenous testimony, divine or mythical representations are also recognised, but those too tend to be interpreted functionally, the god does X, the myth explains Y. There is little or no room for naturalistic art, art for art's sake, humour.

It is the same, perhaps misperception that has been applied to purportedly ancient cave and rock art in the western world, whether Creswell Crags or Lascaux or Blombos (see Sections 2 and 9 of The Problem) or, indeed, any other. Such cave art is still seen as, fundamentally, "primitive", reflecting a functional, albeit sometimes shamanistic preoccupation with hunting, say, of bison or mammoths or wild horses, or, when all else fails, "abstract" or "geometric" patterns. But on a more complete and objective evaluation of the interventions and manipulation of the rock (or other) surface, the evidence appears to suggest that the art work is also informed by what can be highly naturalistic and realistic imagery, which seems in turn to be inseparable from and attributable to the influence of the techniques and motifs of what I have called Linear and cult art.

What appears to be happening, then, is that in any given region - at whatever date it may be - artists use local and contemporary forms (including wild life, deities, favoured abstract patterns, real or fictitious scripts of various kinds) in a kind of collage technique, not only to convey those forms in and of themselves with whatever meaning or purpose they may (or may not) be endowed, but also to convey more complex, even hidden imagery, often highly naturalistic and possibly related to an inherited cult or culture that may be both old and universal. If such be the case, then it is our assumption that they were and are incapable of such purportedly "western" or relatively "modern" aesthetics that may be wrong, not only because they were and are, but possibly because the art is not "western" at all.

So why don't native and aboriginal peoples talk about it when they now appear relatively more comfortable talking about other meanings of their art, including local deities? Maybe for the same reason that we know so little about "the mysteries" from the ancient Greco-Roman world. Widespread it may be, the art itself seems to be a key element in the "mystery" or fertility cult.

3 Australian examples that I have studied at some length include a photo by TimJN1 - Bradshaw Art, CC BY-SA 2.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=22779917; https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/7f/Aboriginal_rock_art%2C_Nourlangie_Rock%2C_Kakadu_-_panoramio.jpg AwOiSoAk KaOsIoWa [CC BY-SA 3.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0)], via Wikimedia Commons; and, with apparently more modern elements, https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/9/97/Ships_and_kangaroo_on_crocodile_-_Google_Art_Project.jpg Griffith University [Public domain], via Wikimedia Commons.

4 One example may be the last in note 3 above, another from Anbangbang in Kakadu National Park, as featured and discussed at https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Aboriginal_Art_Australia(2).jpg. Larger erotic (and other) imagery is visible if you "stand back", or zoom out, but of course it is not the only intended effect. All the art work may possibly be "modern", but even if it is the presence of less obvious forms - whether naturalistic or Linear art - would still be highly significant.
How is it possible for native and aboriginal art from Australia to show not only an aesthetic but physical objects, like perhaps pigs, that are thought to postdate the arrival of European culture? I can only repeat that there are many caveats, and many unanswered questions. For example, the age of many of the art works, or rather their layers and additions, is extremely difficult to establish, even with modern methods. In other cases, it really is tough to say whether an image is a piglet, say, or a baby wallaby. The diffusion of Linear and cult art, and the cult or culture of which it forms part, the relationship or interaction of its various manifestations around the world are difficult issues impeded by how little we really know about contact between prehistoric peoples, and by how readily we seem to have assumed that they were necessarily incapable of sharing idealised but alien imagery, even though the relatively short history of, say, Christian art should have strongly suggested otherwise.

One corollary is that if "western" images are reflected in southern hemisphere Linear and cult art, then the converse might also be the case. I think it is. I have already indicated the suggestion of a penguin on a black figure vase (see Section 8 of The Problem). Those with the time and inclination may care to scrutinise a Linear tablet from Greek Thebes (TH Ug 41) where the imagery seems to include not only wallabies, but a portly dodo. The tablet may not be particularly old. Neither, for that matter, may the black figure vase.

If the ideas in these pages are along approximately the right lines, it should follow that similar evidence for naturalistic imagery, probably related to Linear and cult art, may also be discerned in the art forms of the prehistoric Americas.

To conclude on a technical note, modern imaging technologies potentially have a great part to play in understanding the artefacts to which they are applied. However, they are likely to be counter-productive if their deployment is encumbered by prior assumptions about the nature or purpose of the object, in other words used to reinforce, however unconsciously, a prejudgement. It would be rather like pointing a radio telescope into space and then dismissing the data returned on the grounds that it makes no sense as we cannot see to what it relates in our visible spectrum.

In principle, imaging data should be reviewed impartially, tabula rasa as it were. But, judging by lay reports, that does not appear to be what is happening, at all. In the case of rock art, for example, the technologies have been used, in particular, in an attempt to understand the accumulation of images over time. Whilst that is a potentially valuable procedure - and one that perhaps also needs to be applied to Linear tablets - it can, at best, be only incomplete if it is based on unevidenced and unargued assumptions about the artistic competence, ambition, or aesthetic of "the image" makers, for example that they were concerned solely with mammoths or kangaroos or even a wider subset of "target" species.

It is also unlikely that the technologies involved are currently, perhaps will ever be capable of dating accumulated images or surface interventions with the differentiation necessary to understand their correlation, or otherwise, in time. Relatively modern art works are, after all, often found to be based on accumulated underlying "images", including preliminary sketches. It begs the question to assume that certain lines or colour of one intervention were not perceived as relevant to the addition of a later - one issue being how sooner or later the "later" may be - or that natural features of the surface were not similarly so perceived, or that all images or all component parts of an image can actually be identified by the application of the technology concerned under the direction and in the conditions prevailing at any one time, including any inherent strengths or weaknesses to which the technology itself may be subject.

In so far as they constitute almost primary evidence, it is also essential that imaging results are readily accessible in the public domain, permanently.  

5 Photo by O Mustafin
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Linear_B_tablets_in_the_Archaeological_Museum_of_Thebes
https://media/File:Amth37.jpg

6 My own material is freely available for any lawful public or private non-commercial use so long as the source, and its sources, is duly acknowledged, and such use exercises rights regarding its own use by others that are no more restrictive. Regard should also be had for the rights of those whose work I have used, which may be different. My use of their material in no way reflects their approval or otherwise of my statements or graphics (including extractions from and enlargements of photos). All mistakes are my own. I cannot guarantee that web pages are still live.