

Brooklyn College

BEDFORD AVENUE AND AVENUE H

BROOKLYN 10, N. Y.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL LANGUAGES

July 1, 1948

Dear Pete,

Proofs arrived to-day, and I emerged from copying Minoan long enough to realize I haven't answered your letter of the 23rd.

First, about the proofs though. I will bring them with me on Wednesday. As I figure it, you wouldn't get them earlier by mail ~~anyway~~ anyway, if I sent them on Monday--and there are some things I must talk over with you before you go to work on them.

Actually, the text can stand substantially as it is, but, alas, the figures can't. Do editors boil contributors in oil when they want to change figures? The point is this: one of the signs I use is wrong. I didn't know it myself till a month ago, when I discovered that two variants which I had blithely assumed were the same sign, are two different signs, and, of course, I had drawn the wrong one! That must be changed. It's a matter of a single sign, but I'll redraw the figure.

The other two changes are also because I know more than I did when I wrote the article. In the inflection list, I'd like to add another group. I've told half a dozen people about it already, and used it on lantern slides in my lectures, so I'd like to protest my discovery as soon as possible. I think Sundwall may mention it in his article, as part of what he got in correspondence with me. Anyhow, another group is important, and should be made known as soon as possible. If I add that group, I must also add the two interchanging signs to the next figure.

I'm telling you about it now, so you can make up your mind about whether the changes are possible before I see you.

Also, could you check whether JHS lxvi (the part with Myres' article) has appeared? I can only do it by taking a trip to Columbia, and that is a matter of six hours or so I can't afford. I think not, since Myres* has said nothing, and I had a letter from him about two weeks ago.

Your statement sounds fine. It hits the nail right on the head. Of course, the opinion of me is a little high, but aside from that, it's a clear and exact statement of the situation.

I'm afraid I can't say the same for what I wrote before about forming a sort of society. What I meant was this: in order to get to work on the sign lists, establishment of text, and various other things, I'd have to ask the help of the other scholars working in the field. It would have to be done by letters inviting suggestions on specific points, which would then have to be sent out to others, for their opinion, etc. That would almost necessitate the formation of some sort of mutual aid society (not in capitals) with a distribution center at the Museum. The accepted suggestions would of course have to be credited to the proper person or persons--therefore my idea about Su 1 etc. Now, this can be done informally, by me as a private individual, or formally, as part of the Center's work. (I do not mean the crediting, but the invitation to send suggestions). It isn't a matter of membership

in the Museum, really. Indeed, I rather contemplate the formation of a Minoan Society for the purpose. But there is a tie-up with the Museum, since the services of the Center would be involved, if it is done as a Center project--and I rather think that is desirable.

Now, suppose we start--as I am thinking of doing--by writing to a select list of about ten (Sundwall, Myres, Ktistopoulos, Grumach, Bennett, Hrozny???, Ventris????, --well, I can't think of any others now--maybe Bossert) and ask them to send suggestions for a more correct reading of the great "man" inscription (PM 686). They send them to me, and at a specified date I correlate the returns, and send them out to those who answered, for further suggestions, based on the new ideas. The result--I hope--will be a fairly sound and agreed upon text for this very difficult and important inscription. That can then be published, with notes about who suggested what.

Until SM II is out, we can only work with inscriptions for which photographs have been published, but after that, the job will be a large one, and I think it would be advisable to assign specific inscriptions to various scholars, who will do the correlating, edit the agreed upon text and publish it. Naturally, only a certain fraction of the inscriptions require such care, but there are, I should think, at least 100. I'm thinking far ahead when I ask about the publication of these established texts, but it is a problem which has to be settled some time. The most useful thing for scholarship would be to have everything published in the same place, but it isn't essential.

The same thing is true of the sign-list--more correctly, sign-lists. We can begin work on A immediately (indeed, all that is required is a working-over of Carrateali, and perhaps a few emendations), and the same for Cypro-Minoan, but the others present terrible problems. We should also work out a real, reliable, accurate, list of Cypriote, and of a few other scripts.

All this requires a great deal of mutual interchange of ideas, and must be done by correspondence. If Peruzzi goes on with his idea of a Minoan Annual, we can send him reports occasionally, but a great deal of what we do should be published, before the Center makes it available to scholars in general. Otherwise--sooner or later, there will be a scandal. I remember one such in the Linguistic Society, also because someone used unpublished material from a collection--quite legitimately, as it happens--but some nut started a law suit.

I don't know if I made myself any clearer. We need some kind of association (whether connected with the Museum or not) without dues (that is, financial dues), strictly limited only to those actively working on the problem, and to those willing to contribute time and work for the mutual benefit of all. In other words, the sort of international association of scholars we hear a lot about, but hardly ever see in practice. It can only be successful if proper credit is given for work, and the publication angle is clear. ~~Its~~ Its connection with the Museum will be, in one sense, quite loose--but in another, very close, since the Center will be its center.

The more I write, the more muddled it gets. It reminds me of my high school principal, who always explained something quite clearly the first time, then went on to elaborate, and muddled everything up. The only difference is, I don't explain clearly the first time either.

It certainly makes no difference to me whether I add CMLR to Brooklyn College. Brooklyn College really never did anything for me in a scholarly way. Whatever you think best. As for publications--I've always ~~working~~ worked on the theory that one good article a year is plenty. Which reminds me another is about due. I have the idea, but it will require Myres' permission. Title: Enclitics in Linear Class B--or something similar. Well, end of paper. See you Wednesday.

Alice

P.S. - I forgot your P.S. - of course you can include my publications in your department list - at present that means only A & A material for year. I may write a short article for the Bossett memorial volume - if I can think of something small. Let me know when you want the list, and I'll send it to you.

It occurs to me we're looking at opposite ends of the same problem. You, with the editorial point of view, are considering publication as something you want - add one manuscript at a time, saying you want to be able to publish it. I, with the editorial point of view, am saying that no single individual should be asked to publish more than one article. Publishing 25-30 articles! See what I mean!