

1 Garley Place

LONDON SW7

20. iii. 70

Dear Professor Brice

Thank you very much for your letter of the 24 February, and for outlining matters so kindly. I do appreciate the trouble you took; and I enclose D570, by the way, for your perusal. It is in the form of an interview and the young lady selected her own material. I gave her a good deal on the short-hand aspects but it was hers to shape it as she wished. I have no quarrel with the article which is a good one, it got over the basic message in a way that interested people, so I heard.

I delayed replying to your letter, and during the time I met Professor Schaeffer in London and he told me he had found a new tablet, like the Dikaios ones. He showed me a photograph of it as found, it is quite a substantial fragment. After washing, he is giving it to Madame Nasson for study, but he is confirming her in the time she may have it, and I hope I may see it by the end of this year: also the Louvre tablet. I told him I could let him have readings of both in a couple of weeks for general outline, and somewhat longer for a full transcription; and I have drawn him up a comparative table of the scripts of Coptic and Cyprian with notes.

I thought over your kind letter carefully but it gave rise only to feelings of doubt that are very strong now. I have given explanations in the paper I have submitted, in the lecture I gave to the ^{senior} Mycenaean, & in correspondence with various scholars; & I have been obliged to admit that the academic mind is no different from the general public - it will not tolerate explanations, it will not try to assess them, & it prefers to look at a finished text. I think the worst example of this is the written remarks I have by the reader for the Journal of Hellenic Studies which rejected my paper in December 1968 on the Euboean II Tablet. I had arranged the paper so as to give the preliminary workings that lead up to the point at which you are given the probability you have an early Homeric text beneath your hand, & the supporting factors outside the text. I also attached, to show how the text finally worked out syllabically, a rendering of it in syllables, & an index of words/^{-groups} against their probable Greek-root words. The text was not for examination, or translated; it was the workings up to the take-off point that were at issue. His remarks are mainly about my English style, & the philological aspects

of the index I had supplied which he treated as final when I pointed out it was provisional; I did not say one word about the workings or the final issue of the digamma (leading in the spellings of "Apax" and "Akhaia").

I followed the pattern in my lecture for the Seminar because I thought probably the reader was some old dug-out of the JHS who was near retiring age anyway. I went into much more detail for the Seminar I built up the factors so they could see how they interlinked; and I expected them to discuss, at least, the digamma. I provided no final text or reading, but just took them up to the table-top point, and left the rest of the text out of consideration. Now this was the Mycenaean Seminar; but no-one uttered one word, except Dr Harrisworth or Harrison, and Dr Chadwick who kindly attended, and Dr Stuart Pigg who spoke of his own disengagement. Well, either there was nothing to discuss; or else, which I thought more likely, like every other mid, academic or lay, they simply loathe explanations or being required to follow technical details. They want texts.

So I think your outline is awfully good theoretically; but the audience for it does not exist. Your reader would die of inertia, especially if I did not allow him to use his Greek philology. There is an audience for full readings of the texts;

and that is all I want to publish in Kadmos.
If they are acceptable, doubtless people will read
the explanations at a later date in a very mild
form. But write another paper I will not.
You can have the syllabic & Greek-orthodox stage &
provisional English translations of the Phaistos Disc,
the Linear A texts I have available, & the Euboean
tablets & the cylinder, if they are simply published
ex hoc & left to tell their own tale. They
will explain themselves. My assistant is still
doing the cylinder text, & very fascinated by it now; I
have given her till the end of March, if possible,
but she says it is hard work. So I will not
bother with Greek transcriptions for any of the others,
but let every scholar work them out for himself.
There will be a few notes attached, of course, to
explain a particular point in the text; but no
details of the methods of assessment. I will also
provide the same comparative table of scripts as I
have given Professor Schaeffer, to point the values.

But otherwise, I am quite content to leave
matters be, & publish through my other channels, so
long as you will let any of your contributors
know, who send in articles on the language or
deciphering of all these texts, that my work does
exist & is proceeding. I feel it is unfair to let
a scholar publish something which he might not
do, if he knew there was going on work he did
not know of which would make his article invalid.
I shall be quite happy to correspond with any
scholar, & if after that, they prefer their own
point of view, then that is their own funeral,
so to speak - I don't mean to be rude, only

It was very kind of you to write, & I thank you again.
Yours sincerely - Beatrice V. Guyon

to the point.