

10 November 1955

Dear Chadwick,

This will be about the Mycenae readings and will go in a copy also to Ventris.

602.2: 602 is not one of the tablets I saw, alas, but the photo seems pretty good. At the critical points there are too many cracks, but the main vertical goes too high for na, there is a crack in the right place for the main horizontal, I see marks for both right and left branches, and traces of one crossing on both branches and center. There ~~are~~ other na on 602 for comparison, and the proportions in line 2 would be unusually high and what I call the tip of the right branch seems clearly deliberate and unparallel in the other na's.

605.2: This I did see and copy before and independently of Ventris. I wholeheartedly agree with him that autopsy outranks photographs and ~~XXXXXX~~ drawings, and in editing these texts shall, if I disagree and fail to adopt his reading, indicate that his ought to be better for having been seen. In this one case however, my reading is as good as his on that score. What I put down then was pu<sub>2</sub> with no hesitation or dotting. Now, can I demonstrate it in the photograph? I see the right branch with three clear crossings. A trace toward the tip of the left the lower crossing, and the break follows the line of the lower part of the branch. The dark bit at the very tip and touching the edge of the tablet might even be another crossing. I think I can see traces of the middle branch, but can't describe them clearly. Of the main cross and lower stem no trace in the photo, though there might be in the broken edge. I have great difficulty in seeing what lines I would use to make even a dotted na.

As for alternations with pu and pu<sub>2</sub>. 603 and 604 are by one hand, 602, 605 and 608 by another. Of the ra with single and double horizontal, ditto the da. Of the o with two stroke and one stroke scepter, the abbreviation and non-abbreviation of the spices. Of finally the ka, with different order of making the vertical and horizontal. Different scribes sometimes have different ways of spelling. I'm convinced there are two scribes here, so that I shall put down pu<sub>2</sub>-ke in 602.2, 605.2 and 608., and put Ventris' na in a footnote, saying it is based on autopsy. And if I haven't convinced him I can explain my preference in the commentary. I hope however that I have, and that when he sees them again he will support my reading.

603.1: May I trace both of Ventris readings? This part of 603 I did not see and am inclined to follow autopsy as far as possible, especially since the surface is so poor. Only on the first sign will I be obstinate and maintain da, undotted, and as you suspect I will cite da in line 4, as well as the double stroked ra's to support me. This fellow's hand is fairly close to hand 51, who double strokes a, o, ra, and tu. I think in fact that the ra is less sure, (in line 1). The ra in line 4 has an awfully long base. could the vertical apparently of the third sign be the last stroke of a ra which has only one horizontal instead of an expected two. On the other hand the final ra in line one has no second vertical. The only ki to compare with the fourth sign is in Oelll, which is from the most similar hand of the earlier batch, but no great help. It does however have a horizontal which



While I am looking at the joined tablets, I begin again to wonder how they might be more fully published than in Browning. I did take a set of pictures, as I told you, and now they are at a microfilm works in the hope that they can produce some positive prints on film, which could be distributed if they come out satisfactorily. The Pylos films are there too, except for the very latest rolls. I shall probably have to consult Blegen about them, and it might be politic to consult Platon about the Knossos strips, but I am hoping that they can be distributed, at the cost of the reproductions.

I thought that I might take ~~that~~ a positive print and trace off (with an eye on the SM drawings) all tablets which have been joined, and are worth the trouble, reduce them in scale a bit and paste them up on pages for reproduction in a journal. Transcriptions such as Brownings are good things, but I would like to have drawings available for people to check up on the chances of the transcription's accuracy. Do you suppose that if I did this, the JHS or the BSA would want to use up the space? I dare say MINOS would do it ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ readily enough but there might be reason to keep British finds in England. I should carry this only up to the 5000's and ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ <sup>later</sup> might have a continuation for them, to which you and Chadwick could add the wonderful 895 join and the new 7000's. How many 7000's have joined old tablets so far? Are they noted in your copy?

Blegen reported that the 1955 Pylos tablets were rather good, but I have seen nothing of them yet.

Best wishes to all,

Yours,

