

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN THE HUMANITIES

Old Observatory
THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706

Dear Tom,

On Aa-Ab/Ab-Aa, Sept 13 1979. I doubt anybody will be of great help in this. It is hard to find traces of error copied and then corrected by the later fellow in either direction. Each has his own spelling rules, independent of what he may see before him. The numbers don't seem to help either. Some stay, some go up, some go down. I had a look, which I may have done before but can't remember doing, at whether the corrections of erasures in one set would more nearly resemble the finals of the other set, and thus indicate copying and later correction. No help. I note in Aa more corrections of texts as if he copied old information and then ~~only~~ checks with fact or authority, or as if he keeps it up to date with timely changes. The corrections in Ab look in at least one or two places as if they were connected rather with the calculation of GRANI than with fact. My guess is that neither copied from the other set, but were prepared independently maybe with a common ancestor of a list, and model, but at different times, with different facts, and with different purposes. Obviously, if one had Aa's, one could simply ~~abstract and~~ calculate GRANI, if one knew somehow which ones get 9 supplement instead of 7, and what extra words to put in. Or, if one had Ab's ~~one~~ could simply abstract and regularize to make Aa's. But the additional information, and the different numbers in either case - is a puzzler. I note that with these, as with file cards, one could, as individual changes become known over an extended period, papse an old record and insert a new one (perhaps thus introducing minor variations in tablet shape and format, even with the same scribe) without affecting the bulk of the record. Also, one might thus overlook an oldone which ought to have been papsed and thus produce duplicates and contradictions. For our number 1 to check up on, of course.

So I doubt that Aa is to replace Ab. A different record at different time and different purpose. Maybe made up to fit with, to follow, to supplement the Aa 60/set coming in from outside?

The connection with Cn, revisions and all, seems quite reasonable. and the end cutting and clay-saving ----- I just thought, if number 1 sits in the archives room, and has next door a pithos full of just fine clay (though I've had some doubts on this) he, least of all, should have been subject to a clay crisis, and least needing to conserve. So it is ~~with~~ either to make sure they fit neatly into the filing baskets, as you suggest, or he has some other psychological thing going.

On the job search. BP has just received the jobs announcement, he says, and whether that is as his own, or as ex-head is unclear. PP has not, though he thought ~~he~~ had, received one. In any case I will try to get a look at it soon. One of the two reported that Emory (Kelley/exUW) and Florida (Schmeling/exUW) are both looking.

Another letter asked about turn over period. I doubt it is uniform, but will depend rather on the periodicity of agricultural and manufacturing or sailing seasons. And on the housekeeping talent of the chief fellow. It would be very easy for an old file to be forgotten, too high in a corner to check on, and hanging around for ages. The chief argument, I should think is rather the absence of dates on the texts, which means you can remember from one period to the next. So I would not go farther than that the grezt majority of the texts are not likely to be more than the year and the season long, if one prepares this year's from last year's and then throws them out. So I'm a little timid also about the dating of the destruction because so and so is being ^caccounted for at the last moment, and argument some like to propose.

One letter asked about fingerprints. The best thing is to ~~dz~~ give you the list of fingerprint photos that were examined by our local fingerprint crew (with reluctance, and with no conspicuous results.

60 94 294 123 388 252 926 874 841 807 758 477 268 807 236 641 372 318.

That's it. Generally he ~~came~~ came up with things that were by my reckoning in the same hand could indeed be by the same hand, but never were really compelled to be, and made no suggestions of same hand that I hadn't got by other means. So it was a weak confirmation of one or two things at the most. The trouble is that very few fingertip impressions, which is the best stuff, and lots of palm impressions, which don't help much at all.

Your letter of 1 November has now arrived.

Mostly on the outline. Generally sounds fine.

I introduction. I think of no objections. the contents and emphases will undoubtedly change as you look back over the completed chapters which follow it. I can't think of ~~any~~ any obviously necessary addition now.

I identification of hands. There will inevitably be some duplication. I've seen some theses which take the same stuff and rake it six ways. That's ~~two~~ two much, but it wouldn't hurt to set out a complete assignment of texts to hands -- although perhaps I might be rather inclined to start out with a statement 'we have the se hands', and put ~~the~~ the complete list in the back, perhaps at the beginning of the chapter of the drawings. ~~OK XXX XXXX~~ But with each description of a hand, you ought to repeat the ~~xxx~~ texts it includes, so one doesn't have to chase back and forth to find what's being talked about.

The only other thing I would suggest is that illustrations would be good to make use of. Better to convince ⁿ those who think you're just making it up.

Do you remember Saul Levin, skeptical on decipherment? He was at the Montreal meeting, and reported that he had never been told before just what was in a Linear B text, when I pointed out here the numbers, here the ideograms, here this word a name, this word a place, and all. Of course he could have worked it out, and I guess I had supposed he did when he ~~wxxx~~ was writing that book. But maybe he didn't. So, with illustrations, the more you can bring your reader in to looking over your shoulder, m. E., the better.

III discussion of scribal functions, fine, and I do think your IIIa, comparison of PY with elsewhere is a good idea, and will be appreciated by the others.

III. tables. No complaints.

I will inquire about Mathison and whether he's going, and all, and let you know.

I await the list of slides to make, and send best wishes to all,

19 Nov 1979

Levin

2 slides 2 photos sent
15th or 16th
Trust they get there safely.