

20.2.57.

13. Canterbury Road. Oxford.

Dear Dr. Bennett,

Many thanks for your letter of 12 February.
I have a memorandum of Evans: - "Nos 269-309 and Nos 310-328
(in tin box): minor fragments of tablets as above: curious,
curious, horse". These numbers are therefore already in-
cluded in his final numeration, but not drawn or individ-
ually described. That is why they bear red numbers. ~~Are these~~
~~now directed to them~~ they have been (as you say) 'omitted' from Sm lists
and replaced by others? Nos 267 & one support tablets: Nos 285 & are
described as "other numbered fragments from Chaid-Tablet Room".

Probably some of them will turn out to be parts of tablets
bearing other numbers. But as they bear Evans-numbers I sug-
gest that these numbers be retained, and quoted either in square
brackets or with an asterisk.

The tablets I am most anxious to include in Sm II are those

~~With~~ which do not bear Evans numbers, and should be considered as additions to his definitive list. They may all turn out to bear duplicate numbers like 265-325. But I only want fragments containing sign groups or parts of sign groups, which should be included in the vocabulary of 9m.ii. Fragments with commodify-signs or numerals are less important, though they must of course be taken into account by anyone who can connect them with fragments containing sign-groups.

At a rough count there are 15-8 Candia numbers which are not in Evans list: but of these 5-6 are the duplicated numbers 265-325 (and some of them may be the numbers within these limits which are in the Candia list. (e.g. Evon 295 = H 715. 291 = H. 720.)) So there are about 100 of which I have as yet no transcript or description.

As soon as I have verified the $\frac{1}{2}$ rate of exchange, I will put the amount of the expenses to your account at Blackwells.

With all good wishes, yours sincerely, John L. Myers.