

American School of Classical Studies
Souedias 54, Athens, Greece
February 16, 1960

Dear Emmett,

Gathering up the flood of recent literature from you, I be-
took myself to the Museum this morning, and so have various lit-
tle items to impart. Random order.

I enclose a drawing of Un6; as you will see the original
lines ran half way between the present; on the original spaces
what MV read seems pretty clearly there, though in old line 3
it looks to me more like po daode and the ne is not really very
much there in old line 4; there is perhaps a po visible at the
beginning of old line 2. On the present text with the new lines
there were also erasures, so that there is an erased EWE in front
of the present EWE and an erased something-else with two legs
just after; same in present line 3. In all of these lines there
are odd bits and traces; perhaps if I knew what they said I could
read them. All that on 1189; on 6 itself, no trace of the mid-
pace line that shows up at the end on 1189; perhaps an erased
pe under 146; on 1250 nothing shows because surface is so poor.
On reverse of 1189 there are erasures under ijereja and karawiporo.
There is some doubt in my mind about the edge inscription; there
are three little verticals just above the lower break where six
(Un6) joins on, and there is a little wedge-like piece missing
where they join, but I see no trace of the we and no trace of
anything on the edge of Un6.

On new Eq piece (I am returning your reconstructed effort):
there is perhaps less space between the po and to than the photo-
graph suggests because the two main sections won't stay glued to-
gether so that I just propped them as close as possible for the
phot. There is room for only one sign, and it seems to me that
it should be me, so that I would read po-me togeso. Yes, I just
through/rew the chips down, and did not attempt to arrange them,
so I am not surprised if one was upside down; one reads -sode;
another may be do-e-ro, but the do is doubtful. I have tried des-
perately to fit this just below po-se-da-o-ne, but it will not
go; I have tried to fit some of the bits to Eq887 to serve as a
bridge but they won't go.

On the 920-948 mixup: the big one which is presently publishe
as 948 has an old somewhat obscured 920 written on it, so I guess
that should be 920 (having been a bit of 466), and the little chip
with 948 in pencil must be the real 948 and be 175 aw (whatever
that may be) from 1952. And I guess the simplest solution is for
me to number the little chip 920, and for you, if you ever publish
it to call it 920?

On the fragment-box situation: there are lots of cigarette
boxes marked 1952 with various numbers outside, both seasonal in-
ventory numbers and Group 1 or 2 or such. These I take for gos-
pel since none of the pieces inside is numbered; so that's o.k.
There are also a few cigarette boxes with remnants from '53 and '
'54; also o.k. There are other cig. boxes with no marks, or sev-
numbers from previous uses crossed out; these seem to be 1939
crumbs, which have a few red numbered bits in their midst, so
I have so labelled them outside. Then there are the film boxes
from 1939; some are marked by you 'Fragments 1-199' or Fragments
200-299; others have no indications. Example follos:

Box was originally marked in ink: No. 14 Tablet; this was crossed off; another number in pencil, 652, was also crossed off. No other marking; inside were the following bits, all numbered in red, some (the earlier ones) in orangeish thick lines by BHH, others in finer redder lines by someone else:

13.1	282.3	414.2.5.	This does not seem to make sense as far as location goes, since several pieces here have friends and relatives in other boxes. I can just make lists like this to go on top of each box; I guess that is the best idea if I ever get around to it.
14.4	283.5.7	433.5	
31.4	284.6	442.6.7	
127.2	299.7.8	463.5.6	
165.5	302.5	466.5.6.7	
175.2	310.3	484.7	
234.3 ?	320.3.5.6	485.5	
237.3	321.5	496.3.4	
254B	322.4.5.7	504.5	
261.7.8	335.4	517.2	
266.4	341.3.4	544.3	
267.2	342.5	545.4	
273.6	345.2	569.4	
279.6.10	355.5	621.5	
	363.2.3.4		
	386.2		

I expect the small bits without inked numbers could be identified if you have photographs; but here there is nothing to distinguish amongst 7 uninscribed (I mean unnumbered) fffffff that are sitting in a box marked Fragments 1-199 which included pieces so numbered plus others numbered in the two and three hundreds. They may be fffffff from anything?

DAA/you know Of unpublished 900's; 993 and 997 are sitting in the same box (marked atautista) with 948 (now 920) and some pieces with only 1939 numbers. Of the unpublished ones thereafter, I have these notes: if 999 ever existed, it has left no trace. 1001 may exist somewhere but without a clue as to what it looks like there is no hope of identifying it. Same goes for 1003 and 1005; 1004 it seems we have seen as 19.3 (unless this was your identification?) but no, you have it as on the phot as 18 f); 1019 I do not understand at all, and both 1017 and 1018 are single pieces; 1022 and 1020 ditto like 1001; o.k if you say that ~~324~~ 1024 is in Cn314 as 321, which we saw, and 1029 is really 324.6 which we saw in 324; 324.7 as 1030 and 324.8 as 1032 are both invisible from here; ditto 1035 and 1036 and 1043 OH I can not believe that these are worth worrying about. If you have any specific questions about whether I can institute a search to find something, let me know. There may be some incorrectnesses in the concordance we fixed for you, since mostly it was taken from the copy which Mr. B. had marked when we went through all the frags- and sometimes his marks did not seem to make much sense. We did not, I think, ever see 1165, whatever the concordance says; but we did see otherwise 1164 through 73.

Enough is enough,

Maki