VRG_Folder_0631

2.II.71

1

Coll. of Gh. School

"Sen. Jan. Feb. 1955"

Look up notes on this coll. in Alexandria 1955 folder (w. reg. to Koan corpus) 108

in 43 handles, one Koan only

Greek Community's secondary school in Alexandria

2.II.71

Cosa Koan handles in Corpus

Corpus no. 107 211

[illegible] 24.II.55

19.I.79

Somewhere is another folder for these notes, possibly having something else — more — in it

12.II.79

Note copies — photocopies — were sent to PMWM of both series here, i.e. "Notes on reading catalogue" (correction to be made) and "Notes for introd. text". Acknowledgment from him, see his letter of 23.I.79.

25.I.71

Urgent to get that index of sites made from the text, even to see how to refer in concordance!

Can we say just MS 292

or must it be Rhodes MS 292 (and shd it be ME?)

I.79 photocopies checked pp. 1–8 (later, the rest)

16.I.71 [3.01]

p.m. at 33

19.I.79 Photocopies of all (pp. 1–21) posted to PMWMatthews on 15. or 16.I.79, arrived 1st class. See letter to him of 18.I.79

KOAN: Notes on reading catalogue

MET should fill in

ref.s in un-numbered item after no. 1.

etc.

one could fill in and fill it in

concordance to be corrected:

4B is not at all clear from typeset text to be corrected: what is die B of Iasos ex.? It is not anywhere in the concord. The public ex.s go by die.

23.II.71 We don't hear of Skarpil-M. ex. = one of Grakov's.

VG to check

under no. 3, dates of B 20:2

" 4 " " E 6:2

18.I.71

Notes on system, as I observe it:

When there are only as many examples as there are sites listed, we do not put figures with the sites. I.e. no. 5:

Not 3 ex.: Athens, 1; Naukratis, 1; Taras, 1.

But 3 ex.: Athens, Naukratis, Taras.

Check with MET

30.I.71 to 97

2.II.71 through 119

5.II.71 through 136 & part of 137 (check arrows ←)

9.II.71 through 203

13.II.71 through 214 (but 213-4 to be retyped)

Through 220 16.II.71

Through 238 23.II.71

Through 279 24.II.71

(check w. MSH)

(2)

(18. I. 71) 3.02

27.III.71 through (296) * do this check WITH PLATES *

What about the sequence of sites, as in 6 "mr. Bancalari is one friend"

5.III.71 through (324)

What we have said in the draught intr. to the catalogue is:

first from Cos
then " Athens (Agora first)
" " "other Greek sites"
" " "Egypt, Syria, and more remote places"

9.III through (364)

12.III through (389)

16.III through (418)

What about "other Greek sites"
Is that mainland Greece, plus islands?
Not Anatolian sites such as Labranda?

proof of "Sarian"

20.IV.71 we worked on (419) - not really finished

begin with (444) on 7.V.71

What is reading different bet. (7) & (8)? (letter is not (that fixed))
Are they just 2 dies?

begin with ~~(485)~~ (476-7) on 14.V.71

begin w. (493) on 18.V.71

Retype draught of more complicated numbers such as (10) at least of early part of mo., when we were not clear how we were going to do it.

Notes on system (2)

We list examples in concord - even if they have been publ. if we have seen the exs. NO! just say 1 publ.

? Yes? E.g. see ~~B~~ (13B), (16), (17)

on e.g. they are in Grahov's list? cf. (17)

(3)

(18.I.71) 3.03

Note for editor:
the inv. nos. (or whatever we use) (in each case) must appear on the plates, because which one is ill. is not otherwise to be figured out.

Under (26) Add to mus. no. in concordance "(Samarian)"?
Need to introduce the mus. inv. no. in notes on Samarian as finding place, anyhow

Check w. MSTT

Under (30), go over "stamps of similar type"
Does that include all " " "
Why is there no cross ref. under (2), (79), (183), e [ ] Noted add

I need to collect and discuss them in INTROD

With MSTT checked through here 23.I.71

Under (38) – (43) Why not Ἄνδρος?
Do we have some reason to think it should be say Ἀνδροσθένης? Epistle – Decide on Ἀνδρος Kosmetics

Under (39)
is Grakov's Olbia item the same one as Levi's?

I wonder if we shd not have regular entries for all published items in the concordance (not just "+ 1 publ.)
"Stamm, 1"
"Levi, 1"

— No, I don't think so. Cf. (41) Call the

statement is in the cat. text. The concordance is not to make it all over, but to supplement with specifications.

BM items that have a known provenience shd be so marked. Cf. (43). If you study the cat., you can see that this item ought to be from Halil., but you don't get a check as you do from ABC etc. nos. which always mean the same place.

Restoration of (44)? Then why not (45)?

This is now more than w. Thyra (Ko. FM 60)

What is that ʾΑοφυ[see (000) after (54)?

To be 26.I.71 with M54

Whether to say "Previous publ.":
or e.g. "Tyras example":
See (57) & (76)
By (99) & (100), the 2nd stage seems est.
Is it good NO

20.I.71
3.05

(60) What does "a similar stamp" mean? Not same die? Do we include those not same die?

(66) Shd ref. be to (62) rather than & (63)?

and text & (66) is not adequate, shd be:

"1 ex.: Istria, See Canarache 1957, p. —, no. 713

or 63? Perhaps an example of (62)?"

(67) Wrong cat. text? 3 ex. listed in conc.

(77) and (82)* "The same reading appears on a broad, etc."

This shd surely be omitted. Because there are a whole rept e.g. of early Rhodian stamps that read 19A or API

(80), (82) I think, in concord. omit Grahov nos.? There has got to be a straight list of Grahov nos., surely, referring to cat. nos?

MSS to make draught now of this Grahov-corpus no. concordance.

* The reading ἀριστ ἀρχου in round stamp is surely early Rhodes.

I must look also at the master card.

(6)

3.06

(86)

I think shd not be comments in the middle of the reading. Probably shd run:

Ἀριστέας
Φανίας
device

Pl. 8

9 ex.: Alexander, 7; Labranda, 2.
The device may be an inverted rose.

Look at the picture. Must go with the reading of (90).

21.I.71

(95) The cat. text should state something like:

The handle has not been found by us. ~~do~~ On our investigation in Rhodes, cf. p. 00

25.I.71

(96) Do we have photo. of Pella ex.s ?? (from Pl. 8)

Yes

to here w. MSH 30.I.71

(97) Are we to include ref.s to medium bottles? Do we now think they are Rhodes??

(105) List all prev. publ. of SS 8214:
Shear article (wrongly read, but ill.)
mention in Pnyx
Nessaw
Amphoras
Antikythera?
Delos 27,
other? BCH 1952?
ref. by Zeest??

Shd some of these refs go with texts on jars? E.g. if no mention of reading

Be sure of its reading,
as it is single ex.

(101) vs. (107):
should "Athens" be queried?
Same sit. in both nos.

(108) How many items have we from Alex Gh. School? If this is the only one, in the cat. heading say

... Alexa, 8, of which one is in the coll. of the Gh. School

& in the conc. say:
Alex., Gh. School, 1

(111) check ref. to (695), and fix text of (111).
Is it possible to restore Ἰνίκου?

(25.I.71)
3.08

(112) concordance, EM 82 I think shd follow ABC - AVG. Otherwise one expects it to be from Athens, and just suppose a mistake has happened. Is this not in Neroutsos' publ.??

(112) cat. text;

cf (10) 11 ex.: Athens, 1, Alexandria, 9, of which one is in the N. Museum, Athens (EM 82, from the Demetrios collection);

(Note also: Have we not found out that the Eton College coll. is from Alex.?

But (127) & (128) CHECK INTERNAL REFS.
" (130) & (131) " " "
" (132) & (133) " " "

after (132) — omit citation to Dacia?

(133) What is this "Cairo" in concordance? first

(136) mett think this is surely diff. from more completely pres. items?

(9) 27. I. 71
[3.09]

(137) concord. an Athens ex. can't be an X die

No rubbing this object which could not be found in I. 69, when looked for.

check and fill out this with MSTT, then retrigger

(privates check date)

Context probably of late 2nd century to first half of 1st century B.C. for Nessana examples; and far probably before 69 B.C. for Delos examples published in Grace-Petropoulakou, 1970.



~~Previous publication of Die ___, Grace, 1962, p. 120, no. 14 (ibid pl. ___); of Die C (?), Grace, 1962, p. 125, no. 31 (ibid pl. ___);~~

Previous publication of Die A(?), Grace-Petrop., 1970 (Delos), E 237; of Die B(?), ibid, E 238; of Die C(?), ibid, E 239 (not illustrated), and Grace 1962 (Nessana), p. 125, no. 31 (pl. ___) (?); of Die D, Grace 1962, p. 120, no. 14 (pl. ___); of unknown die,

31.I.71

Yes

(Pergamon), ?

Hepding, 1907, p. 376, no. 152.

Yes

~~(Pergamon)~~ We have been unable to establish a fully satisfactory division among the dies of (137). Apparently some cont. in use when much worn

TD 6511 is a large fragment, on which

see above, p. —.

MSTT

(142) I think we have an addition here, & 2nd ex. of non-doubly ?

~~144~~

(144) why Δ[a]ou ?

why not, say, Δ[i]ou ?

31.I.71

Order of (155), (156), (157)

— and why is not Crowfoot's item attached to (156) just as well (a device would be more likely of mention than a frame ?)

→ MEIT shd write for permission to publish these Cosa items: 107, 211

(11)

(31. I. 71)

3.11

(162)

Is to Olbin ex. the same as in E. Levi?

Yes it is

Reserv. —

Prov. publ. of Die A, th

— of Die B, y

(through (173), again I think

1. II. 71

(174) cat. text following this
whatever is to be kept of this
should probably go with the
heading with the name Δημόστρατος

The name of the proposed non-double is the same as in Graf's list (3 ex.)

(204) general

(209) "

(211)

(213) retype
Is there a context for the
Peiraeus item?

(13. II. 71) Yes

It seems to have come from the Peiraeus cistern (unless it is a mistake for the context of 1/2 2nd)

(214) Do we think the medicine bottles were Koan? Ch Rhod.?

13. II. 71 and take out of Pl. 16

Omit medicine bottle

(12) (1. II. 71)

3.12

13.II.71 * Retype (214) (215) looking at the plate *

(215) retype

Begin again on (218)

3.II.71

(218)

17 examples from 2 dies: Kos, 1; Paphos (Cyprus), 1; Alexandria, 13, ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ of which one is in Athens, from the Rostovits Collection (EM 80); unknown finding-place, 2.

(220)

Surely Mircev's things are from Bulgaria? Yes: Odessos is Varna.

~~Note the same stamp on handles of other shapes: Agora SS 12417 (Pl. 16) and Delos TD 5223, both of Rhodian~~

220

~~shape; and SS 13777~~

The same stamp occurs on non-double handles (two different shapes), from the Agora (Pl. 16) both shapes, and from Delos, see OO below. Note that these handles provide ~~[illegible]~~ further context of the early 2nd century or earlier that of SS 12417 from the MSBF. [SS 12974 = (Ly) SH 222

Two ~~types~~ variations of a Δ with lyre in rect. st. are included ~~below~~ under OO below, as clearly to be assoc. with 220

221 Be sure the non-double here also gets in that section.

B.XI.78 Note the non-double add contents of 3 exc from middle Stoa filling

226 see cat. and concordance: too hard to get the two in focus, more info. needed on places

230 see cat. + conc.

Did Grahovski list include item in Staerman? Yes

MEET is meeting place tele[illegible] [illegible] "Phaleron" [illegible]

Be sure [illegible] contents of non-double section

So they [illegible] not [illegible]

Some presentation [illegible] with Δ 185 "κοιν."

(13) bis

3.14

27 II 71

(280)

Following the upsilon, possibly ~~a vertical line is~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ an iota, in which case ~~[illegible]~~ restore this ~~[illegible]~~ might be an abbreviation of the name in 291-3, in a non-symmetrical designs.

Following the ~~upsilon~~ possibly a vertical hasta. ~~[illegible]~~

~~may~~

(282)



The device was possibly a lyre set on its side, of which those may be the horns projecting above and below the beginning of the name. Compare a (circular) type with this name and device ~~[illegible]~~ known on handles of Rhodian shape but having the same context as (282), Koan (?) clay, see 000 below.

* Note on Rhodian name-list to remove R 217 because this non-Rhodian is the only type.

(14) (3.II-71)

3.15

(230) - (231) see text
(232)

In connection with (232):
METT to look up any other Koan sts
publ. in Amphoras, and add them
in place

Begin again with (309)

Φpa(ΦA

8.II.71

How do we know die of publ. exam
Reisen? (for (76)

We know fakt. ... (the other must be called 76 X)

10.II.71

5.III.71 Yes! but not to change now

(319) should follow (320) - (323)
if she thinks it had another letter

(320) What is the Ki? Ephesus ex.? why X?
Is it publ.? Where did we get it?
Was there no phot. or rubbing?

Not of this

5.III.71 area no. at present

(323) Get the deposit no. complete, and correct the deposit bits.

(15) (10.II.71)

3.16

(324)

(Die A)

Previous publication: Vanderpool, etc., 1962, p. 48, no. 82, the Koroni example; context here dated 265–261 B.C. by the excavation, cf. comment, Grace 1963, pp. 319 and 321, where a date of about 300 B.C. is proposed for the group; cf. further, Gr.-Pets., pp. —

? ?

15.I.79

To be rewritten.

~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~else~~, here just a ref. to pages in the introd. where earlier date is discussed and ref. is given.

(327) Need place names attached — catal. text is not clear.

start again at (331)

15.II.71

3.17

(338) See if that Pridik article is included under site ref.s (in introd) for Athens. Is it Athens. Yes

Is this to same Pridik? Don't

If so, why do we have "H. Pridik" sometimes, as in (364)

start again w. (369)

9.III.71 [illegible]

16.II.71

(384) refers to (215); but I don't believe there is a ref. to (384) under (215)

Check.

start again at (390)

17.II.71

(391) I think the non-double has context

(392) Note this is in slight tech. Kappios etc.

(393) Check that the AN is x referenced in alphab. sequence. done

(405) s ex. with no end?

(407) YOK MEH: are there any others? How did this one come about?

Eminentissimi bottom of a page?

with Mett, start ag at (221)

(17)

17.II.71

3.18

ΥΟΧΟΛ ΛΟΧΟΥ

(419) Nec. to look at plate 32

" " comment on number of ABC items of Die X.
Too little preserved to ident. die? or what?
Are we sure it is (419) along?

See encircled note on Athens item on p. 40

21.II.71

(421) EM 47 has arm rim

Note on context of SS 14252 and its preservation [also context for Benach Late Group]

(428) Reference to discussion of a group of stamps, and some effort to explain this reading?

Also look at plate

stamps in carbonate (18) Kig 205, Mag/Hga (428) Φ 105 (691) and an unusual K ABC 1111 Mett suggests KE is Kapanis

(431) Ref. to ~~disc~~ assembling of those that say Kω etc.

Mett Dus of 443 444 445 446

(450)

2 ex.; Alexandrine (EM 96, from the collection of J. Demetrius), and unknown finding place

13.V.71

[3.19] 21.II.71

(18)

477 shd precede 476, as we have only the NIK (the rest is a comb. [A])

Add at end of 492 comment;

See above, pp. 000 – in the discussion of shapes.

start again at ~~495~~ ~~500~~ 575

On 498 – 501
see below p. 19

14.III.71
Mr. Croswell's Day

~~577 Is there not a similar [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]~~ (Yes)

598 and 599 seem to be from the same dies as are combined in 597. This suggests that the two handles ABC 250 and ABC 338 may be from the same amphora, the two stamps being complementary. However we have no other established example of the stamping of a Koan jar on both handles.

What about that one in a publ.?

(19) (14.III.71)

3.20

METT 15.V.71 don't rub out when changing nos. on plates — must get changes also on copies, so draw line through ~~500~~ 501

Begin again ~~617~~ 630

15.V.71 at EA

Revisions for (498) - (501)

Get photostats. Have they been done?

1.) We need to illustrate Stairman's 91, 92, 93 (also on the file cards) and 101, 102

2.) The non-retrograde type now called (501) should rather be (500), then the forward ones w. same [but ~~501~~ 500 can also be called rate] reading are together, also the Stairman types are all together, and the "see under 499" are " "

3.) We need to explain our ~~figure~~ number "11" and "16" " " to relate the cat. to the concordance

So see new text.

17.V.71

3.21

Types (503) – (507)

(503) cf. φ w. rubbing is φ a little small?

Can this be ex. of 505? (w. E)

(504) (w. A)

add to this EM 61? yes with query (not sure) (now in (505))

because of relation of φ w. 1

(505) w ∈

– Take from this yes EM 61? (put in (504)) with query

---

(508) 8 n master card, resin. Εὔπο(ρος) and "see Cyprus ex."

Where is a file card of e.g. Εὔπορος

(i.e. in general, where are cards of suppl. types.)

(509) prob. shd. dot the A

(512) Use the Labrande φ? yes, in Suppl. Pl. because of ending but also but of letters.

Use ABC for dwarf file?

(21 (17.V.7)

3.22

5.3 Con tem = dic]

[illegible]

B.V.J. See p. 11 for order in cat text

19.I.79 Photocopies of all (pp. 1–13) posted to P.M.W. Matthews on 15 or 16.I.79, arrived 1st class. See letter to him of 18.I.79

I.79 photocopies checked pp. 1–13 (all)

21.I.71 begun

4.01

Notes for introducing text of volume

There must be a summary, with refs., of our Dodekanese investigations. (Need to cite it, e.g. under (95).

25.I.71

In intr. notes on finding-places, must introduce Pal. Museum inv. nos for Samaria.

And in this part, for Samos finds, refer to note 25 of "Sam. Amph." [Ref. also under (492) (Ξανθ/ιππου)]

Again, for Cosa finds, mention ~~the~~ refs in D. Taylor's publ., but Koan are not publ.

→ For standard ref. to Alex. items in F.M., see under (4) though this has pub. ref. cf. (10) (but from Br. Mus.)

26.I.71

Ack. to Gardukwal for photo; and explan. of inv. nos. of some Black Sea stuff, received from him, on back of photo.

(2)

27.I.71

4.02

(For introd. text)

[Explain "Die X"]

Explain A M/46 – 122 (cf. (156))

Is this Gaid.?

or Grahov?

or both?

9 types no contact

compare the series (cad. 147) – (151) (150 trident, 151 tripod) Δ y

with " (cad. 178, 184, 186) – (187 tripod, 186 trident) Δ c

30.I.71

Are we citing Camarahan nos. without

p. refs?

1.II.71

I ought to look at readings with photos. ~~with readings~~

Really, all –

2.II.71

Decide whether to add finding place in concordance with Grahov numbers (the text gives the finding place without the Grahov numbers) cf. (6) – this does really need to finding places – what is Grahov ~~E~~ K 10, under D4 E

(3) (2.II.71)

4.03

For ref. to EM item ~~[illegible]~~ from Alex., cf. proposed text p. (112) notes, p. 8. (X)

Try writing introductory text on this MSTT suggests the EM number all bracketed together, e.g. EM 83-91

Ask MSTT; on Olbis items, cf. number (9),

We cannot have checked with Grahor about Olbis item that are in the ~~Temenos~~ Temenos book. Perhaps some are same as Olbis item otherwise listed?

(X) Try (218) — see notes on text. 3.II.71

another finding-place: Ephesus (227) doesn't need to say Ephesus with the inv. nos

Remarkable that so many (4) names exist in only 1 ex. Importance then also of photos.

4.04

What is MEH's fiction of the arr. of non-double? Are there a separate lot that do not match, and must be separately ill.?

Cf. comment on (281)

Quite likely they did match with something, given fewness of examples per type — easily might not have been found.

Are we putting initials with short-title names? cf. on (297) e.g.

5.II.71

Add Michaelidis collection (cf. (133)) to sources

23.II.71

Also, shorter story on polyg. flasks cf. omittable sect. (235) (236)

13.II.71

Introd. should include a little essay on medicine bottles. Give up publishing them all, but list their names that occur on Koan jars. Keep illustration of the Δ.ov. one on Pl. 16 — try to get a better fiction.

[In the introd. name list, can mark those on medicine bottles, and omit in gen'l cat., as used (425)] and (53)

15.II.71 4.05

332 with 50 and 474 seem to be a group.
(must look at Plates -)
These groups (X) should be taken up in the introd., and

put out that dating part of a group dates all —

if any have contexts. (X) E.g. 2, 50, 79, 183 etc

Discussion of title ἐπιστάτης (cf. 337)

12.III.71

Pairs : cf. 342 Preposition : cf. 381

[on caption for plates using photostat

4.06

(on captions for plates, using photostats — now filed separately

Other general matters: ask MΣΠ: (407)
1.) does she have a list of YOK (< > noted only)
2.) " " " " " " oversized photos — or not to scale

Every plate must say 1 : 1 and give exceptions.

Another group: ΔΙΟΝ ΥCΙΟΥ 215 – ΚΟΡ ΠΟΣ 384 — combs with LΔ LΔ LΔ

21.II.71

~~Introd~~ For Athens examples: get in on ident. of EM with Dumont sts. (give ref. to Delos 27 somewhere)

(Introduction notes) (7) (21.III.71)
4.07

(428) This must be part of a group with Πα, Πας ?, & is discussed.
[cf. also (477)

In introd., assembling of stamps that say Κω or etc. (cf. (431)), ΜΣΠ, does she have this together in files?

Attribute plates and sorting of dies & ΜΣΠ

also Philadelphia – (462)
Krokodeilopolis finding place (441) – check it is in finding place index. Explanation of nos. (ABC)

Matter of querying Athens as finding-place of EM items; ~~[illegible]~~ good arrangement in (445) in which the Athens figure is queried, since it covers both SS & EM.

On L sign (cf. (455)), and Μηνόλωρος as possible dating officials cf. titles – φρουρ. in (473) (Should this date 188 – 167?

→ mentioned with x ref for fabric; see (460) (492)

(Introduction notes) (7) (21.III.71)

4.08

(428) This must be part of a group with Πα, Παρ ?, & be discussed.
[cf. also (477)

In introd., assembling of stamps that say Κω or etc. (cf. (431) ΜΣΠ, does she have this together in files?

Attribute plates and sorting of dies to ΜΣΠ

also |Philadelphia| – (462)
|Krokodeilopolis| finding place ((441)) – check it is in finding place index. Explanation of nos. (ABC).

matter of querying |Athens| as finding-place of EM items; ~~[illegible]~~ good arrangement in (445) in which the Athens figure is queried, since it covers both SS & EM.

On L sign (cf. (455), and Μηνόδωρος as possible dating of fascicle

cf. titles – φρουρ. in (473)
(Should this date 188 – 167?

→ mentioned with x ref. from fabric; see (460)
(492)

(Introd., etc.)

(8)

(21.II.71)

4.09

A big job later: the internal refs. to non-double handles, and seeing that some are not left dangling.

When I have read through once, reconsider what non-double that are not ~~at~~ known to be same die are to be included — 14.III.71 > think, rather more from Tyras, because her eye was peaked for them.

22.II.71 at EA

Put in version of the MSBF text of 1956

23.II.71

Introd., make plain Grakov reference in text

27.II.71

We must round up all "Rhodian with non-Rhodian clay" What about πρῶτος?

5.III.71

Note in case of |Palestine A. Mus| items: reading from Kahane (folder PAL. 1958 - (SRAEL), photos from T. Saad (19.V.58)

Note in case of Ephesos finds: we have the information from Mrs. ~~Tassis~~ Veronica Mitsopoulou — Leon (sometimes with a rubbing or a photograph), ~~the~~

(this for 320 X — we have no φ, no rubbing of this).

227

Note we need either in introd., or under (324), a summary on Koroni.

AT 77 reference "Provisions" article

9.III.71

In discussing the Tyras handles, necessary to state what has been policy about including

10.III.71 Note not v. sure which ones are for Tyras in her article, cf. non-double cited under (525)

(328) In intro. discussion of names, ΖΩΤΙΧΟΣ + ΖΩΤΙΚΟΣ both exist in Paper

(329) is ~~another~~ one of those groups:

11s are (2) (A + club)

(133) (Δ + cadaveres)

(30)

(179)

(183)

(333) refers to a style group (which it does not really resemble): (50) Ἀντίπατρος, (174) Μόσχος, which ~~[illegible]~~ are neat stamps each with a club verbal (upside down) at right end.

Add μετ now Ἀριστεύς in suppl.: (757)

On (339) also (361)
Here in the concordance, the Grahov no. has been added to the Π number for Porthmion Π/, M/ etc. nos. apparently all mean we have φ. Of the pictures sent us by Gail, some of the pictured items have Grahov nos which some do not. Many that do have not yet in our concordance their Grahov nos.
Decide when to combine the nos (Π etc. + Grahov K) whether in the 1st Concordance or in the Grahov concordance.

Incidentally: in our case, that of the Παρθμιον ex. under (339), Π/653/654 was written on the phot., but 651 was in a list sent to us ~~by~~ with the photos. (by the secretary).

(11)

12.III.71
4.12

another style group: Δονυ
σίου

Κλεον
ακτος

Καρ
πος

30.IV.71

(428) Need in introd. discussion of this item as 1.) in cartouche (see also (18) & (691) and an unused ABC IIII
and 2.) marking of various functions.
Μαρ(συας?) πα(ραφύλας?)
Ἡρα(κλειτος?) κε(ραμεύς?)

(431) For introd.
Types with Κω.:

(1) Κωπονι, (232) Δωριμαχος, (431) Μελάνιππος

3.V.71

What is order of regular and occasional items in ~~introd.~~ catalog. text?

1.) reading Pl. no.
2.) figures on ex.s from various geogr. area
3.) previous publ., by die, if any
4.) context of partic. example
5.) note of large frags., w. ref. to introd.
6.) note of non-doubles w. same die
7.) any other comment

Discuss w. Mett

Jobs for Mett for Koan vol. any time;

assemble photo. for plates of devices. Use the photos we have, wh. are at actual sig., but make up to twice normal plate and have reduced to half -

(12)

5.V.71
4.13

From (444) etc.:

we need in introd. a study of case — i.e. nom. & gen., are they according to date at all? Or what? (all the Μενέδεος types known in full are in nomination (Pls. 34-35), whereas other names do appear in gen., e.g. Μενοιτίου

Discussion also of pairs of types = types — e.g. Μενέδας + club in sep. st. (445)

See again if these can be dated — is there any of these-as-group with context?

Ask Mett

Has she checked the later items (135 on) in Staerman's Fig. 5? I.e. through St. may not have known double handles with these types, perhaps we now do know some? And has she looked through the "Greek Brindisi" ABC rubbings?

In introd.: some comment on Staerman's work. She tends to make everything Koan(x); but it is fresh lively writing. (Brand pp. 9, 10 (see also above, p. 9)

She looked at them 11.V.71

Unclear, though cannot be sure [illegible] know when [illegible] [illegible]

(x) E.g. "Greek Brindisi" [illegible] such as Μενέδεον

(13)

U.T. 71

4.14

We decide to leave the numbers of Chios as "Chios 22" not "Chios VG 22" (q.v. Pl. 36)(463A) And then to explain in the index, what kind of nos. these are, i.e. not official to the museum.

MEG suggests to do the same with Rhodes nos. esp. as there is the problem of the signs.

VG NOTES ON CATALOGUE (1971) 631