

lot of money off of that; though a man like Gelb gets pretty well paid, I think. But the one thing he has to work for is recognition. These men in those fields anything they find first they must be given credit for. Anybody else who writes, if he refers to it quotes anything they have ever said, he must give them credit for it. So, Gelb-- he was supposed to be chief editor. I remember suggesting about one of the names I noticed a similarity to something else. In one of my preliminary papers I suggested a possibility it might be interpreted this way. Gelb says, What utter nonsense; we can't stultify a Assyriological reserach by such crazy interepretations! Well, I just dropped the thing because he was putting all his time on this Assyriology, and to me it was a side issue. My main interest was in the OT. About a year later I was working with him one day, and he came to me and said, Say, you know that stack of names there, you know I thought of a real interpretation of it. I've got an idea that will just give us the solution." He tells me what it was and it was exactly what I'd written in the paper before that he had turned absolutely thumbs down on. I said, That's very interesting; I suggested that a year ago. You said it was nonsense." Oh, is that so, he said, and he never mentioned it again. He never even referred to it.

He was supposed to be editor in chief, but Purvis soon found that in his section Gelb would be wanting to change so many things that Purvis made this a rule that when they would get together that he would object to any change that Gelb suggested. So the least thing Gelb suggested Purvis would argue fiercely against. So it got to where Gelb resigned as editor in chief of the ~~world~~ work, and instead they had the three of us be co-authors, and Gelb wrote a couple of sections in it, and we worked with him. Dr. Allen(?) who was an Egyptologist there was editor in chief, and Allen was a grand fellow to work with.