falling short). The sheets are numbered serially, 1 through 20, and the corresponding VMS page is written inaccurately on each sheet. The first four sheets are labeled ‘‘Folio 112 Verso’’ when in fact they transcribe f.111v, the next three are correctly labeled ‘‘Folio 112 Recto’’, the next few incorrectly ‘‘Folio 113 Verso’’ and so on, systematically mislabeling all verso sides. The first sheet has the words ‘‘Francis M. Puckett, Lot #4’’ written on one edge and in blue pencil the words ‘‘To be verf,’’ the first two of which are crossed out.

These sheets are evidently IBM card coding sheets, that is, the written matter an IBM key punch operator looks at while keying in the data. The transcription data has been carefully marked out into 30 character blocks, with a heavy black stroke at the beginning of each block; each block has a 3 digit serial number ranging from 001 through 516.

These are not, however, coding sheets left over from the preparation of 1609. First, the card number series does not start over with each transcribed page, as they do in 1609 (which covers the same part of the VMS in 527 cards). Second, the transcription alphabet used is the ‘‘alphabetical’’ version seen on 1609.2, and not the ‘‘mnemonic’’ version used in 1609.

It is interesting to speculate about the reason for use of the variant transcription alphabet. It might be that this transcription was made before the ‘‘mnemonic’’ equivalents had been chosen, that is, before 9 June 1944. (The 1613 transcription is undated.) Alternatively, the 1613 transcription might have been carried out as an after-the-fact test of the transcription process, as a check on the accuracy of 1609. The variant transcription alphabet was chosen to deliberately shake the transcriber(s) out of any ruts of habit their transcription method might have fallen into, to force them to constantly refer to a non-standard and hence unfamiliar alphabet chart, in order to enforce greater accuracy on this ‘‘quality control’’ transcription.

To see how much 1613 differed from 1609, I instructed my computer to recast 1613’s transcription as much as possible into 1609’s terms. This is a preliminary brief report of the differences, given in 1609’s transcription alphabet. First, the recast version of 1613 takes 15580 characters while that portion of 1609 covering the same material takes 15682 characters. Of these, 14817 were the same in homologous passages. The 1613 version has 763 characters in places where the transcriptions differ, and the 1609 version has 865. This means they disagree by 5% or