

May 20 1951

Dear Bennett,

Thank you for the last instalment of your frequency tables. I see that my first adding up of your cumulative totals was not quite right, & the signs in our VERY FREQUENT & FREQUENT categories are in fact the same.

Incidentally, Ktistopoulos has written an article on the Pylos tablets for presenting to the Athens Academy, & he is going to send me a duplicated copy. I expect he will to you too: if not, I'll pass mine on to you after digesting it. It will be interesting to see what results he gets, particularly if (?) he has thrown over his hampering earlier phonetic values. So far he has sent me only his figure 3, which is a frequency analysis similar to my TABLE C, with the difference that he has counted only complete sign-groups, so his figures are again different from either of ours.

You will probably have detected a mistake in my Note 13 = the "nominative" of al-if-eg-oj $\text{A}^{\text{M}}\Psi\text{A}$ should of course be $\text{A}^{\text{M}}\Psi\text{F}$, $\text{A}^{\text{M}}\Psi 2$ being the form restricted in this "declension" to a position after $\neq+$. Why the latter should be so I can't figure out, since in all other cases the form after $\neq+$ seems indistinguishable from the 'Case 1' (with the exception of $\Psi\text{A}\xi\odot / \Psi\text{A}\xi\text{I}$, whose spelling seems a bit haywire anyway). But I haven't worked through the $\neq+$ forms methodically enough yet, & perhaps there is more of a significant pattern.

I feel the problem of the En-Eo- etc tablets would be clearer if I knew what the ideogram A represented: have you any ideas?

Yours,

Michael Ventris

As you will have seen, the Pylos tablets make my "Grid" table 1 rather out of date. It's a devil of a job rearranging it.

$2\text{F}\text{A}\text{A}\text{A}$ seems to be the only 'full house' of five which is at all amenable. Of the others, I can't as yet get more than 3 or 4 into any one pigeon-hole. — Assuming that 5 is the number to be expected, which maybe it isn't?

I've had a letter from Myres acknowledging the last notes. He's still rather skeptical of all our efforts: "the only man whose work has impressed me at all is Sittig; & that is not saying much."

He repeats his regret that the new Pylos signary order does not tie up with the Knossos ones: and that the Tablet letters & numbers do not seem to be the same as those which Miss Kober passed on to him. But I can't see that this is likely to worry us unduly. If any one wants a Pylos index in Myres' order they can have one tomorrow.