

YALE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

BOX 1967, YALE STATION
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

June 6th 1951

Dear Ventris,

I've been looking at the different ways of counting and was all set to defend my discrete counting when your letter took the wind out of my sails -

I probably should have done a second and penultimate count for "Minoan", and am quite ready to do it next time - just what method of ~~using~~ calculating means I'll discuss later.

I quite agree on ρ or μ for comparison, but did not do it for Minoan since I saw nothing yet to compare it with, except Linear A for which your figures are excellent, but were not compatible with mine. For Knossos and Pylos together we shall certainly want figures which can be directly compared.

We can experiment with means for showing diagraphic positions.

Thank you for the addresses and for the errata. Among the things I should have done was another check to make the index and transcriptions agree. I did it by correcting the one and noting what corrections to make in the other. The groups with non-existent references are the by-products of this.

Kristopoulos got a copy of the published version - ~~for~~ the only one which was usable for statistics from the same mail in which I sent you yours. Mr. Blegen had given him his copy of what I had in my notebook to show you last July, so it was quick work on Kristopoulos' part. I wonder how many more are counting statistics. I imagine that I should have done them as part of the transcriptions - But all that sort of thing was to be the accompaniment of the definitive publication with pictures, and all - that's also why my thesis stuff hasn't come out - (The fractions are an expanded part of it though) Now I shall wait for SM & then try to get ahead of as many as I can - I have no dephlement up my sleeve.

I don't know when SM is to appear, except that I think Myres has it all ready to send the last pieces to the press, or has done so - I think I am supposed to read proof of the concordance I did for it, so I should have advance warning but I've seen nothing yet. Just how I am to supplement it tactfully I don't know - I think the statistics could come out first and the supplements piecemeal, perhaps in studies of certain classes - Incidentally a large part of the thesis ~~is~~ business is simply the arranging of the tablets in those classes, and seeing what results from the groupings.

to consider the methods of counting I wasted some paper and had these forms made, which I trust you can understand though you may not like them. Sample A didn't give me enough to compare the advantages of second and penultimate methods. So I plotted ~~how~~ how many occurrences we might expect on an even distribution within sign-groups on the basis of the known distributions of lengths. Then anything close to expectation would cause no notice, but ~~a~~ a high or low score will perhaps indicate the characteristic of the sign. The trial with \neq I think gives the palm to Ktistopoulos' method. The initial high stands out by any method, as does the final low. The second by yours and K's is just about expectation. But on penultimate yours says \neq is normal K's says it is low. The difference is in 2 and 3 ~~sign~~ sign groups whose initial highs and normal seconds effectively balance a tendency to low penultimates. I ought of course now look at the groups in question.

They confirm my expectation that the \neq seems to be connected more closely ~~with~~ with the first than with the third. From this sign I should think penultimate ought not include 1st of 2 sign-groups, and probably not end of three. I then thought I ought to check a sign in which

the penultimate position is prominent and partly predictable and got by random \neq for Sample C. Here initial and final take care of themselves, so that we need not worry about 2-sign-groups.

I think K. here misses the end of \neq 3 in his penultimate for surely many of them go directly with the final \neq or \neq .

~~At~~ I think then I should at the moment recommend counting second in 3-sign groups and up-penultimate in 3 sign-groups and up, leave the ~~the~~ 2-sign-groups alone, and indicate by asterisk or the like when the second of 3-sign groups perhaps causes unbalanced counts - or perhaps your table B takes care of this. I see no point in noticing how many initials occur in each length - most of them seem to follow expectation as closely as may be with the small numbers involved \neq and \neq may be slightly askew but most signs are not distinguished.

$\neq \neq$
 ~~$\neq \neq \neq$~~
 ~~$\neq \neq$~~
 ~~\neq~~
 $\neq \neq \neq$
 $\neq \neq \neq \neq \neq$
 ~~$\neq \neq \neq \neq$~~
 $\neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq$
 $\neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq$
 $\neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq$
 $\neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq \neq$

yours
James Barrett