

Psychiko (Athens), June 11, 1951

4, Mavili St.

Dear Dr Bennett,

I thank you very much for your kind letter of the 4<sup>th</sup> inst. I am grateful to you for your favourable opinion regarding my article. Please, accept once more the offer of my gratitude for your laborious and excellent work, which permit us now to proceed to various researches on a solid base.

I have also received the Ventris Work-notes 7, 8, 12 and 13, as well as the latest 11 and 11b, and studied his very interesting suggestions on various questions. Peruzzi has informed me that "Minos" will be published very soon, so that I hope that I will have the pleasure to read, with profit, your article in the next future.

It was logical to begin with an analysis of the frequencies of the signs, so that we all three were occupied with the same work, although on somehow different lines. I have preferred to confine myself only to the complete words, in order to get results based on indisputable data. Your counting of only those incomplete sign-groups, which cannot possibly be parts of complete words already known, is the only safe way for the count of incomplete words.

I have paid due attention to your sample in which you put down the results of our analyses regarding  $\ddagger$ , for comparison. I think that I have understood it, because it is clear; I am a little doubtful only as regards the meaning of the Cumulative Total. I assume that it contains the total of occurrences of each sign-group and sign as many times as it occurs (and not only on its first occurrence), according to your method of counting; however, I will ask Prof. Blegen, whom I hope to have pleasure to see one of the next few days.

I think that it would be convenient, taking into consideration that the results of our analyses may interest and be used by other students of the problem, to draw up a comparative table containing the similar principal data of the three analyses, as f.e. would be, according to my opinion, the following:



Comparative table of the frequencies of the signs

(I: initial; F: final; T: total of the occurrences)

B = Bennett: 1172 complete words (100 with 2 signs, 371 w.3, 444 w.4, 200 w.5, 45 w.6, 11 w.7, 1 w.8) containing in total 4444 signs  
 (79/80 signs) ..... incomplete " (.....) " " " ..... "  
 ..... sign-groups

V = Ventris: ..... complete words (.....) " " " ..... "  
 (79 signs) ..... incomplete " (.....) " " " ..... "  
 ..... sign-groups

K = Kristopoulos: 1172 complete words (101 with 2 signs, 370 w.3, 444 w.4, 200 w.5, 45 w.6, 11 w.7, 1 w.8) " " " 4443 "  
 (79 signs)

≠	Occurrences			Order			% of the totals (I, F, T)		
	I	F	T	I	F	T	I	F	T
	B V K	B V K	B V K	B V K	B V K	B V K	B V K	B V K	B V K
	36 ? 34	4 ? 4	66 74 58	8 ? 6	40 ? 24	27 ? 27	? ? 29	? ? 3	? ? 13
				* *			34:1172	4:1172	58:4443

I do not know whether this way of comparison would be more simple or clear.

You are right, I have omitted  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ}$  and counted  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ}$ , as I have also counted  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ}$ ; I think that  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ}$  may represent rather a word, cf.  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ} \text{Ⓜ}$  (Pylos) and  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ} \text{Ⓜ}$  (Crete). I do not know how, I have correctly counted  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ} \text{Ⓜ}$  (instead of  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ} \text{Ⓜ}$ ); it was perhaps by... telepathy. I thank you for the communication of the list of corrections.

Please, note that  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ}$  ( $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ}$  -  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ} \text{Ⓜ}$  -  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ} \text{Ⓜ}$  -  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ} \text{Ⓜ}$ , p. 5 of my article) is an erratum, as  $\text{Ⓛ} \text{Ⓜ}$  does not occur in Pylos; but I think that it is to be found in Crete.

Thanking you again, and with all good wishes, I remain  
 yours sincerely

*K. M. Nicolovits*

\* The discrepancy between the numbers of order (F) 40 (yours) and 24 (mine) seems to me curious.

by 24 = 40 plain