Dear Mr. Ventris,

Let me first offer you my congratulations on having solved the Minoan problem; it is a magnificent achievement and you are yet only at the beginning of your triumph. I am comparatively a newcomer to this research having been only seriously concerned with it for six years; and as Sir John Myres may have told you, I was appointed last winter a lectureship in classical philology at Cambridge, and thus have not been able to spare the time for a real attack since Scripta Minoa II appeared. I hope I shall not be too late now to help you with a few minor suggestions. Ever since hearing your talk on the wireless I have been most excited, and when Sir John showed me your provisional list of identifications last Monday I set to work at once to verify your discovery. Thus I had already anticipated a few of your results before receiving your vocabulary yesterday morning. (By the way the address in 86A not 56, I expect it is Sir J.'s writing.) It is very good of you to allow me to see your working, and I hope a philologist will be able to contribute something to this process. I shall be lecturing on the Greek Dialects, and it will be very nice if I can start with an account of your decipherment and some remarks on Mycenaean Greek.
One or two suggestions. You anticipated my guesses of ζ and μ, but you have not got ιθ = πκ, perhaps because you were afraid of the prep. ιππο for ιππο and ιππο (which may mean simply 'payment' as well as 'repayment'). This is a very interesting feature of the dialect. The equation of course also gives ιθ + = Πόλος; ιτ = ιμ may perhaps be βοβος. I suspect πτ = πεπος, used in poetry for πνε (perhaps here like balte πρ). I had taken πα-κα-να as φαγονα, but your βραβνα may be right. I wonder if κοβομο- means 'temple' rather than 'ship builder' (κοβομο- in an inscription; καβομο is the word one expects for shipwright). Is it possible that the termination of διπλε-ρα-πο-ρο (also κρυβο-) is πολοι 'sellers' with a shift to o-stem?

For α-κα-ρι-ζο I had thought of αεδεβοις 'non-marsh' or possibly 'inland'; but this is not very convincing. Is it possible that πο-σι after θυιξ is really all one word = *Σαιροσι, dat. ablat. plur. in *-bhos(ι?), καθ-τοι, Ital. fs. & Skt. -bhīk. πίπτεπ sounds as if it should mean 'sawyer'. δα-ματ(e) is a puzzle: there is Σαξαρας recorded for Σαμος, and -ατος does occur for -ετος (οινοτος) so I feel inclined to favour a derivative of βοιος; but it might be connected with Homeric Σπαες. An interesting addition to the Cretan place-names is Φυ-Φυ Ιδαιος.
The question of dialect is naturally of great interest to me.

Despite such features as the retention of the I-E. labio-velars, the dialect is not excessively archaic, and shows such characteristically East Greek features as *ti > *ti (3rd plur. in verbs, *~PiôIsôv where West Gr. has *~Piôv-). The use of *á̂n as restricted to what are sometimes called 'Achaean' dialects, i.e. Aeolic, Arcadian and Cyprian. In fact Mycenaean seems likely to be the ancestor of Arcado-Cyprian, though it seems to have *eAv, not *Ev for example. The problem of the ambiguity of the script makes it hard to be certain what is the right reading of the 3rd plurals like e-kosi.

Historically 'pre-ethnic' Greek *~zôrvi was retained in W.Gr. and gave *~zôrvi in Arcadian, *~zôrvi in Lesbian, *~zôrvi in Ionic. I suspect therefore that we e-kosi may conceal *~zôrvi (similarly *~Sidôrvi etc.)

The same problem arises over acc. plurals of o- and e-stems.

If I am right in thinking that the script does not write two like vowels to indicate a long vowel, the forms a-pe-esi, e-ne-e-esi are interesting. The IE. 3rd plur. is *esenti (Skt. *esandi), but Gr. carries over the initial e of the singular (*esmi, *esti) to the plural, hence *espei e-kepe. The 3rd plur. would therefore be *esenti, so we may have *~eAvoi (or even *~e-têvôi). apeisi is surprising and needs to be looked into.
The news from Pylos is excellent; we may yet unearth a contemporary account of the Trojan War! I am very grateful to you for making your solution available to me, and I hope to see it published before long so that everyone can appreciate your success.

I should much like to talk about it with you and hope we can arrange a meeting. I suppose you don't often come to Oxford.

Anyway, if there is anything a mere philologist can do please let me know. I shall go ahead trying to unravel the tablets on the basis of your solution, and will let you know if I find anything helpful.

Yours sincerely,

John Chadwick