Dear Mr. Chadwick,

Thank you very much for your letter. It is very encouraging to hear from someone who has been working on the Minoan problem that they agree with the Greek approach; because frankly, at the moment I feel rather in need of moral support. The whole situation is getting to the stage where a lot of people will be looking at it very sceptically, and I'm conscious that there's a lot which isn't satisfactorily explained. There's a kind of central area of sense, but still a great periphery which is baffling.

Apart from broadcasting round a few more copies of the vocabulary, I propose to leave the problem alone for a month or so, and let it solidify and in particular to see what Eleftherian says about it. I feel sure that if there's something to this vocabulary, then there should be some pretty clear confirmation of it in the new material. It rather depends who you've got working out there on it, and how far they've got with cleaning and cataloging the tablets. But if there's a chance of getting some advance news of what the new material consists of, then I'll certainly pass it on to you.

I'm grateful for the suggestion of Professor W. D. M. Bennett that Carol Bright has a chance of looking at the detail of the new material (in fact she's just been checking through his Linear B index, and couldn't afford to let himself be distracted by the new values); as well as the fact that at first glance these are a matter of things which are, at least, quite reasonable, though he doesn't like the idea of the elaborated spellings. (Still, if you accept particles for "father/mother", and -o, for the nominative, I don't see how one can avoid both of the conclusions of abbreviation).

Professor W. D. M. Bennett has been feeling the need of a "new philologist" to keep me on the right lines. I asked at the Hellenic Society and they suggested I should get on to Professor Page; he's interested and feels there's something in it, though he's a bit sceptical about the details. But although he disclaims being a philologist, and suggests that a specialist might be far more useful, it would be extremely useful to me if I could count on your help, not only in trying to make sense out of the material, but also in drawing the correct conclusions about the formations in terms of dialect and stage of development. I think it is now Scripta Minoa, if they would have room for an article on "Koinean Greek" in next year's number, for which the NS would have to be in by the end of November. And I don't know yet whether they will agree to this (it may be a bit controversial still), but in any case, if the vocabulary can be solidified some more by then, then you are willing to collaborate in this article? We might meet and discuss it in a month or so.

I'm glad we coincided in some of the values which occurred to me when I wrote to Mr. Page, though I suppose a court of law might suppose I'd already pre-cooked the material in such a way that the coincidence wasn't conclusive. This looks very promising.

I don't really understand the context of the Elysos Minoan, not knowing what it represents, but there does seem to be a recurrence of "trade" names on the bottom line. I feel that the form of the stem -daimid - does not look rather more like "ships" and is "temple-builder" really a distinct trade from "builder" rather than a complimentary epithet (after all, ships must be building most of the time, but temples only every so many years).

I felt that -phos would be better, in spelling, for -phos but can we let it take theative? For -phos I think we have to assume a noun -phos.
on which it is formed on the principle of the typical Greek contrast:

\[ \text{μαραθος? \text{ποντας}} / \delta-\mu\text{ορδο} \]

where the "lacking" adjective puts the stem into the C- declension; and that it is the contrast between the stems that have this thing and those that don't which corresponds to the fact that one lot have amounts of bronce next to their names and that the others are named without it. In fact, it was the idea of this contrast between \text{εξωτερ} and \( \delta \) - which first made me feel that the language must be Greek. In the vocabulary, I suggested that the word was \text{μαραθος}, I have seen it argued that the meaning of "wool-spinning" is only a secondary -derivation, applied specifically to women's work, of a term which, if not it comes from the stem \text{μαραθος} must originally have merely mean any concentrated husbandry. There's another occurrence of \text{εξωτερ} in a text which doesn't help much, except that the idea of craftsmanshop probably didn't fit better on a tablet dealing with the construction of boats than if we had found it, say, on a grain tablet.

But I still feel must be identical with the later \text{δαχτυλος}. The slight addition of \( \delta \) - in the plural distinguishes it in form from the equivalent noun times \( \text{τακτές} \). But it obviously has a meaning very different from the classical one, and nearer the derivation \( \text{δαχτυλος} \) - \( \text{αρτομυλος} \), "house-builder in order". What they're doing on Bn 263 I don't see. Your suggestions on the dialect position confirm what I had guessed myself, though your \text{εξωτερ} brings the identification much closer. I toyed with the idea of writing \text{εξωτερας, εξωτερος, \ etc.}, but in the end I thought it was better not to beg the question. I've never asked to follow the principle of adopting a archaic spelling where it was a reasonable reconstruction for a number of dialects, but not of interpreting an ambiguous spelling in a prejudiced way until latter the same dialect position was confirmed independently.

On second thoughts, the spelling of \( \text{εξωτερας} \) isn't very clear, and it would be better to replace than by \text{εξωτερος} or \text{εξωτερας}. The latter would be nearer the Greek morphology but further from the strict value of \( \text{εξωτερας} \). The same vale will \text{εξωτερος} as a bone of contention. I said that the word was \text{μαραθος}, I have an above external argument on why it is reasonable that they should not yet have been eliminated in the Mycenaean period. One indication is the of notable spelling found by Bollack at Karystos, where the legendary land of Spercheus; of the Messenia and Messenia, but also in Phoenician \( \text{Mw} \) (\( \text{Mw} \) = Greek \( \text{Mw} \)). Whether or not the \text{Mw} and the Phoenician in an illusion, it does see to indicate that the sound \text{Mw} was still \text{μαραθος} in about the 13th century, when presumably the same Sperchean settlement of Cilicia led to the contact in names. \text{ος} \( \text{ευκής} \) this is an awkward thing to pronounce, but it is inevitable from the name of \text{ευκης}, the second element in the name of \text{ευκης}, of course, is probably of no sound, the second element in the name of \text{ευκης}, of course, is probably of no sound.

Thank you for the suggestion for the spelling of the verb \text{μαραθως}. It doesn't seem quite as good if \text{Mw} and \text{Mw} is "let them get not too good for \text{εμαραθως} that is, but I suppose all right for \text{εμαραθως} = \text{εμαραθως} \text{εμαραθως} = \text{εμαραθως} \text{εμαραθως}". "as you say, worrying." It just "literally" all means use the Mycenaean suggestion in your lecture, and I am sure it is to you how much is presented as gospel, and how much more or less inspired guesswork.

Yours sincerely, 11th M.1.

[Signature]

Michael North