

Louvain-la-Neuve, Aug 20 1933

Dear D. Kellner

I find that most of the points noted by you will be better dealt with in conversation; I therefore return the marked copy of the book, and confine my remarks now to the questions asked in your letter. It seems clear that § 264 must be replaced by a completely new section on ablaut and reduplication.

§§ 291-2 should be re-written, omitting the polemic against erroneous views, and stating more clearly the facts.

§§ 321-7 must certainly be in great part re-written. Some distinction should be made between suffixes & prefixes which have been productive in Eng. itself, and those which only occur in words formed in pre-English times. In the Romanic part a ~~good~~ deal may be omitted altogether; and it will be needful

to distinguish what is Latin from what  
has undergone the operation of French phonetic  
law.

My impression is that App. II. and III  
might stand ~~under~~ with only correction  
of errors; but I should like to know  
what you think yourself. If you  
have any plan for a complete reconstruction  
of these appendices, it might very probably  
alter my opinion when I knew what you  
would propose.

Believe me

Yours very truly  
A Bradley