Dear Nelson,

Your letter of the 29th and 31st of August have been duly received, as was also the carbon copy of your letter of the 7th, the original of which had reached me in Baltimore.

Everyone was sorry to miss you at Brussels, New Caledon Thompson was particularly anxious to see you. Morgenroth was there for most of the Congress, and Giddean appeared for the last two days with his wife. I gave Winnett's paper to Rockemore after reading it, the Minicean paper I have with me. I shall see whether it can be made suitable for the Bulletin, it is a little thin for 5488, but with a little rearrangement can perhaps suit the Bulletin.

I am very sorry to hear of Helen's continued illness, and sincerely hope that she has recovered since your letter of a fortnight ago.

It is hardly likely that the publication is the October Bulletin, which went to printing 2nd, and must have been in 2nd proof when I received your letter of Sept. 9th, will be embarrassing. I was very careful about the text of your article, which can hardly contain anything which you will have to recall. It is, of you, who will have to recall certain comments, especially on the sufficient inscription. It is a very severe task, which I could not have ventured on in the ice, but for the sending agreement of the enlarged photo with your hand copy, which also offered a clear test here. After the comparative table by you and Gladwin (which I return herewith) your reading seems certain. However, I do not think there is a date before the 3rd century in well done, on account of the (a) and (b) and (c), it is nothing of the and East. The form of the text on which the impression was found, agrees well with a seventh-century date. I suggest that the figures of late type belong to the same time (you say that there are a number which are practically identical, as the 4th of the TBK specimen belonging to the 6th C. B.C., and that the 4488 belong to an early phase of Assyria).
(8th century). These finds are evidently very important for dating purposes.

But at present, then, a date in the 8th-7th century AD and the 7th-6th centuries BC is the reasonable.

But let's try to put the dates back into the 8th century, since it simply won't work!

I suggested to the December Bulletin the article on the history and geography of Kedesh, which you have promised, and a good description of the demijon inscription, as well as of the graffiti, to replace the tentative one which appears in the issue. Let's have precise dates of the discoveries at the Temple of one meeting of the Philosophical Society, in which everything available up to then will be included. I shall send at Contaln et al. before the new application to make, so that we shall not make a mistake there.

The Congress, I believe, was a whole. A success from my point of view; the spirit of the place. Not the first day and a half was bad with brachyuria. There were some 500 persons present. The main discourse and the new health steps were enough to fill me with excitement. The French debates fell after just as a debate by one of the chairmen. The English last of my paper, with little change, appears in the Bulletin. Original, as you can see for yourself. Not the Nigerite theory is philologically dead. I will write and even jump about for a few more. De Lacy's paper was very well received; he is a charming man as well as a brilliant individual. I also saw a good deal of Graves and of

A shall be back in Bethlehem by Oct. 2nd. News from Rabb, as good. He is taking the inscriptions very seriously and is making steady progress under different teachers. — All is well (to a woman Ph.D. who was employed in her office of Haverhill), today women!

Very cordially yours,
William