

All this is of course on the face of the thing.
I do not know all, as you truly observe - &
yet I possibly know some things that ^{would} ~~seem~~
not have come under your notice, & that bear
on the matter indirectly. I have not the
slightest notion who may have been influenc-
ing Knott - though a similar rumour has
reached me about H. S. which I am not
inclined to take in. I must give myself
the pleasure of copying a bit ^{out} of a letter rec?
2 days ago from a most gentlemanly and
kind as well as honourable man - whom I
believe you know nothing of -

"I am very sorry about it, not so much
about its being done, as the manner of doing
it, as I have very reluctantly been compelled
to abandon the illusion of the Cycle being
an accurate book, but it seems to me that
W. S. so completely ignores the undoubtedly

Hardwick Vic: 2 May 79.

240 (197)

My dear Mr Arthur,

I am so much obliged by your taking
the trouble to write to me when you ought to ^{have} been
getting a little relaxation. I earnestly hope you
are not overdoing it - and have I assure you
had my scruples about writing to you now even
to give you the trouble of reading my scrawl -
However - there shall be nothing to answer -
so please lay this aside till you feel quite
inclined.

x x x x x x x x x x

First of all, about Dranks. He is willing
to be re-nominated, hoping for you & me for
2? & 3? - But he is not quite pleased about
the absence of any notice of the gift of his
Catalogue to the Library among the donations
of the past year. Of this I can of course af-
fer no explanation & can only imagine that
worthy Cayley is so deep in $\frac{C+ax+y}{L-e+y}$
he be he that he overlooked it.