

264 - Pan 1 - Always "simple"
264 - 2 - How about Joyce?
264 - 3 - Wrong

265 - ~~1~~ - ~~How can it be~~ - Poe's no expert
- ~~it be~~ - it last part of quote
- ~~is wrong~~ - all wrong
3 - He is inconsistent with himself or at least with Poe

(265 - 2 - Agree with Byrne

265 - 4 - My letter of 1922 denies underphrasing

265 - 1) nothing new
2) 26 cite figures

268 243 - Refer to Winscott
show how - And how he mis-
p'd proof it quotes Poe or Poe's
inasmuch

269 - Par 2. Fork up itoy
3 - " " "

270 - 3 - Yes - but how
deeper?
- Reduce misjet
1 letter
Reminds me of
Kogolepis

