

"scientifically." On p. 58, by way of antidote to poisoning by iron, the translator represents Avicenna as recommending "a drachm of loadstone taken in a draught of the juice of dog's mercury." Gilbert says *mercurialis*, by which he must have understood the French mercury, not the poisonous dog's mercury. But we cannot find that Avicenna really made any such recommendation. He proposes that lodestone should be mixed with iron filings when they are prescribed, and should be taken in "mell-cratum," or mead, not *mercurialis*. Is there not some clerical error? Page 63, Mottelay: "loadstone is chiefly earthy." The Latin is *maxime*, and should certainly be translated "in the highest degree."

On page 64, the translation reads, "So, too, a dry body does not run to the dry rim of a vessel containing water; but, on the contrary, a wet object does." The Latin is: "Ita nec ad limbum vasis siccum appellit humidum, sed humidum petit limbum," which may be rendered, "So a wet object does not approach the dry side of a vessel but seeks the wet side." On p. 87, *gemma Vincentii* is translated "vincentina," but what is that? On p. 97, the translation is: "Electric bodies attract the electric only, and the body attracted undergoes no modification through its own native force, but is drawn freely under impulsion in the ratio of its matter (composition)." The Latin is: "Electrica corpora alliciunt tantum, allectum non immutatur insita vi, sed materie ratione sponte appulsum incumbit." Perhaps this might be rendered; "Electric bodies only attract; the attracted body is not changed in its native force, but by reason of matter, being invoked, willingly exerts itself." Gilbert certainly thinks the excited amber by something very like human persuasion induces things to come to it. On p. 123, the translation reads, "And as light—so the opticians tell us—arrives instantly, in the same way with far greater instantaneousness the magnetic energy is present within the limits of its forces." The words we have italicized are, in the original, *multo magis*, "much more." That is, we have much more reason to think magnetic induction is instantaneous. Mr. Mottelay's translation would make Gilbert deny the absolute instantaneousness of illumination, which he never dreamed of doing. The phrase *multo magis* is often used in the sense of a *fortiori*. On p. 169 occurs the word *halinitro*; but this is not English. It would be better to speak either of "halinitrum (carbonate of soda)" or of "mineral alkali."

We could easily multiply the number of such criticisms by ten; but the general rationale of the course of experimentation is not affected by such slips. We wish, however, before closing this notice, to make some remarks upon some ruling practices of the translator. *Manifestus* is almost everywhere rendered by "manifest." Now, we have no objection at all to an effort to so turn the meaning of the English word; only the peculiar acception should be explained. *Manifestus*, in the language of physicists, means open to direct observation after making the appropriate experiment. It does not imply that the thing is evident unless the experiment is made. For instance, on p. 217: "Here we must express wonder at a manifest error of Baptista Porta, . . . to wit, that iron rubbed with diamond turns to the north." Even when the translator selects a different word, he fails to convey the peculiar meaning of *manifestum*. Thus, on p. 212: "It is plain (*manifestum*) that all the bars so hammered out toward the north and so laid down while cooling will rotate round their

centres, and when afloat will move about in water, and will point north." It is not plain that they will behave so; but if the experiment be made, it will become plain that they do so behave.

An admiring translator of an old author very naturally and almost excusably falls unaware into a way of slurring over his author's cruder conceptions, and of representing him as more modern in his ideas than he really was. We have seen how Mr. Mottelay, by a most forced rendering, would lead his reader to think that Gilbert believed in the finite velocity of light. Gilbert's ignorance of forces was profound. At a time before Galileo's achievements were known, Gilbert could not be expected to have a knowledge of dynamics, but one might suppose that so perspicacious a mind would have a not altogether erroneous instinctive idea of force. If we compare Gilbert with Dr. John Dee, whose period of activity antedates the 'De Magnete' by thirty or forty years, we find the older man, for whom posterity has had only contempt, to be far better equipped with conceptions of mechanics than the younger. Gilbert comes, in the course of his book, into conflict with each one of the three laws of motion, but most frequently with the law of action and reaction.

Between the words *potestas*, *dominium*, *potentia*, *vis*, *virtus*, *robur*, *vigor*, he draws no clear distinction, as can be seen in book ii., chapter xxix., first paragraph, where all these words occur in the same sense. Yet Mr. Mottelay throws a garb of modernness over his translation by an incessant use of the word "energy." Take, for example, the following definition. The original reads, "Verticitas, vigor polaris, non *περιστροφικός*, sed *περιελκυστικός* δύναμις: non vertex aut *ᾠδός*, sed virtus convertens." The obvious translation is, "Verticity, polar vigor, not a rotation, but a tendency to rotation; not a pole, but a property of turning." But Mr. Mottelay translates as follows: "Verticity. Polar strength—activity (or what in Gilbert's day was understood as energy); not gyrating, vortiginous, but turning power; nor is it polar revolution, but a directing virtue, an innate turning vigor."

Where, in the original, does he find anything about its being innate? It is difficult to understand the clause in parenthesis. If Mr. Mottelay means to say that in Elizabethan English the word *energy* was used to translate *vigor*, he is mistaken. The word *energy* was not in use at all, except in the sense of liveliness in writing. The reason it was not used was that the Greek word was perfectly translated by the Latin *actus* and English *act*. As Sir William Hamilton well says, "Energy, act, operation, are convertible terms." Everybody knows that "energy" was the precise contrary to *δύναμις*, the word which Gilbert selects to express what his verticity is; so that energy is particularly adapted for avoidance in translating it. But if Mr. Mottelay means that the word *energy* will convey to electricians and other modern readers the conception in Gilbert's mind, we venture again to dissent. We admit that the converse is true. If one wanted to give a single word which should convey in Latin to the prescientific man the nearest idea possible to that of our energy, *vigor* might perhaps be the best choice. But when, on the contrary, the purpose is to put the modern man into the state of mind of the prescientific man—the Gilbert—the word "vigor," if it be at fault, is so because it conveys a too scientific idea. "Energy" ought not to be thought of for an instant. Mr. Mottelay seems really to be at some pains to con-

ceal a thing which it should have been one of his chief concerns to bring to light, the contrast between Gilbert's conceptions of magnetic action and those of any scientific man of our time. Nevertheless, we are very much obliged to him for the translation. The book is more than amply worth its price.

The History of Illinois and Louisiana under the French Rule, embracing a general view of the French Dominion in North America, with some account of the English occupation of Illinois. By Joseph Wallace, counsellor at law, etc. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1893.

MR. PARKMAN is quoted by name in this book twelve times. The occasions on which he is the real authority must be twelve times twelve. Many incidents in the narrative have also been gleaned from the collections of State historical societies, or monographs on counties and towns, and some from public archives. Still, a volume like this of Mr. Wallace's was needed to bring the history of the Mississippi Valley during its first century within the reach of the great mass of students. In his work there is much to commend. The details are well selected, related, and grouped. We trace with growing interest the progress, decade after decade, of discovery, exploration, and occupation. The obstacles to advancement, owing to the face of the country, climate, conflicts with savages or between civilized nations, and blunders in economics, are fairly presented. The careers of Marquette, with many other missionaries as self-sacrificing—of Joliet, La Salle, Tonty, Iberville, Bienville, and later of several English and Spanish leaders—give a continuity to the historic chain. Everything is set forth from a Western or Mississippi Valley standpoint. The primitive geography at every point possible is brought in touch with that of the living present. Popular errors on this matter are corrected, as where Kaskaskia is shown to have been at first not at its present location, but far up the Illinois River and near Starved Rock.

The two chief lessons, however, of Mr. Wallace's book seem to be these: first, the inferiority of the French settlers of the West to the English who settled the Atlantic slope. The latter were largely a sort of martyrs who had dared dissent from opinions prevalent where they were born, and had pluck enough to suffer for the faith that was in them. The former were not of this class; no Huguenots were allowed among them. The second lesson is that French colonization, even though it had been tolerant of Huguenots and had brought over a half a million of them, must have been a failure. It furnished no school of self-government like New England town-meetings, nothing analogous to the intellectual discipline afforded by Puritan common schools. Hence, at best, it could have developed only a lower type of civilization than that, formed at the East, which overflowed the Alleghenies and fertilized the West. Anglo-Saxon predominance in the great valley is a clear survival of the fittest.

Mr. Wallace's index of seventeen pages is not a mere list of names, but it explains in most cases what those names indicate. The title of his book is too long. Titles and epigraphs cannot be too short. His vocabulary inclines to be verbose and grandiose. His book would be more readable if various documents and statements were either greatly condensed or relegated to an appendix. He seems to know just enough French to misquote, for he

P

60005

the match, and tells the young man so, his reason being that he does not wish to have his daughter seem to inveigle the son of a wealthy man, his friend. He also objects to the young man's lack of a profession, and to his lack of character, shown by his having taken a fancy to several professions, including that of missionary, and having abandoned them all during the preparatory stage. At this point, the young man's father arrives in England from India, announces his intention to marry again soon, struggles with himself over the question whether he shall tell his reputed son that he is only an adopted child, and ends by deciding to transfer his dead wife's property to the young fellow, in accordance with her will, and not to reveal the secret. The reader is led to expect great results from this secret and from the father's struggles, but nothing whatever ensues. The young man follows the girl to Scotland, and, strong in the consciousness of an income, he urges his father to consent to his marriage. The girl's father suddenly changes his mind on the subject, and the girl's stepmother bestows the combined family blessing. The girl dons her best hat, allows herself to be wooed, though she cares no more than before for the man, and ends by refusing him before he asks her. Shortly afterwards, the young man is injured in an accident; she is sent for, retains sufficient vanity, in the midst of her new-born interest and anxiety, to get into her best raiment during her hurried journey to him, and betrays herself to him by taking from his finger a ring which has changed, in the course of a few pages, from one pearl to several emeralds. All this is done, in regulation stage fashion, while the young man is lying, as she thinks, at death's door.

This very slender and very commonplace tale is enlivened by the preternaturally wise chatter of the heroine's little step-brother, who worries over such questions as, "Has mankind any duties towards vermin?" and the like. There are also scraps of adult conversation, evidently culled, like the preceding, from the author's note-book, and woven into the story with more or less awkwardness. In fact, a desire to utilize the dregs of a note-book is responsible for the publication of this volume, which is, to use plain language, unmitigated trash.

The great emotion which between thirty and forty years ago tore the heart of the United States and culminated in civil war, flickers through the pages of 'Rachel Stanwood.' The author has a knowledge in detail of the methods of the abolitionists, and a sympathy with their cause, which are invaluable for a forceful translation of dead issues and past interests into the sphere of the living present; it is therefore to be regretted that this knowledge and sympathy is not supplemented by a literary skill which would fasten the attention of a generation born in tamer times. There is moral rectitude in the effort to describe impartially the three parties to the strife—the abolitionist, the Southern slaveholder with his Northern ally, and the trimmer—admirable in an avowed historian, but fatal to the novelist, who has to reach the intellect by way of the emotions. If Mrs. Stowe had been severely fair, 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' would not to-day count readers by the thousand in divers tongues. It is very hard to resuscitate a passion, and probably nothing short of genius could now give an adequate impression of the greatest historical example of enduring passion for the welfare of a servile race. Occasionally it throbs in Mrs. Morse's pages, yet the heat is lacking, and one must wish that she

could have let herself go more freely with the tide of her inclination and conviction.

FUNK'S STANDARD DICTIONARY.

A *Standard Dictionary* of the English Language. Prepared under the supervision of Isaac K. Funk, D.D., etc. In two volumes. Vol. I. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co. 1893.

GREAT prominence is given in the advertisements to claims for this dictionary of an enormous number of words ("Johnson, 45,000; Stormonth, 50,000; Worcester, 105,000; Webster (International), 125,000; Century, 225,000; Standard, nearly 300,000"), although the strenuous effort of the good lexicographer is to keep down his vocabulary. In an ordinary dictionary of reference, 25,000 words comprise all that anybody ever looks out. The rest is obstructive rubbish. Completeness is not to be thought of in any dictionary. Murray's Dictionary is probably the best that ever was made of any extensive language—better than Grimm, better than the Della Crusca, far better than the performance of Littré. He has had the services of some 1,500 readers. Yet his failure to include every vocable can be made apparent in half an hour by running over the pages of a few books of diction anyways marked in character and which are books Murray's readers may probably have passed by. The statement that Funk's Dictionary contains four words to every three in the Century, of however little consequence it might be, seemed to us, considering the process of manufacture of these compilations, to be sufficiently remarkable to be subjected to some control. We have therefore taken, in the Ds, Fs, Gs, and Hs, evenly distributed alphabetic intervals, amounting in the well-proportioned International Webster to the 150th part of the whole, and have counted the words (rejecting mere variations of spelling and other very slight differences) in both the Century and Funk. We find 1,207 in the former and 1,243 in the latter. This would make a total of 181,000 words in the Century and 186,000 in Funk, which we have no doubt is about the truth. Dr. Funk has inserted all the words in the Century Dictionary, with a very few omissions for which no reason is discernible, unless they were made because good manners prescribe that something shall be left. To these he has added, in the first place, a quantity of derivatives. Thus, the Century having cumbered its pages with *Graciliariidae*, Funk adds *graciliariid* (an individual of the family of *Graciliariidae*) and *graciliarioid* (like a *graciliariid*). The next successor in the business will add *graciliarioidally*. In the second place, Dr. Funk has added a number of compound words, mostly of a technological kind, such as *flock-cutter* (a machine for making flocks), *flock-duster* (a machine for cleansing flock by removing ordinary dust), and *flock-opener* (a machine for loosening out bunches of wool-dust, or other flock, in order that it may feed properly to paper that is being flocked). In the third place, in number equal to less than one-seventh of all his additions, are such as really seem to be of value, such as *dadny*, *fawn-color*, *gladshelm*.

One of the first questions to be asked concerning a dictionary is whether it is well proportioned in the sense of doing equal justice to different parts of the alphabet. Since it is useful for many purposes to have a ready means of dividing an English dictionary into approximately equal parts, we give the following table, showing the proportionate space occu-

pled by different letters in several dictionaries. (The unit is the space occupied by the mean of E, F, G, M, and R, which is estimated for the unfinished dictionaries.)

	Int. Webster.	Century.	Murray.	Funk.
A.....	1.40	1.28	0.81	1.03
B.....	1.25	1.06	1.02	1.22
C—Chl.....	0.99	1.01	1.00	1.08
Co—Cz.....	1.31	1.17	1.20	1.15
D.....	1.39	1.18	1.15
E.....	0.97	0.92	0.93
F.....	0.76	0.78	0.77
G.....	0.85	0.95	0.88
H.....	1.17	0.84	0.95
I, J.....	0.97	0.93	0.96
K, L.....	1.15	1.16	0.98
M.....	0.93	0.92
N, O.....	1.03	1.12
P—Pay.....	1.07	1.09
Pe—Quo.....	1.15	1.14
R.....	1.01	1.02
S—Shy.....	0.83	0.82
St—Spy.....	0.97	0.86
Sq—Sz.....	1.30	1.33
T, U, V.....	0.85	0.71
W, X, Y, Z.....	0.85	0.79

In almost all dictionaries the As are compiled on a different plan from the rest of the dictionary for are deliberately increased to make a show. In a thoroughly well-proportioned work, they would occupy a space not far from one unit. Murray's plan seems to have been somewhat expanded after the As appeared. It was between the publication of Murray's second part, concluding the As, and his third, that the 'Century Dictionary' was announced. In the Century and in the International the space occupied by the As is disproportionately great; in Funk's Dictionary it is grotesquely so. In those parts of the alphabet where the dictionary with longer explanations will be most nearly like the briefer work, as in *un*, *in*, *de*, *dis*, *con*, the relative space in the Century naturally sinks below that in Webster. In H, which abounds in words calling for long explanations (*hesid*, *held*, *hold*, *hang*, *hard*, *he*, *have*, *horse*, *house*, *heart*, etc.) the number for the Century is greater. Funk's Dictionary, owing to its way of packing derivatives and compounds, has proportions closely agreeing with those of the Century. Its As and Bs are disproportionate, owing to its drawing largely from Murray. In order to satisfy ourselves in regard to the causes of the discrepant numbers for A, we have made a careful examination of parts of the above-mentioned dictionaries, together with the Imperial and some others, in a dozen equally distributed alphabetic intervals in the As and Bs. It is upon this comparison that the above assertions rest.

Dr. Funk has a most imposing array of editors and contributors. March (consulting editor), Newcomb, Dr. Doremus, Max Müller, Titus M. Coan, Huxley, Alexander Graham Bell, Henry M. Stanley, Mark Harrington, Gill, Kunz, F. Horace Teall, Rossiter Johnson, Steinitz, Amelia Edwards, Edward Everett Hale, Edward Morse, Bjerregaard, H. B. Storror, Ray Lankester, Benson J. Lossing, William R. Harper, Harrison Gray Fiske, A. H. Sayce, George W. Smalley, Horace Furness, and many others make a wonderful mixture. But they could not, all of them, put a large part of their souls into pages crowded with

"daffodilly", daffadowndilly", daffodilly", daffodowndilly", daffydowndilly", and the like.

To test the definitions, let us select (without consulting either work beforehand) a dozen words in H, which it seems likely that persons such as would wish to possess a dictionary like this would wish to find definitions for; and for these let us compare Funk's definitions with Webster's:

(1.) *Harmony*. One of those enigmas with which Milton loved to empuzzle his readers. The two dictionaries give conflicting explanations.

(2.) *Hank*. "Humphrey had this double hank upon her inclinations" (Humphrey Clincker). Webster is slightly the better, and gives an appropriate example: "The devil bath got such a hank over him."

(3.) *Herry*. A common name in England for a cheap grade of playing-cards showing Henry VIII. on the wrappers. Omitted by both Funk and Webster.

(4.) *Half-sprit*. "She sailed with a half-sprit, like a yacht." (Defoe.) Neither work explains this.

(5.) *Haw*. What is the haw of a blood-hound? Neither dictionary tells.

(6.) *Headcheese*. Why is it called *cheese*? Neither informs us.

(7.) *Heavenstheism*. One of Major Powell's words, and a good one. Funk has it, the International not.

(8.) *Hector*. Defined by Funk as "A quarrelsome, domineering, threatening fellow"; by Webster as "A bully; a blustering, turbulent, insolent fellow." Neither explains this passage in *Ulysses*: "We had a great many hectors in the same box with us, and one, a very fine one, went into the pit and played his dog for a wager."

(9.) *Hegelianism* receives in Funk a correct explanation, but one perfectly unintelligible to anybody who does not understand the system. Webster attempts no such statement.

(10.) *Helicoid*. Funk defines it as "A surface generated by a line one end of which moves along an axis while the other end describes a spiral." Now, since some sort of spiral can be described on every ruled surface, the last clause is without effect, and the definer might as well have said, "A ruled surface containing a straight line not a generator." Webster's definition is, "A warped surface which may be generated by a straight line moving in such a manner that every point of the line shall have a uniform motion in the direction of another fixed straight line, and at the same time an angular motion about it." This covers the "developable helicoid," which the other definition (though otherwise far too wide) excludes.

(11.) *Hertstone*. "King John ordered Doncaster to be enclosed in hertstone and pale." (Southey.) Neither dictionary gives *hertstone*.

(12.) *Heterokinesy*. A term much used by Cudworth. In neither Funk nor Webster.

In arranging the various meanings of a word, for the purpose of definition, Dr. Funk adopts the plan of putting the most ordinary everyday meaning first. At first blush, this looks like good sense in the case of a one-volume dictionary, which can make no pretension to serving the turn of those who wish to study the language scientifically, or even that of those who wish to learn its niceties of expression. Besides, he who is considering what words really do mean becomes so tired of lexicographers' attempts to guess the meaning from the derivation—attempts due to their study of English literature not being sufficient to inform them how that primeval meaning may have become modified in centuries of

growth of associations—that he is disposed to welcome a rupture with etymology. But when he comes to see what Dr. Funk's rule leads to, he begins to think that, after all, there is some merit in definitions based on the very early history of words. The spelling in Funk is very nearly the same as that of the Century Dictionary. That the pronunciation is none too conservative is shown by the fact that no alternative is admitted to any of the following: abstract (adj.), adjectival, bombast, confessor, consistory, cony, cynosure (tonic sh), disinterested, (tonic), dynasty, exhalé (tonic), exile (tonic), extirpate, gas (tonic), housewife, imbecile, isolate (tonic).

A few little things that have struck our attention in looking over Dr. Funk's pages may be mentioned.

Burton, in the sense of *alc* ("I am more inclined to think strong beer of myself, cwrw, Burton, audit-ale, old October," Southey) is omitted by Murray, the Century, and all the dictionaries.

Guillaume. Funk does not puzzle us by calling it a *rabbit*, a *rebat*; but why talk of "joiners"? They are a kind of carpenters hardly known in the breadth of this country.

Diaria. Badly defined. It means pertaining to a diary, an old-fashioned kind of almanac.

Asses bridge. The figure of the 47th proposition is wrongly drawn.

Face of a polyhedron omitted.

Daddered, a second non-existing word introduced, from not understanding the first.

Blanch, the regular meaning in cookery not given, though right in Murray.

The omissions common to Funk and the Century are very curious unless causally connected. Such are, *dissuava* (a general, ditch-water (old wine), doublebob-major, doxoseopy, drop-handkerchief, dubitative (subs.), dudley-nose, dulling, dumrie, durgally, dupper, dyadison, and thousands more.

We should be glad to praise the typography of the Standard Dictionary, but there is no beauty in these pages, and the necessary condensation is extreme.

CABINET GOVERNMENT.—II.

Les Ministres dans les principaux pays d'Europe et d'Amérique. Par L. Dupriez. Professeur à l'Université de Louvain. Paris: J. Rothschild. 1893.

THE second volume of this book is devoted to the republics of the United States, France, and Switzerland. The account of the United States is of interest to an American chiefly as a test of the author's thoroughness and accuracy, and the test is borne extremely well. The usual preliminary and succinct review of the origin of our institutions precedes the actual analysis. The writer, like all foreigners, seems to derive satisfaction from pointing out ours as a peculiar and unique form of government, in that the members of the Cabinet are excluded from all access to the House, because the Constitution forbids them to be members of either house, although he remarks that in Prussia and in Switzerland the ministers have the right of entry into the chambers, while in the former they may not be and in the latter they cannot be members. Yet, like a staunch hound, he recovers the scent when later he says:

"Some years ago the proposition was made in the Federal Congress to permit the ministers to be admitted to speak before each of the two houses upon questions concerning their respective departments, without being able to take part in the debates upon general policy. But

all efforts in this direction have failed through the fear of Congress of seeing this reform menace its independence and considerably increase the force of executive authority."

In other words, this change, which requires only a vote of the two houses, and is immensely for the interest of the nation, is barred merely by the jealousy with which Congress guards its usurpation of all the power of the Government. M. Dupriez sees, further, that in this respect the fear is well grounded.

"The people are generally happy to see the President make a bold use of his right of veto. In the struggles between the executive power and Congress, the people have rarely sided with the latter. Elected by the people, the first magistrate of the republic exercises upon the popular mind the natural ascendancy which a living and acting personality has over the masses. They see in him their direct representative, and they applaud the man whom they have made what he is, when he shows the strength of his character and acts resolutely upon a well-considered plan. The chambers, on the other hand, have too often given to the nation occasion to distrust their conduct. Sometimes obedient to intrigues, at others carried away by passion to hasty decisions, they have shown in their actions an incoherence and a confusion of ideas which have struck the people. Then they appear to the people as an abstract quantity, and the latter do not know how to analyze the causes or to fix the responsibility of their decisions. The President has all the prestige of a king, while his popular origin preserves him from the distrust which is excited by every hereditary and irresponsible power."

M. Dupriez shows further that in financial as well as all other legislation the initiative is entirely in the hands of Congress, neither the President nor his cabinet having the power to submit a bill. All that the executive can do is to send a message or sort of political manifesto, which is only a declaration of opinion, apart from which he has only a veto, or the power of saying what shall not be done. The President and his cabinet can exercise no serious influence upon either the House of Representatives or the Senate—directly, that is, for M. Dupriez shows how this may be done by the use of offices and the operations of the lobby, the spoils system resting upon too solid a foundation to be permanently displaced while the present relation between the two branches exists.

As is natural, our author, while avoiding conclusions, evidently cannot understand how a country can get on with such a complete violation of all well-established principles of government; but, like them also, he is silenced by the splendid material achievements which have been accomplished. An American may suggest that these are owing to the character and political intelligence of the people, to the happy combination of the federal and local governments, and to the strength of trained universal suffrage; that the logic of principles is working itself out here as elsewhere; and that the false relation of executive and legislature is the most threatening danger which confronts not merely our Federal Government, but those of our States and cities. Even the success of our civil war, with the restoration of the Union and the abolition of slavery, which has led Europeans to look upon our institutions with wondering respect, can be shown, in the light of studies like those of M. Dupriez, to have resulted from the fact that Congress, which had blundered along fairly well through some decades of peace, in such an emergency practically abdicated its functions, and surrendered the Government, with the tacit consent of the people, to four years of despotism, precisely in the same way, though with very different circumstances and