

President Cleveland call an early session of the recently elected Congress, so that the expression of the popular will be formulated in a tariff act more or less *à la* McKinley? If there was reason for attributing the election of 1892 to a tariff-reform proclivity, is there not equal reason for ascribing the recent tidal wave to a protectionist reaction?

There were few, if any, Republican speakers who participated in the recent campaign, who were not closely identified with McKinleyism. Governor McKinley was greeted with the wildest enthusiasm, and repeatedly nominated for the Presidency at the meetings which he addressed in New York, as well as in other States. Mr. Harrison, who signed the McKinley bill, and who has since not wavered in his convictions of its merits, was also warmly received. If Mr. Reed was apologetic, we must remember that his Presidential bee cannot well hover around the McKinley hive.

You intimate in a recent editorial that it was apathy rather than changes in conviction, rebuke to party management rather than loss of faith in party policies, which led to the Republican defeat of 1892 and the Democratic rout of 1894. But if this is conclusive, which I question, it does not appear to be more available as an argument for one election than for another. Under our system of government we are obliged to assume that a majority of voters is competent to decide on all economic, political, and financial questions which may come before them, and that such majority knows what it wants. Should not, therefore, the wishes of an overwhelming majority be promptly complied with? C. A. W.

BALTIMORE, November 15, 1894.

[To another correspondent last week we expressed our belief that the Republican majority just elected to the House could not define its mandate. In fact, if ever there was an election in off years which was obscured by mixed issues, that of November 6 was emphatically one. The necessity North and South of getting rid of the Populist incubus, and again of suppressing Tammanyism, unquestionably overruled national considerations over a large tract. Democratic apathy and abstention, produced either by hatred of corruption or disgust with the mismanagement of the tariff, cannot be interpreted to the advantage of the opposite party as a mandate contrary to Democratic principles. The President, grown wiser since 1895, refused to vote for Hill or to utter a single word—even to "save the party"—that would contribute to his success. How absurd to suppose he was thus issuing a "mandate" against himself! He knows, and we all know, that his reelection was public approval of a tariff-reformer, and that while protectionist views were maintained and protectionist orators applauded in the late canvass, the undoing of the mutilated Wilson bill was not a favorite topic with these gentlemen. In fact, if we reasoned logically from Mr. Reed's argumentation, we should have to regard the election as a second whack at protection—for were we not told *ad nauseam* that the Democratic party stultified itself by passing a protectionist measure? Nor, to meet our correspondent's point about an early session,

must we forget that the election of 1892 was a mandate to Mr. Cleveland as the head of a victorious party, for whose fidelity to its principles he more than any one else was responsible. The mandate now, if there be one, may be to the new Congress, but Mr. Cleveland has no responsibility for the party consistency of that body.—ED. NATION.]

THE STRIKE AND THE VOTE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Do you not think that in estimating the reasons why so many Democratic voters stayed at home on the last election day, some weight should be given to the resentment felt by members of the labor-unions all over the country at the action of the President in sending the United States troops to Chicago during the Pullman strike? The feeling was and is very bitter. I have no means of measuring its strength, but from what I have heard said, I should consider it one element, and a very considerable one, in the West.

Good statesmanship is sometimes very poor politics in the narrow sense. Regular troops are especially hateful to our foreign voters.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES F. JOHNSON.

HARTFORD, CONN., Nov. 18, 1894.

HALLUCINATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Permit me, as the spokesman for a number of persons who carefully examined and rejected the evidence about phantasms of the dying presented in the book called 'Phantasms of the Living,' to say that we do not consider the new Census of Hallucinations as satisfactory, nor the conclusion from it legitimate; and that our objection is, to the committee's logic. It is true that for any ordinary case one might let the evidence go as sufficient, but, the conclusion being so revolutionary, in our opinion an exacter proof is necessary.

We object to your assumption that whoever rejects the reasoning of the committee is necessarily a positive disbeliever in the reality of the phantasms. I, for my part, in my attack on that book, fully admitted that it ought to be regarded as sufficient to silence any pooling of the belief in ghosts.

C. S. PEIRCE.

ANISEE, MILFORD, PA., November 13, 1894.

THE ORIGIN OF BAYOU.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The communication of Prof. Wyman in No. 1533 of the *Nation*, page 361, on "the American word *bayou*," seems open to the same criticism as the 'New English Dictionary' and the 'Century' but too often invite when they pass judgment upon a word without fully canvassing the authorities. The Indian origin of *bayou* has been known to the writer of this note for some ten years past, and probably to other students of American dialect as well. It seems strange that Prof. Wyman, while acquainted with the etymologies of Pascagoula, Pensacola, Apalachicola, given by Byington and others, should have failed to notice the following passage in the first volume of Dr. A. S. Gatschet's 'A Migration Legend of the Creek Indians' (Philadelphia, 1884):

"The full form of the tribal name (i. e., Bayougoula) is Bayuk-Okla, or river-tribe, creek, or bayou-people; the Cha'hta word for a smaller river, or river forming part of a delta, is *bayuk*, contr. *bok*, and occurs in Boguechito Bok'amma, etc." (p. 113).

It is in justice to my friend, the distinguished linguist of the Bureau of Ethnology, that I call attention to this, the first scientific statement of the etymology of this interesting American word. Prof. Wyman's independent solution of the etymological problem which the word has presented to many is heartily to be welcomed; but priority lies, I am fain to believe, with Dr. Gatschet. Prof. Hempl of the University of Michigan, to whom the writer of this note communicated his belief in the Indian origin of *bayou*, some time ago, is now engaged upon an investigation of the origin, history, and local distribution of the word, the results of which will no doubt soon be made public. A. F. CHAMBERLAIN.

CLARK UNIVERSITY, WORCESTER, MASS.,
November 16, 1894.

MODERN GREEK AND ITS PRONUNCIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Gennadios's article on "Teaching Greek as a Living Language" has drawn out three letters in the *Nation*. Mr. Alden, in his sympathetic letter, showed clearly that he had caught, to a remarkable degree, the true spirit of modern Greek and its relation to ancient Greek. I am sorry I cannot say the same for Mr. Lawton, for his letter is most unsympathetic; while the distinguished classical scholar, Prof. Goodwin, believes that the question of Greek pronunciation ought to be fought over, not in the columns of the *Nation*, but upon the ramparts of Constantinople between the Greeks and the Turks in a deadly combat. Blood, not ink, he declares, should decide the question. No one ever suspected so amiable a man of being so sanguinary.

Three elements constitute the modern Greek: the dialects, the common language (nicknamed *Romale*), and the literary one. The dialects are used only in their respective localities; the other two prevail all over Greece, now commingling, now struggling for supremacy, and all the time making faces at each other. The common language exists by reaction or rebellion against the slavery of grammar, and it will exist just so long as the literary one exists; if the literary one perishes, the common one will perish too, for want of having something to rebel against. It is well that it is so, for this rivalry has a salutary influence on both of them, since it restrains the one from reaching too high a style, the other from reaching too low. I dare say such is the case more or less with languages everywhere.

Mr. Lawton, in calling modern Greek patois, makes the same mistake all foreigners make when they visit the mother country whose language they have studied in cold type with the eye only, without having ever learned it by ear, and hear it spoken for the first time. The common language is genuine Greek or Hellenic only here and there—in forms and syntax—free from the thralldom of grammar. The Greek detests the stiffness of formality in dress and in speech, and for this reason, when he retires to the privacy of his home, he gladly lays aside cuffs, collars, and frills, and in chatting with his family and friends he suits his speech to his dress by discarding, metaphorically speaking, the grammatical cuffs, collars, and frills from many words and phrases. This