

a point, that is precisely what  
 I maintain, It is truly a  
 ridiculous assumption that  
 some bodies behave like a  
 perfect gas during adiabatic  
 expansion, that is what I  
 have been saying over and  
 over again all along. I maintain  
 that the  $\frac{T-t}{T}$  rule only  
 applies in a very limited way  
 which I have strictly defined  
 in one of my letters to <sup>an</sup> ~~attendant~~  
 friend, that it can only  
 be applied with strict limitation  
 to a steam engine, all along  
 this line it seems to me that  
 we are properly agreed, but  
 point remains open. Is there  
 some indicated the proper  
 measure of the efficiency of a  
 steam engine? I say and here

I have not at all  
 any letter from  
 I had shown my  
 which I shall  
 publish when  
 translated, it is  
 all about  $\frac{T-t}{T}$

16/16

Oct 14<sup>th</sup> 89

My dear Sir,  
 I am glad to find  
 that your health is better,  
 Your letters, & you will  
 excuse me for saying so -  
 amuse me very much, the  
 curious persistence with  
 which you insist on the  
 accuracy of views which  
 I never doubted, is charming.  
 Of course there is no cycle  
 that is just what I have  
 indicated me, It is absolutely  
 true that there is a cycle of

repeatedly said

16/16

That in a commercial sense  
and for commercial purposes  
it is, but that for scientific  
purposes it is not, and I do  
not care to show whether it  
has invariably been used for 50  
years or not. For scientific purposes  
the proper standard is the  
amount of work done by the  
steam, in the engine, not the  
amount of indicated horse power.

For example I happen to have  
something to do with a triple  
expansion engine, owing to a  
defect in design that engine  
has a back pressure in the  
low pressure cylinder, 7<sup>th</sup> above

the condenser pressure. This  
of course is 2<sup>th</sup> and the cylinder  
pressure should not be more  
than 4<sup>th</sup>. You wanted 3<sup>th</sup> expansion  
a loss of 40 I.H.P. Now I  
know that if this be added  
to the actual indicated horse  
power the steam is really working  
very efficiently. The cylinder construction  
and loss by radiation is a very  
small and there is little or  
no room for improvement, but  
if I estimate the performance  
on the engine on the indicated  
horse power the steam is apparently  
working to a considerable disadvantage.  
Very few other days I was  
thinking on this very point to  
a professor of engineering in  
a midland city, and he  
said, "When you are estimating  
the economical efficiency of a

is the heat named — heat  
 rejected out, Dr. Rankine's coefficient  
 for commercial purposes as  
 I have said the only standard  
 of efficiency is indicated here  
 however. For scientific purposes  
 such for example as thermometry  
 heat or meter. The true  
 standard is based on the  
 total work done in the  
 engine by each pound of  
 steam. I do not care whether  
 others hold this view or not  
 I shall try and teach them  
 to hold it before I have  
 done.

Yours  
 16/16

John Fitzgerald

16/16

Steam engine you should carry  
 the diagram down to the  
 line of no pressure, if you  
 don't you can't get the true  
 work of the steam" that is  
 exactly my view, and I  
 have no doubt it will be  
 done if you think we  
 shall do it.

In any engine we have  
 two things to consider, first  
 the spring of the steam  
 secondly the percentage of  
 that <sup>spring</sup> which we get in  
 useful work. Unless you  
 know both we cannot know  
 many other things, the only  
 true standard of spring is