

FACTS FOR VOLUNTEERS.

I have collected a few notes on military titles and accoutrements, which may prove of interest. I shall give them alphabetically, commencing with the bayonet. This was an adaptation of the seventeenth century, being nothing more than a dagger. Ever since the invention of muskets, all sorts of contrivances had been proposed to defend the musketeer while loading. In the *Memoires of De Puységur* we find what is apparently the first recorded notice of the *military* bayonet; this was in the year 1647. I give his words: "It is true that the soldiers did not carry swords, but they had bayonettes with handles one foot long," &c. Puységur does not mention the bayonet as a novelty, and I find it described in Cotgrave's *Dictionary*, first published in 1611, and also in a French work, *Etudes de l'Artillerie*, dated 1660, though this last refers particularly to the use of the bayonet for hunting purposes. The common source of derivation for the word itself is from the city Bayonne, renowned for its iron works and cutlery; it is thus derived by *Ménage* in his *Dictionary* published in 1894, and Voltaire in his *Henriade* gives us the following couplet:—

"Cette arme, que jadis, pour depoupler la terre,
Dans Bayonne inventa la demon de la guerre."

But Cotgrave gives us *Bayonnier*, a cross-bow man, as also does Roquefort in his *Glossaire*. The word Bayonne is said to be a compound of two Basque words, *baia* and *ona* (good bay or port), which offers no explanation. The lexicographers appear to have been puzzled over it. A lower ridge or spur of the Montagne d'Arrhune, in the Pyrenees, is called "La Bayonette." A local tradition exists that at this spot was first extemporised the defence of the bayonet by some Basques, who, being attacked by Spaniards, and having exhausted their ammunition, thrust their long knives into the muzzles of their fire-arms, and by this means defeated their antagonists (see *Becherelle's Essays*, 1852). I might also mention that the ridge of *La Bayonnette* was stormed and carried by the Allies in 1813 before they gained the Arrhune. The most probable etymology of the word is from the city of Bayonne. One instance of the use or rather want of use of the bayonet occurred at the battle of Killiecrankie, where the impetuosity of the onset of the Highlanders rendered it impossible for their opponents to fix their bayonets in time—this was the immediate cause of the loss of the battle.

Canons, or guns—called cannon by the French, and "gonnes" by the English. The word cannon is from "*canna*," the tube by which Greekfire was directed; the word gun is from the ancient ballistic engine *mangona*, as the earliest guns, like the *mangona*, were employed to cast stones. The first authentic account of the use of ordnance by Christians was at Florence in 1326. Barbour, in his metrical *Life of Robert Bruce*, has the following couplet:—

"The tother crakis war of wer
That tha before herd nevir er."

If, as has been supposed by many "crakes of war" meant cannon, then the use of cannon by the English (as mentioned in documents) antedates the adoption by the French some eleven years—as the English account gives the date 1327, and the French, 1338. The first allusion to cannon by Froissart occurs in his account of the siege of Quesnoy by the French in 1340, and he appears to take it for granted that it was a thing well known. Edward III. employed cannon at Crecy in 1346, as we are told by Villani in his *Ist. Fiorentina*: Muratori xiii. Guns were at first constructed in shape like a mortar: the next change appears to have been to the cylindric form, and in the fourteenth century, guns were used to eject Greek fire. They were composed of two pieces detached, a breech or chamber and a chase: the charge was placed in the former, which was then grooved on the latter, which served to give direction to the shot: there were more chambers than chases, so that as soon as one had been discharged, another was ready to be affixed; by degrees these chambers came to be used as independent pieces. Such are the convenient little chamber-guns, which are now fired on grand occasions in the Park and elsewhere and give the same grandeur of sound as heavy ordnance. As guns became gradually larger and had to sustain the resistance of larger charges, it became necessary to re-inforce them; they were then formed of longitudinal bars of wrought-iron, arranged like the staves of a cask and hooped over with wrought-iron rings shrunk on hot upon the bars. The carriages of these guns were of the simplest description; they were wooden stocks or beds, generally scooped out of the solid block. Some of the guns were conveyed on trucks on two wheels; others, again, were fired from the ground, merely elevated on a block of wood. The heavier guns were embedded in solid blocks of oak, grooved for their reception with a loose block at the breech for the recoil; they had loose rings on the chase for lifting them. I might, if space permitted, trace the changes in the manufacture of guns down to the present time, but will proceed to give a few notes on carbines.

The carbine or carbine was a sort of arquebus: the origin of the term is involved in much obscurity. We find in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Wit Without Money*, act V., sc. 1:—

"Nay, I knew,
How'er he wheel'd about like a loose carbine
He would charge home at length, with a gentleman."

Carabins was the designation for a particular sort of light-horse in the French army, and we are told that the name first appeared in France in the reign of Henri III. (1576-89), and that it was derived from the Spaniards, who instituted this description of troops; so we are obliged to believe that the weapon carbine is named after the carabineer, though somewhat inconsistent with analogy. The distinctive feature of the carbine seems to have been its large bore. The following table will show the relative size of the carbine:—

	Length of barrel.	No. of bullets to the pound.
Musquet	4 feet	10
Harquebus	2½ feet	17
Carbine	2½ feet	24

According to Grose, "towards the latter end of the reign of King James II. the cavalry were armed with carbines which they fired on horseback." Harte claims for Gustavus Adolphus the merit of altering "the musquets of the cavalry to carbines." One regiment of British cavalry, the 6th Dragoon Guards, still retains the designation of "Carbiniers."

Cartridges, according to Sir James Turner (*Pallas Armata*), were first adopted in Germany. Writing in 1671 he says: "Let Patrons be made . . . thus he hath no more to do but to bite off a little of the paper of his patron and put his charge of powder and ball in at once and then ram both home." Lord Orrery says in 1677: "I am a great approver of boxes of cartridges; for then by biting off the bottom of the cartridges, you charge your musket for service with one ramming. I would have these cartridge boxes of tin, as the carbines use them, because they are not so apt to break as the wooden ones are, and do not in wet weather or lying in the tents, relax."

The spiritual wants of soldiers were better considered than their physical, and in the train of the ancient British armies we find a large attendance of chaplains. Henry V. took over with him to Harfleur an ecclesiastical staff composed of forty persons. In the army of St. Quintus the great officers had each in their suite a chaplain—the pay being the same as that of the ensign, surgeon, sergeant, drummer and fifer—viz., one shilling a day. Sir James Turner says: "The Preacher, be he Priest or minister, whether Lutheran, Reformed or Roman Catholic, his office is well enough known; there is much respect to be paid him, and the laws of war provide severe punishment to those who offer any injury or offence to his position or charge. His duty is to have *curas animarum*, the care of souls, and it is well if he meddle with no other business, but makes that only his care."

In my next I shall give a few notes on Colonels, Corporals, Colours, and the Feathers of the Prince of Wales. *George Rothwell.*

THE "CHURCH" IN THE "WORLD."

BY A WORLDLING.

To some it may seem somewhat startling to accept as a self-evident truism the fact that there is a "church" in the "world." Perhaps it is needful to define a little the terms used. The term "church" is applied to those who make a profession of religion, while the epithet "world" is descriptive of those who make no profession of any sectarian views—men who would themselves say that they think one world at a time is quite enough; who say that they are honestly studying out this world, and as yet have found no reliable information about the next. Such men feel they have plenty of means at their disposal to learn something of this world in which they find themselves, and have little doubt that if they are really destined to enter on another, they will do so endowed with similar faculties adapted to enable them to understand it also. They feel quite sure that to learn to understand and practise right principles, consistent with the laws of this natural world in which they are, cannot possibly be a bad preparation for any future career which may lie before them.

By the orthodox such men are denominated "rationalists"; but the name is used as a term of reproach. It has almost ceased to be so practically, because their number increases so rapidly, not only among those who eschew all church attendance, but amid those who still attend. Amid this latter class there are many who go to church because they look upon its services as phenomena of natural "worldly" life which they desire to study, in order to know and discern whence arises that halo of outward respectability which the process throws around them.

That this description is not altogether a myth will be really admitted even by the most orthodox of the various orthodox sects. If proof were needed, it will be found in the statistics placed before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in this city. It was there admitted that out of a nominal 400,000 adherents, of which 300,000 are conjectured to be over sixteen years of age, only 100,000, or one-third, are members of the Presbyterian Church. In so far as in the special sect mentioned, membership is not difficult of attainment, it is only fair to infer that other sects will show even a larger proportion of non-professing supporters.

It would seem, therefore, by no means an impertinent, but a pertinent question: Is there no "church" within those grown men and women, youths and maidens, who still belong of right and title to the so-called "world"?