

about the hundredth time from his lips, that though he is glad to be able to state that the navy has not been tried for so many years, he is quite convinced that when it is again tried all its past performances will shrink into insignificance. Nor do your spirits rise as something equally flattering to the army falls on your ears. You feel, indeed, that it is rather hard that fashion and loyalty should impose upon you the penalty of over and over again hearing such ideas enunciated, in a peculiarly unattractive manner, at hours when you are supposed to be enjoying yourself. After a while Mr. Moneybags gets into the way of uttering his stale commonplaces with some degree of comfort to himself. His tongue learns to wag with comparative freedom. When he has arrived at this pitch of perfection he will, under the stimulating influence of good cheer, talk platitudes by the yard. There is reason to believe that he learns to consider himself quite an orator. But he seldom enunciates a new idea or puts an old idea into a new shape. He is content if he can elaborate into a dozen words what might be said in two, and if he can only keep himself on his feet and "going" for a certain time. His audience invariably humour him. They will cheerfully pretend that they are not bored by his performances, and they will cheer to the echo sentiments which they have heard time without number, and which they are persuaded, down in the recesses of their own minds, are so many pieces of tinsel. How it is that they so invite martyrdom is one of those mysteries which we cannot expect to solve.

But the oratory of Mr. Moneybags is not the only type of oratory which is seen in its glory after dinner. In the race for favour it is run very close by the oratory of Mr. Simper. Mr. Simper is a gentleman who suffers from chronic embarrassment, and is invariably labouring under what we may call an attack of humour. When he rises from his seat at the banquetting-table, he does so with an air which seems to say: "Prepare yourselves to be amused, for I am going to be very funny." He will, probably, begin by informing you that he is suffering from "nervousness." After that he will, in all likelihood, go on to give a short autobiography of himself. He may tell you that on such a day he asked a certain lady to be his wife, and she said "yes," or he may expatiate on the defects in his personal appearance which have prevented him from becoming a favourite with the fair sex, which sex he may then go on to satirise and compliment in a vein of gallantry peculiarly his own. Possibly, he will interlard his remarks with puns and jokelets of a daring character. The worst of the matter is that his points are never seen until it is too late for the appreciation of them to make itself properly felt, and he invariably resumes his seat in a state of collapse, feeling that he has made rather an ass of himself. Nevertheless, his friends are prepared to cheer him. When he comes near breaking down they applaud, encouragingly; and when the fancy they see "something" in what he is saying they make a great noise—proceedings flattering to their hearts, if not their heads. He may have to give way for Mr. Gush. Now, Mr. Gush desires to show the appreciation in which he holds his friend Noodle, so he launches into a panegyric, the purport of which is that his friend Noodle is a man who is much too good for this sublunary sphere. Every glowing adjective which he can lay his tongue to he applies to Noodle, and his hearers cheer sympathetically. But no one believes that Noodle deserves what is said of him. Least of all, does the oracular Mr. Gush. Yet no thought that the speaker is a hypocrite troubles either the speaker himself or his audience. They may return to their homes feeling that they have heard what they classically term "rot." Still, no exasperation is endured. They expect to hear "rot" when they go out to dinner, and might be disappointed if they did not. It has not yet, however, been explained why nonsense should invariably be inflicted upon the good people who desire to enjoy themselves in a jovial way.—*Liberal Review*.

## FACTS FOR VOLUNTEERS.

### No. II.

The term "regiment" was introduced in the English service in the sixteenth century—so that the use of the word by Shakespeare in King John, act ii, sc. 1, and Richard III, act v, sc. 3, is an anachronism. The strength of the regiments was various, some consisting of six companies, some eight, some twelve, and some of twenty; ten afterwards became the ordinary, and has remained thus. In the army sent to St. Quintin's in 1557 each troop was officered by a captain, and a lieutenant and a standard-bearer; each company by a captain, lieutenant and ensign. In the army which Charles I. raised to proceed against the Scotch, we find each troop consisting of a captain, lieutenant, coronet, three corporals, two trumpeters, one quarter-master, a *chirurgion* and eighty horsemen (Rushworth).

In Elizabeth's Irish army of 1588 we find the terms "Colonel-General," "Colonel" and "Lieutenant-Colonel," and judging from the rate of pay, the Colonel-General was of higher rank than the Captain-General. In France, infantry regiments were instituted in 1558; cavalry in 1635. The infantry officers were a Colonel-General, a Mestre de Camp and a Sergeant-Major, the first title was abolished and the Maitre de Camp became Colonel of the regiment; in the Cavalry the title of Maitre de Camp was retained by the

commander of the regiment. "The Spanish Colonells," says Sir Roger Williams, "are termed masters of the camp." As to the derivation of the word "Colonel," it is probably from the Spanish. It was at first *Coronell* and *Crownel*, and *Coronello* is still the Spanish for that rank. It has been derived from *Colonna*, a column, but this is doubtful—the root of the word is probably the Latin *Corona*, whence *Coronarius*.

In Ward's *Animadversions of Warre*, published 1639, is found the following:—"The office of a Colonell is very honourable and a place of great consequence in the army; wherefore he ought to bee a grave, experienced souldier, religious, wise, temperate and valiant. Hee that hath his commission first is to be accounted the eldest, and is to take place both in quarters, and in the march, according to the date of his commission. Hee hath under his command two special officers—his lieutenant-colonell and sergeant-major. His place in the battell is various, according as hee shall bee commanded by the generall, but most usuall he takes his place before the right wing of his owne regiment. Hee is to cause so many of his regiment as are to relieve the watch, morning and evening, to bee drawne in parade before the head of the quarters, where divine duties are to bee performed by the preacher amongst them. Every Sabbath day he is to have a sermon in his tent, forenoone and afternoone, and every officer of his regiment is to compell his souldiers that are freed from the guard to repaire thither, and that no sutler shall draw any beere in the time of divine service and sermon," etc. The pay of a colonel in 1583 was—"The colonel, being a nobleman, per day, £1."

The term Captain in the Middle Ages denoted the chief or head (*caput*) of a body of men; since the formation of regiments it has been used to specify the commander of a company of infantry or troop of cavalry. Until the reign of George I., each company had a colour as a distinguishing mark, and the captain had the privilege of having his arms displayed upon it. Ward says that "if a souldier transgresse, the captain ought not to beat him, but to send him to the provost-marshal, to have irons laid upon him; by beating of souldier, a world of hatred will be stirred up and private revenge; a captain ought to carry himselfe in such a way that his souldiers may both fear and love him; too much familiarity breeds contempt, and too sterne a carriage begets hatred."

The Ensign was the lowest commissioned officer, and was so-called from his bearing the ensign—similarly the cornet in the cavalry, from having charge of the cornet or standard. The Ensign was styled Ancient, probably from the French *enseigne*. In "Othello," act v, scene i., we see that *Iago* was "Othello's" ancient. An old writer says that "the honour and reputation, both of the captaine and souldiers depend upon the welfare of the colours, and contrarily, there can be no greater dishonour than to lose them. After any company is cashired (disbanded) if the ensigne hath behaved himselfe honourably, the captain ought to bestow the colours on him as a favour." The Sergeant is the chief of non-commissioned officers, and Sir James Turner, in 1672, says that a sergeant had power to correct soldiers with his halbert and sword and commit to prison any soldier.

The next in rank is the Corporal, or more properly *Caporal*, and comes from the Spanish or Italian—the caporal being the *cabo* or *capo de escadra*, or chief of his squad. Sir James Turner, in 1672, writes it "caporal." *Daniél* (*Mil. Fran.*, ii. 70) says these officers were styled *Caps d'Escadre* in the Ordonnances of François I., and in those of Henry II. *caporals*. Napoleon I. was called "Caporal la Violette" (the violet is or rather was the flower of the Bonapartes, having been adopted during his exile, for the reason that he was expected to return in spring with the violets). The Lance-corporal acts as corporal, but receives the pay of a private. The colours of infantry, often called ensigns, were square and larger than cavalry standards, and were fastened to a spear, as stated above; every company formerly had a stand of colours. Bulstrode (page 83) states that at Edgehill King Charles I.'s Royal Regiment of Foot Guards lost eleven of thirteen colours. At the formation of the standing army at the Restoration, twelve stands of colours were given to the Foot Guards by Royal warrant; afterwards twelve more were given, still in existence, and to these have been added six by Queen Victoria in 1854.

The romantic story that the Black Prince assumed, after the battle of Crecy, the plume of ostrich feathers worn by the King of Bohemia is fabulous, as the crest of the King of Bohemia was not three ostrich feathers, but was the wing of a vulture; it is also pretty clear, for various reasons, that the Black Prince did not kill the King of Bohemia. Further, plumes of feathers were not generally worn in helmets until the reign of Henry V. The form of plume now in use was adopted by Prince Henry, son of James I. Regarding the mottoes "Houmout" (High spirit) and "Ich Dien" (I serve), Mr. Planché says that they should be read: "I serve a high spirit." These mottoes were often used by the Black Prince as his signature, and one relic is still preserved in the Record office (being the only known specimen of his writing extant) signed "*De par, Houmout,—Ich Dene*." It is probable, according to Sir Harris Nicholas, that the feathers and mottoes were derived from the House of Hainault.

Geo. Rothwell.