The Lancashire Fusiliers, formerly the 20th Regiment, were nicknamed "Two Tens.

The Cheshire Regiment was styled the "Two Twos," because it was the 22nd.

The "Vein-Openers" was the suggestive title of the 29th, now the Worcestershire Regiment.

The "Virgin Mary's Guards" is a name for the 7th Dragoon Guards, which originated in the circumstance that in the reign of George II. they acted with the army of the Archduchess Marie of Austria.

"Wardour's Regiment" was the name of the 41st, now part of the Welsh Regiment.

"Warwickshire Lads" is an appropriate designation for the Warwickshire Regiment.

The Royal Marine Artillery are known as the "Water Gunners."

The Loyal North Lancashire Regiment includes the former 47th, known as "Wolfe's Own," in allusion to its services at Quebec.

"Yellow-banded Robbers" is a nickname for Prince Albert's Somersetshire Light Infantry.

The East Surrey Regiment has from the former 31st the name of "Young Buffs." George II. is said to have exclaimed at Dettingen, "Well done, old Buffs!" and when told that it was not the 3rd Foot, he replied, "Well done, young Buffs, then!"

The 7th Hussars have been known as "Young Eyes," but why is a mystery that Tommy Atkins has not revealed.

The present war in South Africa may not improbably add to the number and piquancy of regimental nicknames. The present rough catalogue may at least form the basis of an exhaustive list of these curious designations.

It will be seen that the army nicknames are of the most varied character. Some are more allusions, some territorial, some complimentary, and some are quite the reverse. Some are enigmatical, and have their origin in forgotten incidents; and if some of them are roughly satirical, there are but few that can be regarded as ill-natured or offensive. Each regiment has its own traditions, and if

PROPOSED ALTERATION IN THE RUSSIAN CALENDAR.—It is stated that the Russian Government are proposing to effect an alteration in their calendar, the dates in which, since the end of last February, have differed thirteen days from those of Western Europe and America. We are, however, told they do not propose to adopt the Gregorian reckoning, but to bring into use a scheme more simple and more accurate, and to invite other nations to accept this. It is then to be presumed that the plan in question is that of dropping a leap-year regularly each 128th year, which would keep the calendar right and in accordance with the true length of the tropical year for 80,000 years. Obviously this is far more simple than the Gregorian rule, which is this. Drop a leap-year in each year the number of which is divisible by 100, unless it is also divisible by 400. This would keep the calendar right for over 3,000 years; but if it were further modified by dropping a leap-year in each year the number which is divisible by 4,000, it would preserve the year in accordance with its true length for 100,000 years. So that the modified Gregorian rule, with an exception of an exception of an exception, would be scarcely more accurate than the above simple rule, according to which the next leap-year dropped, after the present one, would be 2028. To prove its accuracy, it is only necessary to point out that it implies having, in every period of 128 years, 97 common years of 305 days each, and 31 bissextile years of 366 days each. This makes in all 46,751 days in 128 years, or the average length of a year 365.24219 days, which differs only in the fifth decimal place from the true length of a tropical year.

But if the Russian Government conclude to adopt this mode of reckoning, it will still become a question when they will commence. When Pope Gregory XIII. reformatted the Julian calendar in 1582 (and his plan was followed in England in 1752), he carried the alteration back to the date of the Council of Nicaea, so
as to make the vernal equinox fall on the same day as it did then, and to do this it was necessary to strike ten days out of the calendar. The year 1600 was not a leap-year according to either system of reckoning; but as 1700 was not by the Gregorian rule and was by the Julian, when the former rule was adopted in England in 1752, eleven days had to be dropped. After 1800 (which was also a leap-year by the Julian rule and not by the Gregorian) the Russian calendar differed by twelve days from ours, and from this year (1900) it differs by thirteen unless a change is now effected.

W. T. LYNN.

Blackheath.

**First Edition of Molière.**—Of the first collected edition of Molière's 'Works' only two volumes are known, although it is generally supposed that at least five volumes were published. I have just purchased a first edition of 'Le Sicilien; ou, l'Amour Peintre,' 1663, and between the title-page and first page of the text is interleaved the following title-page:


As no other edition before 1673 contains more than two volumes, the above title-page must refer to the first collected edition of Molière.

Maurice Jonas.

**Theatrical Anecdote.**—The conflicting statements of history are well illustrated by the following anecdote as related by two reputable authorities, and worthy, I think, of a place in the pages of 'N. & Q.' In the 'Life of Fitz-Greene Halleck,' the American poet, written by James Grant Wilson, published by D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1869, pp. 366-7, we read:

"Another Kemble anecdote, which Halleck related to me with great gusto, was as follows, the *dramatis personae* being John Philip and Charles Kemble, and a son of the Emerald Isle; scene, Drury Lane Theatre, London. The gifted brothers sat late that night in the box, listening to a play written by the "divine William." In the course of the evening Charles Kemble said to his brother, 'I really think this is the best play for representation that Shakespeare ever wrote.' No sooner had he made this remark, than a huge and red-headed, broad-shouldered, bull-necked, ferocious-looking Irishman, who sat immediately behind him, leaned forward, and tapped him on the shoulder to secure his attention. 'I think, sir,' he observed, with a strong brogue, 'ye said it was one Shakespeare what wraught that play. It was not Shakespeare, sir, but my friend, Linnard McNally what wraught that play.' 'Oh, sir,' replied Charles Kemble, coolly, 'very well.' A short time after this the Irishman tapped him on the shoulder again. 'Do you believe, sir, that it was my friend Linnard McNally what wraught that play?' 'Oh yes, certainly, sir, if you say so,' was the peaceable reply. For a while the brothers remained unmolested; but at length Charles felt the heavy hand once more upon him. 'Your friend, what sits on your left side,' exclaimed the Irishman, 'don't look as if he believed it was my friend Linnard McNally what wraught that play.' This was too much for the Kembles; they rose and left the theatre together, not deeming it either pleasant or perfectly safe to remain in such belligerent society. Who the man was they never knew; but the friend whom he was so determined to pass off as the greatest dramatic genius of every age was an obscure writer of plays and songs, who is entitled to remembrance only as the author of "The Lass of Richmond Hill.""

Michael Kelly, in his 'Reminiscences,' published by Colburn in 1826, 2 vols., pp. 261-2, second volume, relates the anecdote, minus the many-adjetived Irishman, in this way:

"I went one day to dine with my witty countryman Curran, the Master of the Rolls, at his pretty place at Rathfarnham. Among his guests was Counsellor MacNally, the author of the opera of 'Robin Hood.' I passed a delightful day there. Many pleasant stories were told after dinner; amongst others, one of MacNally's, to prove the predilection which some of our countrymen formerly had, for getting into scrapes when they first arrived in London. The night his opera, 'Robin Hood,' was brought out at Covent Garden Theatre, a young Irish friend of his, on his first visit to London, was seated on the second seat in the front boxes; on the front row were two gentlemen, who at the close of the first act were saying how much they liked the opera, and that it did great credit to Mrs. Cowley, who wrote it. On hearing this, my Irish friend got up, and tapping one of them on the shoulder, said to him, 'Sir, you say this opera was written by Mrs. Cowley; now I say it was not. This opera was written by Leonard MacNally, Esq., Barrister at Law, of No. 5, Pump Court, in the Temple. Do you take my word for it, sir?' 'Most certainly, sir,' replied the astonished gentleman; and I feel much obliged for the information you have so positively given me.' 'Umph; very well,' said he, and sat down. At the end of the second act, he got up, and again accosted the same gentleman, saying, 'Sir, upon your honour as a gentleman, are you in your own mind perfectly satisfied that Leonard MacNally, Esq., Barrister at Law, of No. 5, Pump Court, in the Temple, has actually written this opera and not Mrs. Cowley?' 'Most perfectly persuaded of it, sir,' said the gentleman, bowing. 'Then, sir,' said the young Irishman, 'I wish you a good-night'; but just as he was leaving the box, he turned to the gentleman whom he had been addressing, and said, 'Pray, sir, permit me to ask, in your friend's name, whether that this opera was written by Mr. MacNally, Barrister at Law, of No. 5, Pump Court, in the Temple?' 'Decidedly, sir,' was the reply; 'we are both fully convinced of the correctness of your statement.' 'Oh, then, if that is the case, I have nothing more to say,' said the Hibernian, 'except that if you had not both assured me you were so, neither of you would be sitting quite so easy on your seats as you do now.' The Kembles, or perhaps Halleck, had a little animus in describing this character as