

soon germinate by pushing out a small tube which perforates the epidermis and thus gains access to the interior of the leaf, where it branches copiously, and forms a mass of thread-like tissue called mycelium. The germ-tubes of sporidia are unable to enter the leaves, *i.e.*, of grass plants. In from six to ten days this mycelium gives rise to flask-shaped bodies called spermoconia (vol. ix. p. 831, fig. 2 B, *sp.*), immediately under the surface of the leaf (usually the upper one), but breaking through it at the neck of the flask, out of which there protrudes a bunch of hairs. Within the flasks are formed at the end of stalks many exceedingly small oval bodies called spermatia, which escape through the neck. The function of these bodies has not yet been definitely made out, but that they bear a very striking resemblance to the male sexual organs of other fungi there can be no doubt. In the same leaves and on the same mycelium there arise several days later numerous basin-shaped bodies containing erect stalks, bearing at the apex a number of round ascospores (reproductive bodies) in vertical series (vol. ix. p. 831, fig. 2 B, *a*). These constitute the second generation. On their escape they germinate by emitting a tube which, if the host on which they fall be a grass plant, enters the leaf through one of the stomata in the epidermis, and there by branching forms a new mycelium. On this there soon appears, bursting through the epidermis, a new generation consisting of round or oval uredospores produced at the end of stalks (vol. ix. p. 831, fig. 2 C). The uredospores constantly reproduce this generation, and in such abundance that the grain crops are extensively ravaged by its attack. It is in this generation that the term mildew is popularly given to the fungus. Later in autumn on the same mycelium the two-celled teliospores appear, and these after hibernating renew in spring the life-history. This very remarkable cycle of generations was first traced by Professor de Bary.

The *Hop-Mildew* (*Sphaerotheca Castagnei*, Lev., Order *Erysiphaceae*) is a parasitic disease of the hop, though it is often to be found on many other plants, such as *Potentilla*, *Spiraea*, *Epilobium*, balsams, cucumbers, dandelions, plantains, &c. The thread-like mycelium appears on the young shoots and leaves of the hop in white spots, which gradually extend and finally unite. This mycelium bears many minute, round conceptacles (perithecia) which with their supporting threads are brown-coloured. Within each perithecium is found a somewhat oval body termed an ascus, containing eight ascospores (reproductive bodies).

The *Vine-Mildew* (*Erysiphe Tuckeri*, Berk., Order *Erysiphaceae*) is known only in one generation—called the oidium stage. Soon after the flowering of the vine the attack takes place on the young leaves, from which the thin white mycelium spreads rapidly to the older leaves and twigs, which it does not appear to affect so injuriously. The chief damage is done to the grapes while they are in a very immature condition. The mycelium which travels over the surface sends down at intervals into the tissues short irregular protuberances called haustoria, which perform for it the functions of roots. Above these rise from the mycelium short stalks bearing each a single oval spore at the apex. The disease spreads on the same plant not only by the extension of the mycelium but by the scattering and germination of the spores. Here no perithecia are known.

The *Paper-Mildew* (*Ascotricha chartarum*, Berk., Order *Erysiphaceae*) grows on damp paper, and therefore is saprophytic in its mode of life. It consists at first of a branching filamentous mycelium on which minute globular spores occur. Finally a round brown perithecium is formed among the threads which appear as radiating from it. Within the perithecium are numerous linear asci containing each a row of dark elliptical ascospores.

For the *Erysiphaceae* generally see FUNGUS, vol. ix. p. 833.

MILETUS, an ancient city on the southern shore of the Latmic Gulf opposite the mouth of the Mæander. Before the Ionic migration it was inhabited by the Carians (*Iliad* ii. 876; Herod. i. 146); other authorities call the original people Leleges, who are always hard to distinguish from Carians. The Greek settlers from Pylus under Neleus massacred all the men in the city, and built for themselves a new city on the coast. It occupied a very favourable situation at the mouth of the rich valley of the Mæander, and was the natural outlet for the trade

of southern Phrygia (Hipponax, *Fr.* 45); it had four harbours, one of considerable size. Its power extended inland for some distance up the valley of the Mæander, and along the coast to the south, where it founded the city of Iasus. The trade with the Black Sea, however, was the greatest source of wealth to the Ionian cities. Miletus like the rest turned its attention chiefly to the north, and after a time it succeeded in almost monopolizing the traffic. Along the Hellespont, the Propontis, and the Black Sea coasts it founded more than sixty cities—among them Abydus, Cyzicus, Sinope, Dioscurias, Panticapeum, and Olbia. All these cities were founded before the middle of the 7th century; and before 500 B.C. Miletus was decidedly the greatest Greek city. During the time when the enterprise and energy of the seafaring population, the *davaðra*, raised Miletus to such power and wealth, nothing is known of its internal history. The analogy of all Greek cities, and some casual statements in later writers, suggest that the usual bloody struggles took place between the oligarchy and the democracy, and that tyrants sometimes raised themselves to supreme power in the city; but no details are known. Miletus was equally distinguished at this early time as a seat of literature. The Ionian epic and lyric poetry indeed had its home farther north; philosophy and history were more akin to the practical race of Miletus, and Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Hecataeus, all belonged to this city. The three Ionian cities of Caria—Miletus, Myus, and Priene—spoke a peculiar dialect of Ionic.¹

When the Mermaid kings raised Lydia to be a great military kingdom, Miletus was their strongest adversary. War was carried on for many years, till Alyattes concluded a peace with Thrasybulus, tyrant of Miletus; the Milesians afterwards seem to have peaceably acknowledged the rule of Croesus. On the Persian conquest Miletus passed under a new master; it headed the revolt of 500 B.C., and was taken by storm after the battle of Lade. Darius treated it with peculiar severity, massacred most of the inhabitants, transported the rest to Ampe at the mouth of the Tigris, and gave up the city to the Carians. Henceforth the history of Miletus has no special interest; it revived indeed when the Persians were expelled from the coast in 479 B.C., and was a town of commercial importance throughout the Græco-Roman period, when it shared in the general fortunes of the Ionian cities under the rule of Athenians, Persians, Macedonians, Pergamenians, and Romans in succession. Its harbours, once protected by Lade and the other Tragusæan islands, were gradually silted up by the Mæander, and Lade is now a hill some miles from the coast. Ephesus took its place as the great Ionian harbour in the Hellenistic and Roman times. It was the seat of a Christian bishopric, but its decay was sure, and its site is now a marsh.

See Schroeder, *Comment. de Reb. Miles.*; Soldan, *Rer. Miles. Comment.*; Rayet, *Milet et le Golfe Latmique*; Head, "Early Electrum Coins," in *Namism. Chron.*, vol. xvi.

MILFORD, a seaport, market-town, and contributory parliamentary borough (one of the Pembroke district) of Pembrokeshire, South Wales, is finely situated on the north side of Milford Haven, about 8 miles west-north-west of Pembroke. The land-locked estuary of Milford Haven stretches about 10 miles inland, with a

¹ The coinage of Miletus during this early period is an important subject on account of the wide commercial connexions of the city. The early electrum coinage belongs to the Phœnician or Græco-Asiatic standard, which was introduced from Phœnicia and spread over many of the Ionian and Thracian cities through the influence of Milesian trade. Very archaic coins of Miletus, Ephesus, Cyme, and Sardis are known of this standard, and at a somewhat later date of Chios, Samos, Clazomenæ, Lampæcus, Abydus, and Cyzicus. The lion is the regular Milesian type, often with a star beside or above him.

breadth of from 1 to 2 miles. In most places it has a depth of from 15 to 19 fathoms, and, as it is completely sheltered by hills, vessels can ride in it at anchor in all kinds of weather. The royal dockyard, founded at Milford in 1790, was removed in 1811, and from that time trade has been in a languishing condition. The town possesses iron-works. The shipping trade is confined chiefly to coasting vessels, but with the completion of new docks, capable of receiving vessels of the largest tonnage, it is supposed that a considerable trade may be carried on with America. The population of the urban sanitary district in 1871 was 3252, and in 1881 it was 3813.

MILFORD, a post-village of the United States, in Worcester county, Massachusetts, lies 34 miles south-west of Boston, at the junction of the Milford branch of the Boston and Albany Railroad with the Hopkinton, Milford, and Woonsocket Railroad. It is one of the principal seats of the boot manufacture in New England, and also produces large quantities of straw goods. The population was 9310 in 1880.

MILICZ, or MILITSCH, of Kremsier, Moravia, was the most influential among those preachers and writers in Moravia and Bohemia who during the 14th century paved the way for the reforming activity of Huss and through him for that of Luther. He was born about 1325, was already in holy orders in 1350, in 1360 was attached to the court of the emperor Charles IV., whom he accompanied into Germany in that year, and about the same time also held a canonry in the cathedral of Prague along with the dignity of archdeacon. About 1363 he resigned all his appointments that he might become a preacher pure and simple; he addressed scholars in Latin, and (an innovation) the laity in their native Czech, or in German, which he acquired for the purpose. The success of his labours in reclaiming the fallen made itself apparent in the reformation of a whole quarter of the city of Prague. As he dwelt more and more on ecclesiastical abuses and the corruption of the clergy, and viewed them in the light of Scripture, the conviction grew in his mind that the "abomination of desolation" was now seen in the temple of God, and that antichrist had come, and in 1367 he went to Rome (where Urban V. was expected from Avignon) to expound these views. He affixed to the gate of St Peter's a placard announcing his sermon, but before he could deliver it was thrown into prison by the Inquisition. Urban, however, on his arrival ordered his release, whereupon he returned to Prague, and from 1369 to 1372 preached daily in the Teyn Church there. In the latter year the clergy of the diocese complained of him to the papal court at Avignon, whither he was summoned in Lent 1374, and where he died before his case was decided. He was the author of a *Libellus de Antichristo*, written in prison at Rome, a series of *Postilles* and *Lectioes Quadragesimales* in Latin, and a similar series of *Postils* in Czech.

MILITARY FRONTIER (German, *Militärgrenze*; Slavonic, *Grunitsa*), a narrow strip of Austrian-Hungarian territory stretching along the borders of Turkey, which had for centuries a peculiar military organization, and from 1849 to 1873 constituted a crown-land. As a separate division of the monarchy it owed its existence to the necessity of maintaining during the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries a strong line of defence against the invasions of the Turks, and may be said to have had its origin with the establishment of the captaincy of Zengg by Matthias Corvinus and the introduction of Uskoks (fugitives from Turkey) into the Warasdin district by the emperor Ferdinand I. By the close of the 17th century there were three frontier "generalates"—Carlstadt, Warasdin, and Petrinia (the last also called the Banal). After the defeat of the Turkish power by Prince Eugene it was proposed to

abolish the military constitution of the frontier, but the change was successfully resisted by the inhabitants of the district; on the other hand, a new Slavonian frontier district was established in 1702, and Maria Theresa extended the organization to the march-lands of Transylvania (the Szekler frontier in 1764, the Wallachian in 1766).¹

As a reward for the service it rendered the Government in the suppression of the Hungarian insurrection in 1848, the Military Frontier was erected in 1849 into a crown-land, with a total area of 15,182 square miles, and a population of 1,220,503. In 1851 the Transylvanian portion (1177 square miles) was incorporated with the rest of Transylvania, and in 1871 effect was given to the imperial decree of 1869 by which the districts of the Warasdin regiments (St George and the Cross) and the towns of Zengg, Belovar, Ivanič, &c., were "provincialized" or incorporated with the Croatian-Slavonian crown-land. In 1872 the Banat regiments followed suit, and in 1873 the old military organization was abolished in all the rest of the frontier. Not till 1881, however, were the Croatian-Slavonian march-lands completely merged in the kingdoms to which they naturally belonged.

The social aspect of the military frontier régime is interesting. A communal system of land tenure natural to the old Slavonians was artificially kept in existence. The mark or plot of ground assigned to the original family of settlers remained the property of the family as such, and could not be portioned out among the several members. In this way the house-community, all under the rule of the same house-father and house-mother (who were not necessarily man and wife, nor the oldest members of the community), and all living within the same palisade, sometimes came to number two or three hundred persons. The "family" dined in a common hall, and after dinner discussed and settled matters affecting the common weal. Every man possessing real property in the country, and capable of bearing arms, was liable to military service from his twentieth year. The house-communities are now beginning to avail themselves of the permissive partition laws, and strangers are free to come and acquire property in land. Watch-towers with wooden clappers and the beacons which flashed the alarm along the whole frontier in a few hours are still features in the landscape.

MILITARY LAW consists of the statutes, rules of procedure, royal warrants, and orders and regulations which prescribe and enforce the public obligations of the officers, soldiers, and others made subject to its provisions. Its essential purpose is the maintenance of discipline; but it also includes the administrative government of the military forces of the state, more especially in the matters of enlistment, service, and billeting. The term "martial law" sometimes applied to it is, as regards modern times at least, a misnomer. For martial law as it is now understood applies not only to military persons but to the civil community, and may be described generally as the abrogation of ordinary law and the substitution for it of military force uncontrolled save by what, in the discretion of the commanding general, may be considered the necessity of the case.

The military law of England in early times existed, like the forces to which it applied, in a period of war only.

¹ By 1848 the following had come to be the division of the Military Frontier:—(1) *The Carlstadt (Carlowitz), Warasdin, and Banat Generalates*: the Licca Regiment (headquarters at Gospič), the Ottochaz Regiment (Ottochaz), the Ogulin (Ogulin), the Sluin (Carlstadt), the Cross (Belovar), the St George's (Belovar), the 1st Banal (Glinas), the 2d Banal (Petrinia). (2) *The Slavonian Generalate*: the Gradiska Regiment (Neu Gradiska), the Brood Regiment (Vinkovec), the Peterwardin (Mitrovic), the Tchaikist Battalion (Titel). (3) *The Banat Generalate*: the German Banat Regiment (Pancsova), the Wallachian Banat (Karansebes), the Illyrian Banat (Weiskirchen). (4) *The Transylvanian Generalate*: the Szekler Regiment No. 14 (Csik Szorede), the Szekler Regiment No. 15 (Kesseli Vasarhely), the Wallachian No. 16 (Orlath), the Wallachian No. 17 (Naszod). Twelve towns, known as "military communities" had communal constitutions not unlike those of the free towns of Hungary—Carlopolo, Zengg, Petrinia, Kostanica, Belovar, Ivanič, Brood, Peterwardin, Carlowitz, Semlin, Pancsova, and Weiskirchen.

Troops were raised for a particular service, and were disbanded upon the cessation of hostilities. The crown, of its mere prerogative, made laws known as Articles of War, for the government and discipline of the troops while thus embodied and serving. Except for the punishment of desertion, which offence was made a felony by statute in the reign of Henry VI., these ordinances or Articles of War remained almost the sole authority for the enforcement of discipline until 1689; when the first Mutiny Act was passed and the military forces of the crown were brought under the direct control of parliament. Even the Parliamentary forces in the time of Charles I. and Cromwell were governed, not by an Act of the legislature, but by articles of war similar to those issued by the king and authorized by an ordinance of the Lords and Commons, exercising in that respect the sovereign prerogative. This power of law-making by prerogative was, however, held to be applicable during a state of actual war only, and attempts to exercise it in time of peace were ineffectual. Subject to this limitation it existed for considerably more than a century after the passing of the first Mutiny Act. From 1689 to 1803, although in peace time the Mutiny Act was occasionally suffered to expire, a statutory power was given to the crown to make Articles of War to operate in the colonies and elsewhere beyond the seas in the same manner as those made by prerogative operated in time of war. In 1715, in consequence of the rebellion, this power was created in respect of the forces in the kingdom. But these enactments were apart from and in no respect affected the principle acknowledged all this time that the crown of its mere prerogative could make laws for the government of the army in foreign countries in time of war. The Mutiny Act of 1803 effected a great constitutional change in this respect: the power of the crown to make any Articles of War became altogether statutory, and the prerogative merged in the Act of Parliament. So matters remained till the year 1879, when the last Mutiny Act was passed and the last Articles of War were promulgated. The Mutiny Act legislated for offences in respect of which death or penal servitude could be awarded, and the Articles of War, while repeating those provisions of the Act, constituted the direct authority for dealing with offences for which imprisonment was the maximum punishment as well as with many matters relating to trial and procedure. The Act and the Articles were found not to harmonize in all respects. Their general arrangement was faulty, and their language sometimes obscure. In 1869 a royal commission recommended that both should be recast in a simple and intelligible shape. In 1878 a committee of the House of Commons endorsed this view and made certain recommendations as to the way in which the task should be performed. In 1879 the Government submitted to parliament and passed into law a measure consolidating in one Act both the Mutiny Act and the Articles of War, and amending their provisions in certain important respects. This measure was called the "Army Discipline and Regulation Act, 1879." After one or two years' experience of its working it also was found capable of improvement, and was in its turn superseded by the Army Act, 1881, which now forms the foundation and the main portion of the military law of England. It contains a proviso saving the right of the crown to make Articles of War, but in such a manner as to render the power in effect a nullity; for it enacts that no crime made punishable by the Act shall be otherwise punishable by such Articles. As the punishment of every conceivable offence is provided for by the Act, any Articles made thereunder can be no more than an empty formality having no practical effect. Thus the history of English military law up to 1879 may be divided into three periods, each having a distinct con-

stitutional aspect:—(1) that prior to 1689, when the army, being regarded as so many personal retainers of the sovereign rather than servants of the state, was mainly governed by the will of the sovereign; (2) that between 1689 and 1803, when the army, being recognized as a permanent force, was governed within the realm by statute and without it by the prerogative of the crown; and (3) that from 1803 to 1879, when it was governed either directly by statute or by the sovereign under an authority derived from and defined and limited by statute. Although in 1879 the power of making Articles of War became in effect altogether inoperative, the sovereign was empowered to make rules of procedure, having the force of law, which regulate the administration of the Act in many matters formerly dealt with by the Articles of War. These rules, however, must not be inconsistent with the provisions of the Army Act itself, and must be laid before parliament immediately after they are made. Thus in 1879 the government and discipline of the army became for the first time completely subject either to the direct action or the close supervision of parliament.

A further notable change took place at the same time. The Mutiny Act had been brought into force on each occasion for one year only, in compliance with the constitutional theory that the maintenance of a standing army in time of peace, unless with the consent of parliament, is against law. Each session therefore the text of the Act had to be passed through both Houses clause by clause and line by line. The Army Act, on the other hand, is a fixed permanent code. But constitutional traditions are fully respected by the insertion in it of a section providing that it shall come into force only by virtue of an annual Act of Parliament. This annual Act recites the illegality of a standing army in time of peace unless with the consent of parliament, and the necessity nevertheless of maintaining a certain number of land forces (exclusive of those serving in India) and a body of royal marine forces on shore, and of keeping them in exact discipline, and it brings into force the Army Act for one year.

Military law is thus chiefly to be found in the Army Act and the rules of procedure made thereunder, the Militia Act, 1882, the Reserve Forces Act, 1882, and the Volunteer Act, 1863, together with certain Acts relating to the yeomanry, and various royal warrants and regulations. The Army Act itself is, however, the chief authority. Although the complaint has been sometimes made, and not without a certain amount of reason, that it does not accomplish much that it might in point of brevity, simplicity, and clearness of expression, it is a very comprehensive piece of legislation, and shows some distinct improvements upon the old Mutiny Acts and Articles of War.

The persons subject to military law are the officers on the active list and the soldiers of the regular forces (including the royal marines), the permanent staff of the auxiliary (*i.e.*, the militia, volunteer, and yeomanry) forces, and the officers of the militia. The above persons are amenable to its provisions at all times except while embarked on board a commissioned ship of the royal navy, when they become subject to the Naval Discipline Act and certain orders in council made under its authority. Those who are subject to military law in certain circumstances only are—officers and men while serving in a force raised out of the United Kingdom and commanded by an officer of the regular forces; pensioners when employed in military service under the command of a regular officer; the non-commissioned officers and men of the militia, during training, when attached to the regulars or when permanently embodied; the officers of the yeomanry and the volunteers when in command of or attached to a body of men subject to military law, or when their corps is on actual military

service, or when ordered on duty with their own consent; the men of the yeomanry when they or their corps are being trained, when they are attached to or acting with the regular forces, when their corps is on actual military service, or when serving in aid of the civil power; the men of the volunteers when they are being trained with or are attached to any body of troops, or when their corps is on actual military service; the men of the army reserve and the militia reserve when called out for training or on duty in aid of the civil power; any person who in an official capacity equivalent to that of an officer accompanies a body of troops on active service beyond the seas; any person accompanying a force on active service holding a pass from the general entitling him to be treated on the footing of an officer. In this last category would of course be included newspaper correspondents, also sutlers and followers. In one or two cases persons are subjected to military law to a limited extent and in respect only of certain offences. Thus a militiaman even when not out for training or not embodied is liable to a military trial and punishment for fraudulent enlistment or making a false answer on attestation. In the same manner an army reserve man may be tried and punished by court martial for neglect to appear at the place where he is bound periodically to report himself, or for insubordination to his superiors on these occasions, or for any fraud in connexion with the receipt of his pay. A man of the army reserve or the militia reserve has the legal status of and in fact becomes a regular soldier when called out on occasions of national danger or emergency under the sovereign's proclamation.

When a person subject to military law commits an offence he is taken into military custody, which means either arrest in his own quarters or confinement. He must without unnecessary delay be brought before his commanding officer, who upon investigating the case may dismiss the charge if in his discretion he thinks it ought not to be proceeded with, or may take steps to bring the offender before a court martial. Where the offender is not an officer he may dispose of the case summarily, the limit of his power in this respect being seven days' imprisonment with hard labour, fines not exceeding 10s. for drunkenness, certain deductions from pay, confinement to barracks for twenty-eight days, this involving severe extra drills, deprivations, and other minor punishments. Where the offence is absence without leave for a period exceeding seven days, the commanding officer may award a day's imprisonment in respect of each day of such absence up to twenty-one. It is only in the case of the imprisonment exceeding seven days that the evidence before the commanding officer is taken on oath, and then only in the event of the accused so desiring it. The commanding officer is enjoined by regulation not to punish summarily the more serious kind of offences, but his legal jurisdiction in this respect is without limit as regards any soldier brought before him, and when he has dealt summarily with a case the accused is free from any other liability in respect of the offence thus disposed of. In any instance where the commanding officer has summarily awarded imprisonment, fine, or deduction from pay, the accused may claim a district court martial instead of submitting to the award.

Ordinary courts martial are of three kinds, *viz.*:—(1) a regimental court martial, usually convened and confirmed by the commanding officer of the regiment or detachment, presided over by an officer not under the rank of captain, composed of at least three officers of the regiment or detachment with not less than one year's service, and having a maximum power of punishment of forty-two days' imprisonment with hard labour; (2) a district court

martial, usually convened by the general of the district, consisting in the United Kingdom, India, Malta, and Gibraltar of not less than five and elsewhere of not less than three officers, each with two years' service or more, and having a maximum power of punishment of two years' imprisonment with hard labour; (3) a general court martial, the only tribunal having authority to try a commissioned officer, and with a power of punishment extending to death or penal servitude, for offences for which these penalties are authorized by statute; it consists of not less than nine officers in the United Kingdom, India, Malta, and Gibraltar and of five elsewhere, each of whom must have over three years' service, five being not under the rank of captain. There is another kind of tribunal incidental to service in the field, or where, in the case of an offence against the person or property of an inhabitant, an ordinary court martial cannot be held, namely, a field general court martial. This court may consist of three officers only, and it has the power of sentencing to death. Another kind of court, called a summary court martial, may be held where an offence has been committed upon active service and an ordinary court cannot be conveniently assembled. In the event of three officers not being available it may consist of two. When thus constituted it can award only a "summary punishment" or imprisonment; where it consists of three officers, however, it can sentence to death. In the case of a field general or a summary court martial many forms and precautions prescribed in the case of ordinary courts are not necessarily observed, the whole proceeding being from the necessity of the case a somewhat rough and ready means of dealing promptly with crime.

The Army Act prescribes the maximum punishment which may be inflicted in respect of each offence. That of death is incurred by various acts of treachery or cowardice before the enemy, or by when on active service interfering with or impeding authority, leaving without orders a guard or post, or when sentry sleeping or being drunk on a post, plundering or committing an offence against the person or property of an inhabitant, intentionally causing false alarms, or deserting. Whether upon active service or not, a soldier also becomes liable to the punishment of death *vis* mutinies or incites to or joins in or connives at a mutiny, who uses or offers violence to or defiantly disobeys the lawful command of his superior officer when in the execution of his office. Penal servitude is the maximum punishment for various acts and irregularities upon active service not distinctly of a treacherous or wilfully injurious character, for using or offering violence or insubordinate language to a superior, or disobeying a lawful command when upon active service. The same punishment is applicable when not upon active service to a second offence of desertion or fraudulent enlistment (*i.e.*, enlistment by one who already belongs to the service), certain embezzlements of public property, wilfully releasing without authority a prisoner or wilfully permitting a prisoner to escape, enlisting when previously discharged from the service with disgrace without disclosing the circumstances of such discharge, or any other offence which by the ordinary criminal law of England is punishable with penal servitude. Imprisonment with hard labour for two years is the maximum punishment for minor forms and degrees of those offences which if committed upon active service would involve death or penal servitude, such as using or offering violence or insubordinate language to a superior or disobeying a lawful command, and for the following offences:—resisting an escort, breaking out of barracks, neglect of orders, a first offence of desertion or attempted desertion or aiding or conniving at desertion, or of fraudulent enlistment, absence without leave, failure to appear at parade, going beyond prescribed bounds, absence from school, malingering or producing disease or infirmity, maiming with intent to render a soldier unfit for service, an act of a fraudulent nature, disgraceful conduct of a cruel, indecent, or unnatural kind, drunkenness, releasing a prisoner without proper authority or allowing him to escape, being concerned in the unreasonable detention of a person awaiting trial, escaping or attempting to escape from lawful custody, conniving at exorbitant exactions, making away with, losing by neglect, or wilfully injuring military clothing or equipments, ill-treating a horse used in the service, making false or fraudulent representations in public documents, making a wilfully false accusation against an officer or soldier, making a false confession of desertion or fraudulent enlistment, or a false statement in respect of the prolongation of furlough, misconduct as a witness before a court martial or contempt of such court, giving false evidence on oath, any offence specified in relation