This article was downloaded by: [New York University]

On: 18 April 2015, At: 08:42

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954

Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

The Mariner's Mirror

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rmir20>

NOTES

C. Field

Published online: 23 Sep 2014.

To cite this article: C. Field (1913) NOTES, *The Mariner's Mirror*, 3:11, 344-348, DOI: [10.1080/00253359.1913.11006040](https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1913.11006040)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1913.11006040>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is

expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

NOTES.

SHIP AND SHEEP.

C. S. H. in Answer 50, August, mentions the Elizabethan pronunciation of ship for sheep. This still holds in Sussex. A blacksmith being shown a ship's bell, and being asked to make a bracket for it to hang from, volunteered that it was "middling heavy for a ship," meaning sheep.—A. M.

[This pronunciation also holds in Romney Marsh.—ED.]

BOAT DAVITS.

In the note at p. 250, G. A. R. C. suggests that the tradition that the model of the *Centurion* at Greenwich was made from one of the old ship's davits must be abandoned "if it is an established truth that boat davits were not introduced till 1790." I believe that it is "an established truth" that boat davits, unless perhaps stern davits in small craft, were not introduced till about the date mentioned; but it does not seem necessary on that account to discredit the tradition. It is possible that the model might have been made from the *fish davit* of the ship, usually spoken of before the introduction of boat davits as *the davit*. This was a large baulk of timber which, when not in use, lay across the forecastle.—L. G. C. L.

BROUAGE GRAFFITI.

The lower of these scratched ships (p. 133, "M.M.," Vol. III.) seems to be a little more like a true picture than the "scots ship." That she is an ancestress of the *chassé-marée* seems to me unlikely, for she has a lateen mizen, sheeted to an outrigger, and the outline of a round Dutch built stern with its high, narrow poop, is clear enough. The projecting stem-head, too, is just like that of a buss or dogger. The buss would have no lateen mizen, or bowsprit, however, and the dogger would have no foremast, so it seems clear that she is a pink, a much more likely type of vessel to find its way to Brouage than either of the other two kinds of round-sterned, square-rigged, Dutch-built craft. Representations of

pinks being rare, it seems worth while to note this as one.—R. M. N.

SNOW.

The historical evolution of the snow mast appears to be held in the hands of Mr. Alan Moore, and I will only add that as far as I have been able to ascertain the chief reason for its adoption was to avoid two spars travelling on the same mast; the term trysail and trysail mast may have arisen from the obsolete term "To Try" for to "Lie to" in a gale when this storm sail would be set. There are several Nova Scotia ships with a spanker mast stepped abaft, the same as the old snow mast, but for the advantage of the smaller diameter of the spar.

Staysails, etc., were laced on rope stays with 15 thread ratline passed *against* the lay of the rope stay to keep it from jamming in the coutlines when hoisting and lowering.

Europe is tarred hemp and when old the shakings were valuable for oakum.—E. J. S.

THE TWO HARDENBROEKS.

In my note on "The Vicissitudes of Some Men-of-War" on pp. 249-250 of the "M. M." for 1911, I mentioned two Dutch ships named *Hardenbroek* as having been taken by the French in 1706 and 1709, and having eventually passed into Russian hands, but I was unable to be sure which *Hardenbroek* became the Russian *Viktorja* and which the *Esperans*. I have since found the dimensions of the ship taken in 1706 (*de Jonge*, vol. 3, p. 731); in English measure her length was 129 ft., beam 34.6 ft., and depth 13.5 ft. Now the *Viktorja* was 127.5 ft. long, on the gun-deck, 35.7 ft. broad outside the planking, and 14 ft. deep; while the *Esperans* was 127 ft. on the gun-deck, or 114 ft. on the keel, 33 ft. broad and 11.7 ft. deep. Probably therefore, it was the *Hardenbroek* taken in 1706 that became the *Viktorja*; the differences in dimensions are no more than might well result from two methods of measurement. We know definitely that the *Esperans* was originally called *Hardenbroek*, and that she was bought at Dunkirk

in 1712. The *Hardenbrock*, taken in 1709, was captured by Dunkirk privateers, so that this evidence also helps to the conclusion that the ship taken in 1706 became the *Viktoría*, and the ship taken in 1709 the *Esperans*.—R. C. A.

THE ADLER OF LUBECK.

The details which L. A. gives of the crew of this ship are very interesting, but he does not tell us whether they represented her official complement or merely the actual number of men on board on some particular occasion. If, as I suspect, the latter is the case, it may well be that at other times she carried the 1,050 of the account given to Mr. Nance and myself, in other words, that she was undermanned when carrying the 672 of this list. The French *Cordelière*, in 1512, carried 1,250; the Swedish *Stora Krafvel*, in 1535, had 1,300. The *Adler* was probably a bigger ship than the *Henri Grace d Dieu*, and she certainly carried more and heavier guns. Even by the standards of a much later age she was a very large ship, while at her date, hand to hand fighting, and therefore small arms, played a very important part in an action. The conditions of a century later had been altered so much by improvements in rig and the growth in importance of pure artillery fighting, that it is hardly worth while to compare ships of the two dates. However, the *Royal Sovereign* carried, according to Pepys' official list, 815 men (not 600), while the French *Soleil Royal* and *Royal Louis* carried 1,200 and 1,100 respectively. The *Zeven Provinciën* was, of course, a comparatively small ship, and Dutch crews were always smaller than those of ships of the same size in other fleets.—R. C. A.

FIGUREHEADS.

Referring to page 294, and the frontispiece of *THE MAKINER'S MIRROR* for October. Is it possible that the heads and bodies of the blue-jacket and marine at Sheerness, which are there described and illustrated, formed part of the figure-head of the *Victory* which she wore at Trafalgar? It would be very interesting if this should prove to be the case. From the statement that they "Capped the stern posts of the *Victory* they evidently have some traditional connection with that famous ship. I cannot give the reference, but I have seen it stated that at Trafalgar she had as figurehead "The

Royal Arms and Motto" with a blue jacket and a Royal marine as supporters, and that these supporters were later on altered to a pair of naked cherubs. Possibly the relics at Sheerness were removed at the time of this change. The model of the *Victory* which formed one of the attractions of the Naval Exhibition of 1891 had the original pattern with the seaman and marine supporters. As to the heads of the figures being moveable, I daresay that, upon investigation, it would be found that the heads of figureheads were not infrequently made of separate pieces of wood, not only for convenience in carving, but because that part of the figure was entrusted to a more accomplished workman or "artist" than those who were good enough to carry out the remainder of the work.—C. FIELD.

The old *Dædalus* was sold to ship-breakers a few years ago. She was for many years the R.N.R. drill ship at Bristol; her figure head was carefully preserved and though a fairly large sum was offered for it (I think by the city), it was refused. This was the ship from which the sea-serpent was seen.—W. H. W.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY BOWS.

The photographs of the Hampton Court and Hinchinbrooke paintings of the ships of James I., show that R. C. A. is right in making the "rounded back-head bulkhead" a common feature of the Jacobean ships, and not a peculiar Pett design. Except the *Benevolence*, all the ships seem to have it, and, unlike the Windsor Castle painting of which I wrote, these pictures show this rounded bulkhead as decked over. It is still, however, a "bulkhead" rather than a continuation of the "normal curve of the ships bow," I think; for the stern-head is below it, and it is a structure that could be added to such a ship as the *Benevolence*, or *Bonaventure*, as Mr. Anderson shows that she should be called. I am not satisfied that the course of development was, with 17th century bows, as R. C. A. suggests. I would rather take this rounded bulkhead as an excrescence (peculiar, as far as I know, to English ships and used in them only for a time) that was dropped even before the level of the bulk-head was raised. At all events it formed no part in the evolution

of Dutch bows, which followed much the same course of growth, and, by 1637, the print of the *Royal Sovereign* shows us that this rounded bulkhead had already grown high enough to reach the level of the forecastle and to be decked over with it; by which time, presumably, the straight bulkhead, behind it in the earlier *Prince*, had gone. The Trinity House picture and Charnock's print, are both, I think, inclined to give one the idea that the *Sovereign's* bulkhead was straight; but the perspective of Payne's print makes it clear that it was rounded like that of the *Prince*, and had an arched opening over the stem-head and the bowsprit. Closely connected with the presence of this bulkhead upon the beakhead is the fact that catheads were in English ships fixed high up on the forecastle and not on the bulk-head itself, as in Dutch ships through the 17th century. I still think that I am right in suggesting that this rounded bulkhead was the "prow," as I did in my answer to query 57, p. 223.—R. M. N.

THE BERGEN MODEL.

The little tail-piece of this model, introduced only as hinting at the possibility of large ships having been used in the Bergen stockfish trade, was made from a tracing of part of a woodcut in Eidem and Lütken's *Vor Somagts Historie*, p. 313, the left-out portions consisting of an impossible suit of sails, a figure-head and stern-davits that disfigured her. Possibly I should have been right in removing the foremost turret on the quarter gallery and the lower masts with their tops might have been retained, but the engraving itself is too small, and at the same time coarse, to allow of very critical examination.

The galleries are roofed in with a scale-patterned roof, the round ports of the upper tier seem to be wreathed, and between the ports below are lions' faces that one would have been less surprised to find on the port lids. Like most church-ships she has practically no underwater parts, and she is not built to any sort of scale, so that interesting as she is in other ways no measurements taken from her would be of any value.

Beneath the illustration is the title "*En hånseatisk Bergenfarer. Modellen hang i mange Aar i St. Mariæ Kirke i Bergen.*" The fact that Saint Mary's was the special church of the Hansa at

Bergen seems to make it probable that the ship was in some way connected with the League; but it is of course possible that she may have been, as R. C. A. suggests, with much reason, a Danish-Norwegian warship. There is always a doubt in my mind whether these ex-votos were in all cases models of actual ships, or simply "ships," made to order by professional modelists, perhaps, or even kept in stock by them, to be sold to pious merchants and sailors. They are so similar in their style, and their faults, that they must belong to a school of model-craft, one would think, and not be the individual attempts of sailors, although no two are exactly alike.

If she is still in existence, a photograph of her would be most interesting, there are so many things that one would like to see more of. Perhaps some member who has visited Bergen can tell us the latest news of this model.

In the same Danish book, on p. 311, is a half-tone reproduction of a print by K. Møller, of a great man-of-war of similar date to (c. 1610) and not unlike, the Bergen model.

Her very elaborate and carefully-drawn rigging follows very closely the engraving of a great ship of 1594, after Barentsen, with modifications that bring it up to date. This rigging is unfortunately the only part of the print that is clear, however, and although turrets on the quarter like those of the Bergen model can be made out, and it is almost possible to number her guns, it is only a vexation to attempt to trace the detail of her hull. I fancy I see a sun that may be the Stralsund emblem on her flags, but even these are blurred. The original print may be known to some of our members; if so, a large and clear photograph of it would, I am sure, be much appreciated by all students of old shipping, coming, as it does, between the before-mentioned Barentsen picture and those of the *Navire Regale* by Hondius and of the *Sovereign* by Payne.—R. M. N.

WILLIAM CANYNGES' SHIPS.

The list of shipping painted on the boards hung over the effigy of William Canynges the younger (1399-1474) in St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol, and printed by M. R. C. in the "M. M." for February, 1913 (p. 57) is a translation from the

Itineraria of William of Wyrcestre, the MS. of which is in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. William (Botoner) of Worcester was born in Bristol in 1415 and his *Itineraria* is "irregularly written on various papers folded and stitched together" (M. R. James, *Cat. MSS. Corp. Christ. Coll. Camb.*, pt. iii., p. 500, No. 210). The MS. has the unusual dimensions of 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ by 4 $\frac{1}{2}$, apparently for carrying in saddle-bags. It was printed in 1778 by James Nasmith, Fellow of the College. Canynges' fleet is given on p. 224 of the MS. and on p. 99 of Nasmith's edition. The list is of interest in that it records perhaps the largest mercantile fleet in point of total tonnage which had up to that day been owned by one man. It is valuable also in giving us an idea of the size of merchant ships of the first class at the close of the XV. century. Pryce, in *Memorials of the Canynges Family and their Times* (1854) points out (p. 97) that perhaps the *Kateryn de Bost* (Boston) did not belong to Canynges, but to John Burton, of Bristol, from the fact that Barrett, in his *Storie of Canynges* (a work I have not seen) alludes to this ship both as "of Boston" and "of Burton." This not very important doubt can hardly be cleared up at this distance of time. King Edward IV. visited Bristol, when Canynges was mayor for the fourth time, and during his stay inspected the shipping. The *Dictionary of National Biography* states that Canynges, who was also a cloth manufacturer, had a monopoly of the fish trade between Iceland, Finland and England, and that he competed with success against the Flemings for the Baltic trade. Ship owning seems to have been hereditary in the Canynges family, for William Canynges the elder and his son, John (father of William the younger) made complaint of the seizure of one of their ships in 1379, which was taken into Hartlepool during a voyage to Calais and Flanders (Surtees, *History of Durham*, III., 1823, p. 101); on this complaint King Richard II. directed a writ to Bishop Hatfield. We might know more of the Canynges ships had it not been for the accidental fire in 1466, which Pryce (*op. cit.*, p. 218) says destroyed almost all the archives of Bristol. Pryce also alludes to the doubts which have been raised as to whether such a large vessel as William Canynges the younger's *Mary and John*, of 900 tons,

could have got up to Bristol Quay in that day; and to the supposition (v. Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 170) that Canynges purchased some of his fleet from Hanseatics, Venetians, or Genoese. The *Itineraria* contains (p. 133 of MS. and p. 224 of Nasmith's edition) another list of ships besides that of Canynges, viz., *Naves Bristollicae pertinentes in anno Christi, 1480* (therefore just after Canynges' time) :—

Mary Grace. 300 *doliata*.

Le (a name apparently corrected, but illegible). 360 *doliata*.

Kateryn. 180.

George. 200 *doliata*.

Mary Bryd, 100 *dol*.

Christopher, 90 *dol*.

Mary Sherrman. 54 *doliat*.

Leonard, 50 *Tontygh*.

Mary of Bristowe (space) *lex* (an illegible word).

Le George qui quer Johannes 511 *tonne* (space) *navis, qui depositus est ad mare. Johannes Godeman habet navium* (space) *Thomas Straunge circiter xij*.

Some of this is unintelligible, for it happens that this list is one of the many portions of the MS. which are very difficult to read.

I have recently spent some time endeavouring to make out the doubtful passages, but cannot venture to suggest any alteration in Nasmith's text. A new edition of the *Itineraria* is much needed.

Nicholls and Taylor's *Bristol Past and Present*, 1882, has a chapter (Vol. II., p. 290) on the maritime history of the city, which gives the following craft from Rymer's *Foedera*, and other sources. *St. Anne of Bristowe*, *St. John of Bristowe*, *The Trinity of Bristowe*, *Catherine Sturmy*, *The Cogg Anne*.—H.H.B.

BELLYING OF XV. CENTURY SAILS.

References have been lately made in the "M. M." to the belling sails shown by artists of the 15th century, and Mr. Morton Nance, in his paper on p. 238 of the August number, again refers to this. It is a matter which has always puzzled me. If it has any semblance of truth the 15th century seamen could never sail "by the wind," or work to windward. But, surely, this was not so. Columbus, Cadamosto, Diego Cam, Bartholomew Diaz were all 15th century seamen. Could they have accomplished their wonderful voyages with vessels which—if we are to believe contemporary

artists—could not work to windward? For, most certainly, the vessels pictured for us could not do so.

The solution of the mystery seems to me to be that the painters of that century exaggerated.

Another thing is that perhaps nine-tenths of vessels pictured were, even up to the middle of the sixteenth century, drawn with the wind abaft the beam.

Now, speaking as a sailor, I am aware that no one can appreciate this matter in all its bearings unless he has had charge of square-rigged vessels with no steam power. I do not wish to appear dogmatic, but, as a sailor, I know this to be true. I do not believe that Columbus went along with a flowing sheet when close hauled.

By the time we reach the middle of the 16th century, enough pictorial examples can be found to show that sailors of that date boarded both tack and sheet when by the wind and did not ease off their topsail sheets as artists of the time would have us believe.

L. Arte Del Navegar (1554) shows us on the title a vessel close hauled, tacks and sheets boarded.

Bruegel (1564) gives, in his series, two vessels with tacks boarded, but with sheets flowing, these vessels must be at least seven points off the wind and, taking leeway into account, could not work to windward.

In his plate of various craft is a vessel with yards sharp up, but though the tacks are meant (?) to be boarded they are not so. Bruegel was not a sailor.

In *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* (1575) there is at least one vessel closed hauled, main tack and sheet boarded, yet fore tack flowing though sheet is aft (probably an engraver's error).

In Lant's funeral of Sir Philip Sidney (1586) the *Black Pynnes*, though not well drawn, has her main yard sharp up and no belly to topsail. But her fore-sail is shown trimmed to a quarterly wind (another engraver's error, probably).

In all this carelessness, or ignorance, there is one exception known to me, and only one. This is Ribero's *Mapa Mundi* of 1529.

Here it may perhaps be supposed that, drawn as it was for such a tremendously serious purpose (the dividing of the world between Spain and Portugal),

pains were taken to have things accurate. Be that as it may, the ships which embellish it are the only ones of that period known to me which to the trained eye of a sailor carry full conviction.

The ships are of the same rig as Columbus' *nave*, the *Santa Maria*, except that some of them carry fore topsails. There are nineteen vessels in all, depicted sailing in different parts of the seas. Only one of these has bellying sails, with flowing tacks and sheets in the case of the *mainsail* only, for her topsail sail is set flat though the sheets do not come home; no topsail sheets did in those days. She is running down to Saint Helena with a quarterly wind, having rounded the Cape, *Vengo de Maluco*. Between Saint Helena and Ascension a ship is shown with her tacks loused down, but sheets flowing; this seems to have been the custom with the wind a little abaft the beam, and is to a less extent the custom still. In the case of vessels of that date, the weather main lift was in these circumstances slacked and the yard allowed to cant down to windward to allow the tack of the sail to be brought right down to the ches-tree overside.

Vessels with the wind in all directions are shown, some with the wind dead aft, both main sheets hauled aft, and the mizen yard (*mezana*) right athwartships, some with wind quarterly, several close hauled all sails trimmed flat. As before said there is only one out of the nineteen with bellying sail such as mediæval artists have generally given us, and in her case it is only the *mainsail* which is set thus flowing.

The date of the map being 1529, and the rig being the same as that of Columbus' day, we may safely say that these ships represent those of the end of the 15th century, and yet we find artists for at least another 50 years giving us these balloon like sails. What is the truth of the matter? My own answer is that artists thought bellying sails more "artistic" in a picture and exaggerated on purpose, but that, in fact, the great seamen of those days were not such arrant lubbers as these artists would have us believe.

The quadrant and astrolabe on this map are also interesting; these are referred to in Vol. lxxvii. of the *Nautical Magazine*.—W. B. W.