This article was downloaded by: [ECU Libraries]

On: 24 April 2015, At: 02:19

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: 22 Mar 2013.

To cite this article: C. Field (1911) NOTES, *The Mariner's Mirror*, 1:8, 216-218, DOI: [10.1080/00253359.1911.10654525](https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1911.10654525)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1911.10654525>

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.

BRITISH ADMIRALS' FLAGS.

Lord Pembroke, who was superseded as Lord High Admiral on May 20th, 1702, by Prince George of Denmark, Prince Consort to Queen Anne, issued an order to the Navy Board on March 20th, 1702, distinguishing for the first time the flags of Vice- and Rear-Admirals of each squadron carried in their boats. The flags prescribed were as follows:—

Vice-Admiral of the Red ..	All red.
Rear-Admiral of the Red..	Red with a white ball.
Vice-Admiral of the White	The Union with a white ball.
Rear-Admiral of the White	The Union with two white balls.
Vice-Admiral of the Blue..	Blue with a white ball.
Rear-Admiral of the Blue..	Blue with two white balls.
	R. M. B.

AN AGE COMPETITION.

In this connection the name of H.M.S. *Victory* naturally occurs to one. It was, however, my intention in the Notes under this heading to attempt some record and comparison of the *working* lives of ships; and the carefully-preserved national relic in Portsmouth Harbour obviously belongs to a category somewhat apart. She was launched in 1765, and is now 146 years old. Another Trafalgar veteran, originally the *Duguay Trouin*, was built in 1793, and captured from the French shortly after that battle. She was renamed *Implacable*: in 1860 she became a training ship for boys, and, as the *Lion*, continued to be so employed until 1904. She is said to be still lying in the Hamoaze above Saltash Bridge. Her age is therefore 118, and she was in employment, if not latterly of a very active kind, for 111 years. The editor has kindly called my attention to the Navy "yachts" of the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th centuries, some of which remained afloat a long time. The *Mary*, built 1677, and rebuilt 1727, continued on the Navy List until 1816,—139 years, though it is to be borne in mind that the rebuilding was probably so thorough as to make practically a new ship of her in 1727. The *William and Mary*, built 1694, the *Medina*, built 1702, and the *Princess Augusta*, built 1710, were all in existence at the commencement of the 19th century; but again it is to be noted that the *William and Mary* appears to have been rebuilt in 1765 and the *Augusta* in 1770. I lately came across certain orders sent from the Admiralty to the *Mary*,

the *William and Mary*, the *Princess Augusta*, and other yachts between 1784 and 1793, when they were getting elderly, which seem to show that the old ships were then having rather an easy time. There are quite a dozen Admiralty Out Letters during those nine years—it was not worth while to pursue the point further—directing the three last-named yachts and the *Catherine* and *Royal Charlotte* to lend a specified number of men each to this or that man-of-war going round to Portsmouth or Plymouth. The address of the five yachts is always the same—Deptford. In March, 1791, the whole quintette are ordered out of the "bason" at Deptford to moorings in the river, pending the repair of the basin gates, and though once in June, 1787, the *Mary* is actually bidden to take in stores and get ready for sailing, the basin at Deptford was clearly their usual residence. I make this point as possibly relevant to the longevity of these craft. The *Catherine* was the oldest, having been built in 1674 and rebuilt in 1720, so that (subject to what has been said above as to rebuilding) she was 127 years old in September, 1801, when she was sold out of the service. The *William and Mary*, sold the same day, was only 20 years younger, taking 1694 as her date. For most of the above dates of building and rebuilding I am indebted to the tables in "British Yachts and Yachtsmen." A further list of aged merchantmen must stand over for another Note.—W. S.

The *Constance*, described on page 183, is rigged with gaff mainsail, square headed gaff topsail, square sail and raffe all in one piece, foresail, jib set on the bowsprit end, and flying jib set on a jibboom, the halyards of this last coming to the lower mast-head. She has a dolphin striker, and a boat in stern davits. Old-fashioned as this rig looks, it cannot be that which she had originally, for at the date of her building gaff topsails and flying jibs had not, as far as we know at present, been thought of.—A. H. M.

THE DOCKYARD MUSEUMS.

Attention has been called in *THE MARINER'S MIRROR* (p. 192) to the catalogue of the Museum in Portsmouth Dockyard. The arrangement of that museum has been for some years a labour of love to Mr. Frost, the secretary to the Admiral Superintendent, and his printed catalogue adds greatly to the value of the collection.

It may not be generally known that there is also a museum in the Dockyard at Chatham, in which there are many figure heads, and two important relics which are believed to be river

barges of Queen Elizabeth. I hope that now the Portsmouth museum has been so lovingly taken in hand, the Chatham Museum may also receive special attention, and, if possible, extension.—D. O.

MIZZEN.

In continuation of the Note at p. 183 above, the New English Dictionary gives both spellings, and does not decide which is preferable. The cognate forms it quotes are:—Ital., *mezzana*; Span., *mesana*; Portug., *mezena*; Dutch, *bezaan*; Germ., *bezan*; and very many English variants. It says also that the ancient French "*misaine*" is believed to be an adaptation of the Italian *mezzana*.

Curiously enough, the N.E.D., thought it notices that *mezzana* is the feminine of *mezzano*—middle, does not refer the derivation back to the Latin *medius*. Also it misses the original meaning of the term, that of a sail set in the middle line of the ship, i.e., a fore and aft sail.

DECKS AND THEIR DEFINITIONS.

In Marryat's "The King's Own," I notice the following passages:—

(1). "Captain M— leaped upon the *quarter-deck* hammocks of the frigate, holding with one hand by the *mizzen-topmast* backstay." (Chapter XVI.).

(2). "The sufferers as they came to hand, English or French, were carefully conveyed to the *half-decks* of the respective ships." (Chap. XVII.).

As to (1) I have always understood that in ships without a poop, the term *quarter deck* did not rightly include that part of the upper deck which lay abaft the mizzen mast. But obviously in this passage Marryat uses *quarter deck* with this extended meaning.

From (2) it is seen that the term *half deck* was being abused as early as 1830, in which year "The King's Own" was published.—S. G.

BROAD ARROW.

In Palliser's "Historic Devices, Badges and War Cries" (1870). I find the following:—"The pheon, or barbed fishing spear, was considered as a badge of Royalty as early as this reign (Richard I.), and under the denomination of 'Broad R.' (either a corruption of 'broad arrow' or an abbreviation of *Rex*) is the Royal mark affixed to the naval stores in the dockyard." I cannot say whether this is correct or not.—C. FIELD.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF 1719.

The establishment for the building and arming of men-of-war which was adopted in 1719 is generally decried, but it would probably puzzle most people to say exactly what changes that establishment introduced. In the South Kensington Museum there is exhibited a portfolio of drawings, lines and sail plans, of ships described as belonging to the period 1705-1720; and with them is shown the sheer draught of

a ship of 1717. The agreement is complete in every detail, so that it would probably be safer to describe the portfolio as, say, 1705-1719, in order to make it clear that it does not include the establishment. Recently, by the courtesy of a member of the society, I was able to compare with these drawings those of another man-of-war of later date, the exact date not being certain, but being believed to be about 1730. The changes introduced are so small that a casual observer might almost fail to notice them. They seem to be confined to the following points:—

In the later ship the "cheeks of the head," i.e., the horizontal brackets between which, in English ships, the hawse-holes were placed, are placed some 3ft. higher than in the earlier ships. In consequence the head rails are altered somewhat and are proportionately higher. Quite apart from the heavy appearance which the old form of head gave, the change must undoubtedly have brought greater comfort and convenience in a seaway.

In the later ship the spritsail topmast has given place to a short jib-boom, the length of the bowsprit remaining the same. As the spritsail-topsail could never be carried save with a free wind, and as, in spite of early prejudice against it, it must very soon have been found that the jib could be used on a wind, we would naturally expect to find this increase of head-sail accompanied by an increase of the gripe. We do accordingly find in the later ship that the bow has been drawn out an appreciable distance further forward. In the earlier ships the foremast was stepped exactly over the forefoot, but in the later ship it is some three or four feet abaft it. This change has not been made by placing the foremast further aft, but by lengthening the keel forward.

If there were other changes of external form made by the establishment, I have failed to notice them. The sail and rigging plans of the two dates agree to the smallest particular (save for the introduction of the jib-boom), and the hulls in all else appear to be identical. It would seem, therefore, that the chief effect of the 1719 establishment was that it fixed a scale of scantlings, where previously there was probably too much latitude. This table of scantlings has been preserved.—L. G. C. L.

THE FRENCH ENSIGN.

In a note on query 106 (p. 159 above), I wrote that, "the Bourbon ensign, of pure white, came to an end very shortly after the Toulon affair." It would have been truer to have said that the white ensign was officially superseded by the tricolour by the terms of a Decree of the National Assembly, on October 24th, 1790, but that the Royalists, who rose at Toulon in 1793, of course raised the white ensign. In 1790 the simple tricolour was established as the jack, the ensign being the tricolour with a blue and red border, counter-

changed, cantoned on a white field. Curiously enough, there seems to be some doubt as to whether the border of the canton in the ensign was separated from the colours of the canton by a fimbriation of white. The blazon mentions no fimbriation, and the drawing of the flag, published by the N.R.S. (*loc. cit.*) shows none; but de Bouillé, "Le Drapeau Français" p. 244, does show a fimbriation, which is indeed both heraldically necessary, and improves the appearance of the flag.—Ed.

XEPEC.

In reading Mr. Glanvill Corney's article on the Xebec, it has struck me that he would be interested to see Baugean's print of a "chébec arrivant au mouillage," in the last part of his "Recueil de Petites Marines," 1817.—W. B. W.

[The drawing referred to is very spirited; and in the same work there is at least one other plate of a lateen-rigged xebec. The same author, in his "Collection de toutes les espèces de bâtiments," 1814, shows also a Genoese square-rigged, polacca, xebec of 14 guns. Each of these works is in the British Museum. They are similar to, but more complete than Cooke's well-known "Shipping and Craft."—Ed.]

MUFTI.

"Olaf Hartelie" makes a slip on p. 142 of the May Number of the *MIRROR*.

I have referred to the N.E.D., and see that it gives the reference to "Peter Simple," Ch. XIV., not XV., and it will be found accordingly in Ch. XIV., about the middle.

But it is to be found much earlier, viz., in Ch. II., near the end.

It also occurs in Ch. XXXI. Curiously enough though, in Chs. II. and XIV., it is printed in ordinary type, and without explanation; in Ch. XXXI. it is printed in italics, "*mufti*, i.e., plain clothes." I always understood that the term was first given to the chaplains, and afterwards extended to plain clothes generally. It is used in infantry, but not in cavalry regiments, who always say "plain clothes."—C. S. H.

NAUTICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIAS.

A correspondent has called my attention to

the descriptions of nautical matters in Ephraim Chambers's *Cyclopædia* (1727, 1738, and many later editions), and has suggested that this work might perhaps have been given a place in the list of dictionaries and encyclopædias published in the March number (pp. 84 *et seq.* above). In preparing that list I had originally intended to include the more important of the general encyclopædias, but afterwards decided not to do so, both in order to save space, and because the compilations of that class issued in the 18th century seemed to be of no great technical value. Indeed it is perhaps not too much to say that until the 1797 edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, to which Professor John Robinson, who had served several years in the Navy, contributed the article on Seamanship, the custom seems to have been to assume that the men with the requisite technical knowledge had not enough literary skill to justify their inclusion among the contributors. After that date the fashion changed, and in the next edition the article on Shipbuilding was written by Augustin Creuze, of Portsmouth Dockyard while Capt. Basil Hall wrote an appendix to the seamanship article. Everyone knows how admirably this policy has been developed in recent editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

In the early 18th century, however, the nautical articles were obviously written "in the office," and were mere compilations from technical works of earlier date. The information given was therefore often obsolete; to quote one instance, the large illustration of the internal arrangements and rigging of a line of battleship which figure in Chambers represents in reality a ship of about 1700 or even earlier. French general encyclopædias of earlier date than the *Encyclopédie Méthodique* exhibit the same fault.

It was after such considerations as these that I wrote (p. 84 above): "General Encyclopædias such as John Harris's *Lexicon Technicum*, begun in 1704, and the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, first edition, 1771, are not included." Harris was the pioneer in that field of publication; Chambers was intermediate between him and the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

L. G. C. L.