

with too many Ships, and their Van with too few. How consistent this is with the other Position, viz. That the Admiral after having retired out of the Line, to avoid being run foul of by the *Marlborough*, instead of advancing towards the Van of the Enemy (as he did in order to engage the *Hercules*, which was the Ship then ahead of the *Real*) ought to have returned to the Engagement of the *Real* in the Rear, I will leave to the Gentlemen who composed the Court Martial to reconsider, tho' their present Consideration can make very little amends to the unfortunate Admiral. Nor will it be any excuse to say, that the *Marlborough* being unassisted by the Ships astern, Mr. *M——ws*, ought in Consideration of their Default, to have returned to the Engagement of the *Real*, for if he could have seen, or had been informed of their Misbehaviour, this surely was not the Method to have been taken. No. The Admiral ought in such Case to have appointed other Commanders of those Ships. But was I to make Observations of this Sort, or Comparisons of the Disagreement of one Resolution with an another, a Volume would scarce suffice. How surprising so ever this may be in Matters of mere Judgment, something more strange still remains. For in Matters of Fact, one finds the Fact stated in one Resolution entirely different from what it is in another, and that too in very material Points. For Instance,

3d Resolution on the 13th Article says,

Resolved unanimously, that it has appeared to the Court, that the Vice-Admiral and his Division did Chace the Enemy on the 15th of *February* in the Morning, in Consequence of a Signal from the Admiral.

This