This article was downloaded by: [ECU Libraries]

On: 19 April 2015, At: 11:06

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

Geoffrey Callender & Geoffrey Robinson

Published online: 22 Mar 2013.

To cite this article: Geoffrey Callender & Geoffrey Robinson (1912) NOTES, The Mariner's Mirror, 2:12, 378-381, DOI: [10.1080/00253359.1912.10654653](https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1912.10654653)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1912.10654653>

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.

PRIVATEERS.

If H. S. V. consults Hutchinson he will find that successful privateers had a good deal of discipline. Hutchinson was brought up in a good school, having sailed with the celebrated *Fortunatus* Wright.—W. B. W.

THE XEBEC.

Mr. Glanvill Corney gave us on pp. 173-7 of the *MARINER'S MIRROR* for 1911 descriptions of various types of vessels known by the name "Xebec," or one of its variants. The accompanying drawings show two types of Russian "shebeks," eight of which were built at St. Petersburg in 1788. These ships were for the most part 120 ft. by 30 ft. and carried 20 to 24 carriage guns and 12 to 26 swivels. They had 40 oars. As

or panorama. Permission being obtained from Bodley's Trustees, the original was sent from Oxford, and deposited in the Print Room of the British Museum. Here photographs were taken, and from them the *facsimile* was prepared by the *Typographic Etching Company*. The reproduction was issued in seven sheets [31in. by 23in.], the impression measuring about 21in. by 17in.] Sheets 5, 6 and 7 were first issued and later sheets 1 to 4.

In 1908 Messrs. A. and C. Black printed and published an atlas entitled *Maps of Old London*. The Editor, Mr. G. E. Mitton, in his Introductory Note, writes: "Up to a recent date the maps here represented had not been reproduced in any form, and the originals were beyond the reach of all but the few. The

far as armament went they were equivalent to the "rowing-frigates" and "secret boats" of the same period. The drawings are copied from two reproductions in a book published in 1907 on the life and death of Captain Saken, a hero of the Russian Navy, who died in action in 1788. They are said to be taken "from the album of P. Dashkov." The inscriptions are in French and read in each case, "Un Chebeke Russe." Possibly the left-hand ship would be more properly called a "Rowing Frigate."—R. C. A.

WYNGAERDE'S MAP.

It was in 1881 that the *Topographical Society of London* reproduced in *facsimile* Antony van den Wyngaerde's view-map

London Topographical Society has done admirable work in hunting out and publishing most of them; but these reproductions are, as nearly as possible, *facsimiles* of the originals as regards size, as well as everything else. It is not every one who can afford to belong to the Society, or who wishes to handle the maps in large sheets. In the present form they are brought within such handy compass that they will form a useful reference-book, even to those who already own the large-scale ones, and, to the many who do not, they will be invaluable."

Turning from the introduction to the maps themselves, the reader comes first to Wyngaerde's panorama. Mr. Mitton gives the following note, "The present reproduction is from that made by the

London Topographical Society, which photographed the original. It is reduced, and is here placed in three sections, which overlap for convenience in handling."

Nothing certainly could be clearer or more explicit.

When I wrote my article on Wyn-gaerde for the "M. M." in July last I was unable to procure the photographic *facsimiles* prepared by the *Topographical Society of London*. I therefore fell back upon Messrs. A. and C. Black's Atlas, confidently trusting the explicit statement quoted above. Since then, by the kindness of Mr. Langton Cole, F.R.I.B.A., I have obtained the actual and genuine *facsimiles*, and regret to state that Messrs. A. and C. Black's reproduction is not what it claims to be. It is assuredly not a reproduction of Whittock's tracings, copies of which may be found in the British Museum and in the Guildhall Library. But most certainly it is not a reproduction of the genuine Wyngaerde, the treasure in the Bodleian at Oxford.

Of Whittock, who executed the tracings, I can discover little or nothing. He is not mentioned in the D.N.B., or in any of my lists of engravers. Mr. Langton Cole gives the date of his work as about 1830. I have not had occasion as yet to compare his tracings with the *facsimiles* in order to test the fidelity of his rendering. But this much is certain, that in addition to his tracings of Wyngaerde he drew a Panorama of his own, and had it engraved. In this brilliant effort he followed the Fleming with zealous care so long as Wyngaerde's detail sufficed. But where Wyngaerde himself grew vague or introduced some charming Surrey-side farmhouse with fine sweeping lines, Whittock substituted new material such as the Abbey of Bermondsey, which does not occur at all in the original. It must be admitted that he did his work most admirably, and it seems certain that all his "working-up" was based upon real research. His "Abbey of Bermondsey" was drawn from an original in the collection of Mr. Upcott [1779-1845] and his other additions were probably derived from equally good material. Many of them conceivably may have been drawn from Wyngaerde's elevations of separate buildings which are also to be seen in the Bodleian. But when every tribute has been paid to Whittock's meticulous industry, and his consuming zeal in a good cause, it must be admitted

that his work is a stumbling block to archaeologists. It is not contemporary, and its evidence, therefore, if not worthless, is likely to be misleading.

It is this reconstruction of Whittock's that Messrs. A. and C. Black have reproduced in their atlas of Old London. It is this reconstruction of Whittock that Mr. G. E. Mitton wrongly describes as made from the *facsimile* of the London Topographical Society. How the mistake occurred I cannot guess, nor do I know whether it has ever been challenged. But it seems to me an error of a very serious kind in an age when photography is so extensively employed in diffusing knowledge of ancient manuscripts. GEOFFREY CALENDER.

PURCHASE IN THE NAVY.

The following passage from "Rattlin the Reefer," Chapter XXXIII., may be thought worth quoting: "Some of them (the officers) had even exchanged into the ship, for certain unlawful considerations, because she was so fine a frigate, and the captain possessed so much interest, being a very near and dear relation of the then treasurer of the navy. With this interest they thought, of course, that he would have the selection of his own station."

The "unlawful considerations" can only mean something approaching purchase; not purchase of promotion, but of an appointment. It is probably not to be supposed that Howard would have introduced such an incident had not the practice been sufficiently familiar to the men of his time. If it existed as a recognised, though illicit, custom of the service, it would appear at least to have left very little trace; a thing perhaps hardly to be wondered at.—G.C.

STEM ROPES.

Mr. Brindley is, I think, quite right when he suggests that D'Arcy Lever (1819) is too late to quote (Vol. I., p. 120) as evidence on mediæval matters, but perhaps I may be permitted to say that an Egyptian ship of 1250 B.C. is a little early (Vol. II., p. 50). My reason for giving the instance in Lever was that it so closely resembled the "stem ropes" of an earlier date, in that they passed round under the stem and not through it, as they appeared to do for about 150 years. As a matter of fact the gammoning remained constant in position; the

cut-water enclosed it. Through the kindness of Mr. R. C. Anderson, I am able to show an example of gammoning of the early seventeenth century, before the introduction of the cut-water (Fig. 1). The sketch is from a photograph of a picture belonging to the Earl of Sandwich, a contemporary painting representing the *Royal Prince* which was built in 1610. It is obvious that here is a fitting of no young growth. In my own mind I have never doubted that long before the seventeenth century, the bowsprit must have had a stout gammoning, but had no reliable evidence as to how it was fitted until I saw this photograph. Big bowsprits were in use (I suppose) at the end of the fifteenth century—I seem to remember in the Rous MS. at the British Museum a ship with a pretty healthy spar. Before that date, the marine artist perhaps

staging assisted the natural tendency of a ship to hog there is no doubt, though it is difficult to see how the stem ropes of the mediæval artist could correct it. Hogging is caused by the upward pressure of the water at the centre of the ship being greater than at the ends, so that the centre of the ship is forced upwards, and the ends fall. The true remedy then would seem to be the strengthening of the ship longitudinally.

In a previous communication on this subject I apologised for the introduction of the word "gammoning" into the discussion, as being somewhat suggestive of the word "gammon." The editor, in a laudable effort to preserve the high standard of humour which the Journal has always maintained, omitted the sentence. Perhaps it will now be admitted when advanced seriously and without

found a big bowsprit an awkward thing to deal with on a seal or a coin. A big bowsprit must have had some sort of seizing to something substantial, and the most natural thing would be the stem and the knee which supported the head or forestage, for you would hardly put the strain on to the staging itself. I'm afraid we shall never know what the designer of the Golden Noble of Edward III. had in mind when he drew those stem ropes—not with any certainty, but perhaps it will be admitted that this note brings the gammoning theory "into the picture." R.M.N.'s suggestion of the forestay (should it not be the mainstay?) seems sound enough. The mainstay must have had a fine holding somewhere, but I should think it would have found it more conveniently at the stemhead. That the addition of the fore and after

apology: for I find that *gammon* is a good Anglo-Saxon word meaning false, and that the French for the outer gammoning is, *la fausse liure*. The Italians use the word *legatura*, meaning, I believe, a tie, a binding—not very far removed from seizing. Is it not possible that the "bow seizings" of early Tudor days were the gammonings? It seems to me, at any rate, preferable to their identification with a fitting, the existence of which depends only on a doubtful interpretation, the evidence of the seal makers and coin-makers of the Middle Ages.—GREGORY ROBINSON.

TORPEDO ATTACKS.

I fancy the torpedoing of the Turkish cruiser, *Hamidieh*, by Bulgarian torpedo boats, on November 21st, was the first case of a successful torpedo attack on a

ship under way, without previous assistance from gun-fire. I have not seen this mentioned, but if it is so, it ought to be put on record as marking the attainment of a long-sought goal.—F. K. I.

ROUND BOWS.

The round bow was, as we know, introduced in English ships about 1810. According to Fincham, "the *Namur*, which was cut down in 1804, was the first ship that had the round bow left on, but it was several years afterwards that the improvement was applied to new ships." The *Namur* was a 90-gun three-decker, built in 1756, and became, after cutting down, a 74-gun ship. As a three-decker she would, of course, have had the square forward bulkhead on the upper deck only, her middle deck, which then became the upper deck, would be naturally round-ended in the bows.

Now Venetian ships of the latter half of the eighteenth century had complete round bows, a fashion adopted in all probability from the galeass. These round bows are shown in a number of models in the Arsenal at Venice. The Venetian ship, *Vulcano* 64, taken by the French in 1797, and re-named *Causse*, was captured by the English at Alexandria in 1801; she was not thought worth keeping, but it may well be that the construction of her bow pointed the way for the improvement in English ships. Curiously enough the only model in the Arsenal of a ship of the period of the French domination at Venice, the *Cesare* 80, shows the ordinary square bulkhead to the upper deck; apparently therefore the French did not adopt the Venetian idea at once. It would be interesting to know at what date the round bow was introduced in various Navies, and whether the galeass tradition survived in any other of the

southern Fleets, the Spanish for instance.—R. C. A.

[Nearly all merchant ships of the eighteenth century in Northern Europe were round-bowed, especially the "cats," some of which (e.g., Cook's ships) were taken into the Royal Navy. The round bow, therefore, must have been familiar in England, apart from foreign models. Of well known southern types, the carrack, as may be seen from Mr. R. Morton Nance's drawings, was also round-bowed.—ED.]

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY RIGGING.

I would not venture to argue with Mr. Moore on questions of rigging, but I am astonished at some of the evidence he quotes. If he looks at pp. 160 and 188 of the "M.M." for this year he will see that the print of "Cromwell's *London*" is simply a copy of the Dutch picture of 1626, and therefore of no value whatever for English practice in Commonwealth times. Besides this, the often-cited "engraving of the *Sovereign of the Seas* of 1637" is nothing of the sort; it is an engraving from the Trinity House painting of the post-Restoration *Royal Sovereign*; in other words, another ship of thirty years or so later.

With regard to the model at Trinity House; it is quite possible that some small details may have been wrongly restored, but I think it must be acknowledged that there is a pretty good case in favour of the *Loyal London* theory. Even if Sir Jeremy Smith be ignored altogether, the Royal Arms certainly put the model between 1660 and 1689. Surely if the model had been rigged in 1730, or later, there would be many differences from what we find in actual fact.—R. C. A.