This article was downloaded by: [New York University]

On: 12 May 2015, At: 06:15

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

H. E. Purey-Cust , R. C. Anderson , R. C. Anderson ,
A. Balsen & Arthur Leetham

Published online: 22 Mar 2013.

To cite this article: H. E. Purey-Cust , R. C. Anderson , R. C. Anderson , A. Balsen & Arthur Leetham (1921) NOTES, *The Mariner's Mirror*, 7:4, 118-127, DOI: [10.1080/00253359.1921.10655009](https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1921.10655009)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1921.10655009>

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.

STATION POINTER.

The origin of this most invaluable instrument to the nautical Surveyor or Navigator is somewhat obscure. The first mention of it occurs in "A Treatise on Maritime Surveying," by Murdoch Mackenzie, senior, 1774, where it is described as consisting of "a brass graduated semi-circle about 6 inches in diameter, having 3 radii with chamfered edges Such an instrument as this may be called a Station Pointer and would be found convenient for finding the Point of Station readily and accurately." In the *Nautical Magazine*, 1842, it is stated that about "1784 Graeme Spence invented the Double Sextant and made a model of a *new* Station Pointer as a counterpart to this Double Sextant. The rough models of these instruments were shown by Mr. Mackenzie to Lord Howe, the First Lord of the Admiralty, who was pleased to order others upon the same pattern, of Troughton, the skilled mathematical instrument maker. Spence never received one penny in reward from Mr. Mackenzie for the same, nor any addition to his small pay of £45 a year, from the Admiralty." This was Murdoch Mackenzie, junior, the nephew of Murdoch Mackenzie, senior; he succeeded his uncle as Admiralty surveyor in 1771, and possibly was in possession of his uncle's original instrument or a similar one. Graeme Spence, his cousin, was bound apprentice to him for 7 years in 1773. It is stated that after the death of Spence in 1812, a small book, containing drawings of many of the instruments and apparatus of his invention and their methods of use, was submitted by his widow to Lord Melville, at that time First Lord of the Admiralty. Then in "Nicholson's Journal, 1804," is given the Description and use of the Station Pointer constructed by Joseph Huddart, F.R.S. Huddart was a very inventive genius and a celebrated surveyor both in home and foreign waters. He served for some years under the Trinity House and became an Elder Brother. This description of his Station Pointer is a very good one and is accompanied by an illustration, which shows it to have been remarkably similar to those

of the present day. Huddart's Station Pointer is still preserved in the Museum of the Trinity House. Cary, London, is the maker's name engraved upon it, but without any date. There is also an inscription stating that it was purchased by Trinity House on Huddart's death in 1842.

In "Simms' Mathematical Instruments," published in 1837, is a description and woodcut of a very antediluvian kind of Station Pointer, with fine wires stretched along the legs instead of chamfered edges, and which strange to say continues to be reproduced to the present day in "Heather's Mathematical Instruments." As Simms became the partner of Troughton in 1826, it is quite possible that it is Spence's model which is here produced.

Captain Belcher in his "Nautical Surveying, 1835," claims to have improved the Station Pointer, principally by substituting an open brass semi-circular centre of half inch aperture, to enable a pencil to be used in place of the pin in the earlier instruments for marking the "Place of Station" which he found so frequently tore the paper.

As Huddart's Station Pointer is still in existence, why should not Mackenzie's or Spence's be possibly hidden away in some Museum or private house? I have searched all the likely London Museums without success. Can anyone throw out any suggestions as to where these instruments might be found or furnish any further information as to the origin of the station Pointer or as to what has become of Graeme Spence's manuscript book? It is not at the Admiralty.

H. E. PUREY-CUST.

A VOLUME OF 18TH CENTURY PLANS.

As my query in July, 1919, about Charnock's promised Supplement of "48 draughts of ships and vessels that have actually been built," has elicited no information, it seems probable that this was never published. I have, however, a large volume of MS. plans of ships dating mainly from 1740-70 which appear to have been collected, if not drawn, by Charnock and may well have been the

source from which he meant to take the materials for his supplement. Thanks to Mr. Manwaring's kindness in calling my attention to it, I bought this and another similar volume on Gunnery and Fortification, from Mr. Halliday, of Leicester, in 1920. There were also two volumes on "Military Architecture," which I did not buy.

The volume on "Naval Architecture" consists of 89 leaves of coarse paper, 25in. by 19in., with folding plans of ships pasted on to them, for the most part on both sides. Altogether there are 41 blank pages out of the 178, but a great number of the remainder have two or more plans. The Volume is lettered on the back, "Naval Architecture, Vol. 2, Charnock," and has a leather label inside the front cover with the words, "Naval Architecture by John Charnock, Esq., Civil Engineer (*sic*) and Historian. Died 1807, aged 51."

On page 2 there is a portrait of Charnock, published in 1810, "engraved by the order of Henry B. H. Beaufoy, Esq.," whose book-plate is found just beneath the label already mentioned.

A catalogue of the plans, etc., would be wearisome. I will only mention a few points. There are many drawings of ships' boats and various small craft, including several of the *Dublin* yacht (as proposed, 1753). Some of the more detailed plans are the *Boreas* and *Trent* (1757), *Rainbow* (1744), *Royal George* (1756) and *Yarmouth* (1745). There is a finished drawing of an 80-gun 3-decker on the 1733 Establishment, and an engraved plan of a proposed 80-gun 2-decker. Another interesting drawing is a diving dress of a very cumbersome design. The earliest ship represented appears to be "Capt. Geo. Mathews, the *Nile*, launched in August, 1727." Many of the drawings are made on the back of printed Dockyard forms.—R. C. ANDERSON.

THE MAYFLOWER.

The writer of the notice of Dr. Rendel Harris's book "The Finding of the *Mayflower*," at p. 352 of the last volume of *THE MARINER'S MIRROR*, very pertinently asks, "Did ships of 1620 have their names and ports of registry on their sterns?" It appears that in endeavouring to identify the ship's timbers in a barn at Jordan's as those of the *Mayflower* reliance is placed by Dr.

Harris upon some lettering on one of the beams; he suggests that this was an inscription across the stern of the ship, and (after considerable restoration) reads it as "Mayflower, Harwich."

I am here only concerned with the giving of an answer to the reviewer's query—an incomplete one, as will be apparent, but which may serve for the present.

John Reeves, the author of a well-known work on "The History of English Law," published in 1792 a "History of the Law of Shipping and Navigation." In this book he makes some comments upon the statute 26 Geo. III. cap. 60, then recently passed, intitled An Act for the further Increase and Encouragement of Shipping and Navigation, and which had probably prompted him to deal with the subject. After pointing out that the frequent changing of the name of his craft had been a favourite trick of the smuggler, Reeves says "It has been before noticed that the changing of the names of ships had been a mode long practised for defeating the effect of the register-laws. To prevent this in future, owners are not to change the name by which a ship was first registered; and they are, within a month after the first registering, to paint in some conspicuous part of the stern, in letters of four inches length, the name of the ship; and any owner or master obliterating or concealing the name so painted . . ." and so on.

The actual wording of the Act of Parliament is more diffuse than this statement of its effect, but I prefer to reproduce Reeves's language because it appears to imply that it was by this statute of 1786 that the painting of names on the sterns of English merchantmen first became obligatory. It will be observed that nothing is yet said about the painting of the name of the port of registry. An earlier Act, 7 and 8 Wm. III. cap. 22 (A.D. 1696), which required the registration of British-built ships, has no word of painting the names of either ship or port.

Perhaps Dr Harris would contend that the *Mayflower* was a case of intelligent anticipation. She had certainly been to America.—W.S.

FIJIAN CANOES.

In the Note on p. 24 of the January issue (vii. 1) H.H.B. asks me for further

information about Fijian sailing canoes. In regard to his first point, I cannot speak from experience as to New Guinea canoes (*lahatoi*); but his remarks about "apex downwards" in his former Note brought the New Guinea canoe sail vividly to my mind's eye, from photographs and drawings I have seen.

As to his second point I can not interpret the expression "bracket or belaying pole"—which may or may not have been Williams's or Calvert's words at all, as their volumes were severely "edited" in London under G. S. Rowe's superintendence, and the latter was never in Fiji himself.

The tack of the Fijian canoe sail is, I believe, secured by a strop: the point of the "yard" fits against a cam, into a kind of slot, cut or carved in the solid covering board at the end of the canoe, which does duty for the time being as the bow. This covering or decking is made in a single piece of hard wood, usually *dogo* (pronounced "ndong-o," which is mangrove). It is of similar form and design at both ends of the canoe, though the two extremities of the "dug out" hull itself always differ slightly. The term *cama* (pronounced *thama*—sounding the *th* as in "then," never as in "think") means "outrigger." *Kau* means wood or wooden, signifying in this instance "log": hence a *camakau* is a solid outrigger craft, in contradistinction to a twin-hulled one. The hull of a *camakau*, or the main hull of a *drua* (pronounced "ndrua") is called the *kata*. The windward hull in a *drua* is always somewhat smaller and shorter than the true *kata*. Hence, in sailing down the wind the word of command to "let her come up a bit" is *Ki cama!* and the order to "let her go off a bit" (you cannot wear ship in a Fijian canoe) is *Ki kata!* These terms mean literally, "outriggerwards" and "hullwards" respectively. If sailing on a wind, or close hauled, the commands are different, viz., *tau!* for "luff," and *uli!* for a rap full, or "bear up"; though the word *lave!* is sometimes used for the latter. It means "raise the loom of the steer-oar," by which movement the blade is depressed and acts as a sort of sliding keel at the after end of the canoe, so that her bow falls off in obedience to the lateral pressure of the wind. It is not a case of porting or starboarding the helm, to govern the direction of her head (since there is no rudder), but of raising, or

depressing the blade (and conversely the loom) of the steer-oar in a plane parallel to the vessel's length (there is no keel). This steer-oar, which, in a canoe of large proportions, is of vast size and weight, is called the *uli*; and the man who wields it stands abaft it, looking forwards. In a double canoe (*drua*) two steer-oars and steersmen were often employed.

Other terms are *ai vana*, the mast; *ai vakavakarewa*, the halyards; *na mua e liu*, the bow or fore part; *na mua e muri*, the stern or after part; *na dreke* (pronounced *ndreke*), the hold or interior, dug-out portion; *ai kaso*, the cross poles that sustain the outrigger; *ai lobi*, the stay; *a dali*, a rope; *ai voce*, a paddle; *ai kelekele*, the killick or mooring stake (no etymological connection between them). In Fijian the vowels are sounded as in Spanish, and every one is pronounced. Of the consonants *c*, as written, is always pronounced as *th*, *b* is always sounded as *mb*, *d* as *nd*, *g* as *ng*, in "singer," *q* as *ng* in "linger"; and no two consonants are ever in juxtaposition excepting *dr* (-*ndr* in English).—B.G.C.

GWYN'S BOOK OF SHIPS.

An engraving by P. C. Canot, after a painting by Thomas Allen, of *Harwich and the Yatches going out, with Lord Anson returning the Salute from Landguard Fort*, is undated, but seems to represent Harwich on August 7th, 1761, when Lord Anson accompanied by a fleet of yachts sailed in the "*Charlotte* yacht" from that port to Cuxhaven to bring the Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg Strelitz to England. It was intended that the future Queen of George III. should land in state at London; but after thrice sighting the English shore and being driven off again by bad weather, once nearly to Norway (the princess meanwhile bearing the voyage well, and amusing herself with a harpsichord, as we are told in the *Gentleman's Magazine*), the fleet finally came again into Harwich.

Possibly Thomas Allen painted a picture of the "*Yatches coming in*" also, but the engraving named above, in the Dawson Collection at the Penzance Library, evidently, unless some other such occasion can be found to fit it, represents the sailing of the *Charlotte* and the accompanying yachts on this Cuxhaven voyage.

The outward-bound fleet shows nothing but broadsides and sterns and it is

impossible to identify the ships by the descriptions of their figure-heads as shown by Gwyn. There is but one ship-rigged yacht however, and as far as it is possible to compare them this and Dr. Dingley's supposed *Charlotte* may well be the same. In the *Encyclopédie Methodique—Marine*, 1783, we have an excellent plan of the *Yach du Roi d'Angleterre*, the *Caroline*, and Lescallier also gives what as to hull at least must be a somewhat fanciful picture of a ship-rigged English Royal Yacht; both of these later ships have more or less marked points of difference from either supposed picture of the *Charlotte*, and thus far support these identifications.

The ketches making up the rest of this fleet of yachts are exactly of the class represented by Gwyn's "yatch ketch," and make it almost certain that this, although not appropriated specially to the service of the King personally, was in the wider sense a Royal Yacht. The ensigns of the print show no cross of St. George and may well be red, the tilts abaft the mainmast are shown in all, and the rig, except for crossed topgallant yards, that were we may be sure sent down again during that stormy homeward passage, is exactly the same. Each of these yachts carries four guns amidships, projecting from wreathed portholes; this is the only detail that I fail to match in Gwyn's picture.

The "Y"-shaped gear from the gaffs of the "yatch-sloop" and the ship-rigged vessels of Gwyn's book, shows a neat device, by means of which two brails were controlled by one fall. This in the case of the "yatch-sloop" was in the period 1760-70 something of a novelty, I believe; for a little earlier we find in this rig instead of the ordinary brails a sort of martnet that had remained a part of the rig since its inception, and had been taken over from the older smacksail (see "M.M.," Vol. V., p. 48). On this same page, curiously, I notice examples in plenty of the door-like port-lids mentioned by Dr. Dingley as being present in Gwyn's oared frigate. These, however, are not so hinged because of the presence of channels above them; they are rather to be compared with the sideways-opening portlids at the waist of 17th century ships, that have immediately over them a waistboard pierced with loopholes for muskets, and seem to be so designed

as to offer no obstruction behind which boarders might find a shelter.

Careful as Gwyn's drawings are, it is not surprising that Dr. Dingley should hesitate to accept the extremely swallow-tailed topsails of his schooners as representing anything normal, for they look so very unpractical. Possibly Gwyn misunderstood a drawing that showed in addition to lower yards the separate square-sail yard that was hoisted with its sail when going free, but remained at other times lowered almost to the foot of the mast. Had he attempted a compromise between these two positions for his lower-yard he would have arrived at his mid-mast position, and would then have had to swallow-tail his topsails to correspond. If such topsails were actually in use it would be difficult indeed, one would imagine, to make them anything but a nuisance in sailing on a wind. One of the flights hanging in the Shippers Hall at Lubeck has a spritsail-topsail of the same shape, but that would only be used when going free and does not help one to accept Gwyn's. I, at all events, although I have noticed many pictures of 18th century schooners, have never elsewhere seen such topsails, and should judge that, if they were a fashion, this must have been for a short period only.—R. M. N.

GWYN'S BOOK OF SHIPS.

The Y-shaped ropes hanging from the gaff of the sloop in Dr. Dingley's article are brails. A careful examination of the mizen of the "Royal Yatch" on the same page shows exactly the same fitting and explains its working. Each brail was fitted as follows: A line was made fast to the leech of the sail, thence it led through a block on the gaff, then through the block at the apex of the Y (or rather V), then through a block farther in on the gaff, and then to the leech below the attachment of the other end. By hauling on the single line made fast to the block at the apex of the V the sail was brailed in two places.—A. M.

GWYN'S BOOK OF SHIPS.

I have an engraving after D. Serres of the *Queen Charlotte* yacht off Harwich. This agrees quite well with the Royal Yacht of Gwyn's book. The picture dates, I believe, from 1761.—R. C. ANDERSON.

GWYN'S BOOK OF SHIPS.

No. 8.—Bow and stern view of a frigate. We have in the Marine Museum at Dunkirk a model brig of 20 guns built during the War of American Independence and a 17-gun cutter of the same date. In both these models the stern is exactly like that in Gwyn's drawing, very narrow compared with the beam. In the models the stern is high and the freeboard very low. In about 1875 I saw a collier brig at Newcastle built in the same way. I never saw another square-sterned ship with such a narrow stern as this brig.

No. 6.—Frigate with oars. In the Museum at the Louvre there is a model of a ship of 48 guns built in 1785 with 20 oars on each side. The oar-ports open aft. I have often seen such ports in Mediterranean ships. In "*Souvenirs de Marine*," by Admiral Paris, there is a plan of a ship built at Lorient in 1707 with 12 oars each side. She carries 24 guns.—A. BALSEN.

GWYN'S BOOK OF SHIPS.

To my mind the most interesting of the ship-drawings reproduced from this book in the *MARINERS' MIRROR* for February is the one referred to in the text as "(6) (Frigate with oars)."

May I suggest that this is probably one of those vessels generally referred to in the 18th and late 17th Century as "Gallies"? Not, of course, the Mediterranean or Baltic style of gallies, but such ships as the famous Captain Kidd's *Adventure Galley*, which is described as being of 287 tons mounting 34 guns and carrying a crew of 154 men. As late as 1735 we find two such "Gallies" in the Navy List—the *Mary Galley* of 40 guns and 190 men, reckoned as a "Fifth Rate" and the "Sixth Rate" *Dursley Galley* of 20 guns and 130 men.

Many other similar ships are mentioned in old Naval works, etc., but I have never before seen a detailed picture of such a war vessel.

This class of ship seems to date from about 1691, and the following references to them in "Luttrell's Brief Relation of Foreign Affairs from 1680 to 1711" are of interest. On 14th October, 1691, he notes that "Several persons are going to build privateers to carry from 18 to 40 guns *after the galley fashion with oars*, and hope to have an act passed at next sessions for encouraging the same."

Again under date 5th August, 1704, we find, "Three new gallies are building at Woolwich and Blackwall, each to have 40 oars to row in a calm"; and on 9th November of the same year that "Sixteen Gallies are ordered to be forthwith built, each to carry 16 oars, to be made use of in the Mediterranean, if occasion requires."

The new craft seem to have been a success, since on June 30th, 1709, it is noted that "Tuesday was launched at Woolwich the *Royal Anne Galley*, of a new invention under the direction of the Marquess of Carmarthen, carrying 40 guns, being the finest that ever was built."

The ship portrayed in Gwyn's sketch book is apparently a 32-gun ship—if we assume there are a couple of bow-chasers—and pulls 28 oars, so that she might well be comprised among such "Gallies" as are referred to by Luttrell. Perhaps some members of the Society might be able to supply the "M.M." with further particulars of this little remembered class of British war ship.—C. F.

[An article on these "Gallies" will appear shortly.—Ed.].

NINETEENTH CENTURY SHIPPING FROM BILLHEADS.

The accompanying illustrations, taken from Billheads and Backnotes (the receipt given by the Master of a vessel to the Farmer or Merchant embarking corn, etc.), are perhaps of interest. They are all dated during the 19th century, but the dies in some cases had obviously been used by the printer for a good many years. The earliest examples are woodcuts on hand-made paper; these are succeeded by really delicate engravings, which are followed by the coarser but cheaper lithographs.

No. 1 is a Backnote of 1805. It represents a sloop but is not at all well drawn, the forestaysail being too much inboard. The girting across the Mainsail is presumably caused by flag halyards. It is noticeable that the vessel is apparently carrying the Man-o'-war Jack.

No. 2, another Backnote of 1805, is a very crude picture of a Ship-rigged vessel. The designer seems to have got a bit disturbed over the mizzen.

No. 3 a Backnote of 1807 shows a Hoy apparently carrying a Spritsail. Her shrouds are somewhat unduly emphasised.

No. 4, a backnote of 1812, is rather a

12.

13.

15.

14.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

CONT.

22.

23.

WORK PROMPTLY ATTENDED TO.

Wm. Snape
1805
 Received of *Wm. Snape*
 1805

Wm. Snape
 1805

Wm. Snape
 1807

Wm. Snape
 1805

Wm. Snape
 1805

Wm. Snape
 1805

Wm. Snape
 1805

Wm. Snape
 1805

Wm. Snape
 1805

Wm. Snape
 1805

Wm. Snape
 1805

pretty little picture of an old-fashioned Brig or Brigantine.

No. 5, a Backnote of 1814, shows a sloop carrying a jibboom, a square topsail and short gaff for her mainsail.

No. 6, from a Bill of Lading for 1832, is a ship-rigged vessel carrying a crossjack course.

No. 7, a Billhead of 1832, shows a two-topsail Schooner.

No. 8, a Billhead of 1841, shows an early steam-vessel, ketch rigged, with a "smoke-stack" reminiscent of some of the American Warships that came to Gibraltar during the war,

No. 9 is rather a nice little picture of a vessel being loaded with coals by a patent loading device (1841).

No. 10 is a view of Newcastle on a billhead of 1841, showing various shipping. A paddle-steamer with sails brailed up, a quarter view of a brig and the foremasts of two other square-rigged vessels.

No. 11, a billhead of 1842, shows a topsail schooner.

No. 12, a billhead of 1843, showing the floating dock at Newcastle; the ships are mostly collier-brigs in varying stages of dismantlement. There is, however, one three-masted vessel in the middle of the picture in act of sending up her topmasts.

No. 13 is a topsail schooner (1846) much more modern in appearance than No. 11, although the dates only show a difference of 4 years.

No. 14, dated 1845, shows a paddle-steamer without any sail and a ship-rigged vessel.

No. 15, a receipt for ballast dated 1846, is a pleasant but somewhat indistinct little picture of a ship-rigged vessel. She gives the impression of having a spritsail furled.

No. 16, a billhead of 1848, shows a typical collier brig; the double dolphin-striker may be noticed.

No. 17, a billhead dated 1850, shows a snow-brig with main-course set.

No. 18 is worthy of remark on account of the careless drawing; the crossjack yard has apparently been omitted altogether and no foretopmast-stay is shown: it may be noted that the vessel has a fore-staysail set (dated 1850).

No. 19 (also 1850) is rather a nice quarter-view of a barque.

No. 20, billhead of 1867, shows a ship-rigged vessel. The double dolphin-striker may be noted.

No. 21, another billhead of 1867, shows a cutter yacht with a gaff-topsail.

No. 22 shows a sloop. This billhead bears a printed date of 1870.

No. 23 shows a ship-rigged vessel carrying a spritsail yard, but the billhead has a printed date of 1870.—H. R. H. V.

THE HALF DECK.

The half-deck covered half the length of the ship, and the after half of it being covered by the poop, the remainder which was uncovered very reasonably was called the quarter-deck. That, I think, is the modern standpoint.

It may be that in earlier days it was the same, but there seem to be difficulties, and I must confess I have been unable to come to any conclusion.

The first difficulty is, of course, the frigate without a poop and a deck covering half the ship, commonly called the quarter-deck. "Guns on the Q.D." is I think always the form of the armament lists. With the exception of the 80 two-deckers, the ships of the later XVII. century are spoken of as having "guns on the quarter-deck," though in many of the third rates that deck must have extended over half the ship, and if they had poops, the guns under it were counted in the Q.D. armament. The *Sovereign* of 1637 had a half-deck but there were only six guns upon it, which does not look as though it extended over half the ship. Mainwaring and Boteler, I think, said that in the ships of their day it did do so, but it does not follow with certainty from that fact that, *because* of it, this platform was called a half-deck.

In Payne's engraving, the *Sovereign's* sides do not appear to be built right up to the half-deck—there is a space letting in light under the half-deck. In the *Prince Royal*, Sebastian Vicars was paid 35s. for carving six arches "to give light under the half-deck" (Perrin N.R.S. LI. 210)—an early reference. A still earlier reference is given by Mouson in 1602. He states that the *Swiftsure* was rent "so terribly that a team of oxen might have crept through her under the half-deck" (Oppenheim N.R.S. XXIII. 181.)

The half-deck (leaving the *Sovereign* out of the account) practically went out with the flush-decked ship—the ghost of it flits about afterwards, I am referring to the Royal Navy, of course.

When did it make its first appearance? Sometimes I think it came in with the galleon, though we may find earlier references in merchant ships, which were in the form of a galleon; you will remember that Hawkins was criticised for making Her Majesty's ships too like the Merchant's. The galleon's half-deck covered half the length of the ship, its forward portion passing over part of the upper deck at such a height that even the thickest headed greenhorn would have it impressed on his mind—if he tried to stand upright—that he was *under* the half-deck. The deck *over* the after portion of the half-deck was called the quarter-deck; when the decks in the fourth quarter of the ship were flush with the rest, the Q.D., which was also the roof of the captain's cabin, was carried forward full height; thus the inconvenience of the half-deck was abolished. The portion of the upper deck just forward of the captain's cabin was still called by some "under the half deck," while others, who argued the half-deck was the extension of the "sole" of the cabin called it "the half-deck." This is all very pretty, but, really, I do not know whether it is true.

There are several alternatives: a deck half closed in at the sides, a deck covering only half athwartships. I think I have said enough to show that it is not sufficient to say cheerfully "a half-deck was a half-deck." No doubt it was but which way?

Mr. Alan Moore thinks that the origin was the same in both the Royal and Merchant Navies. No doubt it was. The open-waisted cattle ship of the chivalric period was the mother of the Great-ship, and the foreign-going trader of the XVI. century took upon herself the burden of the heavy cannon. If I were certain that Great-ships had half-decks, I should be quite certain that the half-deck had nothing to do with length, but I am not certain. When the *Elizabeth* came in for repairs in 1598 she was repainted; in the extract of the account there is mention of a barbican, a somer-deck and a study, but no mention of a half-deck (Oppenheim, *Administration*, p. 131). The *Swietsure*, which we know had a half-deck in 1602, was built in 1573 as a great-ship. Whether at her rebuilding in 1592 she had been brought into the form of a galleon I do not know.

The steerage seems to have trespassed

upon the half-deck. I wonder whether Mr. H. S. Vaughan in his valuable researches into the whipstaff tumbled across anything which would throw light on the half-deck or under it?—G. R.

FRIGATE, FRIGATE-FASHION AND GALLEY-BUILT.

Falconer, towards the end of the 18th century, stated that galley-built merchant ships were those built with a flush deck, and poop and forecastle built upon that deck. On the other hand, he says that frigate-built ships were those with falls in the deck fore and aft. That is the effect of what he said; Burney repeated it; James ("Naval History," introduction, p. 23) contradicts it. We know, at any rate, that the man-of-war frigate of the same date was flush-decked. In passing one may note that the term "galley-built frigate" is occasionally met with.

"Frigate" was applied by Sir Anthony Deane, the master-shipwright of the Restoration, to ships with even two-and-a-half tiers of ordnance, and Pepys used it in the same way (Tanner N.R.S., XXVI., 226). It was, I believe, generally used for all ships, great and small, during the Commonwealth. James thinks that it was not applied to first-rates, but I think he is wrong. All these ships, of course, were flush-decked.

In the T. S. *Mercury's* Museum there is a model of a vessel fitted for oars, labelled:—"A galley-built corvette of 1700." The label is, of course, of little authority, but there it is. She is a block model with painted ports, but there is little doubt she represents a vessel with falls fore and aft. Among the Sergison models now in Mr. R. C. Anderson's care is a ship obviously of the 17th century. She is pierced for oars; she has falls forward and aft. One suspects that some day a label will be found for this model with "galley-built" written upon it.

On the 3rd May, 1696, Sir Peter Pett wrote a letter to Mr. Pepys, in which he mentions that:—"Many years ago I gave Sir Christopher Wren the draught of an old-fashioned ship, and another of the frigate fashion, that he might see the difference of them; and he afterwards desiring me to bring him into the company of some excellent shipwright, who might resolve many of his questions, I brought to him Captain William Castle,

the famous loyal Tory, who was an expert mathematician, and who resolved all the questions Sir Chr. put to him; but all in vain, as to any illustration of the affairs of naval architecture that Sir Chr. could effect." I do not think anyone will seriously question that *Frigate-fashion* was another way of describing flush-decked ships.

Frigate in its more restricted sense is another matter. Pepys states that:—"The *Constant Warwick* was the first frigate built in England. She was built in 1649, by Mr. Peter Pett, for a privateer for the Earl of Warwick, and was sold by him to the States. Mr. Pett took his model of a frigate from a French frigate which he had seen in the Thames; as his son, Sir Phineas Pett, acknowledged to me."

There are two slips in this: the *Constant Warwick* was built in 1646, and Sir Phineas was not the son of Peter Pett. Pepys's statement has been accepted and repeated again and again without comment except from Mr. Oppenheim, who finds difficulty in believing it; he points out that the *Adventure*, *Nonsuch*, and *Assurance*, built in 1646, are of similar proportions.

In the same year that the *Constant Warwick* was built a ship called the *Old Warwick* appears as a prize (Oppenheim, *Administration*, p. 255). We know that at the Restoration she was waiting to be broken up (Tanner, N. R. S., XXVI., 264), when the *Constant Warwick* was still in commission. Mr. Anderson has kindly looked up for me several Commonwealth lists and finds the two ships serving together, so there can be no doubt they were separate ships. Charnock says the older ship was purchased in Dunkirk, in which case she is, of course, not likely to have been British built. In some lists there appears a *Warwick Frigate*; it would be as well to make quite sure that this isn't a third individual.

Curiously enough, I cannot remember the *Constant Warwick* appearing in any list as a frigate, but that may be due to bad memory. In any cases 646 is a surprisingly late date for the invention of frigates. It is said that Peter Pett, buried in St. Nicolas, Deptford, had inscribed on his tomb that he was the inventor of frigates. Which Peter? And what is the actual wording of the inscription?—G. R.

RALFE'S NAVAL CHRONOLOGY.

Several enquiries have been made about the number of illustrations which should be in a complete copy of the above book, now very rare in fine state, and costly as well. A desirable copy has just been advertised by Thorp, of Guildford, in the following terms:—

Ralfe (J.).—The Naval Chronology of Great Britain, or an Historical Account of Naval and Maritime Events, from the Commencement of the War, 1803, to the End of 1816, with sixty finely coloured engravings, three vols., imp. 8vo., original boards, paper labels, uncut, 1820. £148.

The complete set of sixty pictures is very seldom found in the copies which appear in second-hand booksellers' catalogues. Moreover, a book entitled "Naval Victories," without date and without letterpress, is sometimes to be met with, and is entirely illustrated by the plates from Ralfe's Naval Chronology. The number of plates in the "Naval Victories" varies from about 35 to 45, and these are not always arranged in their proper chronological order.

Even in the copies of Ralfe the pictures are sometimes misplaced, in one case "The *Northumberland* engaging two Frigates," which should be the 15th plate of the third volume, being placed twelfth in the second volume, while perhaps the most frequently missing plate is that of the capture of the *Chesapeake*, which should be in the last volume. In one case, this plate is oddly misnamed, "The Capture of the *Shannon*." Uncoloured copies also fetch a good price and are really preferable to those which have been coloured in recent times, when it is not unusual to find that the colourist has very little idea about flags and other technical matters, and that these differ considerably in different copies. The correct sixty plates are as follows:

VOL. I.

Portrait of the Prince Regent.
Sir Sidney Smith's Squadron off Ostend,
May 16th, 1804.
Captain Graham Moore, with Spanish
frigates, October, 1804.
Action off Cape St. Mary, October 5th,
1804.
Commodore Dance and Admiral Linois,
February 15th, 1804.
The *Centurion* in Vizagapatam Roads,
September 18th, 1804.

Sir Robert Calder's action, July 22nd, 1805. (Two plates.)

Capture of the *Didon*, August 10th, 1805. (Two plates.)

Trafalgar, 1805.

Situation of the *Temeraire* at Trafalgar.

Situation of the *Bellerophon* at Trafalgar.

Santa Margareta and *Phoenix*, November 4th, 1805.

Strachan's action, November 5th, 1805.

Capture of the *Guerriere*, July, 1806.

The *Sirius* with a French squadron, April 17th, 1806.

Capture of the *Pomone*, August, 1806.

Capture of the *Maria Riggersbergen*, October, 1806.

VOL. II.

Suggested monument.

Loss of the *Blanche*, March, 1807.

Duckworth at the Dardanelles, February, 1807.

Destroying the Turkish Fleet, February, 1807.

Capture of *Curacoa*, January, 1807.

Capture of the *Thetis*, November, 1808.

The *Implacable* and *Sevolod*, August, 1808.

Burning of the *Sevolod*, August 27th, 1808.

The *Theseus* at the Isle of Crouais, February, 1809.

Stopford's squadron and French frigates, February, 1809.

Capture of the *Niemen*, April, 1809.

The *Prometheus* and *Melpomene* at Riga, 1809.

Capture of the *Var*, February, 1809.

Capture of the *Furieuse*, August, 1809. (Two plates.)

VOL. III.

Suggested mausoleum.

The *Spartan* in the Bay of Naples, May, 1810.

Capture of the *Sparviere*.

Capture of the Isle of Banda, August 9th, 1810.

The *Rinaldo* and French Privateers, December, 1810.

The *Rinaldo* and *Redpole*, September, 1811.

Capture of the *Ville de Lyons*, September, 1811.

Hoste's action off Lissa, March 13th, 1811.

The *Imperieuse* in the Gulf of Salerno, October 11th, 1811.

Capture of the *Pomona*, November 29th, 1811.

Captain Schomberg's action, May 26th, 1811. (Three plates.)

Surrender of Tamatave, May, 1811.
 The *Northumberland* and French frigates,
 May 22nd, 1812.
 Destruction of the French frigates,
 May 23rd, 1812.
 Capture of the *Rivoli*, February 22nd,
 1812.
 The *Leviathan* and *Consorts* on Coast of
 Italy, June, 1812.
 Capture of the *Argus*, August 14th, 1813.
 Destruction of the *Filibustier*, October
 14th, 1813.
 Capture of the Island of Ponza, February
 26th, 1813.
 Capture of the *Chesapeake*, June 1st, 1813.
 Bombardment of Algiers, August, 1816.
 The *Imperieuse* and *Thames* and *Palinuro*,
 November, 1811.
Imperieuse and *Cephalus* off Naples,
 August, 1812.
 Captain Brisbane at Fort Maurigo, April,
 1814.

COAST NAMES.

About five miles north-eastward of
 Yarmouth, between Scroby and Cross

Sands, there is a narrow channel called
 Barley Pile. Can the origin of this
 name be explained? Ashore I believe
 that pick, pickle or pightel means a
 narrow passage between hedges, and I
 know of one case in Middlesex of a
 Barnes Pitch which is now a narrow
 passage between houses, but I have been
 unable to find any other case on or off the
 coast.—G. V. S.

AN OLD KNIGHT-HEAD.

We have just had presented to the
 Museum of the R.U.S.I. an old Knight-
 Head. I am describing it as follows:—

"An old Knight-Head (probably
 XVII. Century) or Bollard Timber of a
 Wooden Vessel. Knight-Heads were the
 timbers on each side of a ship nearest to
 the stem continued high enough to secure
 the bowsprit, they were usually embel-
 lished with a figure designed to repre-
 sent the human head which gave rise
 to the name." I enclose a photograph
 of it.—ARTHUR LEETHAM.

ANSWERS.

83. (1980.) A FEMALE SHIPWRIGHT.—
 I have an illustrated copy of the chap-
 book giving the history of Mary Lacey,
 the woman shipwright, in Portsmouth
 Dockyard, and I shall be glad to show it
 to Mr. Manwaring if he will communicate
 with me.—C. N. R.

14. JACK NICKEL.—I had not known
 this term as being used out of Cornwall,
 but clearly it is at least West Country.
 I quote the following from my, as yet
 unpublished, *Cornish Sea-Words* :—

"JACK NICHOLLS.—A cleat fixed abaft
 the stem-head of a lugger so as to pro-
 ject clear of the bow on either side, and
 having a groove at each end, used as a
 fair-lead. A variant of JACKY NICHOLLS,
 q.v., but applied to a later development
 of the fair-lead that is there described.

"JACKY NICHOLLS. 1.—One of a pair
 of cleats that are nailed upon the gunwale
 of a lugger or a seine-boat on either side
 at a little distance from the stem-head.
 This is tapered away aft to meet the
 gunwale, but rises abruptly forward to
 make with the stem-head a fair-lead for
 ropes. A Mullion variant, 'Jack-

nacker,' suggests a possibility of the name
 being a compound of 'chock' and
 'nock,' but it is simpler to look upon
 'Jacky Nicholls' as an inventive fisher-
 man or boat builder whose name is fixed
 upon his invention.

"2.—One of a pair of cleats nailed at
 each side of the bow, below the gunwale
 on the outside, and running forward to
 the stem. A sort of rudimentary 'cheek,'
 serving only to give a little additional
 strength.

"CADGWITH.—Such 'cheeks' were
 fitted to the old-style luggers, and this is
 possibly the original use of the name."

In this "JACKY NICHOLLS, 1," without
 special mention of the place where it is
 current, implies that this is the common
 use of the word in West Cornwall. In
 making my glossary I have found great
 difficulty in deciding whether such words
 as this are really local; for they are
 scorned both by the big literary dic-
 tionaries and by the dialect glossaries;
 yet it seems that their existence and their
 distribution should be worth recording.—
 R. M. N.