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ABSTRACT

As His Majesty's Sloop-of-war traveled across the Atlantic Ocean, a multivalent landscape shaped the experiences of the eighty-five men living and working on the ship's decks. The Royal Navy Admiralty Board and its subsidiary administrative branches established on the decks of the DeBraak a landscape of spatial organization with the specific intent to maintain the naval hierarchy, impart discipline, and regulate the crew. As a defining factor in the lives of each of the ship's inhabitants, the design of the decks and the constellation of objects used in the ship's living spaces embodied the standardized patterns of daily life and expressed the intended crew relations as established by the Admiralty Board, thus satisfying the expectations and requirements the Royal Navy had for the ship.

Some scholars assert that this established setting of order and hierarchy created for the eighteenth-century Royal Navy seamen a life devoid of social interaction, sensory stimulation, and meaning. However a closer examination offers insight into the nuances of the ship's material world and the crew's experience of it. Within the static architectural setting, the crew acted to complete the landscape. As the men shared intimate details of life and work in confined spaces, they imparted color, sound, texture, and smell to the ship's utilitarian interior, thus creating a reverberating landscape that held meaning for them. In forging group identity, asserting individuality, claiming ownership, and imparting domesticity to the ship accommodations, the artifacts of daily life played an important role in shaping the reality of life aboard the DeBraak.
The recovery of the DeBraak has brought the texture and details of eighteenth century shipboard life to the present. In this synthesis of evidence from artifacts, ship plans, and secondary sources, the material world of the DeBraak's interiors emerges through a series of narrative vignettes, descriptive text, detailed catalogue, and photographs.
With dark clouds looming in the overcast sky, His Majesty's sloop-of-war DeBraak sailed towards the waters of the Delaware Bay in the late afternoon of May 25th, 1798. The ship bustled with activity as the entire crew prepared the ship for its approach to the Delaware shore. A few men assigned to hold duty descended into the hold to retrieve the water casks, now nearly empty. Soon these wooden casks would be loaded onto a small boat and rowed to shore to be filled with fresh water to sustain the crew for the last leg of the ship's voyage. In his stern cabin, Captain Drew glanced in his small decorative looking glass as he donned his coat and hat. He exited the cabin, strode past the red-coated marine sentry standing guard at his cabin door, and climbed the ladder through the stern hatch to the top deck. He looked out across the water, quietly awaiting a Lewes pilot who would direct the ship toward the shore.

As Commander James Drew and the eighty-four member crew of the British convoy ship entered the Delaware Bay, they neared the end of a two-month voyage that would lead to speculation for the next two centuries. What began in late March for the DeBraak as routine convoy duty became something less than routine, and still not entirely clear, during April and much of May when the ship left the fleet with which she was sailing. While the activities of the DeBraak during the months of April and May may never be explained completely, the circumstances that led to her journey, to her demise, and to her recovery 186 years later are understood.

Dispatched on convoy duty from the naval yard in Plymouth, England, Commander Drew of the DeBraak joined H.M.S. St. Albans, a sixty-four gun
man-of-war under the command of Captain Pender, to escort a fleet of forty-four merchant ships carrying the English and Irish trade across the Atlantic to North America. The Admiralty Board, which administered the Royal Navy and thus determined the movements of individual ships and of fleets, directed the two Royal Navy vessels to accompany the group of British and American ships to the Delaware Bay. From there, the *St. Albans* was to turn northward to the ports of Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Halifax, while the *DeBraak* would proceed southward to Chesapeake Bay with the merchant vessels bound for the southern ports. Upon completion of that duty, the *DeBraak* was to return north, sailing directly to the port in Halifax.3

With these directions and careful instructions not to part company, the fleet departed on March 26th and traveled together for several days. However, soon after arriving in the waters off the coast of the Azores, stormy weather, strong winds, and turbulent waters plagued the large group of ships. Amidst the confusion of bad weather and a quickly dispersing fleet, Captain Pender signaled Commander Drew to chase two unknown ships. After discovering that the vessels were a Royal Navy ship and a captured French prize, the *DeBraak* resumed its position in the convoy. However, it proved impossible for the large fleet to stay together. By April 4th, the fleet was widely dispersed, with only seven merchant ships within Captain Pender’s sight. James Drew and his brig *DeBraak* had disappeared. It was not until May 25th that the *DeBraak’s* whereabouts again would be clarified. On that morning in the waters twenty miles south of Cape Henlopen, Delaware, the American sloop *President* sighted the *DeBraak* with the *St. Francis dehaveren*, a Spanish prize captured during the period of separation from the convoy.4
The seven-week period that the DeBraak spent separated from the convoy is not clearly understood because the captain's log, a record of all the ship's activities, sank with the ship. One official account recorded three years after the sinking of the DeBraak does survive. In 1801, Samuel Mitchell, the ship's quarter gunner and a survivor of the De Braak, reported to the Royal Navy Admiralty Board the basic circumstances of the seven weeks prior to May 25th, 1798. According to Mitchell and to a surviving written order from James Drew, dated April 30th, the DeBraak captured the St. Francis dehaveren, a Spanish ship laden with two hundred tons of copper, some cocoa, and other goods valued at £160,000 sterling. Drew placed a prize crew consisting of the DeBraak's master, Thomas Griffiths, as well as one midshipman and several sailors aboard the foreign ship. He then took several of the Spanish crew onto the DeBraak, and granted Griffiths the position as prize master and commanded him to stay in the company of the DeBraak. Knowing well from his recent experience that separation always presented a strong possibility, Drew made sure to include instructions of what to do in the case that the ships did part.5

Apparently all went well and the ships sailed together during the next month, for on the afternoon of May 25th, sometime after being sighted by the sloop President, the DeBraak sailed towards the Capes of Henlopen on the Delaware coast. With the ship just outside Delaware Bay, a bay pilot approached and boarded the ship in order to conduct the DeBraak towards the coast of Lewes, Delaware.6 As the vessel neared land for the first time in nearly two months, the jubilant Commander James Drew offered the pilot a drink to celebrate his good luck and the end of his voyage. Drew then ordered the crew to drop the anchor and to lower the small, six-oared boat which would carry him to shore to take on fresh water for the remainder of
the voyage.\textsuperscript{7} Drew readied himself to head into shore as the crew prepared to lower the anchor to the floor of the Bay.

Clouds loomed and the sky darkened above the flurry of activity on the DeBraak's decks. Suddenly, a freak weather condition struck the DeBraak, causing the vessel immediately to heel to her side. The convivial mood disappeared immediately with the ensuing pandemonium and fear. The open gun ports filled with water that tossed guns, fittings, furnishings, and people around the decks. Frantic crew members clambered for safety aboard the small rowboat next to the ship and on the nearby Spanish prize. Within moments, the DeBraak sat at the bottom of the Delaware Bay with only her uppermost mast sections visible above the surface.\textsuperscript{8}

When the disastrous squall struck, the hull of the DeBraak held seventy-four of the original crew members, fifteen Spanish prisoners, and the pilot. Aboard the Spanish ship, eight crew members under the leadership of Thomas Griffith struggled to keep their ship afloat, all the while watching helplessly as howling winds and swelling waves tossed the ship and their fellow crew. At the end of the storm and struggle, four Spanish prisoners, pilot Andrew Allen, and forty-eight crew members had safely survived the disaster, but thirty-three of the DeBraak's crew and eleven Spanish prisoners lost their lives. Commander James Drew, the ship's lieutenant, purser, surgeon, cook, as well as four marines, and twenty-four men and boys from the crew numbered among the casualties.\textsuperscript{9}

Once the ship had sunk, British officials jumped into action. Receiving word of the disaster, Phineas Bond, the British consul at Philadelphia, set out to assess the situation and to make plans for securing the Spanish prize, determining the extent of human loss, and planning a possible salvage of the vessel. Bond compiled lists of the
survivors and the fatalities in order to inform Lord Grenville, England’s Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, of the losses. Documenting the loss of the ship, taking possession of the prize, and attending to the survivors filled the days that followed the sinking of the *DeBraak*. By early June, the Spanish ship had safely moored near Philadelphia, and the British had taken the four surviving Spanish prisoners into their custody. The British later released these prisoners to Spanish agents.

Within a month of the disaster, the Admiralty Board was making plans to salvage the vessel. Hoping to recover the vessel for the practical reasons of retrieving valuable armaments, stores, and other supplies, the Royal Navy made one attempt to salvage the *DeBraak*. After the unsuccessful attempt, the Admiralty Board decided that recovering the relatively old vessel did not merit the expenditure of further time and money, and in September the Admiralty Board called a halt to all salvage attempts. Although the Royal Navy abandoned hopes of raising the ship, their attempt to recover the *DeBraak* would not be the last.

Not long after the ship’s demise, speculation about Commander Drew’s activities during the seven-week period of separation arose. By the mid-nineteenth century, the legend of the *DeBraak* and the riches purportedly captured during the separation began to course through local, and eventually, national lore. Believing that the *DeBraak* held extensive treasures captured during the separation from the convoy, a pilot from Lewes, a Philadelphia physician, an entrepreneur from New York, and other treasure hunters from around the country eagerly took their turn at locating the ship in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. With each attempt, new versions of the story arose, further stoking suspicions that the wreck held vast treasure. Sweeping
fictional tales smothered all fact and fueled the excitement surrounding the ship quietly resting at the bottom of the Atlantic.

It was not until Spring of 1984 that divers located the *DeBraak* and began the recovery process that would reveal the truth of the ship's contents. Once they had discovered the vessel off the coast of Lewes, Delaware, the private salvage company earnestly began their recovery operations. The project spanned three seasons and attracted national media attention; however, none of the efforts revealed the treasures that allegedly filled the *DeBraak*'s hold and cabins. Unfortunately, circumstances led to a recovery organized and executed by professional divers and treasure hunters, not by trained underwater archaeologists and maritime historians. For the most part, these divers removed objects without fully documenting their provenience and context.

In the first year of the project, the salvers placed a non-systematic grid over the site that provided some control of provenience. However, the salvers carried out most of the excavation with an airlift lacking any means of screening or monitoring of the outflow. By the second season, after staff of the State of Delaware Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs had become actively involved in the operations, the recovery methods became more stringent. A new grid system was established and screening and sluicing of the airlift's outflow began. The divers also started to record gross provenience information based on the four-by-six foot unit from which a diver recovered an artifact. This record is somewhat haphazard, and was only created for the artifacts lifted to the surface in baskets or by hand. In 1986, the salvers began to map the site, measuring and drawing the perimeter of the hull and identifying significant features (e.g., carronades, shot lockers, and large artifact concretions) within and surrounding the hull.
Despite the state officials’ attempts at establishing a grid and mapping site features, one must question the completeness of the collection. In many instances, the salvage team ignored or discarded artifact-bearing sediment. Furthermore, the financially-driven salvagers often made rash judgments on the worth and merit of the artifacts. As a result, the divers collected primarily the remarkable artifacts rather than exhaustively culling all the data from the site. This method of retrieval resulted in the loss of the ship’s cooking stove and in uneven representation in artifact categories such as wooden objects and faunal and floral remains.  

Despite the non-systematic recovery of the ship, this author made all attempts at eliciting as much information as possible from the data at hand. Analysis of collection objects for thesis research commenced with identification of artifacts designated as the focus of the project—furnishings, interior architectural components (e.g., window frames, doors, paneling), and decorative objects. Once catalogued, these artifacts were isolated from the 1985 artifact inventories, which included gross provenience information, and mapped onto the 1984-1985 base map of the site in order to provide a basic understanding of artifact distribution. This mapping assigned the overwhelming majority of inventoried furnishings-related artifacts to the stern of the DeBraak. The mapped distribution reveals a heavy concentration of artifacts on the DeBraak’s right side that resulted from the ship originally coming to rest on the ocean floor at a thirty degree list to the starboard side. As a control, mapping of ceramics accompanied the aforementioned mapping of furnishings. In the artifact inventory, ceramics occur with greater frequency than objects classified as furnishings or decorative. Thus, ceramics provide a good basis for comparing the distribution of the furnishings artifacts. The starboard slant of the ceramics distribution mirrors that of the
furnishings, and for the most part, the ceramics also appear in parts of the ship expected to hold ceramics and dining objects. Both of these artifact distribution patterns suggest that except for the starboard slant, the objects held inside of the hull retained a position relatively close to their original location on the ship.

Due to the non-scientific nature of the DeBraak's recovery, archaeologists have questioned the value of the collection, and have argued that much of the intra-site context has been lost. Citing these shortcomings, some archaeologists have discounted the DeBraak's collection as a spoiled one. While one can not downplay the extreme importance of detailed mapping, recording, and documentation when excavating and recovering a historic site, neither can the importance of the DeBraak collection be downplayed. Although the recovery salvage techniques were archaeologically unethical, subsequent management of the extensive collection has been exemplary. Museum professionals from the Delaware State Museums have carefully catalogued the hull and all artifacts and conservation efforts are on-going. Presently, archaeologists, historians, and material culture specialists are studying the collections in order to extract detailed information about life at sea in the late eighteenth century.

One can not deny that the shortcomings of the recovery hold significant implications for this thesis and all other work that scholars conduct with the collection. The DeBraak collection exists without the complete intra-site context essential for a fully developed interpretation of the materials, and thus for a close understanding of life aboard the DeBraak. The lack of precise provenience information for all of the artifacts and artifact assemblages prevents researchers from knowing the actual placement, use, and relationships of these objects aboard the ship at the time that it sank. Partitions constructed by carpenters after the Admiralty drafted the plans are gone, and a hurried
crane lift severely damaged the hull, dislodged artifacts, and dumped artifact-bearing sediment. Yet, however unfortunate the recovery of the vessel and its contents, there is no reason to discount the need for analysis and interpretation of the materials from the ship. The breadth of materials and the excellent state of preservation of many of the artifacts makes the collection an excellent candidate for a contextualized material culture analysis.

Multiple contexts create a framework for the interpretation of the thousands of artifacts that survive to tell the story of the individuals who lived and worked aboard the DeBraak. As Ian Hodder emphasizes, contextualism is the key to studying the past, for "the relationship between behavior and material culture depends on the actions of individuals within particular cultural and historical contexts." While the recovery and documentation of the site did not occur under ideal circumstances, much of the historical and cultural context can be reconstructed. The fitting, manning, provisioning, sailing, and sinking of the ship took place at a clearly identified time and place, thus situating the objects in a precise temporal and geographical context. The assemblage of artifacts and the detailed plans of the ship’s hull and decks establish the specific locational and material context for the collection objects. Muster lists and survivor and casualty records populate the material world of the DeBraak. Finally, the archaeological evidence from other ships of the period, published narratives of life in the Royal Navy, plans of comparable ships, and general studies of the Royal Navy provide the broad historical, cultural, and technical context for the objects and plans of the DeBraak.

Many historical studies of the Royal Navy exist, but the artifacts recovered from the DeBraak provide an opportunity to study shipboard culture on a detailed,
microscopic level. The fragments of information pieced together from multiple lines of evidence make it possible to create a historic ethnography of life and work aboard the DeBraak in 1798. Robert Schuyler argues that the essential element of a historic ethnography is the humanistic and anthropological focus on people and culture. The scale of the study comprises another crucial component of a historic ethnography. A site-specific analysis of a community or some smaller subunit reveals a “historically-integrated cultural unit” that has the potential to then contribute to an understanding of culture at a broader scale. Overall, the humanism and close attention to all cultural products (documentary, oral, and artifactual) enhances the understanding of the past as the researcher attempts to gain an “appreciation...of human reality.”

The reality of life aboard the DeBraak hinged on the ship’s abundant material culture. In the years since the DeBraak’s recovery, scholars have studied many aspects of material life aboard the DeBraak, including cooperage, dining, footwear, rigging, and hull design. Until this point, there has been no study of the ship’s domestic and work interiors such as cabins, storerooms, and the furnishings, decorative objects, and architectural finishes of these spaces. These objects influenced every crew member’s life in an intimate and recurring way, and thus are an essential component of a historic ethnography of the ship.

Today categorized by function and artifact type, all of the objects in the DeBraak collection once formed a synthesized whole, functioning together with the human residents to create a complex, yet very compact, system. However, there has been no detailed holistic and humanistic analysis of the DeBraak and its material world. More specifically, the significance of the quality and use of interior space has not been considered, nor have the ways that it shaped the crew members’ actions, interactions,
and ways of making sense of the world. As a result, the role the material world of the ship’s interior played in the lives of the ship’s residents and in the ship’s overall function remains at issue.

While a few scholars have produced descriptions of the layout and accommodations of Royal Navy vessel interiors during the *DeBraak*’s period, few, if any, have adopted an anthropological perspective informed by material culture to investigate the significance and role of the ship’s material world for its inhabitants. Noted Royal Navy scholar Brian Lavery and maritime historian Antonia Macarthur provide extensive descriptive information about the ships of the mid to late eighteenth century. Yet neither scholar considers the on-going interaction between the shipboard residents and the physical environment they so carefully describe in their studies. Lavery’s works present the essential technical specifics of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century ship’s interiors and crew organization, but do not go further to assess the implications of a ship’s interior design and contents on its residents. Likewise, Macarthur presents very detailed information about paint, fabrics, and floor coverings, though nothing about the meaning of these decorative elements.18 Social historians of the Royal Navy N.A.M. Rodger, Henry Baynham, and Michael Lewis adopt perspectives that are informed considerably by anthropological insight to portray life aboard a navy ship. None of these writers, however, join their humanistic approach with the physical components of the ship.19 Most recently, Greg Dening has presented an interpretation of the relationships of discipline, power, and oral culture on the H.M.S. *Bounty* prior to and during mutiny. His study is an ethnographic one, though heavily influenced by Marxist thought. Furthermore, like the other scholars Dening continues to disregard the impact of the material world. Marcus Rediker has presented
a similarly Marxist interpretation of maritime life during the first half of the eighteenth century in study, Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea. His study goes beyond Dening’s to consider the many aspects of maritime culture, but Rediker assumes that life at sea was devoid of sensory stimulation and social interaction.\textsuperscript{20} On an eighteenth-century Royal Navy vessel, like the DeBraak, the physical world existed hand-in-hand with the human complement of seamen and officers. A study that fails to address the connection between these fundamental components and denies the full range of experience, texture, and interaction present in the material world can not express the reality of shipboard life.

The interaction between people and between people and their physical surroundings created a “landscape” within the wooden walls of the hull. The topography and material culture of the DeBraak shaped the social world of the ship in crucial ways. Like all other design aspects of the ship—including rigging, sails, and armaments—the overall design and construction was imperative for achieving the Admiralty’s goals for the ship. The two decks, the relatively small number of guns, and the overall size of the vessel classified the DeBraak as a Royal Navy brigantine, suitable for convoy duty. Once one moves from the overall design to the specifics of crew relations and interactions as they put the ship to work, the spatial structure and textures of the ship’s internal spaces come to the forefront. As a physical presence in the lives of all of the individuals aboard the DeBraak, the landscape had a significant impact on the community aboard the ship. It worked actively to define relationships, structure interaction, and establish order among the many individuals living within the confined space. The community of DeBraak worked and lived within the established order and structure, but they were not static actors in a predetermined landscape. Their daily
negotiation with the physical environment and with their shipmates imparted meaning, dynamism, and mutability to the regulation navy ship structure created by the Admiralty Board.\textsuperscript{21}

Not only does current scholarship ignore the connection between material culture and behavior, ideology, and experience, but it also fails to consider the dichotomy between the landscape as intended by the Admiralty and the landscape as the residents experienced and lived it. In many historical studies, the crew, and especially the enlisted seamen, are portrayed as a group of workers devoid of personality, living and working on the ship, though not impacting their environment in any way. In actuality, these men actively drew meaning from and then imparted meaning to their surroundings through their actions, performances, and objects.

The physical and social structure of the ship designated specific areas for sleeping, for manning the guns, for storing sails, for taking tea, for distributing provisions, and for preparing meals for all of the ship’s residents. When used by the ship’s crew, this series of discreet spaces together formed a complex, interactive, and reverberating artifact—a landscape that was experienced in a multi-sensory way by all those who moved within it. One can not simply study this rich and nuanced artifact from a one-dimensional visual viewpoint. In order to understand the varied experiences of shipboard life, the perspectives, interests, and actions of all members of the community must be considered. Moreover, according to Dell Upton, it is necessary to “rethink the self’s interaction with the landscape by recalling the variety of ways we relate to the material world....Most people perceive the world through five senses.” \textsuperscript{22} Rhys Isaac shares this experiential perspective as he advocates that studies of the past
should not be "primarily a record of the researcher's labors, but a persuasive reconstruction of the experiences of past actors."\textsuperscript{23}

To invoke the richness and texture of life aboard the \textit{DeBraak}, it is helpful and necessary to adopt an experiential perspective, considering the engagement of all of the bodily senses, including hearing, smell, and touch, of each of the men who lived on the decks and within the walls of the ship. The focus on experience and perception of the material world put forward by Dell Upton informs this interpretation of the \textit{DeBraak}'s landscape in significant ways. Using Admiralty drafts of the \textit{DeBraak} and numerous artifacts from the collection, this thesis will recreate the sights, sounds, smells, and motions of the vessel's landscape, and will then address the implications of the structure of this landscape for the residents of the \textit{DeBraak}.

To portray the images and atmosphere of the \textit{DeBraak}'s landscape, this thesis is presented in a format that includes a series of narrative vignettes accompanied by descriptive and explanatory text. The italicized narrative components are an interpretive and evocative approach to presenting the research conducted for this thesis, and synthesize the data from primary documents, secondary sources, the ship's plans, and the artifact collection. For the narratives, detailed artifact information for the \textit{DeBraak} furnishings, interior architectural components, and decorative items is presented in catalogue entry form in Appendix B.\textsuperscript{24} These catalogued objects are indicated with a footnote that identifies the object's accession number. The entries in the appendix are then organized consecutively by accession number. Information about other artifact categories, such as ceramics, glassware, mess equipment, and personal objects, is drawn from reports and catalogue sheets prepared by archaeologists, historians, and museum personnel during previous analyses of the collection.
Recently members of The Society for Historical Archaeology have employed storytelling as an interpretive and communicative device. Every archaeological site and set of data contains thousands of clues to the past—a myriad of potential stories. In excavating and researching a site, an archaeologist is charged with communicating to general readers and the scholarly community the results of his or her findings. Storytelling actively engages both the writer and the reader by evoking the sights, sounds, smells, and feelings of the past. More importantly, “the telling of a story is more than a style of presentation; it becomes a way of knowing.” A story situates a series of events, objects, people, and ideas into a compelling plot. Creating a story requires not only heightened creativity and evocative writing, but also close attention to the factual details and a true understanding of what it is that is important and interesting about the data and evidence at hand. In other words, stories are a way for researchers to discover what is “worth knowing from what [they] have analyzed.” Using the interpretive technique of storytelling produces a study of a past community that forgoes formal academic detachment in favor of an interpretation that comes alive with the essence and details of daily life. It is this evocative, narrative technique that shapes this study of life and work in the landscape of the H.M.S. DeBraak.

★ ★ ★

When the DeBraak departed England on its unfortunate voyage to the North American coast, it had been in the Royal Navy’s fleet for almost three years. However, the British did not originally own the DeBraak. The early history of the DeBraak is presently incomplete, but it is generally accepted that the Dutch navy built
the vessel prior to 1781 for the Admiralty of the *Maas*, an admiralty of one of the Dutch districts. British records document the *DeBraak* as originally being a 255-ton cutter with a frame and interiors of oak. A single mast rose from the eighty-four foot long upper deck. In 1795, when war broke out between Great Britain and the Dutch Batavian Republic, a satellite of the French Revolutionary government, the Dutch had the *DeBraak* and five other ships anchored in British ports. The Royal Navy quickly seized the six Dutch vessels, and sent them to the dockyard at Plymouth to be surveyed and refitted for British service.28

After surveying the ship, the Admiralty Board in conjunction with the Navy Board decided to convert the single-mast, fore-and-aft rigged cutter to a brigantine, a vessel that had two square-rigged masts. Because of its small size, the Admiralty classified the *DeBraak* as an unrated sloop-of-war. The term sloop generally applies to any ten-to-eighteen gun vessel commanded by an officer with the rank of commander rather than full captain. The *DeBraak* became a British ship during a period when the Royal Navy greatly increased the number of sloops in the fleet. In fact, between 1793 and 1810, it expanded the fleet to include roughly four times as many sloops as it had had prior to 1793. Sloops were especially important during the Napoleonic wars because they were generally employed for commerce protection, attack of enemy commerce, and inshore work against invasion.29

Within the general category of sloop, the *DeBraak*'s size and rig defined it further. Its two, square-rigged masts made it a brig, and its sixteen guns ranked it as an unrated ship. The Royal Navy rated every vessel carrying twenty guns or more in ascending order from sixth rate to first rate. The number of guns and size of the ship determined its rating and defined the number of officers allocated to the ship and the
amount that they were paid. Furthermore, the rating gave some indication about the use of the ship and its layout. With only sixteen guns and two decks, the DeBraak did not merit a rating. Instead, its small size and intended purpose as a commerce protection ship defined it as a sloop.

As a brig the masts of the DeBraak supported three or possibly four courses of sails. Square canvas sails were laced by their head (or top end) from the yards (supports crossing the mast at right angles). Additional sails on the main mast and on the bow of the ship enhanced the ship’s sailing abilities. Brig armaments varied during the eighteenth century, but due to development in armament technology, the vessels typically carried a combination of long guns and carronades. The use of two long guns and the remainder carronades became a common operational configuration for brigs. The DeBraak was no exception from the typical Royal Navy brig, thus fourteen carronades in the side gun ports and two long guns in the bow ports comprised the ship’s requisite armaments.30

With the work complete, the DeBraak was a copper-sheathed, two-deck vessel measuring eighty-four feet in length and twenty-eight-and-a-half feet wide on deck. The Admiralty Board slated the sixteen gun, brig-rigged sloop to assume routine convoy duty as soon as possible.31 The timing was perfect because the DeBraak joined the Royal Navy fleet as the need for trade escort vessels escalated rapidly. Convoy ships performed a vital role in the heavily trade-dependent economy of the British Empire. It was paramount that the Navy protect commerce during the Napoleonic wars, a time when French privateers trolled the British and American coasts laying claim to the goods on the target British ships.
The Convoy Act enacted at the outbreak of war in 1793 strongly advised ships to cross the Atlantic in escorted convoys. Many merchants objected to the convoys because the added numbers of vessels slowed their trade. However, safety precipitated convoys. A fleet of merchant ships escorted by one large war ship and a smaller one, usually a brig, had a much improved chance of surviving the trip, and thus returning with the American goods and money essential to continued economic success. American merchant ships carrying British goods did not escape the intense privateering. Between March and June 1797, British warships escorted over 150 American vessels filled with British merchandise safely across the Atlantic. As hostilities between the two countries escalated, France declared in January 1798 that any vessel carrying British goods was subject to capture. With the Atlantic waters teeming with French vessels preying on trade ships, protection of the American trade became a crucial role of the Royal Navy. In response to the situation, Parliament passed the Compulsory Convoy Act. This act intensified the advisory nature of the Convoy Act of 1793 by taxing all ships to pay for the cost of the convoy. More importantly, the new act threatened fines of £1000 for ships attempting to sail without an armed escort.\(^{32}\)

In the late Spring of 1797, the sloop-of-war *DeBraak* stood ready to assume a role in the convoy service, but still lacked a commanding officer. The search for a commander for the ship ended on June 13th, 1797, when the Admiralty appointed James Drew to the position.\(^{33}\) The forty-six year old Drew was no stranger to the Royal Navy, having begun his service at thirteen as a captain’s servant on a large man-of-war.\(^{34}\) Throughout his youth, he was transferred between ships, serving alternately
as servant, seaman, clerk, and midshipman. These multiple roles aboard the ship provided the young James Drew with the typical training of a naval officer.

The admiralty expected and required every young man with aspirations to being an officer to begin their career by serving in low positions aboard navy ships. Officer candidates typically began their careers at a young age as servants. Following their years as a servant, young men may have served in any number of capacities. Typically they first assumed the position of ordinary seaman which was the second rating aboard a naval ship. They would then be promoted to the rating of able seaman, a man with the ability to perform all of the duties on the ship. These duties included handling the sails, steering the ship with the wheel, tying knots, preparing the ropes, as well as carrying out the remainder of the routine daily activities aboard a ship. After a total of three years in naval service, the able seaman would automatically be ranked as an inferior officer, either a midshipman or a master's mate. To become an officer the Royal Navy required that a man have served for at least three years as midshipman or master's mate and for a total of at least six years at sea. Once an individual fulfilled all of these requirements and had reached the age of nineteen, he could take his oral examination for rank of lieutenant.35

In June 1771, at the age of twenty, James Drew had served the requisite time and positions in the navy and had prepared to take the qualifying examination to become a lieutenant. Drew passed the examination and earned his lieutenant's certificate, but did not receive his first commission for four more years, when he assumed his role as second lieutenant on the seventy-four gun, H.M.S. Preston. Following that commission, Drew served as lieutenant on three other ships before being promoted to the position of ship commander in 1787. As a new commander, Drew
served on two sloops, the sixteen-gun *Echo* and the fourteen-gun *Fly*, before receiving his commission on the newly-refitted, sixteen-gun *DeBraak*.

In February 1798, the Admiralty Board assigned James Drew and the *DeBraak* to escort a convoy of merchant ships across the Atlantic to North America. A final complement of seventy-three officers and men and twelve Marines was mustered for the trip. These men varied greatly in age, social class, and nationality. Of the seventy-eight men who listed place of origin in the muster records, ninety-three percent hailed from the British Isles while the remaining eight percent represented five different foreign nationalities. Among the foreigners were sailors citing New York, Sweden, France, Hamburg, and Lisbon as their most recent place of abode. The crew of the *DeBraak* was divided into categories based on rank, experience, and ability. The divisions on the De Braak included the commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, inferior officers (or midshipmen), marines, sailors, and boys.

The confined and hierarchical society of the Royal Navy strictly ordered the divisions aboard the *DeBraak*. In the early eighteenth century, the organization of the crew was not especially structured, but by 1793, the structure of shipboard life had become elaborately regulated. This order, structure, and discipline ensured that the ship and crew would function effectively. According to naval historian N.A.M. Rodger, “shipboard society was a complex world in which each person’s place was defined by many invisible and subtle distinctions.” Royal Navy regulations, social structure, daily functional requirements of sailing a ship, and the ship’s material world defined these distinctions. These factors determined the duties, accommodations, and privileges of each individual aboard the sloop, and in turn the individual’s place in the ship’s landscape.
The commissioned officers, Commander James Drew and Lieutenant Thomas Hickson, were the only sea officers appointed by the Royal Navy Admiralty Board. The monarch appointed the Admiralty Board who in turn commissioned the officers. Generally, these men achieved their elevated rank through their merit, ability, as well as their social connections. Typically commissioned officers came from the gentry class, but in some cases a commissioned officer rose from the rank of common seaman. Though the specifics of their social backgrounds varied, commissioned officers were regarded as gentlemen and were expected to act accordingly. The Royal Navy trained commissioned officers in all areas of seamanship, and a competent officer oversaw every aspect of the ship, including navigation, maintenance, and signals of the ship. On the DeBraak, Commander James Drew served as the vessel’s captain and ultimately had responsibility for the entire ship and everything and everyone aboard. Lieutenant Thomas Hickson acted as the commander’s assistant for all of these duties, and as the ship’s chief executive officer.40

The group of seven warrant officers, the master, boatswain, purser, surgeon, gunner, carpenter, and cook, formed the next stratum of shipboard society. One or two mates assisted most of the warrant officers. In most cases, the Royal Navy classed these men as petty officers. The warrant officers were skilled specialists appointed because of their skill and knowledge. Typically, they achieved their position based on their experience and skill, rather than social standing. Once assigned to a ship, they headed different functional departments. Unlike the sailors, they were required to be literate and skilled in arithmetic. Their appointment by warrant from one of several administrative organizations under the Admiralty Board, rather than directly by the Admiralty set them apart from the commissioned officers. The warrant officers
were standing officers, meaning that they were assigned to a ship when it was built and would remain with that ship until the end of either their own or the ship's life.41

The master, Thomas Griffiths, was the highest ranking warrant officer. His pay and status equaled that of the lieutenant. He served as the navigator, plotting the position of the ship each day, supervising the midshipmen and mates in taking sights, and overseeing the ship's compasses. One mate and two quartermasters assisted Thomas Griffiths was assisted in these duties. The ship's surgeon, William White attended to the medical needs of the DeBraak's crew. Unlike many of the other warrant officers, the surgeon was not necessarily a skilled professional. The surgeon's social status and training varied greatly. While ship surgeons had usually learned their trade through an apprenticeship before joining a ship, they very rarely possessed a physician's degree. In order to qualify for a navy position, the surgeon candidate had to pass an oral examination and then was required to serve a period as a surgeon's mate.42

The purser, along with his assistant, the steward, victualled the ship and provided all other consumable provisions such as shoes, clothing, and candles. The purser worked as both an officer of the government and as a private contractor reselling items at his own risk. He received part of his compensation directly from a small salary and the remainder from a twelve-and-a-half percent commission on the issue of the daily victualling allowance.43 The boatswain had usually begun his career as a seaman, and then had been promoted to the rank of warrant officer. He was responsible for the sails, rigging, and the anchors and cables necessary for mooring the ship. Furthermore, the boatswain detailed the crew to conduct the daily tasks on the
ship’s deck and disciplined them when necessary. Aboard the DeBraak, two mates assisted the boatswain, W. Williams, in his duties.

William Rumbold, the DeBraak’s gunner maintained all of the armaments and their equipment. Along with his crew of a gunner’s mate, an armourer, and a quarter gunner, Rumbold maintained supplies for each gun, kept the powder dry and well-aired, and oversaw the gun room. Another of the warrant officers was the carpenter charged with the duty of inspecting, maintaining, and repairing the ship’s hull, masts, and spars. The carpenter also had responsible for constructing all tables and benches that the crew needed. Two carpenters along with their crew of two men served on the DeBraak. The crew’s cook, William Cooper, and the captain’s cook, John O’Neal, were the last of the warrant officers in the DeBraak’s complement. Cooks had often served as seamen at some time during their career, but were usually disabled pensioners appointed as cooks in compensation for injury received in defense of the country.

Between the commissioned and warrant officers and the general enlisted crew ranked the petty officers and inferior officers. The petty officers included the men serving as mates to the boatswain, carpenter, gunner, and purser. The group of petty officers also included the quartermaster, who directed the steerage of the ship, stowing of the ballast in the hole, keeping time with the watch glasses, and oversaw the purser’s steward in his delivery of provisions. The yeoman of the powder room was the only other man ranked as petty officer aboard the DeBraak. He attended the magazines and delivered the powder when it was needed for action.

The DeBraak’s inferior officers numbered four midshipmen and the master’s mate. Midshipmen and mates were regarded as future sea officers and would
likely someday assume the position of a commissioned officer. Thus they sometimes shared the privileges of the officers, and they were expected to dressrespectably and behave like officers. Despite being privileged to special accommodations and meals, the midshipmen did take part in the ship’s watch system. They also received training organized by the captain. Training included learning to cast the lead, to exercise with small arms and great guns, and to tie knots. The midshipmen also maintained detailed logs.47

All Royal Navy ships, except the very smallest, had a contingent of Marines. The number of Marines varied according to the size of the ship. Thirteen privates, a sergeant, and a corporal formed the DeBraak’s group of Marines. The Marines acted as sharpshooters, fought enemy boarding parties, and boarded enemy ships. In certain situations, they would accompany landing parties ashore to serve as their protection. Marines did not serve on watches, but did assist with the work on the ship if necessary. Often their duties included pulling and hauling the ropes or turning the capstan to raise the anchor.48

Classed as ordinary seamen, able seamen, or landsmen, the sailors formed the largest number of the DeBraak’s crew. Experience and skill determined the divisions of sailors. Regardless of their classification, all of the sailors had many duties that varied according to the ship’s activities. The DeBraak’s twenty-one able seamen had over two years experience and could execute all shipboard duties. The seven ordinary seamen had served for two years or less and had limited abilities. The one landsman aboard the DeBraak had no previous shipboard experience prior to mustering for the DeBraak. The final category of shipboard society were the young boys who played a part on every Royal Navy ship. The DeBraak crew included nine boys who
served in many capacities aboard the ship. Ranging in age from eleven to seventeen, the boys often were designated as servants for the captain and other officers. According to navy regulations, each officer was allowed one servant, except the boatswain, carpenter, and gunner who had two each. The boys on Royal Navy ships came from a variety of backgrounds. Some were young gentlemen training for the position of an officer just as Commander Drew had done, while others would become able seamen or warrant officers in the future. Once they reached the age of seventeen, the young men could assume the role of ordinary seaman and then aspire to higher ranks in the coming years. 49

Supplementing the hierarchy built on rank and skill, all of the crew members, except the Marines, a fundamental distinction between seamen and idlers divided the crew. A seaman stood watches through the day and night, while an idler was not placed on watch. Instead of serving watch, the idlers stood constant day duty and slept at night. Nevertheless, they did go on deck if all hands were called at night. 50 The idlers included all the specialist non-seamen, such as the carpenter, purser, surgeon, the yeoman of the powder room, the carpenter’s crew, the armourer, the captain’s clerks, and the cook.

Typically, the seamen were organized into two watches that structured their day. With this structure, only part of the crew stood watch at any one time. The midshipmen, mates, quartermaster, boatswain’s mates, and all of the sailors were assigned to a watch. Among the officers, the lieutenant, master, boatswain, and gunner also stood watch in a ship the size of the DeBraak. Each watch was divided and assigned according to the different areas of the ship that needed attention. Assigned areas of the ship were the masts, the anchor, and the main deck. Most watches were
four hours and divided into eight half-hour periods. Rings of a bell punctuated each period, with eight strokes of the bell indicating a change in the watch. Two two-hour “dog” watches created variety in the watches, so that seamen were not on watch at the same time everyday.51

★★★

Historians often refer to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Royal Navy ships as “wooden worlds.”52 These ships were indeed worlds of sorts, though unlike any world that most non-mariners could imagine. Curving walls enclosed complex landscapes and active communities of men who went about their daily activities with the constant companionship of their fellow crew in physically confined spaces for weeks and months. The DeBraak’s shipboard community initially formed as the men mustered for their assignment on the convoy escort. Most of the men joining the ship were strangers to one another.53 Many had experienced shipboard life, so they had become familiar with the basic physical conditions and work demands of a ship, but most did not know what to expect from their new crew mates. For this recently-formed community, life aboard the DeBraak did not necessarily constitute a challenge to their ship handling skills. Each journey, though, did present a new and changing human dynamic. In the spatially-confined decks of the wooden world, these men negotiated their relationships as they lived and worked together throughout the voyage. One way that these relationships manifested themselves was in the ship’s material landscape.

His Majesty’s sloop-of-war DeBraak was a wooden world comprised of many people living in and shaping a multivalent landscape. When they designed, re-fitted, and provisioned the ship prior to its departure in March 1798, the Admiralty
Board and subsidiary administrative arms of the Royal Navy created a formal physical landscape to house officers, seamen, and Marines. They partitioned and divided the limited space of the DeBraak to maintain order, to enhance functionality and efficiency, and to establish the appropriate hierarchical social structure for the shipboard society. Apart from the changes made to the masts and armament capacity, the majority of additions and alterations to the vessel focused on the interior structure and the domestic accommodations for the crew members. (Figure 2)

Partitions installed on the lower (berthing) deck divided the space in the stern (rear) into a ward room and cabins for the captain, lieutenant, master, captain’s clerk, purser, surgeon, and gunner. Just outside the clerk and gunner’s cabin’s stood the steward room, a location for storing and distributing daily meal provisions and other crew needs. (Figure 3) At the opposite end of the lower deck, in the bow, the carpenter and boatswain had their cabins and their store rooms. (Figure 4) At midship, between these segmented spaces, an open space encompassed the remainder of the lower deck.

Other additions the shipwrights made during re-fitting included a fire hearth for the new galley stove. They also converted a ladder way into a hatch to the bread room, and installed a new ladder way through the stern of the upper (main) deck to provide direct access to the officer’s cabins. To permit more light to the cabins below, the glass companion on the upper deck was enlarged and a second one was added.54 Positioned over the captain’s cabin and ward room, these glass companions consisted of wooden framing and sash lights. On the upper deck, shipwrights added a captain’s pantry, clerk’s office, and a necessary in the stern.55 (Figure 5)
As the men lived on the DeBraak, they reacted to the ship’s design and created their own meaningful spaces within the navy’s imposed structure. With objects, actions, and words, they actively formed and reformed a social landscape within the formal physical structure on an informal daily basis as they lived and worked on the ship. While the design of the ship and navy protocol allotted distinct areas for specific work activities and the ship’s functional requirements and others, like the galley, for domestic needs, each of these locations held the option of having alternate meanings assigned to them by the individuals who used them.

Spaces on the lower deck and upper deck were typically busy with a strict schedule of ship handling and upkeep, but each member of the crew, whether it be the captain, the boatswain, or the landsman, experienced these areas differently. In turn, each individual viewed these parts of the landscape from a different perspective and derived and assigned different meaning to them. As Greg Dening asserts, “space and the language to describe it make a ship.” On the DeBraak, as on all ships, space and language were not static. Instead, mutability and variation characterized each as the men created and perceived their wooden worlds.

With its two, eighty-four foot long decks and the hold, the DeBraak was less structured physically than the mammoth fighting ships of the period. Large men-of-war often consisting of multiple gun decks and carrying up to 875 men have been the focus of much of the study of spatial division and use. Due to their size, enormous crew, and military purpose, these ships had rigid specialization and segregation both vertically and horizontally. Typically, they had multiple levels for accommodating the crew. The lowest decks housed enlisted crew and junior ranks while upper decks accommodated the higher ranking seamen and petty officers.
With multiple chambers allotted for the captain and each of the officers as well as ward rooms for the midshipmen, the use of space aboard these behemoth ships was highly refined. For every single activity and person, a specific place existed, and to maintain effective order there was not to be any deviation from this structure.

The interiors of a smaller ship like the DeBraak were more loosely defined. As on all other naval vessels, the Royal Navy carefully designated every inch of physical space aboard the DeBraak for a specific purpose, but smaller ships did not always have room available to segregate space for every person, duty, and activity. For example, unlike on some larger ships which had a surgeon's dispensary, the DeBraak's surgeon worked only from his cabin in the stern of the berthing deck and perhaps in other areas of the ship not designated on the plans, such as the mess tables in the central berthing area or on makeshift tables on the upper deck.

Even in a small vessel like the DeBraak, distinct differences did exist between the spaces designated for individuals and the communal, shared spaces. These differences fell largely along lines of rank. The lower deck served as the primary domestic area for the entire complement of the ship. For the officers, their portion of the lower deck was characterized by a certain amount of individually-defined space. In the stern of the lower deck, the plan allocated cabins for housing the captain and the officers, while in the bow the boatswain and carpenter had their cabins and workrooms. Unlike the enlisted seamen and the marines, the captain and officers enjoyed the privilege of their own private cabins. A bulkhead wall with a door separated the four small cabins for the purser, surgeon, lieutenant, and master, located in the stern of the ship from the remainder of the lower deck. These officers’ cabins and Captain Drew’s larger cabin opened onto the wardroom, a shared space at the center used for meals.
and leisure activities. Just outside of the wardroom bulkhead stood cabins for the
gunner and the clerk. These warrant officers as well as those living in the bow, could
dine in the wardroom only by the captain’s invitation.

Similar sized personal cabins occupied a position at the bow end of the
lower deck. Behind these two cabins were the storerooms for the boatswain,
carpenter, and gunner. The location of the carpenter’s and boatswain’s cabins gave
them easy access to their workrooms. The boatswain also needed to be in close
proximity to the crew which fell under his supervision for all the work conducted on
deck. A large iron stove and galley occupied a spot in the central berthing area. This
large open space also accommodated the Marines, seamen, and boys who slung their
hammocks and set up their mess tables there. (Figure 6)

During the day, the open area of the lower deck served as a location for
eating, cooking, and other tasks, and by night it became a place for the seamen to
communally sling their hammocks. The fourteen-inches allocated for each hammock
and the hook or ring from which they hung often constituted the only things that the
men could claim as personal space.59 In moments of free time, while working on
tasks, and at mealtimes, the lower deck also hosted sociable, leisure activity, with the
seamen taking part in activities such as smoking around the galley, singing, exchanging
stories, or playing Crowns and Anchors, a game of chance played with a specially-
marked die.60

It is on this lower deck that the most noticeable variation between different
size ships is evidenced. On larger ships, with multiple decks allocated for sleeping,
rank segregated the enlisted men. Midshipmen, marines, and the varying levels of
seamen lived and slept on different decks, and sometimes even in the hold. On smaller
ships, like the De Braak, all of the men berthed on one deck, with the different classes of seamen placed in distinct areas of the berthing deck perhaps separated by canvas curtains. The physical closeness and the proximity of different classes of seamen created a dynamic between the crew far different from the relationships on the larger ships. With men of all classes intermingled on the lower deck, tempers flared and bonds of friendship formed.

Intense communality and cooperation marked the enlisted seaman’s existence. In all of his activities and at almost every moment, a seaman was surrounded by his shipmates. Able seamen worked together during watches on the main deck furling and shortening sails, climbing aloft to tend to the yards and the upper sails, steering, and keeping watch. Selected seamen exercised nearby with their small arms while the detachment of Marines paraded on the deck. Other members of the crew cleaned the upper deck and performed other daily tasks, and down below men repaired sails and rigging, transported provisions from the hold, gathered meal supplies, and aired bedding materials. There were very few, if any, moments to be alone. According to Greg Dening, privacy for these men was not a matter of walls. It was a matter of behaviour [sic], closing the windows of one’s soul. Except for this, the essence of a sailor’s existence was to be utterly without space he could call his own, to have all his possessions calculated narrowly, to be a totally public man to his peers and to be totally public to his superiors who could muster him twice daily from his quarters.

Dening’s concept of mental privacy surely provided moments of solitude for a man at sea. However, there are countless references to the shared bond between
men on a ship. In the moments of song and dance or bending a sail to the yard, men acted together, sharing their talents, knowledge, and skills.

For modern scholars, the seaman’s mental privacy is impossible to assess and reconstruct. Few first-hand accounts and narratives indicate that seamen tried to achieve a sense of privacy by withdrawing into their private mental world. It must, instead, be assumed as one factor in the sociology of the wooden world, but can not be regarded as the central defining one. When assessing shipboard life of the naval seaman and officer, attention must turn to the material components that comprised the landscapes of the wooden world and regulated the actions and interaction of its crew as they claimed their personal identities and forged group identity.

★★★

Crawling through the hatch on the upper deck, down a ladder way and into his outer compartment, Captain James Drew pulled on the brass handle of the paneled door that opened into his personal living quarters within the DeBraak’s wooden walls. (Figure 7) Drew was leaving the morning work on the upper deck of the ship and retiring to a space fitted with several of the domestic comforts of a home. Looking up at the glass-domed companion in the ceiling, Captain Drew could see scattered clouds suspended in the sky above as the early morning light shining through the glass planes bathed the room with a gentle brightness. Drew pulled back the canvas curtains at the door’s four-pane window and secured them around the circular brass cloak pins screwed into the wall on either side. (Figures 8 and 9) He then removed his blue uniform coat, slightly damp from the ocean spray, and hung it over the shining brass coat hook that jutted from the wall. (Figure 10)
Next to him, his cot suspended on ropes from the ceiling rocked gently with the movement of the ship. 70

Before settling down on a side chair upholstered and studded with gleaming brass tacks, 71 Drew rang a small table bell 72 to summon his young servant. The young boy arrived quickly from the outer compartment to arrange the coals in the captain's fireplace.73 The newly lit fire quickly warmed the small cabin and chased the damp from Drew's clothing. As he picked up his ember tongs 74 to light his clay pipe, Drew thanked himself for expending the additional funds to purchase the special ship fireplace. (Figure 11) Not only was it practical, but its gleaming arched and molded brass surround made it a pleasant addition to the small cabin aboard the DeBraak.

Captain James Drew's position as captain of the DeBraak entitled him, as it did all other captains and commanders in the Royal Navy, to the comforts of a private cabin in the ship's stern. Captains used their cabins to conduct business, to relax, to sleep and to dine. A captain either possessed a single cabin for all these activities, or had one or more associated compartments for storage, business, dining, sleeping, or accommodating his servants. The number of compartments allotted to the captain varied with the size and design of the ship. Marcie Renner's study of the compartments in nine eighteenth-century British ships revealed that the majority of the captains were allocated two compartments while one-third of captains received three personal compartments. Only one of the nine captains had a single compartment. With his three compartments, Captain Drew had more space than any other individual on board. However, for a captain these compartments were comparatively small, and they appear
to have functioned primarily as storage spaces. Besides his trapezoidal main cabin, Drew’s compartments included a rectangular vestibule just outside his cabin measuring approximately four-by-eight feet and a sizable pantry on the deck above. Labeled as the Captain’s pantry on the Admiralty drafts, the upper deck compartment stood at the far stern of the port side. It likely held food, dining equipment, and other supplies belonging to the captain and possibly the officers. Captain Drew may also have had a designated storage space in the ship’s hold. It is difficult to determine the exact use of the lower deck vestibule outside of Drew’s room and whether or not it belonged solely to him. The Admiralty draft does not include a name for this area, and first-hand accounts and images rarely exist to document such secondary spaces. The location of this compartment suggests that it functioned as a transitional space serving as a passageway from the wardroom to the captain’s cabin and also as a stairwell for the ladder to the main deck. Its location also indicates that it may have been an office space used to meet with other officers. Finally, being within earshot, it created an ideal place for the captain’s servant to sling his hammock at night.

With the ceiling five-and-a-half feet above him and roughly nine-and-a-half by nine-and-a-half feet of space on the trapezoidal floor below, Captain Drew enjoyed the most commodious private accommodations aboard the DeBraak. Not only was his cabin the most spacious but it also benefited from other physical comforts not available to the majority of the crew. Natural light was hard to come by in most parts of the berthing deck, but Captain Drew experienced a superb amount of light. The quality of light constituted the most striking difference between Drew’s cabin and the living areas of the other officers and the enlisted crew. Furthermore, the walls around him shielded him from the sounds and smells of the men living near him.
The large, three-by-five foot glass companion that pierced the floor of the deck directly above allowed ample light to stream into the cabin. The daylight illuminated and brightened the space, bringing out the luster of brass cabinet handles on furniture and wall fixtures and glinting off the ornate, silver presentation cup that Drew proudly displayed in his quarters. (Figure 12) Natural light rarely entered ship's lower areas only through the open hatches, but the privilege of constant daylight was an advantage of rank for Drew and the officers sharing the wardroom; it too benefited from a smaller glass companion in the floor of the deck above.

Limited light from the open hatch in the outside vestibule above filtered into the cabin through a small fixed sash window installed in either the door or the bulkhead wall. Interior windows of this type were standard in Royal Navy ship cabins of the third quarter of the eighteenth century. Admiralty orders declared that all cabins were “to have proper sashes glazed with stone ground glass for lighting the front....” Ventilation often did not easily reach the lower deck areas. The hatchway opening from Drew’s outer vestibule to the upper deck provided direct access to fresh air from above, but this air could only reach Drew’s main cabin if he left his door open. The window had a fixed sash and could not be opened. Drew’s cabin did not have the bank of stern windows that commonly appeared on larger ships.

Born to a genteel family, Drew knew comfortable living, and clearly he attempted to achieve a certain level of refinement in his shipboard residence. In his cabin with its curving side walls, Drew installed some of the amenities that likely decorated his home. The Navy Board provided some of these comforts, including paneling and floor coverings, as standard design components. If a captain desired a more luxurious cabin, he brought along additional fittings of his own, including more
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elaborate items such as furnishings, specialized dining wares, and decorative items. Captain Edwards, of the H.M.S. *Pandora*, certainly experienced a luxurious cabin, for when he returned to England after his ship was sunk, he reported over £500 worth of personal property, including cabin furniture, lost with the ship.

The interior finishing of a cabin began with the installation of paneling. Paneling for walls and bulkheads ranged from ornate with paint and gilding to simple planking with beading or raised moldings. The Admiralty Board regulated the type of paneling installed in navy ships, though special requests or directions of the ship’s captain occasionally determined the style of these finishes. Typically, the Royal Navy held the captain accountable for the extra cost of additional decorative details.

The addition of supplementary finishes was obviously quite important for many captains, since the paneling in the captain’s cabin has a history of being quite ornate. Heavy moldings, pilasters, panels, and painting and gilding decorated the great cabin in one seventeenth-century ship. In the next century, a captain requested “raised Arched panels” and “mouldings done with vermillion” and “green” and “the Collums with blew,” and another enjoyed a elegant cabin “painted a light pea green, with gold beading.” The addition of fancy paneling acted as a mode of distinction and personal expression. These flamboyant interiors undoubtedly pleased the captains and helped to make their ship board compartments into refined domestic chambers that fit their personal style. Paneled walls decorated the captain’s space, setting it apart from the utilitarian cabin interiors. Thus, the captain’s cabin expressed his personality and aesthetic judgment, as well as his craving for a domestic space in his work place.

The Royal Navy installed far less ornate interior finishes in the cabins. Standard shipyard specifications called for paint call for “three coats of priming and one
final coat of stone, beige or wood, well ground and laid with linseed oyl.” The paneled surfaces shared similarly standard specifications, with one shipyard installing panels no wider than two feet eight inches, simple beamed ceilings, and wainscot doors in the areas accommodating the captain and other officers on a thirty-two gun frigate built in 1760.88 It is likely then, that as Drew settled himself in his cabin aboard the DeBraak, sloping hull walls painted a neutral color and some type of tongue and groove paneling, simple raised moldings, and wainscot finished the walls surrounding him.89

Once the Navy Board’s shipwrights had finished the walls of Captain Drew’s cabin, the next stage of fitting out the interior typically involved placing a floor covering into the space. Whether a floor cloth covered the floor of Captain Drew’s cabin has not been, and may never be, surely determined. While fragments of canvas and other fabrics in the DeBraak collection indicate that textiles appeared plentifully aboard the ship, hundreds of years at the bottom of the sea have left most of these textile fragments unidentifiable. Thus, the presence of a floor cloth in Drew’s cabin can only be surmised based on contextual evidence.

Standard issue floorcloths of painted canvas or kersey covered the floors of captains’ cabins of the mid-eighteenth century. A floorcloth, especially one of the twill weave woolen called kersey (also known as baize), warmed the plank floor and provided protection against two inevitable factors aboard a ship—excessive cold and damp. These floor coverings also brightened small, typically neutral-colored cabins with a splash of warm color, since wool dyed red or canvas painted red served as the usual material for a captain’s floor cloth. Though the wool likely provided more warmth than canvas, it seems that captains preferred the glue-sized and heavily painted canvas floor cloths over the kersey ones. As Captain James Cook prepared for his
journey on the *Endeavour*, he requested that the Navy Board provide him with a kersey floor cloth to cover the floor of the great cabin, only “if there is no painted canvas available.” The Navy Board responded to Cook’s request, for later in 1768 when on board the *Endeavour*, naturalist Joseph Banks observed that “the floor of the Cabbin...was covered with a red floor cloth of painted Canvas, that had been issued to the ship from his majesties stores at Debtford; which was usually washed with salt water every morning, and suffered to dry without ever being taken up....”90

Unlike fabric, brass was an abundant material on the *DeBraak* that remains in a well-preserved state to provide details about the decorative finishes in the captain’s cabins. Shining coat hooks, cloak pins, a scrolled door handle, hinges, hooks, decorative finials, a molded stove surround, candlesticks, 91 and bail handles decorated the doors, furniture, and walls of Drew’s cabin. (Figure 13) Brass hardware was a common fixture in the stern cabins of eighteenth-century Royal Navy vessels. However, the Royal Navy did not necessarily install these brass fittings as standard features. In their frugality, the Admiralty Board called for hinges, handles, hooks, and of iron, rather than the more expensive brass. Captains and officers wanting the extra luxury of brass fittings, and any other special decorative items, had to pay for them.92

On his second commission, Captain James Cook acknowledged that the brass door fittings he requested would “be fitted in this manner at my Expence.”93

Like Captain Cook, Captain Drew found it important to finish his cabin in a decorative manner, for assorted styles of brass bail handles, a pair of commode handles with ornate stamped back plates (Figure 14), a scrolled brass door handle, and several decorative finials94 survive in the collection. For those captains bringing their own furnishings aboard, brass pulls,95 hinges, knobs,96 and hooks would have already been
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a part of the object. Captains could easily procure additional brass hardware to install in the cabin itself. Small brass fittings for doors and walls, like coat hooks and cloak pins, were easy to transport and added to a captain’s cabin a level of refinement and domesticity matching the paneling and furnishings without excessive cost or effort.

The furniture that the brass handles, hinges, and tacks decorated varied greatly with the individual captain. Shipwrights and carpenters installed basic furnishings such as beds, storage lockers, mess tables and benches, and shelves into ships while they were at port or as needed during the journey. Prior to its departure, carpenters worked installing shelves and additional fittings where needed in the cabins of the *Endeavour*. In addition to these standard items of furniture, captains could decorate their cabins with their own objects to match their aesthetic tastes. Individual captains brought their own furniture to add to the regulation furnishings in the cabin. Often the nature of these furnishings depended on the social standing of the captain and his lifestyle at home as well as on the space available in the shipboard cabin.

Captains often brought selected furnishing items from their home in England, and some captains attired their cabins in the same manner as their London townhouses.

A painting by William Hogarth documents the luxury of one wealthy captain’s cabin. In the circa 1750 cabin, Lord George Graham and his companions occupied a room with carpeting on the floor and paneled walls embellished with reeded pilasters topped by gilded and carved capitals. They sat upon stylish cabriole-legged chairs and dined at a round table set with a cloth, silver plates and utensils, and a porcelain punch bowl. A gilded looking glass hung between the stern windows. Another well-equipped captain, sailing for the East Indies in 1750, brought with him “one large and one small bedstead, twelve dining and two leather chairs, a settee, two...
large tables, two escritoires, three bookcases, three chests of drawers, six more chairs and a table, two tea chests, four clothes and china chests, six pictures of the king and the royal family, a looking-glass in a gilt frame and a large quantity of plate.”

About a quarter of a century later, William Hickey commented on the fineness of the captain’s cabin aboard the *Plassey*, remarking that the ship certainly was in a sad plight, but Mr. Douglas’s [the captain] was an exception to the general filth, being neatness itself, and most elegantly fixed up. It was painted a light pea green with gold beading; the bed and curtains of the richest Madras, one of the most complete dressing-tables I ever saw, having every useful article in it; a beautiful bureau and book-case stored with the best books and three neat mahogany chairs formed the furniture.

The wall treatments and furnishings set Captain Douglas’s cabin apart from the rest of the ship’s landscape. Other individuals, and most likely the larger majority of naval captains and officers, outfitted their cabins in a considerably less ornate manner and brought what they considered the basic necessities to make their small cabins comfortable—bedding, dining accouterments, and storage furniture. One captain commented that his cabin, unlike that of an acquaintance, was “strong and plain like an old country-hall.” Joseph Banks, the naturalist aboard the *Endeavour* in 1768, brought only small pieces of furniture and personal belongings, including a bureau and chest of drawers and bedding to furnish the great cabin that he shared with the ship’s captain, James Cook.
While Captain Drew sat in his cabin reviewing the ship’s approach to the American shore, some of the officers assembled in the wardroom for a late breakfast. The air was thick with the smells of the officers’ porridge and the odor of unwashed bodies. A few servant boys stood to the side, ready to gather dishes and food remains when the men finished their meal. Around the cloth-covered gate-leg table, the purser, clerk, surgeon, and gunner silently spooned porridge from their blue and white printed bowls. (Figure 15) Lieutenant Hickson had left the wardroom long ago to supervise activity on the main deck. Finishing his meal, Surgeon White pushed back his chair, stood from the table, and turned towards his cabin.

Just outside the door of Captain Drew’s outer compartment in the wardroom lived the DeBraak’s lieutenant and several warrant officers. Like Drew, these men were privileged to domestic accommodations superior to those of the enlisted crew, however, they did not enjoy the same amount of space as Drew did in his great cabin. Four cabins, averaging approximately eight by nine feet at the ceiling, and gradually narrowing towards the floor with the slope of the ship’s walls, encircled the central part of the wardroom. During refitting, shipwrights created these four wardroom cabins for the lieutenant, master, purser, and surgeon, as well as two slightly smaller ones just outside the bulkhead wall of the wardroom to house the gunner and captain’s clerk. Usually, an officer’s rank determined the location and quality of the cabin, with the first lieutenant entitled to the best cabin in the wardroom. Lieutenant Hickson resided in a cabin to the starboard side and just in front of Captain Drew’s cabin. In dimension Hickson’s cabin matched those of the other wardroom officers, but he may have fitted it with improved paneling or floor covering.
Thin partition walls pierced with swinging doors segregated the individual cabins from the common space of the wardroom. Larger ships-of-the-line with officers cabins located on one or more of the gun decks had canvas curtains that could be rolled up and secured in the daytime or during action. Frigates and other small ships like the DeBraak housed all officers on the gun-less, lower deck, thus cabins could be more permanent. On the DeBraak, one-and-a-half inch wooden walls formed fairly insubstantial partitions between the cabins. The walls or the doors of the cabins may have been fit with small windows or other opening to allow for ventilation. Though only one window frame exists in the collection, Admiralty orders declared that all cabins be fitted with windows to provide light and air. Often, slats crossed the window openings to provide some measure of privacy while allowing air and light to enter the cabin. The openings also could be shielded by drawing the canvas curtains or closing the shutters that may have been installed at the openings. 106

Drafts of the DeBraak cabins, like those of other ships, render the spaces as fairly regular squares and rectangles. However, the sloping of the ship’s hull as it descended to the hold, and the tapering towards the stern produced cabins of irregular proportions. Reverend Edward Mangin described his abode on the 74-gun Gloucester as being

not quite 5 feet broad at one end; and less than 2 at the other: the ship’s timbers projecting in the form of a shelf on which my cot rested, when taken off the hooks in the day-time: and then the interior of this retirement was in shape, precisely, and in size, nearly, the same as a grand-piano forte: for it should be observed that when the cot was slung, as it is termed, the entire space was occupied.107
Inside the cabins, the interior decoration and condition of the oddly-shaped cabins varied considerably. Despite wide variability in personal belongings and moveable contents, some uniformity existed in the cabin interiors because the Admiralty designated that the insides of all cabins be finished with "bedplaces and lockers, and all conveniences that shall be required and is customary to do...." On the Endeavour, each officer's cabin had the regulation built-in locker and a swinging cot for a bed.108 (Figure 16) Typically, cabins had hanging cots for beds, though occasionally a bed was fixed into place and partitioned by a paneled screen.109

Mangin again provides a window into the experience of cabin life with his description of the hanging cots.

The cot, or bed...is a machine of about 6 feet in length, and usually about 2 feet, 3 inches wide: made of coarse canvas, and strained on an oaken frame; provided with such bedding as the owner may choose; and when slung, suspended by cords from each extremity, to hooks in the beams above....if not for the concomitant circumstances, a more luxurious bed can not be conceived...snugness is consulted in its dimensions; and, by its swinging with the ship's motion, sleep is permitted.110

What comprised the additional customary conveniences the Admiralty stipulated for navy ships is not completely clear. Curtains and cloak pins with which to tie them back, clothing hooks, shelves and racks, and floor coverings may have counted as standard features on some ships.111 Aboard the DeBraak, the officers were treated to a pair of simple cloak pins consisting of a flat disk fitted to a trumpet-shaped shaft with an iron screw or pin at the end for adhering to the wooden walls.112 (Figure 9) These pins secured the curtains hanging at the open windows and doubled as garment hooks.113 Other cabin contents such as benches, shelves and racks, and floor coverings
may have been standard but are of an ephemeral nature and therefore do not survive in
the collection of artifacts from the *DeBraak*.

With the six-by-two foot cot hanging in the cabin, little room remained for
furniture. Nevertheless, officers brought candlesticks and chambersticks, chairs,
trunks, chests, and bureaus with brass details to enrich the simple spaces. (Figures 17
and 18) The Admiralty permitted, and even required, the officers, like the captain, to
outfit their compartments with furnishings, objects, and materials of their own. Quite a
bit of variety characterized the interior decoration of the officers’ rooms. A watercolor
of an early nineteenth-century master’s cabin shows a utilitarian space with a plank
floor, simple paneled walls, a built-in locker, a small table, a chest of drawers, and two
hooks on the wall.¹¹⁴ Despite the large bed and strange shape of the room, Reverend
Mangin miraculously managed to add his own belongings to the room. In a watercolor
sketch in his journal he depicted his cabin with a patterned floor cloth, curtains at the
window, a brass-studded trunk, a folding camp stool, and a breakfast table. His chest
held a few key personal items—clothing, bedding, silver utensils, and several table
cloths.¹¹⁵

For the most part, the individual officer’s professional needs, financial
ability, and personal tastes determined the moveable contents of the cabin. In addition
to furniture, an officer usually carried his own bedding, clothing, dining utensils, and
work tools on the ship with him. For one surgeon in 1787, professional duties
influenced several of the items in his cabin, such as a “large medicine chest” and “a hair
trunk with instruments.” A writing box and more than two cases of books also counted
among surgeon Gillespie’s belongings.¹¹⁶ The quantity of belongings requiring
transport annoyed a gunner named William Richardson to the point of complaining,
"No officer in shifting from ship to ship has more bother than a warrant officer; he has not only his chests and bedding to lug about but also his cabin furniture [and] cooking utensils...."117

The cabins of the officers and Captain Drew opened onto the central area of the wardroom. The wardroom functioned as the arena for social interaction for Captain Drew, Lieutenant Hickson, Master Griffiths, Surgeon White, and Purser Wade, as well as for the servants who worked and lived in the space. Other members of the crew, including the gunner and the clerk, as well as the marine sergeant and corporal, sometimes received an invitation to join the officers and captain in the wardroom mess.118 (Figure 19) Lit during the day by the glass companion overhead and at night by tallow candles119 in tall Neoclassical candlesticks or loop-handled chambersticks120, the officers ate, drank, worked on journals, logs, and charts, read, played games of dominoes or cards, and sang in the wardroom.121 Chaplain Mangin also observed officers "writing letters, playing backgammon, fencing, singing (with laudable energy of voice and thorough contempt for music) practising [sic] on a violin, or a German flute...while perhaps, a subaltern of marines, very much devoted to the pursuits of literature, may indulge himself by trying to spell his way through a newspaper of three weeks date...."122 At night, with the day and evening activities concluded, the officers withdrew to their cabins, and likely turned the wardroom over to their servants, who slung their hammocks from the room’s ceiling beams.123

While the wardroom provided the officers with space for interacting and relaxing during leisure moments, it was a closed society that may have presented opportunity for discord, as the officers contested relationships. Unlike the enlisted crew, the officers did not have the option to change messes if they did not like their
companions. According to Lavery, “trivial differences tended to become magnified” in the restrictive wardroom environment. Sometimes, the wardroom became a compartment charged with tension as officers expressed their dislike for one another and their frustration at constant companionship. Whether the DeBraak's officers experienced strained relations or not cannot be determined, however it is likely that at some point there may have been tense moments in the small wardroom.  

For the officers, the cabin provided a retreat from the shared and possibly uneasy space of the wardroom where they could sleep, think, read, eat, and conduct ship business in relative solitude. While the personal quarters did afford physical privacy for these activities, it did not necessarily shelter an officer from the noises, smells, and the comings and goings of his ship mates. The cabins of the lieutenant, master, purser, and surgeon surrounded the gathering area, dining room, and through-way for the officers. Smells of damp wool against unwashed human bodies mingled with the aroma of boiled meats and other food and the sounds of voices, feet against the floor, and music drifted into all of the wardroom cabins. On the other side of the bulkhead and in the open area of the berthing deck stood the gunner’s and captain clerk's cabins. Their cabins were in close proximity to the mass of seamen and their day and evening activities. So while the insubstantial partitions of the officers’ personal cabins did provide them with a measure of solitude, they did not shield them entirely from the bustling activity that accompanied a daily activity like the preparation for the officers’ dinner.

*As Surgeon White sat in his port side cabin inventorying the medical supplies in his chest, the noise from the wardroom permeated his compartment.*
Young voices intermingled with clinking glassware as several of the officers’ servants scurried around the room setting the table for the noon meal. They bustled around the small space, working to unfold the gate-leg table and removing the necessary items from the special shelves at the corner that held ceramic dishes secure in a series of circular cut-outs. One of the boys climbed to the upper deck to retrieve utensils and dining wares from Captain Drew’s pantry. He returned with the cruet frame that held the sought-after condiments for the meal. Three cut glass cruets and two castors rested in the frame. Set at the center of the table, the faceted diamonds, notches, and flutes on these bottles shined in the light from the companion above. Soon the table was a mosaic of scalloped edge pewter dishes, a gleaming silver dish cross, sparkling glass stem ware and cruets, deep green bottles, and ceramics of varying colors, forms, and designs against a white linen ground. The elegant table signaled to the servants the completion of the initial preparation for dinner, and they set out to the galley to retrieve food for the noon meal.

Steam rose from the large copper set into the galley stove as William Cooper selected the earthenware pan with green glazed finish from the uppermost shelf of the galley work area. Removing a handful of raisins from a brown jar next to him, he tossed the raisins into the pan and proceeded to mix the pudding for dinner. Once he had combined all the ingredients, Cooper scooped the pudding into a bag and tossed it into the boiling water. As the bag hit the hot water with a splash, Cooper settled onto the bench behind him, happy to relieve his feet from the pressure of standing on the iron grate below the entire area. At the stove, a second copper of water bubbled and gurgled furiously. It was all ready to receive the bags of
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provisions that would soon be tossed into it. As he waited for the cooks of each mess to arrive with their bag of provisions, William Cooper bantered with his companion in the galley, John O’Neal. O’Neal stood at the open door of the ship’s oven watching a cut of beef drip and sizzle as it roasted. Soon the wardroom servants would arrive, and O’Neal would place the officers’ main course on to the platters they carried.128

Constant activity filled the galley located forward on the berthing deck. At almost any time during the day, the cooks, their mates, and other selected members of the crew could be found preparing meals, fetching provisions from the hold, cleaning plates and utensils, or simply chatting and smoking with others. A four-by-four foot iron stove containing two large, set-in copper kettles and possibly an oven, grill, and turn spit occupied the central area of the galley.129 (Figure 25) A product of eighteenth-century technology, the DeBraak’s Brodie Patent stove distilled fresh water in addition to providing a place to cook.130 The stove sat atop an iron grate to prevent fire from the heat generated by its furnace, and a chimney carried smoke up and out through a cowl into the open air of the upper deck.131 The ship’s cook, William Cooper, boiled most meals in the inset kettles (Figure 26), in copper cauldrons, or in hook pots that hung over the stove, while the captain’s cook John O’Neal, worked on the other side of the stove, making use of the spit, grill, and oven to prepare a more complex meal for the wardroom mess. A well-used and often repaired copper kettle132 rested atop the stove to boil water for Captain Drew and the other officers’ tea. (Figure 27) Bulkheads enclosed the area around the stove, and flat work spaces and shelves outfitted the area.133 Sets of brown stoneware storage jars, white stoneware
galley pots, and earthenware jugs and pans lined the shelves and the work space. 134

(Figure 28)

Aft of the galley, the quarters for the enlisted seamen, marines, and midshipmen occupied the entire lower deck. Opposite of the stern wardroom and cabins, at the bow end of the ship, stood the cabins housing the boatswain and carpenter. In between an open area served as a multi-purpose space for the approximately seventy-five crew members who lived within the curved walls. Here the men slung their hammocks, set their mess tables, scrubbed decks, cleaned hammocks, yarned with their messmates, and danced on the wooden planked floor. (Figure 6) In vivid contrast to the stern quarters, this part of the ship remained largely unfinished and undecorated. The wooden walls and ceilings were untreated wood or whitewashed with a mixture of chalk, water, and glue. Within these plain walls, crowds of men, the coal-burning stove, and limited amounts of fresh air generated overwhelming heat and smell. One civilian passenger traveling on a twenty-gun brig in 1760 was repulsed by the “dark and dismal region, where the fumes of pitch, bilge water, and other kinds of nastiness almost suffocated [him] in a minute.” 135

Two hatches did provide needed air to the lower deck, but they also provided unwanted drafts and dampness during storms and high seas. Drenched clothing, hammocks, and bedding had very little hope of drying in the dank lower deck area. 136 Captains sometimes made attempts to rectify the problems of living under the main hatches. Aboard the Amazon in 1799, complaints provoked the captain to decree that

any man or men who sleep near hatchways or scuttles who feel any draught of wind, or who are subject to be wet in their hammocks from seas or rain, are to acquaint the first lieutenant, that painted canvas
screens may be neatly nailed up to make their berths as comfortable as possible.137

The painted canvas screens approved for the Amazon’s wet berthing deck provided an extra measure of comfort for the seamen. The reference to these screens is also evidence of the makeshift and ephemeral forms of spatial division that defined the berthing area of Royal Navy ships. Often, canvas curtains were hung to segregate the classes of men sleeping and messing on the berthing deck. As in the wardroom, canvas curtains provided a measure of separation and privacy for smaller groups of the higher ranking crew members. Because the DeBraak was a smaller ship, there was no formal wardroom for the midshipmen as there was on larger ships. Instead, the midshipmen may have created physical boundaries with canvas partitions and their own mess tables, or they may have formed social boundaries with their actions and behaviors.138 Usually, the marines as well as the midshipmen and mates slept and ate in parts of the deck just forward of the officers’ wardroom. On some ships, these inferior officers occupied the sheltered areas along the sides of the ship.139

The wardroom servants had come and gone, and Cooper and O’Neal worked together to finish the dinner preparations for the crew. From his spot in the galley, Cooper could hear the stamping feet and loud voices of the crew as they finished their morning duties on the deck above and began to clamber down the hatches. He checked the bags that had been boiling in the coppers on the stove. Then setting out the cream-colored serving platters, he hurriedly began to distribute the bags from the coppers onto the platters. The platters had to be ready, for as soon as
the cooks of the messes finished preparing the tables, they would arrive to carry them to the hungry men at the tables. 140

For the seamen, dinner was the “pleasantest part of the day.” The sounds of general merriment and singing filled the lower deck as the cook of each mess gathered the meal. 141 It was the first time after a long night and morning of work that the men could relax. They ate in messes comprised of eight to ten men. Although the seamen could not initially select their own messmates, they could petition for a change on a monthly or bi-monthly schedule in the event that they did not get along with their assigned messmates. Each mess appointed a “cook of the mess” to fetch and distribute the prepared food to their mess. Assisting the ship’s cook during the day and keeping utensils, basins, and plates clean also fell within the responsibility of the cook of the mess. 142

A table and the associated dining utensils formed the core of the mess. While the human composition of the mess may have changed from month to month, the physical setting remained the same. The built-in tables constructed by the ship’s carpenters fitted against the wall with one end hinged against the ship wall and the other end suspended from the deck above. The men sat on benches on either side of the table. (Figure 29) The swing down tables were convenient for the confined deck, but were not always ideal for meals. A sailor named William Robinson notes that “it sometimes happens that a lurch will dash all the crockery to pieces...”143

Creamware and pearlware plates of varying sizes, bowls, and a large serving platter set each of the DeBraak’s mess tables. (Figure 30) Tin, wood, and horn cups held water or a man’s ration of grog, and pewter and silver forks and an
occasional spoon and knife flanked the plates. (Figure 31) For the most part, the
ceramic plates and bowls were characterized by their uniform plainness. Little in the
way of decoration defined the ceramics, though simple additions did distinguish some
of the plates. A single black band encircled the rim of a few of the creamware plates
while the stylish lobed, royal pattern edge decorated several others. Overall, though,
the creamware plates had a plain rim. More fashionable pearlware also appeared,
though in less numbers, at the enlisted crew’s mess tables. Pearlware plates with black
or brown rims like those on the creamware and green or blue shell edging intermixed
with the creamware plates. On one or two of the tables, a colorfully decorated, tin-
glazed earthenware bowl stood out from the predominantly utilitarian wares.

Seated on benches or sea chests, the seamen ate from standardized cream-
colored and white plates set upon rows of tables extending from the walls of the hull.
At first glance, each of these tables mirrored the one next to it. With a few exceptions
the seamen used matching dishes with limited decoration. Because the crockery and
utensils atop the tables displayed such marked uniformity, it is likely that the purser
bought the items all at once and then sold them to the crew once they boarded the ship.
The men had a limited supply from which to choose, resulting in the standardized
appearance of the table wares. The seamen did make some attempt to personalize and
identify their dining wares and utensils to indicate personal or mess ownership. Incised
initials mark the bowls or handles of several spoons and forks, and a series of scratched
symbols mark the backside of a large number of the plates and one platter. Obviously,
not every mess marked their dishes, but the application of a triangle, straight lines, or
shapes combined with letters to some of the items helped to lessen confusion. 144
After the noon meal, the men swung their tables back to their upright storage position. The cooks of the mess cleared and washed the mess utensils and stored them near the table until supper. After supper, at lights out, the off-duty watch of seamen and idlers slung their hammocks from the upper deck beams in their twenty-eight inches of personal sleeping space. On ships larger than the DeBraak, detailed hammock plans indicated the specific sleeping arrangements. Usually, the organization of the watch and the men’s duties within the watch determined hammock arrangement. Each man’s hammock space was only temporarily their own, for in four hours when the on-duty watch of seamen came below deck for the remainder of the night, the sleeping seamen would rise, remove their hammocks, and relinquish their place to a retiring crew mate. The seaman’s hammock was “a piece of hempen cloth, six feet long and three feet wide, gathered together at the two ends by means of a clew, and slung horizontally under the deck, forming a bed for the sailors to sleep in.” The Navy Board issued each seaman one hammock for the duration of their service on the ship, though by 1800, the Navy typically issued two hammocks. With two, a seaman could alternately use as well as clean and dry their hammocks from time to time. The men brought their own bedding or purchased it from the purser once they boarded the ship. A standard set of bedding included a 5’10” mattress stuffed with wool flock or chopped rags, a wool bolster, a woolen blanket or coverlet, and a pillow. 145

Aside from his clothing and bedding, the enlisted man generally owned very few belongings. Sea chests provided storage for these few items that the sailors did have—clothing, bedding, utensils, fishing materials, and grooming articles. 146 Able seaman Jacob Nagle noted in his diary that he carried his chest and bedding with him from ship to land. 147 Sailors treasured these chests because they contained all of
their worldly belongings. When one midshipman lost his sea chest in 1794, he was devastated. Common sea chests were typically constructed of pine, dovetailed at the corners. Sometimes more elaborate chests, which most likely belonged to officers, were constructed as part writing cabinet and part dressing chest. Painted a dark color or grained to resemble wood, the standard chests had ropes looped through the ends to serve as handles. On the inside they had deep lids and interior tills to hold clothing and small possessions. However, due to restricted space, several men may have shared one chest, or they may not have owned a chest at all. Instead, many men kept their items in canvas bags that could be hung from the side of the ship out of the way of the regular deck sweeping and scrubbing. In Figure 29, these bags hang behind the seamen eating dinner.

After the noon meal, the men rose from their messes, collected their tools and supplies and moved through the crowds of men on the lower deck as they headed to their afternoon post. Many climbed to the main deck and others walked past the galley towards the bow end of the ship. Here the smells of wood shavings and sawdust infused the air, and the noises of voices, hammers, and saws echoed off the wooden walls of the hull. Damaged sails lay spread across open spaces of the deck and in the storerooms awaiting the restorative powers of needle and thread. John Marshall knelt down to inspect the sail he had been working on prior to dinner. Several areas remained worn and ripped. He gathered his supplies around him, sat down on the deck outside of the boatswain's storeroom where some of the light from the open fore hatch could reach him, and began to work on the large canvas sail.
As the center of ship maintenance and upkeep, the bow housed the two warrant officers responsible for keeping the ship afloat, the boatswain and the carpenter. As they did for the officers berthed in the stern of the ship, the Navy Board assigned cabins against the starboard and port walls of the ship for the carpenter and boatswain, respectively. In construction and finish the bow cabins likely mirrored those in the stern, with standard paneling and built-in storage and sleeping furniture installed by the Navy. As in the stern, the contents of the boatswain and carpenter’s cabins varied since the officers brought their own personal belongings to decorate and outfit their living space. These bow end cabins, however, were somewhat larger than those in the stern, measuring approximately eight by ten feet at their aft end and narrowing with the hull as it sloped inwards towards the bow and down towards the hold. At least one of these somewhat larger cabins may have housed more than one person. Muster lists note two carpenters on the DeBraak, William Howard and Edward Redman. When not working to keep the ship afloat with routine repair and inspection of the hull, masts, and yards, these two men may have shared the single cabin. Boatswain Williams also may have shared his cabin with his mate, James Thomas. Otherwise, the boatswain’s mate as well as members of the carpenters’ crew also slung their hammocks in the space just outside the cabins.

Two of the three storerooms behind the officers’ cabins fell under the responsibility of the boatswain and carpenter. The other was gunner Rumbold’s storage facility. Shielded behind a partitioning bulkhead wall and accessed by swinging doors, the storerooms for the gunner, boatswain, and carpenter held supplies and materials. Usually, a yeoman was assigned to attend to each of the rooms. Of the three storerooms, the boatswain’s was the largest. As the location for storing rope,
canvas, and tools, the boatswain’s storeroom was essential to the ship’s operation in the age of sail. Sail makers and other unoccupied crew members sat in the storeroom or on deck with their tools spread around them as they repaired damaged or worn sails. When finished, these sails would be put back into service or stored in the sail room for future use. The boatswain and his mates accessed the sail room through a hatch in the floor, aft of the entrance to the boatswain’s storeroom.

The noises of work on the upper deck were suddenly broken by two strikes of the ship’s bell hanging from a nearby beam. The sound alerted Thomas Larkins that an hour of the afternoon watch was now over. Larkins had spent much of the past hour with his crew mates taking down the hammocks that were hanging in the open air after receiving their weekly scrubbing in the early morning. With that task complete, the boatswain ordered him to stand ready to lower the boat over the side of the ship. The ship was finally approaching land and the captain was headed to shore to take on fresh water. Noticing that the clouds were quickly replacing the clear sky and the wind had picked up considerably, he peered up into the sails. Adjusting his tar-covered hat and casting his eyes towards the uppermost yards, he could just make out the topmen struggling to reef the sails in the strong wind.

Climbing from his quarters below on the lower deck up the ladder way to the open main deck, a seaman entered into the main work area of the ship. The ship’s bell chiming on the half-hour and the boatswain’s shrill disciplinary whistle punctuated the noises of ship work and structured the day for all the men aboard. Landsmen kneeled down to the deck, working their sand-coated scrub brushes back and forth.
across the deck to scour the planking clean before retrieving mops and buckets to wash and swab away the sand and grime. Others coiled and pointed rope. Able and ordinary seamen on watch duty maintained the rigging and handled the sails as the sounds of gun fire periodically erupted from these men selected to practice the guns.

Men working on the main deck maneuvered carefully though the crowded deck landscape. This landscape of work was a complicated one, filled with the necessities of the ship and populated by the many people required to man the vessel. The wooden main and fore masts rising up from below deck stood as prominent features of the main deck. From them, networks of ropes supported the masts and the sails. This web of rigging lines ran from the sails down to the decks where they were secured with blocks. Below the billowing sails and taut shrouds and stays, one or more small boats sat in the area between the masts or hatchways, crowding the deck area and blocking throughways. Fourteen carronades extended through the gun ports in the sides of the hull, and the two long guns stood at the gun ports in the bow. Sometimes, animal pens on the deck held goats, sheep, pigs, and poultry that provided food and milk for the officers.

Amidst the rigging, cannons, boats, and animals, the DeBraak's crew labored at their daily tasks. Men crossed the deck in horizontal and vertical movements. Some men stretched the log-line out behind the ship so that officers could determine its speed in knots and others shinnied up the masts to set, furl, and reef the sails. At least two seamen stood at the aft of the ship manning the capstan, while midshipmen and lieutenants sighted for the ship's latitudinal location. All around on the deck, men washed its surfaces, mended sails, polished brass, and attended to the guns.
Aft of the main mast, in the stern of the ship, partition walls enclosed three compartments from the on-going activity of sailing the ship. These compartments served as the domain of the captain, officers, and officers' servants. At the far end of the stern, the captain's pantry stood against the port wall of the main deck. Behind a door with latticed panels, the pantry was fitted with shelves and cabinets for storage of utensils, plates, serving dishes, glassware, and possibly some foods for the captain and officers' meals. Across the deck from the pantry, Captain Drew's clerk, Richard Mitchell, worked in a small office on the starboard side of the hull. Containing a desk, chair, and supplies, the office was Mitchell's designated place for completing and creating duplicates of the books, accounts, and forms that required by the Admiralty of all ships. These records documented the movements of the ship and the specifics of crew victualling and supplies.

A small compartment housing the officers' necessary occupied the position just aft of the clerk's office. The remainder of the crew used toilets located in the head (very end of the bow) of the ship, but the wardroom officers had the convenience of a facility closer to their quarters. For the crew, the toilet facilities consisted of boxes with multiple seats positioned on either side or just behind the bowsprit. A wooden channel carried the waste out to sea. Usually, the officers' toilet facility in the stern was not much more sophisticated than the crew facilities in the bow, but it did offer more privacy. By 1780, improvements had been made in sanitation aboard ships and the Navy installed simple water closets for the officers. A cistern fitted under the deck provided water for the toilet. The Admiralty drafts do not indicate the presence of this sanitary device on the DeBraak, but an unidentified metal sink-like object...
recovered from the wreck may represent part of the cistern for the DeBraak's water closet.

Ordinary seamen Joseph Palser and James Harrison greeted Thomas Larkins as they passed him on their way down to the lower deck. From a hatch in the floor of the lower deck, the two men descended into the hold. As they stepped into the deepest hold, the stale air greeted them, and they could hear the noises of rats scuttling across the planked floor. Their eyes grew accustomed to the light of the candle illuminating the pervasive darkness, and the two men searched the area for the casks and jars they had been sent to retrieve. Shelves stacked high with wooden casks of all sizes towered around them. Holding the chamberstick 163 out ahead of him, Harrison's eyes alighted on the wooden casks and a tall buff-colored jar next to them. Now empty, the jar had once sat on deck, dispensing fresh water to the men. (Figures 32 and 33) He held the candle as Palser hoisted the first of the near-empty casks on his beck and stepped up onto the first rung of the ladder. Palser ascended to the afternoon light on the main deck where he found the ship's boat waiting to be loaded for its trip to shore.

Below all of the activity on the two decks of the DeBraak, in the eleven foot deep hold, rested the ship's stores. Proper stowage of the hold was vital for safe and optimum sailing. Weight, distribution, and proportion strongly influenced the provision stowage patterns. As on the rest of the ship, bulkheads divided the open space into functional compartments for different types of materials. A bread room, accessed by a hatch and ladder from the upper deck, was not actually part of the lowest
hold. Instead, it occupied a spot positioned aft of Captain Drew’s cabin and above the lower storage areas to prevent bilge water from spoiling the dry provisions. Located aft of the captain’s cabin, on the berthing deck level, the bread room held bread and biscuits in canvas bags, along with oak casks of other dry provisions like cocoa beans, peas, and nutmeg. The crew stowed the casks in tiers with smaller casks or shims wedged between them to hold them in position.

Below the bread room and berthing deck in the hold, compartments for water, spirits, meats and cheese, ammunition, and other ship materials spanned the length of the ship. The spirit room, accessible only through the hatch in the wardroom floor was separated for security and accessibility reasons. Similar issues of safety and accessibility dictated that a hatch in Captain Drew’s outside compartment provide the only access to the magazine. At the bow end of the ship, the carpenter, boatswain, and gunner, along with other members of the crew appointed to hold duty, had access via hatches to storage areas below. These storage spaces held coal, blocks for the rigging, and sail materials. Below all of the stowage in the hold, iron pigs and shingles lined the lowest surface of the hull to serve as ballast and to provide a flat surface for the provisions.

Sailing across the Atlantic Ocean in the spring of 1798, the wood planked hull of the DeBraak enclosed a varied landscape of daily life, work, and social interaction for the community of eighty-five men aboard. Though disparate in appearance, size, structure, and finish, a single purpose united and structured the many segments of the ship’s material world. Charged with the task of escorting a fleet of English and Irish merchant ships safely to ports along the American coast, the DeBraak...
became a steward of the health of the British economy, and thus its actions had implications far beyond its wooden walls. Ensuring the success of the DeBraak’s voyage rested not only in the hands of the ship’s officers and crew, but also in the knowledge, skill, and decision-making power of the Admiralty Board and its subsidiary administrative boards. Before the DeBraak set sail, these groups took all measures to ensure the seaworthiness of the vessel as it prepared for an extended journey across the open sea. Working in the Portsmouth dockyard and at the Admiralty office in Whitehall, London, draftsmen and shipwrights carefully considered the seaworthiness, maneuverability, stability, and armament of the vessel as they refitted the former Dutch cutter for duty as a British convoy brigantine.

Once complete, a streamlined hull with a keel, two towering masts, and several courses of billowing sails formed the seaworthy framework of the refitted vessel. Stability, maneuverability, and speed counted among the most important sailing qualities for the vessel. The carronades and long guns protruding through the sixteen gun ports on the upper deck provided the necessary military protection for the DeBraak and the merchant vessels being escorted across the sea. However, it took more than a well-designed and armed vessel to achieve the goals of the Royal Navy. It was the human component of the ship that made the ship functional. The officers, marines, sailors, and boys manning the ship were at the heart of every voyage.

Sailing the DeBraak required careful coordination and regulation of this crew of men and boys. From the seventeenth century on, the Admiralty Board knew the importance of organizing a ship’s crew to maximize efficiency aboard the vessel. However, prior to 1750, few codes or orders existed to detail crew organization and accommodation. By the second half of the eighteenth century, life aboard a Royal
Navy ship had become increasingly formalized and regulated by the Admiralty Board. Bigger ships, larger crews, long voyages, and intense warfare necessitated increased attention to and regulation of crew organization. 167

Like other military organizations of the eighteenth century, the Royal Navy relied on meticulously disciplined crews to man their ships efficiently. Working the eighty-four foot vessel required intense cooperative labor by the crew. Precision, organization, and discipline structured the men so that their individual and collective actions would result in the smooth and successful operation of the ship at all times. Timetables of work, sleep, and meals marked by the ringing of the ship’s bell or the calls of the boatswain fixed the rhythmic cycle of shipboard life. The day began with loud hollers to rouse the men from their hammocks and continued on through the night with bells at half-hour intervals to mark the passing hours. These auditory signals divided time and signaled movement aboard the DeBraak. For the voyage to proceed as planned, it was essential for every man to be in the right place at the right time, always working on schedule and to his utmost ability. 168

On board a Royal Navy vessel, the repetitive and disciplined schedule was achieved and reinforced through material, architectural, functional, and hierarchical means. The ship’s material and architectural setting, its walls, storage spaces, cabins, and the moveable objects in these spaces, physically expressed and reinforced the naval hierarchy and the ship’s functional requirements. Just as the hull, masts, decks, and fittings formed the overall shape and external appearance of the DeBraak, the bulkheads, paneled partitioning walls, swinging doors, canvas curtains, galley stove, ladders, and hatches created the inner workings of the ship and became the setting for the DeBraak’s crew. As Rhys Isaac has convincingly argued, physical setting is the
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most concrete and determinative aspect of individual action and social interaction. The DeBraak's interior arrangement established the setting of labor, hierarchy, and order crucial to the goals, needs, and ideology of the Royal Navy.

Just as it did with the other ships in its fleet, the Royal Navy used the DeBraak's material world to satisfy the expectations and requirements for the ship and the crew. The material world embodied the communal and standardized patterns of daily life. Moreover, it expressed the authority of the individual officers to be separate from, but a still an essential regulating force, in these patterns. A defining factor in the lives of each of the ship's inhabitants, the design of the decks and the constellation of objects used in the interior expressed the intended crew relationships as established by the Admiralty Board of the Royal Navy. The ways that the crew made use of and shaped these spaces offers insight into the reality of the landscape aboard a Royal Navy ship as it was experienced on a daily basis.

The Royal Navy functioned hierarchically within a well-established and traditional system of rank that was fundamental to its overall social structure. This stratified and overarching system of classification determined a man's duties, privileges, pay, and responsibilities. The Royal Navy designed and outfitted their vessels in a fairly standard manner to maintain the traditional pyramid of naval rank. Along with the ship's functional and military requirements, rank impacted the material world significantly. The location, size, finish, and degree of exclusivity of all accommodations mirrored the established Navy view of social structure. The Royal Navy intended every ship to be ordered according to the rank of all of the individuals on board. First, rank established the basic distribution of individuals through the space.
available. Furthermore, rank partitioned domestic spaces and determined the
allocation, finish, and access rights to these spaces.

While the specific details of eighteenth-century British navy vessels varied
with the size and function of the vessel, all ships shared a common internal layout that
adhered to the traditional ranking system. Typically, designating and enclosing areas of
the ship for certain people or groups of people accomplished the most fundamental
type of spatial distribution. As on other ships, the plan of the DeBraak assigned the
captain and officers personal cabins in the stern with a common dining and recreation
space adjoining. Other officers occupied cabins in the bow and the remainder of the
crew occupied the other open parts of the ship's lower deck.

For the officers, enlisted men and boys, and marines, the established Royal
Navy hierarchy and its expression in the material world of the ship was familiar and
expected. As a seaman moved from ship to ship in the Royal Navy fleet, he would find
a organizational scheme similar to the one in DeBraak. When the crew mustered for
the DeBraak's convoy voyage in March 1798, the men who boarded the ship knew
what to expect from shipboard life. With the exception of four men, the entire crew
had spent time working on a ship.\textsuperscript{171} The basic structure of the berthing deck layout
on these ships was fairly standard and unchanging. As part of an existence that called
for life spent at sea and moving from ship to ship, the seamen had been enculturated to
expect the customary arrangement of the ship's interiors. The men entering the
DeBraak's landscape may not have been wholly satisfied with this normative
arrangement, but it formed the natural core of their shipboard existence.\textsuperscript{172}

Components of the standardized Royal Navy landscape imposed order by
enclosing spaces and people, limiting movement, setting patterns of circulation,
obstructing lines of sight, and restricting access to certain areas of the ship. The physical structure established relationships and dictated crew activity and interaction, but it did not comprise the only part of the ship’s landscape. Within the static architectural setting, people acted to complete the scene. As the men shared, exchanged, and contested thoughts and actions, they imparted color, sound, and texture to the ship’s utilitarian interiors, thus creating a world meaningful for them. They lived within the rigidly structured landscape of a navy ship, but the DeBraak’s crew did not experience an austere existence.

In his study of merchant seamen in the first half of the eighteenth century, Marcus Rediker asserts that “the seamen [were] forcibly assimilated into a severe shipboard regimen of despotic authority, discipline, and control,” that was characterized by “limited space, limited freedom, limited movement, limited sensory stimulation, and... limited social interaction, food, and play.” Certainly the physical limits of the ship’s walls limited allocation of space and restricted freedom of movement, but shipboard life did not lack sensory stimulation, social action, and personal meaning. Every day did consist of perpetual labor, limited space, filth, and monotonous food, but it did not end there. Small details, objects, and actions colored the lives of the DeBraak’s crew—a community of men certainly accustomed to the conditions of life at sea. Within the intimately shared space, whistled tunes, elaborate stories, decorated dining tables, and carefully selected furnishings sustained these men and boys during their time on the ship.

It is these intimate details of life, the songs, stories, beds, stoves, dominoes, and mess equipment, like the guns, scrub brushes, rigging, and masts that constituted the reality of life for the men of the DeBraak. In forging group identity, asserting
individuality, claiming ownership, and adding a sense of domesticity to the ship accommodations, the artifacts of daily life played an important role in maintaining the community on the DeBraak. While the quality, amount, and appearance of the accommodations, furnishings, and personal belongings varied from man to man, all formed an important part of each man's identity and experience aboard the ship.

Men ranking highest in the navy structure of command had the most latitude in actively shaping their space in the DeBraak's landscape. Partitioned from the remainder of the berthing deck, the cabins in the stern and bow presented the captain, lieutenant, and warrant officers with the opportunity to establish their own exclusive domestic quarters. Though not necessarily fully insulated from the noises, smells, and constant activity of the ship and their crew mates, the cabins and wardroom did provide the officers with a chamber where they could withdraw from the starkly functional and crowded upper deck. The DeBraak's officers selected special objects to add elegance, color, comfort, and domesticity to their rooms aboard the ship. In the cabins of James Drew and the officers, brass knobs, mahogany, oak, and pine furnishings, ornamented looking glasses, and gleaming candlesticks holding tallow candles decorated the small, utilitarian spaces. As designed and fitted by the Royal Navy, these cabins remained uniformly unadorned. Regulation paneling, built-in storage lockers, beds, and cloak pins provided the bare necessities. Accustomed to the comforts of their upper-class upbringing, the officers enhanced the plain cabins by introducing furnishings and decorative items. Raised and molded panels and trim commissioned for the cabin created a domestic envelope. As the officers contributed their own textiles, brass, and polished woods, they carefully fashioned a home at sea modeled after those they knew on land. With the addition of these small pieces of
furniture and specialized dining wares, as well as his occupational tools, the cabin became more than just a military lodging. Trimmed out with hand-selected items to satisfy his aesthetic and comfort needs, the cabin developed into an officers’ personalized domicile for the weeks, months, and years he resided aboard the ship.

Because the officers outfitted their cabins according to their individual social background, needs, tastes, and financial abilities, the cabins potentially varied greatly. The material trappings of the officers’ elevated rank and social class satisfied their aesthetic and physical needs, but also affirmed their rank and position in the shipboard society. The officers’ personal cabin additions communicated refinement and status within their own social circle. Though Royal Navy officers generally came from an elevated level of society, quite a bit of variety characterized the individual men. Not all had been raised by genteel families; in fact, six percent of the officers in the Royal Navy at this time came from the working class, and another 3.9% had a commercial or business background.175 Even the upper classes were not homogeneous. The men resided in distant parts of the country, circulated in different social circles, and had experienced a variety of shipboard positions.

Once they joined the ship, the officers became part of the closed society in the wardroom where they interacted during meals, business, and leisure. Suddenly their disparate backgrounds came together to form a new social and professional circle particular to the DeBraak. On a daily basis, the men gathered for their meals around the table in the wardroom. As they took part in professional exchange, the officers gained individual recognition and respect in their individual duties aboard the ship. Professional requirements did not form the sole connection between the officers. In their time at sea, they also formed a communal social bond. At times, some or all of
the officers shared a special meal, celebrated success with group toasts, played over a set of dominoes, and related stories and experiences to one another. In all of these activities, the officers may have used their refinement, charm, and material trappings to jockey for attention or to impress the others or the captain. Their joviality and skill at songs or games may have made them well-liked and vivacious, while an elegant, silver plated cruets frame or porcelain tea equipment contributed to the table at mealtimes cemented their status and declared their good taste.

Because a partition wall shielded the officers’ cabins and wardroom from the rest of the crew, the majority of enlisted men living in the berthing deck likely never personally saw the fancy fittings in the stern area. The boys serving the captain and officers as well as the marine sentries guarding the captain’s door moved between the two domestic spheres, and had the opportunity to relate stories of the stern accommodations to the remainder of the crew. But otherwise, personal interaction between the seamen and the captain was typically limited. One sailor during the period commented about his current situation that he would “not know [the captain] if [he] met him in [his] dish.” Although this comment came from a man aboard a ship larger than the DeBraak, it illustrates the distance between the captain and his crew. Typically the other officers had more daily interaction with the crew as they inspected the cleanliness of their hammocks and clothing, drilled them with the armaments, or assigned them daily tasks.

Like the officers, the enlisted men created their own personal landscape within the regulation ship setting. The seamen made and remade their social networks on the decks—around the mess table, in the storerooms, and high in the masts. In all of these places, they simultaneously forged group unity and claimed their personal identity.
through their material culture, oral culture, and shipboard duties. Among the enlisted crew, a variety of subgroups emerged. As they actively asserted their role as a member of the collective seaman culture and individually claimed their group and personal identity, the enlisted crew aboard the DeBraak relied heavily on action, socialization, and performance and made careful use of personal material possessions.

The established structure and material culture of the ship shaped the crew’s lives in crucial ways. Sloping wooden walls enclosed a disciplined world in which the hours of the day passed with intense predictability as a striking of the bell signaled the movements of seamen between their posts and duties. In the morning, men rose from their matching hammocks, ate the standard breakfast from similar plates and bowls, and began the repetitive tasks of a day at sea. Decks were scrubbed, sails were set, ropes coiled, hammocks washed, and sails mended. The monotonous meals of boiled meats, bread, biscuits, cheese, boiled pudding, and the daily dose of scurvy-preventing lemon juice punctuated the work day. At night, hammocks came down from their storage place and were hung in a line, wool bedding was unrolled, and half of the ship climbed into their sleeping spaces for a short sleep before the watches changed.

Life aboard the DeBraak was dirty, difficult, and often physically uncomfortable for the men. Crowded spaces, low ceilings, general filth, and the pungent smells of bodies and food permeated the low-ceilinged, crowded spaces of the berthing deck. Rain and sea water entering through hatches often soaked hammocks and clothes, which dried slowly in the dark, close quarters; coughs and fevers racked the bodies of sailors in poor health; and the threat of flogging, gagging, or caning for drunkenness, swearing, being wet or dirty, or urinating on the deck.
The prescribed material setting and working routine of shipboard life changed little from day to day. However, the ways that the seamen acted and interacted within this standard setting did vary, and their actions reformed the ship’s landscape. The seamen integrated oral culture within the structured pattern of their material life. Shanties, ballads, dancing, and storytelling infused the repetitive cycles of work. These activities helped the seamen shape their experience, and draw meaning from the standardized, harsh landscape. Shared moments of communication and performance provided a release from the unpleasant realities of shipboard life. Music and song mediated the hard existence by adding cheer to the daily schedule, as voices, claps, and laughter echoed off the walls of the hull. Stories and yarns filled the silence during night watches and entertained fellow crew mates at the mess table or in the sail room.

The oral and performance culture became a critical part of the seaman’s experience. Unlike the officers, the midshipmen, seamen, marines, and boys had little in the way of material possessions. Limited material possessions and space signified the sailors’ lower rank in the Royal Navy hierarchy. The sailors did not have concrete personal space to mark with the sorts of decorative objects that the officers’ possessed. Demeanor, shared stories and songs, and the shared rhythm of work reinforced group identity, while special skills, abilities, and carefully-selected objects singled out members of the crew.

Among the seamen, a ranking system of sorts emerged apart from the formal the Royal Navy’s established structure. Differences existed between the cook of the mess and the rest of the mess, between landsmen and able seamen, and between topmen and waisters. Skill and ability determined these boundaries, and established a
form of hierarchy among the seamen. Whether this hierarchy manifested itself in the DeBraak's material world is impossible to assess. However, it did indeed establish authority to the men with heightened abilities, which in turn may have constituted differences in amounts of food at mealtimes, style of clothing, and hammock position on the lower deck.

Occasionally, items like a personalized pendant, scrub brush, or utensil added a material expression of individuality to the seaman's life aboard the DeBraak. Silver and pewter spoons scrawled with initials and names claimed ownership and set individuals apart. Royal Navy regulations stipulated that the men share the confined decks, eat from the same types of dishes, wear similar clothes, and sleep in matching hammocks. In this setting, some men used their limited personal belongings to declare their identity. Marking spoons, forks, and knives had the practical benefit of lessening the risk of loss in the intensely communal berthing area. A shiny, flattened silver spoon bearing the incised name "Mitch" swung from the neck of another sailor. Personalized objects expressed a sailor's need to identify himself to his crew mates and to the officers in charge, thus setting himself apart from the mass of seamen.

When the Royal Navy Admiralty Board refitted the DeBraak in 1798, it created a static architectural setting for the ship and its crew. During many weeks at sea the crew worked and lived in this setting, fashioning the multivalent, textured landscape that emerged within the walls of the wooden ship. For the Admiralty Boards and its subsidiary administrative organizations, the material world of the ship presented an opportunity to convey ideas of order, discipline, and hierarchy integral to the structure and goals of the Royal Navy and its fleet of ships.
Within this standardized landscape, life for the enlisted crew was arduous and often exhausting. The requirements for manning and maneuvering the ship, and maintaining the regimented order necessary to organize the large crew dictated the layout of they ship, and thus the organization and work of men within it. The DeBraak’s spatially-defined decks, the standardized sleeping and eating accommodations for the enlisted crew, and the rigorous schedule achieved the Royal Navy’s basic goals for efficient operation. Added to this disciplined efficacy was the host of physical qualities that formed the next layer of the landscape—one that was ripe with smells, filth, and constant noise from the daily realities of little fresh air and sunlight, eighty-five infrequently washed bodies, and constant activity on the decks.

The community of the DeBraak lived within the established structure and unpleasant physical circumstances of the ship; however, they were not static actors in a predetermined landscape. Certainly, the crew experienced uncomfortable conditions, but as sailors enculturated into a maritime existence, they came to expect the qualities of life on a ship. The ways that they then responded to and shaped their surroundings enabled the men to negotiate the harsh realities of life in the Royal Navy.

As it was lived and experienced by the officers, midshipmen, seamen, and boys, a host of qualities characterized the final layer of the DeBraak’s landscape. The influence of individual and group action, aesthetics, and personality characterized the completing aspect of the landscape. In the stern cabins, carefully-selected brass fittings, leather-upholstered chairs, sparkling engraved glass, colorful pottery, and white linen tablecloths set within smoothly paneled surfaces transformed the utilitarian space into a comfortable residence and workplace. On the other side of the wardroom wall, the seamen lived in the communal landscape of shared sea chests, hammocks, and
mess tables. They, too, transformed and personalized the standardized landscape with their voices, actions, and limited personal belongings.

Although the specific components of their individual domestic settings varied, the captain, officers, midshipmen, sailors, boys, and Marines shared the material world of the DeBraak. Daily negotiation with their shipmates and with the material world imparted meaning, dynamism, and mutability to their surroundings. Within the walls of the ship, the actions, interaction, and objects of the entire crew created a unified artifact—a multidimensional landscape reverberating with the sights, noises, smells, and textures that shaped the experience of life and work aboard the H.M.S. DeBraak.
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Unfortunately, there are no specific artifacts that can be assigned to the bow cabins. Provenience information did not extend to the bow section during the salvage operations. There is also a dearth of visual or documentary evidence for these cabins. Thus, this author assumes that the Royal Navy outfitted them like the cabins in the stern.
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Questions about mutiny may arise while reading this thesis. For the most part, complaints about inadequate rations and insufficient pay led to mutiny. There is little mention about dissatisfaction with the material conditions of the ships domestic arrangements. Thus, this thesis does not address the mutinies. See Dann, 192; and Bligh; and Lavery, *Nelson’s Navy*, 141-143 for further insight into mutiny aboard Royal Navy ships.

Unfortunately little is know about the upbringing and social backgrounds of Captain Drew and the *DeBraak* officers. See Schomette, 4-5 for a short biographical sketch of James Drew. For the social class of the officers, it must be assumed that they fell within the averages for the time. The following figures are for the general officer population between 1793 and 1815. Nearly forty percent of the Royal Navy officers came from families in the landed gentry or aristocracy; the next fifty-percent came from the professional class (church, law, medicine; military, and government). see Lewis, 27-59 for more detail about the social background of a Royal Navy ship’s crew.
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Figure 1. Hull plan, De Bruyn Admiralty Drafts. Courtesy, National Maritime Museum London.
Figure 2. Deck plans, *DeBraak* Admiralty Drafts. Courtesy, National Maritime Museum London.
Figure 3. Lower deck plan. Stern detail showing captain's cabin, officers' cabins, wardroom, and steward room. *DeBraak* Admiralty Drafts. Courtesy, National Maritime Museum London.
Figure 4. Lower deck plan. Bow detail showing the galley with the stove and hearth grate, the boatswain's and carpenter's cabins, several storerooms, and hatches to the hold. DeBraak Admiralty Drafts. Courtesy, National Maritime Museum London.
Figure 5. Upper deck plan. Stern detail showing captain's pantry, necessary, clerk's office, glass companions, and ladderway to the lower deck. DeBraak Admiralty Drafts. Courtesy, National Maritime Museum London.
Figure 6. The lower deck of the DeBraak likely looked similar to the one pictured here. Lower Deck Scene of a Man-of-war at Gravesend. Watercolor by an unknown artist, c. 1810. Courtesy, National Maritime Museum London.
Figure 7. This scrolled brass handle may have been installed on the door to Captain James Drew's cabin. Acc. No. 86.13.624. Courtesy. Delaware State Museums.
Figure 8. An interior window frame installed in one of the *DeBraak*’s stern cabins, most likely Captain Drew’s, to permit air circulation and light. No accession number. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 9. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, brass cloak pins were used as curtain tie backs, coat hooks, and mirror supports. These were probably installed in pairs as curtain tiebacks in the officers' cabins. Acc. Nos. 85.18.951 and 85.18.849. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 10. The officers drove coathooks into the walls of their cabins to provide a place to hang uniform coats and hats. Acc. Nos. 86.13.937 (top) and 84.442.131 (bottom). Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 11. Top section of brass fireplace surround. Tall, narrow fireplaces with brass surrounds like this one appear to be confined to a shipboard setting. The narrow dimensions fit well into the confined cabin space. Various acc. nos. (see catalogue). Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 12. Captain Drew probably displayed this ornate silver chalice in his cabin. Chalices like this one were sometimes presented to captains to honor their achievements. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 13. Tall, elegant brass, silver, and silver plate candlesticks lit the cabins and the wardroom of the *DeBraak*. Acc. No. 85.18.1365. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 14. Brass cabinet handles with stylishly stamped backplates like this one were fashionable in the late eighteenth century. This handle, and its mate, decorated one officers’ cabin furnishings. Acc. No. 85.18.1365. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 15. These leg and stretcher sections are from the gate-leg table that occupied a position in the officers' wardroom. Acc. Nos. 86.13.407A,C. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 16. Swinging cots outfitted most officers' cabins. This image also shows a typical style of paneling on the walls. *Turning In.* Color lithograph by R. Seymour. 1830. Courtesy. National Maritime Museum London.
Figure 17. Silver Chamberstick. Acc. No. 85.18.2345A. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 18. Bail handles of assorted styles decorated case furniture in the officers' cabins. Acc. Nos. 85.18.1833.2, 84.442.185, and 85.18.625B. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 20. This wooden shelf is pierced with cut-outs to hold fragile vessels. It may have been fitted into a cupboard in the wardroom or the captain's pantry. Acc. no. 86.13.877. Courtesy. Delaware State Museums.
Figure 21. A silver plate cruet frame like this one held faceted cruets and castors for the officers' and captain's meals. Illustration from Ashforth, Ellis, Wilson, Hawkesley Co., Illustrated Catalog (Sheffield, c. 1800). Courtesy, The Winterthur Library: Printed Book and Periodical Collection.
Figure 22. Faceted cruets sat in a silver plate cruet frame on the wardroom table. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 23. This shell motif foot, and six matching ones, probably came from a dish cross or other fancy dining accouterment used in the officers’ wardroom. Acc. No. 85.18.1231. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 24. Cut and engraved decanters, glasses, and tumblers set the officers' table at dinner. Courtesy. Delaware State Museums.
Figure 25. A four-by-four foot iron stove like the one illustrated above outfitted the DeBrauk's galley. Drawing of fire hearth. c. 1785. Courtesy, National Maritime Museum London.
Figure 26. A large copper pot ("copper") was set into the galley stove for boiling water and cooking meals. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 27. Copper kettle. Acc. No. 85.18.1948. Courtesy. Delaware State Museums.
Figure 28. Brown stoneware jars in a variety of sizes stored provisions for meals. Courtesy. Delaware State Museums.
Figure 29. When the crew of the *DeBraak* convened for meals, they swung down tables, pulled up benches, and relaxed over their food and drink with their shipmates. *Saturday Night at Sea*. Engraving by Murray after George Cruikshank. c. 1810. Courtesy, National Maritime Museum London.
Figure 30. The DeBraak's enlisted crew predominantly used creamware plates, bowls, and platters in simple styles. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 31. Sailors, midshipmen, and officers typically carried their own utensils. On the DeBraak, some men personalized the bowl or handles of their utensils, as seen on the spoon in the upper right corner. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 32. Brass chamberstick. Acc. No. 8518.2796. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 33. This large, earthenware jar is pierced near the bottom, probably to accommodate a spigot. It most likely served as a water dispenser on deck. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 34. A 1798 brass catalogue illustrates a coat hook and a cloak pin very similar to those found on the DeBraak. *Birmingham Trade Catalogue* [1798]. Courtesy. The Winterthur Library: Printed Book and Periodical Collection.
Figure 35. Simple brass handles like these decorated drawers and cabinets in the DeBraak's cabins. [Iron and brassfounder's trade catalogue] [Birmingham, Eng.?, c. 1800]. Courtesy. The Winterthur Library: Printed Book and Periodical Collection.
Figure 36. Mortis lock rings may have functioned as drawer pulls, shutter turns, or door handles. Acc. No. 84.442.693A.B. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 37. Cabinet handles with ornate backplates like the pair in the DeBraak collection were widely available in the 1790s. [Brassfounder's Trade Catalogue] [England?: 179-?] Courtesy, The Winterthur Library: Printed Book and Periodical Collection.
Figure 38. These wooden sections are pierced with heart-shaped carrying handles and have dovetailed corners. They composed the gallery of a butler's serving tray that may have rested on an X-shaped folding stand. Acc. Nos. 86.13.468.3 (top) and 86.13.468.3 (bottom). Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 39. Knobs similar to the three shutter latch handles illustrated above are part of the DeBraak collection. Their presence suggests that there may have been shutters at the windows or doors of the cabins, pantry, necessary, or clerk's office. Birmingham Trade Catalogue [1798]. Courtesy. The Winterthur Library: Printed Book and Periodical Collection.
Figure 40. Urn-shaped, copper alloy andiron knobs. Acc. Nos. 84.442.742 and 84.442.89B. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 41. These ball feet formed part of the gate-leg table that furnished the wardroom. Also see Figure 15. Acc. No. 86.13.407B. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 42. Twisted copper latch hook. Acc. No. 85.18.2925. Courtesy, Delaware State Museums.
Figure 43. Color and number grid system from 1985 field season with sketch plan of partial hull perimeter, including location of stove at time of excavation. Drawing by the author.
APPENDIX B
Catalogue of H.M.S. DeBraak Furnishing Objects

The following is a catalogue for the objects in the DeBraak collection identified as furnishing-related, and used in this thesis as significant evidence for interpreting the ship's interior landscape. This class of artifacts includes cabin furniture, furniture hardware, interior architectural components, decorative objects, and lighting equipment. These detailed catalogue entries include descriptive information for the objects in this class. The catalogue entries are arranged by the accession numbers assigned by the Delaware State Museums. In the text, the catalogued objects are indicated with endnotes that contain the accession number of the object in question. In many catalogue entries, a brief discussion section provides further information about the object or its use aboard the ship. Multiple and matching items (such as bail handles, latch hooks, and chair nails) are catalogued only once with their duplicates listed with the first object's catalogue entry. Multiple artifact fragments that comprise a single object are catalogued together under the text-referenced endnote as a unit. When available, site contexts consisting of side of ship color and number from the grid system instituted in the 1985 season are included in parentheses after the accession number. See Figure 43 for the 1985 grid map to which these contexts refer. Figures of many of the objects in this catalogue can be found in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #:</th>
<th>None available</th>
<th><strong>Object:</strong> window frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>Figure 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OH: 16 1/8” OW: 20”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pane openings:</td>
<td>9 1/2”H x 7 1/2”W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Two-over-two light, fixed sash window frame. Wooden frame is joined with pegged mortise and tenon joints at each corner. On the obverse, the inside edges of the pane openings have an ovolo molding. The muntins repeat this ovolo molding. None of these decorative finishes exist on the reverse of the frame. On the top side of each sash, four small, elongated holes pierce the surface. Bottom one-third of frame is missing; otherwise condition is excellent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Most likely an interior window for an officer’s cabin. Because only one of these frames exists, it most likely was located in Captain Drew’s cabin. Excavations of the Betsy (1772) have uncovered a very similar window frame in a stern context associated with the captain’s cabin. The four small, elongated holes at the top side of each sash indicate that something was once attached to the front of the frame with nails or tacks. These holes are likely the result of tacking or nailing curtains or some other window treatment to the frame.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession #:</td>
<td>None available</td>
<td><strong>Object:</strong> chalice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>Figure 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OH: 12 1/4” OW: 11 7/8”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Urn-shaped silver body on top of flared foot. Side handles cast in two parts and soldered together. Handles depict the torso of a man holding a basket on his head. Hand-wrought body is decorated with cast, applied decorations. Raised bell flower swag tied up in bows encircles the upper 2/3rds of the cup. Above the swags, at the center on each side is a laurel wreath. The center of this wreath is damaged on both sides of the cup, but it may have contained an inscription or attached portrait medallion. Top opening of the cup is edged with a narrow reeded band. A band of gothic drop arches encircles the cup directly below the reeded band and then again below the bell flower swag. Base of cup and surface of foot are decorated with repoussé, serrated leaf pattern. Bottom edge of foot has a repoussé lobed border. Overall condition is fair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Comments:

stable, but the front surface is damaged and large area of top rim and face of cup is missing.

Though this chalice can not be definitively assigned to Captain Drew, it is most likely that it did belong to him. It is similar to cups presented by the Royalty or city and county officials to captains, commanders, and other crew members to commemorate bravery, special events, and/or victories.

Occasionally, a crew would present their captain with a chalice as a token of their esteem and regard for leading a good voyage. According to Winterthur Museum Curator of Metals, this chalice was probably made in London between 1785 and 1795, and originally had a lid.2

★★★

Accession #: 84.442.87A Object: padlock
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: 1 3/16” OW: 1 1/16”
Material: brass
Description: Circular brass padlock with four “bull’s eye” stamps in the corners on the front and back sides. On the front, a vertical section of brass swings on a pin to reveal the key opening. This opening is shaped like a figure “8” and has two posts from the spring mechanism set into it. The front face of the lock is separate from the back and sides and is held to them with a small dovetail at each side. Two “ears” protrude from the top of the front and back faces. These ears once held the arm of the lock, which is now missing.

Comments: Spring locks of this type could be purchased in 1798 from brass founders in London and other parts of England. The locks came in a variety of sizes and shapes. Stamped and engraved decoration often decorated the front face, though plain ones also were sold. The size and weight of this lock precludes use as a door lock. It was more likely used on a small box or chest, perhaps the one fit with hinge clasp # 85.18.881.3

★★★

Accession #: 84.442.89F Object: ring
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: 1 ¼” OW: 1”
Material: brass
Description: Cast brass ring with flared base. A circular disc integral
with the object protrudes approx. 1/16” from the flat base.
Pitted and corroded over entire surface.

Comments: Appears to have once been soldered to another metal surface. May be a shutter turn like those pictured in Figure 39.

Accession #: 84.442.98C Object: rim or handle
Illustration: None
Dimensions: OW: 5” Width of band: ¼”
Materials: silver
Description: Curved band with three rows of reeded decoration.

Comments: Use unknown. May have been a handle for a lightweight, decorative object, perhaps a dining accouterment. Also may be a partially-intact rim removed from a silver object, such as a sugar bowl, tea canister, or ink stand.

Accession #: 84.442.121A-C Object: candle or chamber stick
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: A) OH: 3 ½” OW: 15/16”
B) OH: 13/16” OW: 1 7/16”
C) OH: 5/16” OW: 5/8”
Materials: brass
Description: A) Cylindrical candle shaft with raised band encircling it approx. 2/3 from bottom. Open area that once accommodated the push-up knob has irregular, ripped edges. B) Cupped drip pan with molded lip is detached from the shaft. C) Small, irregular spherical knob with thin shaft extending perpendicularly from the knob. Base of candle and push-up mechanism is missing.

Comments: This candle shaft, cup, and knob represent parts of an adjustable candlestick or chamberstick (most likely a chamberstick; see base # 84.442.134). Chambersticks were often fitted with a mechanism in the socket to push up the remaining potion of the candle. This mechanism was activated by sliding the knob handle along the vertical slot in the shaft as the candle was consumed.4

Accession #: 84.442.131 Object: coat hook
Illustration(s): Figure 10
Dimensions: OH: 2” OW: 3 1/8”
Materials: brass
Heavy, ornamental hook; Collared base with narrowing shank turns up into a bulbous hook with a comma-shaped, outward kick at the back of the hook curve. Circular hole in base which once held a iron pin or spike for attachment to a surface.

For the most part, officers purchased their own brass coat hooks to install in their cabins. Coat hooks of many styles were available by the dozen from brass founders throughout England. A coat hook of this exact design appears in a circa 1800 brass trade catalogue. This style and the style of coat hook # 86.13.937 seem to be the most common type of coat hooks available in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.5

Accession #: 84.442.134A  
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: ¾”  OW: 5 3/16”
Materials: brass
Description: Cast, circular chamberstick pan. Incised lines encircle the rim, the marley, and the area around the candle socket. Center area (socket attachment spot) is missing and approx. one-half of the pan’s edge is torn and missing.
Comments: May be the base for # 84.442.121A-C (push-up candlestick).

Accession #: 84.442.152  
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: 1 1/16”  OW: 2”
Materials: unidentified metal, possibly silver plate on base metal
Description: Square base with incurved sides. At the top of the base, the surface is decorated with three, graduated levels of raised lines. Base is filled with lead.
Comments: Filling the base of this candlestick with lead imparted needed weight and stability for its use aboard a moving ship.

Accession #: 84.442.185  
Illustration(s): Figures 18 and 35
Dimensions: OH: 1 5/16”  OW: 3 3/16”
Materials: brass
Related objects: 85.18.709; 85.18.724; 85.18.1652A,B; 85.18.2334.1
Description: Cast brass. Wide U-shaped bail handle with bulbous swell as
center. At the terminus of each side is a pin projecting outwards to insert into an eye for attachment to a surface.

**Comments:**

Bail handles of all types were widely available throughout the last quarter of the eighteenth century. This simple bail handle represents the least ornate style available in most trade catalogues. Some brass trade catalogues depict them in graduated sizes, labeled as “plain drawer handles.” Similar handles with increased surface decoration such as additional central lobes or molded details were also available. These bail handles were attached to the furniture surface with eyes and bulls eye pattern back plates (see # 85.18.336).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #:</th>
<th>Object: finial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OH: 1 ½” OW: 1 1/16”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Cast acorn-shaped finial. Base is pierced with a 1” deep, threaded hole to accommodate an iron screw for attachment to a wood surface. Surface is pitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #:</th>
<th>Object: latch hook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OH: 3/8” OW: 1 13/16”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related objects:</td>
<td>85.18.651; 85.18.846; 85.18.953 (starboard white 3); 85.18.1281.1 (starboard black 3); 85.18.2284; 85.18.2321 (starboard white 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Stamped brass latch hook. Flat shank narrows towards C-shaped hook at one end. The opposite end terminates in a loop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>These small brass hooks most likely appeared on instrument cases, writing boxes, and other small case furniture. They are too small and delicate to be door latch hooks like # 85.18.2925.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #:</th>
<th>Object: candlestick base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension:</td>
<td>OH: 1 ½” OW: 3 ½”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>brass, lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Columnar, Neo-classical style square base with incurved sides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stepped molding at top and bottom of base. Base is filled with lead. Heavy corrosion covers entire object.

Accession #: 84.442.216A  
Object: finial

Illustration(s): None

Dimensions: OH: 1 3/8" OW: 1"

Materials: unidentified white metal (silver or pewter?)

Description: Compressed acorn-shaped finial tapers to a narrow shaft and then flares to a broad, ovolo base measuring 11/16.” Surface is heavily corroded overall.

Comments: In brass, these finials function as “shutter latch handles and knobs” or “Venitian blind turns.” Silversmiths, pewterers and manufacturers of silver plated objects may have produced similar forms of hardware in white metals. The presence of this sort of knob indicates the possibility of shutters on the DeBraak. Mortis ring handles (#85.18.816) also served as shutter knobs or handles. (Figure 39) The high number of mortis ring handles suggest that shutters may have been a common feature on the ship, and may have shielded the window and door openings of cabins, the pantry, steward room, necessary, and clerk’s office.7

Accession #: 84.442.502  
Object: chamberstick

Illustration(s): None

Dimensions: OH: 1 3/8” OW: 3 1/8”

Materials: copper alloy

Description: Base and socket formed from sheet metal. Socket is formed from two halves braised together around a copper rivet that holds it to the base. Rim of base is incised with parallel lines. Underside of the base has a circular foot ring. Handle is missing.

Accession #: 84.442.574  
Object: bell

Illustration(s): None

Dimensions: OH: 2 1/16”  
Diam. of base: 4 ¼”

Materials: copper alloy (probably bronze)

Description: Intact rim fragment of cast bell. Three rows of raised lines near encircle the bell body at ½” from the base. Just above these lines are raised letters from a word ending “…RE.” Remainder of bell body is missing.

Comments: The size of this bell suggests that it may have been used by the
As a table bell, it may have had a handle. Alternatively, it could have hung from a support by itself or with other bells somewhere in the ship to mark the passing hours or to alert the crew.8

Accession #: 84.442.576
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: 3” OW: 1 1/2”
Materials: unidentified metal (silver plate?), lead
Description: Square base of Neo-classical style columnar candlestick. Sides gently curve in to a molded pedestal and the remains of candle shaft. Interior of base is filled with lead. Badly corroded overall.

Accession #: 84.442.611
Illustration(s): Figures 9 and 34 (illustrate similar objects)
Dimensions: OH: 1 1/2” OW: 1 5/8”
Materials: brass
Related objects: 84.442.146.1; 84.442.146.2; 84.442.211; 85.18.93.1; 85.18.565 (starboard black 2); 85.18.651.2; 85.18.738; 85.18.849; 85.18.951 (starboard white 3); 85.18.985.8; 85.18.1105.4 (starboard black 2); 85.18.2076 (starboard black 1); 86.13.1158.2
Description: Circular plate attached to tapering, trumpet-shaped post. The post ends in a raised collar with a molded band. The circular plate is secured to the post with a copper rivet.
Comments: Cloak pins served many purposes in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Available in a variety of styles of decoration, they could be used as curtain tie-backs, coat hooks, or mirror supports in homes as well as on ships. Archaeological excavations have documented the cloak pins on other Royal Navy vessels. The cloak pins from the DeBraak were likely installed by the Royal Navy in the officers’ cabins as curtain tie backs that may have doubled as coat hooks. These cloak pins are fairly plain and lack the raised and molded surface decoration that often is found on cloak hooks from the period.9

Accession #: 84.442.624
Related artifacts: 84.442.635; 85.18.144.2; 85.18.909 (starboard white 2);
85.18.2134 (starboard black 2); 86.13.668; 86.13.928; 86.13.1163; 86.18.1693

Illustration(s): Figure 11
Dimensions: OH: 31 ½” OW: 16” (of entire surround)
Materials: brass
Description: Tall, narrow fireplace surround. Straight sides stepped to a rounded arch at top. Overall surround is formed from several lengths of cast brass with a reverse ogee molding. Threaded pins on the back of the molded sections for attachment to the fire box.
Comments: This style of fireplace surround seems to be confined to shipboard use. Thus far, only one other example of this type has been identified. The comparative example comes from H.M.S. Pandora, a Royal Navy vessel similar in size to the DeBraak that sank in 1791. Excavations have produced a matching fireplace surround from the stern of the ship. This stove was most likely the property of Captain Drew and was probably installed in his cabin at his expense.10

Accession #: 84.442.647
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: ¾” OW: 7/8”
Materials: brass
Related objects: 85.18.1025 (starboard grey 3); 86.13.1186
Description: Brass eye with flared base has a pierced hole to accommodate a free-hanging brass wire ring that measures 7/8”W x ¾”H. Light corrosion overall.
Comments: These delicate brass ring pulls most likely came from small interior drawers in pieces of furniture like medicine cases, dressing boxes, and portable desks

Accession #: 84.442.742
Illustration(s): Figure 40
Dimensions: OH: 3” OW: 1 15/16”
Materials: brass
Related object: 84.442.89B (matching andiron head)
Description: Pair of cast brass, urn-shaped andiron knobs. Body of urn is hollow with solid finial. Urn tapers to a collar that is threaded on the interior. Surfaces pitted and corroded.
Comments: These brass andiron knobs may originally have been attached to
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iron upright shafts, billet bars, and feet which have since corroded. They probably occupied a position in Captain Drew's cabin fireplace.

85.18.08 Object: bell
Accession #: 85.18.08
Illustration(s): None
Dimension: OH: 4 ½” OW: 4”
Materials: bronze
Description: Cast bronze bell of standard form. Flared rim ends in two lines of raised decoration. One raised line encircles the top.
Comments: Like # 84.442.574, this bell may have been used as a table bell or hung in the ship.

85.18.159.1 Object: glass spire
Accession #: 85.18.159.1
Dimensions: OH: 1 3/8” OW: 3/8”
Materials: brass
Description: Narrow cast brass finial on tapered 7/16” spike for attachment into wood. Finial is 15/16” long. Today, the soft details and somewhat nebulous form suggests its original flame shape. The tip of the spike is broken.
Comments: Finials of this type appear often in brass founder's trade catalogues of the late eighteenth century. One of these catalogues identifies the object as a glass spire, indicating that it was used as a decorative component on a looking glass. Documentary and illustrative evidence confirm that many captains and officers had looking glasses in their cabins.

85.18.168 Object: stud
Accession #: 85.18.168
Illustration(s): None
Dimension: OH: 1 1/8” OW: 5/8”
Materials: brass
Description: Decorative stud with conical, pointed cap measuring 7/16”. A decorative ridge encircles the base of the cap. A 11/16” threaded shaft runs through the cap and extends approx. 1/16” through the top of the cap.
Comments: Decorative brass hardware; use not identified. Most likely a component of a piece of furniture.
Accession #: 85.18.226   Object: handle attachment
Illustration(s): Figure 35
Dimensions: OH: 7/8"  OW: 7/8"
Materials: brass
Related objects: 85.18.465.2; 85.18.568; 85.18.625.1A,B,C; 85.18.780; 85.18.847; 85.18.1156.5; 85.18.1233; 85.18.1833.1; 85.18.2541
Description: Eye and back plate attachment for bail handle. Cast eye has a rounded top narrowing to a collared base. A threaded screw extends from the bottom of the base. The base is hollow and open on one side to accommodate the projecting pin from the handle terminus. The top of the eye has an incised bull’s eye pattern. Back plate is stamped. It is pierced with a square hole into which the eye screw inserts. A circular washer screws onto the screw post.
Comments: This is the typical handle attachment for late eighteenth-century bail handles. Eyes and backplates appear in trade catalogues with the plain U-shaped handles as well as with the flat oval and circular commode handles that were becoming very fashionable at this time. Often the back plate of this type of handle attachment is slightly more decorative. While the catalogued example has an undecorated backplate, several of the related examples have a series of concentric circles on the face.13

Accession #: 85.18.507   Object: cruet frame or toast rack
Illustration(s): Figure 21
Dimensions: OH: 1 1/16"  OW: 1 1/8"
Materials: silver plate (?) on unidentified base metal
Related objects: 84.442.386.4; 84.442.210.1; 85.18.2104 (starboard black 2); (as well as those listed under 85.18.760)
Description: Four tab feet that are J-shaped in profile. Several reeded lines across the top and a single one around the perimeter. Top edge appears to have been soldered to another surface. Heavy corrosion and flaking obscure details overall.
Comments: Either a silver plate toast rack or a cruet frame with these four tab feet was used at the officers’ table. The tab feet match the feet commonly used as supports on silver plate toast racks and cruet frames of the 1790s. Manufacturers in Sheffield made cruet frames in hundreds of patterns during the third quarter of the eighteenth century. The basic cruet frame had a flat, circular or oval platform supported by three or four feet. A loop handle rose from the center of the platform and a structure of wire held
three to five cruets or castors. Like cruet frames, toast racks
had a platform supported by feet that had a series of bars
creating slots to hold toast. Often a central bar rose higher and
was fitted with a vertical handle.14

85.18.625B (port black 2-white 2) Object: bail handle
Figure 18
OH: 1 1/8” OW: 2 3/16”
Materials: brass
Description: Half-circular handle with circular cross-section. At the
terminus of each end, two pins project inwards for insertion into
handle attachment eyes.
Comments: Like the bulbous, U-shaped handles (# 84.442.185), these
handles are fairly simple. They do however represent the more
fashionable Sheraton-style, which was coming to the height of
popularity in the late 1790s. The fact that fewer objects aboard
the DeBraak suggests that the officers did not select the highest
fashion or most ornate furnishings to outfit their cabins.

85.18.658.3 Object: chair nails
None
OH: 3/16” OW: 3/8”
Materials: brass
Related objects: 85.18.804 (starboard red 3); 85.18.824 (starboard red 3);
85.18.689; 85.18.920A,B (starboard white 2); 85.18.956; 85.18.981 (starboard white 2); 85.18.1676; 85.18.2266;
85.18.2314A,B (starboard white 2); 85.18.2414; 85.18.2479 (starboard red 1A); 85.18.2554; 85.18.2749; 85.18.3182;
86.13.102
Description: Rounded, convex head with tapered shank measuring 1/8”
centered on hollow side.
Comments: Chair nails (also known as trunk nails, coffin nails, or coach
nails) were used to hold fabric and upholstery onto chair frames.
During the eighteenth century, decorative nails were used
frequently. They also studded the perimeter of trunks to hold
the leather to the surface. The nails from the DeBraak may have
been used on either type of furnishing. Chairs did outfit the
cabins and wardrooms, and trunks are well-documented in ship
contexts. A nail-studded leather trunk like the one depicted by Edward Mangin in his journal, would most likely have belonged to an officer.15

| Accession # | 85.18.760 | Object: cruet frame |
| Illustration(s) | Figure 21 |
| Dimensions | OH: 1 9/16" | OW: 1 7/8" |
| Related objects | 84.442.210.2; 84.442.702; 84.442.715; 85.18.146; 85.18.675; 85.18.730A,B; 85.18.1044; 85.18.1351; 85.18.2067 (starboard black 1); 85.18.2704 |
| Materials | silver plate (?); unidentified base metal |
| Description | Three, large tab feet with a shallow J-shaped profile. Decorative reeded lines across the top edge and a single line around the perimeter. Related objects consist of curved handle sections and small, oval bases, all of which are decorated with the same reeded lines. |
| Comments | Like the smaller tab feet (#85.18.507), these large tab feet probably once supported a cruet frame or other dining accouterment. It is more likely that the large feet came from a cruet frame, while the smaller ones supported a toast rack, which was smaller and required less strength. The curved components that formed the loop handle, cruet receptacles, and/or the toast bars match these feet as well as those of #85.18.507 and may also have come from that object. It appears that the two pieces were part of a matched set. See entry for #85.18.507 for a brief description of cruet frames. |

| Accession # | 85.18.767.3 | Object: knob |
| Illustration(s) | None |
| Dimensions | OH: 7/8" | OW: 7/16" |
| Materials | brass |
| Related objects | 85.18.520; 85.18.820; 85.18.1352.2; 85.18.2221; 85.18.2618 |
| Description | Small, flat-headed knob, circular in plan. Shaft is trumpet-shaped, and then slightly flared at base. A threaded screw extends from the base. |
| Comments | Small knobs like this are typically found on small interior drawers in desks, medicine cases, or dressing boxes. |
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Accession #: 85.18.782 Object: ember tongs handle
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: 1 15/16” OW: ¾”
Materials: copper alloy
Description: Incomplete, cast handle with raised rib encircling mid-point. Circular finger loop on back and remains of a smaller one on the opposite side.

Accession #: 85.18.881 Object: hinge
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: ¾” OW: 1 1/8”
Materials: Copper alloy
Description: Decorative hinged clasp, most likely brass. Trefoil design with holes cut through each of the three lobes to attach to a surface. Hinged closure piece is missing. Condition is stable, but corroded over entire surface.
Comments: Probably used for a small wooden or leather box, such as a instrument case, knife box, or writing box. Padlock # 84.442.87A may have been used with this clasp to secure the contents of the box.

Accession #: 85.18.1013 Object: knob and rail
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OL: 3 9/16” OW: 11/16”
Materials: wood (possibly mahogany), brass
Description: Narrow rail of wood with thin tenon at end. Opposite end is broken. A small brass knob with a threaded shaft (matching # 85.18.767.3) fits into a hole approx. 1 ¼” from the tenon end of the rail. Condition of wood and brass is excellent.
Comments: This narrow rail may be from the interior of a desk, medicine box, or instrument case.

Accession #: 85.18.1122A,B Object: hinge
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: 2 7/8” OW: 1 7/16”
Materials: copper alloy
Description: Two-part hinge with holes irregular holes to accommodate screws for attachment to a surface. Light corrosion overall.
Comments: The size and weight of this hinge suggests that it was used on a
piece of furniture, rather than a door.

★★★

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #</th>
<th>Object: chamberstick handle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.18.1130.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustration(s): None

Dimensions: OH: 1 5/8” OW: 1 7/16”

Materials: brass

Description: C-shaped handle of cast brass. Thumb rest at top curve of “C” and outward kick at bottom curve. Inside lower edge of the handle has pins to attach it to the pan of a chamberstick. A square hole is cut through the top terminus of the handle.

Comments: Chambersticks were essential in the dark, confined spaces of a ship. The wide-dished bases imparted stability and the handle allowed for ease in carrying. This handle fit to the underside of a drip pan. The hole on the top side of the handle could accommodate a pair of wick trimmers or a douter. The wick trimmers (# 85.18.2509) in the DeBraak collection may have been used with this chamberstick. Condition is excellent.★★★

Accession #: 85.18.1212 (starboard black 3) Object: hasp

Illustration(s): None

Dimensions: OH: 1 3/16” OW: ½”

Materials: copper alloy

Description: Elongated trefoil-shaped hasp with circle cut in center for a nail or screw. Two small C-shaped hooks extend from the top of the hasp to connect to other part of hinged clasp (possibly #85.18.881). Stable condition, but corroded over entire surface.★★★

Accession #: 85.18.1231 (starboard white 2) Object: shell foot

Illustration(s): Figure 23

Dimensions: OH: 1 7/16” OW: ¾”

Materials: silver

Related artifacts: 84.442.374, 85.18.112, 85.18.145, 85.18.765; 85.18.877 (starboard white 2); 85.18.1682 (port green 2)

Description: These seven, silver decorative feet are cast in a shell motif. Each has a hollow-backed, C-curve half-shell foot tapering to undecorated ankle. The ankle narrows to an up-turned shell knee, where it would have originally attached to the underside of a serving object, such as a dish cross or salver. Shell feet commonly appear as supports on dining accouterments

Comments: 149

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
in the second half of the eighteenth century. Typically, the cast feet are soldered to the undersides of salvers, stands, dish crosses, or tea wares. These feet may have been the supports for a dish cross, which was a device used to protect the table from hot dishes. Usually, a dish cross consisted of two rotating silver rings with two crossed bars extending from opposite sides of each. Each bar had a foot below, and support attached above to accommodate a dish or bowl. Sometimes a small spirit lamp occupied the center. These matching seven feet appear to have come from one object and may represent the four lower feet and three of the four dish supporters on a dish cross that the officers used in their wardroom.

★★★

Accession #: 85.18.1565 (starboard yellow 2) Object: commode handle
Illustration(s): Figures 14 and 37
Dimensions: Backplate: OH: 2 ½” OW: 1 13/16”
Bail handle: OH: 1 5/8” OW: 2 13/16”
Materials: brass
Related object: 85.18.1833.2 (green 1)
Description: Stamped brass bail handle with stamped, circular back plate. Back plate is very thin metal stamped with concentric bands of decoration. A circular field of petals surrounds the now-missing center of the back plate. Petals are surrounded by a thin row of beading. Beyond the beading is a wide band of undecorated metal. Finally, a geometric flame motif encircles the back plate. The stamped, demi-lune bail handle has a raised rib running through its center. The back side is flat. At the end of the demi-lune, two pins extend inwards to connect to handle attachment eyes soldered to the backplate. These 5/16”h x 3/8”w brass eyes are stamped with a bull’s eye pattern.

Comments: One of a pair of commode (a.k.a. cabinet) handles decorating a drawer on the DeBraak (A matching bail handles exists, though there is no longer a back plate for it.) Commode handles of this type were exceedingly popular in the 1790s. Brass founder’s offered hundreds of designs in varying shapes and sizes in their trade catalogues. This pattern is relatively simple compared to the numerous figurative and elaborate designs that filled the pages of contemporary trade catalogues. However, with its decorative backplate and ribbed handle, these handles are much
more ornate than the other drawer handles on the furniture in the ship's cabins (# 84.442.185 and #85.18.625B).20


Accession #: 85.18.1948 (port white 1)  Object: kettle
Illustration(s): Figure 27
Dimensions: Body: OH: 6 15/16"  OW: 25 1/4"
Handle: OH: 6"  OW: 8 1/2"
Material: copper
Description: Hand-wrought copper kettle of common ball shape. Bottom is set in with dovetails, and body is joined at back with dovetails. Rim of opening is reinforced with a wire and sheet is folded around it. Spout, now mostly missing, is set in and flanged. Cast copper handle comprised of S-curves connected by a single, wide C-curve. Connection between handle and body has been repaired, and there is evidence of re-soldering. Handle is held on at each side with a single rivet.
Comments: This kettle experienced heavy use during its lifetime. The cooks probably used on a daily basis in the galley to heat water for the officers' tea as well as for preparing the crew's meals.

Accession #: 85.18.1993  Object: candlestick
Illustration(s): (starboard white 1-starboard black 1)
Dimensions: OH: 5 7/8"  OW: 2 5/8"
Materials: brass, lead
Description: Columnar, Neo-classical style square base with curving sides. Raised, molded lines at top and bottom edge of base. Cylindrical shaft with two raised bands at base sits directly atop the base. Approx. one inch below drip pan is another, wider raised band. Inverted, circular drip pan is set into the shaft. Lip of pan has three engraved lines on inside surface. Lead fills inside of hollow base.
Comments: This columnar style of candlestick with a square base was the most common form between 1775 and 1810. Like #s 84.442.207 and 84.442.576, the base of this candlestick is filled with lead for stability on the moving ship. The candle may have been purchased like this or altered once introduced to the shipboard setting.21
Accession #: 85.18.2280   Object: stud
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: ½”    OW: 5/16”
Materials: brass
Description: Dome-topped stud with flat base attached to a threaded shaft. Appears to be a decorative stud for screwing into a piece of furniture such as a box, trunk, or looking glass. Simple studs and finials similar to this one are identified as “portable desk furniture” in a 1798 trade catalogue. This decorative stud, along with hinges, escutcheons, and simple bail handles may have formed the hardware on an officers' portable writing desk.22

Accession #: 85.18.2345A   Object: chamberstick
Illustration(s): Figure 17
Dimensions: Base: OH: 1 7/8”    OW: 5 ½”
Candle cup: OH: 3 ½”    OW: 2 7/16”
Materials: silver
Description: Circular pan with loop handle soldered to underside. The edge of the pan is beaded, and there are two incised lines along the length of the handle. Socket with beaded-edge drip pan set into it attached to a beaded shaft is detached from the base.

Accession #: 85.18.2375A,B (starboard grey 1) Object: mortis lock ring
Illustration(s): Figures 36 and 39
Dimensions: OH: 5/16”    OW: 1 ¼”
Materials: brass
Related objects: 84.442.693A,B; 85.18.816; 85.18.2119 (starboard black 2); 85.18.2193A,B (starboard white 1)
Description: Shield-shaped ring with swell at lowest edge of handle. Ring handle connects to a hollow trapezoidal housing which receives a swiveling hinge. The hinge allows the ring to swivel from a flat position to perpendicular. The eye terminates in a flared base with a rectangular hole cut into the underside. This hollow once held an iron shaft or spike.
Comments: Generally, this type of handle was used for many purposes, making it difficult to identify its specific function aboard the DeBraak. One trade catalogue identifies this style of pull as a mortis ring, suggesting that it was used on a locked door or drawer. A 1798 catalogue depicts several of these rings on the ends of rectangular shafts under the heading “Handles for Iron
Oven Doors.” Finally, this style also appears as a shutter handle. The rings could have served any one of these purposes aboard the DeBraak, however, due to their abundance it is most likely that they were door or shutter handles for the officers’ cabins.23

Accession #: 85.18.2379 (starboard white 2) Object: door knob
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: 2 1/8” OW: 2 5/8”
Material: wood
Description: Carved, oval knob. Top surface has three successive petal-lobed ovals. Beyond these ovals is gadrooning that extends to the sides of the knob. The knob narrows to a flared, trumpet-shaped shaft. Raised band of molding at top and base of shaft. The flat bottom of the shaft has a square hole cut into it.
Comments: This door knob may have been fit onto any door on the DeBraak, however its decorative nature indicates that it probably fitted on a fairly significant door, such as the one accessing the wardroom or the steward room.

Accession #: 85.18.2465 Object: candle
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OL: 3 9/16” Circum: 2 7/16”
Material: beeswax
Description: Light brown, cylindrical stub with twisted cotton wick that is matted with melted wax.
Comments: The Royal Navy provided candles for the entire crew to use aboard the ship.24

Accession #: 85.18.2509 Object: wick trimmer
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: 1 3/16” OL: 4 13/16”
Material: brass
Description: Lower section of scissors-like wick trimmers. Handle is broken and missing. Light corrosion over entire surface.
Comments: This pair of wick trimmers may have fit into the chamberstick loop handle pierced with a hole (#85.18.1130.5).
Accession #: 85.18.2683  Object: finial
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OH: 1” OW: 1/8”
Materials: copper alloy
Description: Elongated finial with flared base attached to a ½”
cylindrical tube of matching metal. Enclosed within the tube is a
9/16” shaft. Tip of shaft is broken.
Comments: A finial like this may have been used to decorate a piece of
furniture or a looking glass. Though this exact form does not
appear in trade catalogues, it is quite similar to # 85.18.159.1
(glass spire), though this exact form does not appear in trade
catalogues.

Accession #: 85.18.2796 (starboard black 2)  Object: chamberstick
Illustration(s): Figure 32
Dimensions: OH: 3 1/8” OW: 5 ½”
Materials: brass
Description: Circular drip pan with several incised lines encircling the inside
of the pan. Candle socket is composed of two halves, brazed
together and peened through the bottom and onto the center of
the pan. The socket has a raised band encircling it approx. ½”
from the base. A handle that once attached to underside of pan
is now broken off and missing, though the base of the
connection and two copper pins remain. Excellent condition.

Accession #: 85.18.2925 (starboard red 1)  Object: latch hook
Illustration(s): Fig. 42
Dimensions: OH: 1” OW: 3 ¾”
Materials: copper
Description: Wrought and twisted square copper stock; hook bent into one
end and circular eye formed at the other end.
Comments: This hook is the only piece of copper hardware in the collection,
and appears to be a latch for a door or large cabinet. It is likely
a built-in feature of the ship’s interior architecture. For the most
part, the Royal Navy installed iron fittings as the standard. If
individual officers wished to have higher quality fittings, they
were responsible for assuming the additional cost or for bringing
their own objects. This copper latch may have been fitted into
the ship by the Royal Navy. Alternately, it may also represent a
s singular instance of a copper hardware purchased and installed at the request of an officer.25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #:</th>
<th>86.13.28</th>
<th>Object: rail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OH: 4” OL: 29 1/8” OW: 1 5/8”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>This 1 5/8” wide rail has a rounded and smoother top edge and a flat bottom edge. Tenons protrude from each end. Shaped rail from unidentified furnishing. The width indicates that it may be a head or foot rail for a cot or a built-in bed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #:</th>
<th>86.13.389</th>
<th>Object: escutcheon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OH: 1 5/8” OW: 1”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>brass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Oval escutcheon plate with central key cut-out. Four small holes pierce the escutcheon for nails to attach it to a surface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #:</th>
<th>86.13.397</th>
<th>Object: knob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OH: 1 3/8” OW: 15/16” Circum.: 3”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>copper alloy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related object:</td>
<td>86.13.1078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Round knob with two incised lines encircling the widest point. Below the knob it narrows and then flares again to a trumpet-shaped base, where two incised lines encircle the base. On the flat bottom of the base is a circular 1/16” projection which probably served as a connection point (i.e., it was soldered to a rod or shaft).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Like several other knobs in the DeBraak collection, these two knobs may have been shutter handles. They match one indicated as a “shutter latch handle” in a 1798 trade catalogue.26 Alternately, these two knobs may have formed the opposite sides of a door knob.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #:</th>
<th>86.13.407A</th>
<th>Object: gate-leg table legs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related artifacts:</td>
<td>86.13.407B,C,D; 85.18.3147; 86.13.1190; 86.13.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Gate-leg tables became popular in the early eighteenth century as the predominant form of dining table and continued to be common through the end of the eighteenth century. Gate-leg tables are constructed from a framework of legs, rails, and stretchers joined with pegged mortise-and-tenons throughout. Two side legs (the gate-legs) pivot out to support the leaves which usually have wooden hinges. Typically, the tables are round or oval, and measure about four to five feet when open. When not in use, gate-leg tables could be easily folded to about one-third of their fully opened size. Thus, gate-leg tables were ideal for a shipboard setting. This oak table probably occupied a position in the officers’ wardroom during meals and was folded to save space when not in use.29

Figures 15 and 41

wood, red pine28
Seven individual leg and stretcher sections of a drop-leaf, gate-leg table. Stretcher sections are joined with mortise-and-tenon joints. Legs have simple block turning and terminate in elongated ball feet.

Gate-leg tables became popular in the early eighteenth century as the predominant form of dining table and continued to be common through the end of the eighteenth century. Gate-leg tables are constructed from a framework of legs, rails, and stretchers joined with pegged mortise-and-tenons throughout. Two side legs (the gate-legs) pivot out to support the leaves which usually have wooden hinges. Typically, the tables are round or oval, and measure about four to five feet when open. When not in use, gate-leg tables could be easily folded to about one-third of their fully opened size. Thus, gate-leg tables were ideal for a shipboard setting. This oak table probably occupied a position in the officers’ wardroom during meals and was folded to save space when not in use.29

Accession #: 86.13.417.1
Object: candle
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OL: 1 15/16” Circumference: 2 ¼”
Materials: tallow
Related objects: 86.13.419.1
Description: Creamy white wax. Cylindrical-shaped stub with wick intact.

Accession #: 86.13.468.1-.3
Object: tray table
Illustration(s): Figure 38
Dimensions: 1) OH: 3 5/16” OL: 25 1/8”
2) OH: 3 6/16” OL: 11”
3) OH: 1 5/8” OL: 9 5/8’
Materials: wood, white oak30
Description: Three side sections of a tray gallery. One intact section has three dovetail openings on one side and is pierced with an elongated heart-shaped handle opening. A second side section has the three dovetail pins that fit with the openings in the first section. The last piece is only a fragment from the handle area. Half of the elongated heart-shaped handle remains.
These sections of wood comprised the gallery of a butler's tray table. The trays of these tables were typically rectangular with a raised three quarter gallery and usually rested on an X-shaped folding stand. At least two sides of the gallery were pierced with elongated, heart-shaped handles like these for carrying. Captain Drew probably owned this tray and used it for private meals or tea in his cabin.31

★ ★ ★

Accession #: 86.13.468.2 (duplicate #) Object: shelf
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OL: 20 1/16" OW: 4 15/16"
Materials: wood, oak?
Description: Thin (5/16") plank of wood. Only half of the shelf exists but the three irregular, circular cut-outs are evident. The openings vary in size.
Comments: See #86.13.877

★ ★ ★

Accession #: 86.13.506 Object: stretcher (?)
Illustration(s): None
Dimensions: OL: 12" OW: 1 3/8"
Materials: wood, mahogany?
Description: Thin, rectangular length of wood with a 1 7/16" tenon at one end and an open mortise at the other. A scribe line appears one of the side surfaces.
Comments: Unidentified stretcher or rail.

★ ★ ★

Accession #: 86.13.517T Object: furniture, unidentified
Illustration: None
Dimensions: OH: 3 5/16" OL: 7 1/8"
Materials: wood
Description: Two incomplete lengths of wood—possibly a stile and crest rail. Each length measures 1 3/4" wide of wood. The pieces are joined with a lap joint to create a right angle that is held with a wooden pin. Horizontal piece has a rounded lower edge. The vertical stile is broken just below the joint, and has a chamfered inner edge.
Comments: This appears to represent a section of a side chair's rear stile and crest rail. If this is indeed a chair, it is fairly plain with limited amounts of surface shaping and an unfinished joining
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peg. It is also possible that these joined lengths of wood may be support rails from beneath the top of the gate-leg table (#86.13.407).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #</th>
<th>Object: handle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86.13.624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>Figure 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OH: 15/16” OL: 3 7/8”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Cast brass handle in shallow S-curve with scrolled end. Opposite end is rough, as if broken off from original surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>This latch handle probably outfitted a door on the DeBraak.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #</th>
<th>Object: chamberstick base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86.13.772.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OH: 7/16” OW: 4 3/4”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Circular copper chamberstick pan. Center is depressed, and there is a ½” marley. No incised or turned decoration. A hole in the center is the remains of the shaft that was once riveted to the pan. Some areas of the pan are corroded and missing, but in all the condition is good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #</th>
<th>Object: chamberstick base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86.13.772.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OL: 3 ½” OW: 9/16”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Fragment of the edge of a chamberstick pan. Two lines of incising encircle the edge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #</th>
<th>Object: shelf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86.13.877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>Figure 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OL: 20 ¼” OW: 4 ¾”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>This thin, rectangular plank of wood has three irregular circular cut-outs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>This shelf, and a related object (#86.13.468.2) were once part of a shelf for holding ceramics, glass bottles, and other fragile vessels secure on the moving ship. Though the DeBraak's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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example is much less detailed, but it bears a striking resemblance to several shelves excavated from the *Betsy*. On the *Betsy*, fifty fragments of $\frac{1}{2}$" planking including two cut-out shelves with butterfly-shaped fore edges were found throughout the stern. These shelves fit into a domed-top, corner cupboard, allowing the dishes to be displayed while they remained secure. It is likely that the shelves from the *DeBraak* fit into a similar, though perhaps less ornate, cabinet in the wardroom or the captain’s pantry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #:</th>
<th>86.13.937</th>
<th>Object: coat hook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustration(s):</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td>OL: 2 1/16” OW: 5/8”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>brass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>J-shaped hook with faceted knob at terminus. Trumpet-shaped base is collared. Bottom of base has a hole which originally held an iron spike or screw.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Like # 84.442.131, this style of coat hook was common in the late eighteenth century. Hooks of this type were readily available in graduated sizes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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