The Mariner's Mirror

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rmir20>

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY RIGGING

Alan Moore

Published online: 22 Mar 2013.

To cite this article: Alan Moore (1914) SEVENTEENTH CENTURY RIGGING, *The Mariner's Mirror*, 4:8, 260-265, DOI: [10.1080/00253359.1914.10654826](https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1914.10654826)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1914.10654826>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is

expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

giving details of the ships sailing from and arriving at Batavia I found that the *Schellach* sailed from Batavia for Japan on July 2nd, 1748, and returned on Nov. 7th, 1749. Thus she was in Japan in 1748-9, and this must be when the print was made.

From the dimensions in the Japanese description and the statements in the Dutch records we can classify the *Schellach* as a ship of the second-rate, 145 ft. by 36 ft. by 15 ft., with 36 guns.* She may therefore be compared with the fine model at Rotterdam, mentioned by Mr. Crone in his article on Dutch Naval Museums. This model is a reproduction of the sister ships, *Padmos* (1722) and *Blydorp* (1723). The latter vessel has a sad reputation because of her disastrous wreck on the West African coast on her outward voyage in 1733.

* The East Indiamen of the first rate were 160 ft. by 40 ft. by 17 ft., with 38 guns. Those of the third or smallest rate were 130 ft. by 36 ft. by 14 ft., with 26 guns.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY RIGGING.

BY ALAN MOORE.

RUNNING RIGGING OF THE TOPMASTS AND TOPGALLANT MASTS.

IN the seventeenth century the old windrope,† which in Elizabethan days sent up the topmasts, was replaced, at least in name, by the top rope. In the gear proposed for the *Bear* in 1618 we read of a top rope simply, without mention of any pendant, for the fore and mainmasts. The main mizzen, and bonaventure mizzen topmasts seem to have been unprovided with any top tackle gear.

The fall of the top rope led through one of the sheaves in the fore and main knight.

Heywood in 1660 gives pendants and falls for the fore and main top ropes, and a single rope for the mizzen topmast. Bond,

†cf. French *guindere sse*, XVIII. century and perhaps later.

1677, gives top rope and top rope fall to fore and main, but not the mizzen topmast. Anthony Deane mentions nothing for the mizzen topmast either, nor does Battine some 10 years later. Certainly pictures seldom show the mizzen topmast housed. Being a small spar, and with the mizzen and crossjack yards to complicate matters, it is not surprising that it was generally kept on end.

Throughout the century the fore and main topsail halyards, at any rate in big ships, consisted of tye, runner and falls.

Manwayring describes the topsail tyes as single, and Smith says that there was one hole or hound in the topmast head and one tye, but sometimes there was a block on the yard, with the tye rove double and with, presumably, a purchase at either end.

The mizzen topsail halyards in large ships consisted of tye and halyard, no runner being necessary.

The lower block of the topsail halyards seems to have been in board, and not in the chains.

The topsail yards were filled with parrels.

The topsail lifts served as topgallant sheets throughout the century, when topgallant sails were carried. In the complete inventories topgallant sheets are not met with, but topsail lifts are always found. They rove through blocks at the topmast head below the lower cap, through blocks at the topsail yard arms, and then either to the upper cap or to the clews of the topgallant sails.

The fore topsail braces were fitted with pendants, as were all braces, and led to the main topmast stay, as the fore braces to the main stay, nearly in the middle. The fall led through a fair lead block on the topmast stay, and then through another on the main stay, and so to the forecastle, where all the head yards were worked.

The falls of the main topsail braces led from the deck through a block at the end of a short pendant at the mizzen masthead under the top, through the pendant block, and then to the mizzen cap.

The mizzen topsail braces led to the mizzen yard, one end was made fast to the yard before the crowfoot, the fall led through a block seized to the yard before the standing part, and came down to the poop rail on either side.

The topsails had usually four cringles for bowline bridles.

The fore top bowline led through blocks or bullseyes made fast to the fore topmast stay by small lines that Manwayring

calls horses and Boteler wapps. These were sometimes in many parts, crowfootwise, and are well shown in the *Sovereign* engraving. They were seized to the fore topgallant and fore topmast, main topgallant and main topmast stays for the various bowline leads, but the leads for the braces, which also came to the stays, were more firmly attached, the pull coming more directly upon them than on the bowline leads.

Wapp seems to mean little more than a piece of stuff, for Boteler, Sloane MSS. 2,449, p. 166, has "Also the wapp (wch is that wherby the shrowdes are sett taut) is stiled a Horse." Manwayring as has been mentioned previously in treating of the standing rigging called this wapp a horse also.

The fore top bowline coming from the fairlead on the stay rove through a block on the bowsprit abaft the spritsail top, then sometimes through a fair lead above the upper dead eye of the forestay, then down again through another block on the bowsprit abaft the forestay and so to the head or forecastle. This seems to have been the Dutch practice. In Englishmen the bowline came in board more directly from the block on the forestay. I have seen one picture in which the bowline, having passed through two blocks on the bowsprit, went up to the foretop before reaching the deck. 'As long as the foretop bowline' may well be an old saying. The main top bowline led through a block made fast by a wapp to the main topmast stay and thence came through a fairlead on the mast or perhaps sometimes on the foremast rigging to the deck.

The mizzen top bowline led through a block seized to the after swifter of the main rigging.

The topsail sheets led through the lower sheave of a fiddle block at the lower yard arm, the lower lift reeving through the upper sheave. Battine gives stoppers for topsail sheets in ships above sixth rates.

The clewlines were fitted like the clew garnetts, with the blocks well out from the slings.

At the beginning of the century large ships were sometimes, if not always fitted with fore and main topsail martnetts. These, according to Manwayring and Smith, led to the topgallant mast head, just as the lower martnetts led to the topmast head, and according to the same writers the falls came to the tops.

Presumably when ships had no topgallant masts, as was frequent, the martnetts led to the topmast head. Both Manwayring and Smith also mention leech lines as belonging particularly to the topsails, and that they led through blocks close to the

tyes. They seem not to have led to the topmast itself, and how the blocks were fitted so as to prevent fouling is something of a mystery. It is reasonable to suppose in the absence of pictorial evidence that topsail martnetts and leechlines were not used together.

Heywood in 1660 gives fore and main topsail buntlines, but not leechlines. Most of the later writers give both, and sometimes if not usually, at any rate, in the first years of the XVIII. century, the buntlines crossed the leech lines, the blocks of the latter being nearer the slings of the yard. Battine gives topsail buntlines to all above sixth rates.

The mizzen topsail had no martnetts, leechlines, or buntlines, if lists and pictures may be trusted.

Reef tackles, doubtless, were in use before they were recognised in inventories. Battine gives them for ships above fifth rates. He mentions pendants and falls. I have not been able to find a description or representation of a reef tackle before 1700, but when they first appear in the XVIII. century, they consist of a tackle between the yardarm and the topmast head with a pendant leading through a hole in the yardarm to the leech of the sail. Afterwards the pendant led to the topmast head from the yardarm, and the tackle was placed between the topmast head and the top.

Fore and main top burtons occur in the last quarter of the century.

The topgallant sails throughout the century were, in large ships, fitted with tye and halliards, sheets, bowlines, braces and clewlines. These led much in the same manner as the corresponding gear of the top sails.

In the Admiralty MS. of 1618, quoted above, it is recorded that the main topgallant halyards of the *Moone* and other small ships, led to the maintop.

The topgallant mast rope was single and was called the top rope.

GEAR OF THE CROSSJACK YARD AND OF THE MIZZEN.

The crossjack yard of the *Bear* in 1618, when such yards were newly introduced, was to have been fitted with halyards and lifts, and there is some indication that the possibility of setting a crossjack course on it was considered. There is, however, no mention of parrell or truss. In later years, as both Smith, Manwayring, and nearly all the authorities that follow them

record, the crossjack yard was slung aloft, with standing lifts and without tye or halyards.

The braces led forward to the main rigging.

The mizzen was fitted with tye, halyards, jeer, truss and parrell. The lift and its crowfoot was, as has been shown, considered as a mizzen topmast backstay. Battine records a mizzen burton consisting of pendant and fall for ships above fifth rate, and Bond also mentions the burton. It may have been used in changing the mizzen. The yard was controlled by a tackle or tackles at its forward end. These tackles were curiously named the mizzen bowlines, though differing utterly from bowlines ordinarily so called.

Smith and Manwayring speak as though there was but one mizzen bowline, but the usual arrangement seems to have been to have a tackle leading from the forward mizzen yardarm to each side of the ship. Bond records that the length of the mizzen bowline was once the length of the crossjack yard. Early in the XVIII. century, and therefore probably late in the XVII. the lead was through blocks seized to the one of the after main shrouds. Vangs there were none. Manwayring, writing of pendants, *i.e.*, brace pendants and the like, says that they are fitted to all yard arms but the mizzen; and furthermore Smith in describing the goose winging of the mizzen directs that gyves be fitted to the after yardarm, which would have been unnecessary had there been vangs. The mizzen topsail braces doubtless served to steady the yard, and also, when the sail was furled, the brails. These during most of our period seem to have been simply fitted, leading from the leech and foot through blocks seized to the yard, but early in the XVIII. century we find them more complicated. Fig. 8.*

When the sail was a settee there was a tack.

The sheet, at the beginning of the century, may have still sometimes been led to an outlicker, but the practice was generally given up before many years were passed.

Studding sail gear is hardly ever mentioned in the XVII. century, and doubtless varied according to the whim of masters and boatswains.

Battine, who tried to put everything into his lists, includes studdingsail gear, but how the ropes led we can only guess. For fore and main topmast and main lower studding sails he gives halyards, sheets, tacks, and bowlines and bridles. He mentions

* Fig. 8 is after a rigging plan at S. Kensington Museum. Cat. No. 573.

no studdingsail yards or booms nor any topping lifts, braces, or other gear immediately connected therewith. The studding sail bowlines may have been used in an attempt to set the sails on a wind, but warned by the mizzen bowline, it is well to be cautious in coming to a conclusion.

With staysails also there is a dearth of information. Though used near the middle of the century, their gear continued, almost to the end of it, to be looked upon as an irregular addition, and topgallant bowline bridles are recorded in lists from which main staysail halyards are omitted.

As has been mentioned the staysails were set on false stays set up beneath the regular stays. For the fore and main topmast staysails Battine gives halyards, sheets and tacks, for the main staysail, for some reason he gives only the halyard, and for the mizzen staysail, halyards and tacks (*sic.*)

There has been little attempt in the foregoing pages to describe the varieties of rigging peculiar to various types of shipping. Of all the smaller craft, doggers, busses, pinks, ketches, yachts, hoys, shallops I have not attempted to treat. Occasionally differences between English ships and Dutch, and between large and small ships have been pointed out, but generally speaking the ship in the writer's mind has been a large man-of-war. There were no doubt differences: a first-rate was certainly not fitted precisely like a flute, but the differences were not very great in ship rigged craft; not, for instance, comparable with the contrast between a man-of-war and a merchantman of say 1875.

How much has been left untold the writer knows too well, but it is hoped that some idea has been given of rigging in that period in which ships began to take upon them a modern and familiar look.

THE END.