Chapter III
THE POST-RESTORATION PERIOD

It is not easy at first sight to assign limits to the Restoration period of yachting, but it may perhaps be thought allowable to draw the dividing-line when we come to the first yachtsmen who were not courtiers. Jan Griffier satisfies this condition; but being a Dutchman, he is of the less importance in this inquiry, and he has therefore, as a yachtsman, been included in the period to which his art belongs. Lord Dunblane also might conceivably be included in the Court period, save that we have unfortunately no knowledge, beyond a bare mention, of his career as a yachtsman. The only incident in which he figures at all prominently belongs to the reign of William III. It seems logical, therefore, to look upon the Hon. Roger North, the youngest of an illustrious brotherhood,[1] as the first of the yachtsmen who took no heed to the doings of the Court. Happily he has left us an account of his proceedings which is as vividly interesting as it is detailed and satisfactory. It will be best to allow the yachtsman to speak for himself, adding such comments as seem necessary to illustrate obscure points. The narrative is taken from his autobiography published in Dr. Jessopp's edition of the 'Lives of the Norths.' [2]

'Another of my mathematical entertainments was sailing. I was extremely fond of being master of anything that would sail; and consulting Mr. John Windham[3] about it, he encouraged me with the present of a yacht, built by himself, which I kept four years in the Thames, and received great delight in her. This yacht was small, but had a cabin and a bedroom athwart-ships, aft the mast, and a large locker at the helm; the cook-room, with a cabin for a servant, was forward on, with a small chimney at the very prow. Her ordinary sail was a boom mainsail, stay foresail, and jib. All wrought aft, so we could sail without a hand a-head, which was very troublesome, because of the spray that was not (sailing to windward) to be endured. My crew was a man and a boy, with myself and one servant, and once, making a voyage to Harwich, a pilot. She was no good sea-boat, because she was open aft, and might ship a sea to sink her, especially before the wind in a storm, when the surge breaks over faster than her way flies; but in the river she would sail tolerably and work extraordinarily well. She was ballasted with cast lead. It was a constant entertainment to sail against smacks and hoys, of which the river was always full. At stretch they were too hard for me; but by, I had the better; for I commonly did in two what they could scarce get in three boards. And one reason of the advantage which they had at stretch was their topsail, which I could not carry.

'The seasons of entertainment were the two long vacations, Lent and autumn, especially towards Michaelmas, for the summer is too hot and calm; unless by accident those times are cool and windy, without which the sea is a dull trade. But these were for long voyages, as down below bridge to Gravesend, Sheerness, etc., which lasted for the most part five or six days. But for turning up the river, and about the town above bridge, I could, giving time, have the yacht at any stairs for an afternoon's entertainment, as I saw occasion and found the tide serve. Once on the last seal day, we top practicers in Chancery, as usual, made merry together, and in a frolic would go to sea as I used to call

[1] Sixth son of Dudley, first Lord North. He was born 1653, and died 1734.
[2] Vol. iii., p.26 *et seq.*
[3] Of Lincoln's Inn. Died June 2, 1676.

it. I sent for the yacht, which had lain all Trinity term in the heat uncaulked, so that her upper work was open, though her bottom was as tight as a dish. We went aboard, and when the vessel began to heel the water came in at her seams and flowed into the cabin, where the company was, who were too warm to perceive such an inconvenience, till at last they were almost up to the knees, and then they powdered out. We called for boats and went ashore, and the yacht was run ashore to prevent sinking downright. This made much merriment when we came together again, discovering what a present we had like to have made to our friends at the Bar by sinking and drowning the premier practicers, and so making way for the rest.

'When I prepared for one of these voyages, I used to victual my vessel with cold meats in tin cases, bottles of beer, ale, and for the seamen brandy. And I mention this because I was sensible from it that all the joy of eating, which gluttons so much court, consists in appetite, for that we had in perfection, and though our meat was coarse (beef for the most part) yet no epicure enjoyed that way so much as we did. Once being bound for Suffolk, I layed in a pilot at Greenwich, who understood the North course out of the river well. With a good gale I got in one tide as low as the Ooze edge, and there anchored, and lay for the next tide. This is a great way below the Nore, opposite to Thanet.[4] There is a small sand that lies within the river, above the Nore, called the Middle ground;[5] and a small thread[6] runs from that to the Ooze edge, where is a buoy, to warn sailors of it, whereby it notes that the current is there a little divided, but upon the sands themselves a great deal, so that it does not set with that force as elsewhere. And I observe that all those shelves have a manifest cause from the coast, for where a place is sheltered from the current, as at the point between Thames and Medway, there a shelf, as at the Nore, grows. For want of a stream to scour, a shelf grows there, and is dry at low water. In the evening the wind slackened, and the surge yet wrought, which was a most uneasy condition, to lie stamping and tossing without a breath of wind to pay our sail, which wrought and flapped about most uneasily.

'Here I observed that there was wind aloft, though I was too humble to enjoy it. For empty colliers came down with topsails out, full-bunted, and bows rustling, which did not a little provoke me, but patience is a seaman's capital and necessary virtue.

'Next morning it was hazy, and . . . when the tide was made we weighed, and the wind freshened, and we stood down the King's Channel,[7] and the gale holding we stemmed the neap tide coming in, and, it being high water at the Spits,[8] we ran over all past the Gunfleet, so that the neap ebb by evening carried us into Harwich, where we anchored and went on shore to refresh.

'At the point of the low country between the Thames and Malden waters there is a very ugly shelf for many over [*sic*][9] there were several wrecks upon it, and a great mast is set down at the point which they call the Shoe (that is the name of the shelf) beacon.[10] . . . There was little remarkable in this day's voyage, only that I, with my friend Mr. Chute, sat before the mast in the hatchway, with prospectives and books, the magazine of

---

[4] Possibly he meant Sheppey; but Thanet would be visible in clear weather.

[5] Leigh Middle.

[6] The 'scare' of the tide; or, as the fishermen call it now, and perhaps did then, the 'strimmage'.

[7] I.e. the Swin, which is still sometimes known by the old name.

[8] I.e. the Wallet Spitway. It is called 'the Spits' in a fifteenth-century MS.

[9] Perhaps North meant to write 'for many *miles*, over *twenty*'.

[10] The Shoe Beacon stood about a mile S.W. of where the Maplin Light now is.

provisions, and a boy to make a fire and help broil, make tea, chocolate, etc. And thus, passing alternately from one entertainment to another, we sat out eight whole hours and scarce knew what time was past. For the day proved cool, the gale brisk, air clear, and no inconvenience to molest us, nor wants to trouble our thoughts, neither business to importune, nor formalities to tease us; so that we came nearer to a perfection of life there than I was ever sensible of otherwise.

'At Harwich we were asked if we had left our souls at London, because we took so little care of our bodies. For our vessel was not storm proof, and if that had come we must have run for it, not without danger, but that is pleasure to the eagerness of youth. After our visit . . . we had a fierce gale about S.W.,[11] wherefore we were obliged to turn it out of the harbour; but then made but one run to the Spits, and came to anchor, intending to pass through in the night by the soundings, without sight of the buoy, as we did, it being tide of low ebb. And, keeping in two and three fathoms,[12]- we succeeded well, and anchored again in deep water, expecting the tide. The reason of our putting through in the night, as the pilot told me, was to have a consort, or resort in case of distress; for there lay in the King's Channel, above the Spits, four great East Indiamen, and if a storm had rose we could not have rode it out in the Wallet where we lay, nor safely put through to come at the great ships, much less shifted in the night by making to any port.[13] As soon as the tide of flood was made, we sailed, turning up the King's Channel, ahead of these Indiamen, that weighed not till the morning, and, being ahead, we dropped again, not to lose our friends, if need should be, and lay till broad day. I could not but concern myself in this important naval conduct, though most of my crew, except the sailors, slept. And at midnight in the air, the eating cold meat and bread, and drinking small beer, was a regale beyond imagination. I can say, I scarce ever knew the pleasure of eating till then, and have not observed the like on any occasion since.

'Work being over I took a nap, but before I lay down the pilot asked,

"Master, if the ships send us a bale of goods, shan't we take them in?" I answered " No," considering that if I was caught smuggling, as they call it, I should be laughed at for being condemned to forfeit my vessel at the custom house, where my own brother was a ruling commissioner,[14] as he had certainly done. It was not ill advised to resolve against such a temptation, for next morning a custom-house smack came aboard us and searched every cranny, supposing we had been dabbling. It was not unpleasant to observe the desperate hatred the seamen had to these water waiters. One vowed he could scarce forbear to run his knife in their guts, for he was at his breakfast; and they would snarl and grin, like angry dogs, upon all such searches, which frequently happened to us in the river, but durst not bite, or scarce bark at them, by which I see the trade that such men drive upon the river.

'In the morning when we weighed we had only the tide to carry us up, for it was a dead calm, and no glass was ever so perfectly smooth as the surface of the sea; the reflection of the heavens was as bright and distinct from the water as above, scarce a sensible horizon; and there was everywhere about us much small craft bearing up in the

---

[11] 'Gale' at that date meant 'breeze'. But S.W. will not stand, as the context shows.

[12] The Spitway has for long been slowly silting up. There was 9 feet in it one hundred years ago; now there is only half that depth.

[13] It seems strange that they did not go into the Colne for the night.

[14] If Roger North's memory is to be trusted, this fixes the date as 1683. *Vide* 'Dictionary of National Biography' *sub* 'Sir Dudley North'.

tide. This posture was dull, and if it had been hot weather would have been very painful.[15] We found we had good way by assaying the lead, but otherwise we could scarce know we moved. About nine of the clock the seamen called out that a wind was coming. I looked out as sharp as I could to see this wind, wondering what it should be like; at length with my glass, I could perceive in the horizon at E. as it were a thread, almost imperceptible, whereby only the horizon was a little more sensible than in other places. It was always strange to me that the seamen would descry by their bare eyes things at a distance as well as I could by my glass, though a good one. And I often proved this by asking what a vessel was, how she stood, and what tack she had aboard, and the like: all which they would plainly describe when I could scarce with my bare eyes perceive anything.

'The coming of this wind due east was great joy, because so favourable, and it was a great diversion to observe among the craft which had it and which not; now this, and then another, for it came with much uncertainty, . . . and we laid our sails as fair for it as we could, and at last it came and fluttered us a good space, for, as I said, upon the edge it was very rolling and uncertain, till at last we were full paid and stood in with wind and tide and stemmed good part of the ebb. At last, the wind failing, we came to an anchor within the middle ground, upon the coast of Kent, above St. James' Point.[16] And there shall end the relation of this voyage, which I have made more largely than pertinently, supposing it might at least show the strong inclination I had to action and the pleasure it gave me; for otherwise I could not have had such an impression from it as not to forget one circumstance. And I must needs recommend it to all persons that are fond of pleasure to gratify all inclinations this way, which makes health the chief good we know, rather than those which weaken nature and destroy health.

'This I have related as one of my mathematical entertainments, for the working of a vessel, its rigging, and position of the sails, do exercise as much of mechanics, as all the other arts in the world.'

Little need be added to this very interesting account, beyond, perhaps, a reminder that there is some uncertainty about the exact date of North's sailing trips. He seems only once to have gone out of the river, in 1683; but seeing that Windham, who gave him the yacht, died in 1676, it is hard to account for his statement that he kept his yacht on the river for four years only. He was called to the Bar in 1675, and can hardly have done any yachting before that date, as his allowance was very small. By 1683 he was becoming very busy and was earning a large income, so that it is unlikely that he could spare much time for the amusement in later years; and, on the other hand, we know, by his own confession, that during his yachting days he was not well enough off to marry. If, therefore, we are to believe that he yachted continuously from the time when he received the yacht till his brother became Commissioner of Customs, the four years he mentions will not stand. If, however, the four years be accepted as authentic, one of his dates must be wrong. The present writer, bearing in mind that North wrote his 'Autobiography' from memory, not from a journal, is strongly of opinion that the date 1683 cannot be accepted; that in looking back and remembering that his brother had been at the custom-house he confused what might have been with what actually was; and, finally, that the days of his pleasure-sailing lay probably between 1675 and 1680.

---

[15] They did not bathe in those days, nor did they 'dress the part'.

[16] *I.e.,* on the edge of the Blyth Sand, near the Yantlet.

Another yachtsman of this period is, thanks to Macaulay, better known to the present generation than Roger North, though his claims to recognition are vastly inferior. He was Peregrine, son of Thomas Osborne, who became in turn Earl of Danby, Marquess of Carmarthen, and Duke of Leeds; and since his own style altered as his father rose in the peerage, it becomes necessary, in order to avoid confusion, to introduce him with all formality. From 1674 he was Peregrine, Viscount Osborne of Dunblane, in the peerage of Scotland, and it is known that, as Lord Dunblane, he had a yacht, or pleasure-boat, on the Thames;[17] when in 1689 his father was raised to the Marquisate of Carmarthen, he became by courtesy Earl of Danby, under which title Macaulay introduces him in the adventure shortly to be related; five years later, when the Dukedom of Leeds was conferred upon his father, he became Marquess of Carmarthen, which was his title during his association with Peter the Great. Finally, after his seafaring days were done, he succeeded to the Dukedom of Leeds.

The temptation is strong, however, to say that as a yachtsman he is an impostor. The blame is not his, for we have no reason to believe that he posed as such, but Macaulay's, whose ignorance of everything connected with the sea combined with his usual carelessness to give an utterly false impression of the incidents on which Danby's yachting reputation is based. The first of these is concerned with the Jacobite plot of 1690. The conspirators had chartered a smack, the (*Thomas and Elizabeth* Macaulay calls her the *James and Elizabeth*), in which to sail for France in order to concert matters for a rising. 'Intelligence of what was passing was conveyed to the Lord President. He took his measures with his usual energy and dexterity. His eldest son, the Earl of Danby, a bold, volatile, and somewhat eccentric young man, was fond of the sea, lived much among sailors, and was the proprietor of a small yacht of marvellous speed. This vessel, well manned, was placed under the command of a trusty officer named Billop, and was sent down the river.'[18] Meanwhile, on the night of the last day of the year, the conspirators had slipped away and, in fear and trembling, had passed the guardships in the river and had got below Gravesend. Thinking all safe, 'their spirits rose; their appetites became keen; they unpacked a hamper well stored with roast beef, mince- pies, and bottles of wine, and were just sitting down to their Christmas cheer, when the alarm was given that a swift vessel from Tilbury was flying through the water after them.' So they hid on top of the ballast, where Billop's party found them.

As far as Billop and the conspirators are concerned, the account is true in essentials, but in everything that concerns Danby it is false. The boat which Billop used was not a yacht, she did not belong to Danby, and there was no exciting chase. If we go to the fountain-head for our information,[19] we learn from Billop's evidence that –

'My Lord President told me he heard there were divers persons had papers of dangerous consequence and were going to France. . . . I told my Lord I thought the best way was to go to Woolwich or Deptford, and to take a man-of-war's pinnace with us: upon that, my Lord of Danby being by, said he knew of a boat that he could have, which was my Lord Duke of Grafton's; and my lady Duchess had lent it him and he would go and get it ready. . . . My Lord Danby came to Tower Wharf himself with the boat. . . . We put off from Tower Wharf. It was calm, and we rowed down towards Gravesend. . . I

[17] *Vide* above, p.69.
[18] Macaulay, 'History,' vol. ii., p. 239.
[19] State Trials, vol. xii., trial of Preston and others.

was resolved to take them before they were gotten too far; so we rowed away for Gravesend, and afterwards went down into the Hope, and I did judge that no vessel that came from London that tide could be ahead of me.'

He pressed a fisherman who knew the *Thomas and Elizabeth* by sight, and by an artifice got him to point her out to him; then, as the smack came slowly down in the calm weather, he rowed alongside. The conspirators were found lying on the ballast. As one of the crew of the smack said in evidence, 'When I cried that the barge was a-coming, they took the victuals down into the quarters, and there lay they and the victuals atop of them.' It may be added that the victuals included a chicken, not specified by Macaulay. The boat's head was then turned towards London, and she was rowed all the way back. Obviously, there is little of yachting interest here. Indeed, the whole point of the matter was quite unknown to Macaulay. Danby had recently been appointed Colonel of Lord Torrington's First Marine Regiment, in which Christopher Billop was a Captain. This force was very nautical in its organization; and in addition Danby was appointed on January 2, 1691, to be Captain of the man-of-war *Suffolk*, of seventy guns. This post would bring an increase of pay; possibly it was given to him in acknowledgment of the small share he had in catching the conspirators. As a Captain, and afterwards as an Admiral, he had some war service, but failed to distinguish himself. There can be little doubt that Peter the Great made friends with him, not because he was a volatile yachtsman, but because he was a naval officer of rank. In what concerns yachting, as in more weighty matters, Macaulay is not a safe guide.

We have now reached the eighteenth century, and, before giving some notes on the development of rigs which took place, it may be thought advisable to give some details of the royal yachts belonging to the period.

Some of them lived to almost fabulous ages, thanks to the radical way in which 'rebuilding' was carried out, and one, the *Princess Mary*, which was not built in England, and is not in Charnock's list, is stated to have broken all records for age. She came over with William III. in 1688. She was sold out of the service in or about 1750, and became a trader, being renamed *Betsy Cairns*; in the nineteenth century she was still running, having by then become a collier, of course brig-rigged, and the disclosure of her history[20] suggested the clever couplet -

'Behold the fate of sublunary things;
She exports coal, that once imported Kings.'

In 1827 she was lost at the mouth of the Tyne, being then 8o feet 3 inches long, 23 feet beam, 6 feet 6 inches high between decks, and carvel-built. Though it is possible that she was rebuilt, there is no record of the fact. The *William and Mary* also lasted into the nineteenth century, but she is known to have been rebuilt.

The list, which is taken from Charnock[21], is not quite complete for the end of the period, for it does not include such craft as the *Royal Sovereign* or the still later *Royal George*. Such vessels, however, are of very little interest to this inquiry; indeed, none of the yachts on the list were used as Charles II. would have loved to use them. They carried royalty or ambassadors as occasion arose; but they did little that could strictly be classed as pleasure-sailing. On one of the rare occasions when George III. took his pleasure afloat, in the summer of 1791, the *Juno* frigate was chosen to serve as a yacht, and took the

[20] A.H. Clark, chap. vi.
[21] 'Marine Architecture', vol. iii., p. 272.

Royal Family on board daily. The programme was always the same, to cruise about Portland Roads, and to land the royal passengers in the evening. The King, Queen, and Princesses enjoyed themselves on board, as we are told by Byam Martin, who was an officer in the *Juno*, but Captain Hood, commanding the ship, found himself saddled with the heavy expense of their entertainment, amounting in six weeks to £700. 'It was a shameful omission on the part of the Admiralty,' wrote Byam Martin, 'not to provide against so serious a loss. In after-times the yachts were very properly brought into use on such occasions, and all expenses defrayed by the Board of Green Cloth.'

Royal Yachts of the Eighteenth Century

Name	Gun-deck.	Keel.	Breadth.	Depth.	Tons.	Men.	Guns.	Date.	Where Built.	Builder.
	Ft in	Ft in	Ft in	Ft in						
William and Mary	76 6	61 5½	21 7	9 6	152	40	8	1694	Chatham	R. Lee
Medina	52 10	42 10	17 0	8 6¼	65	10	6	1702	Portsmouth	---
Bolton.	53 2	38 0	14 6	7 6	42	12	6	1709	Portsmouth	T. Podd
Princess Augusta	73 8	57 7½	22 6¼	9 6	155	40	8	1710	Deptford	J. Allen
Queenborough	51 6	37 3	15 2½	6 7	46	7	6	1718	Sheerness	J. Ward
Catherine	76 6	61 6	22 4¼	9 6	161	40	8	1720	(Rebuilt)	R. Stacey
Fubbs	76 9	61 0	22 0	9 8	157	40	8	1724	(Rebuilt)	---
Mary	76 6	61 6	22 4	9 8	164	40	8	1727	Deptford	R. Stacey
Chatham	59 6	47 0	17 3	7 6	74	9	6	1741	Chatham	J. Ward
Portsmouth	59 6	48 3	18 0	8 6	83	10	6	1742	Portsmouth	P. Lock
Royal Charlotte.	90 0	72 2½	24 7	11 0	232	70	10	1749	Deptford	J. Holland
Dorset	78 0	64 10½	21 11	10 10	164	50	8	1753	Deptford	Sir T. Slade
Plymouth	64 6	52 6	17 10	10 0	88	10	6	1755	Plymouth	J. Bucknall
William and Mary	76 9	62 10¼	22 8	10 1	171	40	8	1765	Deptford	(Rebuilt)
Plymouth	64 0	52 7¼.	18 6	10 1	96	10	-	?	Plymouth	(Rebuilt)
Augusta	80 6	64 11⅜	23 1¼	10 11	184	40	8	1770	Deptford	(Rebuilt

It will be noticed that the size of the yachts has grown considerably since Charles II.'s time, and with the growth in size came a change in rig. The smaller yachts were still rigged in smack fashion - that is, with a gaff mainsail without a boom, two head-sails, and a square topsail; but from the very beginning of the century the larger yachts were rigged as ketches.[22] The old ketch rig would seem sufficiently appalling to a modern yachtsman, both in appearance and in handiness. The readiest way of describing it is as a full-rigged ship with the foremast taken out. Thus the mainmast was amidships, and, as the bowsprit was steeved up in the orthodox old-fashioned way, the luff of the jib was nearly horizontal. The only fore and aft sails were a microscopic mizen - the mizen topsail being square - and the headsails. The fore and aft sail on the mainmast came very much later. It seems strange that such odd-looking crafts could sail, but we have every reason to believe that they could. The last of them endured till well into the nineteenth century. From the middle of the century onwards till the introduction of steam the royal yachts were full-ship-rigged, and therefore less interesting to us here.

A French writer at the beginning of the eighteenth century, in a book[23] compiled chiefly from Dutch authors, referred to yachts as ‘small vessels which the English use for pleasure and for war. They are also much used in Holland.’ He gives dimensions of the Dutch yachts, which were much smaller than those in the English table, and he mentions no yachts belonging to other nations.

In 1750[24] yachts were defined as having ‘one mast with a halfspreet or smack sail, and sometimes ketch fashion.’ This was true only until the ship rig for the larger yachts came in, as it seems to have done while Blanckley's fingers still held the pen. The ketch rig, however, continued to hold its own for smaller craft, as is clear from Falconer and many other writers of the second half of the century. The best account of yachts at the time of the American War comes, naturally enough, from a French writer,[25] for throughout the eighteenth century it will uniformly be found that in all that belonged to the shipbuilder's art the French experts bore the palm, just as the Dutch did in the seventeenth century. Yachts, then, according to Lescallier, are an English type. They are usually very light, and are used for short passages or cruises. Their distinctive rig comprises a mainmast, a mizen, and a bowsprit, with the same sails as a ketch; then the sole difference between a yacht and a ketch is that the former is decorated, very lightly rigged, built for speed, with good accommodation, and that the ketch, on the other hand, is built for trade. The Lords of the Admiralty, etc., and many private persons of good fortune, even such as have no connection with the navy, have yachts of from 60 to 8o tons, in which during the fine weather they cruise on their coast, cross to France, to Holland, and sometimes even to Lisbon and Cadiz.

The royal yachts have three masts and the same sails as a ship, but their masts and spars are very slender - as few blocks are used as possible; they are rigged very handily, and as lightly as can be. Sometimes men-of-war make the mistake of copying this style of running gear. He then runs off into a description of the carving and gilding on the royal yachts, into the details of which we need not follow him.

---

[22] Vide Sutherland, ‘England’s Glory,’ p.8.
[23] ‘L’art de bâtir les Vaisseaux,’ 1719, vol. ii., p.18.
[24] Blanckley, ‘Naval Expositor,’.
[25] Lescalier, ‘Vocabulaire,’ 1777, pp. 286, 287.

As far as rigs are concerned, the interest of the eighteenth century lies, not in those vessels which were officially styled yachts, whose development, as we have seen, proceeded along sufficiently obvious lines, but in the rise to favour of new types. It is customary to speak of the schooner, the lugger, the cutter, and possibly the sloop, as having been introduced at this time; and it seems hitherto to have escaped notice that in this instance, as in most cases, tradition is probably wrong. To begin, then, by quoting the tradition. In 1713 the first schooner was built by Andrew Robinson at Gloucester, Massachusetts; up to the time of her launch her constructor had not made up his mind what to call her, but as she took the water a bystander cried: 'Look how she scoons !' Robinson caught at the suggestion and said: 'A schooner let her be.' The present writer must confess that, long before he had occasion to inquire into the truth of this fable, its inherent improbability repelled him. The entry of the cutter into England was, as we are told, less dramatic. The type existed in France, and in 1761 a cutter taken from the French was bought into the Royal Navy as the *Swift*. She was the first vessel of that class to appear in England. Similarly, the first English lugger was *La Gloire*, taken from the French in 1781.

It would be satisfactory to make sure of the origin and derivation of the word 'schooner.' On the face of it it looks Dutch; but hitherto no one seems to have traced any early Dutch use of the word. That, however, is no valid argument against the prior existence of the thing, as we have already seen in the case of the sprit, the gaff, and other nautical developments. It would, in fact, probably be nearly correct to say that the mere existence of a widely recognised name for a thing is proof that the thing itself has for long existed. We know that early in the eighteenth century the name 'schooner' became common. It was in general use throughout the American continents, from beyond Cape Horn to the New England States, by 1740, and it was well known in England, as the lists of shipping in the *Gentleman's Magazine* prove. Even from such evidence it would be reasonable to infer that the rig, as distinct from the name, was older than 1713, but it would not be fair to assume this as a fact without concrete testimony. Fortunately, such testimony exists.

It will perhaps be universally agreed that the full schooner rig implies two gaff sails, the after sail not being smaller than the fore, and a headsail set on a bowsprit. There are many variants of the rig, and there always have been variants; but the description suggested includes all the essentials of a schooner. On the other hand, it would hardly be admissible to speak of a craft without headsails as a schooner, though, in tracing the evolution of the type, it is fair to speak of her as an embryonic schooner if she fulfils the other requirements. We know from illustrations of 1630[26] and thereabouts that small craft rigged with two gaff and boom sails, the main stepped nearly amidships and the fore almost on the stem head, and with no bowsprit or headsails, were fairly common in Dutch waters. Strangely, however, the type seems to have died out. It is possible that Petty's first catamaran had some such rig; she certainly[27] had two pole-masts, placed as in a schooner, and a bowsprit; but it is not until 1697 that we meet with an undoubted schooner, though long boats with two fore and aft sails were common in the seventeenth

---

[26] Mr. Clark reproduces one belonging to 1638; there are others in the British Museum.
[27] According to Dr. Birch's illustration. It does not seem out of place to mention that in 1898 two Frenchmen in Madagascar had a three-float catamaran, 20 feet long, schooner rigged, and carrying 640 square feet of sail. On a reach she could do 10 knots; she had no leeboards, but was very weatherly, and she was so good a sea-boat that she was used as a lifeboat.

as in the eighteenth century. The plate that establishes the fact that the rig was not invented at Gloucester in 1713 is by an English engraver, J. Kip. It will be found in vol. i of the 'Nouveau Théâtre de la Grande Bretagne'; it is dated 1697, and it shows a fully developed schooner, as defined above, sailing on the Thames. An Englishman may draw such satisfaction as he can from this fact. It certainly proves that the rig was not turned out ready made in America sixteen years later; but it does not completely solve the riddle as to who first added the essential headsail. Certainty in such a matter is, however, almost impossible of attainment, and, until definite evidence to the contrary is produced, it is allowable to claim the rig as English. That the name sounds Dutch need not weaken the English claim to have invented the rig.

But it is clear that the schooner was not a popular rig in England until towards the close of the eighteenth century. As late as 1777, Lescallier spoke of the rig as characteristically American, and we know that schooners, as well as sloops, swarmed in American waters at an early date. They were of all sizes - small craft without topsails, large vessels of some 200 tons with a square topsail on each mast. The day of the fore and aft topsail had not yet dawned; but even without it the rig proved advantageous for sailing with side winds, as in the trades of the West Indies. The same natural cause has of late years brought about the abnormal development of American schooners, producing five, six, and even seven masted craft, such as would be most undesirable in European waters.

Little need be said about the sloops. The term, to be sure, is one that admits of much confusion, a definition, or rather description, of it as late as 1750 saying that 'Sloops are sailed and masted as men's fancies lead them, sometimes with one mast, sometimes with two, and with three, with Bermudoes, Shoulder of Mutton, Square, Lugg, and Smack sails; they are in figure either square or round sterned.[28] This includes in reality all small craft not otherwise named; and though it is undoubtedly true that a cutter-rigged vessel with a standing bowsprit and a jib stay - a type common both in England and America in the early eighteenth century - would be called a sloop, yet it must be remembered that the contemporary use of the term 'sloop' by no means necessarily implied a vessel of this class. It might imply a man-of-war sloop, which would be ship, snow, or brig rigged, and it might mean also what we would now call a cutter.

However, there is no doubt that the rig of gaff and boom mainsail, with two headsails, dates back to the seventeenth century. To go no further back, it will be remembered that Roger North's boat had these sails. The point now is to distinguish between the sloop and the cutter before 1761, and to account for the introduction of the term 'cutter' as applied to this type in that year. It is easy to be overprecise. Nowadays, of course, the characteristics of each type are cut and dried; but 200, or even 100, years ago men thought less of what was the exact name to be given to any particular ship or boat. The confusion as to the meaning of sloop has been referred to. Yawl is another term of varying meaning; cutter to this day is another; and an extreme instance will be found in the term 'lugger,' which includes everything intermediate between the three-masted topsail fishing craft of Calais and Dunkirk and the gunter lug sharpies of the Upper Thames.

But although the early differentiation between cutters and sloops seems of small moment, it is at least certain that the cutter, in the most orthodox modern sense, existed

[28] Blanckley, 'Naval Expositor.'

before the name figured on the Navy List. It would seem from illustrations that even Charles II.'s yachts had at least some of the necessary characteristics. They were not sloops by our modern definition, for they had no jib stays; they were not cutters, for they had no boom, and they had, in all probability, fixed bowsprits. Roger North's boat went nearer, for she had a boom. If she had a running bowsprit she was certainly a cutter. But, unfortunately, the owner did not think that such a point was worthy of notice, and we shall never know. The presumption, however, is that she had a standing bowsprit, for it is natural to suppose that the reeving bowsprit was copied from the jibboom of great ships. And we know that it was only in the first few years of the eighteenth century that the jibboom began to displace the spritsail topmast in great ships. In this connection it may be mentioned that the horizontal cut jib first appears in a great ship of 1720. In this year, too, we find that the boats of the Cork Water Club set their jibs flying and had booms; but their bowsprits were steeved, and may therefore be decided to have been fixed. The type reached very near to the cutter ideal, but did not quite attain it. After this date we might expect to find running bowsprits on the lines of the ship's jibboom - fishermen often call a running bowsprit a jibboom to this day - and, in fact, we do find them so fitted. The tilt-boats of the Lower Thames in the middle of the century were undoubtedly cutter-rigged vessels in every particular.

What, then, is the meaning of the introduction of the name ‘cutter’ in 1761? Probably that the confusion of the term ‘sloop’ had come to be recognised. It had recently been complicated by the introduction of the rating of ships below the size of frigates as sloops in the Royal Navy, and it was therefore impossible to continue to describe miscellaneous small craft as sloops, still less to give the name to one distinctive rig. But the cutter-rigged vessel had developed rapidly at this time, the earliest of those on the Navy List being almost identical in length, beam, and tonnage with the large yachts of Charles II.'s reign. Its characteristics were sufficiently marked to allow it to be regarded as a standard type, and a type consequently it became in virtue of its official baptism at the hands of the Navy Board. But the baptism did not create the type, any more than the ceremony at the font creates the child, or the naming function builds the battleship. The cutter existed in an unrecognised form for an unknown number of years before 1761. From this date, however, the modern meaning of the term begins. A cutter was a one-masted vessel with a gaff and boom mainsail, a forestay-sail, a jib set flying, and a running bowsprit. The Navy cutters, and all cutters of any size, had also a topsail or a topsail and a topgallant, but these were almost invariably square sails until well into the nineteenth century. The fore and aft topsail was seemingly never used instead of a square topsail in the eighteenth century; but it was on rare occasions set as a save-all in addition to the square topsail after about 1770. The gaff topsail, for practical purposes, may almost be regarded as the invention of the great yachting clubs. They inherited the germ of it, to be sure, but its development was undoubtedly due to the rise of yacht-racing in the nineteenth century. The old cutters, it may be added, knew not the spinnaker. For running they set a square sail flying, as a topsail schooner does to-day; they also used studding sails, and occasionally royals. A case is known of a cutter in the Mediterranean during the great wars setting not only royal, but royal studding sails, skysail, and moonraker. Such a rig would excite merriment in the Solent in 1907, but a hundred years ago it was not flagrantly abnormal.

The only remaining fore and aft rig is the lugger, but happily the lug rig has never been popular for yachts. It is therefore unnecessary to examine carefully into its origin,

which is fortunate, for of all rigs it presents the most insuperable difficulties. The name dates back only to the middle of the eighteenth century, when it seemingly did not necessarily imply what we call a lugsail. Some bold men have spoken of the ships of the Vikings as lug-rigged - a contention which it would be hard to support. Some have supposed that the thing came in with the name in the eighteenth century - a quite unjustifiable assumption. The fact would seem to be that the origin is hidden in the darkness of the Middle Ages; there is an undoubted lugsail in Wagenaer,[29] and there are others among Kip's engravings of about 1700, but what names they, or the ships that carried them, bore in the mouths of the men of those dates remains at present undetermined.

We have seen that the official adoption of the cutter type, which had existed hitherto without a separate name, coincided with the determination to build no more 'yachts' of the old rig, and that this took place in 1761. It may perhaps be of interest to point out that one of the best-known of nautical novels - Captain Marryat's 'Snarleyow' - is certainly responsible for some of the misapprehension which has existed concerning the antiquity of the cutter type. Among other anachronisms, Mr. Vanslyperken was made to carry on his nefarious practices in a cutter in 1690. Marryat was no student of antiquities, or he would have put his villainous hero in command of a yacht, not of a cutter, and would have avoided other similar steps, the detection of which gladdens the hearts of the hypercritical. Before proceeding to explain the meaning of this rise to favour of the cutter, it will be apposite to trace the development of the centre-board, which, though it has never become popular in this country, save for small pleasure-craft, was introduced in the hope that it would do much to improve the sailing of all types of vessels.

The idea seems to have slumbered for more than 100 years, from the time when the Royal Society was asked to consider 'a versatile keel'; and the earliest centre-board constructed was not 'versatile,' but corresponded far more nearly to William Bourne's 'devise,' of which an account has been given.[30] In 1774 a boat with one long lowering keel was built for Lord Pery at Boston; but the hoisting of so great a weight was clumsy, and we may suppose it to have been very liable to jam, for it was not repeated, and when, fifteen years later, a centre-board cutter was constructed for the Navy, it was decided to give her, not one, but three keels, similar to those which were used in Commodore Taylor's small yacht *Cumberland*. The *Cumberland* had five, but the Navy cutter, which was named the *Trial*, had three, of the type that we should now call dagger plates. There was a small one aft for running, as in some modern lifeboats, there was a large one amidships, and another small one forward. Thus fitted, the *Trial* sailed against other cutters of the Royal Navy in 1790, and easily beat them all on every point of sailing.[31] When on a wind all the keels were kept down, the after-keel was used in wearing, and the forward one was found of much service in tacking. But centre-boards of this type never came into common use, though they were fitted seven years later to a brig, the *Lady Nelson*. The first pivoted centre-board belonged to the new century, being invented, or reinvented, in 1809 by Captain Molyneux Shuldham, R.N.,[32] an officer who afterwards brought forward many other ingenious contrivances, one of which seems to have developed into the balance lug.

---

[29] 'Speculum Nauticum,' 1585.

[30] Above, Chap. I., p. 29.

[31] For an account of these trials, see Charnock, 'Marine Architecture'.

[32] Fulkard, 'The Sailing Boat,' second edition, 1854, p.119 *et seq.*

An American patent for a 'leeboard through the bottom' followed in 1811, and during the nineteenth century the centreboard gradually forced its way on both sides of the Atlantic. That it became more popular in America than in England was due to hydrographical causes. There was less need to use it here for coasting craft, both because we have for the most part a good depth of water on our coasts, and because we had the barge type with its leeboards available for the smaller class of coasting work.

The reason why the cutter type was adopted suddenly for the Navy is perfectly clear. The adoption was purely utilitarian. Anyone who has even a slight acquaintance with the statutes of the eighteenth century will know what a great plague smuggling was to the authorities, and what varied efforts were made to reduce the evil. Of these, those only need concern us which affected the building of fast-sailing craft, and those which, by treating every vessel not engaged in regular trade as at least a potential smuggler, opposed very serious obstacles to the development of pleasure-sailing.

When it was found that the smugglers were taking pains to develop fast-sailing types, and that nothing in the Navy could be relied upon to catch them, it became imperative to adopt the handiest type of vessel which had been evolved. This, as has been seen, was the cutter, and the chases of smuggling cutters by the revenue cutters have passed into a household word, though it must be confessed authentic details of these exciting races are, to say the least of it, scarce. However, the cutters cruising for the protection of the revenue did not entirely meet the case. The smugglers were driven to new efforts indeed, but these they were quite ready to make. They could afford to build their craft lighter, and to rig and spar them more heavily than the preventive vessels, which had to keep the sea, blow high, blow low; but it must not be supposed, therefore, that the Navy cutters were underrigged. As the following establishment[33] for a cutter of 200 tons shows, they were well equipped to carry a crowd of sail:

	Masts		Yards	
	Length	Diameter	Length	Diameter
	Ft ins	Ins	Ft ins	Ins
Mainmast and topmast in one	88 0	22	-	-
Cross-jack yard	-	-	58 0	9½
Main topsail yard	-	-	52 0	7½
Main topgallant mast and yard	44 0	9¾	26 0	6
Ditto short	35 0	9½	13 0	3¾
Bowsprit	64 0	20	-	-
Jibboom	57 0	10	-	-
Main boom and water-sail yard	66 0	14¾	12 0	2½
Driver boom and spread yard	42 0	8	60 0	9½
Gaff and ringtail yard	49 6	10¾	12 0	2½
Storm gaff	21 0	8¾	-	-

[33] Steel, 'Elements of Rigging,' 1800, vol. i., p.99.

The bowsprit and jibboom will excite astonishment, and the ringtail and water-sail will seem strange to those whose knowledge of the cutter rig is limited to the pure fore and aft type.

When it was found that the revenue cutter could not be relied upon to catch the smuggling vessel, the aid of the law was invoked,[34]and in 1784 it was enacted 'That all vessels belonging in the whole, or in part, to any of His Majesty's subjects, called Cutters, Luggers, Shallops, and Wherries (of what build soever), and all vessels belonging as aforesaid, of any other description, whose bottoms are clench work, unless they shall be square rigged, or fitted as sloops, with standing boltsprits; and all vessels belonging as aforesaid, the length of which shall be greater than in the proportion of 3½ feet to 1 foot in breadth, which shall after 1st. October, 1784, be found within the limits of distance, shall be forfeited.'

The law did not, in fact, succeed in putting down smuggling,[35] but we may very well believe that it, and other similar enactments which it would be tedious to quote, succeeded very well in discouraging the evolution of swift-sailing pleasure-yachts. The 'limit of distance' within which 'hovering,' or cruising without obvious business, was disallowed was 4 leagues in 1784. In 1736 it was only 2 leagues, in 1802 it was raised to 8 leagues, and shortly afterwards to 100 leagues. Also, in 1807 a scale of crews for different types of vessel was established. It will be obvious that if the regulations of build and rig made serious yacht-racing impossible, the laws against hovering and the annoyance of constant search by the revenue officers acted as a very serious drawback to cruising, the more so as the law designedly pressed most heavily on small craft.

As concerns yachting, the result was much as we would expect to find it. The earliest racing beyond the limits of harbours was confined to pilot vessels and other fast small craft, which, by virtue of their employment, were exempted by license from the penalties fixed by the law. And the few private yachts which cruised in the Channel and the open sea were of large size. By their size alone they were exempted from some of the disadvantages of the statutes; and it is also reasonable to suppose that their owners, being necessarily men of wealth and of position, were able in that corrupt age to make interest in high quarters in order to be freed from annoyance. But we do not find - nay, rather we recognise the impossibility of - any such widespread pleasure-sailing as at present, when every harbour - in fact, every available strip of beach - has its quota of small privately owned boats. Things were unpleasant enough for the small coasting yacht when the Custom-house men rummaged Roger North's boat and annoyed his crew; as time went on, and the laws grew progressively stricter, the position became frankly impossible.

It is also a matter of some importance to remember that during the long period from 1739 to 1815 England was almost constantly at war. War-time would in any case discourage cruising in open waters, but it could be doubly relied upon to do so, inasmuch as the smugglers saw in it an opportunity for a harvest. They grew more daring, and they added treason of various sorts - such as carrying information to the enemy and helping prisoners of war to escape - to their more venial crimes, with the not unnatural result that the efforts of the revenue cruisers were more strenuous when England was at war than

[34] 24 George III., c. 47, §4.

[35] For the state of the coasts see 'Smuggling Days and Smuggling Ways,' by Commander the Hon. Shore, R.N.; Cassells, 1892.

during the days of peace. But in all this period peace reigned for only thirty years in all, and never for more than twelve years continuously. We are driven, therefore, to make the most of the few casual mentions which the century affords, and of the doings of sailing clubs in sheltered waters.

The earliest and most interesting of these was the Cork Water Club of 1720, but its quaint pageantry need not detain us here, as it will be dealt with in another chapter. It is an interesting subject for speculation as to whether there was any connection between the ancient rules and constitution which this club boasted in
1720 and the efforts of Sir William Petty; but the suggestion seems to be incapable of proof. In gathering up the loose odds and ends of the century - for preference hitherto unchronicled odds and ends - there is interest in learning that the Duke of Bedford had a yacht in 1743, and that, like a wise man who knew the age he lived in, he gave her over to an Admiralty official, John Russell,[36] to be looked after and fitted out. History is silent as to where the cost of the outfit fell, but it is quite likely that the Navy Estimates were made to bear it in some manner best known to the dockyard officials. 'Your Grace's yacht is now complete, and a beauty she is,' wrote Russell, who in return for his complaisance was able to avail himself of the Duke's permission – 'I shall like very well your taking the yacht wherever you please.' There are other mentions of yachts in the Russell letters. In January, 1750, one of the Navy Commissioners owned a small craft which he modestly called 'a fishing boat,' and in the same year we find Russell's son writing[37] that 'Poor Major Philipp's fine yacht is taken from him, and, I believe, to be sold, as is mine, with several others.'

It is permissible to believe that the 'several others' were among those present at the well-known race of the previous year, when 'on the 1st August, between 1 and 2 o'clock, twelve boats started at Greenwich for the Prince of Wales's Cup, to go to the Nore and back again, which was won by a boat built on purpose, called the *Princess Augusta*, belonging to George Bellas, Esquire, who on receiving the prize generously gave the value of it among the men that worked the boat. In the going down to Woolwich she was 1 mile before the rest, and at the Hope 3 miles; but in coming up, by the shifting of the winds, . . . she came in first by ten minutes, which was next day at 40 minutes past 2. . . It was almost a perfect calm, and not the least damage happened, though the river seemed overspread with sailing yachts, galleys, and small boats.'[38]

The presumption is very strong that the great majority of the 'sailing yachts' were small day-boats, owned by London men, and used almost exclusively for work in the upper reaches and above bridge; otherwise it is difficult to reconcile such a picture with that drawn by Henry Fielding only five years later. Writing of his observations afloat in 1754, he comments on[39] 'the deplorable want of taste in our enjoyments, which we show by almost totally neglecting the pursuit of what seems to me the highest degree of amusement, this is the sailing ourselves in little vessels of our own, contrived only for our ease and accommodation. This amusement, I confess, if enjoyed in any perfection, would be of the expensive kind; but such expense would not exceed the reach of a moderate fortune, and would fall very short of the prices which are daily paid for pleasures of a far inferior rate. The truth, I believe, is that sailing in the manner I have just mentioned is a

---

[36] 'A Forgotten John Russell,' by M.E. Matcham, p.217.
[37] *Ibid*, p. 298.
[38] *Gens'. Mag.,* 1775.
[39] 'Voyage to Lisbon,' 12 mo., 1755, p.73.

pleasure rather unknown or unthought of than rejected by those who have experienced it.'

During the peace which followed the Seven Years' War we may suppose that cruising was developed to some degree. Lescallier certainly implies that it was carried on to an appreciable extent, and details available for 1773 show that it was, on occasion, combined with racing. 'On 26 Sept., 1773, Earl Ferrers arrived at Deptford in his yacht from a cruise of about 3 weeks, which he took in order to make a trial of his new method of constructing ships.'[40] We are told that she answered to expectations, was fast, a good sea-boat, and carried sail well; but we are not enlightened as to the secret of her construction. This is a pity, since there must have been something unusual about her if it is true, as stated, that she turned up Sea Reach against the ebb tide at Springs, a performance unheard of at that date. But there is much obvious exaggeration in the accounts; the sporting journalist was not yet developed in 1773, and the layman seemingly wrote down what he was told without question. In an entry for December 31 of the same year we read that in a race across Channel and back 'against two small shallops belonging to Lieutenants Friend and Columbine his Lordship's vessel was weathered two full leagues in coming in with Dover Cliffs. A vessel launched lately for the captain of the *Speedwell* has since beat the shallops, and is thought to be the fastest sailing vessel on the coasts of this kingdom.' Quite possibly, but in the performance of the shallops we seem to smell fluky weather. A 'shallop,' by Blanckley's definition,[41] was a 'small light vessel, with only a small main and fore mast, and lugg-sails to haul up or let down on occasion.' Her development after 1750 has not been worked out. We know that she was fast, because the smugglers used her, and she was legislated against accordingly; but the impression is that she was, originally at least, a rowing boat with auxiliary sails. At any rate, she was nothing like the sloop at this date, though she is often confused with it. More probably she was the ancestor of the celebrated 'beachmen's yawls' of the East Anglian coast. These we know to have been famous sailing vessels, and one of them, the *Reindeer*, 69 feet long, challenged the *America* to race with her[42] in the North Sea. The America, perhaps discreetly, refused to race save for a stake which it was beyond the beachmen's power to raise.

The year 1775 is of considerable importance in yachting history.[43] On June 23 the fashionable world was entertained with a new form of amusement: a 'regatta' was held at Ranelagh, many 'sailing vessels and pleasure boats' belonging to 'several very respectable[44] gentlemen' being present, but merely as spectators, for the proceedings were confined to watermen. However, it was presently announced that on July 11 'a silver cup, the gift of H.R.H. the Duke of Cumberland, is to be sailed for from Westminster Bridge to Putney Bridge and back by pleasure-sailing boats from 2 to 5 tons burden and constantly lying above London Bridge.' Only boats 'never let out for hire' were eligible. The race eventually was sailed on the 13th, and was won by the *Aurora*, owned by Mr. Parks, of Ludgate Hill; but details of the event are lacking.

---

[40] Boulton and Guest, 'Memorials of the Royal Yacht Squadron,' pp. 9, 10, quoting *Gent's Mag.*, etc.

[41] 'Naval Expositor,' 1750.

[42] Folkard, 'The Sailing Boat,' second edition, 1854, p.59.

[43] *Vide* Boulton and Guest, p.18 *et seq.*

[44] The word then meant 'respected'.

'ALARM.'
Winning the Ladies' Challenge Cup at Cowes, August, 1830.

Messrs. Boulton and Guest rightly look upon this cup race as marking the origin of the first of the English yacht clubs, for the Cumberland Society was formed as an up-river racing club from that day. The usual course was from Blackfriars to Putney and back to Vauxhall; but occasionally the boats were sent to Greenwich, or even to the Nore. Sometimes, as in honour of the King's birthday in 1776, a procession of yachts was organized. Sometimes some of the boats went to sea. During the early years of the society England was, indeed, at war, but only with her rebellious colonists on the other side of the Atlantic, and the impression seems to have prevailed that the Channel might be considered safe. The *Hawke*, of the Cumberland Fleet, discovered her error in 1777, when an American privateer chased her into Calais. When France decided to take a hand in the war, the Channel as a cruising-ground was obviously out of the question.

The history of the society[45] belongs of right to the annals of the Thames Yacht Club, which was formed as its lineal successor in 1823. It is only necessary here to refer to the race of 1781, in which the Duke's cup was thrown open, and all 'gentlemen proprietors of pleasure-sailing boats within the British dominions' were invited to compete. However, no visitor, but the *Cumberland*, belonging to Commodore Taylor, won the first open race on record.

There are a few miscellaneous items available for the years of peace following the American War, but they are of no great interest singly, and taken collectively add little to what has been said concerning the course of development at this era. One, not previously noticed,[46] gives a graphic account of how a man-of-war coming up Channel fell in with a sloop yacht which had been dismasted in a gale, and, with considerable danger and difficulty, rescued her crew and passengers, including a lady in a black hat, who showed her gratitude by kissing the midshipman in charge of the boat before the assembled ship's company. Martin, the midshipman in question, was much embarrassed; nor could he understand where the 'pleasure' of sailing came in, nor why people would call their 'yachts' their 'pleasure boats,' for he himself was always a victim of sea-sickness.

One other new item may be worth quoting, and again there is a lady in the case. This was Mrs. Calder, wife of Captain Calder, afterwards the well-known Admiral, a baronet and a K.C.B. 'Mrs. Calder [we are now in 1790] was very fond of boat-sailing, and we had a large double-banked cutter in which she would go to Spit-head when blowing very fresh, and carrying sail as if in chase until the boat's gunwale was under, so that everyone thought she was mad; and very few liked the trip except in fine weather, as

[45] In the Badminton Library, 'Yachting,' vol. ii., chap. iv., Messrs. E.W. and R. Castles speak of their excellent account of this club as being epitomized 'from a larger work which has been our labour of love for some years, and we hope that the book will be published to the world at some future time.' We hope so, too though a dozen years have gone by since those lines were penned.
[46] 'Letters of Sir N.T.Byam Martin,' Navy Records Society, vol. i., p.139 *et seq.*

she would always feel offended if any attempt was made to take in sail.'[47] There was plenty of daring boat-sailing in the Navy in those days, so that we may take it as proved that Mrs. Calder was something really remarkable.

Messrs. Boulton and Guest have worked out the details of the events which preceded the formation of the Royal Yacht Squadron so carefully that the student will find all that he desires in their pages.[48] For the present we are concerned with the meaning of events rather than with names, and find more of interest in such a statement that by 1804 'there had long been organized races between fishing boats and pilot cutters at Cowes, Southampton, Portsmouth, Weymouth, Plymouth, and elsewhere, which were made the occasion of an annual holiday by the inhabitants, who subscribed little purses by way of prize-money. As early as 1788 we read of "a sailing match for 30 guineas to take place at Cowes for vessels carvel built not exceeding 35 tons register, westward round the Island." ' And there is a picture by Serres[49] of a regatta at Cowes in 1776. It is noticeable, however, that in yachting, as in other forms of sport, the gentleman of 1804 thought that where matches were concerned his share should be limited to that of a spectator. There was, for instance, a race for cutters in Southampton Water in this year, but the competitors were watermen, and the gentlemen who were present in their yachts were mere lookers on. The same was the case in later years, and when the amateurs began to think of taking an active part in the proceedings, the proposal was to hold a review of yachts in the Solent. But the review did not take place, and active development was left to be the peculiar function of the Squadron.

It would be interesting to know, if we could know, how many of the yachtsmen of this date had their yachts built for them and took an interest in the design, and how many availed themselves of the advertisements which used to appear concerning the offer for sale of fast-sailing craft 'well worthy the notice of a gentleman wanting a pleasure yacht.' That at least one of the yachts then in
existence was very luxurious we know from the account[50] of Sir William Curtis, the Lord Mayor, who was reported in 1809 to be spending £1,600 a year on his yacht, 'the finest pleasure vessel belonging to any British subject,' and that 'not for the sake of any fashion, but for the sake of the genuine pleasure derived from it by himself and his friends.' The hint that there might be a fashion at this date in yachting is instructive; the rest of the passage inspires us to murmur, 'O si sic omnes !'

But though the Lord Mayor was able to cruise at times, it must not be forgotten that we were still at war, and that the coast was still so unsettled that a harmless country parson, putting off from Hastings Beach in an open boat for an hour or two's fishing, could be fired on by a revenue cutter in the belief that he was a smuggler.[51] The formation of the Squadron followed the peace, and the great development of yachting has been made possible only by the long and prosperous peace which the ascendancy of the Royal Navy has secured to us.

---

[47] 'Recollections of J.A.Gardner,' Navey Records Society, p.109.
[48] 'Memorials of the Royal Yacht Squadron,' pp.35-41.
[49] Reproduced by Messrs. Boulton and Guest.
[50] *Op. cit.,* p.41, etc.
[51] 'Recollections of J.A. Gardner,' p.261.