



Richard Lassels, Jean Gailhard and Richard Hurd: the Grand Tour Debate on the Benefits of Travel for the Nation

Vesselin Budakov,
University of Sofia, Bulgaria

The Grand Tour, defined by a number of scholars as the early phase of modern tourism, was the subject of a debate which focused on its utility and benefits but also touched upon issues such as the significance of travel and the role of educational tours in the shaping of knowledge about native and foreign cultures. The article considers this initial stage of tourism and argues that in addition to the courtly paradigm, which stressed the importance of foreign travel, the education of the English gentleman included patriotic allegiance to the home country. It examines the role of the paradigm of gentility in the making of the virtuous gentleman abroad in Richard Lassels's *The Voyage of Italy* (1670) and Jean (John) Gailhard's *The Compleat Gentleman* (1678). The article also discusses Richard Hurd's *Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel* (1764), which marked a critical return to the debate about the role of educational tours. It is argued that Hurd undermined the former courtly paradigm and challenged the benefits of foreign travel by proclaiming British national values and advocating home education as a more valuable platform for the making of English gentlemen.

Keywords: travel, the Grand Tour, education, improvement, Enlightenment.

Richard Hurd's *Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel* (1764) presents an imaginary dispute between “Lord Shaftesbury” and “John Locke” over the benefits of foreign travel. The dispute supposedly takes place in MDCC, that is, 1700. The dialogic form allows Hurd to conceal which side he himself favours. While agreeing with “Locke” that travel abroad should be viewed with caution, he allows “Shaftesbury” to proclaim that by the end of the seventeenth century the Grand Tour had come to be widely regarded as an institution. Through “Shaftesbury,” who claims in this imagined debate that the “brightest periods” of English history were those in which the nobility was “fashioned in the school of foreign Travel” (16), Hurd practically provides a summary of some of the key features of the rising eighteenth-century tourist culture. In addition to suggesting that travel is a school of life, he also indicates who exactly has benefited from it. Through the fictional Shaftesbury Hurd challenged the high praise of educational tourism and resuscitated a debate over the benefits of the Grand Tour, which first started in the late seventeenth century.

The Grand Tour has often been defined as “the practice of travel” in Western Europe from roughly 1600 to 1830 (Chard, “Grand” 101) and as a “social ritual” (Kriz 87), which entailed an extended journey of young upper- and middle-class gentlemen for either pleasure or improvement. It was a tour stimulated by the study of classical authors and the construal that they put on remote places and past times, the rediscovery of which was provoked by a fashionable hunting for antiquities and aesthetic mercantilism in cities such as Paris, Rome and Venice (Chard, “Nakedness” 14-28; Bunn 303-21). Edward Chaney argues that by the late 1670s the Grand Tour had already been established as a “social convention and educational institution” (58). John Towner views this studious form of tourism as “a cultural institution” that by the end of the eighteenth century had accumulated a substantial literary legacy (“Literature, Tourism” 226-7). The number of English tourists abroad by the middle of the eighteenth century, according to Towner, totalled nearly twenty thousand per

annum (“Grand” 304). He regards this fashion of educational travel as the initial phase of tourism before “a more formalized tourist industry” had come into existence in the nineteenth century (“Grand” 297).

Significantly, 1700, the year in which the debate between “Locke” and “Shaftesbury” supposedly takes place, and 1746, the year of the actual publication of Hurd’s text, mark what Towner has identified as “a key phase” in the formation of British tourist culture (“Grand” 297–9). The closing remarks dedicated to travel in John Locke’s *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693) in which the Grand Tour is ambivalently praised and chastized¹ may be interpreted as a response to Richard Lassels’s laudatory representation of the Grand Tour in *The Voyage of Italy* (1670), the text in which, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, the expression occurs for the first time (Kriz 89). Educational travel is also praised by Jean (John) Gailhard in his *The Compleat Gentleman: or Directions for the Education of Youth as to Their Breeding at Home and Travelling Abroad* [henceforth referred to as *The Compleat Gentleman*] (1678).² Lassels and Gailhard were among those who provided the theoretical and pragmatic rationale of educational tourism. The fact that Hurd chose to involve “Locke” and “Shaftesbury” as opponents in a dispute on the benefits of travel suggests that the debate over the Grand Tour was as much educational and pragmatic as it was philosophical.

Hurd’s debate over the benefits of studious tourism was an attempt to criticize a fashion; its treatment of the subject capitalizes on earlier considerations of travel, as expounded, for instance, in Lassels’s and Gailhard’s books that fused elements from the conduct-book with advice for travellers. Besides, the publication of Hurd’s *Dialogues* in 1764 roughly coincides with what Dennis Porter calls “the dream of travel” which he positions around the middle of the eighteenth century. According to Potter, the desire for travel was continually stimulated at the time by the impressive number of Grand Tour accounts which “rivalled the novel as most popular genre” (54). Around the middle of the eighteenth century, the notion and practice of travel underwent significant quantitative and qualitative changes (Seaton 116): in addition to the “classical” type of privileged grand tourists, a wider range of people were able to journey to the continent as travel was made easier and more affordable (Seaton 116; Towner, “Grand” 312). Hurd’s text appears to record this process. In other words, Hurd’s *Dialogues* comes at a time when, in Jeremy Black’s words, “the nature of tourism” started to alter. While the early eighteenth century was essentially dominated by “the classical Grand Tour – young men travelling with tutors for several years in order to finish their education . . . , in the second part of the century, many still travelled in this manner, but there were also larger numbers of other tourists” whose primary reason for travel was not education (Black 167–8).

On the other hand, the debate over the value of travel was hardly a novelty between the late seventeenth and mid-eighteenth centuries. Against a backdrop of fascination with exploration and commercial profit from contacts with other nations, late sixteenth-century writers, such as Roger Ascham and Thomas Nashe, had been scornful of the alleged benefits of educational travel to continental capitals, finding such tours morally detrimental (Hadfield 102–6; Singh 12–13). Francis Bacon’s essay “Of Travel” (1612, 1625), which must have influenced Locke’s views on itinerary education (Talbot 14–16), lauds experience abroad as a source of

¹ In *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693), Locke devotes sections 199 to 201 to travel. He views foreign travel as the final touch in the education of a young gentleman which “has great Advantages,” particularly with regard to the improvement of foreign languages and the “Improvement in Wisdom and Prudence” by “conversing with People” who are unlike those he knows in his “Parish and Neighbourhood” (253–4). Locke, however, raises some objections. First, he finds the age from sixteen to twenty-one to be the least suitable one for such improvements stressing that the proper age for young men to acquire foreign language competence is from seven to sixteen (254). Second, he thinks tutors are powerless to exercise full control over young travellers; while in their adolescent inexperience, they actually need strict parental guidance (255). Locke suggests that either such educational travels should be undertaken at a younger age “under a tutor” or at an older age “without a governor” (256). As a whole, he is doubtful about the ends of foreign travels as education and complains that young travellers usually return home with little improvement from their tours and with superficial knowledge of what they have seen abroad. Thus he claims that they retain “a relish and memory of those Things wherein their Liberty took its first swing, rather than of what should make them better and wiser after their return” (256–7). See Locke, “Travel,” *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, secs. 199–201, pp. 253–60.

² Jean Gailhard or John Gailhard (1659–1708), an English writer (Editors, “John Gailhard”) and “religious controversialist” (Goldie, “Gailhard”), was an exiled French Huguenot and divine who resided in England (Graham 143; Rose 129). Apart from the two educational treatises included in *The Compleat Gentleman* (1678), he was the author of *The Controversie Between Episcopacy and Presbytery* (1660), *The Present State of the Princes and Republicks of Italy with Observations on Them ... Written Originally in English* (1671), *The Blasphemous Socinian Heresie Disproved and Confuted* (1697) and *The True Character of the Spirit and Principles of Socinianism* (1699).

useful knowledge but warns against the aping of foreign manners, an opinion shared by Gailhard, too. A tradition of the discussion of travel and its value had been in existence for a considerable period of time before Lassels and Gailhard joined the debate.

The exploration of the benefits of travel by Lassels and Gailhard in the late seventeenth century and by Hurd in the 1760s, I want to suggest, delineates an important stage in what Towner identifies as “a key phase” in British tourist culture. This stage comprises a blend of intersecting phenomena that could be linked to the origins of modernity. In what follows I will attempt to pursue the connections and controversies that the debate over the benefits of travel generated in the late seventeenth and the mid-eighteenth centuries. My main argument is that in the late-seventeenth-century context the idea of the Grand Tour was part of a class-bound ideology of travel, which favoured educational travel in foreign parts but also insisted on the teaching of a sound national integrity of home. The article discusses the benefits of travel outlined by Lassels, the principles of education of the young gentleman through travel in Gailhard’s book and some of the key features of travelling that Hurd brings into the debate. On the whole, Lassels, Gailhard and Hurd appear to be in agreement that education via foreign travel has as its ultimate goal the shaping of the character of the English gentleman as a citizen in service to his native country. Lassels and Gailhard, as will be seen, campaign for the value of travel by advertising cosmopolitan, universal postulates that are expected to serve a courtly system while also stressing the importance of duty to the nation for the returned grand tourist. In contrast, from the point of view of the 1760s, Hurd’s critique of travel, moulded by Robert Molesworth (1656–1725), a political analyst and a traveller in his own right, to whom he dedicated his *Dialogues*, aims to cast doubts on the superiority of continental tours. In his arguments he reacts against the mimicking of European polite education as essentially alien to a distinctively English national culture and traditions and applauds instead the worth of a home education. Hurd, in other words, touches upon the issue of nation building as a process of the establishing of a community united by a common language and shared common customs, ideological or religious ideals (Alter 14–19) along with a patriotic consciousness formed “in reaction to” dominant cultural tendencies coming from abroad (Colley 5–7). Linda Colley’s assertion that British national consciousness emerged as a form of reaction against the cultural alterity imported from abroad complies with Michèle Cohen’s claim that as a participant in the debate over foreign travel Hurd praises Englishness by denigrating foreign culture and manners (61-3).

Providing Guidance for Young Travellers to Italy: Lassels’s *The Voyage of Italy*

Lassels’s book, probably largely informed by his own experiences as a tutor accompanying young travellers to Italy in 1649–50, 1658 and 1663, was written in 1654 to instruct a nobleman on his journey to Italy whom he was unable to escort (Bury 542). In the “Preface to the Reader Concerning, Travelling” Lassels claims that his travel book teaches two main lessons: the first one is “*of the Profit of travelling*” (sig. a3r)³ and the second one is “*Of travelling with profit*” (sig. a3r).⁴ A list of nine bullet points in favour of travelling supports his claim. He speculates that if the world is considered a book, no one studies “this *great Book* so much as the Traveler [sic]” (sig. a3r). Next, travel helps the young man achieve independence. It broadens his mind and helps him transcend the parochialism of his own culture by making him realize that the “*Lands-end* [is not] the *Worlds-end*” (sig. a4v). As a result when the “travelling young *Lord*, who hath seen so many greater men, and Estates than his own” (sig. a4v), comes home, he is “far more modest and civil to his inferiours, and farr less puffed up with the empty conceit of his own greatness” (sig. a4v).

In addition, travel helps lift the “*aboriginal curse*” (sig. a4v) of language barriers and encourages the traveller to “learn many languages, and converse freely with people of other countryes” (sig. a5r). Travel is said to be pragmatically beneficial to all professions: merchants become richer, officers learn about lands and armies abroad, the “*Common soldier*” may turn into a perfect spy by picking up a foreign language, while the nobleman learns to be “*Ambassador* abroad for his King in forain countryes” (sig. a5v). It is so intellectually fulfilling and rewarding that it makes a wise man wiser (sig. a6r). In old age only the one who “hath made ... the *Grand Tour* of *France*, and the *Giro* of *Italy*” can interpret classical thinkers correctly (sig. a6r). Travel

³ Prefatory materials in many books printed before 1800 do not have page numbers. Therefore, I provide the signature letter that represents the gathering of pages, followed by the number of the leaf within the signature, accompanied by either “r” (i.e., recto, the right-hand page) or “v” (i.e., verso, the left-hand page of the leaf).

⁴ All emphases are in the original for this and other texts I discuss further on.

“enlightens” the mind of the travelling nobleman who returns home “like a blessing *Sun*” who “blesseth his inferiours with the powerful influences [o]f his knowing spirit” (sig. a6v). A final touch in Lassels’s argument is his assertion that the greatest princes and philosophers of Europe “were all great travellers” (sig. a7r).

The second lesson includes a list of advantages which come under the heading of “Travelling with Profit” (sig. a7r). The focus is on the benefits of travel for the nation rather than for the individual. Similarly to other commentators, Lassels brings up the question of the suitability of the “governor” or tutor, who is expected to monitor the travelling student at close quarters. The choice of a proper tutor is therefore critical as all hopes of the family and the Commonwealth are laid upon the nobleman, and as “*Governours*” “are the *Seconds of Parents*” (sig. a10r) in educating children, they are naturally given a very special status. For this reason parents should “spare no cost” (sig. a7v) in appointing the right kind of “*Governour*,” someone who should be “not onely a Vertuous man, but a *Virtuoso* too” (sig. a8v), that is, a learned person, a scholar or savant. The tutor should possess a number of admirable attributes, such as honesty, honour, breeding, comeliness, gentility and experience of foreign travel, but above all he should “be an *Englishman*, no *stranger*” and be motivated by “a love to [his] own Country men” (sig. a9r). To hammer his point home, Lassels recounts tales of the wrongdoings of foreign tutors. Some, he says, took their charges to Geneva where “they got some *French* language, but lost all their true *English allegiance* and respect to *Monarchy*” (sig. a9r), others got their students married without their parents’ consent and yet others locked “their *pupils* in a chamber with a wanton woman,” unacceptably allowing them sexual freedom (sig. a9v). Lassels’s coupling of young men’s education with the well-being of the state suggests that the investment in the young nobleman’s studious circuit abroad was also an investment with a return for the nation.

The Grand Tour was evidently designed for a select minority of aristocrats. Significantly, on their return, young noblemen were expected to present themselves at court. The Grand Tour thus emerges as a highly elitist practice. At the same time, it appears to be a sort of a mission sanctioned by both parental and royal consent. Interestingly, Lassels advises the young nobleman to take a tour of England before going abroad. Such a tour, he believes, is likely to help him learn more about the laws and the government of his own country (sig. a10r) and thus prepare himself for his foreign journey in the course of which he should retain his loyalty to his homeland.

In speaking about the Grand Tour Lassels advocates meritocratic values: the “best *Lessons*,” he maintains, do not come from the “greatest men in birth” but from the “the wisest, the best bred, the best principled, the best behaved” (sigs. b2v-b3r). Lassels’s instructions should enlighten the young nobleman and help him acquire new accomplishments. Foreign travel, in his estimate, possesses great utilitarian value: the nation benefits from it, no less than the individual traveller and his family. As will be shown, Gailhard’s position on the Grand Tour was not substantially different.

Setting up Standards of Gentility and Civility: Gailhard’s *The Compleat Gentleman*

Gailhard’s *The Compleat Gentleman* is a generic hybrid combining features from the conduct-book and the travel manual. It is comprised of two treatises the first of which is concerned with the instruction needed for a young man to become a scholar at home. The second part of the *Treatise Concerning the Education of Youth*, entitled *Of the Education of Young Gentlemen Abroad*, aims to teach the young man how to become a gentleman and argues that the final polishing of a gentleman should be achieved outside the family circle. The final goal of the instruction is to form a character with the finest attributes of a member of the upper class. Some of the most essential attributes of this kind, it is indicated, can be acquired abroad. Home education is invaluable but the education that comes from foreign travel serves as an “upgrade” to what has already been learned in the native land. Gailhard does not oppose education at home to education abroad. Nor does he privilege the latter: he speaks about vices in European cities which travellers should by all means avoid (*The Second Part. About Their Breeding Abroad* 87–91). However, education abroad apparently adds the finishing touch to the development of the young gentleman as a truly enlightened individual.

Gailhard uses the *theatrum mundi* trope to outline his theory of education,⁵ the ideological basis of which seems to be a blend of Christian humility, social parity and meritocracy. The avowal in his preamble “To the Reader” of the first part of his *Treatise Concerning the Education of Youth*, entitled “About Their Breeding at Home,” cogently reveals his unbiased attitude to class and society:

⁵ On the *theatrum mundi*, the world-as-a-stage metaphor, see Quiring, pp. 1–23.

I look upon this world as a stage, and I value men only according as they act their part in it: He who is but a Countreyman, and lives well as such, seems to me more commendable, than he who is a Gentleman born, and doth not the actions of a Gentleman: so that esteeming every one for what he is, and not for what he hath. (*The First Part. About Their Breeding at Home*, henceforth referred to as *First*, sig. A7v)

Gailhard has no illusions about the class-stratified character of the society in which the young gentleman has to move but does not regard social hierarchy as the main factor that determines human worth. He recommends that children be brought up with the notion of taking part in social interactions and making willing sacrifices to the interests of the public. Thus, as “members of the civil Society,” gentlemen must learn to “deprive themselves of particular advantages for publick good” and be respectful to those who are superior “in quality, place, parts, or age.” They “must” also be “civil and courteous” to those who are their equals as well as “kind, loving, affable, bountiful, generous, and liberal” to their social inferiors (*First* 56–7).

While Lassels insists that travel makes a nobleman aware of the essential equality between individuals of different nations, Gailhard believes that the principle of parity should first be taught at home and be developed later through travel. He claims that if there is difference between one person and another, even though deep down people are all equal, it is virtue and personal achievements that raise a person above others, not their birth or descent. Gailhard maintains that his own travels taught him the “revolutionary” lesson detailed below:

the necessity, benefit, and excellency of a good Breeding, becoming none so much as a Gentleman, who, by his Vertue and Merit, more than by his Extraction, should be raised above the Commonalty; for Vertue first of all made a difference between man and man, there being an equality between all the Children of *Adam*, as to Birth and Nature; and certainly when the Nobility and Gentry want Merits to Command, and Abilities to Govern, they must change place with the lower sort of People, whom Parts and Virtue, ... will raise to the greatest Charges and Dignities in the Land. (“To the Reader,” *First*, sigs. A8r-v)

To my mind, Gailhard’s view on the education of a gentleman at home partially anticipates Habermas’s view of the formation of a civil society in the late seventeenth century.⁶ As he considers children to be the prospective “members of a politick body, and of a civil society,” he wishes that “they were fitted to keep the bond of it, and therefore taught the practice of meekness, humility, civility” as well as “a mutual respect and affection” which “do much contribute to keep peace in families, amongst Neighbours, and through whole Nations” (*First* 87). Through the virtues that make up his good breeding the gentleman can be a conscientious social actor contributing to a balanced political atmosphere in which hostility may be controlled and the nation’s integrity guaranteed.

Foreign education through travel by no means affects or impairs the national identity of the traveller. In the second part of *The Compleat Gentleman, A Treatise Concerning the Education of Youth. About Their Breeding Abroad* (henceforth referred to as *Second*), Gailhard goes so far as to claim that foreign experience fortifies the Englishness of the travelling nobleman. He claims that the country breeding of a gentleman, as opposed to the one acquired at the royal court, in the city, or abroad, is just a “clownish one” (*Second* 3), “but when a man is abroad, he studies the temper of men, and learns their several fashions; he becomes a fit companion for every one, he observes the good and evil of others, ... not forgetting himself to be an Englishman” (*Second* 4). The idea of travel, Gailhard argues, is not to change one’s national belonging but to enrich it (*Second* 4). The aim of the tour is not to make the English nobleman “become a Foreigner” but to enable him to “squeeze the quintessence of what ways, manners, and other good things [foreign] Countries do afford” and build upon the “the true foundation of an Englishman” (*Second* 4). Following Francis Bacon in this, he is

⁶ Gailhard stresses the social role and public consciousness of educated gentlemen (Gailhard, *First* 57), which is slightly reminiscent of how Jürgen Habermas has viewed civil society as the condition for the emergence of a public sphere in the late seventeenth century. Civil society, according to Habermas, was instituted “as the realm of ... social labor governed by its own laws” (3; see also 19, 23) and involved socially engaged private individuals who joined together voluntarily (27–31). Jose Harris has aptly summarized Habermas’s theory of “the evolution of civil society” as “closely linked to the growth of markets and cities, the rise of ‘public opinion,’ the genesis of new forms of privacy and self-awareness, and the burgeoning of a multitude of self-generating free associations that performed a ‘public’ function but operated largely without reference to the realm of the state” (1). On the increasing popularity of the terms “civil” and “civility” in the late seventeenth century and Gailhard who joined this trend, see Peltonen (148).

resolute that a traveller should not turn into a foreigner as he will have to live the rest of his life in England.⁷ Foreign travel “completes” the country gentleman by enlarging his knowledge of a world outside his local context (*Second* 5). But most importantly, at the end of his treatise Gailhard presents society’s expectations of the accomplished gentleman after his return: he should “use [his] utmost endeavors to fit [him]self when [he is] come home to serve [his] King and Country” (*Second* 193). In other words, travel should not in any way diminish the gentleman’s loyalty to his country and the reigning monarch.

Gailhard’s instructions on the making of the enlightened gentleman reflect his own experience as a traveller and a tutor abroad. For this reason the importance of the role of the tutor is repeatedly stressed. He himself emerges as a very enlightened instructor: for instance, he urges young tourists to learn to overcome national prejudices and adopt a tolerant attitude towards foreign customs which appear “strange” to them. To “discommend and dislike” what may be observed abroad or to “make odious comparisons” are activities that should be avoided (*Second* 29). He finds it preposterous to “dis-like any thing which is not exactly as [travellers] have it at home” and even “diagnoses” such xenophobic ignorance by calling it “the disease of their own Country” (*Second* 65). Gailhard advocates intercultural tolerance, instructing travellers that they “must not undertake to condemn a custom approved by a whole Nation, received and continued for several hundreds of years” (*Second* 76). Equally unreasonable are travellers’ disputes over religion and religious differences which lead to no final agreement but only to additional confrontation between the parties involved in them. These are “words in the air” when a traveller aims to force others to accept his opinion on religion, and for that reason “such disputes commonly prove fruitless,” except when a traveller is willing to learn more about other religious practices (*Second* 79).

The “compleat” gentleman’s accomplishments integrate both knowledge and virtue. Gailhard wishes the traveller “to inform himself of the most essential, municipal Laws of Countreys he comes into” (*Second* 57–8), while he exercises the virtues of his home education, keeping himself safe from vices abroad. As opposed to the knowledge of classical times and authors, he speaks of the “conversation with the living” as the essential benefit for the traveller for the latter is “a sociable creature” and “ought to seek for company to enjoy the benefit of society” (*Second* 71–2). Because he is regarded as a stranger in the places that he visits, the traveller has to learn to fit in, and eventually returns home with what we might describe today as *first-rate intercultural skills*. In his practical study on the making of a gentleman, Gailhard draws a parallel between travelling and living: “men are but passengers in this world, out of which they must study to go better than when they came into’t” (*Second* 119). For him a profitable journey apparently equals a fulfilled life.

It should be noted that both Lassels and Gailhard try to abate fears and refute scepticism about travel. Both endeavour to convince English gentlemen that their travels abroad provide the kind of education from which others at home could benefit. At the same time, gentlemen tourists should always keep their homeland in mind while travelling abroad. In this Lassels and Gailhard follow in the footsteps of the Anglo-Welsh writer James Howell (1594–1666), who advised travellers “to find out something that may be applyable to the publique utility of [their] own Country” (73). Locke, on the other hand, appears to have been sceptical about travel: in *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693), he maintains that its merits have been essentially overrated (“Travel” 253–260). He finds little improvement in travellers on their return home and claims that the “knowledge” that they have gained abroad is restricted to the “worst and vainest fashions” one can come across in a foreign country (257). These worries become topical in Hurd’s critique of travel.

Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel: Between Strong Scepticism and Mild Approbation

When Richard Hurd published his *Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel*, the practice of foreign travel was being transformed from an educational and social rite of intellectual growth for the nobility and the more prosperous members of the bourgeoisie to a kind of educational and recreational experience for a wider group of travellers (Towner, “Grand” 310–12). In the revival of the late seventeenth-century dispute over “Grand Tourism,” Hurd’s dialogue correlates with the gradual decline of the “classical” type of elitist travel and the

⁷ Francis Bacon finishes his essay “Of Travel” (1612, 1625) with the following comment on the returned traveller: “let his travel appear rather in his discourse than in his apparel or gesture . . . and let it appear that he doth not change his country manners for those of foreign parts; but only pick in some flowers of that he hath learned abroad into the customs of his own country. “See Bacon, “Of Travel,” *Bacon’s Essays* (175).

emergence of a more democratic attitude to it.⁸ In imagining a dialogue that purportedly took place in the late seventeenth century, Hurd probably felt that the question of the utility of travel was as acutely debatable in the early 1760s as it was at the turn of the century.

The inclusion of John Locke and Lord Shaftesbury in a fictional dialogue needs some explanation. Locke had a long-lasting association with the Ashley household. In 1668 he helped his patron Anthony Ashley Cooper, the First Earl of Shaftesbury, to compose the *Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina* (Marshall 73–4) and was later appointed guardian to Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Third Earl of Shaftesbury, taking care of his education from his early youth (Marshall 172). Although Shaftesbury had been engaged in Locke's thought since his early childhood, he did not fully agree with his mentor's philosophical precepts. Locke and Shaftesbury shared political ideas but fundamentally differed over moral philosophy (Carey 105, 130) which, however, was not a cause to impair their friendship. Locke was a mentor, adviser, and a kind of father figure for the Third Earl in the Ashley household (Blackburn "Shaftesbury;" Carey 100). With this in mind Hurd's *Dialogues* presents a dialogic parity and disagreement between a student and a teacher as well as between two philosophical trends – scepticism and stoicism. Locke was a proponent of human and "cultural diversity" whose roots may be traced to philosophical scepticism (Carey 69–70). Shaftesbury, in contrast, favoured the Stoic claim of moral universalism, "human uniformity" and universal or "common consent" (Carey 69),⁹ related to the notion of innateness, which Locke denied (Carey 51–58); Shaftesbury recommended "the adoption of higher models, from more esteemed nations and sources" (Carey 128; see also 126–30), which indicates, as Hurd's dialogue shows, his aristocratic cosmopolitanism. Later in this section I address this question through Arthur O. Lovejoy's vision of the contesting intellectual tendencies of "universalism" and "diversitarianism" in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The preamble to the debate between "Mr Locke" and "Lord Shaftesbury" invites the addressee Robert Molesworth, Esquire, to state his own position on the issues under discussion, but this looks more like a hint to the readers of the 1760s some of whom were probably familiar with Molesworth's opinions on travel. Like the Mr Locke of the *Dialogues*, Molesworth was in favour of home education and was contemptuous of education via travel for he found England culturally and economically superior to the continent. "Lord Shaftesbury" first raises the question of the merits of travel. His excited opinion that travelling is "the best of those methods" which contribute to the polishing of the manners of the young to prepare them to be active participants in society is grievously deflated by "Mr Locke," who declares that travel, if considered as a form of learning, can bring "nothing but mischiefs" (Hurd 9). His opponent's first evidence is that "the best proficients" in academia are in favour of studious travel, and as they have spent many years abroad they can serve as an example for such a claim (Hurd 11–12). "Locke," who is not entirely against travel, thinks that it was a real advantage in the past "when distant nations had small intercourse with each other" (Hurd 12), yet his counterargument is that Socrates, for example, whom he terms the best of all philosophers was actually "no great Traveller" as he never left Athens (Hurd 14). "Shaftesbury" contends that the most emblematic figures in the "brightest periods" of history were "fashioned in the school of foreign Travel," not in "the coarse mould of *home-breeding*" with which "Locke" partially agrees since in the Elizabethan age Italy was considered the centre of polite sociability and learning and studious travel contributed vastly to English culture, but from France, in the more recent past, travellers essentially brought back folly and vice (Hurd 17–8).

Hurd's fictional Shaftesbury comes close to both Lassels's and Gailhard's views on the mind-opening effect of travel that challenges national bigotry. When people are "shut up within one territory," governed by

⁸ On the change of the type of tourism and its goals about the middle of the eighteenth century, see Seaton 116; Towner, "Grand" 304, 206, 310–12; Black 167–8. Mid-eighteenth century literature often responded to the fashion of travel to the continent. Samuel Richardson's *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (1753), for example, includes episodes discussing the contrast between home education and educational tours. For other works of fiction which also explore the Grand Tour, such as Laurence Sterne's *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* (1759–1767) and Tobias Smollett's *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle* (1751), see Adams 190–2 and Towner, "Literature, Tourism, and the Grand Tour" 234–7. For a discussion of the most famous work of fiction that examines travel, Laurence Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy* (1768), see Adams 218–9, 226–9, 298. Published epistolary travelogues and travel accounts, such as Tobias Smollett's *Travels through France and Italy* (1766) and James Boswell's *Account of Corsica: The Journal of a Tour to that Island* (1768), also contributed to the field.

⁹ See also Carey 40, 98–105, 109, 211. On *universal consent* as identical to *common consent* in the seventeenth century, see Carey 37, note 7.

“the same political constitution,” they “easily assimilate,” they adopt “the same common sentiments and opinions,” and take “one uniform prevailing character” (Hurd 32). “Shaftesbury” declares that the wish to look into the societies of other nations is enlightening as it enables individuals to “shake off” one’s “local” and “territorial prejudices” (Hurd 32). He finds nothing more laughable than the “idiot prejudices” of the “home-bred gentleman,” abusive to foreigners, and says with disdain: “Such warm patriots they are, such furious lovers of their country” (Hurd 38–9). Contemporary education for those, who were “whipped thro” in public schools with the knowledge of Latin and Greek from college, cannot teach the principles and manners of the wider world (Hurd 43–4). Only travel can teach manners and civility, argues Hurd’s Shaftesbury. As Cohen has pointed out, the Locke of these dialogues expresses a denigrating attitude to European manners in general (59, 61–2): in his view, they “effeminate the temper” (Hurd 115) and contradict the “manly conversation” (Hurd 48) which Shaftesbury believes foreign travel can provide for travellers.

Hurd’s Locke questions the positive role which “Shaftesbury” attributes to travel. He finds that his opponent speaks in favour of the “*Citizen of the world*” that Gailhard also holds up as a model for young gentlemen (*Second* 122). The young man, “Locke” asserts, should first of all be taught to be “a worthy citizen of *England*” (74) as it is the place where he is to do business. Besides, for “Locke,” the true philosopher, who is to study the world, should go beyond the limits of Europe and consider the governments and customs of other continents, too. For this reason Hurd makes him look down upon the European educational tour as “a paltry thing,” which “affords nothing but the same polished manners and artificial policies” (156).

Another objection of Hurd’s Locke, which has to do with the “inutility of foreign Travel” (124) goes contrary to the observation of the “real” Locke on studious circuits. In *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, Locke maintains that travel would be of little consequence if not undertaken with the aim of study and improvement (258). Only a traveller who strives “to inform himself in the customs, manners, laws and government” of the foreign country will find support “amongst the best and most knowing persons,” who will additionally “encourage ... the ingenuous and inquisitive Foreigner” (Locke 259). As Cohen argues, Hurd’s Locke speaks in the voice of the mid-eighteenth century (60–1) when the number of English tourists abroad was larger than in the late seventeenth century when the educational tour was intended for those members of the nobility who were likely to be recognized as equals by their aristocratic counterparts abroad. From the point of view of the 1760s, Hurd’s Locke rhetorically asks “how shall this privilege be obtained?” and claims that it is unrealistic to believe that travellers can mingle with the best company in a foreign country (125). Significantly, he reminds his interlocutor that such company may rather be found at home (126).

Hurd’s Shaftesbury argues that the knowledge obtained abroad gives confidence to the traveller on his return allowing him to step into the public world with self-assurance (54). In addition, the nation state mostly benefits from the traveller’s experience abroad which, among other things, has a positive effect on scholastic education at home (Hurd 182–3). To counter this, Hurd produces a homily on the history and superiority of English schools and universities over foreign ones (168–76, 183, 191–6). His Shaftesbury insists that foreign travel contributes largely to the development of the arts at home, and while he is convinced that England is the leader of trade and liberty in Europe, he also wants his native country to be a worthy competitor with neighbouring nations in the arts and letters (60, 62).

Whereas “Shaftesbury” is convinced that “polite and liberal arts” can only be learned abroad, “Locke” disputes this assertion as travel for him is not the “most proper method of a young man’s education,” yet he affirms that it may have its merits and value. Now like the “real” Locke, he accepts that “the practice of foreign Travel” has its uses when it is undertaken “at a proper time and by fit persons” (Hurd 151) and that the benefits of travel are not only for the traveller but for the whole nation (Hurd 150–2). Thus similar to Lassels and Gailhard, Hurd suggests that travel is loaded with social expectations. Aside from this concession, however, “Locke” remains adamant on the question of travel, and even though educational travel for an extended period of time may contribute to proficiency in conversation and foreign languages, the central goal is the “*English gentleman’s*” “accomplishment” in the school of reason and civility (Hurd 158–9). He criticizes “European travels” and provides reasons for his criticism. For instance, “Locke” argues that manners differ from country to country and even though “civility” may be of a higher order in some European countries than it is in England, they should not be automatically viewed as more desirable or superior. According to Hurd’s Locke, refinement in European countries directly stems from the political system in these different nations. While in the “absolute monarchies of *Europe*, all are Courtiers” in contrast to England where “all should be Citizens,” “Locke”

patriotically declares: “Let then the arts of address and insinuation flourish in *France* [but] let manlier character prevail” in England (Hurd 159).

Cohen makes an important point which I find relevant to the study of mid-eighteenth-century educational tourism. According to her, Hurd’s *Dialogues* records the process of a courtly tourist culture going into a decline while the continental notion of a gentleman’s education, which was so very warmly advertised in the late 1690s, began to appear out of place in 1760s Britain (Cohen 62). Hurd’s Locke definitely fits within that context. What comes from Europe, according to him, is unwanted because it contradicts the essentially masculine tendencies in the contemporary English bourgeois public sphere. His appeal identifies with the voice of a more practical social class: “Let our countrymen then be indulged in the plain[n]ess, nay the roughness of their manners: But let them atone for this defect by their useful sense, their superior knowledge, their public spirit, and, above all, by their unpolished integrity” (Hurd 160). “Locke’s” approval of “unpolished integrity” reflects his negative opinion of continental manners and “graces.” He views them as socially inept and harmful particularly for the “men of a common make” (114). Through him Hurd claims that good breeding fashioned in Europe “effeminate[s] temper, and break[s] that force and vigour of mind which is requisite in a man of business for the discharge of his duty, in this free country” (114–5). Hurd’s Locke notes the emergence of a new economically influential social class in English society the majority of whose representatives associated the features of good breeding needed for “polite society” with the courtly past, incommensurate with the mentality, demands and political as well as economic duties of the present.

The discussion of travel in the early (and later) Enlightenment corresponded to the converged socio-economic and cultural changes in attitudes towards class and nation. As we saw, Lassels and Gailhard view the traveller’s ultimate goal as the duty he owes to his home country; though of different opinions, the fictional discussants “Lord Shaftesbury” and “Mr Locke” in Hurd’s dialogues are also convinced that education via travel should ultimately be implemented in the traveller’s native land. The agreement on the utility of travel, however, comes from opposing views on class, society and nation that started to take shape in the late seventeenth century. Arthur O. Lovejoy has aptly pointed out the antithesis between the intellectual tendencies of “universalism” and “diversitarianism” that can be applied to the debate on travel (943, 944-5). On the one hand, Lassels and Gailhard appear to promote universal affinity with a wider, more cosmopolitan world in which travellers are advised to look at their nation as part of a global whole. On the other, Hurd’s Locke is represented as a proponent of the doctrine of “diversitarianism,” which advocates the particular and the idiosyncratic. These two trends, it may be argued, projected doctrines which shaped the framework of cosmopolitan thinking and the construal of national consciousness respectively.

Lassels and Gailhard profess an aristocratic form of cosmopolitanism which benefits a courtly system aiming to keep the polite education and manners of the nobility on equal footing with those in Europe. Hurd, who agrees with Molesworth, who, for his part, elaborates further some of Locke’s doctrines, distinctly supports the particular, local and national as superior to universal cultural continental models. As noted by George Brauer, the praise of uniformity that stems from cosmopolitan thinking and implies freedom from “national prejudices and peculiarities” coexisted, in Enlightenment contexts, with the regard for diversity. However, Hurd evidently opted for “the value of national characteristics at the expense of cosmopolitanism” (Brauer 31-2). By the 1760s the concept of travel had apparently turned into an ideological instrument for *both* preaching global, anti-parochial sentiments and teaching patriotic fervour.

In addressing his *Dialogues* to Molesworth, Hurd showed his preference for an exclusionist attitude to continental culture and cosmopolitan uniformity insofar as in his preface to his own *Account of Denmark* (1694) the Viscount asserted that travel was useful for education as long as it revealed the superiority of English culture and political values over the economic poverty and political subjection (supposedly) dominating the rest of Europe. In Molesworth’s view, the traveller should see “the Misery of the enslaved Parts of the World, to make him in Love with the Happiness of his own Country” (sig. C3r). For this reason the polite cultures of countries, such as France, Spain and Italy, may not be the right choice for observation as the grandeur and elegance in those countries “dazzle the Eyes of most Travellers, and cast a disguise upon the slavery of those parts” (sig. C3r). The expression of patriotic ideals in Molesworth and Hurd bear out Colley’s assertion that the British viewed themselves “as a single people” “not because of any political or cultural consensus at home, but rather in reaction to the Other beyond” the British “shores” (6). In Cohen’s discussion of Hurd, resistance to European polite education is linked to a reasoning that denigrates cultural and supposedly “effeminate” alterities and excludes them from the English cultural context (62, 63).

The tension between home education and itinerant education abroad, which could be traced back to the latter part of the sixteenth century, grew into a conflict between doctrines shaping the ideology of nationalism, on the one hand, and anti-parochial, cosmopolitan ideas, on the other. These two trends, however, appear to be complementary in the British Enlightenment context. The expression of cosmopolitanism in Lassels and Gailhard does not imply any disloyalty to the home culture; on the contrary, itinerant students are expected to be dutiful citizens serving their native country in the best possible way. The expressed preference for home education and the emphasis on the superiority of Britain in Molesworth's preface and in Hurd's *Dialogues* does not so much speak of isolationism as of a competitive parity between national cultures.

That the movement away from relative cosmopolitanism to more nation-centred perceptions of travel and education was by no means straightforward is borne out by Lord Chesterfield's letters to his son, written in the 1750s and 1760s. In the letters Chesterfield emerges as a proponent of the upper-class chameleonic, multicultural reflexivity found in Lassels and Gailhard. He teaches his son to be a true patriot while also being a true cosmopolite.

With a history that goes back to the sixteenth century, the Grand Tour came to be more systematically and coherently considered in late-seventeenth-century books for travellers. Originally open to the nobility and later extended to a wider range of travellers, the prevailing aim of the tour was a first-hand study of the customs, manners, and mores of the politically and intellectually prominent cultural centres of Europe. The educational angle of the tour, however, goes beyond the intended improvement of travellers; as a cultural and social ritual, the tour aimed at teaching young travellers to be social individuals, concerned about their native country. When travel became a cultural factor in British society, it provoked a debate about its profit and its practical use. Writers such as Lassels and Gailhard made it clear in the late seventeenth century that travel played a very special role in the education of young gentlemen. Though having misgivings about the praised improvement that European tours gave to young men, John Locke also seems to agree with them that when the journey has a distinct aim the results can be rewarding. Lassels's text that itemizes instructions for the young nobleman on how travel will make him a gentleman and Gailhard's book on the education of the gentleman both at home and abroad look upon travel as essentially the medium and instrument of accomplishing a young man's final stage of schooling as an English gentleman. Written and published later, Hurd's *Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel* joins in the debate over the value of educational travel by opposing the views of his late-seventeenth-century predecessors. The three texts considered above frame a substantial part of the early phase of British tourist culture before European cultural centres had become accessible to a larger number of travellers. They problematize travel and education as key notions that put the question about nation and nation-state on the agenda. In the context, the criticism levelled at the practice of travelling in the early Enlightenment was primarily provoked by moralistic anxieties about foreign influences on English culture, viewed as disreputable and alien to what was perceived as a traditional native value system. As proposed by Lassels and Gailhard and partly by Hurd through his fictional Shaftesbury, travel was considered to be an investment in the education of young noblemen, the benefits of which would be reaped later, on their return. Travel, as addressed by Lassels, Gailhard and Hurd, was expected to be part of the social growth of "Grand Tourists" as *English* gentlemen. These texts do not merely provide didactic counselling for young men travelling to Europe with tutors. The vibrant debate over the utility of travel reveals antithetical notions engendered by coexisting nation-state polemics and cosmopolitan values, which seems to portray, in part, the complexity of Enlightenment thinking which struggled to reconcile the two.

Works Cited

- Adams, Percy G. *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel*. Reprint 1983, University Press of Kentucky, 2015.
- Alter, Peter. *Nationalism*. Translated by Stuart McKinnon-Evans, Edward Arnold, 1989.
- Bacon, Francis. "Of Travel." *Bacon's Essays: With Annotations*, edited by Richard Whately, London, John W. Parker, 1856, pp. 173–7.
- Black, Jeremy. *The British and the Grand Tour*. Croom Helm (1985) and Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2011.
- Blackburn, Simon. "Shaftesbury, 3rd Earl of (1671–1713)." *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*, 2nd edition, Oxford UP, 2008.
- Brauer, George C., Jr. "Good Breeding in the Eighteenth Century." *The University of Texas Studies in English*, vol. 32, 1953, pp. 25–44.
- Bunn, James H. "The Aesthetics of British Mercantilism." *New Literary History*, vol. 11, no. 2 (Winter 1980), pp. 303–321.

- Bury, John. Review of *The Grand Tour and the Great Rebellion: Richard Lassels and 'The Voyage of Italy' in the Seventeenth Century*, by Edward Chaney. *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 130, no. 1024 (July 1988), p. 542.
- Carey, Daniel. *Locke, Shaftesbury, and Hutcheson: Contesting Diversity in the Enlightenment and Beyond*. Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Chaney, Edward. "Quo Vadis? Travel as Education and the Impact of Italy in the Sixteenth Century." *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian Cultural Relations Since the Renaissance*, Frank Cass Publishers, 1998, pp. 58-101.
- Chard, Chloe. "Grand and Ghostly Tours: The Topography of Memory." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 31, no. 1 (Fall 1997), pp. 101-108.
- . "Nakedness and Tourism: Classical Sculpture and the Imaginative Geography of the Grand Tour." *The Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 18, no. 1, 1995, pp. 14-28.
- Chesterfield, Philip Dormer Stanhope. *The Works of Lord Chesterfield, Including His Letters to His Son, &c: To Which is Prefixed an Original Life of the Author*. Harper and Brothers, 1853.
- Cohen, Michèle. *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century*. Routledge, Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2002.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. Yale UP, 1992.
- Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, The. "John Gailhard." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 20 July, 1998, www.britannica.com/biography/John-Gailhard.
- Gailhard, J[ean]. *The Compleat Gentleman, or, Directions for the Education of Youth as to Their Breeding at Home and Travelling Abroad in Two Treatises: A Treatise Concerning the Education of Youth. The First Part. About their Breeding at Home and A Treatise Concerning the Education of Youth. The Second Part. About Their Breeding Abroad*, in the Savoy: printed by Tho. Newcomb for John Starkey, 1678.
- Goldie, Mark. "Gailhard, Jean (fl. 1659-1708), Writer and Religious Controversialist." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. September 23, 2004, Oxford UP, 15 Aug. 2018, www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-68206.
- Graham, Michael F. *The Blasphemies of Thomas Aikenhead: Boundaries of Belief on the Eve of the Enlightenment*. Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence, MIT Press, 1991.
- Hadfield, Andrew. "The Benefits of a Warm Study: The Resistance to Travel Before Empire." Singh, *Companion*, pp. 101-113.
- Harris, Jose. "Civil Society in British History: Paradigm or Peculiarity?" Introduction. *Civil Society in British History: Ideas, Identities, Institutions*, edited by Jose Harris, Oxford UP, 2003, pp. 1-12.
- Howell, James. *Instructions for Forreine Travell: 1642. Collated with the Second Edition of 1650*. London, Arber, 1869.
- Hurd, Richard. *Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel: Considered as a Part of an English Gentleman's Education: [Dialogue I.] between Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Locke. By the Editor of Moral and Political Dialogues. [Adressed to Robert Molesworth, Esq. In the Year MDCC]*. London, printed by W. B. for A. Millar, in the Strand; and W. Thurlbourn and J. Woodyer, in Cambridge, 1764.
- Kriz, Kay Dian. "Introduction: The Grand Tour." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 31, no. 1 (Fall 1997), pp. 87-89.
- Lassels, Richard. *The Voyage of Italy, or, A Compleat Journey Through Italy. In Two Parts. With the Characters of the People, and the Description of the Chief Towns, Churches, Monasteries, Tombs, Libraries, Pallaces, Villas, Garments, Pictures, Statues and Antiquities. As Also of the Interest, Government, Riches, Force, &c. Of All the Princes. With Instructions Concerning Travel*, Newly printed at Paris, and are to be sold in London, by John Starkey, 1670.
- Locke, John. "Travel." *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, London, A. and J. Churchill, 1693, Sec. 199., pp. 253-260.
- Lovejoy, Arthur O. "Optimism and Romanticism." *PMLA*, vol. 42, no. 4, Dec. 1927, pp. 921-45.
- Marshall, John. *John Locke: Resistance, Religion and Responsibility*. Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Molesworth, Robert. *An Account of Denmark, as it Was in the Year 1692. The Third Edition Corrected*, London, Timothy Goodwin, 1694.
- Peltonen, Markku. *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness, and Honour*. Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Porter, Dennis. "Modernism and the Dream of Travel." *Literature and Travel*, edited by Michael Hanne, Rodopi, 1993, pp. 53-70.
- Quiring, Björn. Introduction. "If Then the World a Theatre Present...": *Revisions of the Theatrum Mundi Metaphor in Early Modern England*, edited by Björn Quiring, Walter de Gruyter, 2014, pp. 1-23.
- Rose, Jacqueline. *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660-1688*. Cambridge UP, 2011.

- Seaton, A.V. "Getting Socially on the Road: The Short, Happy Life of the Anapaestic Tourism Narrative, 1766–1830." *Travel Writing, Visual Culture and Form, 1760–1900*, edited by Mary Henes and Brian H. Murray, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 115–138.
- Singh, Jyotsna, editor. "Introduction: The Global Renaissance." *A Companion to the Global Renaissance: English Literature and Culture in the Era of Expansion*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 1–27.
- Talbot, Ann. "*The Great Ocean of Knowledge*": *The Influence of Travel Literature on the Work of John Locke*. Brill, 2010.
- Towner, John. "The Grand Tour: A Key Phase in the History of Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 12, 1985, pp. 297–333.
- . "Literature, Tourism, and the Grand Tour." *Literature and Tourism*, edited by Mike Robinson and Hans-Christian Andersen, Thomson Learning, 2003, pp. 226–238.