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ABSTRACT

SUSAN KATHLEEN LAMB

Ph.D 1997

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO GRADUATE STUDIES

Transformations:
The Culture of Tourism
and Novelistic Literature in the Eighteenth Century.

Tourism is a form of performance that defines individual and collective identity through a complex process of differentiation and affiliation. Touring became a customary formative experience for increasingly large numbers of influential men and women after 1660. Because of this trend, the power of tourism's ritualized experimentation and border-crossing to reinforce or transform identity and culture fascinated and often alarmed contemporary novelists. I have concentrated on novels in which tourism and women of the host region are linked to explore alternative sexual and gender relations, utopian social organization, morality, and political choice. I pay close attention to the reciprocity between non-literary practices and the literary form of the novel, and to how gender difference is used to reflect other types of difference, or to posit alternatives to contemporary normative power relationships.

After an overview of tourist culture and the theoretical issues involved, I address the Maria episodes in Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental*
Journey, trace their influence on subsequent tourist culture, and finish by discussing the Maid of Buttermere and William Wordsworth's use of her in Book VII of The Prelude. In the first section of Chapter 3, I examine Thomas Amory's John Buncle narratives and Sarah Scott's Millenium Hall for the way the male tourist acts as a protected witness of all-female communities, and to address the reasons both writers produced sequels giving the life stories of the tourists themselves. In the second section of this chapter, I discuss a little known anti-woman satire, The Travels and Adventures of Mademoiselle de Richelieu. This work is narrated by a woman who cross-dresses as a man to tour Europe and engage amorously with the women of each country. It is particularly interesting for its ambivalent treatment of both sexuality and gender. In the final chapter, I address Samuel Richardson's fascination with the influence and importance of tourism in the lives of the governing elite, especially in Sir Charles Grandison.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Methods of Travelling, Subjects for Writing

The spectacle is not a collection of images, but a social relation among people, mediated by images.

--Guy Debord.

i. Novelistic Literature and the Culture of Tourism

This dissertation investigates intersections between the culture of tourism and eighteenth-century literary forms, especially the novel. Such intersections often articulate the way gender and sexuality organize experience and the socio-political order. This is particularly true when the period's literature interwove with how women were treated and represented in tourist culture. This work is not, then, a context study in the usual sense. The social history of tourism is used only very occasionally as an external source of information which will explain what is going on in a text or in a particularly mysterious part of it. In addressing the implications of women in the culture of tourism and the novel, the common critical oppositions between text and context, or between art and life, obfuscate instead of clarify.

Tourism involves a crossing of both figurative and geopolitical borders or at the very least a change of places. The world becomes, temporarily, fluid and malleable as dominant versions of reality are tested. This reconfiguration of the relationship between the domestic to the wider world means that, as a cultural practice, tourism endangers as much as it ensures cultural values and identities. Writing about a concept of identity emerging in feminist writings, Teresa de Lauretis finds that identity

is interpreted or reconstructed by each of us within the horizon of meanings and knowledge available in the culture at given historical moments....Self and
identity...are always grasped and understood within particular discursive configurations. Consciousness, therefore, is never fixed, never attained once and for all, because discursive boundaries change with historical conditions.¹

Consciousness and discursive boundaries—the "horizon of meanings and knowledge available"—also shift for an individual when he or she engages with things outside the domestic circle, no matter how mediated this engagement might be by guidebooks and prejudice. Tourism has never merely reflected reality and identity, but has created, recreated, altered, or confirmed them. This dynamic becomes especially pertinent when it is deployed in literary forms which are both fictional and narrative. In such literature, the full potential and impact of the tourist practice on identity and community could be imagined. By appropriating tourism, novelistic narratives harness a set of associations and assumptions, culturally understood meanings and practices. They thereby convincingly posit realities that could not be encountered otherwise, and make them refer to the familiar and domestic in ways usually impossible.

A number of scholars have investigated related subjects such as the literary conventions of travel accounts, the use of particular tourist locales such as Bath in the novel, or the relationship between itinerary-based travel writing and the novel.² Less intimately related to the project here, post-colonial scholars have examined the ideology of exploration and imperial travel descriptions, firmly rejecting the celebratory or strictly documentary treatments such writings have received in the past.³ Like these scholars, I have rejected the methodologies and assumptions present in the celebratory, nostalgic, or documentary treatments ubiquitous in histories of


³ The most influential studies in this line of scholarship are Mary Louise Pratt, Imperial Eyes, and Stephen Greenblatt, Marvelous Possessions.
tourism. Even so, I have found such studies more useful than most post-colonialist practitioners seem to have found their equivalents. While the research here is indebted to these bodies of scholarship in ways that are carefully credited in the following pages, this dissertation strikes out for new territory. Instead of investigating the ideological inflections of tourist descriptions in the novel, or the use of particular tourist spots, I focus on why and how the culture of tourism is used in the novel, and on the capacity imaginative literary narrative has to shape subsequent tourist practice. The following chapters investigate how a multiplicity of complex conceptual and representational structures, along with interrelated and mutually reinforcing cultural practices, are superimposed upon and knotted into one another. I became particularly fascinated by the ways women and tourism are linked in the novel. In many cases, sexual difference reflected and interrogated culture-wide options and alternatives.

The approach here, then, is premised on a recognition of the symbiotic relationship between the literary form of the novel and tourism, and therefore between the two senses of the term "culture." Years ago, Raymond Williams pointed out that in the way the term is generally used, "culture" refers either to the Arts and learning or to a community's whole way of life. Though "some writers reserve the word for one or other of these senses," Williams "insist[s] on both [senses of 'culture'], and on the significance of their conjunction." My concern is with the intersection of two powerful cultural forms—the novel and tourism. In the novels I have selected, aspects of gender relationships are used in conjunction with tourism to question, attack, confirm, or reformulate all forms of difference and affiliation, especially those structuring power relationships. These relationships could be political, sexual, gender-

4 "Culture is Ordinary" (1958), 4. Cf. Keywords, 76. There Williams defined the "three broad categories of usage" of the term "culture" (outside its scientific applications) as: a noun describing "a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development"; that "which indicates a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period or a group..."; and as a noun designating "the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity." Williams addresses the development of these senses of the term during the Industrial Revolution in Culture and Society (see esp. xvi-xviii).
related, familial, or indeed any relationship that was contested and anxiety-producing. At its broadest, then, this dissertation investigates the function of literary art within the culture that produces it, as well as the function of cultural practices within the literature that it reproduces and alters.

In the wake of Michel Foucault there has been extensive discussion about how knowledge has been produced. Studies influenced by Foucault aim, in his words,

to rediscover on what basis knowledge and theory became possible; within what space of order knowledge was constituted; on the basis of what historical a priori, and in the element of what positivity, ideas could appear, sciences be established, experience be reflected in philosophies, rationalities be formed, only, perhaps, to dissolve and vanish soon afterwards.5

"Knowledge," for Foucault, is the way societies and cultures order their world. It is a form of power, a way of presenting one's own views and values (or those of a particular community) in the guise of objective disinterestedness. It is the understanding societies produce of human relationships, an understanding produced in complex ways within large epistemic frames that have their own history. Knowledge, then, refers not only to ideas but to institutions and structures, everyday practices as well as specialized rituals--everything which constitutes social relationships. The use and meanings of knowledge are contested politically because these understandings are the means by which power relationships of dominance and submission are constructed. Knowledge, then, is always relative and contested.6

The deconstructionist project has been used fruitfully in conjunction with Foucault by scholars such as Joan Wallach Scott for its contention that seeming unities actually contain destabilizing contradictions. The culture of tourism is unusually open to an investigation loosely founded on the theoretical insights offered by Foucault and

5 The Order of Things, xxi-xxii.

6 See esp. The Order of Things, but also Madness and Civilization, Power/Knowledge, Discipline and Punish, and The History of Sexuality.
deconstruction. Tourism was one of the eighteenth century's primary modes of producing, confirming, and interpreting knowledge in the Foucauldian sense—about human relationships of all kinds. This relationship between tourism and knowledge was (and probably still is) true on both the literal and, more surprisingly, figurative levels. For instance, Georges Van Den Abbeele, in his examination of the role played by the metaphor of travel in Renaissance and eighteenth-century French critical discourse, finds that travel's commonplace use for figuring the processes of critical thought occurred because of the congruencies between the problems of travel, textuality, and critical thinking. He argues, further, that the metaphor of travel constituted a set of limits to the freedom of critical thought. This leads him to ask a question pertinent to this dissertation: "What if the critique of a system were itself encoded as an institutionalized part of the system?" (Van Den Abbeele, xiv).

Contemporary responses to actual tourism reflect a widespread fear that the production of knowledge could go awry because of tourism's inherent contradictions. Contemporaries were aware that the institution, widely supported for its ability to reproduce the wider culture's constituent knowledge of human relations, contained within it elements which could change the order of things in often disturbing ways.

The project of this dissertation is to investigate, not so much what Foucault calls "the condition of possibility" of knowledge, but the conditions and techniques used to produce visions of alternative human relationships, and to tease out some of their implications. The historical culture of tourism seems to have had less potential to produce alternatives to mainstream social, religious, political, and gender relationships, than did its use in fiction. Many historical tours projected change or constructed human relationships anew; many fictions used the culture of tourism to show what such change would be like, or what it would mean. This is not to argue that all use of the culture of tourism in the novel was subversive in ways palatable to

---

7 In fact, the tour's production of such knowledge was the period's foremost justification for the practice (see section ii).

8 Travel as Metaphor from Montaigne to Rousseau, esp. xiii-xxx.
us now. In many cases the alternatives projected are horrifying because they strip
groups such as women or the poor of all agency. Some of the alternatives, too, do not
strike at the core of the power relationships in and of themselves—as when a female
character must learn to choose between suitors at Bath, keeping in mind the impact
each would have on her future life. Sometimes these marital choices were used to
figure larger social issues, but not universally.

Tourism crystallized and controlled conceptions of difference and affiliation as
they concerned the period's cultural, gender, political, sexual, and religious
preoccupations. Tourism had the capacity to localize ideas, sentiments, political
movements, behaviours, or attitudes, making them concrete because adjacent
circumstances, peoples, lands, and monuments could be made to work metonymically
and metaphorically. In tourism, the immediate situation stands for a whole. By the
1740s, tourism and its productions were one of the century's primary modes for
achieving self-understanding and for imagining social and national interaction and
difference. To incorporate this practice into the imaginative economy of the novel was
to harness its potential to offer possibly explosive alternatives as if they were already
part of the European (or even the domestic) lived experience.

The congruencies between novelistic and touristic cultural forms clarify the
powerful possibilities of their occasional intersection. Both novelistic works and
tourism offer an experience of densely arrayed meaning, laid out with the help of
communally accepted conventions designed for especially intense interpretive activity.
Both provide an opportunity for self-consciously constructing realities. Both promote
sustained verification of certain "truths" or "facts" about the domestic and foreign
cultures to which a given community feels political, artistic, economic, or even
colonial ties (as when the American writer Washington Irving wrote his popular travel
sketches of England).9 Both are codified processes for forging knowledge out of
experience. They both illustrate how a body of experience may be organised and
manipulated to advantage, and provide forums in which unformulated experience sorts

9 The Sketch Book of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent. (1819-20).
itself out and realizes itself.

The juncture of the potentialities of tourism and novelistic narrative allowed writers and readers to explore a wide variety of alternatives. Because the history of tourism (and even what tourism is) remains more unfamiliar than the form or history of the novel, this introduction focuses on the culture and history of tourism to clear some ground for the subsequent discussions of the novels. Some scholars have responded to the widespread prejudice against "tourist" and "tourism" by substituting "traveller" and "travel" for them or renaming tourism entirely. Yet, though tourism is indeed a form of travel, "travel" is a baggy monster that also includes forms as diverse as forced marches, immigration, an African slave's "middle voyage" over the Atlantic, deportation, exploration, the desperate flight of a delinquent, and aimless wandering. Touring is, at its most basic, a distinct form of travel distinguishable from other forms in how it is undertaken and in how it is understood and positioned by the larger culture. Unlike travel undertaken as part of immigration, exile, or deportation, tourism assumes at least the fiction of voluntarily undertaken circular travel; the tourist always expects to go home. In tourism, domestic culture acts as a point of reference that organizes the "foreign" things encountered by defining them all in relation to itself.

In imperial travel or exploration (for counter-examples which also assume a return home) the traveller inserts himself or herself into the environment to change it utterly by literally mastering it or annexing it on behalf of a metropolitan power. Jonathan Swift attacks the conventional connections between exploration and imperial expansion in *Gulliver's Travels* (1726). In his closing letter Gulliver remonstrates with those who have criticized him for failing to inform the authorities of his

---

10 For instance, fully aware that "travel" is too broad to use with critical rigour, Rob Shields substitutes "ritual spatial displacement" for the term "tourism" in his excellent investigation of the liminality of tourist spaces. (See *Places on the Margin.*) The strategy makes the subject of study appear more respectable to those who habitually denigrate tourism, but makes it difficult for other scholars to locate and respond to some of the more interesting and subtle work which has been done on the subject.
discoveries, since "whatever Lands are discovered by a Subject, belong to the Crown" (Swift, 293). Gulliver explains that it was not practical to attempt to impose British rule in these cases, that it had not occurred to him to do so, and, furthermore:

as those Countries which I have described do not appear to have a Desire of being conquered, and enslaved, murdered or driven out by Colonies; nor abound either in Gold, Silver, Sugar or Tobacco; I did humbly conceive they were by no Means proper Objects of our Zeal, our Valour, or our Interest. (Swift, 295)

A good tourist, in contrast, ideally submitted to the rules governing the foreign environment, and consciously tried to preserve its foreignness. Tourism had a clear stake in maintaining the host environment in its otherness for the benefit of a long line of tourists. In practice, of course, tourism's infrastructural requirements such as guides, bankers, and inns alter the toured environment, something bemoaned as much in the eighteenth century as it is now. Though both forms were undertaken (at least in theory) for the benefit of both the traveller and the people left at home, the impact of the travels on the environment through which the explorer or tourist passed was different, as was their orientation to it as they travelled. Unlike the repercussions of exploration or imperial travel, the alterations made--for instance, in the Lake District--as a result of a heavy tourist presence were publicly and almost universally lamented.

Travel is tourism when a reasonable and probable facsimile of the overall experience can be envisioned before leaving. When James Boswell relayed to Samuel Johnson someone's observation "that a great part of what was in his Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland had been in his mind before he left London," Johnson replied:

"Why yes, Sir, the topicks were; and books of travels will be good in proportion to what a man has previously in his mind; his knowing what to

---

11 The degree to which individuals or groups actually did so, of course, was highly variable.
observe; his power of contrasting one mode of life with another. As the Spanish proverb says, 'He, who would bring home the wealth of the Indies, must carry the wealth of the Indies with him.' So it is in travelling; a man must carry knowledge with him, if he would bring home knowledge.'

This pre-knowledge does not necessarily mean that a tourist does, perceives, or experiences what every previous tourist had. On the most basic level the variety of tour itineraries one could design ensured the diversity of tourist experience. In his 1789 two-volume advice to travellers, Count Leopold von Berchtold stressed how important it is for a traveller to research what would make the best tour itinerary, by reading everything of any relevance. To that end, he provided an alphabetical "Catalogue of the most interesting EUROPEAN TRAVELS" of over two hundred pages. But he also tells the hopeful traveller how to read these works. Berchtold advises the future tourist to internalize this preparatory reading as follows:

It will also be requisite to procure, some time previous to his setting out...Maps of the Country, to have them properly fitted upon linen, in order to render them convenient for the pocket; this Map must be referred to as often as he wishes to read some account of that Country. By the frequency of inspection, the content of the Map will be deeply impressed on the mind; and by this method he will be able to select such a Tour as will be probably one of the most instructive: the common road is too well known to afford any thing very new or curious, and consequently fewer discoveries are to be made upon it than upon an unbeaten one....

But this transferring of information onto a pocket map and into the mind was not, in fact, in the service of discovering the entirely undiscovered. An itinerary was to juxtapose sites which had not been before, but which had also been enough studied by previous writers to allow painstaking research. Berchtold continues:

---

12 Life of Johnson, 954.

13 An Essay to Direct and Extend the Inquiries of Patriotic Travellers, 16-17.
...a traveller ought to know what to look for, in order to discover the object of his pursuit before he comes on the spot; otherwise it is too late: the principal work is to see how far the ideas we had formed of an object were founded on reason during anticipation. (Berchtold 17)

For Berchtold and many others, tourism principally corrects the misinformation or misreadings of written texts and of common knowledge. The very fact that tourism offers a way of testing expectations and versions of reality makes the results of a tour unpredictable, no matter how many precedents there are for its form, content, and order.

Unlike many of other forms of travel, moreover, the tour has a long history of being carefully developed as an art form. Commentators in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries produced numerous treatises on what they called, alternatively: the Art of Travel, the *Ars Apodemica* (Art of Being Abroad) or the *Methodus Apodemica* (Method of Being Abroad) and the *Ars Peregrinari* or the *Arte Peregrinandi* (Art of Travel). The performance-art conventions applied to touring were adapted for exploration and other circular travel forms, but it is nonetheless for reproducible tours that they were consciously developed and honed. The art of travel encouraged a set of distinct travel styles which were in effect collectively developed, sustained, and successfully transmitted as performance conventions. The failure of the traditional, and highly respectable, formulations of the art of travel to shape most of the tourism which occurred during the eighteenth century, and the anxiety and contradictions this situation caused, is an important background for the chapters which follow, and is addressed in the next section.

As a travel form, tourism involves a double movement of projection and reinternalization. Values and stereotypes are emblematically fixed in a place or a people and are then reappropriated through an encounter with the literal geography or society. Dislocations, of course, are bound to occur when preconceptions and pre-

---

14 This discussion of tourism as an art form is indebted to Judith Adler's historically and theoretically sensitive "Travel as Performed Art."
knowledge do not match the empirical evidence amassed in the course of the tour. These dislocations are what the formal performance conventions of tourism were designed to deal with and transform to the tourist and his or her society's advantage. This is why the tourist's home community—the audience the tour assumed—is so important to the form. Several features of the expected tour performance reflected the importance of the audience's approval. A tourist wrote letters and travel accounts to show how carefully he or she had adhered to the best tour conventions, and to benefit those left at home with the information which was gathered. Furthermore, the wider public never abdicated its position as arbiter of tour forms, hence the ubiquitous commentary in all public venues upon the utility or value of different modes of tourism. This commentary, often scathing, illustrates how much tourism was perceived to alter conditions at home.\footnote{The most publicly discussed form of tourism in this period was, of course, the educational tour undertaken by young men. For a brief survey of the main lines of attack in this period, see Jeremy Black, \emph{The British Abroad}, 287-300. For the pre-eighteenth-century history of these attacks, see Sara Warneke, \emph{Images of the Educational Traveller in Early Modern England}.}

The next two sections sketch the period's tourism. Here I want to address several other issues briefly. There are two ways of thinking about tourism which make the subject of this dissertation disappear. One has to do with a common partisan and entirely subjective use of the terms "tourist" and "tourism" to designate certain travellers or travel experiences as inherently superficial or meaningless. Tourism is synonymous, for many now, of a complete absence of depth, of genius, of thought, of art, of sense, and of everything else held to be valuable in a person and a person's experience. Since the cultural performance form addressed in this dissertation had enormous power for those it touched, some of whom produced art that is intellectually challenging, breathtakingly beautiful, deeply amusing, or even brilliantly satirical, it must—one would assume—be travel, not tourism, that is at issue.

In fact, some twentieth-century commentary on travel and tourism posits tourism as a sign of the decline of civilization, identifying the eighteenth century as
the last time "real" travel (difficult, expensive, adventurous, unmediated, unconventional) was possible.\textsuperscript{16} Less nostalgic accounts often view the period as the locus of an uninteresting "prehistory" to real tourism, which was invented by the Victorians.\textsuperscript{17} Both approaches draw support from the \textit{OED}, which gives the date of the first use of the term "tourist" as 1780 and of "tourism" as 1811. Yet nothing prevents a practice from pre-existing its most recent nomenclature. On the contrary, evidence suggests that the new terminology marks, not the beginning of tourism, but a shift in the anxieties it produced in the cultural elite and the middling classes. At the end of the eighteenth century, these groups felt an increasing desire to strongly mark their touristic travels and travel experiences as different from those of the undereducated and badly dressed "vulgar hoards" who stood with them on the steps of monuments and passed with them through the storied countryside.\textsuperscript{18} In effect, then, the partisan anti-tourism engaged in by tourists and commentators alike is a strong component of post-eighteenth-century tourism, but does not mark the beginning of tourism as a cultural practice (I will return to this point).

The other way of making the subject of this dissertation disappear finds its lead in ahistorical theorization about tourism, often by sociologists. Assuming that young male aristocrats were the only ones who travelled by choice before the end of the Napoleonic Wars, such theorists have addressed tourism as a nineteenth- and twentieth-century phenomenon.\textsuperscript{19} Though I have found much of what sociologists and other practitioners of historically limited tourist theory have written intriguing and suggestive, their theoretical discussions and definitional moves rarely account for

\textsuperscript{16} See, for instance, Daniel J. Boorstin's passionate rejection of tourism in \textit{The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America}, 77-117.

\textsuperscript{17} See, for instance, James Buzard, \textit{The Beaten Track}.

\textsuperscript{18} For a detailed account of how the anti-tourism within tourism has so functioned since the beginning of the nineteenth century, see James Buzard, \textit{The Beaten Track}.

\textsuperscript{19} Judith Adler, a sociological historian, is one of the few sociologists who are sensitive to how traditions of tourism reach back well before the nineteenth century.
variability. Their theories about tourism, and the definitions they use to address the practice are therefore tied to what are actually historically specific manifestations of tourism. Their theoretical paradigms become difficult or impossible to use on historical material without ripping the core out of either the paradigms or of the material one would use them to illuminate.

These two ways of making my subject disappear are, in fact, twisted into one another. Dean MacCannell, in his seminal study of tourism, argues that tourism gives the tourist a cohesive world-view otherwise lacking in the fragmentation of industrialized societies. It is the social form most invested with the imaginative and emotional energies of its practitioners. With industrialization, MacCannell also argues, leisure displaces work from the centre of social arrangements, and tourism is one of the most concentrated and highly organized forms of leisure. In effect, touristic desires provide a map and measure of what is denied in tourists’ regular life. He concludes that the tourist stands for modern man in general.\(^2\) In terms of MacCannell’s argument, then, there are no such creatures as pre-industrial or non-leisure tourists. This isolates the individual tourist and the tourist’s circumstances alone as the principal criteria defining tourism and giving it its meaning. The function MacCannell gives tourism in society limits it unnecessarily both historically and within the twentieth century. For instance, even twentieth-century forms such as educational tourism or the professional tourism of travel book writers are cast by his theory into the never-never land of exceptions. MacCannell’s work, though suggestive, is impossible to use without modification in relation to the way literary forms harness tourism’s multiple potentials. It can, however, be remodelled to discuss pre-industrial tourism in interesting ways.

Despite his claims, by MacCannell’s definition of tourism (as an organized form of leisure which is highly invested with imaginative and emotional energies, and which provides a cohesive world-view) tourism has a very long history in the West. Ancient Greeks and the Romans left home for short periods of time for a leisurely trot

around their world. The Romans, for instance, were particularly fond of visiting spas as a simultaneously religious, recreational, and recuperative activity. In the habit of modelling themselves on the Ancients, many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century tourists looked (somewhat inappropriately) to Ulysses as a model. James Howell, for instance, wrote in 1642 that:

This made Ulisses to be cryed up so much amongst the Greeks for their greatest wise man, because he had Travelled through many strange Countreys, and observed the manners of divers Nations, having seene, as it was said and sung of him, more Cities than there were Houses in Athens...and the Greatest of their Emperours did use to glory in nothing so often, as that he had surveved more Land with his Eye, than other Kings could comprehend with their thoughts.

The destruction of Ulysses' companions and the involuntary nature of his travels were conveniently ignored when tourists were exhorted to be like Ulysses, or when he was used to justify touring. Despite a desire to emulate the Ancients, however, more recent Western tourism is akin to the medieval pilgrimage. The number who engaged in pilgrimage is surprising. At the peak of its popularity, an estimated 500,000 people from all over Europe visited the shrine of the Apostle James the Greater at Santiago de Compostela in Northern Spain per year. In 1434, for instance, Henry VI granted licences to 2433 pilgrims to visit this shrine. In England, some 200,000 per year visited St. Thomas Beckett's shrine at Canterbury. Pilgrimage, like twentieth-century tourism, provided a cohesive world view for many participants. Similarly,

---

21 For an example, see Frederick Alderson's discussion of the Roman use of Bath (in England), The Inland Resorts and Spas of Britain, 16-23.

22 Instructions for Forreine Travell, 13.


24 Clare Howard, English Travellers of the Renaissance, 3.

pilgrims had a deep emotional investment in the practice, even though this investment was not necessarily spiritual in nature, as contemporary commentators often lamented. Pilgrimage even had the expected tourist paraphernalia of phrasebooks, guidebooks, and souvenirs, and was, like later tourism, attacked as socially and spiritually deleterious if practised incorrectly. Thus, to take the distinctly post-industrial aspects of tourism as definitional, not as aspects of more recent manifestations of tourism, is to argue with an obfuscating circularity.

Discussions of the widespread touristic denial of being identified as a tourist provide a good case in point for illustrating both the continuity and the changes between pre- and post-industrial tourism. Despite claims to the contrary, industrialism did not cause a huge rupture in travel practice through which tourism made its way into the world. While extending MacCannell's idea that the tourist can stand for modern man in general to explain why tourism should interest semioticians, Jonathan Culler argues that a tourist's denial of being a tourist (which MacCannell addresses briefly) is tourism's defining structure. Paul Fussell and John Urry, however, identify the denigration of tourists and the denial of being a tourist as marking the educated middle class, not as a mark of all tourists. Yet these observations too address only the most recent manifestations of tourism. James Buzard, in a wonderful study of tourism, literature, and acculturation between 1800-1918, identifies anti-tourist sentiments as so many

new formulations about what constituted 'authentic' cultural experience (such as travel is supposed to provide) and new representations aimed at

---

26 A good short discussion of the connections between the medieval pilgrimage and later tourism is Tinniswood's in A History of Country House Visiting, 14-22.


28 Fussell idealizes an upper-class capacity to embrace the collective pleasures of tourism (Abroad, 47-50); Urry, a working-class post-modern one (The Tourist Gaze, 45-47).
distinguishing authentic from spurious or merely repetitive experience [that which is had by the vulgar tourist]. (Buzard, 6)

Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, as Buzard claims, travellers were not rejected as "mere" tourists--superficial, tasteless, gauche, ill-informed. Such rejections, Buzard argues, have developed to mark off the provinces of elite culture from those of low culture. The touristic denial Culler identifies as tourism's defining structure, then, is both class-based and historically recent.

Such touristic denial, however, is a new manifestation of something that was occurring in the eighteenth century. While today many travellers try to avoid being taken as tourists, most eighteenth-century travellers actually insisted on being so taken, whether they were or not. Being a good tourist had enormous cachet which could be transformed into real power and social advancement.\(^{29}\) This is why Tobias Smollett's Roderick Random conceals his actual experiences of being abducted from England, abandoned by smugglers in France, robbed by a Capuchin, soldiering out of financial desperation, and being saved and repatriated through the financial means of Strap the barber. Travel in France in itself would not make him eligible for promotion; touring there, he knows, would. When Random returns to England, therefore, he reinvents his time in France as a Grand Tour which should give him the social leverage required to have certain privileges and opportunities for promotion at home. If everyone wanted to be a tourist, however, not everyone was accepted as one, and here the connections to Culler's and MacCannell's theories about anti-tourism and touristic denial become clear. It also clarifies the extent much such theory requires modification to be applicable to travel occurring before the nineteenth century.

Though anti-tourism and touristic denial were not yet structural features of tourism, bad tourists were deployed strategically in representations of tourism, usually as foils to good tourists. According to Chloe Chard, for instance, comments of female

\(^{29}\) Many who were not tourists at all presented themselves as tourists for exactly this reason. For instance, Charles II's exile was presented as tourism by his panegyrists. (See David R. Evans' discussion in "Charles II's 'Grand Tour.'")
tourists were often used to delineate inappropriate responses to classical art that the good male tourist could then refute.\textsuperscript{30} Similarly, Francis Lynch stigmatizes the male ex-tourists who were importing Italian opera and singers to London by transforming them into the person of Lady Warble in his 1737 play \textit{The Independent Patriot}. To be a bad tourist was to be like a woman, something is was assumed no one would seek to be. However, in this period women were less commonly used to illustrate tourist inadequacy than were the Irish. An excellent example of an inadequate Irish tourist is in David Garrick’s smash hit, \textit{The Jubilee} (1769), which replayed his Stratford-upon-Avon Shakespeare celebration. Garrick’s own summary of the afterpiece is best:

\begin{quote}
I suppose an Irishman…to come from Dublin to See y° Pageant--he is oblig’d to lye in a post Chaise all Night--undergoes all kind of fatigue & inconvenience to see y° Pageant, but unluckily goes to Sleep as y° Pageant passes by; & returns to Ireland without knowing any thing of y° Matter--it occasions much laughter…\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

Of course, Garrick counted on his London audience to reject this tourist’s experience as ridiculous because it was that of an Irishman and because they see the spectacular pageant he misses. In effect, they are better tourists than the Irishman. By marshalling national prejudice and clearly inadequate tourism to his aid, Garrick encouraged his audience to dissociate themselves from the negative evaluations and attacks that he had received for his efforts and conception of the ill-fated Stratford-upon-Avon Shakespeare Jubilee of September 6-9, 1769.

Nineteenth- and twentieth-century anti-tourism and eighteenth-century pro-tourism both depend on the perception that some people are inappropriate travellers or do not travel properly. There was a widely held opinion that certain groups would never make good tourists, an opinion that reproduced the social distinctions which divided people and predisposed their relationships. Many commentators found it

\textsuperscript{30} See "Effeminacy, Pleasure and the Classical Body."

\textsuperscript{31} Garrick to the Reverend Evan Lloyd (December 4, 1769), \textit{Letters} II:675.
outrageous that if an Irishman, colonial, or merchant had the wherewithal and money to tour or to be at a tourist spot such as Bath in style, he would be on the same footing as a peer of the realm or a gentleman of an ancient family. In Smollett’s The Expedition of Humphry Clinker (1771), Matthew Bramble complains about Bath:

Every upstart of fortune, harnessed in the trappings of the mode, presents himself at Bath, as in the very focus of observation—Clerks and factors from the East Indies, loaded with the spoil of plundered provinces; planters, negro-drivers, and hucksters, from our American plantations, enriched they know not how; agents, commissaries, and contractors, who have fattened, in two successive wars, on the blood of the nation; usurers, brokers, and jobbers of every kind; men of low birth, and no breeding, have found themselves suddenly translated into a state of affluence, unknown to former ages; and no wonder that their brains should be intoxicated with pride, vanity, and presumption. Knowing no other criterion of greatness, but the ostentation of wealth, they discharge their affluence without taste or conduct...and all of them hurry, to Bath...where they may...[dance] among lordlings, squires, counsellors, and clergy...Such is the composition of what is called the fashionable company at Bath; where a very inconsiderable proportion of genteel people are lost in a mob of impudent plebeians, who have neither understanding nor judgment, nor the least idea of propriety and decorum; and seem to enjoy nothing so much as an opportunity of insulting their betters. (Smollett, 36-37)

Like many of his contemporaries, Bramble rails at the presumption of those who do not have, from his standpoint, the right social and educational background for touring.

Where eighteenth-century commentary divided good tourists from inadequate or inappropriate ones, later commentary divides "travellers" from the "tourists" who do the same thing with less success, or who are seen as having the wrong class, nationality, educational level, or gender to travel properly. The eighteenth-century stigmatization for failing to perform a tour correctly, then, is related to the nineteenth- and twentieth-century denigration of tourists. Tourism has been an ubiquitous and highly visible cultural form for hundreds of years, one which generates, promotes, and maintains highly charged images of considerable potency. The absence of extensive industrialization, or touristic denial, or blanket denigrations of tourists does not, then, mean that tourism did not exist.
The culture of tourism centres on tourists and their activities, but it also includes the whole infrastructure of people and things that are not solely or even exclusively tourist-oriented, especially everything peripherally credited with a tour's success or failure. For instance, inns and innkeepers are part of most tourists' experience in the eighteenth century, and might even be particularly tourist-oriented as Monsieur Dessein and his Hôtel d'Angleterre were in Calais. But Dessein was also a member of the non-touring Calais community, the servants at the inn had their own lives beyond the tourist line of vision, and a number of the inn’s patrons would not have been tourists at all (for instance, postilions and merchants). Certain aspects of the other wayfarers' experiences at the hotel would be shaped by the culture of tourism even if there was not, at that moment, a tourist to be found in the place. Other people who are necessary to the culture of tourism would include bankers, the reading public, and even people going about their quotidian business in tourist spots such as Paris. Similarly, horses, carriages, and roads were not by any means exclusively tourist-oriented, but were nevertheless part of the culture of tourism, as a narrative like Laurence Sterne's, which lovingly dwells on Yorick's experiences at the Remise and in the Desobligeant, illustrates.

The arts too often played a huge role in the culture of tourism, though often not exclusively (or even primarily) tourist-oriented. Shakespeare bears a surprisingly large role in eighteenth-century tourism. Not only was he quoted whenever tourists encountered anything they knew was referred to in his plays—for instance, the cliffs of Dover brought Lear to mind, and Inverness and Dunsinane in Scotland, Macbeth—but Shakespeare-adulation alone made Stratford-upon-Avon one of the most popular tourist destinations in England by the end of the eighteenth century.32 The writings and homes of more recent writers regularly became part of tourist culture too, as a few arbitrary examples show. Touring around Upton and Malvern, the Honourable John Byng read Henry Fielding's Tom Jones into his experiences, imagining that he and his

32 For an account of this development, see Ian Ousby, The Englishman's England, 33-57.
wife were like Tom and Sophia, and that a certain wood was where Tom Jones rescued "Mrs Walters"[sic]. Of course, Alexander Pope's villa at Twickenham became a popular tourist spot, instantly recognizable from its representations in guidebooks and on everything from meat platters to vases. In the nineteenth century, the poet Byron's writing and persona became an inescapable part of the Venetian culture of tourism. Chapter Two of this dissertation addresses some of Laurence Sterne's and William Wordsworth's connections to the culture of tourism.

The culture of tourism, then, is a wide net of relationships, technologies, sites, routes, conventions, norms, and representations that make tourism possible and recognizable to contemporaries. The knowledge amassed and deployed in tourism is at once iconic, linguistic, historical, textual, numerical, temporal, spatial, and political. It is a remarkably complex cultural form. To pay attention to any one component of the culture in isolation—for instance, either to the tourist or to tour accounts or to the patterns of behaviour at a particular site—can cause distortion. This is especially true when the culture of tourism is employed for all its densely meaning-laden potential in fictional narrative. This dissertation investigates the possibilities which intersections between tourism and the novel provided readers, writers, and even tourists to reconceptualize or maintain many of their societies' most important structures.

ii. Touring Cultures: The Triumphs and Failures of a Traditional Art

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, after almost two hundred years of intense discussion, the reasons one toured, the best conventions to be used in the performance of a tour, and the generic formulae for writing tour accounts all seemed

33 Byng's Tours, 35, 40.

34 See Morris R. Brownell, "The Iconography of Pope's Villa." To discourage tourist interest in the villa, an exasperated Baroness Sophia Charlotte Howe tore it down in 1807. The strategy did not work—tourists visit the site to this day.

35 For Byron and tourism, see Buzard, The Beaten Track, 114-130.
The travel methods had been formulated in the sixteenth century, and were initially designed to promote communication on the most basic matters between European nations. As the historical anthropologist Justin Stagl has shown, before the sixteenth century, the educated would have known little of foreign countries beyond the unsystematic practical information provided in pilgrim guidebooks. There were no reliable descriptions of countries, cities, or even of peoples. The information was collected, of course, but was carefully guarded from unauthorized perusal in archives and chanceries, and therefore did not exist for the private individual. Though merchants and missionaries had a practical knowledge of other places, "little need was felt for a systematic collection of precise and trustworthy information on foreign social, cultural and political conditions," as Stagl puts it. Why and how the shift to collecting, systematizing, and publicizing this information occurred is an under-researched area beyond the scope of this dissertation. What is important is that, in the shift, the objects of interest to travellers and the public were defined. Furthermore, a rigorous program for amassing information about these objects of interest through travel was formulated, codified, and legitimized.

By the eighteenth century, the *Ars Peregrinari* had been carefully methodised into an encyclopedic program whose successful performance was almost the sole legitimation for any tour, and which had become central to the education of young

---

36 The most thorough discussions of the development of travel theory are Justin Stagl’s *A History of Curiosity* and Howard’s more dated *English Travellers of the Renaissance*; Batten’s *Pleasurable Instruction* remains the most thorough account of the generic conventions governing tour accounts intended for publication; to date there exists no thorough discussion of the generic conventions governing tour accounts which, though not meant to be published, were meant to be circulated. The latter form was usually chosen by the nobility and women.

37 *A History of Curiosity*, 95. Stagl offers a preliminary discussion of the shift to the systemisation of knowledge through travel in his second chapter, "Rerum Memoria: Early Modern Surveys and Documentation Centres," 95-153. Though as an anthropologist Stagl’s hobbyhorse (the early history of social research) runs in a different direction from mine, many of his findings and observations underwrite my argument here.
men of the governing groups.\textsuperscript{38} In theory, these young men became fluent in the languages necessary for international diplomatic negotiation; became familiar with the internal dynamics of foreign courts and religions; networked with foreign luminaries; read widely and judiciously; became connoisseurs of art and antiquities; enumerated the trade, manufactures, and agriculture of each region; and learned and practised both military exercises (such as fencing and horsemanship) and social ones (such as gallantry, dancing, and a musical instrument). On the tourists' return to Britain, they judiciously introduced select foreign improvements; being of the ruling elite (at least in theory), they had the power to do so. This program was so well understood that it could be represented visually. A German example from 1693 shows a young man and his tutor at the bottom of the staircase of his travels. Each stair is labelled with the Latin name of the subject he will master as he passes over alien lands (theology, politics, foreign languages, mathematics and on up the stairs).\textsuperscript{39} Likewise, the perception that educational tours produced the best statesmen was well-established by the late seventeenth century. Charles II's panegyrists, for instance, regularly reformulated his involuntary exile as an educational tour that ensured his good government.\textsuperscript{40} Similarly, when France's chargé d'affaires at Rome commissioned pendant paintings from Gian Paolo Pannini, he chose to celebrate and represent his achievements as a tourist rather than as a diplomat. He is shown among the famous sights of Rome. The power properly performed tourism was thought to accrue to the

\textsuperscript{38} For a comprehensive picture of touring during the earlier period as it became part of the educational program of young men, see Ernest S. Bates, \textit{Travel in 1600}; for an excellent survey of advice to travellers, see Howard, \textit{English Travellers of the Renaissance}; for a discussion of the solidification of the touring itinerary used by young men, see John Stoye, \textit{English Travellers Abroad, 1604-1667}; for its place in the education of young men, see George C. Brauer Jr., \textit{The Education of a Gentleman}, 156-192, esp. 178-189.

\textsuperscript{39} See the frontispiece of Anton Wilhelm Schwart, \textit{Der Adeliche Hofmeister} (Frankfurt, 1693), reproduced in Stagl, \textit{A History of Curiosity}, 83.

\textsuperscript{40} See Evans, "Charles II's 'Grand Tour.'"
tourist underwrites the 1759 paintings.\footnote{These paintings will be more thoroughly discussed in Chapter 2.}

The problem facing contemporaries was that the traditional art of travel and its justifications were increasingly challenged by actual practice. This situation initially produced strident attacks on travellers, but finally led to inventive celebrations of previously unacceptable forms of tourism in such works as Sterne’s \textit{A Sentimental Journey} (1768). The ubiquity and conventionality of the debates raised by the practice of sending young men abroad on the traditional educational program has given rise to the commonly held twentieth-century misconception that only young men and their governors toured, and that they kept to an immutable itinerary. The situation was considerably more complex, and, as the eighteenth century progressed, the development and extension of a leisured, consumer society only made it more and more so.\footnote{For the development of a consumer society, see Neil McKendrick, John Brewer and J.H. Plumb, \textit{The Birth of a Consumer Society}, esp. McKendrick’s "The Consumer Revolution of Eighteenth-century England," 9-33.}

Routes, preoccupations, and destinations were necessarily fluid in response to wars and political events in both Great Britain and the Continent.\footnote{See Part 3 of John Towner’s 1984 dissertation for a collection of tour itineraries compiled from throughout this period.} Of course, in times of war the average British tourist avoided those nations hostile to Britain, and this could sometimes result in atypical routes and destinations. This pragmatic practice, for instance, shaped Byron’s travels in the Mediterranean 1809-1811. These travels are reflected in the first two cantos of \textit{Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage} (1812), where Childe Harold’s movements map an itinerary of tour sites open to an Englishman before the close of the Napoleonic Wars. The pressure of Britain’s regular engagement in wars over the century also diversified and popularized domestic tourism. Even during war, however, the stress placed on examining military affairs by the literature advising tourists meant that raging battles and armies were popular
tourist attractions (one viewed such things from the friendly side). One could also sketch the fortifications of those friendly to one's nation, but to do so without guile could cause arrest, as William Hogarth found in 1748 when he was, much to his disgust, apprehended as an English spy on being discovered sketching fortifications at Calais. Similarly, though Rome, Venice, and Paris were the three centres a young grand tourist (along with everyone else) hoped to visit, and Italian and French two of the modern languages he was supposed to bring home with him, other destinations and accomplishments became fashionable in response to domestic pressures. When the Dutch William of Orange and his consort Mary ruled, the Netherlands were popular, the Dutch admired or criticized for their "avariciousness," and surprise was expressed about the economic and social independence of Dutch women; similarly, when the House of Hanover came to the throne, the German states were toured, German learned, and the German courts criticized for their vulgarity.

How a tourist negotiated the social and political culture of the urban centres also varied. Sometimes these shifts were innocuous enough--numberless social stratagems and delicate negotiations were often required to view particularly interesting antiquities held in private hands (an especially acute problem with the newly uncovered artifacts and excavations at Herculaneum and Pompeii) or to visit continental luminaries. Voltaire, for instance, was particularly popular (crowds gathered outside his residence at Ferney hoping for a glimpse of the man) and was fully cognizant of his status as a tourist attraction, quipping to one group of English

---

44 For an account of Hogarth's problem, see Ronald Paulson, *Hogarth: His Life, Art, and Times*, II:75-78. Hogarth described the outcome of his arrest as follows: "I conceal'd [sic] none of the memorandum I had privately taken and they being found to be only those of a painter for [my] own use it was judged necessary only to confine me to my lodging till the wind changed for our coming away to England" (cited in Paulson, 75). This incident is commemorated in Hogarth's "The Gate of Calais, or O the Roast Beef of Old England" (1748).

45 There are a number of accounts of how difficult of access Don Carlos (Charles III of Spain) and his successor made these, but one of the most succinct is Michael Grant, "Bourbon Patronage and Foreign Involvement at Pompeii and Herculaneum."
gentlemen, "Well, gentlemen, you now see me; and did you take me to be a wild beast or a monster that was fit only to be stared at, as a show?"^46 The more difficult it grew to get access to Voltaire, the more the prestige of meeting him and the number of maneuvers required to do so grew as well.

Less innocuously, the presence of Roman Catholics and exiled Jacobites on the continent complicated the continental political and social picture, especially in the years around the rebellions of 1715 and 1745. A tourist could spy on Jacobites, be spied on by them, or be converted by them. In any case, as the Jacobite Court and the exiled Stuarts shifted around Europe, activities of tourists in St. Germain, then Rome, and finally Paris were carefully monitored by the British government,"^47 while parents warned their touring children against getting involved with Jacobites. Lord Chesterfield, for instance, gave such a warning to his grand touring son Philip when he was visiting the Young Pretender Charles Edward Stuart’s haunt, Paris, in 1751. Similarly, most of the population on the continent was Roman Catholic, and the Roman Catholic Church was, of course, centred in Rome, one of the most important tourist destinations in the century. Protestant England was not so secure in its religion, nor in the permanence of the Hanover regime, nor so tolerant of Catholicism, that the potential the continent offered for the religious or political conversion of young ruling class tourists was not worrisome. Chapter 4 addresses Samuel Richardson’s sophisticated and surprising negotiation in *Sir Charles Grandison* of English associations of continental tourism with possible religious and political conversion.

Most importantly, however, the majority of tourists in this century, especially in its second half, were not young ruling-class men engaged in educational travels at all—they were professionals seeking advancement, wealthy shopkeepers, middle-aged men, families, the old and ailing, women—in short, anyone who could afford the

---


^47 For an account of the connection between tourism and such espionage, see Leslie Lewis, *Connoisseurs and Secret Agents in Eighteenth-Century Rome*.
expense and the time toured at home and on the continent. The diversity of the
touring population and the domestic impact of tourist practice will be discussed in the
next section. Here I want to address the implications of the growing dislocations
between the practice and actual practitioners, on one hand, and the program set out
in the traditional Art of Travel and its justification as creating an ideal governing
class, on the other. The widespread confusion about the implications of the attacks on
the travellers who did not adhere to the traditional program of travel or hold the social
positions it presupposed makes an understanding of these dislocations important.
Furthermore, many of the works addressed in the following chapters assume a
familiarity with both actual practice and the traditional Art of Travel and its
justifications.

While programmatic educational tours of young men were stridently and
regularly attacked as socially, sexually, politically, religiously, and culturally
deleterious, marking an increased awareness of the unwieldiness of the traditional Ars
Peregrinari as a precise and predictable educational tool, the more illuminating attacks
for my purposes worried perceived weaknesses in the travel methodology most tourists
followed.48 Samuel Johnson opined in a 1760 Idler essay:

The greater part of travellers tell nothing, because their method of travelling
supplies them with nothing to be told. He that enters a town at night and
surveys it in the morning, and then hastens away to another place and guesses
at the manners of the inhabitants by the entertainment which his inn has
afforded him, may please himself for a time with a hasty change of scenes, and
a confused remembrance of palaces and churches; he may gratify his eye with
a variety of landscapes; and regale his palate with a succession of vintages; but
let him be contented to please himself without endeavour to disturb others.
Why should he record excursions by which nothing could be learned, or wish
to make a show of knowledge which, without some power of intuition

48 I will return to the implications of the attacks on young male tourists in the
following section and in the discussion of Samuel Richardson's novels in Chapter 4.
unknown to other mortals, he never could attain?  

Johnson believed, as did many by the mid-eighteenth century, that any information or observations of value collected while touring should be published for the benefit of the general public. Johnson’s essay is one of the most succinct articulations of common contemporary opinions and assumptions about travel and travel writing. These commonplaces and value judgements were also being questioned and reformulated by actual practice, though Johnson does not recognise this in his essay.

Like many contemporaries, Johnson expresses concern that the travel methodology practised by the majority of travellers could produce nothing of value, by which he means that which would potentially improve the entire literate and illiterate community of Great Britain:

He that would travel for the entertainment of others, should remember that the great object of remark is human life. Every nation has something peculiar in its manufactures, its works of genius, its medicines, its agriculture, its customs, and its policy. He only is a useful traveller who brings home something by which his country may be benefited; who procures some supply of want or some mitigation of evil, which may enable his readers to compare their condition with that of others, to improve it whenever it is worse, and whenever it is better to enjoy it. (Johnson, 300)

The traveller, then, was supposed to sift the alternatives presented to him in the foreign place, carefully ascertaining their relative value. He or she was then to import newly acquired, improving knowledge into his/her own country, but otherwise use the

49 ["Narratives of Travelers Considered"], No. 97, The Idler, 298. Thomas M. Curley argues that Johnson "paraphrased" James Howell’s Instructions for Forreine Travell (1646) in this essay (Samuel Johnson and the Age of Travel, 71-77). Howell’s Instructions is representative of the Renaissance program of travel, and it was a work which remained popular throughout the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, Howell’s ideas were utterly conventional when he wrote (even if he was able to express them particularly well) and they continued to be widely held in the eighteenth century. There is no reason to think that Johnson was "paraphrasing" Howell in particular.
knowledge culled from travels to help maintain or celebrate domestic superiority. Voltaire, an English favourite partially because of his flattering travel book, *Letters Concerning the English Nation* (1733), advised travellers in another context to "be busied chiefly in giving faithful Accounts of all the useful Things and of the extraordinary Persons, whom to know, and to imitate, would be a Benefit to our Countrymen." Such a traveller, he added, is a "Merchant of the noble Kind, who imports into his native country the Arts and Virtues of other Nations." The concrete and preferably practical enlightenment resulting from this importation was what Johnson, like most of the reading public, expected. William Cowper provides one of the more poetic treatments of this commonplace in *The Task* (1785):

He travels and expatiates, as the bee  
From flow'r to flow'r, so he from land to land;  
The manners, customs, policy of all  
Pay contribution to the store he gleans,  
He sucks intelligence in ev'ry clime,  
And spreads the honey of his deep research  
At his return, a rich repast for me.  
He travels and I too. I tread his deck,  
Ascend his topmast, through his peering eyes  
Discover countries, with a kindred heart  
Suffer his woes and share in his escapes,  
While fancy, like the finger of a clock,  
Runs the great circuit, and is still at home.  

Travellers and travel writers were supposed to serve the public at large by disseminating the results of their "deep research." The actual realisation of a journey, then, was supposed to support domestic improvements, most often through the subsequent composition of a form of travel writing which would influence the home

---

50 "Advertisement" to *An Essay upon the Civil Wars* (London: S. Jallasson, 1727), n.p., as cited in Charles L. Batten, Jr., *Pleasurable Instruction*, 73.

51 Lines 107-119, Book IV, 189-190.
community in profound but specific and identifiable ways.

As Johnson identifies it, the proper object of a traveller's investigation is "human life," which consists, for him, of "its manufactures, its works of genius, its medicines, its agriculture, its customs, and its policy." His list is typical except for its boiled-down quality. It is important to recognize that the objects of inquiry recommended to the traveller of foreign parts were the domestic traveller's game too. A sample from the title page of Daniel Defoe's enormously popular *A Tour thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1724-7) gives a typical bill of fare for both domestic and foreign travels (in Defoe's case, of course, Great Britain is the field of inquiry, the British his target audience). His written travels will provide the fascinated reader with:

I. A Description of the Principal Cities and Towns, their Situation, Magnitude, Government, and Commerce.

II. The Customs, Manners, Speech, as also the Exercises, Diversions, and Employment of the People.

III. The Produce and Improvement of the Lands, the Trade, and Manufactures.

IV. The Sea Ports and Fortifications, the Course of Rivers, and the Inland Navigation.

V. The Publick Edifices, Seats, and Palaces of the Nobility and Gentry. With Useful Observations upon the Whole. 52

Whether reflecting the Home and Self or the Foreign and Other, then, prescribed objects were to be painstakingly inspected and prominently described in travel writing. Furthermore, it was firmly believed that "human life" would be best revealed in intentionally dry accounts of such objects as "Publick Edifices" and "Sea Ports." People were the product of their environment, while, especially at the beginning of the

52 *A Tour thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain, Divided into Circuits or Journies...* (London, 1724).
century, lively or flamboyant accounts were thought untrustworthy—it was felt that the author given to such a style would be equally given to lying.\footnote{See Batten, \textit{Pleasurable Instruction}, 56-60 et. passim.}

Realistically, however, the cultural project for which the methodology had been formulated—the achievement the most basic, if wide ranging, knowledge of one’s neighbours, and rendering that knowledge both useful and widely accessible—had been accomplished by the early seventeenth century. Increasingly diverse populations, however, continued to tour, and did so in increasing numbers. This phenomenon alarmed many. In a passage which Sterne twists around in the Preface of \textit{A Sentimental Journey} to become a praise of Yorick’s travel method,\footnote{Alan H. Vrooman was the first to identify Sterne’s often verbatim borrowing from Hall in "The Origin and Development of the Sentimental Journey as a work of Travel Literature and of Sensibility," 49-50. Gardiner D. Stout Jr. extends on Vrooman’s findings in "Sterne’s Borrowings from Bishop Joseph Hall’s Quo Vadis?," the substance of which is reproduced in the notes to his edition of \textit{A Sentimental Journey}, 332-336. Both argue that Sterne employs Hall for the humour of using an attack on travel in a travel book, and that it also serves to emphasize the novelty of Sterne’s journey. There is actually more at stake here, as shall become clear.} Joseph Hall attacks travel in his 1617 \textit{Quo Vadis? A Just Censure of Travell} as superficial and unnecessary:

\begin{quote}
The ordinary Traveller propounds some prime Cities to himselfe, and thither hee walkes right forward, if he meet with ought that is memorable in the way, he takes it up; but how many thousand matters of note fall beside him, on either hand; of the knowledge whereof hee is not guilty: Whereas some grave and painfull Author hath collected into one view, whatsoever his country affords worthy of marke; having measured many a fowle step for that, which we may see dry-shod; and wore out many yeares in the search of that, which one houre shall make no lesse ours, then it was his owne....This age is so full of light, that there is no one countrey of the habitable world, whose beames are not crossed and interchanged with other; Knowledge of all affaires, is like musicke in the streets, whereof those may partake, which pay nothing.\footnote{Section 11, 32-33. Hall’s counter-arguments against the educational journey of the English upper classes were, as Stagl points out, conventional. (See \textit{A History of Curiosity}, 73, n. 114). Unfamiliar with the English tradition, Stagl does not recognize} \end{quote}
By the 1700s, most members of the educated classes of Britain had a basic idea of the customs, religion, and government of the French and Italians, and if an individual found a gap in his or her knowledge there were many books, as Hall points out, to fill it. Questions posed by the English traveller about the principal manufactures of France, for instance, became in some eyes a poor substitute for reading, and in others, a way of confirming and fixing reading experientially. (The latter were given to quoting or paraphrasing Horace, "segnius irritant animos dimissa per aurem, quam quae sunt oculis subjicit et quae/ ipse sibi tradit spectator" ("But things intrusted to the ear/Impress our minds less vividly than what is exposed/To our trustworthy eyes so that a viewer informs himself/Of precisely what happened").

Yet the purely educational value of the tour was far from clear or universally endorsed even for young men. Sterne's narrator of A Sentimental Journey pointedly rejects the project of "the poor Traveller, sailing and posting through the politer kingdoms of the globe in pursuit of knowledge and improvements" (SJ 83). He explains:

Knowledge and improvements are to be got by sailing and posting for that purpose; but whether useful knowledge and real improvements, is all a lottery—and even where the adventurer is successful, the acquired stock must be used with caution and sobriety to turn to any profit—but as the chances run prodigiously the other way both as to the acquisition and application, I am of opinion, That a man would act as wisely, if he could prevail upon himself, to live contented without foreign knowledge or foreign improvements, especially if he lives in a country that has no absolute want of either.... (SJ 83-84)

that the English counter-arguments Hall propounds were widespread by the time Hall wrote, and, according to Sara Warnke, were first articulated in print by Roger Ascham in his The Scholmaster (1570). (See Stagl, Images of the Educational Traveller in Early Modern England.)

56 Epist. II:3, 180-182 (the "Epistle to the Pisones" or "Ars Poetica." Latin from the Niall Rudd edition, 64. Translation by Smith Palmer Bovie, Satires and Epistles of Horace, 278.

57 The Gardiner D. Stout, Jr. edition of A Sentimental Journey will be cited parenthetically as SJ with page numbers. The Florida edition of Tristram Shandy will be cited parenthetically as TS with volume and page number.
Most who took up this line of argument shared with their opponents the sincere belief that amassing "foreign knowledge or foreign improvements" was the only justification for touring, but not Sterne. Instead, he chose to point out that other modes of touring could be justified as well, and that therefore the fact that England had no need of any more "foreign knowledge or foreign improvements" was no argument against travel.

A tour's legitimation as a program for familiarizing the young with the already known--its educational value--failed to justify the travels of anyone else that toured (and many did). Like most contemporaries who complained about the faulty methodology travellers and travel writers generally practised, Johnson does not proceed in his *Idler* essay to give precise guidelines for how to travel to greatest advantage. Other eighteenth-century writers, however, were more proactive. Josiah Tucker provided a carefully reasoned list of questions meant to cover the usual topics (ranging from the nature of a country's soil to the nature of its political institutions) in his *Instructions for Travellers* (1757). More ambitiously still, Count Leopold von Berchtold provides eager patriotic travellers with detailed advice and a series of 2443 questions (divided into 37 sections) for thoroughly grilling informants in his two-volume *An Essay to Direct and Extend the Inquiries of Patriotic Travellers* (1789).

Such unfocussed, if earnest, programmatic travel as Tucker and Berchtold advocate had been undertaken in European nations since it was first formulated and codified in the sixteenth-century as the most precise set of tools that one could use to uncover and publicize the nature and accomplishments of one's neighbours. But even if France or Italy were entirely unknown regions, the assumptions underpinning both this travel methodology and its program of travel legitimation doomed it to failure. Most travellers had a limited ability to master an encyclopedic range of heterogeneous material. The success of the material to which Defoe's table of contents refers, for instance, rests on the bedrock of the organizational ability of an unusually talented individual, and, perhaps even more importantly, a remarkable fluency in both travel methodology and travel writing conventions. Such talent and fluency are rare, as was continually lamented.

Furthermore, by the mid-eighteenth century, the societal position and means of
the majority of the travellers themselves militated against success even if the talent were there. Johnson decries the scarcity of the model travels and travellers Tucker and Berchtold tried to form. Few travellers had the power, talent, or inclination to put their travels to the strengthening or reformative use popularly believed to be voluntary peregrination's only defense, though it was possible. In 1797, after seventeen years of travels, Count Leopold von Berchtold (d. 1811), for instance, remodelled his domain of Buchlau in Moravia according to a travel-induced Utopian scheme sharply reminiscent of Sarah Scott's in *Millenium Hall.* Berchtold meant his domain to be a model agricultural-industrial-philanthropic enterprise. Among other things, he introduced new agricultural methods, machines, cultivated plants, and breeding stock; converted the wooded park into farmland; planted a tree nursery; provided the poor with cheap loans and cheap staple food; founded a hospital; gave free medical care to all who needed it with the condition that they do the same for another in need; erected a cloth and cashmere factory to create new jobs; instituted five schools; and built a mortuary for the resuscitation of the apparently dead. To make time for his projects, he slept only four to five hours per night. Few could hope to lead such a life, or to put their travels to such use.

More damaging still to the traditional justifications of travel, by the mid-eighteenth century the likelihood of discovering much that was both new and beneficial in Europe using the traditional wide-ranging methodology Berchtold advocated was slim to non-existent. Tobias Smollett, in his brilliant *Travels through France and Italy* (1766), was one of the last to write a widely admired general tour using the traditional *Ars Peregrinari.* Yet as a Scot, a medical man, and a professional writer, he did not have much money or patrician power, nor did he have the basis to argue that his travels would directly benefit those who did, since he had discovered nothing revelatory. Smollett's response to these problems was to reformulate the

---

58 Scott's work is discussed in Chapter 3.

59 For a more complete account of Berchtold and the German/Austrian context for this form of travel, see Stagl, *A History of Curiosity,* 209-231.
conditions of the tour's acceptance by making the value of the observations he amassed contingent on the personality, trustworthiness, and expertise of the tourist-narrator. In doing so, he turned his back on the narrative restrictions stipulated for the eighteenth-century version of objectivity in an account.

Smollett's privileging of his narrator provoked Sterne's famous attack in *A Sentimental Journey* even as the later took the privileging of subjective responses and personality to a hitherto unimagined extreme. Sterne charged Smollett with two things: an attitude which distorted facts, and a failure to practise an orientation towards the world which would help him in the afterlife. The first item of Sterne's attack preceded similar attacks on Smollett over the years. For instance, William Edward Mead writes:

Smollett has the querulous and petulant tone of a nervous invalid, who sees everything through jaundiced eyes and makes sweeping assertions based upon an occasional unpleasant experience. In no case is it safe to allow him the final word in judging any part of the Continent, though his keen eye and marvellous descriptive faculty enable him to picture individual facts and scenes with great accuracy. One might easily gather from his pages a choice collection of vituperative adjectives, usually in the superlative degree, for he taxes the resources of the language to express his disgust at the treatment he received from scoundrels of every sort.

Yet the fact that readers have so easily recognized Smollett's narrator's personality, whatever they think of it, as the mechanism which legitimates or discounts the tour's information is significant.

According to accepted contemporary tour-writing convention, the personality of

---

60 Other tourists had tried this ploy before Smollett adopted it, but his tour was its first success.

61 *SJ* 116-120. See Chapter 2 for a further discussion of this passage and the relationship between Sterne and Smollett.

the tourist was supposed to be suppressed, and those who did not suppress it were usually charged with "egotism." Smollett, however, chose to invoke every source of authority at his disposal except objectivity: his status as a patient, as a medical man, and as a wary splenetic with an admirably sound critical judgement. If the public accepted the authority of his persona, they would accept the validity of his tour. Nonetheless, though Smollett's tour displayed a new privileging of the tourist's individualized attitude, and showed an extraordinary ability to organize and play upon the tour's materials and conventions, the materials themselves were not particularly new. Smollett used the standard guidebook, Thomas Nugent's four-volume *The Grand Tour*, along with less easily traced local guides. He offered a new way of looking at the old subjects of interest for tour accounts, not entirely new information.

Smollett experimented yet further with the way tour information was filtered and organized by the societal position, age, education, sex, and frame of mind of the tourist in *Humphry Clinker* (1771). In that work, a set of remarkably different characters—a splenetic old man, his undereducated, marriage-mad sister and her pretentious and high-strung maid, his young Oxford-educated hot-headed nephew, and finally his even younger boarding school-educated, naive, and optimistic niece—undertake a tour of England and Scotland. The differences between their parallel epistolary descriptions—of, for instance, Bath—serve to characterize both the tourists and the places they see. Furthermore, by grafting a novelistic romance plot onto a tour description, Smollett suggested the social and personal impact of touring.

---

63 See Batten, *Pleasurable Instruction*, 13, 24 et. passim. For instance, a concern with being attacked on this basis for his VERY occasional use of the first-person pronoun led John Howard to apologise: "The writer begs his reader to excuse the frequent egotisms; which he did not know ho to avoid, without using circumlocutions that might have been more disgusting" (*The State of Prisons*, 3). Howard wrote after Smollett and Sterne (1771), which illustrates the continuance of the convention. (This convention, it should be stressed in passing, did not apply to tour accounts meant for private circulation.)

something that tour accounts by themselves had rarely done. For instance, not only
are Smollett’s characters shown to learn from their experiences, but Matthew
Bramble’s physical condition ameliorates; he discovers in Humphry Clinker an
unknown son; a Welsh Tabitha Bramble marries a Scottish Lismahago (who is also
identified with the American colonies); a Welsh Lydia Melford marries an English
Wilson/George Dennison; and Matthew Bramble’s bastard son, Humphry
Clinker/Matthew Loyd marries Tabitha’s maid. By the end of the work, the
geographically, culturally, and socially separated people of England, Wales, Scotland
and the colonies are symbolically brought together through a series of marriages just
as the landscape has been made unified by being traversed, experienced, and
represented by the tourists.

In their travel accounts, Smollett and Sterne had surprisingly similar projects,
something which has not been recognized in the general rush to confirm Sterne’s
comments about how different they were from one another. Sterne had in fact
extended on Smollett’s breakthrough when he did away almost entirely with
descriptions of the traditional objects of tourist and tour-reader interest in favour of
detailed descriptions of the tourist’s subjective responses. While Smollett chose not to
hide the shaping influence of a tour’s narrator but retained the descriptions of
traditional objects of enquiry, Sterne chose to invert travel account conventions
entirely. He suppressed, instead of the narrator’s idiosyncratic responses, the
descriptions of foreign life, history, religion, politics, art, architecture, and landscape—
everything that until that point had been considered essential material in a publishable
tour account. Though the travel accounts of both Smollett and Sterne popularize
certain forms of knowledge or teach readers how to negotiate realities, the common
pool of knowledge itself was not substantially expanded. Sterne and Smollett had,
therefore, turned away from what contemporaries, in their pedantic moments, viewed
to be one of the best rationalizations for travel.

The expansion and systemisation of knowledge through travel, however, did
continue in tightly focused thematic tours such as Joseph Addison’s on the classics
(1705), Arthur Young’s on agriculture (1768 onward), Edward Wright’s on painting
and sculpture (1730), Charles Burney’s on music (1771; 1773), Johann Jokob Ferver’s on mineralogy (1776), Andre Ducarel’s on antiquities (1754), John Howard’s on prisons (1777 onward), Helen Maria Williams’ on the effects of the French Revolution (1790), or John Dillon’s on the origin and progress of poetry in Spain (1781). While these tours adapted the older travel methodology and travel justification still advocated by Tucker and Berchtold by specializing in one of the traditional objects of interest, their narrow focus also challenged and undermined it. Furthermore, most thematic travellers were drawn from a group of men uneasily making their way through the grey area between the gentleman and the professional, or were (like John Howard, whose father was a successful merchant) newly arrived at gentry status. Their travels promoted their social ascension or helped bolster a faltering or ambiguous social position. Their acceptance as authorities relied on the link usually assumed between travel and the acquisition of information required for communal maintenance and reform. What these men (and those who practised this form of tourism were almost all men) did not have was much power at their personal disposal. They were not drawn from the patrician classes for whom the travel methodology they used had been formulated, though their travels still served to help consolidate or extend established power. David Evans has argued that the serious purpose of travel between 1640 and 1714 was to provide a new legitimation of inherited authority after the Civil War (1642-1646) and Charles I’s execution (1649) had stripped it of its traditional basis. As he points out, by giving travel this purpose, people who were not of the ruling classes could perform a tour and claim authority. However, since travel had been perceived to legitimate authority from the sixteenth century (well before the Civil War), it seems more likely that it often served as a social pressure valve through which very talented men could enter the upper ranks throughout the period. By the end of the eighteenth-century, however, young men of the patrician

---

65 This represents a very partial list of such tours, selected on the basis of variety and to show the continuance of the form over the century.

66 "The Literature of European Travel and the Question of Authority, 1640-1714."
class performing this type of tour were in the minority, not the majority. The social position held by most who would traditionally have been identified as good tourists, in other words, had shifted downwards. The reasons these men appropriated tour conventions, and the contemporary response to their efforts, show what was happening to the traditional *Ars Peregrinari* by mid-century.

Arthur Young’s agricultural tours and John Howard’s prison tours are particularly illustrative. The tour accounts of both were immensely popular and highly praised by contemporaries. Furthermore, both men explicitly presented themselves for extended periods of time as tourists and tour writers, not as concerned citizens who wrote tours in addition to their more important activities, or as a component of a writing career. Young, for instance, published dozens of tours between 1768 and 1809 (forty-one years), and Howard toured and re-toured the same prisons, continuously updating his 1777 account until he died in 1790. In his early tours, Young celebrated and promoted examples of agricultural and industrial change along with displays of conspicuous wealth, and lamented the widespread "backwardness" he encountered. Howard, on the other hand, told tales of horror and demanded reforms. Underwriting both is a utopian vision of the future, and an earnest desire to lay out precedents for widespread adoption and examples of what should be rejected. Though both explicitly endorse maintaining and extending established centres of economic and political hegemony, they openly challenge specific practices and institutions. This structural support and criticism of well-established social forms is shared by the works discussed in the following chapters, so it is important to get a sense of how it could operate.

Now known more as reformers than as tourists, Young and Howard chose to organize their findings according to their tour itineraries, not according to abstracted subject, theme, or issue (as, for instance, Voltaire had done in his travel book, *Letters Concerning the English Nation*). Young, in his *Travels in France and Italy* (the tour which is most familiar to us now), explains in his introductory remarks:

There are two methods of writing travels; to register the journey itself, or the result of it. In the former case, it is a diary, under which head are to be
classed all those books of travels written in the form of letters. The latter usually falls into the shape of essays on distinct subjects. (Young, 5)

Young chooses the journal form for the reasons most today would choose the essay form, because it has "the advantage of carrying with it a greater degree of credibility; and, of course, more weight" (Young, 5). Further, Young thinks the journal form would have greater entertainment value, which would make the ideas more widely influential since more people would read the account. Yet Young is fully aware that the problem with the itinerary form is

that subjects of importance, instead of being treated de suite for illustration or comparison, are given by scraps as received, without order and without connection; a mode which lessens the effect of writing and destroys much of its utility. (Young, 6)

Young wrote this at the end of the century in 1792. His concern registers an increasingly common suspicion. Travel, and the writing conventions most used to relay to the public travel-collected information, were beginning to be seen as inefficient ways of ordering closely focused inquiries.

Yet the itinerary form still had considerable weight with the public, and that is why Young chooses it. In this form, the process by which travellers accumulated their facts could be evaluated by the reader. Young observes:

A traveller who thus registers his observations [in diary form] is detected the moment he writes of things he has not seen. He is precluded from giving studied or elaborate remarks upon insufficient foundations: if he sees little, he must register little; if he has few good opportunities of being well informed, the reader is enabled to observe it, and will be induced to give no more credit to his relations than the sources of them appear to deserve; if he passes so rapidly through a country as necessarily to be no judge of what he sees, the reader knows it; if he dwells long in places of little or no moment with private views or for private business, the circumstance is seen; and thus the reader has the satisfaction of being as safe from imposition, either designed or involuntary, as the nature of the case will admit: all which advantages are wanted in the [essay or results method]. (Young, 5)
The reader is to be active and vigilant; and the tourist must see everything with his own eyes, relegating nothing to reading or unconfirmed conversation alone. Yet the reasons Young gives for why the diary form lent authority to his factual information and interpretations could today be used to justify the essay form. What for him and his contemporaries still guaranteed a work's thoroughness and profundity tends to convince us of its superficiality. Young's assessment of the diary form of travel writing is underwritten by several hundred years of the authority: Well-performed tours gave both the tourist and his findings credibility and social force. Howard insisted:

The journeys were not undertaken for the traveller's amusement; and the collections are not published for general entertainment; but for the perusal of those who have it in their power to give redress to the sufferers.

Tourists such as Howard and Young wrote tours to capture the attention of those who did have power, and to convince them to institute what was sometimes radical change. This radical change, however, was presented as something that would help the already powerful maintain or extend their franchise.

Beth Fowkes Tobin argues that Arthur Young represented a new middle-class masculinity which acted oppositionally to aristocratic masculinity. She points particularly to his interest in agriculture and to the skills of quantification, valuation, and management of land and labour skills that Young so carefully highlights in his tours. Young and others like him (such as Howard) were indeed challenging the

---

67 In an interesting article on the growth of sightseeing, Judith Adler suggests that the insistence on actually seeing things and not trusting to written or verbal reports, very common in this period, originally arose from a Protestant distrust of what was assumed to be the corrupted language and ideas of the Roman Catholics who dominated the continent. See "Origins of Sightseeing."

68 The State of Prisons, 3.

69 "Arthur Young, Agriculture, and the Construction of the New Economic Man."
aristocracy in their tours, but not in the way Tobin suggests, and, as the example of Howard illustrates, it was not only in agricultural matters that they did so. The challenge Young poses was not to ideas about what constituted aristocratic masculinity; his attacks are not directed at the aristocracy alone, as Tobin implies. In fact, Young equally castigates landowners in general (not only the "aristocracy") and the labouring populations on charges of idleness stemming from leisure-induced unprofitable complaisance or backwardness on the one hand, and from unprofitable laziness on the other. Any absence of improvement- and profit-minded activity horrified him. Furthermore, the skills Young flaunts were in fact those that members of the aristocracy and gentry were supposed to have honed on the Grand Tour, though most of course did not. Young, Howard, and others like them were borrowing and adapting a program designed to educate or maintain the governing classes, and in doing so they attempted to assume some of its power. If there is a challenge to the "aristocracy" in Young's tours, it is in the adoption, despite his own lack of direct power and impressive social status, of the tools the aristocracy used to legitimate and extend its power, and in a narrow focus that precluded casual inexpert inquiry. Tours made by men like Young and Howard illustrate the sea change that was occurring in the understanding of the Art of Travel, its potential, and its meanings.

On one level, Arthur Young's agricultural tours were aimed at publicizing new agricultural methods. Yet his first three tours also "made" Young's reputation as a patriotic Englishman, and as an authority on agricultural reform and what was known to contemporaries as "political arithmetic."70 These tours of England were made while he struggled to maintain his precarious position as a gentleman farmer, and not simply out of a benevolent desire to investigate, identify, and publicise the latest improvements, as one might deduce from his tourist-persona. The published tours

70 The A Six Week's Tour Through the Southern Counties of England and Wales of 1769, A Six Months' Tour through the North of England of 1770, and the The Farmer's Tour Through the East of England of 1771. For the sake of brevity, I will refer to these tours as the Southern Tour, the Northern Tour, and the Eastern Tour, respectively.
were lucrative and gave him the status which finally led to his position at the Board of Agriculture in 1792, a position that his farming failures would never have been able to afford him.\(^{71}\)

Young's allegiance to the traditional *Ars Peregrinari* is illustrated in both his own statements and in contemporary reviews. Young tells the reader of his *Northern Tour* that his work "pretend[s] to nothing but a book of facts" in which he "display[s] the proper objects of imitation" (Young, xiii). Young's tours encouraged two types of imitative performance. The reader could reproduce Young's literal movement in space, encountering and appraising the objects Young chose as exemplary. The *Critical Review*, for instance, advised its readers that patriotic tours should be performed in "the same manner and upon the same principles that [Young] has followed,"\(^{72}\) while *The Monthly Review* asserted that:

...if a gentleman can be supposed to have any views in travelling, beyond the mere amusements of the journey...it may be doubted whether... he can travel over the extent of ground comprehended in this partial tour...in any other land, Italy perhaps excepted, which would afford an equal degree of entertainment to an intelligent mind.\(^{73}\)

To help the reader-turned-tourist, Young provides practical travelling advice. For instance, in the *Eastern Tour* he gives a long annotated list of the Inns at which he stayed. More importantly, however, the reader could reproduce the ideal country that Young envisions in his tours at home by, for instance, enclosing land or (in response to an extensive panegyric offered on them in the *Northern Tour*) beginning to cultivate cabbages. Finally, the reader could reproduce the examples of taste given in Young's extensive descriptions of country seats and assembly halls.

\(^{71}\) For a good short biography of Arthur Young, see G.E. Mingay's introduction to *Arthur Young and his Times*, 1-25.

\(^{72}\) Review of the *Northern Tour*, vol. 28 (Dec. 1769), 414.

\(^{73}\) Review of the *Southern Tour*, vol. 38 (March 1768), 222.
Contemporaries were also clear about the function of Young's tours in the larger community, and about the authority the information he presented had simply by being arranged and amassed in a tour.\textsuperscript{74} In 1769, The Critical Review enthusiastically wrote about Young's Northern Tour that...

...we must look upon this publication to be a fair essay towards obtaining that most useful of all learning, the knowledge of ourselves. The author has removed the cause from the court of conjecture and supposition, to that of fact and experience. If he has been mistaken, it would be of national benefit to disprove what he has advanced; but till this is done...this work must continue the public standard for the intrinsic state and value of England....\textsuperscript{75}

The seemingly unbiased data, the "fact and experience" so meticulously assembled and organized to follow a reproducible movement through a space, is made to correlate with a national self, thereby providing a solid basis for "knowledge of ourselves." Young consciously pursued a unified "knowledge of ourselves" in his tours. He had planned to tour all England, Wales, and Scotland to calculate "the exact averages of the whole nation."\textsuperscript{76} Averages of soil types, crops, and rents would, to cite Young in another tour, "draw the whole into one view."\textsuperscript{77} Young devoted the last letter of the one-volume first tour (1769), and the final volume of the next two tours (1770; 1771) to such averaging, creating an homogenous nation by erasing regional variation.\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{74} The common twentieth-century dismissal of information gathered by touring as casual and gossipy, and necessarily erroneous and even idiotic, has occasionally paved the way to evaluating Young as a superficial quack. Mingay summarizes these attacks in Arthur Young and his Times, 1 and 15.

\textsuperscript{75} Vol. 28 (December 1769), 413-414.

\textsuperscript{76} Eastern Tour, I:i.

\textsuperscript{77} Northern Tour, IV:572.

\textsuperscript{78} For a complementary reading of the way Young's tour accounts reinvisioned the countryside, in particular how they erased any sense of individuated place, see John Barrell, The Idea of Landscape and the Sense of Place, 1730-1840, 64-97.
His contemporaries recognized in his tours a vision of the nation as a coherent community, and it was one that fired their imaginations.

The enthusiasm which greeted Young's early tours stemmed from the way they acted as an antidote to patrician insecurity caused by recent social disturbances. Huge changes in industry and agriculture were causing widespread unrest and even rioting among the working poor. Young "proved" that unrest among labourers was unjustifiable because it was not due to injustice or exploitation as he would define those conditions. By juxtaposing examples of conspicuous consumption (such as opulent country seats) with upbeat and meticulously documented accounts of a well-maintained working poor, new industry and reformed agriculture, Young presented a compelling picture of an England of guaranteed prosperity, harmonious cooperation, intelligent benevolence, and progress. In the summary of his Northern Tour, Young describes this country. The mutual reliance of the parts is stressed by using one very long sentence. (The quotation begins mid-sentence):

...from this review of the agriculture and c. of this kingdom, I apprehend there is no slight reason to conclude, that England is, at present, in a most rich and flourishing situation; that as agriculture is, upon the whole, good and spirited, and everyday improving; that her industrious poor are well fed, clothed, and lodged, and at reasonable rates of expense; the prices of all the necessaries of life being moderate; that our population is consequently increasing; that the price of labour is in general high; of itself one of the strongest symptoms of political health; but at the same time not so high as to leave any reason to fear those ill effects which have been prognosticated concerning it; that the wealth of all ranks of people appear to be very great, from the almost universal manner in which the kingdom is adorned with stately as well as useful buildings, ornamented parks, lawns, plantations, waters, & c. which all speak a wealth and happiness not easily mistaken: that all kinds of public works shew the public to be rich; witness the navigations, roads, and public edifices. If these do not combine to prove a kingdom to be flourishing, I must confess myself to be totally in the dark. (Young, IV:570-571)

---

The reassuring picture Young presents here is backed up with three volumes of empirical—and presumably verifiable—"evidence." The results of a well-performed tour should be reproducible, just as the results of a well-designed experiment are reproducible, and in fact must be so in order to be valid. This is what the Critical Review called Young's "experimental manner" of doing a tour.\textsuperscript{80} Young's version of the nation and of the universally positive impact of agricultural and industrial changes, then, was verifiable, and, at least for contemporaries, it therefore must represent the objective (and palatable) truth.

The agricultural reform Young promoted was for the wealthy, because of the extensive capital outlay it required. He generally identified with the powerful and their concerns. In his three earliest tours, he argues that all vestiges of subsistence or communal farming should be erased as unpatriotic and as marring the "one view" he promoted. All his pleasant prospects include "sweet" or "beautiful" enclosures. Opulent houses are carefully described and celebrated, and their owners are rarely criticized. When they are, it is for displaying poor taste or an unbecoming lack of progressive zeal in agricultural or industrial matters. In contrast, the dwellings of the poor are never entered or described, while Young lists the poor's income and expenditures down to the tiniest outlay on each food item, soap, candles, fuel, and rent. Though presented as comprehensive, these lists do not account for necessities such as clothing, thereby giving a false idea of the poor's "profit." Each item of expenditure is weighed as to its necessity. Tea drinking and sugar consumption, for instance, are inveighed against as increasing the poor-rates, as apparently the poor should be saving the money spent on tea and sugar against sickness and old age.\textsuperscript{81}

Ironically, an older Young was to look back on his earlier promotion of the

\textsuperscript{80} According to the Critical Review, the Eastern Tour is "conducted in the same experimental manner [as the Northern Tour was]." Vol. 32 (December 1771), 401.

\textsuperscript{81} Jonas Hanway's 1756 tour makes these same claims at greater length and with a vehemence which is surprising and even horrifying to a twentieth-century reader. For an intriguing reading of attacks on the poor's sugar and tea consumption, see Susan Willis, A Primer for Daily Life, 133-146.
interests of the wealthy and powerful with horror. In a diary entry dated 1800, an older and intensely religious Young writes of feeling impelled, for the second time in two days, to visit some cottages, something he would never have considered in early life. In one he finds:

On a bed, which was hardly good enough for a hog, was the woman very ill and moaning; she had been lately brought to bed, and her infant was dead in a cradle by the bedside. What a spectacle! My heart sank within me at the sight of so much misery, and so dark, cold, tattered and wretched a room.... But how strange yesterday to find a dead woman in a house, and to-day a dead child....What have not great and rich people to answer, for not examining into the situation of their poor neighbours?82

Young proceeds to denigrate his own "farming tours," saying

...were the improvement of agriculture alone to be considered, I believe little doubt could be entertained. But what is the tendency of all these improvements except to add to the wealth and prosperity of a country that is already under a most heavy responsibility to the Almighty for innumerable temporal blessings.... (Young, 333)

These feelings led him to undertake another tour to examine, not innovations which could lead to large-scale profit and displays of wealth, but the conditions of the English poor. As a result of his findings, he elaborated a scheme for applying waste lands to their benefit, basically advocating the creation of the subsistence farms which had horrified him much earlier. His criticism no longer benefitted the already powerful, and his reputation plummeted. His later opinions came to be understood as those of a possibly deranged religious fanatic.

Like Arthur Young, John Howard chose traditional objects of tourist interest. Prisons and hospitals were conventional tourist attractions, while particularly notable prisoners were inspected by sightseers after paying a fee to the keeper. However,

82 The Autobiography of Arthur Young, 331-333.
Howard, unlike the conventional tourist, investigated the conditions of prison inmates, and interviewed even the least titillating of them. Like Young, he advanced the interests of those who already held power. But unlike Young, Howard did not tour to increase their wealth or power, but to convince them that adopting the reforms he proposed would help them retain it. Prisoners properly treated, he argued, could be rehabilitated, and become useful members of society. They would no longer be a threat to social order. To that end, he used the same techniques as Young had, painstakingly quantifying, enumerating, evaluating, and interviewing. He drew the plans of prisons, and gave detailed data on such matters as the numbers of the prisoners in each prison who died of disease or whether and what bedding was provided.

After an exhaustive survey of the British and Irish situation, Howard went abroad—first to continental Europe and then to parts of Asia—to find solutions and precedents for ameliorating the situation he found at home. He has often been considered (rather inaccurately) the father of the present penal system, though almost all of his suggested reforms did not begin to be implemented until the mid-nineteenth century and were still in the process of being adopted at the beginning of the twentieth. To give only a few instances, he called for a segregation of prisoners by age, sex, and seriousness of crime; individual cells for prisoners; a chaplain, a doctor, and an infirmary at each prison; centralized government regulation of prisons; prison inspections by disinterested officials; the provision of at least minimal food, clothing, and bedding for each prisoner; and the substitution of government funding of prisons for funding by often extortionary fees levied against the prisoners by the jailers.83 These things are now routine in the prisons of most European and post-colonial countries.

For his pains, Howard became a national hero, even though his suggestions

83 For an account of John Howard and his suggestions, see Ralph W. England Jr.'s introduction to John Howard's tours, I:[v]-xxii. For a readable account of eighteenth-century prison conditions, see John Bender, Imagining the Penitentiary, 11-40.
were adopted by his contemporaries unequally and haphazardly, prison by prison, when they were adopted at all. One particularly popular appropriation of Howard makes clear how contemporaries valued his tours, and indicates the work tours such as Howard's (and by extension Young's) were understood to do in the culture. On February 10, 1787 Elizabeth Inchbald's play *Such Things Are* was staged at Covent Garden. It was an instant success, playing 22 times that season, and impressively bringing Inchbald over £1000 on author benefit nights. Though rarely staged after the first season, it continued to be popular in print, receiving its fourteenth edition by 1806. Inchbald's own remarks on the play are illustrative:

When this play was written, in 1786, Howard, the hero of the piece, under the name of Haswell, was on his philanthropic travels through Europe and parts of Asia, to mitigate the sufferings of the prisoner. His fame, the anxiety of his countrymen for the success of his labours, and their pride in his beneficent character, suggested to the author a subject for the following pages. The scene chosen for its exhibition is the island of Sumatra [in the East Indies]; where the English settlement, the system of government, modes and [sic] habits of the natives, the residents, and the visitors of the isle, may well reconcile the fable and incidents of the drama to an interesting degree of possibility.

Inchbald also seeks to contrast the benefits of Howard's focused and community-minded touring to the form Chesterfield had advocated to his touring son in his *Letters*. Chesterfield stressed the value of learning the characters of men in order to turn this knowledge to personal advantage. Twineall's character and conduct is formed on the plan of Lord Chesterfield's finished gentleman. That nobleman's *Letters* to his Son excited, at least, the idea of Twineall in the author's mind; and the public appeared to be as well acquainted with his despicable reputation, as with the highly honourable one of Howard.

---


85 *Selected Comedies*, ed. Roger Manvell, xix.

86 *Such Things Are*. Rprt. in *Selected Comedies*, 4.
Twineall, for his flattery, is sentenced to decapitation. (Haswell/Howard saves and reforms him.) Clearly, Inchbald did not want to present the particular traditional form of tourism Chesterfield advocated as leading to individual or national power.

Howard, of course, envisioned his tours as contributing to the reformation of prisons at home. Inchbald sidesteps Howard’s challenge to the domestic situation, and shows how his brand of British benevolence and touring will extend and consolidate British imperial power. Haswell/Howard shows the tyrannical Sultan the benefits to the government of treating political prisoners well (they are so grateful that they live for evermore in peaceful support of the government). The Sultan is so impressed that he literally hands over his power to Haswell/Howard by giving him his signet ring, and declares

here I vow, before he [Haswell/Howard] leaves our shores, I will adopt every measure he shall point out; and those acts of my life whereon he shall lay his censure, these will I make the subject of repentance. (Inchbald, V.iii, 72)

Perhaps even more unbelievably, Zedan, an Indian imprisoned for taking up arms against the Sultan, voluntarily exclaims to Haswell/Howard (who has just obtained his release) that 'I did he not have a family to return to, "you should be my master, and I would be your slave"' (Inchbald, V.iv, 76). Instead of envisioning Howard’s tours as leading to the amelioration of prison conditions at home as Howard himself did, Inchbald saw their potential for lending a moral authority to the indoctrination and enslavement of colonial peoples. If Howard sought to make opinion makers look at the conditions around them and change them, they saw in him a hero whose program would serve to secure power over those who currently escaped it.

87 Politically disaffected members of the audience could, of course, have read Sumatra allegorically for England, but it would not have been necessary to do so to make sense of the play.
Berchtold, Young, and Howard were recognized by contemporaries as exceptionally good tourists. They also reveal the problems tourists and tour writers faced rendering their travels globally pertinent. Young and Howard had to focus their enquiries beyond the hope of more casual travellers, and Berchtold was well-placed and exceptionally driven. In tourism, the interest of the individual, his country, and humanity in general would rarely coincide, nor would the good of each necessarily consist in a spirit of improvement furthered by the extension of knowledge. As an objective, maintaining a complementary and mutually beneficial flow of travel information and interest from the individual to his or her nation to the ultimate benefit all humanity, was not realistic. This meant that most eighteenth-century tourists (at least before Sterne changed the rules) were bad tourists by their own well-established standards, however earnest and sincere they might have been as individuals.

To remarkably different ends, the travelling narrators of Henry Fielding’s The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon (1755) and Laurence Sterne’s Tristram Shandy (1760-7) and A Sentimental Journey (1768) self-consciously practised conventionally "bad" travel methodology and writing. Both writers suppressed conventional travel description in favour of what Johnson and other contemporaries identified as the "trivial" and "trifling." Because of the way travel and travel writing conventions are flaunted in these works, readers and critics have registered confusion over the genre and aims of Fielding’s work, have often dismissed Book VII of Tristram Shandy as confusing or boring, and have worried the problem of whether Sterne’s Yorick or Sterne himself are solipsistic in A Sentimental Journey. While both writers were demonstrably aware that they broke through generic conventions and cultural assumptions, they also carefully maintained or transformed key elements commonly used to legitimate travel and travel writing.

The gap between the knowledge gained by travel and the ability and/or positional power of the traveller to effect change underwrites Fielding’s Voyage. An underappreciated work, the melancholic Voyage begins with the a self-portrait of the obviously dying, grotesquely bloated, and almost paralysed narrator leaving his children for the last time, and ends with his arrival at the white city of Lisbon,
beautiful from a distance over the water, terrifyingly ugly on closer inspection, an emblem of death. In this intensely political work, Henry Fielding registered his frustration with the lack of usable power knowledge actually has without the societal position to effect change. At the end of his "Preface" he gives a disillusioned and ironic assessment of a writer's power to effect real societal change. In it, he assigns roles to both himself as a travel writer and to the Samuel Richardson who wrote explicitly reformatory novels from the Duke of Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*:

But perhaps I may hear, from some critic...that my vanity must have made a horrid dupe of my judgment, if it hath flattered me with an expectation of having anything here seen in a grave light, or of conveying any useful instruction to the public, or to their guardians. I answer with [Samuel Richardson]...that my purpose is to convey instruction in the vehicle of entertainment; and so to bring about at once, like the revolution in *The Rehearsal*, a perfect reformation of the laws relating to our maritime affairs: an undertaking...more feasible, than that of reforming a whole people, by making use of a vehicular story, to wheel in among them worse manners than their own. (Fielding, 11)

Fielding is comparing himself, his project, and its likely efficacy (along with Richardson and his endeavour) to the project of Buckingham's two usurpers, a physician and an usher. They briefly and secretly sit in a pair of makeshift thrones, swords unsheathed (Buckingham, II.iv). Neither the rulers they have thereby "deposed," nor their new "subjects," are ever aware of the revolution. Fielding's earlier description of this scene in the *True Patriot*, "the most striking Ridicule of all worldly Greatness drawn from its Instability," is a propos here:

the Gentleman Usher and Physician dethrone the two Kings of Brentford by a Whisper...These two Usurpers therefore, who are always personated by two very ridiculous Actors, having sat a little while in their Places, to the great Diversion of the Spectators, sneak off as comically and as absurdly as they
The "great Diversion of the Spectators" arises from the obvious lack of real power the "ridiculous Actors" have—they do not have the means to effect a revolution except in a sense that is not even recognized within the constricted world of the stage. It is an usurpation claimed and known only by the usurpers, a revolution none of the powerful even know about. It therefore effects no systemic change.

Unwilling entrapment and confinement, as Melinda Alliker Rabb has demonstrated, are the Voyage's central ideas both in its subject matter and in the structural patterns of its narrative. Others have also examined how Fielding defends himself as a magistrate and pleads for help for his wife and children, and figures the nation as a body which has become similar to his own grotesque and disintegrated frame. Fielding also takes the opportunity of the Voyage to discuss issues of freedom and enslavement and to advocate maritime reform. But why do this in a travel book that breaks the rules he advocates in his own prefatory discussion of the genre? For instance, Fielding inundates his readers with trivialities, a practice he excoriates in the "Preface." These "trifles" and the nature of the "trivial" were as well-defined as the proper objects of inquiry were. Alarmed contemporaries charged that most travellers were, like Vicesimus Knox's grand touring boys, "struck and captivated with vanity and trifles." Samuel Johnson, for instance, complains that

---

88 True Patriot 16 (11-18 Feb. 1746), cited by Tom Keymer in his notes to the Voyage, 117-118, n. 15.

89 "Confinement and Entrapment in Henry Fielding's Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon."


91 Liberal Education, 236.
travellers "recount the number of the pillars" in a church, or, crossing a valley "find that it is green" instead of improving reader and country with directly applicable, preferably utilitarian or moral, information. Playwrights, too, repeatedly made fun of travellers obsessed with the trivial. Fielding himself alludes to a passage in Aphra Behn's 1679 *The Feign'd Curtizans*, in which Behn's inept and hypocritical bearleader, Parson Tickletext, keeps a "small volume" in which he "transcribe[s] the most memorable and remarkable transactions of the day." Behn proceeds to give an impressive sample of them:

April the Twentieth, arose a very great storm of Wind, Thunder, Lightning, and Rain,--which was a shrew'd sign of foul weather. The 22nd, 9 of our 12 chickens getting loose, flew over-bord, the other three miraculous escaping, by being eaten by me, that Morning for breakfast. (Behn, III.i, 119)

Fielding, then, could not be unaware of what counted as trivial, and what important--he specifies each in his own "Preface," and makes it clear that he is aware that others agree. Fielding asserts that the reader of well-conceived books of travels is "to acquire from them a real and valuable knowledge of men and things; both which are best known by comparison" (Fielding, 5). What, then, is one to make of his entries for June 30 and July 2, which discuss his wife's toothache; or the information that on July 9 or 10 a kitten is saved from drowning; or the entries in which he informs the reader of the precise number of quarts of liquid which are tapped from his body each time the operation is performed, and about the relief he felt?

Tom Keymer suggests that the *Voyage* is "a parody of inept travel writing, ironically written at the expense of, and sending up, his own narrating voice." There is an element of parody in the *Voyage*, but it is in the service of a serious critique of the underlying assumptions about what travels were thought to achieve for

92 Johnson, ["Narratives of Travellers Considered"], No. 97, *The Idler*, 300.

both the writer and for the culture. The point of Fielding’s *Voyage* is to explore the jarring dislocations between the travel theory Fielding propounds in his "Preface," the conventionally assumed authority travelling should give him in matters of maritime and judicial reform, and the entrapment, confinement and powerlessness he experiences. Fielding is dying, and he knows it—he will receive no praise or advancement for performing his travels well. The gap between the reality of his situation and the claims made by and for travellers made him acutely aware of his own powerlessness and the actual powerlessness of the majority of travellers and travel writers, even those of the most earnest cast.

Almost a quarter of a century earlier, in *Gulliver’s Travels*, Jonathan Swift had also pointed out the inefficacy of properly written travels to change society. Gulliver complains to his cousin Sympson:

> Pray bring to your Mind how often I desired you to consider, when you insisted on the Motive of *public Good* [in publishing the travels]; that the *Yahoos* were a Species of Animals utterly incapable of Amendment by Precepts or Examples: And so it hath proved; for instead of seeing a full Stop put to all Abuses and Corruptions, at least in this little Island, as I had Reason to expect: Behold, after above six Months Warning, I cannot learn that my book hath produced one single Effect according to mine Intentions: I desired you would let me know by a Letter, when Party and Faction were extinguished; Judges learned and upright; Pleaders honest and modest, with some Tincture of common Cense; and *Smithfield* blazing with Pyramids of Law-Books; the young Nobility’s Education entirely changed; the Physicians banished; the Female *Yahoos* abounding in Virtue, Honour, Truth and good Sense [and so on].... (Swift, 6)

As Swift implies, the power of a travel book to reform the nation in the way authors and travel advocates envisioned was severely limited. It depended not only on whether the traveller’s account seemed like non-fiction (which Gulliver’s certainly does not) but on how much it was in the reader’s interest to accept the implications of the material presented. As the example of Elizabeth Inchbald’s use of John Howard and his tours suggest, the response might not be what the tourist had anticipated in writing up his travels. And this is one of the problems on which Fielding’s procedure
in his *Voyage* hinges.

The other problem Fielding grimly plays with is the insistence "trifles" had of becoming of utmost importance in the lived experience of the tour. Most travel knowledge of pressing and crucial interest to the individual traveller--for instance, the price of a night's lodging in Calais--would be unlikely to further the interests of the traveller's country or of humankind. Furthermore, the diversification of the touring population and the forms of tourism engaged in after mid-century meant that increasing numbers of tourists were not positioned so that any "useful" knowledge they acquired--of, for instance, maritime abuses--could be rendered by them to be directly useful to their country. Fielding's *Voyage* poignantly reflects this situation by making the mixed interests of the decaying traveller-narrator the centre of attention, and by ending his travels at the point most contemporary travel accounts finished their introduction--the landing on the continent. Fielding had broken most of the rules, rules about which his Preface makes clear that he had a professional writer's understanding. The account's generic innovations, its focus on the grotesque and melancholic, Fielding's sliding reputation among contemporaries (many of whom thought his end fitting for one of such a dissipated life), and the account's implicit (if ill-understood) challenge to the way travels were legitimated and power allocated, guaranteed the account's contemporary unpopularity. What has seemed to be its generic indeterminateness (it lacks descriptions of foreign places, so for many readers it cannot be a travel book, but it does not seem to be anything else either) has, until recently, made it almost ignored in Fielding criticism. When read in terms of contemporary travel theory and practice, however, it emerges as a brilliantly conceived work.

Like Fielding, Sterne knew the theory and justifications of the traditional *Ars Peregrinari*. Sterne's sermon based on the biblical story of the prodigal son reads Luke XV.13 specifically in terms of the educational tour undertaken by male minors, and more generally of travel as a whole. Scholars have determined that it was probably written very early in Sterne's career as a divine, but that it was revised for
publication. The sermon was originally published in 1766, between the publication of the seventh and eighth volumes (1765) and the last volume (1767) of *Tristram Shandy*, and, of course, before *A Sentimental Journey* (1768). If one were to insert it into *Tristram Shandy*, then, it appears while Tristram is in "a handsome pavillion built by Pringello, upon the banks of the Garonne, which Mons. Slijniac lent" him (*TS* II:622). There he simultaneously recounts the educational tour he took accompanied by his father, my Uncle Toby, and Trim; the tour he is currently making to flee Death; and the story of my Uncle Toby's amours with the Widow Wadman. Sterne ends Volume VIII with Tristram's father accusing his mother with dissembling the true source of her wish to look through a keyhole to view the beginnings of my Uncle Toby's courtship. Tristram, then, is on tour, writing of a home story, when Yorick's sermon theorizing touring appeared.

Because of its publication date, the sermon would seem to reflect Sterne's attitude towards its subject matter while he was writing the last few volumes of *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental Journey*. It is remarkable in several respects, but in none so much as for how little what he preaches in his sermon is reflected in his travel writing. In this sermon, his defense of travel is reasoned, but conventional. Though he clearly does not favour travel for the young, Sterne sees the desire to travel "planted within us for the solid purposes of carrying forwards the mind to fresh enquiry and knowledge." He points out that it is not travel itself which is bad, but the abuse of travelling:

> It is to this spur ["The love of variety, or curiosity of seeing new things, which is the same, or at least a sister passion to it"] which is ever in our sides, that we owe the impatience of this desire for travelling: the passion is no way bad.-

---


95 "The Prodigal Son," in *The Sermons of Mr. Yorick*, I:234. This sermon will be cited parenthetically as PS with page number.
--but as others are,—in it's [sic] mismanagement or excess;—order it rightly
the advantages are worth the pursuit.... (PS 234)

The way one should "order it rightly" will sound familiar after the above discussion of
the traditional Ars Peregrinari. One travels

...to learn the languages, the laws and customs, and understand the government
and interest of other nations,—to acquire an urbanity and confidence of
behaviour, and fit the mind more easily for conversation and discourse;—to
take us out of the company of our aunts and grandmothers, and from the track
of nursery mistakes; and by shewing us new objects, or old ones in new lights,
to reform our judgments—by tasting perpetually the varieties of nature, to
know what is good,—by observing the address and arts of men, to conceive
what is sincere,—and by seeing the difference of so many various humours and
manners,—to look into ourselves and form our own. (PS 234-235)

Neither Tristram nor Yorick adhere to the traditional performance form Sterne
advocates here. Sterne was to propose a new way of justifying and managing the
forms of tourism most attacked earlier in the century.66 His Sermon is most
remarkable in one thing. It is written by the first writer who successfully legitimatized
prevalent travel practices which had been a constant source of ridicule. Sterne is the
first writer to define the more usual performance forms of tourism without seeming (to
his original readers at least) to attack them.

I have discussed works that are delicately poised on the boundary between the
novel and the nonfiction travel account (Smollett's Humphry Clinker, Fielding's
Voyage, and Sterne's works) alongside works which were undeniably meant as non-
fiction travels. The Preface to his Voyage makes it clear that Fielding thought of the
travel book as, to use Wilbur Cross' summation, a "novel without a plot,"97 while
both Humphry Clinker and A Sentimental Journey, though conventionally considered

66 This is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

novels now, are equally in the travel account tradition. The travel accounts of Smollett, Fielding, and Sterne turned, in different ways, on the failure of the traditional Ars Peregrinari and its justifications. Smollett used the tour account to experiment with the positional nature of an individual tourist's knowledge and opinion. Fielding used it to figure the powerlessness of an individual in the face of the vicissitudes of life, sickness, and death. Sterne chose to transvalue and celebrate the trivialities traditionally legitimized tourism eschewed. The cases of tourists and tour writers who capitalized on the legitimacy and authority of the traditional Ars Peregrinari show how it could still operate, though as a limited and not widely practicable form. Arthur Young and John Howard deployed an adapted version of the traditional Ars Peregrinari to compensate for their lack of patrician power and authority. Smollett, Fielding, Sterne, Young, and Howard wrote their tours in the name of reform and envisioned potential alternatives to what they described. They used the form to persuade. This capacity for envisioning and suggesting change that contemporaries saw in tourism is something that is fundamental to why the novelistic literature discussed in the following chapters makes extensive use of the form.

Having addressed these examples, however briefly, it should start to be clear why the authors dealt with at length in this dissertation--Laurence Sterne, Thomas Amory, Sarah Scott, William Erskine, and Samuel Richardson--chose to employ the culture of tourism when they envisioned sometimes radical change or alternatives to conventional social, political, and personal relationships. Each of these authors, like Arthur Young and John Howard, used tourism for its potential to add to their possibly suspect authority or to move them into a new social positions. On the eve of his fame, Laurence Sterne lived in York, far from the centres of power, was the son of an

---

98 Sterne always referred to Sentimental Journey as his "travels" in his letters, not as his novel. Further, Curley notes that "Novels like A Sentimental Journey and Humphry Clinker occasionally appeared in lists of bona fide travel books," (Samuel Johnson and the Age of Travel, 38) thereby neatly illustrating a generic assumption about these works shared by most twentieth-century readers that was, by his own evidence, far from assumed by their original audience.
unsuccessful military man, and a minor member of the Anglican clergy; the Anglo-Irish Thomas Amory seems to have been an eccentric and reclusive doctor; an impoverished gentlewoman, Sarah Scott was separated from her husband, and barely managed gentry status; the shadowy William Erskine was probably a minor Jacobite exile and was certainly not particularly prominent; Samuel Richardson was a prosperous printer who did not have gentry standing at all, though he sometimes assumed a gentlewoman’s persona. Having no established patrician power themselves, these writers could use the links to power assumed in tourism to give credibility and authority to the alternatives they envisioned. Tourism was, however, an unpredictable tool, as we shall see.

iii. Touring Cultures: Diversity, Bordercrossings, Influence

Although the bitterness of Fielding’s travel account made its implications easily dismissable by contemporaries as the product of a weakened and expiring intellect, he had isolated and explored a central problem of the traditional Ars Peregrinari and its justifications. The form was so unwieldy that it was usually unworkable and, even when properly employed, did not necessarily produce the expected individual and communal improvements. Furthermore, most tourists revelled shamefacedly in what were called "trifles," or at least found trivial encounters and observations of greater moment than they found (for instance) successful turnip-growing. For example, to a couple such as the actor and theatre manager David Garrick and his wife, the dancer Maria Veigel, who toured Europe in 1751 and 1763-5, the information one would gather using the traditional Ars Peregrinari was useless. They were not, for instance, positioned to use it to do things such as to alter military policy or to reform British methods of fortification, and they probably did not find the relative fertility of the women of each country the burning and relevant question that Tucker, Berchtold, and Young considered it.

The failures of the Ars Peregrinari and its aims did not mean that tourism did not have an impact on the lives of most people whether they toured or not. This is
partially because of the sheer diversity of both the populations that travelled and the practices they engaged in, but also because of the objects, tastes, ideas, and fads tourists brought back with them, the travel books they wrote, and the importance contemporaries assigned to touring. The impact of travelling on the lives and ideas of the tourists themselves could be profound because of the opportunity the practice presented to cross both literal and figurative borders experimentally. Many of these bordercrossings could be vicariously experienced by the readers of both tour accounts and of the narrative fiction which drew on the culture of tourism. Literal, figurative, and vicarious bordercrossing made tourism one of the most flexible mediums available to explore cultural, sexual, political, social, and institutional options. Tourism, then, had the capacity to be used to work out the issues and problems that particularly preoccupied contemporaries. It is this aspect of tourism which made it particularly attractive to novelists and satirists.

What I would like to suggest in this section is the sheer diversity of contemporary touring populations, their concerns, and their practices, along with a few of the ways tourism functioned within the larger culture and within literary forms. By the period covered in this dissertation, the culture of tourism was composed of a loosely linked series of related performance codes, representational conventions, and social relationships which together were an enormously influential and formative cultural practice. A general idea of what tourism could entail in the eighteenth century is necessary for even the most basic historicist understanding of how fiction writers employed the culture of tourism. Unfortunately, because the practice of sending well-heeled young men to the continent for two to four years to finish their education provoked so much contemporary public comment and satire, many commentators now assume that this was the normative (if not the only) form of tourism practised. John Towner's criticism of many social histories of tourism is apposite here. That a tourist practice has not been reflected much or at all in published tour descriptions does not indicate its unpopularity or non-existence.99 To

99 John Towner, "Approaches to Tourism History."
this I would add a number of other caveats. Not all forms of tourism were thought worthy of being written up, or, even when written up, of being published as tour accounts. A clear example of this can be seen in British domestic tourism. In the 1770s there was an explosion in the publication of domestic tour accounts. This has often led commentators to assume that domestic tourism was not practised before that point. Resort tourism was in full swing, however, by the beginning of the century; country-house tourism had been popular since the seventeenth century, flowering into a rage in the 1750s which was reflected in the intense guidebook wars at Stowe, and nature tourism at the Peak District had been thrilling tourists since the late seventeenth century. Furthermore, wide-ranging antiquarian tourism was a coherent enough target to be parodied by the early eighteenth century. In 1732 Hogarth and several cronies took a Rabelaisian "antiquarian" tour from the Bedford Arms, Covent Garden to Queenborough and back. The tourists commemorated the

100 The exception here is Esther Moir's excellent descriptive The Discovery of Britain. As she writes, "The [English] habit of touring their native land began in the sixteenth century; it was a Tudor phenomenon" (xxv). Her shifting focus on individual travellers and particular tour forms gives an impression of comprehensiveness that has fooled many subsequent commentators into believing that her work is in fact comprehensive. Comprehensiveness is not Moir's aim. Her work is excellent in what she treats, but does not address everything that was occurring and should not be treated as such.

101 There are numerous works which address resort tourism. The best on Bath remains R.S. Neale's Bath, 1680-1850. On seventeenth-century resort tourism in particular, see William Addison, English Spas, 14-29 and Frederick Alderson, The Inland Resorts and Spas of Britain, 23-44.


momentous tour: Ebenezer Forrest wrote it up; Hogarth illustrated it. The work was later given the title *Hogarth's Peregrination*. That tours were not being written up as serious tour accounts, then, does not indicate that they were not made.\(^\text{104}\) Only certain forms of tourism in this period stipulated producing either a journal or a published tour account as part of their performance.

What complicates the picture still further, is that some tourists were discouraged from writing tour accounts for publication, while travel-writing convention dictated erasing certain classes of people who toured. On the one hand, young men were advised to keep several written accounts--at the very least, one of "literary" reflections and one of practical information such as population estimates or lists of manufactures. This has, not surprisingly, resulted in many surviving manuscript travel accounts written by young men. On the other hand, women were sometimes discouraged from writing accounts, and though this may have changed towards the end of the century, it was rarely considered a necessary part of a woman's tour performance. In the second part of *Pamela*, for instance, Pamela, Mr. B. and Lady Davers all stress how inappropriate it would be for Pamela to write descriptions of her tours of London and later of the continent. Instead she is to write her comments on Locke.\(^\text{105}\)

Many women such as Celia Fiennes or Margaret Calderwood did, however, write in a travel account form that was meant for wide circulation but not publication. It is this form of travel writing that Samuel Johnson recommended to Nancy Welch in a letter written in 1778 to her father and "fellow traveller," Saunders Welch, then at Rome. The advice is detailed:

\(^{104}\) This is not to suggest that domestic tourism did not increase dramatically in the second half of the century (all tourism did), but that domestic tourism thrived for at least a century before the publication explosion of domestic tour accounts in the 1770s.

\(^{105}\) *Pamela II* [Pamela in her Exalted Condition], 225, 237, 372, 419.
Miss Nancy has doubtless kept a constant and copious journal. She must not expect to be welcome when she returns without a great mass of information. Let her review her journal often, and set down what she finds herself to have omitted, that she may trust to memory as little as possible, for memory is soon confused by a quick succession of things; and she will grow every day less confident of the truth of her own narratives, unless she can recur to some written memorials. If she has satisfied herself with hints, instead of full representations, let her supply the deficiencies now while her memory is yet fresh, and while her father's memory may help her. If she observes this direction, she will not have travelled in vain; for she will bring home a book with which she may entertain herself to the end of life. If it were not now too late, I would advise her to note the impression which the first sight of any thing new and wonderful made upon her mind. Let her now set her thoughts down as she can recollect them; for faint as they may already be, they will grow every day fainter.  

I have quoted Johnson at length for a number of reasons. Johnson's opinions on travel and travel writing had a tendency to be utterly conventional if peculiarly well-phrased. Boswell thought the letter worth reproducing in full in his Life of Johnson, thereby illustrating how good, solid, and unimpeachable he thought its contents. Nancy Welch was not receiving subversive instructions, whatever she may have done with them. The differences between what Johnson exhorted travel writers to do in his Idler essay and what he suggests to "Miss Nancy" are significant—she is, in effect, to write in a well-defined sub-genre of tour literature. His Idler travellers are to write only about what will benefit all humankind, and to publish; she is to write of everything that strikes her, by implication whether these things were trivial or important by the standards of the day. She was also to write for her own subsequent amusement, and perhaps for the amusement of a circle of acquaintance (after all, Johnson implies in his opening remarks that he expects to hear or read abstracts of the journal), but by strong implication, she is not to write an account for publication. In his advice, Johnson appears to be conventional. Nevertheless, a minority of the women who travelled did

---
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choose to write accounts specifically designed for publication. The publication of relatively few published tours written by women, however, does not mean that women did not travel, or even that those who travelled or wrote travels were automatically subversive.

The way travel writing conventions could erase whole classes of tourists is most clear with women tourists as well. Male writers of serious travel accounts regularly (though not universally) erased the wives, daughters, and kinswomen who accompanied them, along with the individual women they met. Arthur Young’s first tours were made with his wife. During the second one, she was undergoing a difficult pregnancy which made her ill almost continuously, regularly impeding the couple’s progress over the countryside. In his accounts, Young travels alone. Sterne, too, travelled over much of France with his wife and daughter. Again, the characters with whom he publicly had himself identified travel without these companions. Tristram travels alone and Yorick with only a servant (though servants, too, were often erased). The volume and contents of tours published or even written by

108 For instance, the farthest point on the standard continental circuit was Naples, a place most women never reached because their tours tended to be short in duration and confined primarily to France. Nonetheless, in the two decades between the Treaty of Paris to the outbreak of war with revolutionary France, at least three women wrote accounts of Naples for publication. (Lady Anna Miller, Letters from Italy [London, 1776]; Hester Lynch Piozzi, Observations [London, 1789]; Mariana Starke, Letters from Italy [London 1800]). Other women who wrote travel descriptions of Naples in this period include Cornelia Knight, Mary Berry, Elizabeth Wynne, and Elizabeth Webster.

109 In this I depart from the opinions expressed in several recent studies such as Elizabeth A. Bohls’ Women Travel Writers and the Language of Aesthetics, 1716-1818 and Sandra Adickes’ The Social Quest: The Expanded Vision of Four Women Travelers in the Era of the French Revolution. These works translate the tendency in many twentieth-century histories to ignore women into a reflection the absence of real women who travelled. Women were, of course, sometimes subversive in how they travelled or wrote about travel, but they were not subversive simply in the fact of travelling and writing.

110 He also travelled with a diplomat, among others—such erasures were not aimed at women alone.
contemporaries reflect particular forms of tourism, not all of tourism. They indicate the generic conventions, ideas about propriety and about what made a work worthy of publication. Similarly, the extensiveness of public commentary on a particular form shows the intensity of the public concerns raised by it, but not necessarily how much the form was practised.

This situation does not mean that the populations who toured and their practices are impossible to trace, but that the travel accounts intended for publication distort and fragment the actual situation, as do the ubiquitous attacks on grand-touring young men. Neither of these sources reflects actual practice in its completeness, complexity, and variety. In conjunction with other sources, however, the importance and function of the picture they present comes alive, and the distortions and erasures themselves stand forth with splendid significance. To point out the obvious, novels, plays, and other imaginative narrative forms, not to mention materials such as guidebooks, satirical cartoons, and personal letters, did not labour under the same conventions as did travel accounts designed for publication. Unlike tour accounts, these alternative sources tend to reveal the diversity, importance, and impact of tourism in ways that the tour accounts chosen by many historians rarely do.

Most tourist modes, whether publicly trumpeted and written about in tour accounts or not, had their own well-understood performance conventions. These were significantly different from those expected in the adult who followed the program of the traditional Ars Peregrinari or from a gawky sixteen or seventeen-year old boy sent abroad with the hope that he would return a miracle of gentlemanly and elegant behaviour. Young male tourists formed part of only one category of travellers Sterne identified in the famous "Preface" of A Sentimental Journey. Travellers, Yorick claims, leave their country out of

Infirmity of body,
Imbecility of mind, or
Inevitable necessity. (SJ 79)
The third category is where he places the "peregrine martyrs"—the grand touring young gentleman, among others (SJ 79). Such travellers receive little attention from Yorick. In a passage that made the Monthly Review celebrate Sterne with delight as a "curious naturalist" and "a very Linnaeus,"\textsuperscript{111} Yorick sums up his observations with:

Thus the whole circle of travellers may be reduced to the following Heads.

Idle Travellers,
Inquisitive Travellers,
Lying Travellers,
Proud Travellers,
Vain Travellers,
Splenetic Travellers.

Then follow the Travellers of Necessity.
The delinquent and felonious Traveller,
The unfortunate and innocent Traveller,
The simple Traveller,
And last of all (if you please) The Sentimental Traveller (meaning thereby myself) who have travell'd, and of which I am now sitting down to give an account—as much out of Necessity, and the besoin de Voyager, as any one in the class. (SJ 81-82)

The humour of Sterne's list relies on the reader's knowledge that the travelling population was extraordinarily diverse. For a very select audience it also plays on the recognition of his parody of the similarly torturous divisions and subdivisions of travellers and their objects of interest in the travel methodizations of Theodor Zwinger (1577) and Sir Thomas Palmer (1606).\textsuperscript{112} According to Sterne's subdivisions, at one end of life were the travellers sent to

\textsuperscript{111} Series 1, vol. 38 (1768), 174.

\textsuperscript{112} Theodor Zwinger (or Zwingerus), Methodus Apodemica (Basil, 1577) and Sir Thomas Palmer, An Essay of the Meanes Mow to Make our Travailes in Fорraine Countries the More Profitable and Honourable (London, 1606). Combining this observation with Vrooman's identification of Sterne's parody of Joseph Hall in the
the continent as part of an educational program; at the other end of life, were the elderly, sick or dying, who travelled to Spa, Montpelier, or Lisbon to rejuvenate, occasionally (but not usually) writing tour descriptions.

Because of the diversity of both tourists and tourist practices, it is methodologically problematic to use material arising from one distinct form of tourism, for instance, material from Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* (a tour conducted by an adult man on a whim) or Arthur Young's *Travels in France* (a tour made by a professional adult man thematizing agricultural information) to characterize the educative touring of young men. Conversely, it is equally problematic to use the criticisms of touring young men as a register of concerns about all continental tourism, or to explain the existence of all continental tourism as arising from a need to keep young men from jockeying for power with their fathers. To assume that a particular form of tourism meant to educate elite male minors is normative for the period causes critical confusion and an obfuscation of what was at issue in each form, and renders some popular forms invisible.

What these tourists looked at and did while on tour, and why they thought they did what they did, were at least as diverse as the touring population itself. Until the last third of the century most tourism was urban in nature, though certain forms of rural tourism such as country-house visiting were very popular. The pervasiveness of a trip to London or Bath in the eighteenth-century novel closely reflects the urban nature of most tourism at the time, and the importance it was thought to have for the formation and testing of the characters of young men and women. Continental tourism in particular, especially among young men, was almost exclusively an urban tourism, in which exposure to foreign urban culture, not to rural life or to spectacular scenery, was emphasized. As they travelled, tourists expected to see and engage with famous prisoners, the mad, celebrities, architectural gems, "monsters," collections

"Preface," it seems to me that Sterne is displaying his awareness of conventional travel advice even as he flaunted and rewrote it. He was signalling that he knew the rules he broke.

With the rise of Romanticism at the end of the century there was a marked shift towards more scenic modes of tourism. See Judith Adler, "Origins of Sightseeing."
of animals, pictures, plants. They went to the theatre and enjoyed pleasure gardens. They climbed into baskets to be lowered into caves or mines, and thrilled at fiery forges. They painted landscapes and buildings and had themselves painted and sculpted. They botanized and anatomized, learned languages and how to sing. They went to the theatre to examine the audience (mainly), or set off small cannon blasts at night when they knew from their guidebooks that the bang would produce an echo. They watched mock naval battles mounted by Joseph Pocklington on Derwentwater in the Lake District, and located West’s numbered viewing "Stations." They turned their backs on desired views to look at them in small plano-convex mirrors, over which they threw coloured filters to approximate different seasons, weather, and times of day. They took notes on foreign weather patterns, and judged the air quality of each region. They clambered up volcanoes imagining life-threatening danger, and drank celebrated waters to achieve long life.

The tangible things or ideas tourists brought home with them were equally diverse and wide ranging. Because almost every area of English life, from table manners to gardens, underwent tour-inspired change, only a few necessarily arbitrary examples will be given here. The broad and longstanding popularity of country-house visiting meant that architectural and garden importations are particularly easily traced, if only because they were so widely commented upon by contemporaries. In both cases, there was a widespread tour-inspired drive to translate Italy into England, adapting it appropriately. After undertaking a short second continental tour in 1719 to inspect examples of Palladian architecture in Italy, Richard Boyle, Third Earl of Burlington, became largely responsible for Neo-Palladianism and its exclusion of the baroque and rococo from Georgian architecture. On his return,

---

114 See Joseph Burke, "The Grand Tour and the Rule of Taste" for a broad ranging reading of the influence of tourism on English neo-classical taste.

115 For Burlington and English Neo-Palladianism, see Rudolf Wittkower, Palladio and English Neo-Palladianism, 114-174. Incidentally, when Burlington returned from his initial grand tour in 1715, he brought home a diverse collection which gives a taste of the piecemeal cultural importation engaged in by wealthy tourists. This collection included pictures, porphyry vases, the violinists Pietro and Prospero Castrucci, the cellist and composer Giovanni Bononcini, and the sculptor Giovanni Battista Guelfi.
he built the villa at Chiswick in a Palladian fashion, lent his support to Neo-Palladian architects such as William Kent (who himself had studied for ten years in Italy), financed publications such as Kent’s *Designs of Inigo Jones* (1727) and Palladio’s drawings of the Roman *thermae* (1730), and generally preached and encouraged Neo-Palladianism. His Italy-inspired taste had great influence, not all of it in good taste, as Alexander Pope, in his “Epistle to Richard Boyle, Earl of Burlington” complains:

```
You show us, Rome was glorious, not profuse,  
And pompous buildings once were things of Use.  
Yet shall (my Lord) your just, your noble rules  
Fill half the land with Imitating Fools;  
Who random drawings from your sheets shall take,  
And of one beauty many blunders make;  
Load some vain Church with old Theatric state,  
Turn Arcs of triumph to a Garden-gate;  
Reverse your Ornaments, and hang them all  
On some patch’d dog-hole ek’d with ends of wall,  
Then clap four slices of Pilaster on’t.  
That, lac’d with bits of rustic, makes a Front.  
Or call the winds thro’ long Arcades to roar,  
Proud to catch cold at a Venetian door;  
Conscious they act a true Palladian part,  
And if they starve, they starve by rules of art.  
```

Pope used Burlington as the positive example of an expensive, tour-inspired taste which would lead to widespread imitation among fools. They would adopt Italian architecture without adapting it to the native English climate. In Pope’s formulation, both uses of riches—tasteful and foolish—promoted the interests of the nation. Burlington’s architectural endeavours were similarly praised as immensely useful and patriotic by Francis Lynch in the dedication to Burlington of his 1737 play *The Independent Patriot.* In the same play, the support of opera and the importation of Italian music and musicians (which Burlington and other wealthy men such as Lord Middlesex were doing) is satirized as something that only a foolish woman (Lady

---

Warble) would do. Like Pope, Lynch both applauds and criticizes tour-inspired innovations.

Tour-inspired architectural innovation happened in less exalted circles too. A la Ronde in Devon, a sixteen-sided cottage, was built for Jane and Mary Parminter in 1798. While on a ten year tour of the continent beginning in 1784, the Parminter sisters had been especially struck by the octagonal basilica of San Vitale at Ravenna. To remind them of their tour and to provide a home for their souvenirs, they built a house reminiscent of this building near the fashionable sea bathing resort of Exmouth when they returned to England. Their translation of an Italian Basilica to England and into a smallish English home which is complete with a shellwork gallery and a music room, and which the sisters stipulated was to be willed to single female relatives alone, is a remarkable variation on the tradition of tour-inspired building.¹¹⁷ In fact, tourists' importations and tour-inspired changes to domestic culture were so numerous and so diverse, that I will be discussing more of them in the following chapters as they become important for understanding the texts in question.

The way the culture of tourism both influenced and reinforced many aspects of lived experience is apparent in more unexpected places. For instance, the first dated children’s board game had the players imagine that they were touring Europe (1759). Such "geographical" games remained popular well into the nineteenth century.¹¹⁸ The versions of this game which used Europe employed the same map plates as were used in popular contemporary tourbooks, something that was often used to sell the games. A 1780 advertisement on Bowles’s British Geographical Amusement, or Game of Geography: In a Most Compleat and Elegant Tour thro England, Wales, and

¹¹⁷ For a short descriptive account of A la Ronde and the Parminters, see Hugh Meller, A la Ronde, Devon. I would like to thank Nicole Pohl for drawing this building to my attention.

¹¹⁸ For a descriptive list of early geographical board games, see F.R.B. Whitehouse, Table Games of Georgian and Victorian Days, 5-19. I would like to thank Jill Shefrin of the Osborne Collection of Early Children’s Books (Toronto Public Library) for drawing my attention to these games and discussing them with me.
the Adjoining Parts of Scotland & Ireland, for instance, tried to entice purchasers to buy a second game by explaining that Carrington Bowles' *European Geographical Amusement, or Game of Geography* was "designed from the Grand Tour of Europe by Dr. Nugent." By openly using the most popular tourbooks and accounts to formulate the games, publishers stressed the overlap between the actual practice of an adult passing through space on a literal tour and a child’s imagined tour, implying that the children will experience a digested version of an adult’s tour.

In the board games a track is incorporated into the tour map, starting usually at a south coast English port and passing through places of interest or importance throughout the Continent before terminating in London. Each of these tourist spots is numbered consecutively. Players moved their "pillars" (markers) according throws of the TE-TO-TUM or dice, at least until these were removed from children’s games around 1790 out of a concern that their use encouraged gambling in later life. Each spot has its own specialized narrative instructions explaining what the player would find, do, or should know about each place. Despite the consecutive numbering which follows the more usual tour routes, the children playing these games created a variety of tour itineraries as each throw of the TE-TO-TUM, and the instructions at each stop, controlled their next destination. The instructions shaped the tour storylines and served to map out the social geography of Europe from an English Protestant perspective, carefully replicating the imperatives of the metropolitan English community. In the 1759 Carrington Bowles game, for example,

He who rests on N° 28 at Hanover shall by order of ye King of Great Britain who is Elector be conducted to N° 54 at Gibraltar to visit his Countrymen ye English who keep Garrison [sic] there.

Since the idea of the game is to get to London (number 77) first, landing on Hanover was both patriotic and immediately advantageous. Landing on Rome, however, was not, though in reality it was the height of tourist ambition:
He who rests at N° 48 at Rome for kissing y° Pope's Toe shall be banished for his folly to N° 4 in the cold island of Iceland and miss three turns.

The "objective" facticity of the map itself—a real map, used by real tourists—makes the content of the game's instructions seem as if they would be objective too, even if whimsically relayed. The cultural gulf between 1759 and the late-twentieth century makes the attempt to reproduce or reinforce dominant values and beliefs in the instructions glaring, but they all had the status common-sense "truths" in 1759. The accuracy of the map lends authority to the ideological content of the games. Some of J.B. Harley's observations are helpful:

Maps are never value-free images....Both in the selectivity of their content and in their signs and styles of representation maps are a way of conceiving, articulating, and structuring the human world which is biased towards, promoted by, and exerts influence upon particular sets of social relations.119

As communicators of communally accepted messages about differentiation and affiliation, these board games reveal how tourism could be used as an aggressive complement to these same messages promulgated in media as varied as children's games, newspapers, and histories. Nothing illustrates how important tourism was considered by contemporaries for conceptualizing Europe and its relation to everyday lived experience than its use to teach elementary social geography and to inculcate national and religious prejudice.

The culture of tourism's encouragement of all forms of border-crossing, and its capacity to engage with what was on the other side, made it attractive to novelists and satirists. In tourism the literal political-geographical borders of nations were (and

---

119 "Maps, Knowledge, and Power," 278. Harley claims that maps are not "inert records of morphological landscapes or passive reflections of the world of objects, but are....refracted images contributing to dialogue in a socially constructed world" (278). I have found this article helpful in understanding the significance of these board games.
often still are) figured as coinciding with cultural, sexual, gender, and political boundaries. Tourism spatialized difference and even abstract concepts.\textsuperscript{120} This could be comparatively innocuous. For instance, sometimes the mapping of the geographical was used as a metaphor for a mapping of the social, thereby underlining the way the two were understood to be complementary. Lord Chesterfield wrote to his grand touring son in 1749:

\begin{quote}
Let us resume our reflections upon men, their characters, their manners, in a word, our reflections upon the world. They may help you to form yourself and to know others....[T]he world can doubtless never be well known by theory; practice is absolutely necessary; but surely, it is of great use to a young man, before he sets out for that country, full of mazes, windings, and turnings, to have at least a general map of it, made by some experienced traveller.\textsuperscript{121}
\end{quote}

Chesterfield, the experienced social traveller, then proceeds to map out a theory of the impact of manners, merriness, joking, flattery, "frivolous curiosity," and seriousness on company (Chesterfield, 140-43). Such advice was meant to help his son Philip in his visits to European courts and fashionable circles, and ultimately to prepare him to be a professional diplomat. At several points Chesterfield makes comments to his son such as "You will always take care to keep the best company in the place where you are, which is the only use of travelling...." (Chesterfield, 83-4). Chesterfield’s aim in sending his son abroad was conventional: to give him the skills and knowledge necessary to navigate the most intricate international and domestic social and political geography.

The shrewd and cynical manipulativeness and superficial politeness Chesterfield advocated that his son learn as a tourist worried many of his

\textsuperscript{120} Rob Shields investigates this phenomenon in his book \textit{Places on the Margin}. As a social geographer, Shields’ work on social spatialization and the mapping of the non-spatial onto space to create distinct "places" was helpful in the initial formulation of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Lord Chesterfield’s Letters}, 140.
contemporaries, though the popularity of the work indicated many thought it instructive or entertaining. Johnson's famous comment that the Letters "teach the morals of a whore, and the manners of a dancing master" summed up the public response of many, whatever their private feelings were.\(^2\) Chesterfield's treatment of the grand tour as a form of social touring had a more common analogue. Touring geographical space was often meshed with a tour of vices and virtues. Sometimes this was accomplished in a space as small as a city. As Ned Ward and Tom Brown tour London, for instance, each part of the city is made to contribute a discrete comment upon human nature, London, or the nation as a whole.\(^3\) More commonly, however, the political, ethnic, and topographical map of Europe was understood as analogous to a cultural, sexual, and social map in which vices or virtues had identifiable geopolitical locations. France, for instance, was the location and source of politeness (good) and foppishness (bad).

One of the most remarkable conceptualizations of geopolitical regions in terms of discrete virtues and vices is Daniel Defoe's "The True-Born Englishman. A Satire" (1700;1716). In it Defoe traces each major vice existing in the English population to its supposed geopolitical place of origin, claiming that it was imported into England with a set of invaders or immigrants. These influxes make England a "mixed" nation, an "amphibious ill-born mob," composed of "That het’rogenous thing, an Englishman," who engages in everything from the rapes and sodomy of the "torrid zone of Italy" to the "Drunk’ness" of Germany and the fickleness of France. The native English purity, embodied by the poem in the figure of Britannia, has so often been "raped" that there is no longer such a thing as a "true-born Englishman," and so, the poem argues, to reject William of Orange solely on the grounds of his foreignness is hypocrisy. In Defoe's satire common human attributes or practices (such as lust or greed) are not figured as natural to humankind and therefore as natural to the English, but as imports

\(^2\) Cited by Boswell, Life of Johnson, 188.

\(^3\) Brown, Amusements Serious and Comical (1700) and Ward, The London Spy (1698-1703).
that have become, in all senses, naturalized. Defoe's originary geopolitical attributions of vices are conventional for the period, but to claim them as naturalized in the English population is not.\textsuperscript{124}

A less explosive but related formulation made human culture and political structures the product of factors such as soil and climate (which is part of the reason questioning informants on such matters was considered so important by contemporaries). Though most famously formulated in Montesquieu's \textit{The Spirit of Laws} (1748), this equation between culture and natural environment was conventional. Oliver Goldsmith's \textit{The Traveller, or a Prospect of Society} (1764) is a good British example of this equation which was, not surprisingly, drafted by Goldsmith on his grand tour in 1755. Goldsmith's poem describes, from a mountain with an extraordinary view, Italy, Switzerland, France, Holland, and, finally, Britain. He lists the essential cultural characteristics of each, as reflected in their forms of government, but as determined by their climate and topography. He does so as if these countries were not contiguous, and their boundaries not mutable by war or by other forms of territorial expansion and contraction. National identities are discrete, essential, and pre-determined—a "natural" growth of the clime. Overlaps of ethnic or language groups between, or any similar differences within, each of the different national communities are rendered invisible. The popularity of such formulations of the "naturalness" of national communities is reflected by the success of Goldsmith's poem among his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{125}

The convention of overlaying a map of the human vices and virtues onto the cultural and political map of Europe had influenced the way tours and tourists were perceived, and, indeed, what they themselves thought they were doing. In Samuel

\textsuperscript{124} For the poem's reception, see Paula Backscheider, \textit{Daniel Defoe: His Life}, 75-6, and the introduction to the work in the \textit{Anthology of Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse}, 1660-1714, 623.

\textsuperscript{125} For the reception of Goldsmith's poem, see Arthur Friedman's introduction to it in \textit{Collected Works of Oliver Goldsmith}, IV:236-238.
Foote's popular play *The Englishman Returned from Paris* (1756), the villain of the piece is Buck, a returned tourist who believes that England should be remade to be like Paris. When he expresses this opinion, the ideal returned grand tourist, Lord John, disagrees with him. He carefully explains that the world in composed of "naturally" determined nations:

> The forms and customs which climate, constitution, and government have given to one kingdom, can never be transplanted with advantage to another, founded on different principles. And thus, though the habits and manners of different countries may be directly opposite, yet, in my humble conception, they may be strictly, because naturally, right. (Foote, I:148)

Lord John, like Goldsmith, makes national communities "natural" growths within which the recognition of either internal differences or similarities with outsiders is suppressed in favour of positing an "essential" and "natural" internal sameness that marks the community as absolutely different from all others. In such a naturalized frame, nations have essentially unalterable political, cultural, and moral boundaries. Therefore, imposing a foreign form of government or culture on one of these units is as "unnatural" as voluntarily adopting a foreign form. (This is why Defoe's vision of a "mix'd" "het'rogenous" population is so provocative.) Buck has become an "unnatural" Englishman by not understanding that he was experiencing a culture in Paris which could not be directly transferred to England because both nations are "naturally" different. The implications of this conceptualization for the aims and assessment of all types of travel (which involved coming into contact with other climates and their cultural "growths"), but especially the bordercrossings of tourists, were quite worrying to contemporaries.

A tour's bordercrossings created individuals who were hybrids—and this process was both feared and welcomed.  

---

126 For an interesting discussion of the range of fears provoked by tourism during the eighteenth century, see Jeremy Black, "Tourism as Cultural Challenge."
"foreign" practices that would weaken national, gender, religious, or class identity and interests haunted the eighteenth-century imagination. This thought was much more worrisome than the possibility that tourists would return improved or capable of promoting improvement, as they were supposed to according to travel theory. Furthermore, the value of the improvements to an individual, or of those he or she proposed to the domestic community, had to meet with that community's approval or at least its recognition that the proposals would indeed improve matters. This situation meant that there was a great deal of anxiety centred around tourism, and that the use of the form in narrative fiction to suggest improvements or as moral warning could undermine itself, and be taken by different reading communities very differently than the author could reasonably have expected. A very clever author such as Sterne, could, as we shall see, capitalize on this instability. Thomas Amory and Sarah Scott, however, felt it necessary to vindicate their tourist-narrators after they had been used to describe and praise radically subversive communal organizations, by writing sequels giving their tourists' life stories. William Erskine's narrative The Travels and Adventures of Mademoiselle de Richelieu has become open to being read entirely against the grain, and may have been to certain communities (e.g. men engaged in the sodomite sub-culture) even in the eighteenth century. Samuel Richardson was to find himself defending his paragon Sir Charles Grandison's negotiation of continental Roman Catholicism in letter after letter.
iv. Novelistic Literature and Women as Tourist Attractions

[Samuel Johnson] delighted no more in music than painting; he was almost as deaf as he was blind: travelling with Dr. Johnson was for these reasons tiresome enough. Mr. Thrale loved prospects, and was mortified that his friend could not enjoy the sight of those different dispositions of wood and water, hill and valley, that travelling through England and France affords a man. But when he wished to point them out to his companion: "Never heed such nonsense," would be the reply: "a blade of grass is always a blade of grass, whether in one country or another: let us if we do talk, talk about something; men and women are my subjects of enquiry; let us see how these differ from those we have left behind."[127]

In this passage Hester Lynch Piozzi enumerates most of the major eighteenth-century tourist attractions—painting, music, (she could have added theatre, architecture, and industry), picturesque prospects, and men and women. Any of these could be discussed for the way they shape or add to literary narratives. One of them, picturesque prospects, has received a great deal of critical attention, especially in relation to Romantic poetry. Yet novelistic narratives, especially between 1740 and 1780 (the period of focus here) were interested primarily in people and their relationships. They are, like Samuel Johnson as a tourist, interested in men and women, and the differences between them.

The way men and women entered into the culture of tourism as attractions was almost as varied as the practice itself. Sightseers ranging from neighbours to foreign tourists flocked to see the "monsters" exhibited by showmen at fairs and in taverns, and to see Marie Antoinette at public functions at Versailles.[128] The wealthier or

[127] Piozzi, Anecdotes of Samuel Johnson, 66. I would like to thank Carrie Hintz for drawing this passage to my attention.

[128] For the exhibition of "monsters" in London, see Richard D. Altick, The Shows of London, 34-49. This was a Europe-wide phenomenon. For Swift's use of the practice, see Aline Mackenzie Taylor, "Sights and Monsters and Gulliver's Voyage to Brobdingnag." Taylor discusses the practice in general, 57-69. For a descriptive
better placed could get private audiences with popular sights, whether monsters or Queens. Of course, tourists tended to watch large groups of people who, for one reason or another, seem odd or noteworthy to them. In Smollett's *Humphry Clinker*, Jery Melford writes to his friend:

[At Bath] a man has daily opportunities of seeing the most remarkable characters of the community. He sees them in their natural attitudes and true colours; descended from their pedestals, and divested of their formal draperies, undisguised by art and affectation — Here we have ministers of state, judges, generals, bishops, projectors, philosophers, wits, poets, players, chemists, fiddlers, and buffoons. (Smollett, 47)

But the focus of this dissertation is not in such diffused tourist interest in people, as interesting as it may be for how tourists negotiated it. It is, nonetheless, important to understand the diversity of tourist interest in human attractions.

A number of the novelistic narratives of this period use women in conjunction with tourism to work through those issues that particularly preoccupied contemporaries. Of course, women were tourist attractions in the non-fictional tourist culture too. This occurred on the levels of casual encounter, planned engagement, and methodical investigation. With the exception of women in convents or royalty, individual women were (for reasons that will become clear in the following chapter) written about less than men in published tour accounts, at least before 1768. Private accounts were another matter. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu wrote to her husband:

I find (contrary to the rest of the world) I did not think my selfe so considerable as I am, for I verily beleive [sic] if one of the Pyramids of Ægypt had travell'd, it could not have been more follow'd...¹²⁹

¹²⁹ To Edward Wortley, 25 September [1739], *Complete Letters*, II:151.
Robert Halsband reads Montagu's initial popularity in Italy as showing how travel "liberated [her] from her unfortunate past of literary notoriety and family feuds." But whatever travel meant to Montagu personally, to most of those who visited her she was, as her comparison of herself to the Egyptian pyramids shows she was aware, a tourist attraction. Her geographical displacement assumed a removal from the domestic web of obligations and significances. This meant that Montagu could be visited safely, without scandal, and with the understanding that the visit did not mean that she was being solicited to enter into her visitor's domestic social circle. Her life had made her a curiosity. In London, she had been either an unapproachable celebrity or an unwise connection; on the continent, she was one of the things one sought and could encounter as part of the tourist experience.

Women were methodically investigated as a group too. Berchtold lists fifty-one questions in the section "Women" meant for the patriotic traveller's use, and draws the reader's attention to the incompleteness of the picture that would result without asking the other questions about women listed under the sections "POPULATION, STATE of the PEASANTRY, POLICE, CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS, EDUCATION, ORIGIN, MANNERS, and CUSTOMS of the NATION, NOBILITY" (Berchtold, I:423-430). While inquiries, whether methodical or casual, were programmatic in tourism, travellers scrutinized women the world over, as Felicity A. Nussbaum and Mary Louise Pratt show. When Lady Mary Wortley Montagu wrote in the Embassy Letters so extensively about the treatment of Turkish women, their lifestyle, and the relative freedom the veil provided them, the account is

130 The Life of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, 185.

131 For two examples of tourist responses to Montagu, see Joseph Spence to his mother (Joseph Spence: Letters from the Grand Tour, 356-363) and Lord Lincoln to Newcastle (reproduced in the same volume, 346-347). Spence wrote: "Lady Mary is one of the most extraordinary shining characters in the world; but she shines like a comet; she is all irregular, and always wandering. She is the most wise, most imprudent; loveliest, disagreeablest; best-natured, cruellest woman in the world" (356).

132 See Nussbaum, Torrid Zones, and Pratt, Imperial Eyes, 155-171.
more remarkable for her observations or the way it is handled and written than in the choice of subject matter. In the novelistic narratives addressed here, women are used to locate and embody an enormous variety of alternative political, familial, sexual, and gender formulations. In locating these alternatives physically in geographic space, they become placed and accessible through the culture of tourism; by embodying them in women, they became examinable using conventional tourist techniques. Furthermore, the ways gender was understood and negotiated opened up avenues to certain forms of enquiry or objectification that would have been otherwise difficult or impossible.

The works addressed here are not primarily "about" the inequality between men and women, nor do they isolate the origins of patriarchy. But they do insist that the world of women is part of the world of men, created in it and by it, but also, more surprisingly, creating it. Gender and issues of gender difference are often used in these texts for how they reflect the social order or can promote its change. In a highly influential work advocating a gender studies approach to history, Joan Wallach Scott writes:

Gender...provides a way to decode meaning and to understand the complex connections among various forms of human interaction. When historians look for ways in which the concept of gender legitimizes and constructs social relationships, they develop insight into the reciprocal nature of gender and society and into the particular and contextually specific ways in which politics constructs gender and gender constructs politics.\(^{133}\)

The novelists addressed in the following chapters used tourists, tourism, and women of the host region to capitalize on what Scott here calls "the reciprocal nature of gender and society." When the tourist experience is shaped by sexual difference, the tendency that both tourism and gender have to order and even test accepted realities becomes intensified. When this linkage was harnessed in novelistic forms, the public could be

\(^{133}\) Gender and the Politics of History, 45-46.
addressed in such a way that established relationships could be confirmed, shaken, or transformed.

There are a several issues and bodies of literature that fall outside the province of this dissertation. Writers such as Frances Burney and Jane Austen wrote novels which hinge on the relationships between tourists at resorts such as Bath or Brighton, and usually rely on the reader to identify with the female protagonists. Of course, most of the interest in such places for a tourist was created by the other tourists and their activities. Resort tourists lived in a perpetually liminal state of being both insiders and outsiders, tourists and objects of tourist interest. The women, such as Burney’s Evelina, are as much tourists as they are objects of tourist attention. Though occasionally addressed, the relationship between people who are equally tourists and objects or tourist interest raises a number of issues which require and deserve delicate negotiation and rigorous investigation in their own right. Though resonant with much of what is dealt with here, the peculiar position of the women in these novels—as both tourists and tourist attractions—deserves a separate treatment.

This dissertation focuses on the period between 1740 and 1780, though it occasionally reaches into other periods to elucidate the trajectory or the implications of certain tour forms or tour scripts. The 1740s saw a flowering of the novel form, thereby providing a convenient starting point, while around 1780 the increasing dominance of Gothic forms and the Romantic literary movement marked a shift in the orientation of the cultural elite towards tourism. Though bound up with the culture of tourism and perhaps even more implicated in tourist discourses and practices than ever before, Gothic and Romantic works usually elide or actively suppress these connections. This trend shaded into the anti-tourism that James Buzard traces in literature after 1800. As with collective tourism and the novel, the connections between the culture of tourism and both Gothic and Romantic literatures require their own studies to do them justice.

The selection of texts here is not meant to delineate a separate canon of works in which the culture of tourism is incorporated into the novel with the greatest brilliance. Nor are the texts selected as points illuminating the evolutionary path of
either tourism or the novel. They are not meant to illustrate every aspect of eighteenth-century tourism, nor are they meant as resting points along a road to a comprehensive literary history of the practice’s use in the novel. Both projects would be impossible given the erroneous, fragmentary, and methodologically problematic nature of most of the histories of tourism which are currently available. The second project would be problematic even if reliable social and cultural histories of tourism existed. Although there are legions of eighteenth-century novels which participate in the culture of tourism either by incorporating it or by shaping subsequent tourism—the cultural forms had a pervasive influence upon one another—developments in the novel and in tourism are not continually and inextricably dependent on one another. In 1983, Percy G. Adams attempted an evolution of travel literature and the novel, but it is little more than a usefully annotated, thematically organized survey that draws the reader’s attention to such banalities as that both forms employ landscape description and narrators. There has not yet been enough preliminary spadework done to warrant even an attempt at an evolutionary study. The works I chose to address in detail employ tourism’s capacity to allow border crossing, to embody challenges to existing conditions, and to envision alternatives.

I use the looser term "novel" interchangeably with the more precise "novelistic narrative." Many of the works addressed here are novels only in the sense of being lengthy narrative prose fictions. Works such as A Sentimental Journey are most accurately fictionalized travel accounts than novels, while a work such as Richardson’s Sir Charles Grandison is arguably an anatomy (in Northrop Frye’s sense). Many of the authors discussed in this dissertation meshed together several distinguishable subforms in their search to find the best way to realize the options they envisioned. Nonetheless, each of these works has strong novelistic elements. For convenience,

---

134 There are, nevertheless, some truly excellent carefully limited histories such as Adrian Tinniswood’s history of country-house visiting or Sara Warneke’s history of the images of tourists before 1700 and the fears they reflected. The histories which attempt to account for all pre-nineteenth century tourism, or even all of it at a particular location, however, must be used with great caution.
then, the looser terms "novel" and its more accurate but more intimidating and ungainly cousin, "novelistic narrative," are both used. When an understanding of other generic conventions is crucial to interpretation (as it is in Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* and Erskine's *The Travels and Adventures of Mademoiselle de Richelieu*), these will be discussed in detail.

I have chosen works which seem to me to pose particularly interesting interpretive problems or which are particularly useful for understanding the appearance and significance of novelistic literature in the culture of tourism and, conversely, the culture of tourism in the novel. I have sought to balance texts in which the alternatives addressed encouraged formal literary experimentation (the works by Sterne, Amory, Erskine) with more formally conventional texts (the works by Wordsworth, Scott, and Richardson). In addition, I address both well-known and almost unknown authors and works, along with writers expected in a critical discussion on tourism and literature (such as Sterne), and those who would not be expected (such as Richardson). Most importantly, however, the texts were chosen for the diversity of their responses to the interrelationships between tourists and the women whom they encountered on tour, and in the cultural preoccupations and anxieties addressed in these encounters.
CHAPTER 2

Unwritten Tourist Attractions (Women) become Written: The Case of Sterne's Maria and Mary of Buttermere.

---'tis a quiet journey of the heart in pursuit of NATURE, and those affections which rise out of her, which make us love each other---
-Yorick (SJ 219)

i. What Sterne's Maria Did

Most treatments of travel in Laurence Sterne discuss it as thematic, or as in some sense didactic, or as commentary on human experience.\(^1\) Though often illuminating, these usually ignore the actual tourist culture Sterne drew upon and depended on his audience to understand. The majority of the discussions of Sterne and contemporary tourism which do exist tend to map the opposition between Sentimental Journey and Tobias Smollett's Travels through France, or, more generally, the form of tourism in which Smollett engaged.\(^2\) Smollett's splenetic francophile

\(^1\) To illustrate the variety of these approaches: for a general reading of Sterne's use of the "metaphor of the journey" (47) arguing that it is important, see Morris Golden, "Sterne's Journeys and Sallies"; for the argument that "both Tristram's and Yorick's journeys mark modes of coming to terms with death" (25), see K.E. Smith, "Ordering Things in France"; for an intriguing argument that SJ uses obstacles such as closed doors, locked portmanteaus, and the Alps to figure the separations between men, see Martin C. Battestin, "A Sentimental Journey and the Syntax of Things"; for the argument that SJ metaphorically enacts and reifies cross-cultural difference and that the sequences of narrative crossing are not limited to the spatial terrain, see Michael Seidel, "Narrative Crossings: Sterne's A Sentimental Journey"; and for a reading of how SJ employs the metaphor of the journey to help Yorick confront his false expectations about women and to integrate the feminine into his life, see Melinda Alliker Rabb, "Engendering Accounts in Sterne's A Sentimental Journey."

\(^2\) Many works on SJ gesture towards this opposition, usually assuming implications of it are self evident. Some of the more considered treatments include: Frédéric Ogée argues that Sterne is more artistic than Smollett because he "raises the notion of journey to use it as the metaphor of artistic creation in which subjectivity
tours a material, historical, and political world; Sterne’s benevolent, uninformed francophile tours a sensational world of shimmering emotional possibility. In an oft-quoted passage, Sterne’s Yorick says of Smelfungus (Smollett):

The learned SMELFUNGUS travelled from Boulogne to Paris---from Paris to Rome---and so on---but he set out with the spleen and jaundice, and every object he pass’d by was discoloured or distorted---He wrote an account of them, but ’twas nothing but the account of his miserable feelings. (SJ 116)

As commentators routinely point out, Sterne is here setting up a flattering contrast between his own tour and its virtues, and Smollett’s. However, this contrast is not as transparent as it seems. In a tour which displays an almost complete absence of factual information in favour of a detailed anatomy of the tourist’s subjective responses, Sterne accuses Smollett of distorting the facts to reflect his subjective state. Yet the accuracy of much of the material Smollett describes—for instance, the measurements of monuments or meteorological information—would be unaffected by the disposition of the tourist.

By ignoring undeniably objective information and laboriously catalogued facts in favour of his tourist’s disposition, Sterne renders irrelevant the century’s most cherished defence of travel. Information and instruction about the nature of the material, historical, agricultural, military, and artistic world—so important to Smollett and intimacy, as opposed to pseudo-scientific objectivity [i.e. in Smollett], are celebrated" ("Channelling Emotions: Travel and Literary Creation in Smollett and Sterne," 42); Louis T. Milic outlines how Sterne "parodies the Travels and makes ironic use of its contents in many places in his book" ("Sterne and Smollett’s ‘Travels,’” 80); and Robert W. Upahaus compellingly argues that Smollett applied the lessons he learned from Sterne’s tour and criticism in the composition of Humphry Clinker ("Sentiment and Spleen"). Though they also attend to this opposition, Vrooman, Stout, and Curley address the influence of the travel literature Sterne could have read, and the biographical influence of Sterne’s actual tours. See, respectively, "The Origin and Development of the Sentimental Journey as a work of Travel Literature and of Sensibility”; Stout’s introduction to his edition; and “Sterne’s A Sentimental Journey and the Tradition of Travel Literature."
in his brilliant tour, and to many of Smollett's contemporaries—are made insignificant. It is not accidental or autobiographical that Sterne's Yorick has gone to France without knowing that his country and France are at war. Sterne had been fully cognisant of this political situation and its ramifications for travel. Not only did a sealed border mean that he had to travel with Britain's new envoy to Turin, George Pitt, as a member of his entourage (something he was able to accomplish because of his celebrity status), but he worried that his movements in the south of France would strike the authorities to be those of a spy. When he ignores the realities that shaped his own experience in describing Yorick's foray into France, Sterne turned his back on two hundred years of travel performance and writing convention which called for detailed research into political and religious difference before engaging in travel, to be followed by a detailed analysis of the political situation in situ. Sterne promotes, instead, the tourist's subjective responses. Further, Sterne implies that Smollett's choice of tour performance form will make it impossible for him to enjoy Heaven because, having "brought up no faculties for this work" (SJ 120), residence there will

---

3 For Sterne and celebrity, see Peter M. Briggs, "Laurence Sterne and Literary Celebrity in 1760." There were marked differences between Sterne's tours and his characters'. See Arthur H. Cash, Laurence Sterne: The Later Years, 108-249, or K.E. Smith's summary in "Ordering Things in France," 15-16. Cash printed the letters which show how Sterne entered France in an April 1965 issue of the TLS. Sterne's comment about the risk he ran of being taken up as a spy is in a letter to John Mill, November 24, 1763 (Letters, 205).

4 Once again, however, Sterne was a more conventional traveller than his characters are. In a letter to Lord Fauconberg from Paris dated April 10, 1762, Sterne writes: "I could never have been in France at so critical a period, as this, when two of the greatest Concerns that ever affected the Interest of this kingdome are upon the Anvil together—the Affair of the Jesuists [sic]—& the War—for, much of this kingdoms [sic] future glory & welfare seems to be depending upon the<em>se</em> [sic] two great points—the first takes up the attention of the french, much more than the last—& well it may—for in this city alone, the Society have a rent of 95,000 pounds a year—what must their revenues be, from the whole Kingdome?—It will end, I trow, like our Henry y' 8th's, in a gen' Resumption—" (Letters, 160). He then proceeds to suggest a good book on the Jesuits to his Lordship—in other words, Sterne (unlike Tristram and Yorick) had done his travel research carefully and traditionally.
be penance to him. The proper attitude in tourism is given the same ameliorative function as the proper attitude in prayer. Tourism is made important as an opportunity for what we might call personal growth, not as something that will aid or inform the larger community. The success of Sterne's rejection of the traditional *Ars Apodemia* made *Sentimental Journey* pivotal both in the history of tour writing and in the history of tourism as a performance form. But in rejecting Smollett's chosen performance form to privilege the tourist's subjective experience, Sterne needed to respond to a number of tour practises that were elided in works such as Smollett's. I want to discuss a few of these other practices, particularly concentrating on Sterne's twist on sex tourism and the publicly acceptable tourist attraction it inaugurated.

Melinda Alliker Rabb has rightly asserted that "People form [Yorick's] real itinerary. Places, in country or town, matter only as backdrops for human encounters." More recently, Jacques Berthoud has argued for the importance of beggars to Yorick's growth as a traveller. Yet Sterne's stated human quarry is not people in general, though he shows the usual (if unusually expressed and understood) contemporary British interest in monks, beggars, military men, peasants, and the Paris elite. When Sterne's Shakespeare-loving French Count teases Yorick that he had "come to spy the nakedness of...our women," instead of "the nakedness of the land," Yorick responds that, in place of the women's naked bodies, he "could wish...to spy the nakedness of [women's] hearts, and...find out what is good in them, to fashion my own by---and therefore I am come" (*SJ* 217-218). In other words, Yorick is proposing

---

5 Curley argues that Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*, "in resuscitating older conventions of travel literature, managed to shift its locus of inquiry to the ever new revelations of personal feeling and spiritual meaning" ("Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* and the Tradition of Travel Literature," 215). I would argue, instead, that he turns his back on the literary traditions and transvalues and rewrites previously attacked travel practice as a Christian endeavour.

6 "Engendering Accounts," 531.

7 See "The Beggar in *A Sentimental Journey*," 37-48. For a less celebratory reading of Yorick's charity, see Robert Markley, "Sentimentality as Performance."
an entirely new way of touring. He will ignore everything of political and artistic importance ("the Palais royal...the Luxembourg...the Façade of the Louvre...pictures, statues, and churches" [SJ 218]) in favour of examining French women: "I conceive every fair being as a temple, and would rather enter in, and see the original drawings and loose sketches hung up in it, than the transfiguration of Raphael itself" (SJ 218-219). Further, as his "shock" at the Count's "indecent insinuation" that he is a sex tourist implies, he will tour women without succumbing to the usual male tourist ploy of having sex with them (SJ 217).

Nevertheless women, and what Yorick believes they will teach him, are clearly the object of his tour. Sterne had a problem. In a man's "journey of the heart" (SJ 219) where he pays particular attention to women in their "different disguises of customs, climates, and religion" (SJ 218), how does one negotiate the widely held understanding that touring the continent was also, for most men, touring everything that was sexually available? In his contemporaries' intentionally dry and insistently impersonal published tour accounts, their own contacts with sexually available women were left out. But if one is to do a tour in which the heart is to be educated, not the mind, how could one do it politely enough to be publishable for a mainstream market? Sterne's solution recast how the women of host regions were responded to by male tourists.

Sterne's tour writing contains both publishable and publicly regretted earlier conventions and what they were transformed into in response to his writing. 

Sentimental Journey is a pivot point in both the history of literature and of tourism. Its status as such is particularly evident in the Maria episodes and their influence.

---

8 This was especially true, of course, for men who liked men (see Chapter 3). It was also true in a different way for women, who occasionally eloped to the continent to have affairs, or went there discreetly for the same purpose. (Mary Godwin, who eloped to the continent in 1814 with the already married Percy Bysshe Shelley, is a late example of the first; Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, whose assignation with Francesco Algarotti in Venice took her to the continent in 1739 and began an exile which only ended in 1762, is an example of the second.) All such activity was usually done under cover of tourism.
Sterne satirizes his contemporaries’ misuse of people as tourist attractions in Tristram’s spontaneous encounter with Maria. When Yorick is shown intentionally seeking Maria out to replicate Tristram’s experience, the process by which a woman became a fixed tourist site is mapped in miniature and rendered innocent by Sterne’s rescripting of a male tourist’s expected sexual responsiveness to a beautiful Frenchwoman. The immense popularity of the Maria episodes transformed the nature and the rules of a conventional practice. Sterne’s Maria episodes made the use of individual women as tourist attractions an innocent and sentimental novelty, and moreover set the performance codes, necessary roles, themes, and script for such encounters. The publicly prohibited forms of tourism still existed, of course, but Sterne offered a publicly acceptable alternative. The episodes provided a model for publicly acceptable erotic, sexually charged male tourist contact with female tourist attractions that nevertheless maintained the physical chastity of both. There has been much discussion of Sterne’s use in Tristram Shandy of sexual double entendre and sexuality itself.\(^9\) For instance, Jacques Berthoud argues that Tristram Shandy acts out sexual prohibitions through the repression of sexual meaning in the double entendre.\(^10\) Along similar lines John Mullan has recently argued that

In A Sentimental Journey Sterne...conflates the suggestive and the sentimental. The Sentimental Journey goes out of its way to find scenes of erotic encounter, and thus seems to risk the production of outrage. It does this by interposing a body [Yorick’s]...whose sentimental whims sanction its erotic encounters.\(^11\)

Here I want to investigate how and why the conflation of the suggestive and the

\(^9\) This line of discussion began forty years ago with A.R. Towers’ “Sterne’s Cock and Bull Story,” which was immediately followed by Robert Alter’s "Tristram Shandy and the Game of Love," and Frank Brady’s "Tristram Shandy: Sexuality, Morality, and Sensibility," and has received new life in the more recent debate about whether Sterne is misogynist. Most of this work focuses almost exclusively on Tristram Shandy.

\(^10\) “Shandeism and Sexuality.”

\(^11\) Sentiment and Sociability, 189.
sentimental happened in a tour narrative, and how such management of sexual expressiveness plays off contemporary tour traditions and created new ones. In *Tristram Shandy*, volume IX, Tristram is pleasingly startled by "the sweetest notes I ever heard" out of the heartwarming reminiscences of Toby Shandy's amours, which, throughout the continental tour he has been on since volume VII, "had the same effect upon me as if they had been my own" (TS II:781). The tune he hears is the evening service to the virgin, played on a pipe by a beautiful young woman with a goat. His postilion tells him that the woman, Maria, had gone mad after having her marriage barns forbidden. Tristram sits by her, asks her if he resembles her goat, considers asking her to tell her own story, but is too rushed to do so, and hears her play the tune again while he "with broken and irregular steps walk'd softly to my chaise." The episode ends abruptly with a quick evaluation of the Inn at Moulins as "excellent" (TS II:874).

Though contemporaries admired this episode, it did not capture the public imagination until after Maria reappeared in *Sentimental Journey*. The first illustration of Maria in *Tristram Shandy* came out in 1785, while the first painted *Tristram Shandy* Maria appeared in 1817—respectively eighteen and fifty years after her literary debut. In *Sentimental Journey*, Yorick seeks Maria out because:

The story [Tristram Shandy] had told of that disorder'd maid affect'd me not a little in the reading; but when I got within the neighbourhood where she lived, it returned so strong into my mind, that I could not resist an impulse which prompted me to go half a league out of the road to...enquire after her. (SJ 269)

Maria is still mad, but her tragedy has deepened—her father has died and the goat has

---

12 Robert Dighton, "Tristram Shandy discovering Maria with her little Goat beside her" (1785); C. Bestland, *Maria and her goat* (1815). Catherine M. Gordon discusses the shift from *Sentimental Journey* to *Tristram Shandy* Marias, *British Paintings*, 87-88. For a detailed discussion of both the paintings and the illustrations of Sterne's novels, see T.C. Duncan Eaves, "Graphic Illustration of the Principal English Novels of the Eighteenth Century," 211-265, and his descriptive catalogue, 576-672.
run away. Yorick sits by her and Sylvio, the dog she has "tied by a string to her girdle" "in lieu" of her "faithless" goat (SJ 271). Yorick and she cry together, and Yorick alternately wipes her tears and his with his handkerchief. Yorick feels so emotional that he becomes convinced he has a soul. She shows him Tristram's handkerchief (her goat had stolen it), talks of her own madness-induced European rambles. He makes an ambiguously virtuous offer of "shelter," inviting her to live with him. Luckily for Yorick's chastity, the offer depends on her already being an English resident (SJ 273). She washes Yorick's tear-steeped handkerchief, dries it on her bosom ("'twill do me good," Maria says [SJ 273]). Finally, they walk back to town together, Maria's arm in Yorick's. As she parts from him, Yorick assesses her:

Maria, tho' not tall, was nevertheless of the first order of fine forms--affliction had touch'd her looks with something that was scarce earthly--still she was feminine--and so much was there about her of all that the heart wishes, or the eye looks for in woman, that could the traces be ever worn out of her brain, and those of Eliza's out of mine, she should not only eat of my bread and drink of my own cup, but Maria should lay in my bosom, and be unto me as a daughter. (SJ 275)

In this passage, any suspicions a reader might have entertained about the source of Yorick's benevolence are strengthened. Maria already has shelter (she lives with her mother) and therefore would not need to sleep with him (even metaphorically), while the feasibility of cohabitation as father and daughter should not rely on both of them overcoming previous romantic attachments. Yet the passage's suggestiveness is reined in by invoking the sentimental ties of a familial relationship.

The Sentimental Journey Maria caught the contemporary imagination. Her story was repeatedly continued--or rather ended, since the continuations almost invariably killed her. 13 (This obsession with Maria's death will be addressed later.)

13 An example of the first is Sterne's Maria (c. 1800) and of the second, the song "Maria's Urn" (c. 1785-1801), or the poem "The Death of Sterne's Maria," in A Collection of Poems by A Young Lady (1792), 98-105.
Musicians responded with songs and even an opera--in 1799, William Dunlap's *Sterne's Maria, or The Vintage* was produced in New York, but is, alas, now lost.\(^{14}\) Moreover, a number of women identified with Maria closely enough to be painted as her, while a Louise von Ziegler of Darmstadt assumed her character, adopting, instead of a goat or a little dog, a lamb as her companion.\(^{15}\) The *Sentimental Journey* Maria episode was the most commonly excerpted and illustrated in Sterne.\(^{16}\) For instance, of the thirty-three designs for illustrations ornamenting editions before 1810, eleven were of Maria, who thereby far outstripped the next favourite, the monk (four treatments).\(^{17}\) The public was inundated with the image of Maria sitting under a poplar in an attitude of melancholy, wearing a white dress, a pipe hanging from the pale green ribbon and a little dog at her feet or in her arms--there was even a Wedgwood Maria. Angelica Kauffman's rendition of Maria was so popular that, not only did prints of it circulate all over Europe, but, "In the elegant manufactures of London, Birmingham, etc. it assumed an incalculable variety of forms and dimensions, and it was transferred to a variety of articles of all sorts and sizes, from a watch-case

\(^{14}\) For a bibliography of many of these songs, see J.C.T. Oates, "Maria and the Bell." For an account of Dunlap's opera, see Lodwick Hartley, "Laurence Sterne and the Eighteenth-Century Stage," 151-155.

\(^{15}\) For a catalogue of paintings of subjects drawn from Sterne's novels, including many of actual women as Maria, see Gordon, *British Painting*, 263-274. The earliest one Gordon has located is George Carter's *Miss Carter as Maria*, which was engraved by J.R. Smith, and published and exhibited at the Society of Artists of Great Britain in 1774 (Gordon, 264). For Louise von Ziegler, see J.C.T. Oates, *Shandyism*, 23.

\(^{16}\) For which sections were excerpted, see Robert D. Mayo, *The English Novel in the Magazines*, 337 (the other popular excerpt from *SL* was "La Fleur and the Dead Ass"). The "Maria" episode was also reprinted in the overwhelmingly popular *Beauties of Sterne* (1782) and was offered as a moral rhetorical model by both Reverend William Enfield in *The Speaker* (1774) and Vicesimus Knox in his *Elegant Extracts* (1783), neither of whom thought any other novel worthy of notice.

\(^{17}\) Eaves, "Graphic Illustration of the Principal English Novels of the Eighteenth Century," 239.
to a tea-waiter."18 Though other Sentimental Journey episodes were excerpted, painted and illustrated, or embodied,19 no episode in either novel had the impact of the Maria episode of Sentimental Journey or employed and rewrote as many different recognizable tourist conventions. Furthermore, the Maria episodes produced a need for certain types of female tourist attractions, and set a script for a stylized and publishable encounter between a male tourist and these attractions.

But pointing to the subsequent popularity of the Sentimental Journey Maria does not tell us anything about the Maria episodes themselves, or explain why Sterne chose to reintroduce her. Similarly, noting that the Maria episode in Sentimental Journey was responsible for producing a large part of what J.C.T. Oates called the "lunatic fringe of Sterneana"20 fails to explain why and how the episode was adopted by the culture at large or within the culture of tourism. Despite serious considerations of the reasons Sterne chose to write Sentimental Journey in the character of Yorick (who was also introduced in Tristram Shandy), commentators have accounted for Maria's reappearance by positing that in Tristram Shandy she is an "Advertisement" for the volume of travels Sterne had in mind.21 Even if this accounted for her appearance in Tristram Shandy, it does not account for her amplified reappearance in Sentimental Journey. Furthermore, even if all travel and mention of travel in volumes VII through IX of Tristram Shandy is advertisement for Sentimental Journey, or even

---


19 For instance, young men in Germany exchanged horn snuff-boxes in imitation of Yorick and the Monk (see Oates, Shandyism, 23).

20 Oates, Shandyism, 23.

21 Stout's "Introduction" to ST; Putney, "Evolution," 364-367. Though scholars know the two works are interconnected, the only lengthy attempt to relate their uses of tourism is Vrooman's dissertation, "The Origin and Development of the Sentimental Journey." Vrooman reads the works biographically, making little or no distinction between Sterne and his personae. He therefore looks for Sterne's experience and changing opinions in Tristram's and Yorick's accounts.
if one were to conceptualize these volumes as an extended warm-up or an eighteenth-century variation on a market test, it is a mistake to leave the matter there.

The sentimental mode of touring prescribed a stylized interaction with those identifiably outside the tourist’s usual social milieu. After the mode dropped from high fashion at the end of the eighteenth century, William Combe ridiculed this practice:

The tour-writer must have strong feelings. This is a *sine qua non*. It does not signify what they are employed upon—whether a dead jack-ass, a monk, a nun, a grey-bearded peasant, or a lame soldier. Fine feelings can operate upon any thing, and, in all cases, the more contemptible and unaffecting the subject is, the better.  

By beginning this list of tour objects with what is either the corpse of a brute or of an annoying, idiotic person, the undeniably human objects that follow are degraded by association. The best sentimental tour object, Combe implies, is human, and, since he or she can be described as being "contemptible and unaffecting," must be as far removed—socially, politically, religiously, and economically—as possible from the tourist with the "fine feelings." As Combe’s comment illustrates, most of those whom Sterne’s Yorick encounters—dead asses, monks, peasants, beggars, lame soldiers (and, one could add, the mad, labour- and merchant-class women, and the deformed)—were transformed by his *Sentimental Journey* into acceptable occasions for publishable and emotional tourist response. The roots of the poverty producing the beggars, the Christian doctrine resulting in monasticism, or the lifestyle of peasants, expected in earlier published tour accounts, become irrelevant.

More importantly, however, the very fact that Combe effortlessly divides the world between the spectating tourist and those who are no more than "contemptible" spectacles is significant. The division itself marks the latter as cynosures of aspects of a social cosmology; Combe’s ease in making it shows the work sentimental tourism

22 "Rules for Tour Writing," 123.
did in mapping out cultural and social norms on the flat but ambiguous surface of the
toured. Tourism modifies and regenerates systems of knowledge to fit them to a
changing world. For this reason, it is both a conservative and a subversive activity.
Between the cultural impact of imperial expansion and major industrial, agricultural,
and political revolutions, there have been few more disturbed worlds than that of
Western Europeans in the second half of the eighteenth century. For Europeans,
tourism was one of the primary media through which to understand and adjust to
change without necessarily challenging old or new sources, forms, or holders of
power. Through it, an identity can emerge, or be modified and re-asserted, or
(sometimes) attacked.

In the Maria episodes, Sterne transforms several popular tour traditions. One
of the conventional justifications for tourism was the opportunity it presented to
network with foreign intellectuals, writers, artists, courtiers, nobility, and other human
curiosties or luminaries. Sterne himself, travelling in a more traditional manner than
his characters did, made sure he met and engaged with the French aristocracy and men
of the stature of Denis Diderot and the Baron D'Holbach. Since earlier only the
most important members of society had the money and leisure to tour or the
connections to acquire appropriate letters, such touring enabled the famous, the well-
born, and the talented to connect with their foreign counterparts. By the eighteenth
century the expanding touring population could be characterized as influential and
powerful as a group, but not generally as individuals. The average tourist could not
hope to meet and converse with members of the foreign elite simply because he or she

---

23 Examples of peoples with more disturbed worlds in this period would, of
course, include the indigenous populations of the lands being colonized, whose
cultures were sometimes shattered by European contact.

24 Martin C. Battestin examines some of the ways Sterne's contact with the
Philosophes may have shaped A Sentimental Journey's treatment of body and soul.
See "Sterne among the Philosophes." However, though the work might have been a
response to his travels, for instance in the issues Sterne chooses to address, it is not a
direct reflection of them.
was a tourist, though many tried. By the pressure of sheer numbers, the English tourist droves who attempted to see Voltaire at Ferney (most only saw his house) were exploding a tradition dating back to the sixteenth century, and transforming it into something resembling the almost adversarial dynamics we now see operating around celebrities.25 With this development, tourist attention shifted to those who depended on tourists for their livelihood or who did not have the social leverage to prevent the attention (such as the inmates of prisons and madhouses).

Sterne's Tristram, as an amusingly bad tourist, describes meeting a nobody. Encountering a madwoman in a tour was something one did in London's Bedlam, rather than waste precious moments abroad doing it. Furthermore, Maria's madness has nothing particularly "French" about it, and therefore does not reflect on France; she had done nothing to contribute to the arts, letters, science, or industry of her country; she has no social position. It is in this context that the sentence which ends the Tristram Shandy sequence--the one which contemporaries found so inappropriate--must be understood. The sequence ends with Tristram's jarring ejaculation: "-----What an excellent inn at Moulines!" (TS II:784).26 The Monthly Review's response to the passage is typical:

What a pretty, whimsical, affecting kind of episode has he introduced, in his chapter entitled INVOCATION! ...But our Readers shall have the chapter entire, except the abrupt transition in the two last lines, which, in our opinion, serve but to spoil all, by an ill-tim'd stroke of levity; like a ludicrous epilogue, or ridiculous farce, unnaturally tagged at the end of a deep tragedy, only as it were, to efface every elevated, generous, or tender sentiment that might before

25 Though under pressure, the tradition did continue until the end of the century. For a lively example, see James Boswell's private account of his tour of Germany and Switzerland, during which he met Rousseau and Voltaire.

have been excited by the nobler part of the evening's entertainment.  

In Tristram's tour, Sterne had set out by his own account to write a "a laughing good temper'd Satyr against Travelling (as puppies travel)."

But for contemporaries, the fact that this tourist had broken the rules of the Ars Apodemica by describing a nobody and nobody's story in such detail was overcome by the readers' emotional response to the pathos (the "deep tragedy") of Maria's situation. Sterne's readers reacted with their hearts and not their minds, and in doing so contributed to reformulating the rules by which tourists behaved. The offending sentence's trivialization of Tristram's response to Maria makes perfect sense in the satiric mode because it signals the author's awareness of the trivial nature of Tristram's encounter, as well as the author's assumption that the reader will understand the whole as equally trivial. Sterne's initial readers, however, refused to see Maria as trivial. Sterne, as many scholars have remarked (often with horror) was sensitive to his readers' responses, and learned from them. Yorick, unlike Tristram, engages with Maria in earnest—if there is satire and parody in the Sentimental Journey sequence, it is not of Yorick's identification of Maria as a worthy tourist attraction.

There were two other types of human tourist attractions that even more closely underwrite the Maria episodes than the convention of visiting luminaries does. One is the surprisingly popular domestic activity of touring madhouses, especially Bethlehem Hospital (Bedlam). Sterne could rely on his audience's assumption that a madwoman was a perfectly acceptable tourist attraction, though not one that it was necessary to

27 [Ralph Griffiths], Vol. 36 (1767), 98-99. Alan B. Howes writes that most reviews of volume IX were perfunctory in Yorick and the Critics, 20-21.

28 Sterne to Robert Foley, November 11, 1764 (Letters, 231).

29 John Mullan makes a similar argument. He says that the offending sentence "is the device by which [Sterne's] text parenthesizes the sentimental encounter, returning us to the 'mirth' and frivolity of Tristram's encounters" (Sentiment and Sociability, 154). I break with Mullan in that I suspect that Sterne thought that his readers would find Maria frivolous, and wanted to signal his agreement with them. He misjudged.
travel outside Great Britain to see. A common estimate puts the number of visitors to Bedlam at 96,000 per year. As Michael DePorte aptly writes, if with twentieth-century distaste for the practice, Bethlehem "was commonly regarded less as a hospital than as a kind of zoo, with a fine, permanent exhibition of human curiosities." Across the century, representations of Bedlam routinely included tourists. An illustration to a 1710 edition of Jonathan Swift's "Digression on Madness" in A Tale of a Tub, for instance, depicts featureless tourists peeping through the barred windows. The famous eighth plate of Hogarth's A Rake's Progress (1735;1763) shows amused and titillated tourists in the persons of two fashionable, brightly lit women, who are placed almost in the centre of the scene, in a diagonal line from the emotionally fraught grouping of Rakewell and the woman he once seduced. In Richard Newton's 1794 A Visit to Bedlam, the tourists and the mad would be interchangeable but for a crowned inmate, and the tourists are presented as the centre of interest.

Semi-fictional accounts, like the illustrations, make the sightseers themselves one of the sights at Bedlam. They are used to make the point that Bedlam and the world are not as separate as one might think. Ned Ward’s The London Spy (1698-1703), Tom Brown’s Amusements Serious and Comical (1700;1760), and Samuel Richardson’s account in the Familiar Letters (1741) wedded descriptions of sane tourists and mad inmates. The mad who are described are chosen for the lesson

---

30 This improbable figure originates in Robert Rentoul Reed, Jr.’s Bedlam on the Jacobean Stage (25-26), and is based on a late eighteenth-century source stating that Bethlehem Hospital made £400 per year from sightseers. Admission was a penny per sightseer. Reed gives a handy short history of Bethlehem Hospital and its status as a sightseeing spot, 13-22. Altick gives an even shorter account of it as a tourist attraction in The Shows of London, 44-45. Unfortunately no one has investigated the practice itself or (except incidently) its literary or pictorial representations. Though the figure of 96,000 visitors seems unlikely, it is certain that Bedlam was one of the most popular of the London attractions.

31 Nightmares and Hobbyhorses, 3.

32 These are reproduced in Sander L. Gilman, Seeing the Insane, 52;55;57.
implicit in their condition—for instance, both Ward and Brown display a man mad with an unpopular political opinion. Similarly, Hogarth’s Rakewell has a grandfather in the madman in Ward’s Bedlam who explains to the narrator that he is "under this confinement for the noble sins of drinking and whoring, and if thou hast not a care it will bring thee into the same condition" (Ward, 56). As Tom Brown writes of Bedlam, it is "A sad representation of the greater chimerical world! Only in this there’s no whoring, cheating, or fleecing, unless after the Platonic mode, in thought, for want of action" (Brown, 26).

Brown proceeds, however, to show that sightseers do not labour under the restraint of the "Platonic mode" experienced by the mad. All three accounts tax the sightseers with sexual impropriety and cruelty. Richardson’s young lady writes more to her aunt in the country about the sightseers than about the mad, and reports with shock that

Instead of the concern I think unavoidable at such a sight, a sort of mirth appeared on [the sightseers’] countenances; and the distemper’d fancies of the miserable patients most unaccountably provoked mirth, and loud laughter, in the unthinking auditors; and the many hideous roarings, and wild motions of others, seemed equally entertaining to them. Nay, so shamefully inhuman were some, among whom...were several of my own sex, as to endeavour to provoke the patients into rage to make them sport. (Richardson, 202)

She goes on to write "I have been told, this dreadful place is often used for the resort of lewd persons to meet and make assignments: But that I cannot credit; since the heart must be abandon’d indeed, that could be vicious amidst so many examples of misery...." (Richardson, 202). Ward, after a colourful account of the "abundance of intriguing" to be observed in the spectators, sums up his description of Bedlam with "All that I can say of it is this: 'Tis an almshouse for madmen, a showing-room for whores, a sure market for lechers, and a dry walk for loiterers" (Ward 57;58). The juxtaposition is significant. Madmen, whores, lechers, and loiterers are given both social and grammatical equality.

Max Byrd has written that the madhouse, the whorehouse, and the convent
"served the Age of Reason as symbolic prisons, where irrational energy was locked away from normal society."

But as the accounts of Brown, Richardson, and Ward make clear, normal society entered the madhouse as tourists who expected to interact with the inmates ("normal society" also, incidently, entered the prison, the whorehouse, and the convent). The link between madhouses, prostitution, lechery, and the wider world was much more close and complicated than a simple figuration of whorehouses and madhouses as symbolic prisons.

The passions of the mad (whether political, sexual, or religious) have been neutralized in being unleavened by reason, and by the restraint of manacles and bars. The passions of the mad are, in Brown's terminology, forcibly confined to the "platonic mode." The spectators, however, have the power to act on those same passions, and were thought to act on the worst of them, especially on "lewdness."

The connection between tourism as practised by men and "lewdness," especially with prostitutes, was a close one, and it is the other tour tradition that Sterne is transforming in the Maria episodes. In tracing this connection, histories of prostitution are only tangentially helpful.

Equally unhelpful are the contemporary stereotyped literary descriptions of prostitutes. They usually isolate the prostitute, her condition, and her story without addressing the practice which defines her, or the

---

33 "The Madhouse, the Whorehouse and the Convent," 275.

34 See Chapter 3 for a discussion of tourism and convents.

35 One of the few histories of prostitution which draws the connection between tourism and prostitution is Fernando Henriques, Prostitution and Society (Vol II), esp. the chapters "The Century of the Courtesan" (74-115) and "London in the Eighteenth Century" (143-191). Antoni Maczak gives several instances of tourists' entanglements with prostitutes in Travel in Early Modern Europe, 244-253. For a brief survey of the literature responding to prostitution, see Vern L. Bullough, "Prostitution and Reform," esp. 62-67. For an account of how the prostitute was used to figure urban human relationships, see John B. Radner, "Harlot's Curse," 59-64.

36 For an excellent wide-ranging discussion of the treatment of prostitutes and prostitution in the period's literature, see Ian Bell, Literature and Crime in Augustan England, 92-46.
overarching social, economic, and political structure that made her a functional necessity. After all, in this period the position of the virtuous woman necessitated the existence of the whore, and the position of the good wife presupposed the kept woman. A very few commentators were perfectly clear about these relationships. Bernard Mandeville, for instance, in *Fable of the Bees* (1723) wrote:

> Who would imagine, that Virtuous Women, unknowingly should be instrumental in promoting the Advantage of Prostitutes? Or (what still seems the greater Paradox) that Incontinence should be made serviceable to the Preservation of Chastity.... [T]here is a Necessity of sacrificing one part of Womankind to preserve the other, and prevent a Filthiness of a more heinous Nature. From whence I think I may justly conclude (what was the seeming Paradox I went about to prove) that Chastity may be supported by Incontinence, and the best of Virtues want the Assistance of the worst of Vices.38

As Ian Bell has argued, Mandeville here confronts contemporary hypocrisies, extrapolating them to their logical conclusion. The public responded with hostility to Mandeville’s postulation of structural links between private vice and public virtue. Most actively denied any necessary link between the categories of the virtuous woman and the whore, its importance to the contemporary social structure, and the implications of this importance. Since the categories themselves divided the physically like into what were insisted upon as mutually exclusive groups, the

---

37 Radner ("Harlot’s Curse") addresses the figurative function of prostitutes in the literature of the period. He does not address the function of the male narrator of the works he examines, nor how or why the male clientele is rendered invisible in most of the literary descriptions of prostitutes where the narrator is male. (Fictional prostitute-narrators, such as Moll Flanders, Roxana, or Fanny Hill, describe their clients in sometimes graphic detail.) The double standard was reflected legally. The transaction between a prostitute and her client was a prohibited commerce in which only the woman was considered punishable.

38 "Remark H," 126-130. Mandeville extended on this idea in *A Modest Defence of the Public Stews* (1726). For a good discussion of both works, see Bell, *Literature and Crime in Augustan England*, 130-132.
potential for confusion and the possibility of overlap was persistently and anxiously rehearsed in all media. Richardson’s novel Clarissa, of course, is probably the period’s most powerful and disturbing re-enactment of the division between whore and virgin, kept mistress and wife. It also illustrates how hard the culture had to work to maintain its important, anxiety-ridden, and ultimately self-contradictory categories.

By enclosing an angelic woman in a brothel, the novel literalized the connections between whore and good woman while insisting on their incommensurability. The whore and the good woman were the two sides of the same coin—and therefore absolutely inseparable. The inseparability of the two sides of woman was used like coins are used—to reinforce and maintain the societal position of the possessor.

Of course, most major cities had printed catalogues of prostitutes such as London’s List of the Sporting Ladies (c. 1770) or Harris’s List of Covent Garden Ladies; or, Man of pleasure’s kalendar, for the year, 1788.... Though meant to guide men without intimate knowledge of who was working—probably men who were London outsiders—only the women’s prices hint at the social stations of their clientele. Sexual tourism was an unofficially prohibited topic for men writing in polite and public forums except when they excoriated it, and then it is never figured as something in which the writer himself would participate in the usual manner.

When Alexander Pope wrote in The Dunciad about a Grand Tourist that

...he sauntered Europe round,
And gathered every vice on Christian ground...
The stews and palace equally explored,
Intrigued with glory, and with spirit whored

39 Pamela also rehearses the division. But although the plot hinges on Pamela’s insistence on remaining a "good" woman, the problematic nature of the division is not literalized as it is in Clarissa.

40 I refer here to narrators who are closely identified with the writer himself, or who are presented as virtuous. Where the author maintains a gulf between himself and his narrator, as, for instance, Richardson does with Lovelace, the case is different.

41 Lines 311-316, "Book the Fourth," 534.
readers were not meant to believe that either Pope or Pope’s narrator kept his tourist company in his investigation of the stews.

A male narrator could, however, engage in virtuous attempts to reform fallen women, or perhaps to relieve a penitent whore in her last moments of sin-induced illness before she dies, an otherwise friendless pauper. Warning tales aimed at men, such as Richardson’s in Sir Charles Grandison, are equally opaque. In that novel, a Mr. Lorimer, the demonic double for Grandison the good tourist, reaches the apogee of his career of immorality when, under the direct influence of a Venetian courtesan, he tries to arrange the murder of his governor, the good Dr. Bartlett. But this tale does not reveal how prostitution and sex in general functioned in relation to tourism, nor how the average male tourist responded to a courtesan (presumably most did not become murderous monsters) nor how he thought of her and other sexually available women in relation to the publishable aspects of his tour. Similarly, personal accounts of touring men engaging with aristocrats, gentlewomen, actresses, opera singers, dancers, shop keepers, maids, prostitutes, and courtesans could indicate more the exception than a widespread practice. As James Boswell’s private journal of his attempts on Italian gentlewomen and aristocrats makes clear, their easiness was perhaps more reputed than experienced.

These two narratives of the encounter between a male narrator and a prostitute are so common and insistent throughout the century that one is forced to wonder about their function in the broader culture. In explicitly fictional accounts, male narrators had more freedom, but still, Henry Mackenzie’s Harley helps reform one prostitute, and Tobias Smollett’s Roderick Random another (of these two narrators, Roderick is the more morally culpable). Such encounters had a sub-genre of their own, both in periodical literature and in poetry. See Radner, "Harlot’s Curse," for a discussion of some of these.

Boswell, as usual eager for sexual liaisons, approached three Italian countesses and the ex-mistress of a friend in succession without success. When he did succeed with Girolama Piccolomini, he discovered that she was less enamoured than he was with the idea of a fleeting affair. See Boswell on the Grand Tour: Italy, Corsica, and France, 1765-1766.
the courtesans in Renaissance Venice and elsewhere, particularly of the ones who were also writers. But, understandably, these studies concentrate on what the courtesans' lives were like and on the poetry they wrote, not on how the masculine culture around them supported touring men's negotiation of a publicly prohibited but privately encouraged commerce with them.

Just how entwined sexual experience and tourism were for men can be illustrated by means of two texts that are, perhaps unsurprisingly, both written by women. Prostitutes plied their trade at public shows, feasts, executions, churches, plays, parks—anywhere there was a recreational crowd. But if there were prostitutes, there were clients whose sightseeing agenda included them, even if this practice is usually invisible in the records we have. Frances Burney's Evelina, who is brought to Marylebone-Gardens and Vauxhall to sightsee by her socially insensitive and ill-bred relatives, is accosted as a prostitute in both places. The unwelcome sexual role which is thrust upon her at these places profoundly threatens her already tottering social identity. With the same person and mind she had when under the protection of Lady Howard or the Mirvans, and feeling no difference herself, she is nevertheless instantly identified as sexually available by the men she meets. At Marylebone, her cousins irresponsibly lead her into the dark walks, where men assume her sexual availability, and, thinking to engage her, will not let her pass. When she protests, one compliments her, instead of letting her go, with having "the voice of the prettiest little actress I have seen this age," thereby marking the interchangeability of "actress" and "prostitute" (Burney, 196). Evelina is found in this compromising situation by the predatory Sir Clement Willoughby, who uses it as leverage against her.

Similarly, in Vauxhall Evelina is propositioned by a number of men after she is accidentally separated from her party. She seeks the protection of two women who

---

44 For an example in English, see Margaret Rosenthal's work on Veronica Franco, The Honest Courtesan.

45 Frances Burney, Evelina. The Vauxhall incident runs from 196-198; the Marylebone Gardens incident, 232-237.
are, she discovers with horror, themselves prostitutes, and is seen in this situation by Lord Orville, the good (and marriageable) man in the text. Her unshielded exposure at public places threatens Evelina’s identity as a virtuous gentlewoman, but it also reinforces the social position of the men she encounters, most of whom have come to Marylebone and Vauxhall to engage prostitutes. The verisimilitude of Evelina’s situation depends on a broad understanding in Burney’s audience that trawling for sexually available women was one of the principal activities of men at such places as Marylebone and Vauxhall.

The connection between male sightseeing and sex was also strong (if not stronger) in Continental touring. Aphra Behn’s *The Feign’d Curtizans* (1679) relies on the understanding that all male English tourists in Rome will gossip about, visit, and hope to engage, courtesans. Marcella has fled Viterbo, and the prospect of marrying an unappealing man, for Rome and the love of the Englishman, Fillamour. She and her sister Cornelia masquerade as courtesans both because the unlikeness of their disguise will prevent their detection by their relatives, and because they assume that, as courtesans, Fillamour will of course come to see them. Taking a turn in a public garden, the sisters discuss their circumstance:

Cornelia
...a little impertinent Honour, we may chance to lose ’tis true, but our right down honesty, I perceive you are resolv’d we shall maintain through all the dangers of Love and Gallantry;--though to say truth I finde enough to do, to defend my heart against some of those Members that Nightly serenade us: and daily show themselves before our window, Gay as young Bridegrooms and as full of expectation.

Marcella
But is’t not wondrous, that amongst all these crowds we should not once see Fillamour; I thought the charms of a fair young curtizan, might have oblig’d him to some curiosity at least.

Cornelia
Ay! And an English Cavalier too, a Nation so fond of all new Faces.

Marcella
Heaven, if I should never see him, and I frequent all publique places to meet him; or if he be gone from Rome, if he have forgot me, or some other Beauty have imploy’d his thoughts! – (Behn, II.i,103)
Behn's heroines, unlike Burney's, are fully capable of using their society's brutal and coercive distinction between virtuous and whorish women to their own advantage. For Cornelia and Marcella, it becomes a weapon to be wielded against those who would control their destinies by using the word "whore" as the threat that Evelina so painfully feels.

Marcella and Cornelia use the ease with which they can pass as whores as a means of disinformation and of communication. They know their relatives believe that they would want to preserve their reputations as virtuous women. In fact, their pursuers assume they are likely hiding in a convent. As Marcella's fiancé (Octavio) complains in frustration to a servant who has been unable to locate the women:

That's wondrous strange. Rome's a place of that general Intelligence, methinks thou might'st have news of such Trivial things as women, amongst the Cardinals Pages; I'le undertake to learn the Region de stato, and present juncture of all affairs in Italy of a common courtesan. (Behn, II.i,102)

As whores, then, the women become invisible to their pursuers in a city famed for quickly procurable intelligence. Furthermore, because of the nature of their public position, they also, as Octavio indicates, will be able to collect highly sensitive information to which even men do not have easy access. This is why Marcella believes that acting the part of a courtesan will perforce draw to her the man she seeks, or at least give her information on his whereabouts. She is perplexed and alarmed when her plan fails.

Fillamour's atypical behaviour, which derives from his virtue, is equally mystifying to his friend Galliard, who has been "a Dozen times in Love" since coming to Rome less than a month before, and who has been trying to bring Fillamour to the sisters ever since they went on the market (Behn, I.i,91). When Fillamour remonstrates that he prefers "innocent passion" to lust and "whores," Galliard rejoins with what seems to have been a common English attitude:
Innocent Passion at Rome! Oh, 'tis not to be nam'd but in some Northern Clima: to be an Anchoret here, is to be an Epicure in Greenland; impossibilities, Harry! (Behn, Li,92)

This "impossibility" of innocent women in Rome leads Fillamour to doubt his senses when he does see Marcella, and believe that she is perhaps what she is dressed to be, a courtesan. For him this means that she could not possibly also be the woman he loves. From this and other confusions the plot of Behn's frolicsome comedy gambols ahead. The point to be made is that here, as in Evelina, the believability of Behn's play stems from the contemporary audience's acceptance of the inseparability of male sightseeing from sexual trawling.

At this juncture, I want to mention one earlier travel writer. Thomas Coryat's 1611 "deciphered and as it were anatomized" description of the courtesan and her place in the Venetian state deserves much more attention than I can give it here. He discusses how the courtesan profession was integrated into the Venetian state and culture, and how the practice functioned on a non-individual level. It is, to my knowledge, the only such analysis in a popular travel account that was designed for publication. Venetian courtesans were mentioned in later tour accounts, but often with a rabid anti-Catholicism that in effect excludes any realistic description of the women and their place in Venice. The Roman Catholic Church is the real prey in these accounts, and the courtesans the easiest weapon to seize for the attack. The Venetian countenance of courtesan culture was used as the clinching evidence for Roman Catholic "corruption." The Venetian sequence of The Travels and Adventures of Mademoiselle de Richelieu, a work which is discussed in Chapter 3, has a good example of this. In this work, the abbé-guide is also a debaucher of young virgins, a bawd, and an assiduous procurator for tourists. In contrast, Coryat's approach to the subject sheds light on how male tourism and sexual sightseeing were linked and on how and why the links were suppressed in polite published tours. Coryat is also

46 Coryat's Crudities, I:409.
important as a popular tour writer before Sterne who, like Sterne, publicly negotiated the sex-tourism aspect of continental tourism.

Coryat, like Sterne, was well known as a wit and as something of a jester. The similarities between the two were not unmarked in the eighteenth century—Samuel Paterson, the first to imitate Sterne's travel writing, took "Coriat Junior" as his pseudonym because of the kinship of approach. Coryat begins his travels with a short but learned history of Calais and the information that he arrived there about five of the clocke in the afternoone, after I had varnished the exterior parts of the ship with the excremental ebullitions of my tumultuous stomach, as desiring to satiate the gormandizing paunches of the hungry Haddocks...with that wherewith I had superfluously stuffed my selfe at land, having made my rumbling belly their capacious aumbrie. (Coryat, I:152)

In other words, for those who did not understand it from his title—Corvat's Crudities: Hastily Gobled Up in Five Moneths Travells—he will be egotistical, audacious, provocative, informative, and witty. He will also talk of things no one else would dare to do for fear of being accused of impropriety.

It is exactly Coryat's self-conscious willingness to break through convention to titillate, inform, and amuse, that drives his description of the courtesans:

---

47 For a short biographical account of Coryat, see Boies Penrose, *Urbane Travelers*, 58-108.

48 That Paterson was imitating Sterne was instantly recognized by contemporary reviewers, who praised his ability to graft morality onto a Shandean tour-writing style. *The Monthly Review* writes of "Coriat Junior": "The sprightly, the humorous, the sentimental Yorick, was the first who had sense and taste enough to quit the beaten packhorse path; and the ingenious author of the present travels has the good fortune to follow him at no despicable rate" (vol. 29 [1768], 435). The *Critical Review* agreed, noting in addition that "...it is only doing justice to Mr. Coriat Junior, when we declare, that we do not find thro' his whole performance any of those reprehensible passages which so justly gave offence to virtue and modesty, in the works of Tristram Shandy" (vol. 26 [1768], 354).
But since I have taken occasion to mention some notable particulars of their women, I will insist farther upon that matter, and make relation of their Cortezans also, as being a thing incident and very proper to this discourse, especially because the name of a Cortezan of Venice is famoused over all Christendome....Surely by so much the more willing I am to treate something of them, because I perceive it is so rare a matter to find a description of the Venetian Cortezans in any Author, that all the writers that I could ever see, which have described the city, have altogether excluded them out of their writings. Therefore seeing the History of these famous gallants is omitted by all others that have written just Commentaries of the Venetian state, as I know it is not impertinent to this present Discourse to write of them.... (Coryat, I:401-2)

He points, then, to the unofficial prohibition against printing any serious analysis of one of the most famous of Venice's tourist attractions. Though other cities had courtesans, those of Venice were particularly renowned. Just before a long passage which piles perfume, lilies, "chains of gold and orient pearle" on top of luteplaying, good conversation, and many, many other examples of "Venereous titillations" (Coryat, I:404-5), he explains:

For so infinite are the allurements of these amorous Calypsoes, that the fame of them hath drawn many to Venice from some of the remotest parts of Christendome, to contemplate their beauties, and enjoy their pleasing dalliances. (Coryat, I:403)

In other words, men come to Venice solely for the courtesans, and, from Coryat's description, one can understand why. Yet Coryat is acutely aware that he is breaking a number of conventions and taboos in writing about them, and that he is opening himself to attack. The persona he maintains as a whimsical traveller (after all, he did the whole trip on foot, hung up his shoes in Odcombe Church after his return, and provided an illustration of them in his prefatory matter) is part of how he gets away with a description that would irreparably damage the credibility of a grave author. But he also knows that he will have to "adde some Apologie for my selfe" at the end of the description (Coryat, I:402).
He finally points out that "the knowledge of evill is not evill, but the practice and execution thereof"; furthermore, "a virtuous man will be the more confirmed and settled in virtue by the observation of some vices, then if he did not at all know what they were" (Coryat, I:408). Besides, he only went to see a courtesan (only one) to work her conversion into a "holy and religious woman." (He was unsuccessful.) However, his altruism is questionable. He proceeds:

Withall I went thither partly to the end to see whether those things were true that I often heard before both in England, France, Savoy, Italy, and also in Venice it selfe concerning these famous women.... (Coryat, I:408)

He went to a courtesan, in other words, because it was expected of tourists when they saw Venice. His claim to be interested only in the courtesan's spiritual welfare is perhaps still further undercut by the picture accompanying the description (one of the few in the tour) of Thomas and a possibly bare-breasted courtesan running into each other's arms (Coryat, opposite I:408). This picture is ambiguous. It could also be a dramatic representation of a concerned Coryat, hand to heart, pleading with a momentarily guilt-stricken courtesan. Interpretation depends on the interpreter's own desires.

The practices Coryat addresses, and the rhetorical and narrative strategies necessary for his purpose, speak directly to Sterne's challenge in politely representing his narrator's encounters with attractive continental women. In the impersonal published accounts of important things to understand, see, and experience in Europe, sexually available women or prostitutes could be ignored or distanced by generalization, and even their political significance, which Coryat addresses, ignored politely. Coryat, who happily launched undeniably important information about governmental structure and cultural difference into flights about how the state of his stomach on the channel crossing benefited "Haddocks," could get away with his description through a combination of bold-faced audacity and an insistence that he was filling in a gap in everyone's knowledge by writing about something everyone had
heard about. The apparent contradiction in his approach is superficial. Everyone knew about the courtesans; many came to Venice just to see them. But Coryat discusses their function in the Venetian social structure, and no one had done that, possibly not even in gossip. Sterne, whose Yorick pointedly displays no political awareness, and whose narrative actively avoids the conventionally serious subjects Coryat audaciously juxtaposes with the titillating and the trivial, cannot pass off sexually charged descriptions of his interaction with women as necessary for ethnographical purposes.

Sterne promoted a close identification between himself and his narrators, which had the practical effect of barring certain stereotypical narratorial poses from his fictions. For a man with Sterne's reputation for immorality and obscenity, the role of a reformer of fallen women would have provoked ridicule. The stereotypical narrative in which a benevolent man reforms a penitent prostitute after patiently listening to her heart-rending tale was not then a narrative Yorick could tell, although there are elements of it in his encounter with the fille de chambre. Yorick gives her money for her virtue. As A. Alvarez has noted, the events that follow can be persuasively interpreted in two mutually exclusive ways—the chapter headed "The Temptation" "could as easily describe the act of making love as the reasons for abstaining from it."49 One could add that "The Conquest" of the following chapter's title could refer either to Yorick's sexual conquest of the fille de chambre (in which case she has exchanged her virtue for his money), or to Yorick's conquest over his desires (in which case he has given her money to encourage her to keep her virtue, as convention dictated that male narrators do when faced with redeemable fallen women). Either possibility, it should be stressed, assumes the fille de chambre's sexual availability.

The fille de chambre's availability is never questioned in the Sentimental Journey—even the innkeeper assumes that Yorick has had sex with the young woman.

---

49 "Introduction" to A Sentimental Journey, 16. John Mullan too points to the suggestiveness of this passage but without going into detail, Sentiment and Sociability, 189.
Nor was it questioned by at least one contemporary reviewer, who expresses relief at Yorick’s commendable restraint.\textsuperscript{50} Even though this reviewer saw the woman as an "unguarded innocent," he assumes her body is at Yorick’s disposal (313). Furthermore, the reviewer chides his countrywomen, who "may be inclined to pronounce the little \textit{fille de chambre} a ‘forward hussy,’” as not allowing for national difference in chaste deportment (314). The gendering of the inadequate reader here is, of course, interesting, but it is still more significant that the reviewer thought readers required sophistication not to read the \textit{fille de chambre} as proffering herself. The drama does not hinge on the \textit{fille de chambre}’s struggle against temptation—she is treated as already and openly sexually available— but with the male tourist’s.\textsuperscript{51}

The problem facing Sterne in his account of emotively pregnant trivialities, then, was how to deal politely with the tight connection between sightseeing and sexual experience. In one of the most commonly quoted passages of his letters, Sterne, thanking a correspondent for a "shande\textit{an} piece of sculpture," writes about it:

Your walking stick is in no sense more shandaic than in that of its having \textbf{more handles than one}---The parallel breaks only in this, that in using the stick, every one will take the handle which suits his convenience. In Tristram \textit{Shandy}, the handle is taken which suits their passions, their ignorance or sensibility.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{The Monthly Review} 38 (1768), 309-314.

\textsuperscript{51} In Between \textit{Men}, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick makes a similar point about the \textit{fille de chambre}’s assumed sexual availability and also points out that the scene, like similar ones in the book, is about "whether he [Yorick] will succumb to temptation" not about the women’s temptations (78). She reads this scene in terms of homosociality: "Yorick’s fantasy opposition-to/identification-with a fantasied male betrayer and a fantasied paternal ‘governor of nature’” (79)—that is, she maps the way Yorick conceives of himself in terms of other men. Though our readings overlap, my concern here is with the episode’s relationship to tourist culture, specifically with how Sterne rewrites a stereotypical tourist encounter with a chambermaid at an inn to make it polite, not on how Yorick conceives of himself in relation to other men as a whole group.

\textsuperscript{52} Sterne to Dr. John Eustace, February 9, 1768 (\textit{Letters}, 411).
This letter is dated early in 1768—just before the release of *Sentimental Journey*. Though he refers only to *Tristram Shandy*, Sterne structured his fiction so that there were multiple handles. This structuring is more blatant in *Tristram Shandy* than in *Sentimental Journey*. The latter has a carefully maintained surface of pure feeling which many eighteenth-century readers adored, but which readers have subsequently often regarded with dislike, suspicion, or bewilderment. However, the very debate about whether *Sentimental Journey* is seriously sentimental, parodically sentimental, satirical of sentimentality, or simply, as Rufus Putney has argued, a hoax, supports the argument that Sterne built into *Sentimental Journey* as many handles as he did in *Tristram Shandy.* Sterne seems to have done this intentionally. To his bookseller Thomas Becket, Sterne had written that *Sentimental Journey* is "an Original work, and likely to take in all Kinds of Readers." The handles for "all Kinds of Readers" are there, though they are differently configured than in the earlier work.

The Maria episode could be read (and has been read) as sexually charged or as charmingly, chastely, innocent. Paul D. McGlynn, after demonstrating "the discrepancy between [Yorick's] rhetoric, which suggests a combination of delicate sentiment and religiously noble benevolence, and his performance, which is rooted in elementary sexual inclinations," moves on to show that, according to his conception of eighteenth-century standards, Yorick's treatment of Maria is "sexually offensive" and that she represents a "failed moral test" for Yorick (McGlynn, 40). Even though McGlynn recognizes that Maria is more important than she has generally been taken to be, he is reading for authorial intention and evidence for the "larger pattern" of the

---

53 Putney concludes that *Sentimental Journey* "was a hoax by which Sterne persuaded his contemporaries that the humor he wanted to write was the pathos they wished to read" (368) and, furthermore, that "Far from wantoning with his emotions, Sterne made fun of the man who did" (369). See "Evolution." For a general discussion of the changing reception of Sterne's works, see Howes, *Yorick and the Critics.*

54 Sterne to Thomas Becket, September 3, 1767 (Letters, 393).

55 "Sterne's Maria," 41.
work. I am not concerned about whether Sterne or his personae are blameworthy or praiseworthy in Maria's treatment, or whether Yorick's sexual motivations make a mockery of his language of benevolence. But I am interested that the second question could even be asked.

Most eighteenth-century reviewers, far from finding the episodes sexually offensive, as McGlynn assumes they would, praised them profusely for their innocence. Following the work of Alan B. Howes on Sterne's reception, the standard critical line now is that Sentimental Journey was almost universally admired by contemporaries as a gratifying contrast to Tristram Shandy in its uncomplicated, de-sexualized sentiment and pathos. There were nevertheless dissenting voices, and these should not be as quickly discounted as they have been. Sterne died within a few weeks of Sentimental Journey's publication, and the possibility remains that the work may have received harsher treatment but for a sense that articulating its openness to "lewd" readings would be an inappropriate attack on the dead. As Howes points out, many of the reviews doubled as eulogies. In fact, one of the reviews which predated the news of Sterne's death is scathing. The Critical Review saw Sentimental Journey as "substituting immorality, impudence, and dulness, in the room of virtue, decency, and wit..." and identified Yorick as a "dictator of lewdness and dissipation!"

Similarly, the second American edition of Sentimental Journey was "By the late celebrated Dr Sterne of Double Entendre Memory." By so advertising the book, the reader was directed to watch for the double entendres many reviewers praised Sterne for (finally) eschewing. Furthermore, though many reviewers saw innocence, some roughly contemporary paintings which depict both Yorick and Maria are far more ambiguous, and A Sentimental Journey has the dubious distinction of being published in 1795 complete with obscene illustrations which the ESTC describes as

---

56 See Yorick and the Critics, 40-46.

57 Vol. 25 (March 1768), 181.

"among the earliest of their kind to be printed in America." Though in the minority, then, some contemporaries could and did find the work suggestive. The episodes are designed in such a way that they can be interpreted as shot through with sex or as completely innocent. Sterne managed his narrative so that the sexual content of the Maria episodes was simultaneously stressed and denied—and provided a model for how to contain sexual desire and transmute it into benevolent thoughts instead of "immoral" action.

Sterne built in the many handles by re-deploying both tour traditions and literary, dramatic, and pictorial allusions as they were used in contemporary tourism. One of the strongest contemporary tour traditions translated literary or pictorial citation into a tour experience. Joseph Addison, famously, mapped the Italy of classical allusion onto contemporary Italy, and was mocked by Sterne as his example of those
tourists

who have wrote and gallop'd—or who have gallop'd and wrote, which is a different way still; or who for more expedition than the rest, have wrote-galloping...from the great Addison who did it with his satchel of school-books hanging at his a--, and galling his beast's crupper at every stroke---there is not a galloper of us all who might not have....wrote all he had to write [at home].

(TS II:580)

---

59 T.C. Duncan Eaves writes about these with some shock as "among the most obscene prints I have ever seen" ("Graphic Illustration of the Principal English Novels of the Eighteenth Century," 255). The edition in question was published in New York, probably for John Reed.

60 This polarization of interpretation continues. When Sentimental Journey came back into fashion in the second third of the twentieth century, it was often published with illustrations. These are fascinating for the way they interpret the text as either totally innocent or rife with sexual innuendo. See especially Mahlon Blaine's illustrations (reproduced in the New York: Three Sirens Press edition of 1929), in which the women's nipples are usually showing, and a naked woman with a tail overarches a carriage on the opening page of text, and Sylvain Sauvage's illustrations (produced in the New York: The Heritage Press edition of 1941) which display the strained innocence of a particularly saccharine Walt Disney cartoon.
Addison’s *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy* (1705), was one of the most popular and influential travel accounts of the century, which made Addison almost as good a target for Sterne as Smollett was. The work’s popularity stemmed from its brilliant and thorough performance of what I would call referential tourism. Addison visited and described places well known from classical literature, and provided the appropriate Latin quotation and its English translation for those who would follow. He systematized the common practice of visiting Italy as the land of classical allusion. Even closer to home, however, tourists read the landscape through literature.\(^{61}\) Faced with forges and mines, they quoted the hell sections of Milton’s *Paradise Lost*; wandering through Scotland they thrilled to Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*. Furthermore, tourists tried to encounter in life the subjects of pictures—either human, architectural, or landscape. After Boswell met Voltaire in 1764, he enthusiastically related in his journal that:

> At last Monsieur de Voltaire opened the door of his apartment, and stepped forth: I surveyed him with eager attention and found him just as his print had made me conceive of him.\(^{62}\)

Tourists’ attempts to see the original of landscape paintings developed into a referential tourist form still familiar to us—picturesque tourism. Similarly, their desire to walk into the painting developed by the end of the century into the popular panorama—a 360° view painted on the inside of a huge cylinder and viewed from a platform at its centre. Its object was to thrill the viewers with the illusion that they were actually seeing the thing (often their own city or a recent battle) that was

---

\(^{61}\) For an account of that part of this convention that drew on prospect poetry and which pays particular attention to its connection to picturesque tourism, see Malcolm Andrews, *The Search for the Picturesque*, 3-23.

\(^{62}\) *Boswell on the Grand Tour: Germany and Switzerland, 1764*, 272.
represented. In referential tourism, lived experience was used to comment upon the literary and pictorial ones and vice versa. Identifying the pictorial and literary citations and resonances that Sterne employs helps identify what he is doing in the interaction between his tourists and Maria. Sterne had his tourists encounter in Maria pictorial traditions as well as both obscure and unmistakable literary and stage heroines.

Maria is presented in both episodes as if she were already a picture. In the Tristram Shandy sequence she is introduced

sitting up on a bank playing her vespers upon her pipe, with her little goat beside her....[S]he was in a thin white jacket with her hair, all but two tresses, drawn up into a silk net, with a few olive leaves twisted a little fantastically on one side—she was beautiful... (TS II:782-783)

Sterne used conventional visual shorthand—for instance, in paintings, loose hair conventionally indicates female madness or sexual looseness, and the olive leaves, peace, victory, and fertility. But the goat is the startling component of the tableau. Though sometimes associated with tragedy, the goat is usually associated with Venus or lust (especially male lubricity). Maria is thus iconographically connected to depictions of tragedy, Venus with a goat, and nymphs with saryrs. The connection between goats and men is underlined by Sterne himself. Tristram leaps out of his carriage and places himself between Maria and her goat:

MARIA look’d wistfully for some time at me, and then at her goat—and then at me—and then at her goat again, and so on alternately—
---Well, Maria, said I softly—What resemblance do you find?
I do entreat the candid reader to believe me, that it was from the humblest conviction of what a Beast man is,—that I ask’d the question....(TS II:783-784)

Maria does not answer, which leaves the "candid reader" to do so. Tristram, who is made to share characteristics with a goat, is sitting by a beautiful, almost wild madwoman with olive leaves, emblematic of fertility, wound into her hair, and a goat. Since the reader knows that the setting is the vintage, the picture of goat and a beautiful, loose-haired young woman mad with love and playing on a pastoral pipe resonates strongly with conventional representations of Bacchanals. Though exuding a "venerable presence of Misery" (TS II:784) and playing music to the Virgin, the other things Maria exudes are perhaps why she does not seem to have been painted until the nineteenth century, despite a description which is presented as if it were already of a painting.

The Sentimental Journey Maria is also presented as a picture, but this time she was painted by contemporaries. Unlike the iconography Sterne employed for the Tristram Shandy Maria, this iconography was currently in fashion for portraits of young women, except, perhaps, in her madness, the green ribbon attached to her pipe, and her loose hair. A young woman dressed in white, with a little dog in a rural setting, drew strongly on eighteenth-century portraiture of young women, especially recently married ones. Countless women were painted like this by Sir Joshua Reynolds, Thomas Gainsborough, and George Romney--conventionally the dog was inserted to indicate the woman's marital fidelity. The green ribbon and the loose hair, however, potentially undermine the innocence of the picture. Green, of course, was associated with freshness and fertility. But it was also--as in "green-sickness" (an illness striking unmarried women that was cured by the consummation following marriage)--associated with sexual readiness.

The tradition of high-fashion portraiture Sterne used in Sentimental Journey, then, might initially seem to clean up the sexually suggestive iconography of the first Maria, though not unequivocally. What is so intriguing about the move Sterne makes here--of representing Maria in terms of pictorial convention--is its relationship to contemporary tourist practice. Sterne uses and rewrites a number of interrelated tourist conventions which took sightseers to famous art collections (and resulted in the production of numerous tedious lists of artwork), caused them to seek landscapes and
people that fit popular pictorial conventions, and encouraged wealthy tourists to buy masterworks of continental art, to have themselves painted, and to commission souvenir paintings. Sterne reworks the tourist conventions of seeing the original work, of putting oneself into a picture, and of taking home souvenir representations of the real thing—either of the tourist as he or she looked on tour or of what was seen.

People travelled to acquire taste in art, and, sometimes, if they wealthy and well-placed, commissioned a vedute from painters such as Giovanni Paolo Pannini (Rome) or Antonio Canaletto (Venice), or an elevating portrait of themselves in vaguely classical surroundings by a painter such as Pompeo Girolamo Batoni, or a flattering portrait by a painter such as Rosalba Carriera, or a good-humoured caricature by such as Thomas Patch in Florence. Tourists liked walking into the frame. Sterne himself was caricatured by Thomas Patch when he was in Florence in 1765 (the famous representation of Sterne greeting death), and had a bust made of himself by Joseph Nollekens in Rome in 1766. Some particularly wealthy tourists took their own artists with them as a kind of expensive and potentially temperamental picture-taker. John Robert Cozens, for instance, painted at least ninety-six watercolours for William Beckford with whom he toured Italy. The experience and conventions of sightseeing and of pictorial representation, then, were laced together as a major component of the continental tour experience.

In an age pre-dating the souvenir postcard and the photograph, some painters specialized in decorative compositions recording groups of the principal monuments to

---

64 For a short summary of painting and tourism, see Black, *British Abroad*, 260-275. For an example of how such tourism could shape the career of an artist, see J.G. Links, *Canaletto and His Patrons*.

65 These are reproduced in Arthur H. Cash, *Laurence Sterne: The Early & Middle Years*, between pages 304 and 305. For full details, see 310-313. One other Sterne portrait done during his residence abroad has been located—when Sterne was in France the Duke of Orleans had him painted by Louis Carrogis (Charmontelle) in 1762 (Cash, 307-308).

66 Black, *British Abroad*, 262.
be seen on the Grand Tour. Pannini's famous pendant compositions, *Roma Antica* and *Roma Moderna* (1757; 1759) which exist in a number of versions (the patron for each is different) are an interesting example. In the 1759 version held at the Louvre, the patron (Claude-François Rogier de Beaufort-Montboissier de Canillac) and his companions are shown admiring the collection of famous sights they have seen, all of which have been re-imaged as paintings hung on the walls and painted on the ceilings of a vast thermal vault.\(^67\) It is as if the inside of de Canillac's mind—or at least the part that would prove him to have been a good tourist—has externalized itself, and thrown itself up into a museum-like collection of gilt-framed snapshots to be examined at leisure. These paintings represented the acquisitions of the tour which could not be literally alienated from Italy. They collapsed into one, cavernous but imaginary space the geographically dispersed architectural and artistic highlights of the tour, things that were supposed to be foremost in the mind of the tourist. The objection might be made that Pannini's famous compositions were painted for France's chargé d'affaires in Rome, not a tourist. Yet Canillac is not here boasting of his accomplishments as a diplomat, but as a tourist. That a diplomat would have chosen to stress his assiduous tourism in Italy instead of his political accomplishments there attests to the power and influence properly performed tourism was believed to have.

Similarly, the portraits which showed the tourist in a vaguely classical background implied that Italy and all that the tour stood for would be a permanent part of the ex-tourist's experience. Again, in the generalized but strained timelessness of their painted "classical" backgrounds, these portraits externalize the power that was thought to accrue to the tourist by having come to understand continental art and architecture. Other portraits show the traveller surrounded by the material evidence of his tour-inspired acquirements—for instance, by his *cicerone*, a fencing master, books, items of *virtù*, and a harpsichord. By putting themselves into the pictures they commissioned, tourists gave external evidence of their mastery of all that the continent

---

\(^67\) These are reproduced in Michael Kiene, *Exposition-dossier du Département des Peintures: Pannini*, 142-146.
had to offer. Sterne took this tourist habit of looking at art, collecting it, projecting the self into the frame, and reproducing a tour’s highlights on canvas and in print and reformulated it in his tourists’ encounters with Maria. Sterne takes the tourist impulse to travel to see and master the original one step further. His tourists become the heart of a picture which can only be experienced on tour because it is the tourists’ subjective response to a pictorial experience which is privileged.

Sentimental tourism and the picturesque tourism that was beginning to develop at mid-century overlap in that both treated the site, whether human or natural, as in some sense artificial, as a picture, and both suppressed the shaping forces of economic and political conditions and history. Both forms rewrote human ties to landscape and to society, as well as the way people and landscape are shaped by societal pressures, as purely aesthetic phenomena. James Plumptre’s 1798 comic opera, The Lakers, satirizes the habit tourists had of turning the human beings they encountered into pictures. One of Plumptre’s principal characters is an inadequate tourist, the wealthy and landed Veronica Beccabunga, whose bad tourism is linked directly to her unfeminine intellectual and artistic pretensions and is also deployed to illustrate her inadequacy as a woman. Faced with her future husband, a gentleman’s gentleman who has tricked her but who is represented as the best she will get, Veronica treats Speedwell as a framed landscape in order to come to terms with him:

68 For a discussion of the importance of pictorial elements in sentimental description, see Anne Patricia Williams, "Description and Tableau in the Eighteenth-Century British Sentimental Novel." For a discussion of how sentimentality suppresses questions about social and economic inequality, see Robert Markley, "Sentimentality as Performance," and Judith Frank, "'A Man Who Laughs Is Never Dangerous': Character and Class in Sterne’s ‘A Sentimental Journey.’" In his intriguing discussion of Wordsworth’s use of tourism, Alan Liu analyzes the way tourism (by which he means picturesque tourism) suppresses history. (Though Liu aims at tourism in general, he addresses something specific to the form of tourism that influenced Wordsworth the most, not to the intensely political and historically aware tours which continued to be made well into the nineteenth century by people such as William Cobbett.) See Wordsworth: The Sense of History. For a broader reading of picturesque tourism, see Andrews, Search for the Picturesque.
I fear I shall never get another offer [of marriage] half so good, and I'm determined not 'to wither on the virgin thorn.' (Aside.) He's a vastly clever man, he's a botanist, he's picturesque—I'll throw a Gilpin tint over him. (Looks through glass.) Yes, he's gorgeously glowing. I must not view him with the other lights, for a husband should not be either glaringly gloomy, or frigidly frozen; nor should I like to be haunted by a blue devil.—Then he's a servant— but Lord Level married his daughter to a servant. I think the incident would be picturesque; and it would be perfectly botanic for Veronica and Speedwell to marry. (Plumptre, 58)

Plumptre's Veronica is anti-feminist satire—her punishment for inappropriately unfeminine intellectual and artistic ambition is a class demotion that the characters in the play find fitting. Nevertheless, it is her ability to aestheticize a matter of economic exchange as a picture (by marrying, she will be handing over her money, her estate, and her independence to someone who has nothing), of fraud (Speedwell has been posing as a baronet), and of social inequality, that allows her to gloss over the undeniably insulting treatment she has undergone.

By looking through a coloured glass lens at her future husband, Veronica makes one final attempt to control her circumstance, one that is doomed to failure by its internal dynamics. In the terms of the play, this failure of female control over the environment is a good thing, and is construed as emblematic of all such attempts, when made by women. She is represented as weaker than what she looks at. But what Plumptre sees as an obviously ridiculous misappropriation of tourist convention lays bare an assumed power relation between the tourist and the attraction. While using a woman or an Irishman as examples of inadequate or wrong-headed tourists was conventional, Plumptre's satire pivots on his audience's recognition that Veronica,

---

69 It is unclear in the text whether Veronica is looking through a tinted lens at Speedwell, or has her back turned to him, and is looking at his reflection in the popular yellow or "sunrise" Claude Glass (a plano-convex mirror) that had exactly the effect Veronica here describes. For accounts of Claude Glasses and lenses, see Andrews, Search for the Picturesque, 67-73 (Andrews provides a picture of several Claude Glasses, 68); Jean Hagstrum, Sister Arts, 141-142; and John Dixon Hunt, "Picturesque Mirrors."
not Speedwell, is the disempowered curiosity, and that Veronica has not recognized this "truth." In Veronica's attempt to transform people and landscape into pictures, Plumptre illustrates how powerless and ultimately futile such an attempt at containment, limitation, and control was when perpetrated by a disdained, disenfranchised, and ill-educated individual. He does not thereby imply that such aestheticization would be as inadequate to the task of limiting the importance and power of someone of a much lower social and economic status than that of the tourist. The humour of the scene relies on the audience's recognition that Veronica, as a woman and as an inadequate tourist, is on the wrong side of the glass she holds up. Veronica's intellectual pretensions have rendered her, in terms of the play, less than any man, and it is her powerlessness that makes her act of peering at her fiancé in a tourist glass ridiculous.

However, neither the employment of the tourist glass, nor its empowering function, are attacked in themselves by Plumptre, even though his satire reveals the power dynamics operative in such tourism and can be used to illuminate the dynamics operative in Sterne. Judith Frank has discussed how precarious Yorick's social position is, driven into his tour by a servant's snide remark implying that he does not have the social position to have toured France, and how the way he tours defines him as a gentleman against servants, labourers, and the poor. By treating Maria as a picture, however, Sterne's tourists control the terms of their encounters, and neatly contain them within a specified frame which excludes all the untidy details of things like economic inequality, sex acts, and political disenfranchisement. When Ernest Nevin Dilworth derisively calls Maria Yorick's "figurine," he is only half right. Sterne had indeed moved the picture and the statue out of the gallery and into the French countryside for the novel delectation of his tourists and readers alike. But he did much more than this.

---

70 "A Man Who Laughs Is Never Dangerous."

71 Unsentimental Journey, 105.
If his tourists met at the side of a French post road an original version of women they had seen for years in paintings, they also engaged in referential literary tourism. Maria's literary forbears, like her pictorial ones, have received little attention. The only literary allusion which has been discussed in relation to the episode is to Andrew Marvell's "Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Faun." In his excellent article on the subject, Tom Keymer writes:

[Maria's] link with the nymph lies not simply in a shared tension between her own naive distraction and the clever authorial wit that plays upon it, nor simply in some shared ancestry in literary traditions or idioms....For Sterne...plays on the specifically Marvellian precedent. Abandoned first by her lover and then by her goat, and now clinging obsessively to her lapdog 'Sylvio', Maria suffers a comic intensification of the nymph's misfortune. Not only does her childish resort to an animal surrogatus amantis resemble the nymph's; so too does its failure, though now the forsaken lover suffers not sudden bereavement but precisely the second betrayal that the nymph had feared....It hardly raises the tone that the pastoral name 'Sylvio' is now attached not to a [faithless] swain but to a lapdog....

Keymer's findings can be extended. Sterne expected some of his readers to read Yorick's tour experience through Marvell, since most of his readers would fully understand the tradition that saw tourism as an opportunity to engage in literary citation, paraphrase, allusion, and even parody. Additionally, both Maria and the nymph maintain residual marks of innocence while indicating sexual awareness through the strength and shape of their grief. Marvell's poem, of course, has as its foundation the naivety and sexual betrayal of the nymph. The nymph mourns the loss of her faun, and through him the loss of her innocence and her lover. Maria, in playing a tune to the Virgin and in her attachment to her pets, tells the tale of lost love that she cannot tell otherwise with propriety. Both women are presented in a way that encourages the reader/viewer to think that he or she has a better understanding of their condition than they do. The unsophisticated Nymph finds Sylvio's behaviour

---

incomprehensible, though it is perfectly legible to the reader; Maria's madness prevents her from comprehending her own condition, or how she must seem to the tourists who sit by her. The silent Tristram Shandy Maria cannot tell her own story outside the non-linguistic medium of music, which requires an interpreter to be communicated in a literary form. She has no direct voice.

Keymer argues that for the "very small audience, who were equipped to see it," the Maria episode is parodic of Marvell (Keymer, 25). Sterne's sly allusion shows that the book might be consumed in different ways by different categories of reader: the naive may read it as pure feeling, productive simply of tears; the sophisticated may read it as pure irony, productive rather of laughter. (Keymer 10-11)

Keymer's point about the implications of Sterne's use of a Marvell allusion, which takes in both Marvell's obscurity in the eighteenth century and his interest to a tiny group of Sterne's friends, though, is more broadly applicable. If some readers recognized in Sterne's Maria a new version of Marvell's nymph, they also met in her a popular figure who had been translated from the English stage into the French countryside. She was regularly presented on the stage, but not often in the visual arts until the nineteenth century. I am speaking, of course, of William Shakespeare's Ophelia.

Maria's literary madwomen forebears are few. Though madwomen were common on the stage (Thomas Otway's Belvidera in Venice Preserv'd and Nicholas Rowe's Alicia in The Tragedy of Jane Shore come to mind), before Sterne and outside Hamlet there were few popular figures of virginal women gone mad from thwarted

73 There has been little helpful work on representations of madwomen during this period. Max Byrd notes a connection between madness and women, but he talks indiscriminately of non-fictional and fictional representations of madwomen, of women represented as causing madness in men, and of representations of allegorical women (like the muse or Pope's Queen of Spleen) as mad. Each of these is to my mind discreet subjects of inquiry. See Visits, 65-68 et. passim.
love. One exception, of course, is Samuel Richardson's extremely popular Clementina della Porretta who, caught between her Roman Catholicism and her love for the Protestant "heretic" Sir Charles Grandison, goes mad. However, she too is typed on Ophelia, and like Maria, is a "foreigner" met by an Englishman in the course of a tour. In contemporary productions, Ophelia was presented as a virgin who, after she has gone mad from Hamlet's treatment of her in love matters, comes on stage loose-haired, singing, and wearing white. When Sterne presented the Sentimental Journey Maria like a fashionable young woman in a portrait, he also drew on representations of the white clad, loose-haired, musical Ophelia which would have been even more widely accessible to his audience. It is Ophelia, not Marvell's nymph, that most contemporaries would sense in Maria, and would be thrilled to meet on tour.

In Shakespeare's Hamlet, Yorick's skull is literally thrown up from Ophelia's waiting grave. I do not think it is accidental that Sterne had a character named Yorick meet a madwoman typed on Ophelia in life, not juxtaposed in death as Yorick and the madwoman are in Shakespeare's graveyard (Hamlet V.i). After all, Hamlet is mentioned more than once in Sentimental Journey. Not only does Yorick try to buy a copy of Shakespeare's plays at the beginning of the second volume, but, asked who he is by the Count de B---, owner of a set of Shakespeare, Yorick,

recollecting I was in [Shakespeare's] books, I took up Hamlet, and turning immediately to the grave-diggers scene in the fifth act, I laid my finger upon YORICK, and advancing the book to the Count, with my finger all the way over the name---Me, Voici! said I. (SJ 221)

---

74 Operative in this absence is the widespread conviction that good young women would not fall in love before they were irrevocably engaged, or, preferably, married. A good young unmarried women would not go mad for thwarted love, then, though a jealous bad woman (Alicia) or good wife (Belvedira) might.

75 See chapter 4 for a detailed reading of the relationship between the Italian Catholic Clementina and that ideal grand tourist, Sir Charles Grandison.

76 Yorick was, of course, introduced in Tristram Shandy, but this does not prevent Sterne from continuing to play off Shakespeare's Hamlet in Sentimental Journey.
This explicit connection of Sterne's Yorick to the Yorick in *Hamlet*’s graveyard is furthered when Yorick continues his journey under a passport issued to "Mr. Yorick, the King’s jester" (SI 228). As Sterne’s friend David Garrick was forcibly reminded when he cut it from his adaptation, the graveyard scene, though regretted by critics for its mixture of high and low, was a real crowd-pleaser. People knew it intimately. And it is the place which linked Yorick the jester with Ophelia the mad virgin. Shakespeare was claimed as a common national property. *Hamlet* was one of the century’s favourite Shakespeare plays. It was also one of the few that was, with the exception of Garrick’s adaptation, only shortened, not "improved" almost out of recognition. Sterne took Ophelia off the stage and incorporated her into a tourist script. Sterne’s tourists encounter a stage heroine in the countryside where they can become momentary actors in the drama. Sterne here accomplishes an extraordinary thing—he took one form of scripted performance—the continental tour—and melded it to another—the stage play. By doing so, he emphasized the performative nature of tourism.

Sterne draws heavily on Ophelia in his representation of Maria, and the dynamics operating between his tourists and his madwoman are predicated on what Ophelia could be to an eighteenth-century audience. Since the form of Maria’s madness and her musicality mean that, like Ophelia, she is represented so that she will be understood as either completely innocent or as completely sexual and sexy, I must take issue with recent claims in feminist criticism which use the eighteenth-century treatment of Ophelia to exemplify the way it purged representations of women of sexual desire and any hint of sexuality. Following Elaine Showalter’s lead, Ellen J. O’Brien and Mary Floyd-Wilson argue that Restoration and eighteenth-century cuts to Ophelia’s part strip her of her sexiness and her sexuality while relegating her to a

---

77 See Edward Tomarken, "The Comedy of the Graveyard Scene in *Hamlet,*" and, for Garrick’s rationale behind cutting it, and the contemporary response to the cut, see Jeffrey Lawson Lawrence Johnson, "Sweeping up Shakespeare’s ‘Rubbish.’"
position of minor importance in the play. By mustering together questionable value judgments and factual error these critics have, instead, produced an eighteenth-century Ophelia which never existed.

Showalter, O'Brien, and Floyd-Wilson base their findings on what they have identified as the demotion of Ophelia's part during the period. Ophelia was not usually played by actresses, but "mere" singers, they claim. This part of the argument rests on both a questionable value judgement and factual error. Why would music necessarily be less emotive than acted text? A privileging of the expressiveness of spoken over musical language is perhaps more in keeping with twentieth-century attitudes than those of the eighteenth. The critical marginalia to at least one popular contemporary edition of the play indicates that the music was taken as adding expressive intensity to Ophelia's madness. Presumably, eighteenth-century readers read Maria's reliance on music as they read Ophelia's—as a way of expressing emotions mere words could not plumb. A song Thomas Billington wrote on the theme of Sterne's Maria makes the point that music offered a release for otherwise hidden emotion. The first verse to his "Maria's Evening Service to the Virgin" (the tune Sterne says Maria plays) runs:

At Morn and Eve to Thee I pray,
And as I pass the Mountain's side
I drop a tear and heave the sigh,
For who for who can all their sorrows hide.

This privileging of music as more expressive than language for indicating sorrow is

---

78 See Showalter, Female Malady, 10-13, and "Representing Ophelia"; and O'Brien, "Ophelia's Mad Scene." Floyd-Wilson dissents slightly from Showalter and O'Brien, arguing that despite the censors' best efforts, discordant and subversive elements remained in Ophelia's character. However, Floyd-Wilson's article is immeasurably weakened by a surprising avoidance of consulting even one eighteenth-century Hamlet play text. See "Ophelia and Femininity in the Eighteenth Century."

important to keep in mind when both Tristram and Yorick encounter a madwoman playing a pipe. It is particularly relevant for understanding why readers responded so strongly to the Maria Tristram encounters, who tells her tale only through her music.

But there is an even more serious problem with the argument that the part of Ophelia was devalued and demoted to singers. It is historically incorrect, and seems to be a myth about the eighteenth-century treatment of Ophelia that originated in the nineteenth century. Ophelia was actually played by the most powerful actresses of the age—for instance, by Kitty Clive, Susannah Cibber, Peg Woffington, and Sarah Siddons. Furthermore, the part was usually considered vital to the success of the play. For instance, one contemporary critic, writing marginal commentary for the cheap and popular Bell's Edition of Shakespeare's Plays (1774), identifies Ophelia as "the chief support" of the fourth act (III:70). Along similar lines, Jeffrey Lawson Lawrence Johnson has shown that the century's most truncated version of the play, David Garrick's Hamlet (1771), actually increased the importance of Ophelia's part, despite cuts which took the length of the fourth and fifth acts from approximately two hours' playing time down to approximately a half hour. Therefore, Ophelia's part was not de-emphasized or demoted during this period, and, in fact, Ophelia was one of Shakespeare's most popular characters, male or female. She was even one of only thirty-six Shakespeare characters represented in Bell's' popular edition of Shakespeare's works, 1775-1776. When Sterne modelled Maria on Ophelia, then, he could guarantee resonance with her popular Shakespearean model for almost every English reader.

For Showalter, O'Brien, and Floyd-Wilson, however, the most damning piece of evidence for an eighteenth-century campaign to suppress female desire (as

---

80 O'Brien, for instance, cites the husband of the nineteenth-century actress Helena Faucit as her evidence for the phenomenon ("Ophelia's Mad Scene," 111-112). I suspect this myth found its birth in the eighteenth-century's vocal admiration for the fitting expressiveness of music for Ophelia's plight.

exemplified in Ophelia’s treatment) is that Ophelia’s bawdiest lines were cut from the staged productions of the play. Since Maria is verbally silent in Tristram Shandy and verbally inoffensive in Sentimental Journey, it is important to weigh the argument that by cutting Ophelia’s sexually explicit lines, the eighteenth-century universally desexualized her character. The assumption that female sexuality can only be expressed or understood when a woman uses sexually explicit language is a simplification that limits sexual expressiveness to a tightly constrained channel. However, not only is it a suspicious supposition that female sexual desire can only be expressed in bawdy language, but Hamlet’s bawdiest lines were also cut—the censorship, then, was not gender-driven but aimed at extreme sexual expressions in general.82

More importantly, perhaps, the character Ophelia was not only to be encountered in an expurgated version on the stage. The full text of Hamlet was widely available, and avidly read. By mid-century scholarly editions of Shakespeare’s works began to appear, the most famous of which are William Warburton’s and Samuel Johnson’s. Even more important to the general reading public, however, was the printed form of the play texts. Not only was Hamlet one of the few Shakespeare plays that was usually only shortened for the stage, not adapted out of recognition, but the full text was regularly provided to the readers of the play texts. The parts which were not actually played were carefully indicated, usually by quotation marks, and, in an unusual move given the typical eighteenth-century treatment of Shakespeare plays, they were left in to be read. This tradition, and the popularity of the play itself, meant that the full-text Hamlet was familiar to most literate English speakers. A sexy and sexualized Ophelia could, then, be operative in Sterne’s allusion to her.

There were, in fact, mutually exclusive interpretations of Ophelia during the period, and this is significant for understanding Sterne’s representation of Maria. I would argue that eighteenth-century interpretations of Ophelia were obsessed with the

82 John A. Mills notes that most of the cuts to Hamlet’s part "have to do either with sexual explicitness or with lack of reverence in matters of religion" (Hamlet on Stage, 19). For Mills’ discussion of these, see 19-20 for Betterton’s cuts, and 29 for Garrick’s.
meaning of her sexuality and suppressed, instead, the political ramifications of the original character’s madness. Some contemporaries read Ophelia as sexually aware despite the cuts. Jeremy Collier, attacking the immorality of the stage in 1698 (decades after the bawdiest lines were cut) complained of the "Lewd" and "unreasonable" characterization of Ophelia. The "young Virgin Ophelia," he laments, loses her wits and her modesty. He suggests that since Shakespeare

was resolv’d to drown the Lady like a Kitten, he should have set her a-swimming a little sooner. To keep her alive only to sully her Reputation, and discover the Rankness of her Breath, was very Cruel.83

Floyd-Wilson points out Collier’s comments, but uses them to support her claim that "The editorial denial of Ophelia’s own sexuality, together with the undeniable presence of an actress [who would have been seen as sexually available] and the lingering echoes of her expurgated songs, transform the character into a passive object of desire" (Floyd-Wilson, 403). But Collier is specific—it is Ophelia herself who is unfortunately sexual, not the audience. He is worried because her sexual awareness made her, in his opinion, a bad role model. Despite cuts which would now function to suppress the expression of Ophelia’s sexuality, Collier’s complaint indicates that at least part of the audience understood that her madness expressed her sexual awareness. While Collier complained of the expurgated stage Ophelia’s immodesty and lewdness, others saw her as a blameless victim. In fact, even though all three critics assume that the full-text Ophelia would have been seen as so completely sexual that she would have profoundly disturbed "Augustan" conceptions of passive, modest femininity, Samuel Johnson described the full-text Ophelia as "the young, the beautiful, the harmless, and the pious."84 The eighteenth-century understanding of mad Ophelias, then, is much more varied and complex than has been allowed—and, more importantly,

83 A Short View, 18.
84 Notes on Hamlet, in Johnson on Shakespeare, 1011.
was usually focused on the extent and propriety of the mad Ophelia’s sexual awareness. Her madness made her sexual but unable to act on her desires. Because her madness neutralizes her ability to act on the desires she expressed, she was open to being read as entirely pure or entirely impure.

Ophelia’s openness to contradictory interpretation is inherent in the part. The problem with interpreting Ophelia (and characters who are closely modelled on her such as Maria) is gestured to in the play itself, and has been discussed by Bridget Gellert Lyons. A messenger prepares the audience and Gertrude for Ophelia’s entrance, characterizing the effect of Ophelia’s madness upon her spectators as follows:

She speaks much of her father, says she hears
There’s tricks i’ th’ world, and hems, and beats her heart,
Spurns enviously at straws, speaks things in doubt
That carry but half sense. Her speech is nothing,
Yet the unshaped use of it doth move
The hearers to collection; they yawn at it,
And both the words up fit to their own thoughts,
Which as her winks and nods and gestures yield them,
Indeed would make one think there might be thought,
Though nothing sure, Yet much unhappily.

**Horatio:** 'Twere good she were spoken with, for she may strew
Dangerous conjectures in ill-breeding minds.
**(Hamlet IV.v.5-16)**

Mad Ophelia’s words and actions, then, are read according to the individual propensities of her hearers (they “up fit [her words] to their own thoughts”). In his response to the messenger’s report, Horatio refers to the possible political ramifications of the ill-breeding conjectures founded in Ophelia’s seeming transparency, but as soon as she enters, singing of love and death, her sexual

---

85 “The Iconography of Ophelia.” For an art history discussion of the Flora iconography Shakespeare employed, see Julius S. Held, "Flora."
awareness also becomes an issue. Restoration and eighteenth-century representations of the play cut the first part of the messenger's lines, thereby eliminating the indications of the political implications of Ophelia's speech. Horatio and the Queen are made to seem worried about Ophelia's reputation, not about the danger her speech poses to their political well-being. The political, not the sexual, ramifications of her disorder are suppressed. Ophelia's representation is structured so that interpreting her either as innocent or sexually aware can be, and, even more importantly, could be in the period under discussion, made with equal confidence. Ophelia has as many "handles" as Sterne's "shandean piece of sculpture" and his Maria do. By modelling Maria on Ophelia, Sterne could ensure that she could be read as lewd or as innocent. By making his Ophelia a French peasant, he could strip her madness of its dangerously seditious side because it would be assumed that she had no links to those with political power. The courtly Ophelia's mad language and song threatens the security of the state, as Horatio and the Queen are aware; Maria's mad language and music threatens nothing, not even the tourists' chastity. It was not then, sexual expressiveness that was suppressed in eighteenth-century Ophelias and madwomen like Maria who were modelled on them, but women's political power and actual sexual activity. Their closely focused sexual desire and awareness was so represented that it stripped them of all active participation in, and importance to, the structure of their societies.

In Maria and her model, Ophelia, the woman's madness finds its source in thwarted love--her desire is so strong that, unfulfilled, it renders her unfit for regular society and occupations. If the eighteenth century is to be criticized for its portrayal of female desire in madwomen, it is not for its suppression of sexuality, but for its management. It is focused to prevent full economic, familial, and political

---

86 Once again, however, the caveat must be made that the complete text of the messenger's speech was widely available.
participation in the world. Maria’s overwhelming desire for a particular man legitimates her madness, making it almost praiseworthy. The masculinist ideal of the woman who is devoted to one male partner at the expense of her sanity and every other consideration is celebrated in Sterne’s treatment of Maria. She has privileged her attachment to one man over all other matters. Her affections are not transferrable, and her devotion to a particular man has made her unfit for anything but as a figure for a virtuous attachment lacking its object. The extent of Maria’s virtuous devotion reflects the extent to which she has been removed from the web of power and sanity. Her desire is not criticized or suppressed (in the terms of the text). The form of her madness means that she has no dangerous ambition, no dangerously unfixed sexual, political, or economic desire, and she has no social position which would make madness dangerous to the state or to family fortunes. Mad with focused sexual desire, she is a threat to nothing, not even to Yorick’s chastity.

Hamlet’s mad Ophelia scenes did not provide a script for an unimplicated outsider to engage with an attractive madwoman. Sterne’s innovation was to move the figure of Ophelia to the French countryside, and, using the precedents of madhouse, referential, and sex tourism, transform encountering her into a tourist script. Sterne had found the means to describe sexually suggestive encounters between men and women so that in narrative terms the possibility of sexual consummation was removed. The touching, the mixing of bodily fluids, and Maria’s offer to dry Yorick’s handkerchief on her breast, which in any other circumstance would be prohibited from publication because of their suggestiveness, are made publishable. The prostitute and

87 Cf. Michel Foucault’s "Repressive Hypothesis": "It may well be true that adults and children themselves were deprived of a certain way of speaking about sex, a mode that was disallowed as being too direct, crude, or coarse. But this was only the counterpart of other discourses, and perhaps the condition necessary in order for them to function, discourses that were interlocking, hierarchized, and all highly articulated around a cluster of relations" (The History of Sexuality, 30). For Foucault, of course, all sexuality is managed, not suppressed. He points to a simultaneous growth in the Modern period of discourses about sex and sexuality, and the idea that sex and sexuality are repressed and undiscussed.
the sexually available woman could remain unspoken in the sentimental male sightseer’s quest for publishable sexual experience. The fall into the possible immorality of acting on sexual desire was avoided by writing an undeniably sexual woman as mad and therefore as sexually unavailable. Her madness and the literary referentiality of the episode gave licence for sexually charged interplay, and rendered it open to being read as innocent because actual sexual intercourse was considered unthinkable. Sterne managed the difficult trick of telling the story of boy meets girl while pleasing both the readers who craved sexual titillation and those who craved representations of innocent virginal desire.

It is in this context that the bizarre tendency of the continuations of Maria’s story to either kill Maria or lament her death can be understood. No one wanted to imagine her finally acting on her sexual desires. Her value was as a figure in which sexuality was simultaneously expressed and denied. The continuations sometimes went to some length to maintain her contradictory status as both sexual and pre-sexual. In Sterne’s Maria: a Pathetic Story. With an Account of her Death, at the Castle of Valerine (c. 1800) tourists encounter Maria wandering down a road in Italy on one of her mad rambles. They take her up, and she recovers her sanity (remarkably, given the ominous circumstances) during conventionally Gothic experiences at the Castle of Valerine. After the Gothic confusion is sorted out, all of the characters, including Maria, are coupled up for marriage. She gets over her first love. She marries.

---

88 According to Showalter, later reports of sexual abuse of female inmates at mental institutions led to reform (Female Malady, 8-9 et. passim.). Nonetheless in this earlier period (which Showalter does not address) female madness was usually represented as rendering a woman almost invulnerable to sexual intercourse (representation and practice might, of course, be different matters). I suspect that the madwoman’s perceived inability to understand the implications of sex was the barrier. One thinks of Mr. B.’s inability to rape Pamela after she faints. Her unconsciousness makes it more difficult for him to assault her, not less. This is a mindset alien to us now, when there is so much evidence that unconsciousness increases the chances of sexual assault. Richardson probably meant to show Lovelace’s total moral depravity when he rapes a semi-conscious drugged Clarissa. In doing so, Lovelace went beyond the pale of even a rape-friendly libertine culture.
Thrice blessed happy day; but oh! fatal--fatal night, (ye gods! how can I express the sorrows of poor Maria) whose delicacy had not been able to support the fatigues of the day, swooned away in the presence of the assembly [and recovered, but quickly disappeared]... How she had stolen away, no one could tell; shocking to relate! her reason once more had forsaken her, and after a long search, was discovered near the hermit’s cell, bedecking herself with wild flowers that grew spontaneously near the spot. Maria had selected from the flock a little lamb, (sweet emblem of innocence), to which she was incoherently, though melodiously, chaunting, and seemed completely happy. Her affable disposition soon yielded to persuasion and she entered the castle—but never—no, never to reach the marriage-bed, for the clay cold hand of death had seized her, and she fell a lifeless corpse, in the arms of her affectionate husband and protector. (n.p.)

The reader is then presented with a long "INSCRIPTION on the Tomb of Maria." Before Maria becomes sexually experienced, then, she goes mad, reassuming Ophelia’s flowers and song, and then unfortunately drops dead without any warning. Whoever this rather bad writer was, he or she vehemently resisted a narrative closure which would assume Maria’s sexual initiation. Sterne’s revision of previous tourist practice had to be modified for use by real tourists, but was easily transferable to fictional ones. A subsequent canonical novel shows how Sterne’s model could be used to script tours. Henry Mackenzie’s 1771 The Man of Feeling repatriates Sterne’s madwoman to her source in Bedlam. Max Byrd has noted that Tristram Shandy’s Maria (he does not seem aware of her reappearance in Sentimental Journey) was "doubtless the model" for Mackenzie’s Bedlam madwoman. Not concerned with tourism himself, Byrd does not realize that Sterne’s Maria had herself been alienated from Bedlam. He does not analyze either scene other than parenthetically commending Sterne and MacKenzie for their lack of misogyny (madwomen "now appear as creatures of extraordinary delicacy, sensitivity, genius") and noting that in these examples, unlike in earlier treatments of madness,
"elements of sympathy and identification [are]...tentatively set forth." Given that these madwomen functioned to save touring men from the implications of sexual behaviour, and are furthermore highly referential since they are typed on the visual arts, Ophelia, possibly Clementina, and, in the case of Maria, Andrew Marvell's nymph in "The Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Faun," questions of misogyny are simplistic.

In The Man of Feeling, the narrator writes: "Of those things called Sights in London, which every stranger is supposed desirous to see, Bedlam is one." The man of feeling, Harley, objects to the tour because he

"think[s] it an inhuman practice to expose the greatest misery with which our nature is afflicted to every idle visitant who can afford a trifling perquisite to the keeper; especially as it is a distress which the humane must see, with the painful reflection, that it is not in their power to alleviate it." (Mackenzie, 19)

He goes anyway, and sees familiar examples of madness—the man who cared too much for money and lost it; the man who cared too much for knowledge of an esoteric mathematical sort, but whose predictions about comets failed; and the man who cared too much for greatness, and assumed the identity of a monarch. These examples of the mad had appeared in Swift and others as warnings against excess in the usual male preoccupations (money, knowledge, power). However, MacKenzie describes these madmen as one might their paintings in an exhibit. Their actions are depicted and then their history is explained by his guide (who is the final example of a madman, thinking he is the Chan [sic] of Tartary). The Chan acts as informant and static exemplar.

Finally, Harley encounters the virgin gentlewoman who had loved too much, and had gone mad upon her lover's death. It is the madwoman who touches Harley

---

89 Visits to Bedlam, 93. The other extensive work on Sterne and madness does not address Maria at all, though she is the only one Sterne explicitly presents as mad. Michael V. DePorte uses medical definitions of madness to investigate Sterne's use of theories of madness, but ignores Maria (Nightmares).
the most—both literally and sentimentally. She notices him crying after the Keeper has told her story:

"---I love you for resembling my Billy; but I shall never love any man like him." ---She stretched out her hand to Harley; he pressed it between both of his, and bathed it with his tears.---"Nay that is Billy's ring," said she, "you cannot have it, indeed; but here is another, look here, which I platéd to-day of some gold-thread...will you keep it for my sake? I am a strange girl; but my heart is harmless: my poor heart; it will burst some day; feel how it beats!" She pressed his hand to her bosom...."---but I had forgotten the ring." She put it on his finger.---"Farewell! I must leave you now."---She would have withdrawn her hand; Harley held it to his lips.---"I dare not stay longer; my head throbs sadly: farewell!" (Mackenzie, 23)

This madwoman is sexual and sexualized when she gives her hand to Harley, puts his hand on her breast to feel her heart, and puts a ring on his finger. Like Maria, however, her social position means that her madness has no social or political impact—when she went mad she was unmarried, childless, parentless, and penniless. She is sexually unavailable because of her madness but despite what would otherwise be sexually suggestive physical contact. One cannot imagine Clarissa putting Lovelace's hand on her breast and asking him to feel her heart beat even when she is mentally disturbed after the rape, nor can one imagine Sir Charles Grandison and Clementina making this sort of sexually suggestive contact. In both cases, the man is implicated in the woman's madness, and therefore physical contact would be improper if not an outright violation. But as male tourists guiltless of the cause of the women's madness, Yorick and Harley could touch the women because no possibility of sex is involved—they are not the objects of the women's sexual desire.

There was a practical problem with reproducing Sterne's Maria script in a non-representational form, with real bodies, in real time and space. In the lived reality of the late eighteenth century one could not reliably encounter virginal women who had gone mad from thwarted love except, perhaps, in institutions such as Bethlehem. The first of the laws requiring the incarceration of the insane had been passed in England at the beginning of the eighteenth century, which had the practical effect of isolating
the obviously mad from spontaneous public view. Furthermore, tourism depends upon reliable experience—meaning that a wandering madwoman, though perhaps a chance object of interest to a lucky tourist, was by definition not a tourist attraction—subsequent tourists could not rely on her presence when they passed by the same place. This meant that realistically, out of the bounds of fictional literature or lucky chance, a real-life sentimental tourist in the countryside had to find sane substitutes for Sterne’s madwoman.

ii. Postscript: Mary Robinson, The Maid of Buttermere

These sane substitutes for Maria were found. Most of them are lost to us now, or have become almost unrecognizable because of a shift in taste and in ideas about what could constitute a tourist attraction. But since the tourist script Sterne set usually required active complicity in both the women and the tourists, when either party broke with the script the resulting scandal could make the players easily visible to us even now. There are two instances in which this happened—with Emma, Lady Hamilton and Mary Robinson. I will limit detailed discussion to Mary Robinson because the contemporary response to her illustrates the dynamics of the literary referential form of tourist site that women could be following Sterne’s Maria’s lead. Nonetheless, a brief summary of the case of Emma Hamilton provides a good example of the form of pictorial/theatrical referential tourism Maria had inaugurated and how it could play

---

90 Byrd, Visits to Bedlam, 44. For a franco-centric account of the incarceration of the mad and its implications, see Foucault, Madness and Civilization.

91 Following Maria, there was a rash of poems which recounted the stories of women, who, like Maria, had gone mad from unanswered love and who are met by chance. The one with the longest tradition seems to be Matthew Lewis’ 1793 "Crazy Jane." For a summary of the history of the ballad’s popularity, and a discussion of W.B. Yeats’ later use of the figure of Crazy Jane, see Ole Munch-Pedersen, "Crazy Jane: A Cycle of Popular Literature."
Emma, Lady Hamilton, an ex-prostitute and a favourite model of the painter George Romney, was the classically beautiful mistress and then wife of Sir William Hamilton, British Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Although better known now for her later and highly publicized adulterous affair with Admiral Horatio Nelson, she was a favourite tourist attraction at Naples from the mid-1780s. As one commentator writes: "she quickly became as much a sight of Naples for artists and travelling visitors from all over Europe as a visit to Pompeii or Vesuvius." Her status relied on the gossip about her rise from maidservant to kept mistress to titled wife, and, more importantly, the regular performances of her Attitudes for tourists. Lady Hamilton's Attitudes were poised on the borderline between pictorial art and theatre. According to contemporary accounts, Hamilton placed herself in the centre of a room dressed in "classical" garb, fluidly embodying a shifting series of what were for contemporaries easily recognizable classical and high art pictures, personages, and statues. Spectators were thrilled at the speed of the transformations, and the apparent ease with which she assumed, successively, the characters of women as different as Medea and the Virgin Mary. No music or dance was involved, and no one had seen anything like it before--except in art collections and on the walls of churches or the newly excavated Pompeii.

Lady Hamilton's prominence and her scandalous life have rendered her visible even now, making her the subject of numerous biographies and a thoughtful and

---


93 See Chapter 4 for Samuel Richardson's use of a similar tourist tale about a woman who had risen from maidservant to lady of the manor through marriage who had been seen on a tour of England.

94 The best description of Lady Hamilton's attitudes remains Kirsten Gram Holmström's in Monodrama, Attitudes, Tableaux Vivants, 110-140.
intriguing novel by Susan Sontag, *The Volcano Lover*. As with Sterne’s Maria, tourists could realize in the body and performances of Lady Emma Hamilton the works of art they were viewing around Naples. Because she was both titled and politically connected by marriage, overtly sexualized descriptions of her or orientation towards her were considered inappropriate. On the other hand, even though her marriage made her seem inaccessible, she was open to being understood as a sexy spectacle because of her performances and because she came from the labouring class and was universally known to have been a kept woman and prostitute. The inherent contradictions contemporaries felt in their orientation towards Lady Hamilton caused anxiety at the time. Thomas Rowlandson’s famous satirical etching "Lady H******* Attitudes" shows Sir William drawing aside a curtain for a leering male artist at the Royal Academy to reveal a nude Lady Hamilton in an attitude. Voicing an opinion about the impropriety of the marriage, Rowlandson plays on the sexually charged nature of Lady Hamilton’s performances and shows that Sir William’s position is central to how Lady Hamilton was understood. Drawing aside a curtain and pointing, he is both a necessary ingredient in making her a spectacle and the thing that makes her performances risqué. Unlike Rowlandson, many were more discreet about dealing with the perceived contradictions of Lady Hamilton’s position. Rehberg and Pirol’s popular *Drawings Faithfully Copied from Nature and with Permission Dedicated to the Right Honourable Sir William Hamilton* (Rome, 1794), a set of illustrations of Lady Hamilton’s Attitudes, delicately negotiated the problems she posed and opportunities

---

95 The most recent biography is Flora Fraser’s 1986 *Beloved Emma*. Though popular in twentieth-century literary circles, Lady Hamilton does not seem to have inspired any characters in contemporary English imaginative literature as she seems to have in both German and French literature, especially in novels by Goethe and de Staël. See Holmström, *Monodrama*, 112, 140-145 et. passim.

96 There is some debate over the dating of the print. It may have appeared around the Hamiltons’ marriage in 1791, or c. 1800, during the scandal about the adulterous affair with Nelson. It is reproduced in Ian Jenkins and Kim Sloan, *Vases and Volcanoes*, 303, item 192.
she offered. In the interests of propriety, her name is never revealed, though a cameo of her face appears on the title page and she is the "Nature" copied. The prominent display of Lady Hamilton’s husband’s name and the implicit approval of the project it implies, neutralized the possibility that the publication would be perceived to transgress family honour. The subject of the drawings was no secret, despite the bows to propriety. Lady Hamilton’s background, marriage, and innovative semi-public performances combined to ensure she could be publicly displayed as long as her distance from England and the fiction of privacy and sexual inaccessibility was maintained. She was an openly visited though eroticized tourist attraction. It was a precarious balance that did not last.

The other instance in which a breach of the script resulted in a scandal is of greater significance to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literary history, and, for this reason, is the one I choose to examine closely. In 1802 James Hatfield, a Lake District tourist impersonating a nobleman’s brother, bigamously married the Maid of Buttermere, a famous sentimental tourist attraction. The public response to the marriage and then to the unmasking of Hatfield illustrates what was at stake when women were the objects of sentimental tourism. Mary Robinson, the Maid of Buttermere, is now most familiar to us from her appearance in Book VII of William Wordsworth’s The Prelude. Wordsworth’s poem was penned as this form of tourist attraction was fading into cultural memory at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The details and implications of Wordsworth’s poetic use of the Maid reveal the dynamics operating in Sterne’s Maria sequences.

Wordsworth’s treatment of the figure of a betrayed, sheltered peasant girl who was, in reality, an internationally famous tourist attraction, is one of the last employments of such a figure to protect the tourist from implicating contact with that more notoriously public woman, the infamous prostitute. Until recently, the Maid of Buttermere sequence has been dismissed as uninteresting or as a lapse in Wordsworth’s usually good judgement. Richard Onorato, Lawrence Kramer, and Mary

---

97 These are reproduced in Hölmstrom, Monodrama, 122-125.
Jacobus, however, have used psychoanalytic theory to isolate it as particularly illustrative of Wordsworth's treatment of sexuality and representation. My own project, in contrast, historicizes the form Wordsworth's sexual anxieties take, and suggests the reasons Wordsworth would have employed Mary Robinson in particular as the figure which could contain or suppress unruly sexual expressiveness and desire. Furthermore, I am less interested in what the sequence reveals about Wordsworth than how it illuminates an historically specific strategy used to manage expressions of sexuality in male tourist encounters with women. In Wordsworth's poem, the substitution of a woman who is a sentimental tourist attraction for a sexually available woman is unstable and in danger of failure. Though a prostitute and a woman cast in the role of Sterne's Maria can substitute for one another, this substitution has radical implications for the position of the male tourist. As female sentimental tour attractions went out of fashion, the sexually available women they masked became disturbingly visible.

Much of the historical background concerning the Maid of Buttermere as it relates specifically to the canonical Romantics has been available since Donald H. Reiman's 1984 article. Reiman draws together the raw historical data of the instances in which the Romantics addressed the story before discussing Robinson's function in Romantic literature. Reiman rightly ascertains that Wordsworth's use of the tale in Book VII of The Prelude does not depend on personal knowledge or a childhood shared with Robinson. He concludes, however, that Wordsworth's contrast of the "two unwed mothers and their innocent children" is "a practical lesson in moral tolerance." He believes Wordsworth shows Mary Robinson's "loving family and supportive neighbours" tolerating shame, and provides Wordsworth with an explicit concern with a community's blindness when faced by an aristocratic name. Reiman's plot summary of Wordsworth's poem is inaccurate--there is no mention in the poet's text

98 See Onorato, The Character of the Poet, 198-205; Kramer, "Gender and Sexuality in The Prelude"; and Jacobus, "Splitting the Race of Man in Twain."

of aristocracy (false or real), or of Robinson's family and neighbours, or of the painted woman's marital status. Furthermore, Wordsworth responds, not with toleration, but with aversion to the painted woman. To him, she is the source of her young son's encroaching "contamination." Reiman's narrative unwittingly conflates Wordsworth's account of Robinson in The Prelude with Thomas De Quincey's in the Recollections of the Lakes and the Lake Poets (1834). De Quincey was the first to add the moralizing fiction about the response of Robinson's family and community to aristocracy and then to Robinson's "ruin." Reiman's reading does little to recover Robinson's function in tourist culture, or to explain how her appearance functions in Wordsworth's The Prelude.

Ian Ousby gives a more historically accurate account of Robinson in The Englishman's England, though he does not attempt to account for her pre-scandal popularity. However, he usefully suggests that "guilt helps explain [the fame of] the case of Mary Robinson, daughter of the landlord at Buttermere,"100 and that for contemporaries her story was emblematic of the destruction that ensued when tourists made unmediated contact with the fragile Lake District society (Ousby, 174-176). I would add that Robinson's story also maps the historical shift in Lake District tourism from outsiders wanting to tour it to get in touch with English pastoral innocence to wanting to tour it to get in touch with the Romantics. But to understand what the Romantics were doing with Robinson, even on the most elementary level, her pre-Romantic history and cultural importance needs to be addressed.

By the 1770s the Lake District of England was one of the most popular tourist destinations in England, spawning a huge literature which included guidebooks for every genteel taste.101 In 1792 Joseph Budworth trumpeted a 14-year-old waitress at the Fish Inn in Buttermere in his sentimental (and popular) A Fortnight's Ramble To The Lakes in Westmoreland, Lancashire, and Cumberland. Consequently, Mary

---

100 Englishman's England. 174.

101 See Peter Bicknell's Picturesque Scenery for samples. For a good account of early nature tourism, see Ousby, Englishman's England. 130-194.
Robinson, variously known as the Maid of Buttermere, the Beauty of Buttermere, Sally of Buttermere, and Mary of Buttermere, became a standard attraction on the tourist circuit of the Lake District. The epigraph on Budworth’s title page of his Ramble is drawn from James Thomson’s "Panegyric on GREAT Britain" in The Seasons (1730):

```
HEAVENS! what a goodly prospect spreads around
Of Hills, and Dales, and Woods, and Lawns---
----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- 
----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- 
Happy BRITANNIA! where the QUEEN OF ARTS
Inspiring vigour, Liberty abroad
Walks, unconfin’d, even to thy farthest cots,
And scatters plenty with unsparing hand.102
```

The epigraph’s patriotism is fitting. In a project analogous to Thomson’s, Budworth’s mission is to show native Englishmen that their country is just as good to tour as France is:

```
Had these beauties been formed in a foreign land, they would have been long ago more known; but since a once-boasted, though now unfortunate, part of the Continent is become a scene of horror and devastation, they may be thought worthy attention....Nature has sported in such variety at HOME, no views can exceed them in that delightful miniature which the eye takes in, without being either glutted by expanse, or DISGUSTED by deformity. (Budworth, xiii-xiv)
```

Happily for British pride, then, the French Revolution has forced the touring population to examine the domestic environment, finding a better version of what could be found abroad. It is in the context of his nationalist aims that Budworth’s naturalization of Sterne’s Maria, Mary Robinson, must be understood. Despite Robinson’s sanity and her job in an inn (which for most touring men would seem to

102 Thomson, lines 1437-1445, "Summer," in The Seasons, as quoted on the title page of Budworth’s Formight’s Ramble.
guarantee her sexual availability) Budworth figures her as unavailable.

Maria, a Woman mad from thwarted love, is French; Mary, a sane woman displaying modesty and shyness, is English. She is also "a very Lavinia, 'Seeming when unadorn'd, adorn'd the most'" (Budworth, 203). As with Yorick and Maria, we are led into referential tourism, though in this case the allusions are to texts closely bound up in British national identity and pride. The poetry Budworth quotes would have been instantly recognizable to contemporaries. It is the famous line 208 of the "Autumn" section of Thomson’s *The Seasons*, and is taken from the exceptionally popular interpolated love story of the impoverished Lavinia and the wealthy Palemon. As with Sterne’s Maria episode, Thomson’s Lavinia and Palemon episode was illustrated, painted, and excerpted with an intense industry that is surprising today. Even Thomas Gainsborough painted a Lavinia. The popular demand for the tale was so high that Oliver Goldsmith included it in his compilation of excerpts, *The Beauties of English Poesy* (1767), despite his dislike of it. "[I]t is rather given here for being much esteemed by the public, than by the editor," he explained peevishly. The meeting between Palemon and Lavinia was the most popular incident in the tale for illustrators, which suggests that for contemporaries it was their focus of interest. Therefore, when Budworth types Robinson on Lavinia, he, as both participant and writer, plays the double role of the lover Palemon and the poet Thomson. Those who followed in his footsteps would assume a modified version of Palemon’s role alone.

Though Budworth’s immediate allusion is to Thomson, he relies on his reader to catch two embedded allusions. Thomson’s Lavinia alludes to Virgil’s character

---


104 *Collected Works*, V:325.


106 I depart here from the standard critical take on this passage which sees it as a reworking of the biblical story of Ruth and a comment on charity. I do not disagree with this reading, but if one is to read the passage as a commentary on romantic love
of the same name (Thomson's character even blushes on being affianced as Virgil's famously did in the same situation [Aeneid XII.64]). Virgil's Lavinia is, of course, Aeneas' God-chosen and indigenous Italian wife. By association, Mary becomes the native beauty, unadulterated by any foreign--especially French--influence, to be seen by the men from that New Troy, London. The name "Palemon" alludes to Geoffrey Chaucer's Palamon in "The Knight's Tale" of The Canterbury Tales.¹⁰⁷ Chaucer's Palamon, literally imprisoned, is forced by circumstance to love from a distance, a structuring of desire Thomson puts to a peculiarly eighteenth-century use. Virtue and class difference act in place of Chaucer's walls and locked doors to keep the lovers apart. Palemon's response to Lavinia in Thomson could equally characterize Sterne's tourists' responses to Maria. Budworth presumably meant it to come to mind when he made the reference to Lavinia.

[Palemon]...his Fancy with autumnal Scenes
Amusing, chanc'd beside his Reaper-Train
To walk, when poor LAVINIA drew his Eye;
Unconscious of her Power, and turning quick
With unaffected Blushes from his Gaze:
He saw her charming, but saw not Half
The Charms her down-cast Modesty conceal'd.
The very Moment Love and chaste Desire
Sprung to his Bosom, to himself unknown...(l.224-231)

Thomson's Palemon is left in a state that should be contradictory--acutely suffering from "chaste desire," and other things that remain "to himself unknown." Chaucer's

¹⁰⁷ This association might account for Palemon's antique garb in many contemporary illustrations. Of course, Thomson lists Chaucer among the great poets in the patriotic apostrophe to Britannia in the "Summer" section of The Seasons.
Palamon cannot declare his love because he is literally imprisoned. Thomson's is faced with a woman he cannot love acceptably because of social difference (Palamon only admits his love to himself when he discovers Lavinia's exalted parentage). A perceived status difference builds an effective prison wall. The beloved is perceived as neither debased enough nor exalted enough to be approached for sex or marriage. Budworth responds to Robinson as male viewers did to her literary forebears--Sterne's Maria and Thomson's Lavinia--with "chaste desire" and an unwritten acknowledgement that however attractive she was, she was not to be understood by either tourist or tour reader as sexually or maritally appropriate.

Joseph Budworth re-introduced Robinson's name to the readers of The Gentleman's Magazine in "A Rambler's Revisit to Buttermere" in January 1800. He gives an account of a winter tour he had undertaken with the "grand intention...to settle an account with my own mind; and do away any false pride, which the handsome things said of a young creature at Buttermere might have disordered her with."108 Like most tour writers in the Lake District, Budworth worried that any interaction between tourists and their chosen spectacle, whether a forest or a native, would "spoil" it.109 Budworth found verses to Robinson scrawled in numerous languages over the walls and windows of the Fish Inn, but presented an attractive picture of the modest, if internationally famous, maiden. Nevertheless, he is stricken with condescending concern, and takes her aside for a private conference:

I told her I knew the author of a Fortnight's Ramble, and as such had something to say to her...[and] taking her by the hand I began: 'Mary, I wrote it, and rejoice in having had such an opportunity of minutely observing the propriety of your behaviour. You may remember, I advised you in that Book never to leave your native valley. Your age and situation require the utmost care. Strangers will come, and have come, purposely to see you; and some of them with very bad intentions. We hope you will never suffer from them; but never cease to be upon your guard. You really are not so handsome as you

108 Vol. 70 (January 1800), 19.
109 For a further discussion, see Ousby, Englishman's England, 167 ff.
promised to be; and I have long wished, by conversation like this, to do away what mischief the flattering character I gave you may expose you to. Be merry and wise.\textsuperscript{110}

Robinson responds ambiguously "I hope, Sir, I ever have, and trust I always shall take care of myself," which Budworth assumes to be acquiescence, and leaves her and the Valley of Buttermere "teeming with good wishes towards my fellow-mortals."

Budworth is specifically worried about Robinson's sexual propriety. Not all tourists, he knows, will gaze on her with his own, Palemon's, or Yorick's "chaste desire." Most of them, by definition, would be her social superiors and therefore capable of powerful economic and social coercion. Put another way, not all male tourists would look at Mary Robinson with the "innocent" connoisseurship of a Sentimental tourist who was careful to have a sexual charge without the sex itself.

In 1802 Mary Robinson married a man who presented himself as Alexander Augustus Hope, Lake District Tourist, Member of Parliament, and brother to the Earl of Hopetoun. After, and because, Samuel Taylor Coleridge wrote the marriage up for the \textit{Morning Post}, the man was exposed as John Hatfield, a bigamist, forger, and imposter.\textsuperscript{111} A national scandal followed. Mary Robinson, already a nationalist icon of the hidden and rare pastoral purity the British were capable of, became, with the scandal, the heroine of plays, poems and novels throughout the nineteenth and into the

\textsuperscript{110} Budworth, 24. This warning itself was quoted whenever the Maid of Buttermere was discussed during or after the marriage scandal. For instance, it is quoted in the letter subscribed "Indignant," published mid-scareland in the November 1802 \textit{Gentleman's Magazine} (vol. 62), 1013, and later in William Green, \textit{The Tourist's New Guide} (1819), II:181-183.

\textsuperscript{111} Coleridge wrote a number of articles for \textit{The Morning Post} about the affair between October and December 1802. Following Coleridge's first article, which announced the marriage, Charles Hope wrote to the newspaper explaining that his brother was in Vienna and therefore the man mentioned as marrying the Maid of Buttermere was an imposter. This precipitated the scandal.
late twentieth century.\textsuperscript{112}

In \textit{The Gentleman’s Magazine}, some of the problems contemporaries had with writing about a woman who was on public display, who was sexually experienced (it was reported that Robinson was pregnant), but was nevertheless "innocent," become clear.\textsuperscript{113} To write about Robinson as an innocent, ideal woman, contemporaries changed or ignored well-known facts about her situation. The poetic responses to the incident are particularly relevant here. In the 1802 Supplement’s "The Maid of Buttermere, A Ballad," the "Gentle Shepherd, of Witham, Essex," "mourn[s]" what has happened to the Maid. He uses the poetic conceit of woman as flower, but stresses the flower’s isolation. The deflowering is described as follows:

\begin{quote}
As some rude townsman passes by,  
And plucks the flow’r to all so dear  
So one rude hand, one keener eye,  
Plucked the fair flower of Buttermere.\textsuperscript{114}
\end{quote}

Despite the public knowledge that Hatfield too was reared in the country, the innocent country/corrupt city dichotomy was too attractive to give way to the truth.

Furthermore, the fact that Robinson was well known to the urban portion of the population is also elided. This tendency towards suppressing her pre-scandal fame is even more blatant in a March 1803 poem. Once again the conceit of the cut flower is combined with Robinson’s fictional pastoral obscurity:

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{112} The latest non-academic version I have located is Melvyn Bragg’s 1987 novel, \textit{The Maid of Buttermere}.

\textsuperscript{113} The widely read and respected \textit{Gentleman’s Magazine} published Budworth’s "A Rambler’s Revisit to Buttermere," indicating that the publication was marketed to the class which toured the Lake District and was interested in Mary Robinson as a tourist attraction. But for this consideration, any number of publications could have served the purpose here.

\textsuperscript{114} R.M.R., \textit{Gentleman’s Magazine} 72 (Supplement to 1802): 1209.
\end{quote}
So [like the rural flower] hapless Mary, first in Beauty’s train,  
Unknown, unenvied, bloom’d a village maid;  
Till he, who dar’d each sacred rite profane,  
In borrow’d guise th’ unconscious fair betray’d!

To her deceive’d, forsaken, left to mourn,  
The heaving sigh of pity still must turn!115

In contrast, "The Unfortunate Beauty of Buttermere" (January 1803) acknowledges Robinson’s previous fame and celebrates her resistance to its potential effects:

Her fame spread o’er the country wide  
And many a swain, both far and near,  
Sought, vainly sought, to make his bride  
The lovely Lass of Buttermere.

But once again poetic convention could not reflect the actual situation. The swains who sought Robinson because of her fame, wealthy and (often) married tourists, had no marital intentions. The true shape of the relationship between Robinson and her very un-swain-like spectators is suppressed so that the story can fit a stereotypical pastoral pattern. After relating the heinous crime perpetrated by "the artful villain,“ the poet concludes, reassuring Mary that

Tho’ now Misfortune frowns severe,  
From this reflection comfort take--  
Thy Character, thy Honour’s clear:  
Thy cause the virtuous have espous’d,  
Espous’d with more than common zeal;  
Thy wrongs have Public Justice rous’d--

The traitor vengeance soon shall feel.\textsuperscript{116}

The poet, then, posits that Robinson remains immune to contamination because of the public understanding of her as a pastoral virgin who has been imposed upon by an outsider. Paradoxically, Robinson’s retention of pastoral purity in the face of evil is implicitly linked to Robinson’s fame as a model of isolated innocence.

In these early literary responses to the story, the pastoral maid, with her simplicity and "naturalness," so germane in the highly artificial literary tradition of aristocratic shepherds and shepherdesses, is used to figure the "true life" Mary Robinson. The scandal, however, brought the contradictions inherent in the sentimental orientation towards a public figure such as Robinson to the surface. When applied to Robinson’s situation, conventional poetic plots and constructions of the ideal woman foundered. The difficulty these poets experienced representing the innocent but nevertheless sexually experienced public woman (her "marriage" was consummated) is remarkable. What Robinson had become was not fully imaginable within contemporary poetic and narrative conventions.

The narrative problem arising from Robinson’s status as a tour attraction was not one for poets alone. William Mudford’s novel, \textit{Augustus and Mary: or, The Maid of Buttermere: A Domestic Tale} (1803), had almost nothing to do with historical events, as Mudford admits:

\begin{quote}
...it is incumbent upon me to declare, that nothing except the bare event, the point, round which all the other circumstances revolve, have any connexion whatever with that unfortunate female, the peculiar nature of whose fate has excited the commiseration of all Europe. (Mudford, ix)
\end{quote}

To make his point William Mudford had to change everything but the names. In Mudford’s narrative Mary is the daughter of a private gentleman of small fortune who

after much importunity takes in Augustus as a boarder. Though the proper precautions are taken, it is only after Mary’s marriage to Augustus that he is revealed to be a criminal and a bigamist. There is no publicity. Everyone acts self-sacrificially. Mudford could not write the public though innocent woman as Sterne had done. And unlike the continuations of Maria’s story, which killed her before she had become sexually experienced and therefore a narrative liability, Mary of Buttermere had lived through a sham marriage. What was one to make of it? The Gentleman’s Magazine poets, among others, had taken the situation as an opportunity to display their condescending (if sincere) compassion and worldliness, but were unable to do so without changing key circumstances in the story. What was the "moral" of the story, now that it had burst beyond the tourist script set by Sterne?

By marrying, both tourist and Maid broke the script Sterne had set for innocent, sexually charged encounters between sophisticated male tourists and sexually unavailable women. Budworth’s own moral reading of the events is illustrative here. In the third edition of A Fortnight’s Ramble (1810), he blames himself for introducing Robinson to the public, but he also accuses Robinson of vanity, implying that it led to her destruction:

Having brought her into notice, as the reigning Lily of the Valley...and on a revisit to Buttermere witnessed her unassuming and correct behaviour...a Rambler will always retain his cordial good wishes; at the same time, takes this opportunity of deploring that he ever wrote in commendation of any young living creature, as vanity, alas, is the most intoxicating of human plants! and too apt to spread, when unfortunately introduced to public approval. Indeed few minds are proof against it; and happy would it be for many a flower, were they "Born to blush unseen."117

Robinson’s vanity, Budworth would have his reader understand, led her to her doomed attempt to move upwards on the social scale. A handwritten epigram in the British Library’s copy of The Life of Mary Robinson, the Celebrated Beauty of Buttermere

(1803) makes the implications of Budworth’s comment explicit:

By Hatfield warn’d of each Impostor’s snare,
Henceforth shall Buttermere’s fond maids beware;
nor, lur’d to ruin by Love’s faithless smile
Her future Maries [sic] shall false Hopes beguile. (n.p.)118

As here, many contemporaries felt that an innocent woman who is a tourist attraction should never try to cross the divide to become a tourist’s social equal. To cross the divide in a "hope" of "bettering" herself, the female tourist attraction risked being "ruined." When she did so, she certainly ruined Sterne’s script.

Because of the success of Sterne’s Maria episodes, the terms in which Budworth introduced Robinson to the public meant that male tourists could encounter and describe her without raising the suspicion that they had ulterior motives. For this reason Wordsworth deploys his contact with Robinson to deflect the implications of his encounters with prostitutes in Book VII of The Prelude. Wordsworth writes of Mary Robinson in 1805 and 1850, well after she had ceased to be a tourist attraction. He also removes her to the City of London, and has her represented by an actress in the less than entirely respectable Sadler’s Wells Theatre. In the sequence in which she appears, the Maid of Buttermere’s image alternates with those of a painted woman and a prostitute. The three culturally determined versions of a woman’s body and status—the deathly pure, the dissolute, and the marketed—are therefore closely linked in the text. The sexually available women whom the sentimental female tourist attraction had been designed to replace or contain resurface, to be anxiously noted and rejected.

The type of tourist attraction Mary Robinson had been was passing from the lexicon of tourist practices by the beginning of the nineteenth century. Writers wanted to retell or continue Mary Robinson’s story just as they had wanted to continue Maria’s. But it soon ceased to be imaginable that Robinson had been a tourist

118 B.L. shelfmark G. 14265.
attraction for decades before the famous Coleridge had singled her out by writing of her marriage. It had also become unimaginable that the Lake District itself had been one of England’s most popular tourist spots before Wordsworth wrote about it. Like the Lake District as a whole, Robinson came to be understood as unknown until publicly noticed by one of the great Romantic poets. In 1834 De Quincey’s article on Coleridge rewrote the story at length. Significantly, he revises the point at which Mary Robinson became a famous tourist attraction. According to De Quincey "shoals of tourists crowded to the secluded lake, and the little homely cabaret, which had been the scene of her brief romance" only after the scandal (De Quincey, 89). Like others, De Quincey insisted that Robinson’s pastoral naïveté excused her from the usual community repudiation of such a false step:

It could be no blame to a shepherd girl, bred in the sternest solitude which England has to show, that she should fall into a snare which many of her betters had not escaped. (De Quincey, 83)

By changing the facts, De Quincey solved the problem of how to depict a public, famous, and sexually experienced woman as innocent. As in many of the Gentleman’s Magazine poems, Robinson’s pre-marital other-worldly solitude was fabricated to prove her sexual and social innocence. De Quincey’s version of the story was used in subsequent novelistic versions, and unintentionally by Donald Reiman in his article. Wordsworth himself had a copy of one of these novels, Edward Carrington’s 1841 James Hatfield and the Beauty of Buttermere, in his library. The "Advertisement" of this novel points out that

In approaching...the scenes in which the events took place, another and a different source of interest presents itself. When we call to mind that those scenes have aided the inspiration of a Coleridge, a Wordsworth, and a Southey, we feel that we are treading on classic ground. (Carrington, vi)

---

119 This appeared in Tait’s Edinburgh Magazine (October 1834) and was reprinted in Recollections of the Lakes (1862).
It had become difficult to imagine why or how Mary Robinson could have been a tourist attraction prior to Coleridge's and Wordsworth's notice of her.

In Book VII of *The Prelude*, Wordsworth outlines his expectations of London (81-153;77-148), followed by an account of what he found (the rest of the Book). He does not find the unmediated reality he expects. Instead, he writes, he passed from the "real," which he casts as the popular tourist destination of the Lake District, to the "unreal," the distorted representations of that reality in London. The paintings which he sees in London, "mimic sights that ape/the absolute presence of reality" (248-249;232-233) are of tourist sites. They represent "All that the traveller sees when he is there" (279;259). In London Wordsworth sees visual representations of tourist attractions located outside London. He sees the etchings and watercolours of scenes future tourists bought to take with them on their tours in the hope that with the representations' help they could find and experience the original, and the Panoramas which gave the illusion of being somewhere else, enabling viewers sights of tourist spots from an impressive vantage point. (Wordsworth is complaining, of course, about a form of the referential tourism discussed above.) In Book VII, the usual tourist process is inverted. As a visitor to London Wordsworth confronts what the Londoner would bear in mind on his or her tour of the Lake District and other tourist draws such as Rome and the Falls of Tivoli.

Wordsworth defines his own position as a spectator of the Lake District,

---

120 Because both the 1805 and 1850 versions of Book VII are being used, the citation format for line numbers is as follows: (1805;1850); (1805: line numbers); (1850: line numbers). The edition used here is William Wordsworth, *The Prelude: A Parallel Text*, ed. J.C. Maxwell.

121 The London Panoramas often represented London itself. In the nineteenth century, the panorama at the Colosseum in Regent's Park, for instance, represented London from the spire of St. Paul's. The Colosseum's visitor could just make out Regent's Park and the building in which he or she stood in the painted distance. Wordsworth does not, however, refer to these self-reflexive London sights. Contemporaries had mixed feelings about panoramic painting—on the one hand, they found many examples stunning; on the other, too realistic and perhaps too gimmicky to be "real" art.
London, and the Sadler's Wells play in which he sees Mary Robinson represented, as exceptional. The Sadler's Wells sequence elaborates his contention that the Lake District functions in London as a falsified spectacle for an urban population. Paradoxically, he casts his Lake District childhood as the thing that permits him to appropriate a heavily mediated London representation of a woman whose cultural importance to London-based tourists had relied on a carefully maintained distance between herself and her spectators. This is particularly clear in the earlier version of the Book, in which Wordsworth makes Robinson's Lake District childhood "almost" identical to his:

       .....This memorial verse  
          Comes from the Poet's heart, and is her due.  
          For we were nursed, as almost might be said,  
             On the same mountains; children at one time  
           Must haply often on the self-same day  
          Have from our several dwellings gone abroad  
             To gather daffodils on Coker's Stream. (1805:339-445)

If, as Neil Hertz argues, the subsequent blind beggar incident re-establishes the "boundaries between the representor and the represented and, while minimizing the differences between them, keeps the poet-impresario from tumbling into his text,"\textsuperscript{122} the 1805 Maid of Buttermere episode has a willing Wordsworth diving headlong into it. As Lawrence Kramer has argued in a different context, "what Wordsworth sees so compellingly in Mary Robinson is himself."\textsuperscript{123} In this passage, the differences between the presenter and the represented are virtually eliminated. A geological formation, not the human beings living on it, becomes "almost" a mutual mother, erasing the biological plurality of mothers. As children, Wordsworth would have his reader believe, both he and Mary of Buttermere had the same destination and

\textsuperscript{122} See "The Notion of Blockage in the Literature of the Sublime," 84.  
\textsuperscript{123} Kramer, 619-620.
occupation ("gather[ing] daffodils on Coker's Stream") despite differences in sex, education, and social status. Still another connection is implied. As Wordsworth's sensibilities are ultimately in danger of being contaminated by the city, the Maid of Buttermere is later in danger of being contaminated by an imposter and bigamist commonly aligned with the city. Despite potential violation by outside agents, both seem to retain purity.

Wordsworth does not describe the Maid of Buttermere in the context of the historical moment in which he saw her (if he ever did) but as a memory enveloped within a memory of an encounter with an urban environment. The sequence is a series of enveloped spectacles: the prostitute within the painted mother and her child, within the memory of the Maid of Buttermere, within the actress playing the Maid, within the theatre at Sadler's Wells, within a description of the city as spectacle, within a poem displaying the growth and development of the poet's mind. The sequence itself occurs at the centre of Book VII by line count. Here, Wordsworth relates seeing the Sadler's Wells melodrama based on the story of Mary of Buttermere (280;260 ff). Faced with the acted Mary on stage, he recounts as the plot of the play the story of her marriage scandal, and what he and a friend felt and saw when they first sighted her in the Lake District (320;296 ff).

The sequence is fictional—an unadmitted example of what Wordsworth earlier calls "A tale from my own heart, more near akin/To my own passions and habitual thoughts" (1850, Book 2:122-123). It displays something Wordsworth felt important about himself rather than relating actual events which enlightened him as his mind developed. Book VII correlates to Wordsworth's residence in London in 1799. This is the year scholars assume he saw Mary Robinson, the Beauty of Buttermere, on his tour of the Lake District with Coleridge, but the marriage scandal did not occur until 1802. Furthermore, Charles Dibdin Jr.'s melodrama "Edward and Susan, or the Maid of Buttermere," which Wordsworth implies that he saw in 1799, was not performed until 1803. Wordsworth is unlikely to have ever seen the play. His information probably came from a letter dated 9 July [1803] sent by Mary Lamb to Dorothy Wordsworth, in which she describes Sadler's Wells as "the lowest and most London-
like of all our London amusements" and explains that

--the entertainments were Goody Two Shoes, Jack the Giant-Killer, and Mary of Buttermere! poor Mary was very happily married at the end of the piece, to a sailor her former sweetheart—we had a prodigious fine view of her fathers [sic] house in the vale of Buttermere—mountains very like large haycocks, and a lake like nothing at all....\(^{124}\)

Jack the Giant-Killer also makes an appearance in Wordsworth's poem. Sadler's Wells had changed ownership in 1802 and the rope dancing that Wordsworth mentions in the 1805 version was at that time eliminated (along with tumbling) in favour of what were known as aquatic representations (a novelty marketed to the middle classes).\(^{125}\) If Wordsworth did chance to read Dibdin's published play, the plot is not as Wordsworth has it with the spoiler successful. Wordsworth's version shows:

\begin{quote}
...how the spoiler came, 'a bold bad Man'
To God unfaithful, children, wife, and home,
And wooed the artless daughter of the hills,
And wedded her, in cruel mockery
Of love and marriage bonds. (1805:322-326)
\end{quote}

Dibdin's Maid, on the other hand, rejects the advances of Cheatall (Wordsworth's "spoiler") in favour of the patriotic sailor, her former sweetheart. Her sailor takes on part of John Hatfield's real-life role by assuming various disguises, while Cheatall remains Cheatall throughout. Mary Lamb's letter is the source of Wordsworth's "memory." None of it could have happened in 1799, and probably little (if any) of it was part of Wordsworth's subsequent lived experience.

As tourists, Wordsworth and Coleridge could freely assess Mary Robinson in her inn without being negatively implicated in the description:

\(^{124}\) The Letters of Charles and Mary Lamb, II:117.

...in her cottage inn [we]
 Were welcomed, and attended on by her,
 Both stricken with one feeling of delight,
 An admiration of her modest mien
 And carriage, marked by unexampled grace.
 Not unfamiliarly we since that time
 Have seen her,—her discretion have observed,
 Her just opinions, female modesty,
 Her patience, and retiredness of mind
 Unsoiled by commendation and the excess
 Of public notice. (1805:329-339)

Being "not unfamiliar" with Mary Robinson is not the same as being "not unfamiliar" with a prostitute. To be familiar with the prostitute would be to express one's desire in a publicly prohibited manner. Robinson could be treated as innocent (though possibly erotic) spectacle.

Immediately following Wordsworth's description of Mary, her dead child, and a painted mother and her child, Wordsworth describes his first encounter with prostitution. The prostitute, by profession, attempts to collapse the space between the male spectator and herself, and by doing so forces moral decisions on the spectator. Wordsworth responds to her by imagining the "race of man" "split" in two. The whore and the good woman are dramatically separated from one another, though both have "the same outward shape":

Full surely from the bottom of my heart
I shuddered; but the pain was almost lost,
Absorbed and buried in the immensity
Of the effect: a barrier seemed at once
Thrown in, that from humanity divorced
The human form, splitting the race of man
In twain, yet leaving the same outward shape.
Distress of mind ensued upon this sight
And ardent meditation. Afterwards
A milder sadness on such spectacles
Attended.... (1805:420-430)
The prostitute’s position as a spectacle soliciting complicit sexual and monetary exchange profoundly shakes Wordsworth’s understanding of human relations. Because of the threat she poses to his understanding, her ubiquitous presence in the spectacle of London requires neutralization. The consciously imposed barrier seems necessary since the prostitute is not constituted as an inaccessible attraction as were sentimental tourist attractions such as Mary Robinson. Interaction with a prostitute implicates the male spectator in a way an appreciation of mountains, children, or of female sentimental tourist attractions, does not. Sterne had, as I have argued above, designed the Maria episodes so that the tourist would not be implicated in exactly the way a terrified Wordsworth fears he is when he describes encounters with prostitutes. Wordsworth attempts to use a sentimental female tourist attraction to protect himself as Sterne had, but with much less success.

As the last of a series of encounters concerned with the breakdown of the boundaries between spectator and spectacle, the prostitute is only introduced for her implications to be suppressed. Mary Jacobus has argued that Wordsworth throws sexuality out of the poem in the figure of the prostitute. But sexuality is clearly not all Wordsworth eliminates with the prostitute. She represents the possibility that his system of understanding, based on the isolation of the spectator from the spectacle, the pure from the impure, must fail. Acknowledging the prostitute’s presence could collapse his system of "order and relation" (729;761). By editing her out of his landscape as anomalous, and by writing of Mary of Buttermere’s marriage to a false tourist as something which caused no change in her life, he masks the permeability of the boundary between spectator and spectacle and its shifting, reconstitutable nature. Wordsworth is positively implicated by his "familiarity" with Robinson because she is a famous figure of publicly approved permanent innocence. Familiarity with a prostitute, on the other hand, would negatively implicate him, making him partially responsible for her degraded social position. Furthermore, familiarity with Mary Robinson is presented as something which proves his own innocence since he can appreciate women from a distance.

In the 1850 version Wordsworth uses the Maid of Buttermere sequence to
illustrate the difference between spectacle and reality. The sequence shows

How casual incidents of real life,
Observed where pastime only had been sought,
Outweighed, or put to flight, the set events
And measured passions of the stage... (1850:402-405)

But not only is the sequence a blatant fabrication of Wordsworth's "real life," since it never happened, but there is no "real life" to outweigh "or put to flight" staged spectacle. There was no unstaged, unmediated Robinson in existence. Distinguishing the "real life" Mary Robinson from her myth was difficult by the time Wordsworth writes about her. This was the case simply because of the volume of material already existing which, even if presented as "non-fiction," fictionalized her story. Wordsworth's particular example of "real life" had a template in Sterne's Maria, and had already been mediated by Budworth and his allusion to Thomson, and then by the responses to the scandal.

Strangely, given the function Wordsworth gives the Maid, he identifies with the Lake District phenomenon through the actress playing Mary Robinson. Actresses, of course, were considered in the same light as prostitutes ("actress" was a common euphemism for prostitute, as in the Evelina passage cited above). An implicit connection is therefore made between Mary of Buttermere and the prostitute who appears at the end of the sequence. To Wordsworth, the prostitute is dangerous because her identity explicitly relies on the permeable, shifting, and continually reconstitutable boundary between spectator and spectacle, but the connection between Mary and the prostitute cannot be entirely masked. Not only is Robinson played by an actress in Wordsworth's poem, but, like the prostitute, much of the real woman's economic livelihood relied on the kindness and needs of sightseers. The real-life Mary

---

126 This is still the case, even in the bare facts and history her representation. To the best of my knowledge, Mary Robinson never wrote anything that gave her response to either her initial fame or to the scandal. Her experience--her reality--is lost.
Robinson was a waitress at her parents’ Lake District inn. It was in her interest to play the part she had been assigned by Budworth, and to play it well. There would be no escape from the mediation between a buying spectator and Mary Robinson’s form of spectacle. As the text plays itself out, the distinctions Wordsworth insists upon between the Lake District Mary, the acted Mary, the painted woman in the theatre, the prostitute, and perhaps even Wordsworth as the observer, become highly unstable and possibly close to meaningless, as do his claims of having escaped mediation between himself and the material world.

Throughout the period that Wordsworth wrote and revised Book VII the popular story of the Maid of Buttermere became increasingly associated with the Romantics as an example of the pastoral purity of the Lake District thought to inspire them. This trend is continued in Donald Reiman’s article, which displays a confusion that has become generic to discussions of Robinson. It is now difficult to imagine her cultural importance without reference to the Romantics and the myths they promulgated, even though it pre-dates them. Now she is made to be significant for what she reveals about a great poet when he uses her story. Wordsworth’s use of the public association between himself and the story becomes, in Book VII of The Prelude, a reflexive move. It also brings us back to where we began—with an eroticized, sexually unavailable woman who is a tourist attraction, the rejected prostitute, and a tourist who is such a skilful writer that he can use a representation of his response to a woman to his own advantage.
CHAPTER 3

Tourists, Good Women, Bad Women: Witnessing Protestant Sisterhoods and Desirous Whores

In Chapter 2, we saw how Sterne proposed an alternative model for managing and writing about erotic or sexual experience on tour. Its success created a certain form of female tourist attraction which had not previously existed. Sterne picked up on the contemporary treatment of women in tourism and altered it so successfully that it struck the contemporary imagination with a force that is surprising now. Among other things, he had shown how to have sexual contact without its usual implications for the tourist. As the female sentimental tourist attraction lost its value for the wider culture, William Wordsworth found himself grappling with the same problems Sterne had. He reached back to the figure of a famous female tourist attraction to protect himself both from the sexually available women she had been used to mask and from the way contact with these women implicated the tourist.

This chapter continues to address the ways the tourist was simultaneously implicated in and protected both from the people and lifestyles he or she contacted, and from the ramifications of the ideas and the sometimes radical thought or morality the tourist then described to the domestic public. Again, in these works women serve as the focus point for anxieties raised by touring and in society at large. Through tourists’ encounters with women in these particular works, ideas with radical implications for the gendered political and social structure could be explored, as could worries about gender fluidity and expressions of sexuality. By using tourism in conjunction with a carefully constructed tourist and a hybrid of novelistic, tour account, and anatomy conventions, Thomas Amory, Sarah Scott, and William Erskine could broach subjects that would be uncontrollably explosive in most other media.
i. Protected Witnesses: The Male Tourist and Female Communities in Thomas Amory and Sarah Scott

In Thomas Amory's *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain* (1755) and *The Life of John Buncle, Esq.* (1756; 1766), and Sarah Scott's *A Description of Millenium Hall* (1762), tourist-narrators describe fictional Protestant sisterhoods. Both writers use well-understood tour conventions to frame and focus descriptions of institutionalized alternatives to the conventional country-house community. Typically, the country-house community was conceptualized as a property-based, genealogical or contractually related "family" of a master and his dependents, usually consisting of a married father and mother, children, and servants. Both families and country-house communities were still conceptualized as microcosms of the national community—they were commonly understood as ordered by the same principals of domination and subordination. Therefore, in presenting sisterhoods as functioning alternative families, Amory and Scott interrogated the very basis of the genealogical and property-based social order as it existed in the eighteenth century. The utopian alternatives thus posited, however, are marginalized by the dynamics of the works and by the life stories of the tourists.

Amory’s and Scott’s narrators are presented as witnesses protected by tourism’s conventions from complicity in the conditions producing the communities they describe. In the journal of his Italian tour of 1833, Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote that "The singular position of the American traveller in Italy...is like that of a being of

---

1 Amory also describes a society of men at Ulubrae who study natural philosophy and mathematics, and a society of married friars (Ivonites). Amory's *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain* [...] (1755) is abbreviated as *Memoirs* and cited parenthetically as *Mem.*; *The Life of John Buncle, Esq.* [...] *Vol. I* (1756) and *Vol. II* (1766) are abbreviated as *Buncle* and cited parenthetically as *JB* with volume and page number; Gary Kelly's edition of Scott's *A Description of Millenium Hall* (1762) is abbreviated as *Millenium Hall* and cited parenthetically as *MH*, and Betty Rizzo's edition of *The History of Sir George Ellison* (1766) is abbreviated as *Ellison*. 
another planet who invisibly visits the earth. He is a protected witness." In receiving the account from the male tourist, not from the female members of the community, readers too are potentially released from being tainted by both guilt in the conditions the women found intolerable and in their radical response to these conditions—the creation of new separatist social orders. A nervousness over the validity of the position of the protected witness produces from both authors sequels recounting their tourists' life stories. These in effect promote the spectator as the key to the toured, and contain the implications of the all-female communities they witnessed. By placing these works in the historical context of the tour practices they rely upon, this section clarifies the nature and limitations of their projects of social protest and reform.

The echoing of the actual in the fictional is particularly interesting in connection to the touring of all-female communities. Both Amory and Scott choose the tour description form to frame and lend authenticity to their accounts. Amory was so successful, in fact, that his Memoirs account of the founder of a Protestant sisterhood, Harriot Eusebia Harcourt, made its way into the non-fiction compilations of remarkable women’s lives. The island on which Amory locates Harcourt’s community does not exist, nor does any independent account of her. Of course, the tradition of touring all-female communities made fictional descriptions and tours plausible. The British treated English convents on the continent as a necessary tourist stop—as a Protestant, one should investigate this peculiarly Catholic institution; as a recusant, one wanted to visit the courageously religious, and one’s friends and relatives who had taken the veil or were being educated by the nuns. Amory refers to the practice when he attributes the origin of Harcourt’s community to her exposure to European convents in a tour:

---

2 Journals, 4:78.

When this lady was travelling with her father over Europe, she became acquainted with some noble nuns in several monasteries [sic], and was so pleased with the goodness of their lives, that she determined to found a recluse society of protestants as soon as it was in her power; and immediately after her father’s death, proposed the scheme of her Instituto to some ladys [sic] of her acquaintance of several nations. (Mem. 339)

The practice of touring convents was so common that it cropped up in the most unexpected situations. In 1791 Elizabeth Simcoe, travelling through Quebec City with her husband on the way to his post as the first lieutenant-governor of Upper Canada (now Ontario), toured and described the Ursuline convent there as a routine (and expected) part of her sightseeing. It was not until the 1780s, however, that the domestic British tourist could visit an example of an all-female, Protestant community with outlines familiar from sources as diverse as the writings of Mary Astell, Daniel Defoe, Samuel Richardson, Sarah Scott, and Thomas Amory.

One might be startled to read in a conventional tourist’s 1799 account of a pedestrian journey that he had breakfasted, along with twelve other tourists, with two "female hermits" in Llangollen, Wales. He had visited them twice before, and apparently considered them one of the two major tourist attractions of the neighbourhood (the other was a ruin). Lady Eleanor Butler, Sarah Ponsonby, and their cottage and garden fascinated a bewildering variety of famous tourists from writers such as William Wordsworth, Anna Seward, Madame de Genlis, Hester Piozzi, Sir Walter Scott, Robert Southey, and Thomas De Quincey to the members of assorted royal families, some of whom became friends. They were an attraction from the early

---

4 Mrs. Simcoe’s Diary, 43-4.


6 James Plumptre, James Plumptre’s Britain: The Journals of a Tourist in the 1790s, 162.
1780s through 1831—almost fifty years. The common occurrence of two women living together would not provoke such tourist interest, nor would their house and garden, though these were remarkable. What captivated people was their mode of life. They had retreated to relative isolation to live a systematized and highly cultivated life with one another, thereby, it was assumed, rejecting the marriages that would be their usual destiny.7

To those familiar with the writings advocating Protestant convents or with works such as Scott’s Millenium Hall, contemporary accounts of the Ladies of Llangollen seem familiar. They were well-born. They created a highly artificial and aestheticized garden (it even had Italian quotations on placards attached to trees) and an atmospheric house complete with an Aeolian harp in the library. They were well-read and developed their reading carefully; they were known to engage in such acceptably feminine activities as calligraphy, purse-netting, and map-copying. They were known to live to a system—for instance, they rarely left their house overnight (in fact it was widely reported that they never slept away from it). They eschewed the vanities of the world by wearing an unusually plain and highly practical dress and hair style. That this life-style choice was initially understood by contemporaries as an expandable communal structure and not as a sexual coupling is indicated by the two separate instances in which other women wanted to join them in their system of life.8

Though the Ladies have come to symbolize any number of things to different groups since their deaths, their interest for the tourists who drew them to public

7 For strictly biographical details I have relied on Elizabeth Mavor, The Ladies of Llangollen: A Study in Romantic Friendship.

8 The suspicion that they were a lesbian couple originated in a 1790 newspaper article (reproduced, Mavor, The Ladies of Llangollen, 82-83) which outraged the Ladies and their friends. As Randolph Trumbach notes, though the Ladies have since been promoted as lesbian or proto-lesbian, this was not how they presented themselves, nor how they expected to be taken. (See "London’s Sapphists: From Three Sexes to Four Genders in the Making of Modern Culture," in Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity, 132.)
attention and then fixed it there was that they were a real-life and functioning version of communities which writers such as Amory and Scott had described in their fiction, and which had been debated and projected since the seventeenth century. There was something about the community they incarnated and in tourism of the period that made the Ladies of Llangollen a tourist site, and ensured that the fictional communities of Amory and Scott were mediated by tourists. The frontispiece of Scott's *Millenium Hall* shows the two tourists peering though the trees at a country seat (which one assumes is Millenium Hall) instead of, for a counter-example, depicting the women at work. To isolate these writers' descriptions of all-female communities from the practice of tourism and its implications is to suppress much of what is going on in the texts.

Though domestic tourism became more widespread and multifaceted in the 1770s, it was not a new phenomenon. The antiquarian tourism that Buncle engages in between country-house tours, for instance, was so well developed by 1732 that Hogarth and a group of friends were able to satirize it. In concentrating on touring the country houses of their own nation, however, Buncle and Ellison engage in an activity popular since the seventeenth century, but which was particularly fashionable in the 1750s. Such tourism as part of a regime to recover health or from grief—as with Buncle and Ellison—was also conventional. Alexander Pope, for instance,

---


10 See especially Fabricant, "The Literature of Domestic Tourism and the Public Consumption of Private Property," which, despite its all-inclusive title, focuses almost exclusively on country-house tourism; and Tinniswood, *A History of Country House Visiting*. It was rare to engage in country-house tourism alone. Buncle is also interested in nature and antiquities, and in *Millenium Hall*’s sequel, Ellison tours Wales and makes yearly charitable tours of debtor’s prisons.

11 More familiar fictions in which tourists travel to regain health include Smollett’s *Humphry Clinker* and Sterne’s *A Sentimental Journey*. Motivation, however, does not determine the form of tourism—neither of these narratives is primarily structured around describing country houses or their communities.
routinely made such tours to recover health, while, in the fictional world, Harriet Byron makes such a recuperative domestic tour in Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison* with her family and the newly affianced Charles.

Country-house touring was consciously used to ratify and justify the position of the landed classes, a development traced by Adrian Tinniswood and Carole Fabricant. The order and opulence preserved in country houses and their gardens was routinely read synecdochally for that of the nation, as we have already seen in Arthur Young's agricultural tours. Amory and Scott, therefore, employ a tour tradition that conventionally celebrated and justified the position of the most powerful members of society. However, instead of promoting the position of a landed, tasteful, and hereditary family line (and through it the glory of the nation) by finding its reflection in house and garden, Amory and Scott describe country-house communities that consist solely of those who are usually disempowered. Amory's communities are freely chosen substitutes for the conventional family, and typically break with established religious practice too (all good people in Amory are Unitarians). In contrast, Millenium Hall is a refuge for those who have been repeatedly victimized by their powerlessness. Ruth Perry writes that Millenium Hall "is imagined as a place that redeems otherness, whether figured as monstrosity, physical handicap, or merely femaleness—all are restored here to their full human dignity."

That these communities are discussed in tour accounts marks them as remarkable. Unlike exploration accounts, for example, tour accounts were conventionally meant to refine, correct, or fill out pre-existing knowledge. In the descriptions of his travels, Buncle provides precise and banal travelling advice about such things as the location of inns, and refutes or adds to works such as William Camden's *Britannia* and Daniel Defoe's *Tour*. Amory's *Memoirs* centre around a tour

---

12 See Pat Rogers, "Pope's Rambles."

13 "Bluestockings in Utopia," 163.
of the Western Isles of Scotland, while his character John Buncle spends most of his Life getting lost, pole-vaulting down precipices or across moats, climbing up the inside of "mountains" and falling through holes (literally) in the "mountains" of the Stanemore Hills and in the "alps" of adjacent Cumberland and Westmoreland. Since these parts of England and Scotland were not popular tourist destinations until the early 1770s, they were unfamiliar to the average Englishman except as a reader of antiquarian treatises and the standard tour accounts by Martin Martin or Daniel Defoe.

Through such references, advice, and detail, Amory constructs a believable frame for his descriptions of unlikely communities, extraordinarily educated women, and fantastic natural scenery. His success here also opened him to the charge of insanity. In fact, until quite recently Amory and Scott have both been dismissed by critics and scholars because they did not write what were understood to be good novels, or at least ones that foreshadowed nineteenth-century novelistic conventions. Though Scott has begun to be addressed seriously, Amory’s works have received little sustained critical attention in the twentieth century.14 Despite the absence of independent biographical material on Amory, most commentators have attempted to determine his mental condition and to separate the parts of his work that are "really" autobiographical from those parts are that are products of a possibly diseased imagination, generally using probability as the only sieve.15 Based on his fiction alone, then, commentators have accused Amory of not knowing which parts of his

14 Although Amory is often briefly mentioned in early twentieth-century histories of the novel in connection with Sterne, the only relatively lengthy critical treatments are Howard V. Hong’s 1938 dissertation "Thomas Amory: Eccentric Literary Philosopher," which identifies, in addition to shaky biographical readings, some of Amory’s intellectual sources; Ian Campbell Ross’ "Thomas Amory, John Buncle, and the Origins of Irish Fiction," which links Amory to Irish narrative traditions; and Frans de Bruyn’s "Thomas Amory," which argues that the eighteenth century defined Amory’s works as novels.

15 Twentieth-century examples of this problematic procedure are Hong’s chapter on Amory’s life; Katherine A. Esdaile, "The Real Thomas Amory"; and J. Cuming Walters, "John Buncle": A Curio of Literature.
works were real and which fictional, assuming that the works were meant to be autobiographical and that their own confusion was Amory’s. His rejection of the Church of England and most other Christian denominations in favour of Unitarianism, the number of highly educated women and utopian communities, and the peculiar fragmentary literary form he chose seemed to support dismissing his work as nothing more than a madman’s scribblings. Amory may have been mad. But the generic experimentation, the educated women, the Unitarianism, and the hyperbolic landscape descriptions of his works are not irrefutable evidence of madness. His work deserves serious attention.

The unsupportable conviction that Amory must have thought all he wrote autobiographical, in conjunction with an idea that much of what he writes is objectionable on moral or aesthetic grounds, has usually stopped further inquiry. Sarah Scott’s works have also presented problems. Until feminist critics recently took interest in Millenium Hall, commentators on her works routinely apologized for the apparently devastating exclusion of psychological depth and drama resulting from her master-interest in charity. Recent criticism has revealed Scott’s work to be more complex than earlier criticism indicates, but still tends to treat her as a bad novelist who nevertheless has very interesting and important ideas about women and their place in society.

In part, Amory and Scott have presented problems for commentators because their works are generic hybrids which combine novelistic elements with two forms which are not as familiar or as well-understood—the tour account and the anatomy. In 1957 Northrop Frye identified John Buncle as an anatomy, which in its "most concentrated" form is the Menippean satire. Such satire presents us with a vision of the world in terms of a single intellectual pattern. The intellectual structure built up from the story makes for violent dislocations

---

16 The most thorough of these earlier commentators are Walter Marion Crittenden, The Life and Writings of Mrs. Sarah Scott, Novelist (1723-1795) (1932) and Gaby Esther Onderwyzer, "Sarah Scott: Her Life and Works" (1957).
in the customary logic of narrative... The purely moral type is a serious vision of society as a single intellectual pattern, in other words a Utopia.\(^7\)

The works addressed in this chapter present a fictional world designed according to what Frye calls "a single intellectual pattern."\(^8\) The two over-riding concerns for Amory are a Christian Deist system known as Unitarianism, and the value and urgency of giving women the same education as men because they (we?) are rational beings of the same species as men, with souls of equal worth to those of men. Sarah Scott's works *Millenium Hall* and *Ellison* are also structured around an intellectual system. In Scott, rationalized systems of philanthropy--one developed by a community of women, and one by a wealthy paternalistic man--organize the narratives, creating in England limited utopias. The compensatory measures she suggests for the social problems she describes act as the primary organizing force of her narratives.

Both writers adopt novelistic conventions, which is part of the reason their works have been misread as bad novels. *Memoirs* has inset stories using the standard novel plot-lines of abduction and true love, but takes the over-all shape of a tour narrative. Buncle meets Mrs. Benlow, the putative subject of the *Memoirs*, while on a tour of Richmondshire, treating her and her interesting house as local curiosities, and then joins Mrs. Benlow and her companions for a tour of the Western Islands of Scotland. *Buncle* has a similarly novelistic skeleton. The nineteenth-century saw a much-reprinted abridgement of *Buncle* titled *The Spirit of Buncle; or the Surprising Adventures of that Original and Extraordinary Character John Buncle, Esq.* which, though it deleted Amory's many references to sex and his lengthy religious

---

\(^7\) *Anatomy of Criticism*, 312-310. For Frye on the anatomy form, see "Varieties of Eighteenth-Century Sensibility"; "The Anatomy In Prose Fiction"; and, of course, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 308-314 et. passim.

\(^8\) Erskine's *Travel and Adventures of Mademoiselle de Richelieu* is a specific form of anatomy, the Menippean Satire. As I argue in the following section, in Erskine's case identifying the satirical mode in which he operates is crucial to interpretation.
exhortations, leaves the reader with an amusing picaresque tale of an adventurer and fortune-hunter who sees and does amazing things, marries extraordinarily educated women and is widowed seven times, and who tours a truly magical British countryside. Though cleaned up and regularized, the language and narrative structure are Amory’s. The nineteenth-century abridger dumped the anatomy and left the novel, reducing a 1000 page work to a one of less than 350 pages. By stripping away the flesh, Buncle’s supporting skeleton, unequivocally a novel, is left bare.

The foundation of Scott’s Millenium Hall is the country-house description found so ubiquitously in published tours. The inset biographies of each of the "ladies" of Millenium Hall, however, use many of the standard plot and character tropes of the contemporary novel, creating a kind of reader’s digest for stock novel-heroine dilemmas such as forced marriage, attempted seduction, and parental misunderstanding. Melinda Alliker Rabb has argued that Millenium Hall "develops an alternative fiction to the paradigmatic ones in which the heroine marries happily or dies tragically,"19 but, it should be added, this difference is in the ending of the women’s stories, not in what leads up to this ending. Instead of happy marriage or tragic death, their lives all conclude at Millenium Hall. Likewise, Scott’s Ellison is, in addition to being an anatomy, a hagiography, a biography, and a standard novelistic personal "history."

Though both writers use tourism and tour account forms to lend their accounts authority, they combine them with other literary forms to remarkably different ends. Amory’s works, which are much more radical than Scott’s, pose problems for the reader. The mixture of fact and fiction, most obvious in his use of historical individuals such as Edmund Curll (the notorious printer and bookseller) alongside fictional ones, or real places such as Harrogate alongside obviously imagined ones, and the highly unorthodox textual forms of his works, make reading him a wild and bizarre experience. Amory’s formal experimentation is designed to shake readers’

19 "Making and Rethinking the Canon: General Introduction and the Case of Millenium Hall." 9.
preconceptions, while Scott combines forms to harness their potential to support a 
conservative agenda. Scott's fictions explicitly posit a means of reinforcing the 
mainstream religious and paternalistic formations which are threatened by their internal 
problems and abuses. She is not interested in subverting mainstream culture, as 
Amory, with his push to convert his readers to unitarianism and his insistence on a 
"male" education for women, clearly is. At one point George Ellison contrasts his 
wife's homeland Jamaica, a land of slavery and "tyranny," to England, saying:

I, on the contrary, was born in a country, that with all its faults is 
conspicuously generous, frank, and merciful, because it is free; no 
subordination exists there, but what is for the benefit of the lower as well as 
the higher ranks; all live in a state of reciprocal services, the great and the poor 
are linked in compact; each side has its obligations to perform....whenever [the 
labourer] finds it eligible to change his master, he is as free as I am. (GE, 16- 
17)

To those labourers involved in the food-riots of the period, who were unable to afford 
firing and would be hanged for "stealing" it from the neighbourhood trees, such a 
description of England as an ideal "compact" in which they hold a subordinate 
position for their own "benefit" would seem obtuse. The problems Scott's 
philanthropic men and women solve indicate an implicit recognition that there were 
deeper faultlines in the English domestic order than Ellison indicates. However, 
Ellison's is the England Scott's works Millenium Hall and Ellison insist will unfold 
when the patrician orders devote themselves to a philanthropy specifically designed for 
painless reinforcement of the current power structure.

Amory's use of the tourism and the tour account form to mesh fiction and non- 
fiction is particularly interesting for the way in which it creates appropriate settings for 
his communities. His insistence upon the lack of thoroughness displayed by previous 
tour accounts is not disingenuous. Amory cites Martin Martin's passage on the Green 
Isle as "All Mr. Martin says of this land is, that he believes he saw it at a distance 
once, and a captain of a ship told him he had been on it" (Mem, 320). Amory inserts 
an absence into Martin's account where there is none. Martin's description of the
Green Isle is:

...I was becalmed near a little isle, where I dropped anchor and went ashore. I found it covered all over with long grass. There was abundance of seals lying on the rocks and on the shore; there is likewise a multitude of sea-fowls in it; there is a river in the middle, and on each side of it I found great heaps of fish bones of many sorts; there are many planks and boards cast up upon the coast of the isle, and it being all plain and level with the sea....This isle is four English miles in length, and one in breadth....[B]y reason of the description above recited, we may aptly enough call [this island] the Green Island.  

Amory transforms the relatively barren flat island Martin describes. He moves it hundreds of miles to the north-west of its position on Martin’s map, in fact moving it well off the edge. Furthermore, he dramatically changes its topography, and gives it human inhabitants. In his description, the island becomes analogous to the "good" woman--she presents an outside of stony virtue, but has a fertile and safe interior only accessible through one well-guarded opening. The island is

four miles and three quarters in its greatest length, and four and a half in its greatest breadth, as hath been found upon a late survey. It is walled round with rocks, excepting one narrow opening to the north, which is an entrance to a small bay, and these vast rocks rise so high from the surface of the water, and above the land they inclose so far, that it looks without like a mountain of stone, and within the ground is finely sheltered from the surf of the sea. On every side there are many perils by rocks under water. There is a very dangerous one without the mouth of the entry, on the right hand. (Memo. 406)

This island not only contains the (fictional) summer retreat of the sisterhood founded by Harriet Eusebia Harcourt, but a garden "imitation of Virgil’s Elysian Fields" of "near forty acres" (Memo. 410) comparable to Stowe’s, the ruins of a thirteenth-century monastery, spectacular caverns, medicinal and "petrifying" springs in "the valley of the wells," a fabulous grotto, and a cabinet of curiosities including egyptian mummies

---

20 *A Description of the Western Islands of Scotland* (1703), 276-277.
The references to Martin’s account (though falsified), and to a topographical survey render Amory’s fictional setting and sisterhood plausible. The insertion of alternative communities into the gaps or lesser known sections of well-known tour narratives, so well exemplified by the Green Isle and its community, makes them an unexplored part of a familiar landscape, and already part of British culture. More importantly, however, Amory’s unadmitted re-writing of such sources as Martin to include a place for women and extraordinary all-female communities, and his choice of locating them off the map, reflects and criticizes the invisibility and marginalization of women in contemporary cultural life.

Unlike Amory, Scott keeps the larger geographical frame sketchy. Millenium Hall is placed with an eye to probability. Cornwall was familiar, but not central to the lives of many of Scott’s readers. While Amory stresses the strangeness and mystery of what he encounters (whether fictional or non-fictional, mountains or women), Scott maintains the links between Millenium Hall and a normative world. Though Millenium Hall is physically isolated, accounts of the women’s lives before coming to the Hall compose the bulk of the work. The women’s life histories are interwoven with descriptions of their current activities at Millenium Hall. In effect, the two worlds interpenetrate and reflect one another in the neutral, slightly displaced, normative environment of Cornwall.

The authority of Scott’s description does not rest on invoking specific non-fiction tour accounts, as Amory’s does, but on the narrator and the Ars Peregrinari tradition. Critics have either ignored Ellison, or have argued either that he is an unproblematic and respectable conduit to the male-dominated world, a masculine buffer between the women’s ideas and the male-dominated world, or that he undergoes a neutralizing feminization. But Ellison is more than a conduit, buffer, or feminized man. As James Cruise has demonstrated, Ellison’s desires and expectations

---

21 See, for instance, James Cruise, "A House Divided: Sarah Scott’s Millenium Hall"; Susan Snaider Lanser, Fictions of Authority: Women Writers and Narrative Voice, 225-230; and Jane Spencer, "Introduction" to A Description of Millenium Hall, xi-xv.
result in a representation which is often at odds with how the women represent themselves. I would add that Ellison exemplifies one of the most fundamental structural fictions of tourism. His role as tourist guarantees him a potentially neutral position. Ellison is a protected witness. His position's fiction is that he has no responsibility for conditions either at Millenium Hall or in the world that made Millenium Hall necessary. In other words, the implications of his full integration in the world which has victimized and abused the members of the community at Millenium Hall are suppressed. As a wealthy man, he has a power to oppress and victimize unmatched by the women he encounters. As a returned Jamaican planter, he almost certainly has participated in the deployment of power in its most naked form—he would have owned slaves. Clearly, however, Scott was aware of the less savory implications of Ellison's position. Her next work, Ellison, served to palliate the tourist/narrator's life choices and integration with the world outside Millenium Hall.

Amory's work underlines how ambiguous and potentially deceptive the "neutral" position of a tourist is. His games of supplementation and fragmentation disrupt Buncle's position as a protected witness as it is constructed. Though Amory's first fiction, Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain (1755), is a fragment itself composed of heterogeneous shards of women's biographies, sermons, travelogues, pamphlets, poems, mathematical theorems, theological debates, and accounts of antiquities, Buncle primarily recounts the formation of an all-woman family around Mrs. Benlow and describes the sisterhood founded by Harcourt. The work claims to be the first instalment of an eight-volume "Supplement" (Mem. xix et. passim.) to an even longer "Thing" (Mem. xix) to be called The antient and present State of Great Britain, and more particular Observations of what is remarkable in Nature, Art, and Antiquity, than have been yet communicated to the Public. Unfortunately, Amory/Buncle explains, the first two volumes, on the eve of their publication, were accidentally consumed by fire. What was the author to do?

...[T]o print he was determined....The author had made more antique and natural enquiries than he could possibly have had room for in his work, and
had beside become acquainted, in his travels over England and Scotland, with several ingenious and excellent women, who are glorious on account of their virtue and piety, and to be for ever admired for their literary accomplishments. Those illustrious personages, and these things, he resolved to put together, and call them a Supplement to his large work. (Mem. xxiii-xxiv)

The result is Amory's Memoirs, which, despite its supplementarity, was to compose eight (!) volumes. Amory/Buncle further characterizes this work as a

...heap of minutes and notes, which are called Memoirs of several ladies of Great Britain, because the illustrious women therein mentioned are the choicest things in the collection, and every other account, with all the literary reflexions, spring from their stories, and are recited occasionally, as they relate to particulars in their histories. (Mem. xxv)

According to the "Table of Lives," which lists the twenty women reputedly to be covered in the first volume, these "choicest things" that Buncle encountered on his travels include "Judith, the charming Hebrew," and "the beautiful Isyphena," along with women with more conventional-sounding names such as Mrs. Wallis and Mrs. Lowman. Yet "the narrations relative to the ladies" are indeed "the least Part of the performance." Though all twenty women were to be covered, only one is mentioned, or her history started. The narrator promises his correspondent, and the reader is so notified at the top of each page, that he is being treated to the "History of Mrs. Marinda Benlow." Yet we get little of this history. The long "Postscript" admits that the descriptions of such as Harcourt's sisterhood

...have little relation to the thing you asked for, the life of Mrs. Benlow [but]...I determined...to make my epistle to you one of several letters, that are to form a supplement to an itinerary I am giving the last hand to....(Mem. 405)

Memoirs, then, is a fragment of the first of a projected eight-volume work composed from the "heap" of fragments to do with women that has been left over from and supplementing a no longer existing men's history of Britain, that nevertheless requires
itself a further supplement in the form of a "supplement to an itinerary."

Amory's first work is an extraordinary reading experience. The text's formal aspects inscribe the simultaneous centrality of the women as the subject of the work and their marginality to the culture. If women and their achievements are the left out, left over bits of a history of male Britain, Amory underlines their peripheral cultural status by the way he proceeds. Again, his treatment of the Green Isle and its community is illustrative. Most of the tour of the Western Islands of Scotland is written by Mrs. Benlow, with footnoted commentary by Buncle. Her lengthy account ends abruptly at the beginning of her description of the inhabitants of the Green Isle because Buncle had "lost the remaining sheets of her observations by some accident or other; I know not how..." (Mem. 324). Buncle continues with a description of Harcourt and the community, but then delays providing the complete description of the Green Isle he insists is necessary with the account of the conversion to Unitarianism of the Island's new owner, Mr. Hamner (Mem. 359-403). Mrs. Benlow's Buncle-annotated description of the community is displaced by Buncle's, which is further displaced by an account of Mr. Hamner's conversion. The full description of the island is deferred to the "Postscript," which includes the promise of further volumes to recount the lives of the women who were supposed to be written about in Memoirs. The women are put off the map, their stories displaced, their voices fragmented. Amory was never again to mirror women's experience in fictional form the way he does in Memoirs, though he continued to act out the way women's history and achievement were displaced and contained by men's.

Amory went on to write, instead of the promised biographies, the narrator's autobiography, The Life of John Buncle, Esq. He wrote it explicitly as a "key" and "supplement" to the Memoirs. The descriptions of the sisterhoods in Memoirs and the many self-contained utopias of Buncle become embedded in Buncle's life and understandable only through that life. However, while Buncle insists that his autobiography is necessary to understand Memoirs, he also repeatedly calls it "chiefly a further vindication of [him]self" ([II:[iii]]. Buncle explains "My own apology is the principal thing, interspersed with real characters of several sorts; and the additions
to it, are as many solid, natural, and delicate adventitious things as came my way. This is my book" (JB II:iv). Apparently his position as a protected witness in the Memoirs had left him exposed. Bewildered contemporary critics had found the work strange and suspicious. The subsequently appearing life story was to be Amory's armour. Since Buncle's life is now the subject, the extraordinary communities and women he meets on his tours are de-emphasized. Women are described almost incidentally as members of the communities he happens on in his prioritized searches for new wives, or he marries them and they die.

Despite the blissful alternative families Buncle encounters, he rejects membership in them in favour of seven successive marriages. This intense attachment to a conventional family form suggests that Amory and, he perceived, his audience, felt undermined by the depictions of highly educated women and the unorthodox communities which implicitly criticize contemporary family structures. An account of the narrator's life became necessary to rehabilitate the narrator's (if not the author's) authority. However, Amory's nervousness about the Memoirs, and his apologies, are more ambiguous than they might at first appear. Amory seems to make a decisive retreat from the implications of Memoirs in the first volume of Buncle by ending it with the narrator's first marriage and retreat to an Edenic Orton Lodge, thereby implying the creation of a new, stable, and conventional family. Ten years later, however, volume II of Buncle appeared. In volume II Buncle's first wife dies, and we follow Buncle as he wanders over the English countryside running through six more wives. (A woman's life-expectancy on marrying John Buncle is typically one or two years.) Conventional marriage is no longer the reliable, stable social form that it was in volume I. In Memoirs, Amory created a marginal, supplemental text that further marginalizes and supplements itself internally and through the subsequent appearance of its "supplement" and "key," the life of its narrator. Amory's texts reenact the marginality and supplementarity of their subjects, whether educated women, all-female communities, or the Western Isles of Scotland.

Amory rejects the contemporary social models Scott finds so important. In Amory, biological reproduction is never used as a model for communal reproduction.
The reproduction of both the social hierarchy and property-holding patterns through blood ties, with the one understood to reflect and promote the other, so common in the period, is continually disrupted and suppressed. The only durable social forms in Amory's novels are the alternative forms his narrator encounters on his travels. Outside these, his characters are independent women and men (often recluses), or are in threatened families (daughters and a single soon-dead parent; sisters and their soon-dead brothers; couples about to lose a spouse to death). Not one character is represented as pregnant or as having young children. Children are so unimportant that Buncle dismisses his own "great many" in a footnote (JB II:137). However, where these "great many" go when Buncle repeatedly shuts up his residences to wander over Britain with only a servant remains a mystery. The absent children reflect his rejection of the model of community reproduction which fused it to the presence and production of children.

Amory's alternative families are drawn together, not by the accident of genealogy or marriage, but by economic need or by doctrinal, scientific, or educational interests. For example, the all-woman Burcot Lodge and community came together as a "little republic" for economic reasons; the all-woman community on the Green Isle was founded by Harcourt for religious, philanthropic and educational reasons; and, during the course of Memoirs, an all-female unitarian community is drawn together by financial need, patronage, and doctrinal agreement when the widowed Mrs Benlow is joined by two penniless women who have been disowned for their unitarianism, a penniless nun whom she has converted from Catholicism, and a black deposed princess whom she has converted from Catholic and Islamic beliefs combined. Unlike the deaths of the many parents and spouses of the text, the deaths of Benlow, Harcourt and Burcot do not cause the dissolution of the communities they founded. These survive death because what is maintained is not physical property or being, but a rationalized social system that can be adopted through education.

Unlike Amory, Scott depicts society as riddled with fissures created by the abuse of power and brutal victimization. The narrative substance of Millenium Hall and Ellison depends on the inequality between men and women, older and younger
sons, the wealthy and the poor, the elderly and the young, the physically maimed and the whole. But, while such narrative dependence reflects an acute awareness of social problems on a scale absent in Amory’s fictional world, in Scott’s fictions philanthropy reinforces the power structure where it is threatened by the hunger, discontent, and ambition of the disempowered or victimized. It is tempting to palliate Scott’s refusal to attack the source of the ills she ably describes by claiming that in the act of identifying abuse and injustice Scott intentionally undermines the power structure, or by hypothesizing that contemporary conditions or her gender militated against the expression of how she "really" felt. But identifying abuse and injustice only to propose reforms specifically meant to pacify the powerless, to prevent system-changing revolt, and to bolster a praised superstructure is not equivalent to subverting the system.22 Furthermore, what Scott does not write or strongly suggest may not exist. In what she actually writes, Scott displays little explicit interest in subverting mainstream culture, as Amory, with his push to convert his readers to Unitarianism and his insistence on a "male" education for women, clearly does.

However, there is, unavoidably, an unresolvable tension between Millenium Hall’s explicit conservatism and the women’s horrendous experiences of victimization in conventional family arrangements (especially that of marriage) before coming to Millenium Hall. Mrs. Morgan, for instance, who upon widowhood had co-founded Millenium Hall, had married a detestable man out of obedience to tyrannical parents and to protect her good reputation from slander:

...she thought it the highest injustice to marry a man whom she could not love,

22 Moira Ferguson makes a similar argument about Scott’s treatment of slavery in Ellison, which was, of course, written as Granville Sharp was pursuing his emancipation campaign. In the novel, Ellison is introduced as a merchant and benevolent slaveowner whose imperialist and racist activities are justified by Scott because of his kindness in conducting them. Ferguson argues that the novel promotes a sentimentalism that acts as a substitute for political action and the eradication of slavery. See Subject to Others: British Women Writers and Colonial Slavery, 1670-1834, 101-111.
as well as a very criminal mockery of the most solemn vows. [But]...to preserve her reputation was not only necessary to her own happiness, but a duty to society. [She said] "...The care of our virtue we owe to ourselves, the preservation of our characters is due to the world, and both are required by Him, who commands us to preserve ourself pure and unpolluted, and to contribute as far as we are able to the well-being of all his creatures. Example is the means given universally to all whereby to benefit society. I therefore look on it as one of our principal duties to avoid every imputation of evil...."

(MH 124-125)

In other words, she chooses to create an illusion that she has not been victimized because of what is represented as her duty to God and the benefit of such a charade to society.

Despite the serious physical and mental abuse Mrs. Morgan sustains throughout her "courtship" and marriage, her decision not to complain or attempt to alter her circumstances is held up as worthy of imitation:

Mrs. Morgan saw no means of redress [for the abuse of her husband and sister-in-law], and therefore thought it best to suffer without complaint; she considered, that, by contention, she could not prevail over their ill temper, but must infallibly sour her own, and destroy that composure of mind, necessary to enable every one to acquit herself well in Christian duties. By this patient acquiescence her virtues were refined, though her health suffered, and she found some satisfaction in reflecting, that him whom she most wished to please, would graciously accept her endeavours... (MH 155-156)

Declining health resulting from abuse, self-sacrifice, and self-abnegation, all directly caused by a marriage, is hardly an advertisement for the felicities of the state. All of the biographies (including Mrs. Morgan's) illustrate systemic abuse and injustice. Yet the women advocate intentionally covering up that abuse and injustice because not to do so would contravene "God's will" and the "benefit of society." In Gary Kelly's introduction to his edition of Millenium Hall, he writes about this issue:

In the first place, resignation to Providence removes responsibility for suffering from the plane of the human and social to that of the divine and absolute—an
agent against whom one cannot or should not protest. Secondly, it places individual suffering in a universal and transhistorical context, generalizing it and disarming it as a motive for individual or collective protest and reform. (Kelly, 33)

In Scott, invocations of "God" and "duty" consistently prevent questioning systemic injustice or investigating possibilities of systemic change. This does not, however, mean that Scott's work does not have subversive potential for the reader. In describing so evocatively the victimization and brutalization of such groups as women (in Millenium Hall) or slaves (in Ellison), Scott gives the reader an opportunity to come to conclusions opposing the ones she painstakingly advocates. In the structure and the deployment of stories and descriptions in Scott, however, there is no call for such interrogation, as there is both explicitly and implicitly in Amory's work.

The institution of Millenium Hall is created as a response to the serious social and political threat posed to the powerful by the outcast or disempowered populations. Describing the Millenium Hall haymakers (who are women) and labouring children, the narrator says:

in them we [he is travelling with a profligate named Lamont] beheld rural simplicity, without any of those marks of poverty and boorish rusticity, which would have spoilt the pastoral air of the scene around us; but not even the happy amiable innocence [they expressed]....gave me so much satisfaction as the sight of the number of children, who were all exerting the utmost of their strength, with an air of delighted emulation between themselves, to contribute their share to the general undertaking....their rosy cheeks shewed the benefits of youthful labour. (MH 57-58)

The lack of child labour, subsistence provision, and satisfaction has "spoilt the pastoral air of the scene" elsewhere for Ellison and Lamont. The two gentlemen's surprise reveals how rare such satisfied haymakers and child-labourers were. As the narrative goes on to demonstrate, it is out of the women's philanthropy that the haymakers and their children, along with other people connected with the manor, have been raised from "poverty and boorish rusticity" into the innocence and happy, satisfied labour that
the travellers find unprecedented and aesthetically rewarding. Without the benevolent intervention of the "ladies," the labourers, the poor, the old, the side-show freak, and the maimed are starving, barely-clothed, discontented. The assumption is that they will not want to alter their social status once their basic needs of food, clothing, spiritual guidance, and employment are met. In Scott, philanthropy maintains a power structure threatened by those not squarely benefitting from the system.²³ It is offered as a prop, not as the undermining spade.

Despite the call to reform which the women's own experiences seem to require, it is insisted that "We do not set up for reformers..." (MH 166). The life of each woman in the core group is given in detail to demonstrate how each woman, though scrupulously virtuous, has been circumstance so that a happy conventional family life has been rendered impossible in the past. After extreme hardship in which the core group of women have maintained their virtue, along with a façade denying all the problems they experience (achieved through severe penalties to themselves) they are rewarded with residence in a paradise on earth, and the power to help, though emphatically not to empower, the powerless. This is reflected in many of their activities. For instance, though marriage is an institution with which many of the women of Millenium Hall have had exceptional problems, they actively support it. After the travellers witness the wedding of a servant and a farmer, one of the ladies explains:

Does it surprise you...to see people promote that in others, which they themselves do not chuse to practise? We consider matrimony as absolutely necessary to the good of society; it is a general duty; but as, according to all antient tenures, those obliged to perform knight's service, might, if they chose to enjoy their own fire-sides, be excused by sending deputies to supply their places; so we, using the same privilege substitute many others, and certainly much more promote wedlock, than we could do by entering into it ourselves. (MH 163)

²³ For a discussion of philanthropy in Scott, see Dorice Williams Elliot, "Sarah Scott's Millenium Hall and Female Philanthropy."
Since the women at Millenium Hall have the power, this speaker argues, they can maintain a comfortable unmarried life next to their firesides and fulfil their duty. They send the less powerful into the marital battle in their places, and, given that bad marriages are normative in this text, possible destruction. However, such a promotion is undermined by the option of women "enjoy[ing] their own firesides," safe from victimization and still useful to society.

The masculine narrator of Millenium Hall and his life story in the sequel act to contain Millenium Hall, as Vincent Carretta has suggested. But the sequel also demonstrates how wealthy benevolent men could compensate for social flaws, rendering serious structural change (including the abolition of slavery) unnecessary, if not dangerous. Ellison demonstrates how a man's charity renders institutions such as Millenium Hall superfluous. Ellison, whose role as the protected witness in the earlier work suppresses his complicity in the conditions from which members of the Millenium Hall community have retreated, is revealed to be a protected witness of the innocent kind. He is a man, a Jamaican planter, a slave owner, and wealthy, but he is not, Scott shows, an abusive victimizer, and therefore is not to be identified with the powerful who have driven the women of Millenium Hall into their community. Furthermore, unlike Buncle, Ellison is positively acquisitive of children—he has biological, step, and figuratively adopted children—in fact, not including his slaves (whom he considers as his children), he ends with around twenty or thirty of them. By the close of the work, most of these are well-married, producing more children, and reproducing Ellison's enlightened life-style across England. In Scott, social and communal reproduction across generations reflects and reinforces models of biological reproduction—they are fused.

Since the innovations of these communities assume a direct response to contemporary societal problems, the problems are given an urgent concreteness that threatens the neutral, passive spectatorship of both Buncle and Ellison. Significantly, both Amory and Scott wrote sequels which retreat from the social criticism implicit in

---

24 "Utopia Limited: Sarah Scott’s Millenium Hall and Sir George Ellison."
the elaborate descriptions of successfully unorthodox utopian communities, whether these communities be revisionary or compensatory. The narrators' obsession with women and social organization reflects their motivations for touring. Buncle makes tours in search of consolation, a replacement wife, and a new society based on Unitarian principals. In Millenium Hall, Ellison tours to recover from a long residence in the "unwholesome climate" of Jamaica and from grief. Ellison is refamiliarizing himself with the health and social organization of England. As Dean MacCannell has demonstrated, tourism allows individuals to create a cohesive picture of otherwise fragmented phenomena. Since both writers concentrate on the isolated country house and its community, the innovative social structures are self-contained and easily compassed. However, they can also be understood as models for innovative governance of the whole nation or as safely isolated curiosities. This contradictory doubleness--isolated instance or model--is reflected in recent interpretations of the Millenium Hall community which seek to prove that it is either meant to be contained and isolated, or to be taken as a model to be reproduced on a national level. Millenium Hall can be understood either way, but Scott's subsequent enclosure of the Hall in the life of the male narrator acts to limit its original expansive potential.

Part of the explicit project of published tour descriptions in this period was to add to the knowledge of well-known landscapes. As the subject of tour narratives, the self-contained utopias of Amory's works and Scott's Millenium Hall represent previously unknown curiosities in a known landscape. Carefully situated in Great Britain, the communities become natively conceived compensation (in Scott) or natively conceived substitution (in Amory) for conventional country-house-bound

25 The reason of health alone is given in Millenium Hall, 54. Ellison, however, gives both reasons, 39. There are a number of minor changes to Ellison's biography between the two works.


27 For the first approach, see, for example, Vincent Carretta, "Utopia Limited: Sarah Scott's Millenium Hall and The History of Sir George Ellison"; for the second, see Gary Kelly's introduction to Millenium Hall, 26-43.
families and communities, not the suspicious product of foreign lands. The members
of these communities are British or have emigrated to Britain to enjoy "British"
freedom, and they have what are represented as exemplary British national habits and
preferences. The plausibility of the fiction that these communities are already part of
familiar society means that by extension they would be actually possible.

Nonetheless, though both narrators admire the sisterhoods they describe, such
alternatives are explicitly marginalized in the initial texts themselves as well as in the
sequels narrating the life of the male narrator. It is perhaps more risky to project such
fictions, claiming their plausibility or reality, than to actually visit such a community.
The Ladies of Llangollen and their lifestyle could be examined by tourists with
impunity—the implications of imaginatively generating such a community were not an
issue. Their community took its place as one of a series of curiosities encountered in
a tour of Wales or a trip from Ireland to Bath. Analogously, the disruptive potential
presented by the fictional utopian communities in Amory and Scott is limited by the
tourist's subsequently appearing life story. They are embedded in Buncle's attempts to
remain married, and Ellison's philanthropic and socially conservative actions. The
sequels serve to protect the witnesses of such extraordinary institutions from the
radical implications of their descriptions. In the end, though, the works of Amory and
Scott bring peripheral alternatives into mainstream consciousness, even if only as
peripheral, and even if only as curiosities encountered on tours made by men in the
course of long, eventful lives.
ii. "Be Such a Man as I": Mademoiselle does the Tour of Europe in Men's Clothes

TELL me, gentle hob de hoy!
Art thou Girl, or art thou Boy?
....
For thy Gesture and thy Shape,
And thy Features and thy Dress,
Such contraries do express:
I stand amaz'd, and at a Loss to know,
To what new Species thou thy Form dost owe.
....
Man, or Woman, thou art neither;
Such a blot, a shame to either.
....
Thy Oddities so much my Mind perplex,
I neither can define thy Kind or Sex.
....
Unghastly yet, thou only can'st provoke,
Our Rage, our Detessation[sic], and our Joke.

From: "The Petit Maitre" in Satan's Harvest Home (1749)

Thomas Amory and Sarah Scott linked the culture of tourism and novelistic anatomy to advocate reform. Amory's works explore and reflect the marginalization of women and women's culture and advocate unitarianism and women's education; Scott illustrates how certain changes would legitimate and stabilize the existing social order. Yet using tourism and the novel together to explore highly charged issues could backfire or cause the meaning of a text to break open and become susceptible to interpretations which would not usually coexist. Whereas Amory and Scott combined anatomy, novel, and tour account forms both to illustrate their visions and to increase their authority and trustworthiness, the work addressed in this section uses some of the same strategies to interrogate and perhaps attack contemporary changes in gender and sexual relations.
The years 1743/4 saw the publication of The Travels and Adventures of Mademoiselle de Richelieu, which purported to be an authentic tour account "Now done into ENGLISH from the LADY'S own MANUSCRIPT." Its narrator, Mademoiselle Alithea de Richelieu, or Monsieur le Chevalier de Raphont, is a wealthy, orphaned young woman who dresses herself and her maid Lucy in men's clothes to travel. She believes her tour as a man will "cure me of Prepossessions and Weaknesses incident to my Sex," and introduce her to the behaviour of women toward a man such as herself "from...which I may draw Lessons extremely useful in the Conduct of Life" (Travels I:329). To that end, she proceeds to flirt her way across France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, England, and the Netherlands, making numerous "conquests" of the hearts of other women (who think her a man), and listening to many courtship stories, accounts of "gallantry," and occasional dissertations on such topics as the origin and nature of the Passions. She finally resumes women's clothing and settles down in an explicitly erotic relationship with the "delicious" widow (Arabella de Montferan) who, on joining her tour at Montpelier, had also donned men's clothes.

The Travels' narration is predominately playful in tone, and alternates between conventional tour description, topical dissertations, and novelistic romances in which sexual desire, when not restrained by circumstance, is unbounded. The "autobiographical" narrative linking the tourist descriptions hinges on sexual and gender ambiguity—the narrator is a male impersonator in love with her/his travelling companion, another male impersonator. By accepting the narrator as trustworthy and

---

28 I will refer to The Travels and Adventures of Mademoiselle de Richelieu...Who Made the Tour of Europe, Dressed in Men's Cloathes....Now Done into English from the Lady's Own Manuscript. By the Translator of the Memoirs and Adventures of the Marques of Bretagne... as Travels. The full work was printed by Oli. Nelson for the translator in Dublin, 1743-4; for M. Cooper in London, 1744 (the edition used here); and by S. Ballard, in London, n.d.). The Entertaining Travels and Surprizing Adventures of Mademoiselle de Leuirich.... By a Masterly Hand., an abridgment which changed the last name of the narrator, was printed twice: by Alex M'Culloh in Dublin, 1758 and for T. Thompson in London, 1748.
as an uncomplicated mouthpiece for the author, and by ignoring the generic
conventions employed, this work has wrongly been identified as an apology for
women's rights and as a transgressive celebration of lesbian desire.²⁹ However, the
satirical technique of masking the writer under an abhorred face to make a set of ideas
or behaviours ridiculous was, as Howard D. Weinbrot has demonstrated, well-beloved
by writers and readers alike in the first half of the eighteenth-century.³⁰ Alithea, or
the Chevalier de Radpont, is arguably a satirical persona used to castigate women,
early feminism, and same-sex eroticism and sexual love. In its repeated transgression
of the categories of male and female, Travels seeks to confirm, not dismantle, them.
To identify Travels in the way it has been considerably diminishes the work's
sophistication and its implications. Its satirical voice communicates contemporary
understandings and confusions about what it meant to be a woman or a man, and how
same-sex erotic bonds (not only between women, but also between men) operate.

Though I will be primarily concerned with the narrator and the stories in which
she/he is a direct participant, thereby pushing to the background much of the Travels,
a few words concerning the work's overall genre are necessary. The work is
composed of highly heterogeneous matter, ranging from sheet music to poems to
theological arguments to political histories to letters to critical discussions of literary
genre, to place description, to novelistic romances. Furthermore, the narrator is, by
conventional contemporary mores, monstrous. Not only does she choose to pass as a

²⁹ Carolyn Woodward, in the work's only lengthy treatment, argues that its place
in an emerging lesbian discourse has ensured that it has been ignored. See "'My
Heart So Wraei': Lesbian Disruptions in Eighteenth-Century British Fiction." The
work has had scattered citations as a feminist production in such as Angela J.
Smallwood, Fielding and the Woman Question: The Novels of Henry Fielding and
Feminist Debate, 1700-1780, 191, and Adams, Travel Literature and the Evolution of
the Novel, 152, 190, 232.

³⁰ For a fuller discussion, see Howard D. Weinbrot, "Masked Men and Satire and
Pope: Towards an Historical Basis for the Eighteenth-Century Persona," in
Eighteenth-Century Satire: Essays of Text and Context from Dryden to Peter Pindar,
34-49.
man, but she guiltlessly engages in an explicitly homoerotic relationship. Such relationships were legally actionable and publicly condemned. Similarly, the narrator's explicit refusal of male control, marriage, children, and God as things below the lot of an intelligent, spirited woman, was far from conventionally acceptable, even if it is raucously advanced. A work with a narrator who undefensively presents an unorthodox world-view that would be reviled by most contemporaries usually assumes that the contemporary norm will act as the yardstick by which the reader would assess the narrator's validity. The conventional view is, in other words, implicitly operating. If Alithea's narration and opinions are overtly guiltless, witty, and forthright, this is to expose them as sophistc and even dangerous, not to endorse them.

Though structured as a travel account, the presence of a facetious narrator whose rationalized ideas and actions (from the conventional contemporary viewpoint) are outrageous and "unnatural" in a work with little plot, but over a thousand pages of heterogenous material, clearly points to satire. John Dryden and other contemporaries conceived of satire as satira lanx, a well-filled platter, in which discourses of all kinds were mixed together. Travels would probably have been identified as Varronian or, synonymously, Menippean, by contemporaries, though, in the wake of Northrop Frye, we might label it more loosely an anatomy. Though it resembles the works addressed in the previous section in its strategic combination of travel account, novel, and anatomy, its satirical idiom changes the dynamics of the combination. Furthermore, the Travels' obsession with one two-part thing--gender and sexuality--resonates strangely with Frye's observation that such satire "presents us with a vision of the

---

31 A good summary of what is known about both male and female same-sex relationships in this period is Bryant T. Ragan, Jr., "The Enlightenment Confronts Homosexuality," in Homosexuality in Modern France, 8-29. Relatively little has been published on eighteenth-century female same-sex sexuality. Beyond what I cite in subsequent notes, see Kristina Straub, Sexual Suspects: Eighteenth-Century Players and Sexual Ideology; Randolph Trumbach, "The Origin and Development of the Modern Lesbian Role in the Western Gender System: Northwestern Europe and the United States, 1750-1990"; and Martha Vicinus, "'They Wonder to Which Sex I Belong': The Historical Roots of the Modern Lesbian Identity."
world in terms of a single intellectual pattern," and that "deals less with people as such than with mental attitudes." I say "strangely" because, of course, gender and sexuality have usually been, until quite recently, conceived of as "natural" rather than as produced by discursive thought and attitude. By contemporary standards, the work was certainly Varronian/Menippean. Appealing to John Dryden's famous analysis of satire for validation, Mary Delariviere Manley explicitly identifies Secret Memoirs from the New Atalantis (1709) as a Varronian satire because it is written "on different Subjects, Tales, Stories and Characters of Invention." If heterogeneity alone was enough for Manley to place her work within the Menippean tradition, the Travels, which is much more extreme, is certainly in it.

Dryden's examples, however, also stress the facetiousness of the narrator (with which he is uncomfortable because an amused reader might not recognize the presence of the correcting lash) and the way such narrators made serious thought ridiculous. Such a narrator exposes fallacies of thought by being an example of it. However, as Frye observes and Dryden worries, for the satire to work as satire the reader must have a strong sense of either right-thinking (if one is Dryden) or of the historical norm against which the narrator's ideas and behaviour are being placed. What is interesting about the Travels, however, is that instead of satirizing male thinkers and occupations, the writer uses a well-known conventional form to address something as fundamental as gender and sexuality, and uses a learned, witty woman to do it. Of course, the newly emergent homosexual subculture, the emerging sapphic one, and the contemporary groundshifts in gender distinctions, received voluminous commentary. These changes were often attacked in print—for example in the poem which opens this

---

32 Frye, Anatomy, 310; 309.

33 The Novels of Mary Delariviere Manley, I:526.

34 "Discourse concerning the Original and Progress of Satire," in The Works of John Dryden, Vol. IV: Poems 1693–1696, 47. Garry Sherbert has recently argued that a witty, learned, and wrong-headed narrator (the philosophus gloriosus) is a necessary ingredient in Menippean satire. See Menippean Satire and the Poetics of Wit: Ideologies of Self-Consciousness in Dunton, D'Urfey, and Sterne.
section—or encouraged in conduct manuals. But by attacking what seemed to contemporaries to be new sexualities and gender behaviour within a form designed to castigate things as artificial and mutable as schools of thought, attitudes, or occupation-related behaviour, the writer of Travels broaches the possibility that gender and sexuality are also artificial and mutable. Living according to recognizable gender codes and sexual behaviour is made equivalent to living by an intellectual code, and, by implication, as potentially ridiculous. Fusing Menippean satire, novelistic romance, and travel account forms produced a space in which a nexus of contemporary preoccupations about the meaning and naturalness of gender and sexual behaviours could be explored.

Though Travels has received little commentary, it was marketable enough in the eighteenth century to be printed five times in two forms. It has been attributed to one William Erskine, though at this point there seems to be no irrefutable evidence for such an attribution. The bare possibility that the author may not be William Erskine has led Carolyn Woodward to assume that the author is a woman who camouflages a story of lesbian desire beneath well over a thousand pages of superfluous tour description, topical essays, and novelistic accounts of heterosexual romance. However, there is no reason to assume that only a woman would write about female same-sex love, or that an account of such a love would require

35 Two standard sources attribute the work to [William] Erskine. See Samuel Halkett and John Laing, A Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature, 6:80, and Jerry C. Beasley, A Check List of Prose Fiction Published in England 1740-9, 58.

36 Woodward posits Lady Mary Wortley Montagu as a particularly pleasing possibility for authorship ("My Heart So Wrapt," 854-855). The work's openly Jacobite politics and a prose style so divergent from Montagu's make the attribution unlikely. "William Erskine" is, of course, a common name, and for this reason alone I think it is premature to discount that a William Erskine really did write the Travels. A good place to look would be among the Jacobites on the continent, among whom William Erskine, brother to the Earl of Pittodrie, could be a candidate. (Incidentally, I suspect the work's Jacobitism might account better for the lack of contemporary commentary than its titillating female same-sex eroticism.)
camouflage, or that most of the work is superfluous, or that the sexual predilections of the narrator have ensured the work's obscurity. The novel was just bursting into its overwhelming popularity, while the dry tour description Woodward finds tedious was demanded by readers in the century's other overwhelmingly popular genre--the travel account.\footnote{For a discussion of the popularity of travel accounts, and their generic conventions, see Batten, \textit{Pleasurable Instruction}.} Since these genres were avidly consumed by the original audience, it is demonstrable that the whole work was meant to be uniformly entertaining, and that the narrator's own story was meant to add to the entertainment, not be hidden by it. Furthermore, as Felicity A. Nussbaum's and Emma Donoghue's work makes clear, female same-sex sexuality was fully and visibly imaginable throughout the eighteenth-century within popular, medical, and literary discourses.\footnote{Nussbaum has a coherent, short, and balanced account of the visibility of same-sex female sexuality in \textit{Torrid Zones}, 141-149. Though it is not her intention, Emma Donoghue's book is valuable for tracing in which contexts broadly defined lesbian relationships were represented, and for showing how imaginable all forms of intimacy (sexual, erotic, or platonic) between women were in the period. Her insistence that the ability to imagine diverse forms of intimacy between women is evidence for a "lesbian culture" is problematic, especially since most of the material she presents was written by and for men. See \textit{Passions Between Women: British Lesbian Culture, 1668-1801}.} An account of a lesbian relationship did not, then, require concealment. Moreover, as many of the examples retailed by Emma Donoghue show, one does not need to be a woman to write about women having sex with women, and, in fact, detailed lesbian love scenes were and are still a perennial favourite amongst male readers and writers of pornography. Visibility in representational and print media did not, of course, mean that such sexual expressions were sanctioned or in any way acceptable for real women, though they were certainly not perceived to be as threatening as male same-sex sexuality. For this reason, Erskine's contemporary John Cleland seems to have thinly disguised male homoerotic desire in his female narrator's accounts of aroused men.\footnote{For discussions of the way homoeroticism and cross-dressing operate in Cleland's novel, see esp. Julia Epstein, "Fanny's Fanny: Epistolarity, Eroticism, and the Transsexual Text"; Nussbaum, \textit{Torrid Zones}, 102-105; Nancy K. Miller, "'I's' in
entirely possible that *Travels* was written by a man for a male audience, and was meant, like Cleland’s *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748-9), to celebrate male superiority. Furthermore, it is possible to argue that the text is homoerotic, and that the female narrator allows the male bond of privilege and authority to constitute or reconstitute itself.

*Travels* was probably written by a man, and perhaps by a woman careful to pass as a man, who writes out his tour as a cross-dressing Frenchwoman (who, as she notes, "often forget[s] the masculine Gender" [*Travels* II:157]). Such a text raises important questions. Why would a male author choose to speak as a woman impersonating a man to write an Englishman’s tour? (Or, perhaps, even more dizzyingly, why would a female author pretend to be a male author pretending to be a woman who pretends to be a man to perform and write a man’s tour?) And what effect does the ambiguous nature of such a narrator have on the interpretation of the text? How does it fit into the rapidly changing ideas about gender in the 1740s?

Though there were other forms of continental tourism engaged in by the ill, women, older men, and families, Erskine’s narrator chooses the form most canvassed by contemporaries and social historians alike—the programmatic educational travel undertaken on the continent by a wealthy young man, generally accompanied by a governor, and generally with a duration of two to four years.\(^{40}\) Male dress was certainly necessary for the form of tourism Alithea chooses, but it was not necessary if the point of her travels was simply to tour. There were several performance styles available to her as a woman-traveller, and by mid-century the repercussions of continental tourism on women were occasionally satirized, which presupposes a recognized practice.\(^{41}\) The text nods to the alternative when, at the end of her

---

Drag: The Sex of Recollection."

\(^{40}\) In fact, many of the work’s details rely on the tour being performed between 1727 and 1729 as the narrator claims.

\(^{41}\) See Lord Chesterfield’s anonymous and satirical letter written from the point of view of a man whose wife and daughter have been rendered unrecognizable by their
travels, Alithea assures her steward "...the Travelling Humour is now over, at least as a Man..." (Travels III:351). This is not to imply that travelling as a woman is as easy as for a man (then or now). When Alithea reveals her sex to Arabella, she explains that she passes as a man "that I might travel with more Freedom and Safety" (Travels II:229). Nevertheless, Alithea was not forced into men's clothing to travel, nor did she have only this one tour form available to her as a man.

Despite Alithea's options, she chooses the travel form constitutive of the social and sexual identity of elite young men. For contemporaries, a young man's tour of Europe was thought to provide a forum in which to initiate, develop and crystallize both sexual and social behaviour. "Checking out the women" (and sometimes the men) was an integral part of a young man's grand tour. For instance, Lord Chesterfield, writing to his touring son Philip, advised him both on social and (slightly more euphemistically) sexual navigation, wistfully encouraging him to have affairs with married gentlewomen and female aristocrats.42 By impersonating a man to engage in gallantry on a tour, Alithea inserts herself into a specifically male field of sexual development. This is all the more remarkable, because in this period a woman cross-dressed as a man did not imply sexual interest in women. It was read as a lascivious sartorial choice, but as calling attention to the woman as an erotic object for men.43 However, it is not accidental that Alithea, as a young man engaged in travels in World (May 3, 1753) and the letter from another writer ridiculing such well-travelled women, World (May 31, 1753). Francis Lynch's play, The Independent Patriot (London, 1737) also gently satirizes the effect of tourism on women in the tour-inspired musical foibles of Lady Warble. Women tourists were not, however, as heavily satirized during this period as they were in the nineteenth century.

42 See Chesterfield's popular letters to his son (originally written from 1737 onwards; published in 1774).

43 On the late eighteenth-century shift to an understanding of cross-dressed women as sexually interested in women, see Trumbach, "London's Sapphists." For a discussion of the remarkable range in female cross-dressing practices, including the breeches part so popular on the stage, see Kenneth Fraser Easton's excellent synopsis of cross-dressing practices in the period, "Bad Habits: Cross-Dressing and the Regulation of Gender in Eighteenth-Century British Literature and Society," esp. 19-
educational travels, would so carefully observe women and feminine behaviour.

To define and make the man, of course, the woman needed to be addressed and femininity defined. Continental tourism as engaged in by young men like Alithea/Radpont was bound up with notions of femaleness, enquiries into the nature and behaviour of women, and the definition of both sexuality and politeness expected of women. The impact of this process of sexual and gender definition alternately alarmed and delighted commentators. Contemporaries such as the writer of Satan’s Harvest Home (1749) and John Brown in his popular An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times (1757) consistently charged this form of tourism with producing a foreign effeminacy in the manly English gentleman, and with promoting a general confusion of masculine identity and sexual preferences with those which were "naturally" feminine. In the section on what it identifies as the horrifying growth of sodomy, for instance, the writer of Satan’s Harvest Home charges:

But of all the Customs Effeminacy has produc’d, none more hateful, predominant, and pernicious, than that of the Mens Kissing each other. This Fashion was brought over from Italy, (the Mother and Nurse of Sodomy); where the Master is oftener Intriguing with his Page, than a fair Lady. And not only in that Country, but in France, which copies from them, the Contagion is diversify’d, and the Ladies (in the Nunneries) are criminally amorous of each other, in a Method too gross for Expression. (Anon., 51)

Though this is more blunt than usual, commentators habitually labelled sexual and gender deviance as foreign imports. There is, then, a certain amount of cultural logic

49. Most male impersonation was undertaken for practical reasons—for safety, to perpetuate crimes without detection, or to get better employment. My thinking on cross-dressing is indebted to Marjorie Garber, Vested Interests: Cross-dressing & Cultural Anxiety.

44 The choice of examples here is arbitrary—the charge was a commonplace throughout the century. Of course, these were not the only charges laid against this form of tourism. For a thorough discussion, see Warneke, Images of the Educational Traveller in Early Modern England.
in showing a sexually ambiguous, effeminate man/masculine woman narrator, who is French and convent-educated, engage in this form of tourism while displaying homoerotic behaviour.

Less alarmist writers wedded tourism to male heterosexual behaviour. Learning foreign languages on the tour, for instance, was often figured as sexual conquest:

but the Learner of French must not bee choleric awhit at [the difficulties], but though she neither writes as she speaks, nor pronounce as she writes, yet she must not shake you off so, but after a little intermission hee must come on more strongly, and with a pertinacity of resolution set upon her again and again, and woe her as one would do a coy Mistres, with a kind of importunity, untill he overmaster her and she will be very plyable at last.⁴⁵

More literally, the good young male tourist was regularly advised to ask questions about women, their marriage, and their fertility, along with the usual questions about fortifications and the type of soil. For instance Josiah Tucker, in his 1757 Instructions for Travellers (by which he means young men), had his ideal young traveller ask, "Are the married Women observed to be more, or less fruitful here than in other Countries?" between a question on climate and another on the country’s geopolitical situation (Tucker, 232). Convents and female beauty were also carefully enquired into. Alithea’s male tourist’s interest in women and their behaviour, though extreme, clearly takes its cue from contemporary practice. Furthermore, the sexual and gender ambiguity she embodies reflected the alarmists’ view of the gender-bending impact of the programmatic, educational tourism undertaken by young men.

In Travels the crossing of literal geopolitical borders mirrors the crossing of the borders operating in expressions of gender and sexuality. Though the narration depends upon and highlights the artificiality and permeability of borders, it also insists on their functional reality. None of the narration plays with concepts of androgyny or

⁴⁵ James Howell, Instructions for Forreine Travell (1650), 19.
bisexuality (or, to use contemporary terminology, "hermaphroditism"). No one the "chevaliers" (Alithea and her beloved Arabella) meet questions the continuity between the gender of their dress and behaviour and the sex of their bodies. When dressed as women, all conclude them women; when as men, all conclude them men. And yet the process of interpretation is considerably complicated by the transformation and disguise inscribed both in the presence of an audacious cross-dressed narrator and in the presentation and content of the narrative. A male author (or a female author passing as one) pretends to be the translator of a female author who pretends to be a man with the skills, education, land holdings, economic privilege, and independence of a man.

In presenting the text, the implied writer both conceals and flaunts his identity. He maintains the fiction that he has nothing at stake in his "translation" but producing for an English-speaking public an amusing French tour he found in manuscript. The real author is dead, and despite the English and Scottish source material, Jacobitism, anti-gallicism, and anti-Catholicism, the narrator is a Catholic Frenchwoman. Moreover, the "translator" is concealed by referring the public to another work in which he is credited by name. The plagiarism from such instantly recognizable sources as Joseph Addison’s Remarks on Several Parts of Italy, along with the work’s unabashed and unmistakable politics, would have made it readily apparent to contemporaries that the point of view is British, not French. Such masking articulates both a "foreignness" and applicability to Britain. Combined with the work’s implied male authorship masked by female authorship masked in the plot by male dress, this split points to the projection, displacement, doublespeak and disguise so fundamental to the narrative. Nothing is meant to be taken as presented. The "truth" is masked as Alithea masks her female body in men’s clothing and performance, as the implied male author masks himself in his female narrator and in his status as her "translator."

46 A "Mr Erskine" translated Prévost’s Mémoires d’un Homme de Qualité (1728-1731) as The Memoirs and Adventures of the Marquis de Bretagne and Duc d’Harcourt (London, 1743).
as the British Protestant identity is masked by the French Catholic one.

Because of the *Travels*’ obsession with disguise and interpretation, a reader’s response to it depends what he or she thinks is behind the mask. The reader’s response hinges on which sex he or she assigns to the narrator, and on whether the reader identifies with the narrator, or his/her female subjects, or, alternatively, rejects the narrator as monstrous. The interpretations provoked by the text should be mutually exclusive, but are not. Lesbian sexual relationships are repeatedly described as impossibilities, while gay sexual relationships are overtly, if perfunctorily, condemned when the Chevaliers visit Genoa. Nevertheless, if one looks through the transvestism, the conclusion that *Travels* is an account of a same-sex love relationship seems unavoidable, given the clearly homoerotic foundation of the central relationship. But which of the two possibilities (woman–woman; man–man) is less clear. The possibility of same-sex female love is continually highlighted, both in the openly erotic relationship between Alithea and Arabella, and in the stories Alithea tells of the women who make sexual advances to the seeming men. For instance, the narrator and her companion are continually doing things like hugging "with Transports rather of a Lover than of a Friend" (*Travels* II:229), while, to give another example, the subscription to one of Arabella’s letters reads:

> in the mean Time, be assured that every Minute is an Age till I have the Pleasure of embracing my dear Alithea, who is Husband, Lover and Friend to ARABELLA. (*Travels* II:328)

This relationship would seem to be unambiguously sexual. But the situation is considerably muddied by the text’s insistence that a sexual relationship is impossible between women. When Alithea considers engaging sexually with Arabella (who at this point thinks her a man), she laments:

> what Madness possesses me to rave at this Rate, and wish for Impossibilities; since Providence has put an invincible Bar to Wishes of this kind...(*Travels* II:217)
In this text, at least one male body is necessary for sex. Furthermore, the many women who fall in love with Arabella and Alithea do not know they are women when they do so. The two to whom the secret is revealed take the incident as a lucky admonition to change their lustful ways. Neither disillusioned woman is provoked to question her heterosexuality. One of these women has kidnapped the Chevaliers for sexual purposes (she is Spanish, and in this text such extremity marks how female desire is inflected in Spain). In the discovery scene which ends the episode, Arabella, the Donna's object of desire, is the initial speaker:

...I think it would be an unpardonable Crime in me not to lay my Heart open to a Lady of your Merit, and thereby prevent the bad Consequences which might attend my Dissembling, or appearing to be what I am not; know then, dear Madam, that you have before your Eyes, in the Likeness of Men, two real Women.... Good God, cried [sic] She, you a Woman, and directly fainted.... [S]he soon recovered, and said...I have but too plainly discovered my Weakness to pretend now that I did but act the Enamorata; my Heart was really seduced, and a first Surprize made a terrible Revolution in it, but as I lost my Reason in one Moment, I recover it again in another, and am now glad that there is an invincible Obstacle, and much stronger than my Virtue, to prevent my Ruin.... (Travels III:206)

The "invincible Obstacle" to which the Donna refers is, like Alithea's "invincible Bar" above, Arabella's concealed body—or more specifically her lack of male genitalia. This lack is repeatedly referred to as being equivalent to a sexual incapacity that meant one woman could not have sexual contact with another, rehearsing a common contemporary opinion. The text displays an awareness that women could love one another erotically, but also a refusal or confusion about how this could work sexually. By repeatedly showing women sexually attracted to women they believe to be men, the text flirts with the possibility of female bisexuality without positing its reality. As Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has written, "what counts as sexual is...variable

---

and itself political. It is also historically contingent. In this text, sex between women is considered impossible, no matter how much it is desired.

Alitheia repeatedly wishes she could "metamorphose...really into the Sex I represent" (Travels II:217) so that she could play the man sexually with Arabella. The two women are literally impotent, though they intentionally act the potent male part until the last possible moment. The enormous amount of anxiety expressed in this work about impotence raises an interesting point. A woman would be "naturally" impotent, but the man who likely made this tour would probably have considered male impotence unnatural, or at least inconvenient. According to Felicity Nussbaum in The Brink of All We Hate, a literally impotent male narrator was a common feature of openly misogynist literature in this period. It is of course a common trope in the misogynist literary tradition that women make men powerless. Erskine's ambiguous twist to these tropes is that a woman is likewise powerless in the face of the desire for another woman.

Since the narrative is obsessed with disguise and displacement, it may be a disguised account of a sexual liaison between men. Though the text identifies the narrator and her companion as women, the expressions of love between them are made between two people who look and act as men, are economically and socially independent, own large estates, have somehow received an identifiably male classical education, and who fake sexual interest in women to comply with social expectations. The open contemporary hostility towards "sodomites" would create the necessity for a positive account of sexual contact between men to be disguised, and could explain the stance of authorial neutrality generated from the number of displacements in the framework, from the concealment of the author as a "translator" to making the narrator

---

48 Between Men, 15.

49 See also Katharine Rogers' standard survey, The Troublesome Helpmate: A History of Misogyny in Literature.
female.  

The possibility that the story is "really" about male same-sex desire is also raised by some of the tour description. For instance, the two "chevaliers" are particularly well-received by the last Duke of Medici at Florence. Florence was itself associated with homosexuality. One roughly contemporary commentator wrote:

[The Florentines] are, even to a proverb, addicted to that atrocious and unnatural vice which brought down the divine vengeance on Sodom and Gomorrah...  

But the setting is not the most interesting side of the episode. Alithea and Arabella are introduced by a Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the Duke in his closet. He comments on their extraordinary physical beauty and invites them to visit his court often (Travels III:331). Alithea is highly enthusiastic about his treatment of them and

---

50 The historical and conceptual framework of this section is especially indebted to, among others, G.J. Barker-Benfield, "The Question of Effeminacy," in The Culture of Sensibility, 104-153; G.S. Rousseau, "The Pursuit of Homosexuality in the Eighteenth-Century: 'Utterly Confused Category' and/or Rich Repository?"; Randolph Trumbach, "Sodimical Subcultures, Sodimical Roles, and the Gender Revolution of the Eighteenth Century: The Recent Historiography"; the essays in The Pursuit of Sodomy (ed. Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma), and those in Homosexuality in Modern France (ed. Jeffrey Merrick and Bryant T. Ragan, Jr.). There is, of course, a terminological problem. The term "homosexual" was not employed until well into the nineteenth century, while "sodomite" designated one who engaged in a range of sexual activities considered unnatural, with men or women, though in the period under discussion it increasingly designated male same-sex sexual practices. Furthermore, until the nineteenth century such practices were not understood as symptoms of a psychological condition effecting a man's entire personality and life, as they often are now. Following Mary McIntosh's seminal article, "The Homosexual Role," which proposes to study homosexuality as a role, and distinguishes between homosexual behaviour (acts or practices) and this role, I use the term "homosexual" to refer to acts and roles, not to psychology. McIntosh, along with most commentators, dates the emergence of "a distinct separate, specialized role of 'homosexual'" to the late seventeenth century (McIntosh, 38).

51 Johann Georg Keysler, Travels through Germany, etc, 1756-57 (as cited Sir Harold Acton, The Last Medici, 290).
his court in general. This court visit is one of the few that are related in detail. Many contemporary readers, especially those who had toured Italy, would remember that the Duke was notorious for his sexual preference for men, and also for his employment of as many as three hundred and seventy men and women, known as "ruspanti" after the "ruspi" (a currency) they were paid with. They performed sexual acts with and before the Duke. These "ruspanti," who included some beautiful foreign men, roamed freely around Florence, and were considered by male tourists to be a worthwhile sight. Sodomitical practices were (or at least were widely reported to be) very popular among them.52

The Chevalier's claim to have met the Duke in 1729 would have been striking to contemporaries. By then the Duke had withdrawn to his bed (a situation explaining why the Chevaliers are introduced to him in such an informal venue as his closet), had made the last of his increasingly rare public appearances that year, and saw almost none but his "ruspanti." Because of the notoriety of the Duke's household arrangements, there is almost no possibility that Erskine's reference to a Gentleman of the Bedchamber could have been taken as anything but a reference to a sexually suspect man, probably one of the ruspanti. The Duke's infamy undermines his portrayal in the text as a condescending and model ruler. In the act of concealing something everyone knew about, the narrator raises the possibility that throughout the tour other things of the same nature are similarly concealed. This episode, like so much else in the text, reveals as much as it hides. Alithea/the Chevalier de Radpont is clearly an unreliable narrator, but whether this unreliability indicates a shrewd strategy of self-protection, or a moral blindness (she interprets a notoriously corrupt and indecorous court as a model of propriety and decorum) is less clear.

One is left with a suspicion that this is perhaps a man writing about his own tour, and his own love relationship with his male travelling companion. At the

---

52 For an account of Gian Gastone de Medici, see Acton, The Last Medici; for a brief account of the contemporary fascination with the last Duke's practices, see G.S. Rousseau, "The Pursuit of Homosexuality in the Eighteenth-Century: 'Utterly Confused Category' and/or Rich Repository?" 159-160.
beginning of the eighteenth-century, male effeminacy began to be associated with a
predilection for homosexual practices, an association which continues today. This
trend was even more true of how certain forms of female impersonation were
understood by contemporaries, especially in the accounts connecting female
impersonation with homosexual practices in London's Molly houses. That "Mr.
Erskine" uses the voice of a woman, as the men in the Molly houses did, would seem
to confirm the nature of the thing concealed, as would the use of sartorial
displacement. Using a woman as a narrator would also explain the elaborate
performance of acts of gallantry that are never carried through the way most would
expect them to be if the narrator were a man. The narrator herself displays an
excessive anxiety about publicly maintaining a false appearance of sexual interest in
women. Alithea repeatedly terms a man's lack of interest in women an "unpardonable
Crime" (e.g. Travels I:5), giving it as her reason for flirting with women. Because the
text is so over-determined, any interpretation of it as endorsing same-sex male love
depends on a reader's biases. Alithea's own statements are untrustworthy. Even so,
since the narrative is marked as doublespeak, it might be speaking about both sexual
liaisons between men and erotic desire between women.

One episode is particularly emblematic of the text's chronic indeterminacy
about which sexes and practices are invoked. Dressed as a man, the Chevalier de
Radpont is looking for two of his friends in the Tuileries in Paris. Unable to locate
them, he "went to the Alley called the Lover's Walk, or the Alley of Sighs; and
having seated myself on a Bench, a handsom [sic] genteel young Man came and sat
down by me" (Travels I:261). What follows reads like a pick-up scene:

It is a little surprizing, Sir, said I, that People of your Age and mine should
come and seek Solitude in this retired Alley, unless it be to sigh for some cruel
Fair; for my Part I never was maltreated by Love, and nothing of that Kind
brings me here, and I should be glad to think the Case were so with you too;
but a certain Melancholy which I observe in your Looks...make[s] me conclude
that your Mind is not easy; and tho' I am an intire [sic] Stranger to you, and
consequently ought not to imagine that you will trust me with any Secret, yet I
find, from I know not what Reason, that it would give me great Pleasure to do
you Service. (Travels I:261)

In the Restoration and eighteenth century, the isolated sections of public and royal gardens were used for illicit sexual encounters. This was well known about the sodomitical subculture of London, and is suggested in the name "Lover's walk" or the "Alley of Sighs." In fact, the Tuileries was one of Paris' favourite homosexual cruising grounds, judging from contemporary sources such as police reports. In this passage, one gentleman would seem to be suggesting to another that he is perhaps sexually available—he is not in Lover's Walk out of love for a woman, and hopes that the handsome gentleman is not there for the love of a woman. He then asks to share his chance companion's secret and offers his service. His interlocutor responds by thanking him, indicating that he is flattered, and, after saying that he is "very ready to cultivate" "a nearer Acquaintance," suggests that they get together later in an even more intimate setting. The sexual undertones to the episode are underlined when Alithea wonders "what made me so fond of this young Man at first Sight" considering that it might be love (Travels I:262).

Any straightforward reading of this episode as the beginning of a sexual tryst between two men is impossible. As the reader knows, the narrator is "really" a woman, so presumably nothing about homosexual practices is necessarily being referred to here. Alithea is just showing natural female desire for a goodlooking gentleman, while the young gentleman's positive response to the Chevalier's approaches could be understood in the same way as Orlando's attraction to Ganymede in As You Like It—that is as really, underneath it all, an attraction to a woman. But this is not the end of the episode. The young man in the gardens turns out to be......a cross-dressed woman. She writes to the Chevalier, breaking the rendezvous because

...I have changed my Breeches into Petticoats, or rather as I am not a Man, but a Girl...Decency and Modesty...will not permit my visiting a Gentleman who is no Relation...[but] my Aunt...[invites the Chevalier to visit] if his Curiosity prompts him to come and see whether Petoats [sic] or Breeches best becomes his Humble Servant.

Felicité de Courbon. (Travels I:268)

This letter continues an already ambiguous flirtation. Now it would seem that Courbon, knowing herself to be a woman, responded in the Gardens thinking that Radpont was "really" a man. Who is Ganymede/Rosalind, and who Orlando? The reader knows Radpont is a woman as well--so we have moved from a possibly erotic encounter between two people who think one another men, but are really women, to an encounter in which one has revealed her "true" sex, while the other still maintains the illusion of manhood. We seem to have modulated into the relationship between Cesario/Viola and Olivia in Twelfth Night, or, What You Will, though Cesario has no Duke to love, and Olivia no Cesario substitute. The Chevalier responds to Courbon's note with something remarkably resembling a love letter:

MADAM,

YOUR Metamorphosis neither surprizes nor afflicts me; for to speak the Truth, I thought there was something too delicate in your Shape, Complexion, and Features for a Man: Though the Sight of you in Petoats [sic] may be dangerous, and the Loss of my Liberty may perhaps be the Consequence of it, yet I must satisfy my Curiosity, and assure the lovely Miss Courbon in Person that none is more her most obedient Servant than [me]. (Travels I:269)

That Courbon's "true" sex could possibly "afflict" the Chevalier is significant, though ambiguous. Is there a hint that s/he recognizes that Courbon might be concerned that her true sex is a disappointment of an erotic possibility? Or is it just that a straightforward friendship is no longer possible?

On encountering Radpont at her aunt's, Courbon plays with the notion of dressing as a man to travel with him. The Chevalier responds that he "could not
hinder myself from thinking that such a Metamorphosis would never be brought about, but in downright Opposition to the Wishes of the Male Sex; and I, in particular, would protest against it" (Travels II:13). Courbon rejoins that, at least out of politeness, Radpont should be pleased. The Chevalier:

No, no, Madam cried I with Emotion, I am not so much Master of the Dissembling Art, as basely to betray the Sentiments of my Heart, which, for what Reason I know not, trembles at the very Thoughts of your being a Man. (Travels II:14)

What is being "dissembled" here? Is Radpont attracted to Courbon or not? And is s/he attracted to Courbon only when she (Courbon) is male? Does the attraction rely on both of them being the same sex, or on seeming to be the same sex? And, if so, which sex? Or does the attraction rely on anatomical asymmetry? Sartorial? Courbon, in complaisance to him, "give[s] up [her] Manhood" (Travels II:14), implying or playing with the idea that she has a manhood to give up. The ambiguity about what is really being addressed continues until the end of the episode. Radpont parts from Courbon with the speech:

Madam, my Heart feels the Weight of a Separation from you not less than it did your metamorphosing Project; but I hope I shall find you unchanged as to your Sex at my Return, and that during my Absence, you will think sometimes of a Person whose Heart is Your Conquest, and allow it to conceive Hopes that, one Day or other, I may aspire to the Happiness of possessing yours. (Travels II:16)

To which "metamorphosing Project" is Radpont referring? Is it the one which opens the episode, in which Radpont takes Courbon to be a man, the one in which Courbon changes from a man to a woman, or the projected one of her accompanying Radpont's travels as a man? And from what source, exactly, arises the anxiety about Courbon's choice of gender? In its playful tone and in the issues it raises, the Courbon episode is synecdochal for the whole work. The forms of crossing which occur between male
and female generate what would usually be contradictory interpretations.

How are we to take the narrator’s cross-dressing, since it threatens stable interpretation? If the form of tourism engaged in was specifically one for men, why have a female narrator/tourist? There are two internally marked reasons for the narrator’s sex. The first is a connection between genre, subject matter, and gender. The work opens with:

Were I a common Writer, I should follow common Form, that is to say, deduce my Origin from a long Race of illustrious Ancestors, and conclude the pompous Introduction with a Word or two to the Male Sex, who think it a monstrous Presumption in a Woman to pretend to write; but I would have those vain Creatures to know, that though, out of our great Condescension, we may allow them the masculine nervous Stile, yet the soft and tender is all our own. (Travels I:1-2)

Tour accounts designed for publication followed well-defined generic conventions, militating that the account be impersonal and full of "useful" information. Tales of gallantry, gossip, and sentimental incidents (everything "soft and tender" to use Erskine’s terminology) were ruthlessly excluded from published tours. However, the conventions for published tours were different from those which were produced for broad circulation among friends and acquaintances. The latter, especially when written by women, were expected to retail personal responses and amusing anecdotes. Furthermore, tour accounts written specifically for publication in this period were almost all written by men, primarily because of the genre’s conventional claims to public utility and the close connection between such publication and professional or status advancement. This meant that many of the tours written only for private circulation (which were occasionally published soon after their author’s death) were
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54 See Batten, Pleasurable Instruction. Though Batten concentrates on what the contemporaries believed appropriate in publication, he points out the difference between private accounts and those meant to be published, 39. Black also mentions in passing the existence of travel accounts meant for wide distribution but not for publication, The British Abroad, 289.
written by women, who typically would not have anything to gain by publication. The Travels is clearly meant to be of the second genre (it is only to be published after the author’s death), and can therefore, according to convention, combine gossip with "useful" information on fortifications, antiquities, and the governmental structure and manufactures of different regions.

However, more than a concern about travel writing conventions is signalled in the work’s opening remarks. They imply that the novelistic romances appearing throughout the work could only interest a woman narrator. Men were not thought to be drawn to recount or read that sort of trashy thing. As Nancy Armstrong has argued in Desire and Domestic Fiction, the novel form was gendered female, regardless of the author’s sex.55 A male writer, then, might be motivated to adopt a woman’s voice to tell romances, even, and perhaps especially, when these stories were designed to reaffirm masculine identity.56 The work’s peculiar mix of anecdote, gossip, travel writing, and novel forms make Alithea’s sex a logical response to formal considerations. But there is, in fact, more at stake in the choice of her sex than its resonance with novelistic and travel writing conventions.

The narrator is explicit about the purposes for which she cross-dresses and travels. Alithea has doubts about her project just before setting out, but rationalizes it as follows:

WILL not...the Knowledge of the World contribute much to cure me of Prepossessions[sic] and Weaknesses incident to my Sex....

WILL not the Accomplishments and Virtues of some eminent Women, whom I may happen to meet with in the Course of my Travels excite me to Emulation?

55 For a treatment of the gendering of novels as female that departs slightly from Armstrong, and specifically treats the early novel, see Laura L. Runge, "Gendered Strategies in the Criticism of Early Fiction."

56 For a treatment of the use of a female narrator by male authors to reaffirm masculine identity, see Madeleine Kahn, Narrative Transvestism: Rhetoric and Gender in the Eighteenth-Century British Novel.
and on the other Hand shall I not be disgusted with the unguarded Behaviour and Follies of others?...

BESIDES, can I not appear to be a Man without giving into the Extravagancies of your Rakes and Debauchees? Thanks to my Sex I am in no Danger one Way; and for any thing else, barring obscene Language, I can appear to be as extravagant as the best of them, that's to say, make Love to every Woman I meet with, appear as passionate as 'tis possible for a Man of Gallantry to be, and press hard for Favours which I cannot receive...thus I shall divert myself with the Foibles of my Sex... (Travels I:329-330)

By the "Prepossessions and Weaknesses incident to my Sex" is meant "the unguarded Behaviour and Follies" of the women s/he encounters. The use of a female narrator is strategic—it possibly disguises an account of a same-sex male liaison, but it also gives authority to the work's misogyny while allowing the tone to remain playful. The narrative repeatedly acts out how little cultural restraint, be it marriage or reputation, restricts a woman's drive toward sexual union. Women are almost always depicted as sexual aggressors. Most typically, they send unsolicited letters to the Chevaliers making explicit offers of themselves, for marriage if unmarried, for an affair if married. One woman even abducts them for sexual purposes. Women make explicit sexual advances to the Chevaliers at every stop on the tour, including England, the difference between the form of each being national. Spanish women, for instance, send letters replete with dramatic references to death, blood, and daggers, the French women letters full of wit. Often the young "gentlemen" do not even know who has sent the letter, and sometimes have never met her (they were seen through a grated window, or passing by in a gondola). Though Alithea is flirtatious, she never employs stratagem to circumvent or try a woman's virtue. Alithea does not seduce, but rather improves on the explicit advances of the women s/he encounters. A man relating such stories could be easily accused of a ridiculous inflation of his own sexual attractiveness to women, but a woman would seem disinterested—she would have no reason to lie about such things.

In a passage which gathers together recurring ideas, Arabella and Alithea compare men and women. Arabella complains that, while men identify women's
"Wit, good Humour, Sweetness of Temper, and all that, [as] the principal Motives for their Attachment...the whole View in Men, who profess to be Lovers, is the Gratification of the sensual Appetite...." (Travels III:162). Such a passage would seem to support a pro-woman argument. It suggests that the wit, humour, sweetness of temper, "and all that" women have has remained stupidly unacknowledged by men in general. But Alithea "impartially" (her term) responds that men act this way because women are only good for sex:

....but after all, can we blame them? Is not our Sex a very odd Compound of Inconsistencies? Is the Wind more changeable than a Woman, and can she afford a Man any real Satisfaction but in a sensual Gratification? Let us impartially examine ourselves, and I am afraid we will find little in us to preserve a Man's Esteem, when he is either cloy'd or disgusted with our Persons and Possession; and were it not for the Tie by which he is bound, and which gnaws his very Vitals, he would soon pursue other Game, not finding any Gratification in what is now become insipid by frequent Use, and since this is and necessarily must be the Case of every Man, as a Punishment...in Consequence of the Fall of Man, and since, by our Punishment for the same Crime of our Grand-mother Eve, we are condemned to be silly, empty, vain and whimsical Creatures, why should we condemn the Men for despising us after we can afford them no more Pleasure? (Travels III:162-163)

In this passage, the uselessness of women for everything but sex is posited as natural and coming directly from God, not culturally determined, as many early feminists ranging from Mary Astell to Mary Wollstonecraft argued. Alithea goes on to support matrimony as "God's will," but explicitly rejects it as a "Woman of Spirit." I will return to the implications of Alithea's recurring rejection of what she sees as God's will in her life and choice of partner, but here it is important to consider that Alithea and Arabella agree that lust is the only bond between men and women—without that, they have nothing in common. Since a woman caused the fall of man, women are naturally no more than sexual objects, and the conduit by which the species continues. Because this state of empty silliness is natural and a punishment from God, women are allowed no capacity to improve or reform. The extremity of this position becomes clear when compared to the common contemporary belief in women's improvability,
as indexed by Richardson's work and the rise of those self-improvement books for women, the conduct book. Passages like this one, which litter the text, make one of the reasons for choosing a female narrator absolutely clear. The ideas are so misogynistic that they would be unacceptable coming from a man, even if that man assumes the jocularity of an Alithea.

The narrative repeatedly acts out how little marriage or reputation restrains a woman's drive toward sexual fulfilment, and just as repeatedly (the stories usually close with a moralizing comment) attacks these women for giving into their desires. Radpont and Montferon meet few women explicitly described as chaste, and even these are covertly undermined. Their stories are structurally alike. In each case, they return the love of a well-intentioned man (they do not love first) and the barriers to their marital union are economic or social and are therefore outside their own control. The chaste women who are not of the Chevaliers' social status (as the sexually rapacious women are) are explicitly said to be not sexually attracted to the Chevaliers, though they are perceived as sexual objects. (The only two chaste women of the Chevaliers' social station are treated differently, as we shall see.) In Venice, for instance, Radpont and Montferan go to view a young girl their abbé/guide/procurator has found to sell to them for sexual services. (This incident is presented as typical of Venice, and is a good example of the work's anti-Catholicism.) The girl is being sacrificed to prostitution by her unwilling widowed mother to save the large family from starvation. That the girl herself has already placed her love elsewhere is used to explain her lack of sexual interest in the Chevaliers. Radpont and Montferon save the family by giving them the funds to begin their own business, thereby providing a window to expose the reader to the usual eighteenth-century embellishments to acts of charity--saccharine and tearful gratefulness, knee-bending, and pages of praise for the God-sent deliverers. As with the few other stories of threatened virtue encountered in the tour, it is economic hardship that generates the story, not the woman's desire or the stratagems of unscrupulous men. As in the Venetian episode, most of these virtuous women are not physically attracted to their lovers or to the Chevaliers, and therefore overcoming temptation is not the point. In the case of the Venetian girl's
story, for instance, the heartwarming rewards of charity, and the thoroughness of the
corruption of the Roman Catholic clergy, are the proffered lessons.

Given the number of romances related, the absence of typical storylines of tried
virtue is remarkable. There are no resistance narratives, with the possible exception of
the virtuous Countess de Saluce’s courtship story. She resists marrying an equally
virtuous man until the secret of her birth is uncovered. But even her virtue is
implicitly questioned. The name she assumes to disguise herself at one point in her
story is the loaded and easily identifiable one of Calista. Calista is, of course, the
heroine of Nicholas Rowe’s popular play *The Fair Penitent* (1703). Rowe’s Calista
looks innocent, and is taken to be so by her husband and family, though she has in
fact had an illicit affair with the family enemy, Lothario. The affair’s detection causes
civil war and she commits suicide. The other story the name alludes to is that of
Callisto and Jupiter in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Book II. Callisto is a chaste follower
of the chaste goddess Diana. Jupiter disguises himself as Diana to make love to her.
She pretends to be a virgin until an accident reveals her pregnancy and Diana expels
her. For the Countess to choose such a loaded name necessarily questions her
appearance of innocence and chastity, and perhaps even questions her sexual
preference for men (after all, the mythical Callisto succumbed to a God who appeared
to be Diana). Few of Erskine’s contemporaries would have missed the name’s
allusions to sham innocence. The one other chaste married woman encountered is
connected to the gentleman of the bedchamber at the Duke of Medici’s court. The
presentation of her as chaste, therefore, is surely ironic. As with much misogynist
literature, women are divided in this text between exceptional angels and numerous
whores. But in Erskine even the angels are perhaps fallen. At one point, a reformed
rake comments, "Let not the Women complain of Men, for they are but what they
have made them" (*Travels* III:256), neatly summing up the text’s attitude toward
relations between the sexes. Responsibility for lascivious carnality is shifted almost
entirely to women. Men only enthusiastically reciprocate (if physically able). The
only bond between men and women, in this text, is the bond of reciprocal sexual
desire.
After Alithea links gender, generic convention and subject matter (cited above), she continues with arguments which seem, at least initially, to support women's emancipation:

Why truly, as your Notion of a Woman is, that she is a domestic Tool designed for no other Use but to satisfy the brutal Inclinations of her Lord and Master Man, my Scheme of Life must give you offence, and your Indignation will still rise higher, when I very fairly and plainly tell you, that I abhor the shameful Drudgery to which my Sex is fatally subjected in propagating the Species, that I am highly sensible of our Misery in this Disposition of Nature, and I find that I have a Soul as capable of noble and refined Sentiments, as those male Things who would fain make us meer Machines formed by God and Nature, for no other Purpose but to serve their Pleasures. (Travels I:2)

This is spirited and playful, but initially misleading. To the twentieth-century ear none of this is particularly unusual, and may even seem surprisingly enlightened. However "your Notion of a Woman" is also the one the text promotes unless the reader reads against the grain. The narrator's rejection of male hegemony and cultural logic makes her the ideal spokeswoman for revealing this cultural logic to be absolutely true. Alithea samples the behaviour of the women (not of the men) of various nationalities, and the majority of the women encountered on the tour are solely motivated by sexual desire: "your Notion of Woman" is confirmed.

Even in this first passage, however, there are hints that the narrator's logic is not to be trusted. Stripped of its spirited playfulness, Alithea's argument is that though her position is against God and Nature she holds it anyway. She rejects motherhood, God's will, and Nature. This is not a case of writerly infelicity here--she reformulates the argument using the same foundation on a number of occasions. For an eighteenth-century audience her argument would be unacceptable. She later acknowledges that most women would think her "a Monster more hideous than a Canibal [sic], or a Castrato" (Travels III:163) for justifying her choices on the way she does. Alithea is one of the learned ladies, so popular in the overtly misogynist works of the period, whose knowledge of Greek or Latin renders her "unnatural" and has led her to
obviously flawed intellectual positions. So, even though she and Arabella do not jump all restraints in pursuit of men, this is because they are reprehensibly and knowingly unnatural. Women, then, are in a double bind—not to lust after men, as Alithea and Arabella do not, is unnatural; to do so, to be a "natural" woman, is to be reprehensible. There is no escape from the text’s insistence on the uncontrollable lust and inconsistency of natural woman. Nonetheless this passage, burlesquing as it does the emancipatory arguments of thinkers like Astell, could be read as a sincere, if ill-thought out, pro-woman position, if it were not for the rest of the text. Instead it seems to be meant as an example of how illogical emancipatory arguments about women are, and perhaps as a condemnation of same-sex unions.

Even in the first few pages, however, women are covertly attacked. On discussing the pride and vanity she shares with other women, Alithea tells the reader:

...if they cannot, strictly speaking, be called Virtues, they very much contribute, however, to make us virtuous; and were it not for these two happy Defects in our Constitution, many poor frail Females would consent to gratify Passions, to which we are all more or less subjected; but Thanks to our Pride and Vanity we dare face the Enemy, and force them to honourable Terms.... (Travels I:6)

If the reader is prepossessed (as I was in my first reading) with the notion that the narrative has as its agenda debunking misogynist myth, the reference to "many poor frail Females" seems a sarcasm aimed at misogynist mythmakers. It would seem instead to be sarcasm levelled at those who were questioning the assumption that women are motivated solely by sexual desire. The barb is clever—the passage posits that in women one of the seven deadly sins is the only check to another deadly sin. The positive checks to rampant female desire such as education, morality or religion, so popular with Erskine’s reform-minded contemporaries, are entirely suppressed as possibilities. Furthermore, as becomes apparent in the following narrative, very few women have pride and vanity in sufficient quantities to prevent the gratification of what the text clearly presents to be criminal desires.

In the end, Erskine’s choice of a cross-dressed woman as the one who will
encounter, collect, and describe the evidence to support ideas of women’s sexual rapaciousness and God-determined moral and intellectual bankruptcy undermines itself in the very performance of its mission. Instead of simply "proving" one thing, the text opens up possibilities, many of which would probably be unimaginable to Erskine and his contemporaries. Mutually contradictory readings co-exist. In this context, it is illuminating that her name, "Alithea," in Greek means "without stones" (another reference to her anatomy?) and "one who speaks or acts foolishly," though its more common form, "Alethea" means "truth." The co-existence of mutually exclusive meanings in the name is cemented by the lack of contemporary orthographic standardization—phonetically the name has either meaning. Even "Alithea," the name, contains the type of mutually contradictory meanings that Alithea the narrator embodies—both truth and lie, both man and woman. The text repeatedly collapses its culture’s most structurally important binary oppositions. Tourism and cross-dressing are fundamentally concerned with highly articulated cultural representation and with both the maintenance and investigation of cultural categories. They are structured to rehearse the permeability of boundaries and distinctions, and the personal transformation and displacement between them. Both are performed activities permitting enquiries into definitional distinctions, thereby focusing cultural anxiety. Erskine’s juxtaposition of tourism and cross-dressing, then, creates a text in which one cultural practice stands for and explains the other. Though clearly meant to re-confirm endangered category definitions, the combination of tourism with cross-dressing ultimately questions the "naturalness" of the culture’s working definitions.

In the Travels, cross-dressing and tourism enable the exploration of
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57 In the feminine adjectival form, "alithia" means to speak or act foolishly; the verb form, "alithi-o" means to make foolish, to distract; and "alithos" (fem. "alitha") means without stones. I would like to thank Tanya Caldwell for pointing out this significance, and both her and Anita George for sorting through the Greek for me. "Alethea," on the other hand, is a learned coinage of the seventeenth century. It represents the Greek word "aletheia," truth. (See Patrick Hanks and Flavia Hodges, A Dictionary of First Names, 9). I would like to thank Carrie Hintz for drawing my attention to this more common version and meaning of Alithea’s name.
alternatives, even when the implications of the existence of these alternatives are denied, or the alternatives themselves are rejected. Recent work on the history of gender roles and sexuality has found that over the eighteenth century they went through a revolution which dramatically polarized gendered behaviour and fused it to ideas about biological sex. In such a context, Erskine’s anxious and cross-national insistence on anatomy as determining "natural" gender-bound behaviour becomes significant. Clothing, status, and even gender-coded practices such as duelling (Alithea is given to sending and receiving challenges) could no longer be relied upon as necessarily possessing significance. Furthermore, the portrayal of same-sex desire within the text destabilizes the "naturalness" of gender roles even as the text insists upon them. There is no "original" and "natural" sexuality or gender for the narrator and her/his (his/her?) companion. The original is ultimately untraceable, and its absence raises the possibility that it has no existence outside performance and culturally contingent understandings. The validity of Erskine’s culture’s misogyny, along with its gender and sexual categories, are necessarily undermined by the devices he uses--a male impersonator who is in an erotic relationship with another male impersonator, and whose narration is so joyous and playful in tone, and of an authority so untrustworthy. This is what makes the text so tempting and likely to be read against the grain.

The Travels, then, marks a crisis in the cultural categories of male and female. Its importance rests, at least in part, in its attempt to address the limits of its culture’s understanding of gender and sexuality issues during a particularly pivotal period. To insert a woman into an explicitly male framework highlights what women lack and its importance. Alithea acts out masculinity in her sartorial and behavioral choices, and in the performance style of the tour she makes, but cannot perform sexually. The
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58 These inquiries began with works such as Michel Foucault’s The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction, and have continued through more detailed studies such as Thomas Laqueur’s Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud. Much of this work is surveyed in Michael McKeon, "Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660-1760."
grand tour was supposed to make the man. It was a boy’s exercise in self-creation, and in the learning of the differences between himself and others. His movement over the landscape, and his ability to translate himself into different cultural contexts, were thought to crystallize his identity. *Travels* posits the tour and masculine identity as performative (two women can do it too), but posits the necessity of male anatomy to act masculinity out fully. The simultaneous insistence on biological sex as determining the extent of enfranchisement, and on the non-fixedness and performativity of gender and sexuality is disconcerting. Though the text is profoundly conservative in its support of patriarchy, it is readily open to readings that go against its grain in readers who do not share its misogyny or its problems with same-sex sexuality. These readings stem from the disarming playfulness of the narration and the impact on a reader’s interpretation made by the sexual and gender ambiguity of the narrator and her/his travelling companion. In necessarily showing the alternatives in the *Travels*’ attempt to dismiss them, they become more than just possibilities. The basis of gender differentiation as "natural" is (if unintentionally) challenged.
Chapter 3 illustrated the discomfort and celebration novels which use tourism to address women and their lifestyles, especially alternative ones, could lead to. Amory, Scott, and Erskine use tourist-narrators to filter and frame descriptions of women. These descriptions necessarily question women's place in the contemporary gender order, if not the social and political order as a whole. In all three instances, the reader is positioned as the judge of the value of the tour, the legitimacy of both the description and the viewpoint of the tourist, and the implications of the descriptions and their applicability to the domestic sphere. Because of the way tourism was understood as presenting adoptable alternatives, the tour descriptions implicated both the fictional tourists and the authors in ways the authors could not have foreseen. Amory and Scott wrote the biographies of Buncle and Ellison to shore up the radical implications of the all-female communities they had seen as tourists, and, more damagingly, described in glowing terms. In Erskine's text, the ambiguous positioning of the tourist/narrator breaks the text open into a kaleidoscope's pattern of possible meanings and implications, many of which would probably have horrified the author and much of his initial audience. What we would now label essentialist and constructionist approaches to sexuality and gender identity coexist in this text, mutually undermining one another.

This chapter addresses an author who was fascinated with the importance and impact of tourism but had little personal experience as a tourist and never chose to reproduce his characters' tours or tour accounts in detail. Throughout his novels, Samuel Richardson is concerned with the issues tourism raises. Whether explicitly or implicitly, he concerned himself with the example tour attractions provided to the wider community, the potential impact on family and state of a returned tourist, and with the importance of tour experience both to individuals and to social groups.
Significantly, he grafts these concerns into courtship plots. Women and tourism are surprisingly closely linked in each of his novels.

i. Richardson and the Culture of Tourism

DORCAS: To forsake all your friends was a shame and a sin. Leave roving, and make your own country your wife.

LINCO: From this moment I wed her and take her for life,
    Shall quit all the world and think her the most comely;
    For home is still home, though never so homely.

-David Garrick, Linco's Travels, An Interlude (1767)

A discussion of Richardson in a dissertation on imaginative literature and the culture of tourism might at first seem idiosyncratic. Not only were his own travels limited to places in the south of England such as Bath and Tunbridge, but to Thomas Edwards he wrote, "I know nothing of Situations of Places, Distances, Contiguities." He was even more specific about his limited tour experience to Lady Echlin: he had not "had the Opportunity of seeing Sea Prospects, and hardly any Rocks but the Inland ones at Tunbridge." Furthermore, the standard critical narrative about Richardson would seem to afford no room for a discussion of Richardson and tourism. He is the great novelist of the enclosed--of his characters' internal responses, of private spaces, of sometimes crushing stasis. Furthermore, we usually trace how Richardson, provoked by public response, rewrote Pamela in Clarissa, and Clarissa in Sir Charles Grandison. Because criticism has emphasized the way Richardson reworked many of the same issues and refined many of the same techniques in each successive work, his
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1 15 August 1753; 20 February 1756. Cited by T.C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kempel, Samuel Richardson: A Biography, 73.
last work, *Grandison*, is usually approached with the same questions that have already been asked of *Pamela* and *Clarissa*. This critical strategy has obscured much of what is going on in Richardson’s last novel, as well as the significance of some aspects of the earlier works which are most fully developed in *Grandison*. For these reasons, I will focus on Richardson’s last novel.

*Pamela, or, Virtue Rewarded* and *Clarissa* are primarily prison and siege narratives, in which a beleaguered woman is presented as the model character. This focus on female beleaguerment shapes much of the novels’ subject matter and the interpretive strategies and issues one might identify and use to approach them. *Grandison*, for the most part, is neither a prison nor a siege narrative. Unlike *Pamela* or *Clarissa*, Sir Charles can travel to Peking if he chooses:

> Seas are nothing to him.... [H]e considers all nations as joined on the same continent; and doubted not but if he had a call, he would undertake a journey to Constantinople or Pekin, with as little difficulty as some others would...to the Land’s-end. (SCG III:30)

The freedom of movement *Grandison* has (and takes) to range over Europe and parts of Asia and Africa has serious interpretive implications for Richardson’s last novel.

*Grandison* is Richardson’s first and last attempt to present a virtuous man as a central character. This gender switch causes a sea change in Richardson’s treatment of many of his usual issues. As Jocelyn Harris writes:

> No woman could change the world, but a very special man just might. To a new kind of gentleman, benevolent, sensitive, conscious of duties as well as rights, social rather than individualistic, woman-like and Christ-like rather than

---

2 The T.C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel edition of *Pamela* will be cited parenthetically by *P* and page number. The Everyman edition of the second part of *Pamela* will be cited parenthetically by *Pit* and page number. The Angus Ross edition of *Clarissa*, or *The History of a Young Lady* will be cited parenthetically as *C* and page number. The Jocelyn Harris edition of *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* will be cited parenthetically by *SCG*, volume, and page number.
man-like in the old pagan, heroic and patriarchal ways—to such a man, to Sir Charles Grandison in short, one might safely entrust male power. Modelling himself as he may on Adam, Christ, and Solomon, Sir Charles stands forth as an ideal king, and an ideal man for Britain.³

In other words, the change of gender of the last novel’s central character shifts Richardson’s focus. Richardson’s project in Grandison, as Tassie Gwilliam addresses, was the redemption of masculinity.⁴ But Sir Charles’ identity is established and tested differently from the way Clarissa’s and Pamela’s are. Unlike them, Grandison begins with power; he does not need to earn it. The central issue in the novel is what shape he gives that power.

Pamela and Clarissa, enclosed and beleaguered, do not have the leisure to ruminate on tourism, and certainly cannot take leave their captors to tour France or Italy. Unsurprisingly, then, neither the first instalment of Pamela nor Clarissa makes the extensive use of the culture of tourism as Grandison does. Surprisingly, though, tourism does structure the narratives of the earlier novels. Furthermore, both contain multiple references to various forms of travel, as Peter Sabor has shown in his recent survey of the topic.⁵ Looking back from the vantage point of Grandison, it becomes apparent that Richardson was always aware of the shaping influence of tourism, and had an increasing interest in it as time went on. Richardson did not have to have seen much of foreign places and cultures to have an acute sense of how important having toured was to the behaviour and morality of the patrician classes, to how their power was legitimated or abused through tourism, or of tourism’s use as a status marker, and of the way it could even shape the lives of those who went nowhere except on business.

³ Samuel Richardson, 138.

⁴ Samuel Richardson’s Fictions of Gender, 111-160. Gwilliam is particularly interested in tracing the cost to others of Sir Charles’ "phallic power."

⁵ "'A Safe Bridge over the Narrow Seas': Crossing the Channel with Samuel Richardson."
In Richardson power and freely-chosen mobility are linked. Sir Charles Grandison’s characterization depends on his status as a "good" tourist, while much of the novel’s narrative literally springs from the continuing impact of his continental travels. The dependence of the novel on the culture of tourism for characterization, event, detail, and even storylines has received almost no critical commentary. Sylvia Kasey Marks, writing on Grandison in terms of the conduct book tradition, does note that

The Italian section provides a typical description of the problems of an Englishman abroad on the Grand Tour. Conduct books warned against the dangers to faith and morals encountered on such trips.6

And, like Phyllis Patricia Smith, Marks goes on to note that sections of Grandison rehearse common contemporary concerns that the young male traveller would return corrupted in habits, religion, and morals.7 They point, for instance, to comments such as Harriet Byron’s, when she has discovered Sir Charles is in love with a woman he met abroad:

Travelling! Young men travelling! I cannot, my dear, but think it a very nonsensical thing! What can they see, but the ruins of the gay, once busy world, of which they have read?
To see a parcel of giddy boys, under the direction of tutors, or governors, hunting after—What?—Nothing; or at best but ruins of ruins; for the imagination, aided by reflexion, must be left, after all, to make out the greater glories which the grave-digger Time has buried too deep for discovery.
And when this grand tour is completed, the travell’d youth returns: And, what is his boast? Why to be able to tell, perhaps his better-taught friend, who


has never been out of his native country, that he has seen in ruins, what the other has a juster idea of, from reading: And of which, it is more than probable, he can give a much better account than the traveller. (SCG IV:291)

Pointing to passages such as this one both critics assume that Richardson engages in a conventional one-sided attack on travel. Yet this ignores both the circumstances under which such comments are made (in this case, for instance, Harriet has identified Charles’ travels as the source of her own shattered dreams) and the novel’s widespread deployment of the culture of tourism and of references to Sir Charles’ tour. Neither critic addresses how Grandison fits the image of the ideal tourist in all ways, nor the significance of his tour and contemporary ideas about the meanings and impact of tourism to the narrative. If Richardson continually displays a profound ambivalence towards educational travel, this ambivalence does not prevent him from mulcting the practice to enhance his paragon’s status and to shape the story.

The alternatives faced by Richardson’s grand-touring contemporaries are easy to enumerate, as are the advantages commonly assumed to come from the practice. In touring, young men negotiated and articulated the differences between vice and virtue, Jacobitism and loyalty to the House of Hanover, Catholicism and Protestantism, and continental and British culture. It was assumed that this process tested their mettle and proved them either worthy or utterly unworthy of their influential social positions. It also, theoretically, gave them a broad-based knowledge of how to govern (since touring provided an opportunity to investigate numerous models of government) and this in turn legitimated their continued power. Richardson’s Grandison employs the cultural significance of tourism to negotiate a series of alternatives and to found his paragon’s status. Further, Richardson uses tourism and his idealized grand tourist to neutralize the disruptive power of the alternatives available to tourists. Remarkably, Richardson does not suppress the alternatives, or treat them as chimeras. Many of them are presented as attractive, powerful, and plausible, but also as integrities alien to Grandison’s, and therefore incommensurable with his.

Richardson’s insistence on the incommensurability of powerful integrities leads
to many of the narrative peculiarities of the novel. Richardson translates political, religious, or nationalist choices into a choice between marriage partners. Surprisingly, the virtue of Grandison and each woman transforms the choice into no choice at all. Significantly, the difference between the women would transform the narrative from a comedy to a tragedy if Grandison's virtue faltered. Clementina della Porretta comes to represent all the continent has to offer; Harriet Byron all that Britain can. Both women are extraordinarily attractive and virtuous. Grandison loves both, but can only marry one. When Lucy Selby writes to Lady G. after Grandison's marriage to Harriet, she echoes an opinion already expressed by many other characters:

How could Sir Charles, so thorough an Englishman, have been happy with an Italian wife? His heart indeed, is, generously open and benevolent to people of all countries: He is...in the noblest sense, a Citizen of the World: But, see we not, that his long residence abroad, has only the more endeared to him the Religion, the Government, the Manners of England? (SCG VII:263)⁸

Though the majority of the minor narratives in Sir Charles Grandison trace the continuing impact of Charles's travels,⁹ such narratives are ornamental compared to Grandison's entanglement with the Italian Catholic della Porrettas. This entanglement suspends the issue of the courtship plot between Sir Charles and Harriet Byron for over a thousand pages, continuing a story where otherwise there would be none. Grandison's responses to the della Porrettas and the continental values and political options they represent establish him as the ideal nationalist Englishman, what, Margaret Anne Doody has argued, "the true Tory Prince should look like."¹⁰ He is proven to be unshakeably Protestant, non-partisan, cosmopolitan, merciful, benevolent, and dedicated to his country. Such a character profile would have been familiar to
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⁸ Cf. SCG III:263, for instance.

⁹ A partial list of these would include the narratives concerning Emily Jervois, Edward Beauchamp, and Edward Danby.

¹⁰ "Richardson's Politics," 125.
contemporaries from the defenses of travel which had been widely circulating for over 200 years. The dream of creating such a man had spurred the development of the *Ars Apodemica*, and kept the institution of educational travel it had methodized alive until the end of the eighteenth century.

If Grandison had never been a tourist, he would never have been tempted by everything which the continent, in the form of the della Porrettas, stood for in the English imagination, and his English Protestant identity would remain unproven. Like Garrick’s Linco, Grandison marries England. Unlike Linco, however, he never makes an active choice of partners because his "heart...is, generously open and benevolent to people of all countries." But his essential Englishness nonetheless has him fated to marry Harriet Byron because she is essentially English too. The narrative problem, then, hinges on establishing both Clementina, associated with Jacobitism, Catholicism, and Italiness, and Harriet Byron, the perfect Englishwoman, as sympathetic and attractive without one undermining the status of the other. To make one woman essentially inferior would test Sir Charles’ judgement and interpretive discernment, not his English Protestant identity.

Many early readers were disturbed by Richardson’s decision to test identity, rather than discernment, and strenuously criticized Sir Charles Grandison’s openness to something they understood as fundamentally un-English. Several almost vitriolic anonymous letters argued that Sir Charles’ entertainment of the Catholic della Porrettas encouraged the English to embrace their "irreconcilable enemies," pointing out, for instance, how absurd it would be for a true Englishman to (among many other things):

> think of setting a part any Place in his House as an idolatrous Chapel [?with an] undermining Priest! (the Nation, perhaps, is on the Brink of Ruin, with the
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11 Several such anonymous letters to Samuel Richardson are available in the Forster Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum. See, for instance, the letters in F.48.E.9 dated 26 January, 1754 (item 25/27); May 23, 1754 (item 25/47); and a very polite one, n.d. (item 25/52).
numbers already here) always inflaming, always plotting. Vile Aspersions!

Most correspondents were less alarmist, but referred to Sir Charles' offers to the Italian della Porrettas as a "blot" on his character. Several suggested that Richardson write another volume, where "perhaps by a retrospect of Sr. Charles himself, acknowledging and bewailing it [the "great...impropriety"], as the great Blot of his life..." or where the reader could

hear him acknowledge y' goodness & Wisdom of Providence, that had so signally interposed to prevent his Union with [?]an Italian Family, as y' [?]consciousness] arising from difference of Religion & Country must on this count appear in y' strongest light to him, his nobly Pious Heart must [?]burst forth at his lips in praises & thankfulness for what he once esteemed so great a disappointment.

The criticism of the un-Englishness of Charles' compromises with the della Porrettas was so persistent that Lady Bradshaigh suggested that Richardson "let it pass as a fault, and so satisfie people that Sr. Charles is not above nature faultless" and Richardson found a need to justify himself in "A Concluding Note by The EDITOR" appended to subsequent editions of the novel (SCG VII:464-466). Though Richardson was praised by some for his treatment of the religious issues raised by the relationship between Sir Charles and Clementina, to many of his original readers the maintenance of identity meant putting English Protestantism in a clear position of superiority.

12 Anon. letter to Richardson, 11 June, 1754. See also another anonymous letter to Richardson about the dangerousness of such a narrative at "the time so critical, the hope of the nation in the hands in the papists [sic]" (26 December, 1754). Items 25/48; 25/21, F.48.E.9 (Forster Collection).

13 Sarah Chapone to Samuel Richardson, 10 December, 1753 (item 2, F.48.E.7, [Forster Collection]); Anon. to Samuel Richardson, 17 April 1754. Item 25/34, F.48.E.9 (Forster Collection).

Richardson's interest in tourism did not extend to writing tour description in his novels. Though he revised Defoe's *Tour* and wrote tour descriptions of London in the *Familiar Letters*, there is only one complete tour description in his novels. It occurs in *Grandison* in a letter which describes Sir Charles' passage over Mount Cenis (*SCG* IV:445-448). For this, it seems that Richardson did not rely on his own invention, but on William Windham and Pierre Martel's *An Account of the Glaciers or Ice Alps in Savoy* (London, 1744).15 When Richardson does give touristic description undeniably his own—as when he engages in a country house description of Grandison Hall—the description breaks off. The "complete" description promised of Grandison Hall peter's off into an ellipses after Harriet's "slight sketch" and an excerpt of Lucy Selby's description (*SCG* VII:272-273). Lucy's unreproduced letters are constantly referred to as the location of the missing touristic description. "Be it Lucy's task to describe..." as Harriet says, but the novel's reader sees only sketches and fragments (*SCG* VII:275). Richardson's avoidance of recognizably touristic description results in the highly disjointed and elliptical narrative at the beginning of Volume VII (the post-marriage volume).

Typically, Richardson marks missing tour descriptions as absent. In *Sir Charles Grandison*, they are often in Lucy's unseen letters. As Harriet tells Mrs. Shirley:

Lucy loves to describe houses, furniture, gardens, and such like. She says, she will sometimes give you conversations too, at which I shall not be present; but will leave to my pen persons, characters, and what passes of the more tender sort in conversations where I am by. (*SCG* VII:268)

Richardson limits his writing to the same subjects as Harriet does. Similarly, Charles' "Literary Journal" of his continental tour is mentioned repeatedly, especially when he is courting Harriet, though it is never produced or excerpted. Throughout the

---

courtship, Harriet refers to the journal as one of the benefits of marrying Sir Charles. For instance, on recounting that Sir Charles had described some of the sights at a meal, Harriet enthusiastically writes:

What pleasure do I hope one day to receive from the perusal (if I shall be favoured with it) of Sir Charles's LITERARY JOURNAL.... For it includes, I presume, a description of palaces, cities, cabinets of the curious, diversions, amusements, customs, of different nations. How attentive were we all, to the answers he made to my cousin James's questions [about "the principal courts, and places of note, in Italy"]! My memory serves but for a few generals; and those I will not trouble you with. (SCG VI:81)

Once again, Richardson avoids "troubling" the reader with touristic description. This Literary Journal is, significantly, first mentioned in Charles' letters to Dr. Bartlett to explain the lack of tour description accompanying his account of the unfolding della Porretta situation. Richardson would have the reader believe Grandison is creating two texts parallel to his lived experience: the excerpted letters we see, and the Literary Journal of touristic description we never do. As Harriet comments to Lucy Selby, perhaps echoing Richardson's contemporary tour-description-hungry readers, "I fansy, my dear, [Sir Charles' Literary Journal] must be a charming thing. I wish we could have before us every line he wrote while he was in Italy" (SCG III:244). Richardson thought his readers expected description and felt that he needed to explain why it was not being produced for them.

However, Richardson's lack of interest in producing tour descriptions should not be confused with a lack of interest in, or a refusal to deploy, the cultural meanings and uses of tourism. Though Richardson himself rarely travelled and never toured the continent, his interest in tourism is much more insistent than has been recognized. Of course, Richardson printed travel accounts and adapted and reprinted Defoe's popular A Tour thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain; more importantly, however, the novels preceding Grandison have strong ties to tourism. This is unsurprising given Richardson's well-documented habit of elaborating on his concerns in successive narratives. Though not a principal concern in Pamela and Clarissa, tourism and its
impact are addressed. Richardson's self-conscious deployment of the culture of tourism is reflected in the appearance of travel as a substantial category in his 1755 *A Collection of Moral and Instructive Sentiments* (Richardson, 75-77; 386-387). Since he thought of this collection as giving "at one View ye Pith & Marrow" of the novels, he apparently believed he was saying something important about the moral use of travel. Sir Charles Grandison himself—the returned grand tourist, the male paragon—is presented by Richardson as an alternative to all other men, and, specifically within his own writings, as an alternative to such morally questionable men as Mr. B. and Robert Lovelace. All three have travelled extensively on the continent.

There are only scattered references to Mr. B.'s travels in the first part of *Pamela*—he was, we are told, attended on his original tour by his Swiss servant, Colbrand; he travelled to avoid his conscience after seducing Sally Godfrey (P 399); and at one point Lady Davers taunts him with his tour, saying:

> We all know...that since your Italian Duel, you have commenc'd a Bravo; and all your Airs breathe as strongly of the Manslayer as of the Libertine. (P 347)

His response shows his promise as an upstanding gentleman: "I have no Reason to be ashamed of that Duel, nor the Cause of it; since it was to save a Friend" (P 347). He does not then, duel without pressing cause. I will return to the first part of *Pamela* shortly. It is much more deeply involved in contemporary tourism than it first appears from the very few references to the practice appearing in the novel itself.

In the relatively neglected second part of *Pamela, Pamela in her Exalted Condition* (1742), Richardson explicitly engages with the significance and social uses of tourism. Not only are Mr. B.'s earlier travels given in more detail, and are made the basis for his three year "honourable employment abroad in the service of the state" (P II, 481), but he gives his thoughts on the method to be taken in educational travel
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for young men, and takes Pamela on an extensive series of domestic tours and then on
a lengthy continental tour. Richardson himself considered Mr. B.'s highly conventional
thoughts on educational travel of enough importance to paraphrase them in A
Collection of Moral and Instructive Sentiments, thereby making an unoriginal
contribution to the long tradition of debate over the institution. But what is more
interesting in the sequel is what it reveals about the importance of touring to the status
and acculturation of women. Such touring is part of Mr. B.'s campaign, as Pamela
herself writes enthusiastically, to counteract her position as his "inferior... in learning,
in parts, in knowledge of the world, and in all the graces which make conversation
agreeable and improving...." It is, she says, a method of fashioning a good
gentlewomanly wife, a fit companion of a gentleman of Mr. B.'s high stature, and it is
a method that Pamela highly recommends (P11 414). Pamela does not write accounts
of what she sees on the grounds that it would be inappropriate. Her correspondents,
she points out, have seen those places she is visiting for the first time; others better
qualified have already described the sights; and besides, she could better use the time
it would take to write tour descriptions to write her remarks on Locke's theories of
education.

Unsurprisingly, the mode of tour she performs is not one suggested to a young
man on his educative travels. Such a tourist was instructed to keep as many as three
accounts of his travels. Count Leopold von Berchtold, in his Essay to Direct and
Extend the Inquiries of Patriotic Travellers, even suggested keeping at least one of
these multiple versions in code. Women, especially when they travelled with their
families, were not required by convention to keep such accounts of their tours.
Pamela is touring to learn social codes, and to legitimize her newly "exalted
condition." She is not touring to familiarize herself with political, religious, economic,
military, and historical difference. Therefore producing written descriptions of sites,
or political, religious or military institutions to prove she had taken proper note of
them would have little relevance to the purpose of her tour. Richardson's choice of
having his heroine substitute writings on Locke and education for ones about her
experience in Holland, the Netherlands, France, Italy, and the German States is
curious, and is perhaps meant to imply that she is learning, as Locke theorizes, from experience and association. She also takes the opportunity to relate how Mr. B. expands on Locke’s ideas on travel as part of a young man’s education.17

Richardson’s deployment of tourism in the second part of Pamela illustrates how fundamental he believed tourism was to the British elite. All of the gentry and aristocracy in Pamela had been tourists. The experience marks them as distinct from those below them, and shapes some of their responses to the circumstances in which they find themselves. For instance, the Dowager Countess of ----, though virtuous, behaves with an un-English freedom towards Mr. B. because, Richardson explains, she was educated in Italy as a child (PIII 370). With Pamela’s social elevation, she enters a world in which extensive touring is socially prescribed, if only for the modelling available through "the opportunity of conversing with the politest and most learned gentry of different nations" (PIII 426). To be travelled marked one as a member of the elite and gave one the cultural equipment to legitimize that status. Pamela’s extraordinary virtue, Richardson would have us believe, justifies her elevation; the social and cultural capital accumulated in the practice of touring, however, legitimizes it. Despite her travels and knowledge of "two or three languages," she comes back with a "heart as entirely English as ever" PIII 427. Furthermore:

All our neighbours here admire us more and more. You’ll excuse my seeming (for it is but seeming) vanity...."Never," says Mrs. Towers, who is still a single lady, "did I see, before, a lady so much advantaged by her residence in that fantastic nation" (for she loves not the French) "who brought home with her nothing of their affectation!"--She says, that the French politeness, and the English frankness and plainness of heart, appear happily blended in all we [the B. family] say and do. (PIII 428)

As Sir Charles’ travels are later to do, Pamela’s travels have tested, proved, and

17 Pamela gives Mr. B’s theories on the function travel should take in a young man’s education (PIII 435-438). These are paraphrased in A Collection of Moral and Instructive Sentiments, 75-77. Mr. B. suggests that the young man tour Britain before going abroad with a reliable governor.
improved her as a model gentlewoman. She is no longer simply a suspiciously 
elevated servant girl. Unlike those below her, she has toured and received the benefits 
of the practice. She is both cosmopolitan and more truly English than someone who 
has not travelled since she has the experience and knowledge to know what the 
identity really means.

But, whatever Richardson’s explicit use of tourism and its cultural significance 
in Pamela may mean, Pamela’s connection to tourist culture is actually foundational. 
Richardson wrote an account of Pamela’s genesis in a letter addressed to Aaron Hill in 
early 1741. In the section of this letter commonly rehearsed in criticism, Richardson 
explains how the novel developed from an attempt to write a volume of model letters, 
and how he found himself instead developing "a new species of writing."\(^{18}\) But this 
passage is prefaced by a lengthy account of the source of the story itself. Richardson 
claims that

About twenty-five years ago, a gentleman...met with such a story as that 
of Pamela, in one of the summer tours which he used to take for his pleasure, 
attended with one servant only. At every inn he put up at, it was his way to 
inquire after curiosities in its neighbourhood, either ancient or modern; and 
particularly he asked who was the owner of a fine house...which he had passed 
by....

It was a fine house, the landlord said. The owner was Mr. B. .... That 
his and his lady’s story engaged the attention of every body who came that 
way, and put a stop to all other enquiries, though the house and gardens were 
well worth seeing. (Richardson, 39)

The landlord then proceeds to tell Pamela’s story, which engages his interlocutor so 
much that "he had the curiosity to stay in the neighbourhood from Friday to Sunday, 
that he might see this happy couple at church." The gentleman is so impressed with 
Mrs. B. that he told the whole story to Richardson "with transport" (Richardson, 40). 
Richardson’s Pamela or, Virtue Rewarded deviates little from the account he gives to 
Hill of his friend’s story.

\(^{18}\) [January or February 1741], in Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson, 41.
Pamela is, therefore, a traveller's tale in which the traveller and his tour have been suppressed. Instead of tourist description such as his friend's, Richardson provides the reader with an imagined insider's rendering of the process by which the tourist's favourite site became so noteworthy. The tour itself was made during a period in which the peripatetic domestic tourism (as opposed to resort tourism at such places as Bath) was undertaken mainly to define the essence of the British, and specifically as a way of comprehending the full potential of British lands, history, and people. As Celia Fiennes argued at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the practice of domestic travel dissipated the "vapours" and counteracted laziness. Most importantly, domestic travel would "form such an Idea of England, add much to its Glory and Esteem in our minds and cure the evil itch of over-valueing [sic] foreign parts...." To tour one's own country was to tour to the limits of one's own community, and to amass empirical evidence of its capabilities. England is capable of producing a Pamela.

Pamela's origin in a traveller's tale is significant. As Terri Nickel has pointed out, Richardson's strategy here involves one often associated with tourism—the nostalgic search for authenticity. Richardson's Mrs. B. is possible, is authentic—she has been seen by an intimate friend of Richardson. Though a nostalgic product of the past (the sighting occurred about twenty-five years before the novel's composition), she is not an impossibility sprouted in the fertile soil of a hopeful imagination. However, whether apocryphal or not, the gentleman's story represents more than a nostalgic claim to authenticity. The Innkeeper indicates that the story is a special item he presents to all those touring through, and that it produces the same response in most tourists, substituting itself for their usual interests, as it does for Richardson's friend. The narrative associated with Mrs. B. makes her an exemplar, a living monument to female virtue, and therefore transforms her into something worth

19 "To the Reader," in The Illustrated Journeys of Celia Fiennes, 32. Fiennes' argument for domestic tourism is conventional.

20 "Tourism and Nostalgia: Pamela as Country Heroine."
changing one's schedule to see. Mrs. B. becomes a more popular tourist site than her husband's house and garden, though these "were well worth seeing." Richardson's friend would not have been so "transported" in relating a story of seeing a pretty housemaid at church, and such a story would have been unlikely to produce a novel. Mrs. B. is worth seeing because she and her story represent an alternative to the two stories one might expect to arise in response to the originary situation of a young man pursuing his mother's beautiful maid. The maid could be debauched, or, as Fielding rewrote the story in Shamela, she could take worldly advantage of the situation. It could easily have been presented as a story of human predation, lasciviousness, or thoughtlessness.

As the innkeeper presents the story, there is no way of determining whether predation, lasciviousness, or thoughtlessness is in the unseen space behind it. His Mrs. B., glimpsed superficially in neighbourhood gossip and a church appearance, could indeed be Shamela. There is no substantial evidence to the contrary. But it was important to the innkeeper, the tourists, and to Richardson that the story could be told the way the innkeeper tells it, and that the image Mrs. B. presented at church seemed to confirm the narrative. One of Johannes Fabian's comments on anthropological writing is illuminating:

our ways of making the Other are ways of making ourselves. The need to go there (to exotic places, be they far away or around the corner) is really our desire to be here (to find or defend our position in the world).  

Richardson made Mrs. B.'s story his own, and assumed her voice to defend his own position in the world and to give others a map to it. In Pamela's writings he tried to fill the space behind the site of a woman in a church, a woman who represented, for the tourist and the man to whom he told his traveller's tale, a moral. Fielding was to respond by giving an entirely different substance and moral to the same story of a man

21 "Presence and Representation: The Other and Anthropological Writing," 756.
marrying his pretty maid, a moral that would have "transported" neither the tourist nor Richardson.

Tourism and its social uses (or, in this case, abuses) also plays a part in Richardson's *Clarissa*. There are many passing references to tourism in this novel, especially in Lovelace’s letters, and, of course, Colonel Morden, after discovering the Harlowe family’s obstinacy, wants to take Clarissa on a two year tour of the continent to recover her health and reputation. However, the use of tourism to recover reputation, and to escape an otherwise destructive circumstance, is less obviously one of the structuring elements of the work. The narrative is framed by Robert Lovelace’s continental tours. It is strongly suggested that in both cases he tours the continent, not for educative benefit or recreation, but to escape the consequences of rape. As Peter Sabor briefly argues, Lovelace also sees touring as "primarily a path to sexual gratification, with France and Italy representing havens of eroticism." Lovelace associates touring the continent with sexual opportunities which would be difficult to compass in England, a common association we have seen Sterne work through in *A Sentimental Journey* (Chapter 2).

Lovelace’s status as a recently returned tourist is mentioned almost as soon as we are introduced to him (C 46). At first one assumes his travels have been the conventional educational tour, as undertaken by young men of his social standing. But a later letter written by Joseph Leman, Lovelace’s informant and agitator in the Harlowe household, suggests otherwise:

He acquaints Mr Lovelace of the prosecution intended to be set up against him by his masters [the Harlowes], for a rape upon Miss Betterton, whom by a stratagem he had got into his hands; and who afterwards died in child-bed....He hears...that his honour went abroad to avoid the prosecution which the lady’s relations otherwise would have set on foot. (C 494-495)

Though Lovelace claims "that there was no rape in the case: that he went not abroad

---

22 "'A Safe Bridge over the Narrow Seas,'" 164.
on her account..."(C 495), his assertion is doubtful. He is in the habit of lying when convenient, and, in fact, later tells Belford that this letter is not the truth but only "pretty near the truth" (C 720). He seems to be a pattern rapist. The case with Miss Betterton is ambiguous; Clarissa's case is not. Further, while trying to convince himself to rape Clarissa, Lovelace himself makes a gloating confession to Belford that he had engaged in an affair with a woman in Paris who enjoyed his initial rape of her. "'No woman ever gave me a private meeting for nothing; my dearest Miss Harlowe excepted'" (C 675). It would seem that he is given to raping women.

Miss Betterton's story prefigures Clarissa's. After injuring a woman and angering her friends Lovelace removes to the continent. He certainly conceives of tourism as the way to avoid the anger of an injured woman's friends. When he projects raping Anna Howe, for instance, he says he would do so even "if [he] should be obliged to take another tour upon it" (C 753). Even if he believes he did not leave England because of his connection to Miss Betterton, this is no guarantee that his relatives and friends thought likewise. In his own mind, though not in the minds of anyone else, he later goes abroad for the sake of his health, not to avoid the Harlowe family's vengeance. Even in Lovelace's travels, however, he had to leave Rome and Florence as a result of "some liberties in which he indulged himself, that endangered his person and liberty" (C 563). It is highly probable that the "liberties" Lovelace took in Rome and Florence were of a sexual nature too: he is repeatedly said to have no vices but attempts on women. Lovelace, therefore, habitually uses tourism to camouflage the necessity he is under to escape the repercussions of the sexual liberties he takes. He is an example of Yorick's "delinquent and felonious Traveller" SI 82), travelling to avoid the ramifications of his actions. If Clarissa recovers her reputation by death, Lovelace habitually recovers his by going on tour, until by going on tour he meets death.

Ironically, it is also Lovelace's knowledge of the continent that gives him access to Clarissa by letter. As Clarissa explains to Anna Howe, her uncle Hervey

has thoughts of sending ["a young gentleman entrusted to his care"] abroad a
year or two hence, to make the Grand Tour, as it is called; and finding Mr.
Lovelace could give a good account of everything necessary for a young
traveller to observe upon such an occasion, he desired him to write down a
description of the courts and countries he had visited, and what was most
worthy of curiosity in them.

He consented, on condition that I would direct his subjects, as he called
it: and as everyone had heard his manner of writing commended, and thought
his relations might be agreeable amusements in winter evenings; and that he
could have no opportunity particularly to address me in them, since they were
to be read in full assembly before they were to be given to the young
gentleman, I made the less scruple to write... (C 47)

On reading these letters, Clarissa, Anna, and the Harlowes find cause to admire
Lovelace because "he was no common observer upon what he had seen" (C 47). Like
Lovelace's other uses of tourism, though, he uses these letters as a socially prestigious
camouflage for socially destructive behaviour. He encloses particular letters to
Clarissa in the general ones to her family. His tour has given him a way of
commencing a correspondence with a woman who would never have allowed it
otherwise. It is the raw material for one of the planks of Clarissa's coffin.

ii. Taking Your Country to Wife: Sir Charles Grandison Negotiates the Continent

Grandison's thickly scattered references to Sir Charles' travels act as so many
proofs of his extraordinary merit. They also act as both a firm foundation and a
justification for the narrative which arches over them. These references implicitly
contrast Sir Charles with the conventionally "bad" tourist Clarissa's cousin Colonel
Morden describes so well:

Oh my dear cousin, were you but with us here at Florence, or at Rome, or at
Paris...to see the gentlemen whose supposed rough English manners at setting
out are to be polished, and what their improvements are in their return through
the same places, you would infinitely prefer the man in his first stage, to the
same man in his last. You find the difference on their return: foreign fashions,
foreign vices, and foreign diseases too, often complete the man, and to despise
his own country and countrymen, himself still more despicable than the most
despicable of those he despises: these too generally make up, with a mixture of
an unblushing effrontery, the travelled gentleman! (C 563)

Richardson is painstaking in drawing an implicit contrast between Grandison and the
well-known figure of the bad tourist Morden sketches here. For instance,
Richardson’s passing comments on Grandison’s virtuous deployment of his allowance
give a picture of exemplary frugality. As Jeremy Black points out,

Cost was one of the principal planks of the attack on tourism, and it was
possibly the major topic of the printed attack, particularly in the latter half of
the century when Jacobitism had largely ceased to be an issue and the sense of
threat posed by Catholicism had receded.23

Sir Charles begins with £800, and this is later augmented to £1000 per year (SCG
II:319). These sums put him at a surprisingly low expenditure level for someone of
his social standing who is touring the continent, as well as parts of Asia and Africa.
Later he requests his father, who is having financial difficulties, to remit half the
amount, explaining that "My reputation is established; and I will engage not to
discredit my father" (SCG II:330). Not only does less than £1000 cover his own
touring expenses, but he draws from this allowance to pay for Edward Beauchamp’s
Eastern tour, and for Dr. Bartlett’s expenses to act as a guide and companion to
Beauchamp (SCG II:462). An Eastern tour was usually prohibitively expensive (as
Richardson’s contemporaries would have known). Therefore, instead of over-spending
and continually requesting further funds, like the often satirized grand tourist,
Grandison does with less and less money over the eight or nine years he is on tour,
and even pays for two friends to take an extremely expensive trip. Similarly,
Richardson’s comment that the touring Grandison, in Harriet’s words "studied
Husbandry and Law, in order...to be his father’s steward" (SCG VII:288) is one of the

23 Black, The British Abroad, 86. For more data on the expense of touring, see
92-109.
many meant to show that he took the educative purpose of the tour seriously. His tour of Europe, Asia, and Africa was no frolic of dissipation and debauchery.

The implicit contrast between Sir Charles’ exemplary performance and the negative stereotype of the educational tourist is not the only way Richardson establishes Sir Charles’s superiority as a tourist. Grandison has also toured much more extensively than was conventional. In the mid-eighteenth century, the standard circuit was France, Savoy, and Italy down to Naples. Sometimes a young man also visited the German and the Netherlandish states, and even more rarely he added Spain to the list. The average tour took two to four years. Few visited Africa and Asia, in addition to the standard European destinations, partially because such touring was prohibitively expensive, and partially because it necessitated powerful political connections. Furthermore, Grandison’s tour takes him eight or nine years—over double the average. Implicitly, part of Grandison’s extraordinariness arises from such an extraordinary use of the practice of educational touring.

The difference between Grandison and what he could have been becomes extremely pointed in the complicated tale attached to Grandison’s association with Dr. Bartlett. Dr. Bartlett begins as the governor to a "wicked youth" (SCG II:457), a Mr. Lorimer, who tries to get him killed in Venice and then Greece, partially at the instigation of a Venetian courtesan of whom he is enamoured. Sir Charles, of course, saves Dr. Bartlett, with help from his friend Edward Beauchamp. Mr. Lorimer, fittingly for the moral, dies abroad in unspeakable horror at his immoral actions. Mr. Lorimer’s "baseness so very villainous" (SCG II:461) is obviously meant as a contrast to Sir Charles’ exceptional virtuousness. To sharpen the point further, however, Sir Charles, the exemplary charge, had a villainous and corrupt governor, Monsieur Creutzer, who tries to lead him into the crooked paths exemplified in Dr. Bartlett’s original charge:

See Black, The British Abroad, 14-85.

For this complicated and geographically exotic story, see SCG II:456-461.
It seems, the man was not only profligate himself, but, in order to keep himself in countenance, laid snares for the young gentleman's virtue; which, however, he had the happiness to escape; tho' at an age in which youth is generally unguarded. This man was also contentious, quarrelsome, and a drinker; and yet...it had so very indifferent an appearance, for a young man to find fault with his governor, that, as well for appearance-sake, as for the man's, he was very loth to complain, till he became insupportable. (SCG II:385)

Creutzer's governorship "became insupportable" when he and Mr. Lorimer meet. They become involved in an intrigue which forces them to flee the law. In this passage the doubling of governors and charges is explicit:

"Mr Grandison became acquainted with Dr. Bartlett at Turin: Monsieur Creutzer, at the same time, commenced an intimacy with Mr. Lorimer [the bad tourist]; and the two former were not more united from good qualities, than the two latter were from bad." (SCG II:457)

The tale of the association between Grandison and Bartlett is one of the few points where Richardson makes explicit the comparison between Grandison and the demonic grand tourist so familiar to contemporaries. But the contrast, whether explicit or implicit, underwrites almost every reference to Sir Charles' travels.

As we have seen, Lovelace, as one of Richardson's "bad" men, abuses the advantages of touring. Lovelace even uses his experience and authority as a returned tourist to try to provoke a duel. Grandison, on the other hand, uses it to avoid one. Though fleeting and insignificant in Clarissa, the contrast between these uses of tour experience clarifies how tourism is used in many episodes in Sir Charles Grandison. Lovelace uses his tour experience to try (unsuccessfully) to provoke Hickman, to distract him, and to trivialize his anxiety about the subject upon which they meet (Lovelace's ambivalent letter about Clarissa to Anna Howe). When Hickman commences to read Lovelace's letter out loud, intending to query him on sections of it, Lovelace breaks in with:

Do you use spectacles, Mr. Hickman?
Spectacles, sir! His whole broad face lifted up at me. Spectacles!--What makes you ask me such a question? Such a young man as I use spectacles, sir!--

They do in Spain, Mr. Hickman; young as well as old; to save their eyes....

[Hickman:]...Custom is everything in nations, as well as individuals: I know the meaning of your question--But 'tis not the English custom--Was you ever in Spain, Mr. Hickman?

No, sir: I have been in Holland.

In Holland, sir!--Never in France or Italy? I was resolved to travel with him into the land of Puzzledom.

No, sir, I cannot say I have, as yet.

That's a wonder, sir, when on the continent!

I went on a particular affair: I was obliged to return soon." (C 1092)

Lovelace here abuses his status as a returned tourist as part of his attempt to provoke Hickman into a duel. Lovelace has no grounds on which to challenge Hickman, but he does his best to give Hickman the grounds on which to challenge him. He asserts his superior social standing in an intentionally insulting manner. Lovelace had the leisure and opportunity to tour, has taken it to tour fashionable places, and has even extended his tour to a place slightly off the beaten track (Spain). Lovelace, in his mock surprise that Hickman was not touring when he travelled, implies that his social position is such that he never comes into contact with those, like Hickman, who travel only for business. The solidity Hickman displays in his responses helps turn the interview, despite Lovelace's claim to Belford to have "played him off" (C 1091). Lovelace's inability to use his status as a returned tourist to purpose here reflects his general inability to shape events to his own ends after the rape of Clarissa.

The "good" man of Richardson's next novel was to use the cultural authority of tourism to counteract, not provoke, a duel. Sir Charles' response to Sir Hargrave Pollexfen's challenge is shot through with references to Sir Charles' tour. Sir Hargrave challenges Sir Charles because Sir Charles knocked out his teeth and prevented him from marrying the kidnapped and resisting Harriet Byron. Throughout Sir Hargrave Pollexfen's threatenings and challenges, Grandison appeals to the resolution, tried and proven on the continent, not to engage in duelling. As he tells a
worried Mr. Reeves:

My intention is, not to run into mischief, but to prevent it. My principles are better known abroad, than they are in England. I have been challenged more than once by men, who knew them, and thought to find their safety from them. I have been obliged to take some extraordinary steps to save myself from insult; and those steps have answered my end, in more licentious countries than this. I hope this step will preserve me from calls of this nature in my own country. (SCG II:243)

The "extraordinary" step he takes in England is to invite himself to breakfast at his challenger's house. At the breakfast itself he gives Sir Hargrave Pollexfen and his friends a specific account of where he got the idea for his extraordinary proceeding. He tells them of an incident which occurred to him in a German wood on the way to Mannheim. In the woods, he encountered pandours who were obviously robbers, but instead of acknowledging them as such, and before they could declare themselves, he appealed to them for directions, and offered them money if they would guide him through. The full extent of his danger was later revealed when two other travellers were found murdered in the woods. Drawing a lesson from this incident, Sir Charles invited himself to breakfast at the house of his English challenger, something he would never have done, he assures his interlocutors, had the challenger been Italian (SCG II:257-258).

Sir Hargrave and his friends are properly impressed by Sir Charles' virtuous originality, but Sir Hargrave is still not entirely pacified. He wants to know if Sir Charles has ever before subdued a challenger without duelling. After appeals to modesty, Sir Charles tells them a story set in Venice and Verona. He was provoked to cane a young noble Venetian, who is now, Sir Charles explains, happily married and furthermore attributes his felicity to Sir Charles' restraint (SCG II:258-260). By implication, the toothless and Harriet-less Pollexfen will also attribute any future felicity to Sir Charles Grandison's restraint.

Both of these stories partially depend on their exotic nature for their power. They are traveller's tales, and are told as such. They work by illustrating a truth
applicable to the domestic sphere. Their moral is controlled by the maintenance of geographical, cultural, and political space between the site of the stories (the continent) and the site of their application (Britain). Because they are traveller's tales, Sir Charles' examples of duel-avoidance remain uncontaminated by the strong narrative expectations they would have been subject to had they been set in Britain. Those meant to benefit from the morality of the story do not get caught up in the wrong train of thought. The presence of murderous robbers in a German wood does not have the same relevance to an English reader as the presence of murderous robbers in the New Forest. In the second case, Grandison's image would probably have been tarnished for not bringing them to justice. Similarly, since the identity of the Venetian is of little consequence to a British public, the damaging gossip which would result from a humiliating caning of a young British aristocrat (one of Sir Charles' own peers) is avoided. If either narrative were set in Britain, it would be hard to confine it as commentary upon duelling alone. The foreign setting provides Richardson with a relatively neutral space in which to present his alternative social behaviour, while the centrality of the English hero to the stories sharpens their moral for the domestic audience.

But this is not the only way Richardson links Sir Charles' continental tour to his extraordinary (at least extraordinary to all of the characters) refusal to duel in this scene or indeed in any of the other, shorter treatments of the subject. The amazement expressed by Sir Hargrave and his friends at Sir Charles' example results in their request to be enlightened about how he came to act in such an original fashion. Sir Charles, in his response, stresses the anti-duelling precepts his mother inculcated, and that her precepts were confirmed when she died from the strain which was a result of a duel in which his father had engaged. He then gives, at great length, the fruits of the research he undertook at the beginning of his grand tour, he "then supposing I might fall into circumstances that might affect the principles my Mother had been so careful to instil into me, and to which my Father's danger, and her death, had added force..." (SCG II:263). That such historical researches were recommended as part of the program of the grand tour is important here--Sir Charles is showing that he
performed the tour properly—but, more importantly, his research is applicable to the domestic situation. It can be used to convert Pollexfen and his friends into admirers of Sir Charles, and can perhaps move the readers into emulation. A foreign environment is constituted as necessary to disinterested speculation and action. Because Sir Charles had the opportunity touring was thought to provide, and had the necessary disposition and natural talents, the fruits of his enquiry must be scrupulously just and well-considered. When one adds to this the consideration that the mastery of fencing was conventionally pursued while on the tour (along with dancing, languages, and horsemanship), Richardson’s use of Sir Charles’ tour experience as inculcating an entirely different code is particularly remarkable.

Sir Charles, then, has learned to understand and negotiate the issues surrounding duelling on a tour which was taken as a result, in part, of his father’s thoughtless duel. His father had sent Grandison to the continent “in order to abate [his] grief” over the death of his mother (SCG II:263). As Sir Charles passes over the physical landscape, he maps out its cultural history—here, the cultural history of duelling—and he finds a new way to negotiate social pressures. In this case he maps out an alternative route through the belligerent culture of the men of his own class without undermining his gender-identification. At the beginning of the episode it is established that a refusal to duel was conventionally understood as a refusal of manhood, and that Grandison will reveal this cultural assumption to be illusory. Sir Hargrave passionately says “If you are a man, Sir Charles Grandison, take your choice of one of those pistols, G— d—n you. I insist upon it.” Sir Charles responds, “As I AM a man, Sir Hargrave, I will not” (SCG II:250). REAL men do not duel. The rest of the episode shows how one may be a man without accepting and sending challenges, and the source of that knowledge of alternative manhood is clearly Sir Charles’ excellently performed tour.

This episode is typical of the way many of the specific references to Sir Charles’ tour work in the novel when they do not shape the main narrative. Often his experience as a tourist is invoked to support both his social innovations and his social conservatism. In this, Richardson relies on widespread contemporary ideas about the
cultural work the grand tour performed. It made the Man. It makes Lovelace; it makes Grandison. The performance tradition of the educational tour was thought necessary to give young men the skills and knowledge required to navigate the most intricate social and political geography at home and abroad. As the introduction explains, programmatic tourism was instituted to produce an able governing class. Charles II’s exile was, according to David R. Evans, refigured by his panegyrist as a conventional grand tour to illustrate how ideal he was for governing. Though he refuses to take up politics, Sir Charles too, has become super-fit for governing, as many of the characters remark.

Richardson clearly does not believe that all young men will be transformed into Grandisons by touring, and it is his comments against the abuse of tourism which have led commentators to conclude that he reviled the practice. The use of travelling, and the interpretative and performance rigours it necessarily entailed, was the medium through which the ruling class identity was forged. The practice was potentially explosive, as contemporaries like Richardson were well aware. The tour, in effect, magnified what was already there in the young man: in Lovelace, it magnifies his power and ability to destroy the lives of women; in Grandison, it magnifies his power and ability to do good. As Harriet comments: "My poor cousin Jemmy is on a sudden very earnest to go abroad; as if, silly youth, travelling would make him a Sir Charles Grandison!" (SCG VI:52). The flip side of Harriet’s comment is, of course, that the full glory and impact of a Sir Charles Grandison would be impossible without travel. Charlotte Grandison is clear about the shock effect of his return:

He came over to us all at once so perfect, after an eight or nine years absence, with so much power, and such a will, to do us good, that we were awed into a kind of reverence for him. (SCG II:444)

Lord W. more shrewdly evaluates what the tour has done for Sir Charles:

26 Evans, "Charles II’s ‘Grand Tour.’"
I wonder...that every young man is not good. I have heard you...praised in all the circles where you have been mentioned. It was certainly an advantage to you to come back to us a stranger, as I may say. Many youthful follies may perhaps be over-passed, that we shall never know any-thing of: But, be that as it will...I have heard such praises of you...I was told, within this month past, that no fewer than Five Ladies, out of one circle, declared, that they would stand out by consent, and let you pick and choose a wife from among them. (SCG III:43)

To come back a "stranger" startles relatives and acquaintances into admiration for tour-magnified perfection. Relatives are "awed," and women praise the young man as a potential partner. Long familiarity would make Sir Charles' goodness ordinary. The time Grandison spends off the domestic stage gives everyone an opportunity to appreciate the transformation of the ordinary into the extraordinary. Furthermore, Grandison's presence after a long absence makes his fully developed perfection all the more striking. The Grand Tour's traditional function of mystifying the source of the governing class' virtue, power, and knowledge as both attainable and unattainable is clearly in operation here.

Though Grandison is a "good" tourist, he is explicitly tempted towards Catholicism and, implicitly, Jacobitism, in the form of the woman he almost marries, Clementina della Porretta. In this temptation, Richardson reflects the common contemporary cultural assumption that family and state were analogous and could stand for one another in descriptions of the way power worked. Only after Grandison has been disentangled from his commitments to Clementina can he write: "Now, at last, is the day approaching, that the writer of this will be allowed to consider himself wholly as an Englishman" (SCG V:640). Traditionally, concerns about the potential conversion of young male tourists had been a relatively uncomplicated matter of religion. Writers could get flowery about a traveller's resistance to religious conversion, as in this seventeenth-century opinion:

...he that is well instructed in his own Religion, may passe under the torrid Zone, and not bee Sun-burnt....or like the River Danube which scornes to mingle with the muddy streame of Sava, though they run both in one Channell,
or like [the chast River] Arethusa, which Travelleth many hundred miles through the very bowels of the Sea, yet at her journeys end issueth out fresh again, without the least mixture of saltmesse or brackishnesse: So such a one may passe and repasse through the very midst of the Roman Sea...and shoot the most dangerous Gulphe thereof, and yet returne home an untainted [English] Protestant; nay he will be confirmed in zeale to his owne Religion, and illuminated the more with the brightnesse of the truth thereof....(Howell 17)

Concerns about Catholicism were voiced throughout the eighteenth century, though their prominence receded as the century wore on. However, the exiled Jacobites endlessly complicated the continental social picture, especially in the years around the rebellions in 1715 and 1745. It put a particularly sharp point on the usual English Protestant religious fears--the exiled Stuarts were, after all, Catholic; and their restoration might lead to persecution of Protestants. Exiled Jacobites were prominent in the major tourist spots, especially in Rome and Paris, thereby providing a constant source of anxiety about possible connections between tourists and Jacobites.27

Richardson was never open about his politics, but that does not mean that he did not have any, and several critics have examined how he brings the unmistakeably political world into the domestic scenes of his novels.28 In Grandison, Richardson

27 For an account of the connection between tourism and the spying on the Jacobite court in Rome, see Lewis, Connoisseurs and Secret Agents in Eighteenth-Century Rome. Jacobites had to be highly circumspect on the grand tour, especially in Rome, where there were many spies (see Paul Kléber Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788, 278-279).

28 Most of this type of enquiry has centred on Clarissa, and is therefore outside the focus of this chapter. Doody traces both Whig and Tory references in Richardson's three major works and bases her reading on what she believes to be Richardson's Tory leanings (see "Richardson's Politics"). See also Tom Keymer's chapter "Tearing Up Fences: Lovelace as Plotter," in Richardson's 'Clarissa' and the Eighteenth-Century Reader, 157-76, esp. 168-176 for a reading of Lovelace as a Jacobite secret agent; for Richardson's general political allusiveness, with an emphasis on his allusions to the Hanoverian royal family and contemporary domestic politics, see Morris Golden, "Public Context and Imagining Self in Clarissa," "Public Context and Imagining Self in Pamela and Shamela," and "Public Context and Imagining Self in Sir Charles Grandison"; and John A. Dussinger, "Clarissa, Jacobitism, and the 'Spirit of the
brings the Jacobite situation into the novel quietly but insistently. One of the only explicit political references in the novel is to the Jacobite rebellion of 1745. To avoid confrontations with sympathizers of Charles Edward Stuart's armed incursion into Britain, Grandison withdraws from the della Porrettas and from Italy to Vienna and the German courts. He thereby associates himself with the German House of Hanover, as would his statements of support for the King. For instance, Harriet tells Mrs. Shirley that "Sir Charles has been twice at the Drawing-room, since we have been in town. He admires the integrity of heart of his Sovereign, as much as he reveres his royal dignity" (SCG VIII:268). Furthermore, he criticizes his military uncle for what is implied to be his Jacobitism (SCG I:262). Sir Charles is, it would seem, a supporter of the House of Hanover.

However, Richardson muddies the waters of political allegiance considerably. Many of the references which have political overtones are ambivalent. As Margaret Anne Doody points out without comment, Grandison is the name of one of the leading Royalists in the Civil War, while the name of the woman Sir Charles eventually marries, Byron, is also a Royalist name. Both names, then, are closely associated with active support of a beleaguered monarch. In a fashion typical in this novel, however, what this choice of last names means is ambiguous. It could indicate allegiance for the exiled Stuarts or for the currently reigning House of Hanover. The names definitely evoke memories of active and costly allegiance to a legitimate but beleaguered King. But in the late 1740s there were still two claimants to that honour.

George Frederick Handel's "Alexander's Feast," which, as Margaret Anne Doody points out, "runs as a kind of leit-motif throughout the novel," functions

---

University," for a reading of Richardson and Clarissa as participating in opinions held by the whig partisan Benjamin Kennicott.

29 Doody, A Natural Passion, 249.
similarly. To employ "Alexander's Feast" necessarily means referring to both Handel and John Dryden. Charlotte Grandison suggests the piece to Harriet, as a debut for her skills as a musician in front of Sir Charles:

Here's [Handel's] Alexander's Feast: My Brother admires that, I know; and says it is the noblest composition that ever was produced by man; and is as finely set, as written. (SCG II:239)

Sir Charles, then, "admires" this piece both for the words of Dryden and the music of Handel. Handel had been a favourite of the ruling Protestant King, but Dryden, of course, was known to be a Roman Catholic supporter of the exiled Stuarts. The significance of the names Grandison and Byron, and of the use of the Dryden/Handel Ode, would crystallize in support of the reader's own loyalties. But it is quite possible that Richardson was trying to reconcile a polemicized England in such a choice by showing how the two sides could work together to glorious purpose.

Less ambiguously, however, the Christian names of the Grandisons--Charles, Charlotte, and Caroline--would imply to contemporaries that the Grandison family had Jacobite sympathies, since the naming of children after the exiled Stuarts was one of the few legal venues by which Jacobites signalled their allegiance. Even the details support the Grandison family's connection with Jacobitism. On the level of blood-relations, Sir Charles Grandison's military uncle is strongly hinted to be an exiled Jacobite. The family allegiance is also signalled in concrete details. Scottish Firs are

---

30 Doody, A Natural Passion, 357. Doody discusses music as a major image in the novel, 352-364 and 366-367, and pays particular attention to "Alexander's Feast," 356-360. She does not address the political implications of the choice.

31 Monod, Jacobitism, 272. Doody also points out that the names are Jacobite (see "Richardson's Politics," 124-125). Doody does not point out that "Caroline," while a feminine version of "Charles," is, of course, also the name of King George's consort. I would like to thank John Beattie for drawing this to my attention. It further illustrates my point that Richardson was trying to suggest that the two political options could be brought together seamlessly.
one of the few trees specified as planted by Charles' father at Grandison Hall. According to Paul Monod, Scottish Firs were very rare in England in this period, and were planted in parks to signal safe refuge for Jacobite agents.32

Along similar lines, Charles is not only associated with Charles Edward Stuart by his name. He is, like the Stuarts, closely associated with sun imagery;33 he repeatedly calls his tour his "exile," thereby playing on the same ambiguity between tour and exile that Charles II's panegyrists used;34 the age at which Grandison returns to England is the same as Charles Stuart's in 1745;35 and the restoration of virtue, morality, communal order, and happiness he brings with his return is similar to what Jacobite propagandists prognosticated would occur upon the return of the Stuarts.36 Furthermore, Sir Charles is almost always referred to as "the Chevalier" by the della Porrettas, as the British did when making polite or veiled references to Charles Edward Stuart; and his behaviour is repeatedly compared to that of a prince or king (e.g. Harriet exclaims "What a king would he make! Power could not corrupt such a mind as his" [SCG II:446]). Characters are so insistent on connecting him to royalty by association, simile, or implication that Sir Charles has to point out that he is not a royal on numerous occasions (e.g. to Mr. Deane [SCG VI:36] and to Greville, "I am no Prince" [SCG VI:70]). None of these things by themselves would signify greatly,

32 Jacobitism. 289. According to Monod, this was the significance of the Scottish Firs at Kirtlington Park, Oxfordshire (the estate of Sir James Dashwood), and at Henry Jones' house at Chastleton, Gloucestershire.

33 For sun imagery and Grandison, see Harris, Samuel Richardson, 138, 142, 162, 163; for a discussion of sun imagery and English Jacobite art, see Monod, Jacobitism, 78 et. passim.

34 See Evans, "Charles II's 'Grand Tour.'"

35 Doody, "Richardson's Politics," 125.

36 See Monod, Jacobitism, 35-37 et. passim. Monod's conclusion is noteworthy in this context: "In Jacobite propaganda...divine right gradually shed its association with absolutist government, and increasingly became a myth of moral legitimation rather than an excuse for royal power" (44).
but the accumulation of Jacobite symbolism, names, and echoes of well-known stories associated with the Stuarts suggests more than coincidence.

The novel’s deployment of Jacobite culture does not indicate that Charles Grandison is a Jacobite, or that Richardson was, or that Grandison is meant as a crypto-Charles Edward Stewart. Even if Thomas Grandison is meant to be seen as a Jacobite, that does not mean that his son is. Sir Thomas is, additionally, presented as flawed—he is an arbitrary, tyrannical, immature, immoral, and unjust father. His abuse of his daughters is horrifying. His depiction would surely undermine his status as a beacon for Jacobitism, and may even be a comment upon the failings of Jacobitism.

Biographically, Richardson was associated with High Flying Tories and Jacobites in his early printing career, an association risky enough to suggest at least a Tory sympathy. However, what may have been a respect for the Stuart claim does not mean that Richardson would have seen a Stuart reinstatement as either possible or desirable; therefore to claim that Richardson was a Jacobite would be as false a move as to claim Sir Charles is one. Similarly, the employment of so much that resonates with the Jacobite movement is not equivalent to writing an allegory or a crypto-history. But nonetheless, as Monod writes, "The notion of 'hiding the king' was also a metaphor for Stuart propaganda, in which the identity of the monarch was disguised, and he was recognizable only to those who loved him." As with the use of names and "Alexander’s Feast," a polemicized audience could meet and agree in the figure of Sir Charles Grandison. The Jacobite audience could read him as Prince Charles; all others as politically opposed to Jacobitism.

Richardson addresses the Stuart claim in his treatment of Charles Grandison’s entanglement with the della Porrettas. Again, naming is important, as are the stories

---

37 Richardson was involved in printing the Duke of Wharton’s opposition *The True Britain*, Atterbury’s *Maxims* (1723), and the 4th and 5th editions of Kelly’s defence before the House of Lords. All three men were known to be Jacobites. For details, see William Merritt Sale Jr., *Samuel Richardson: Master Printer*, 43-47; 212-214; 226; 285-288; see also Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography*, 19-36.

associated with the name. Clementina, the Italian Catholic whom Charles Grandison almost marries, is also the name of Clementina Sobieska, the mother of the Young Pretender, Charles Edward Stuart, and the name of Clementina Walkinshaw, his Italian-bred mistress. Because of the first of these associations, the name Clementina was popular among English Jacobites. Furthermore, there was a story widely circulated among English tourists in the 1730s and 1740s that Clementina Sobieska had threatened to withdraw to a convent when her husband suggested bringing his sons up Protestant. Charles Grandison, too, suggests that his sons be brought up as Protestant, and his Clementina, too, would prefer life in a convent to life under such conditions. There are many other resonances in the courtship to the problems associated with the Stuarts. For instance, the marriage compromise suggested by Charles—that both he and Clementina would maintain their separate faiths; that the daughters would be brought up Catholic, the sons Protestant; that Clementina could have her own Catholic attendants and confessor—would immediately call to mind, in a public accustomed to reading crypto-histories, the marriage arrangements of both Charles I and Charles II. Neither marriage was successful. As Father Marescotti points out to Charles Grandison, Charles I’s wife Henrietta Maria’s vehement Catholicism helped alienate his subjects, and he was beheaded (SCG III:219). Furthermore, most of Richardson’s readers would remember that Charles II’s marriage was childless, and his faith always questioned.

I have said that Clementina della Porretta embodies the temptations a virtuous English tourist might encounter in the 1740s and 1750s. There is more than one way that this is true. Characters’ names are used interchangeably with place names, especially in the second half of the novel. For instance, both Clementina and Olivia consistently refer to one another as Bologna and Florence. Lady Olivia is particularly explicit about the reasons she does this. She makes the substitution, she writes to Sir

---

39 The connection of Clementina’s name to Jacobitism is noted by Harris in Samuel Richardson, 160. Harris further suggests that this association may be partially responsible for Clementina’s popularity with Richardson’s original audience.
Charles, out of her hatred for the della Porrettas (SCG V:645). Advising Sir Charles to pursue Harriet, she writes, "To her the slighted Florentine can resign, which with patience, she never could to the proud Bologna; and the sooner, because of the immortal hatred she bears to that woman of Bologna" (SCG V:647). English characters have the same knack for substituting place for family or personal name. Lady G. refers to Clementina as "Bologna" in a letter to her sister (SCG V:545), while Sir Charles, on referring to the della Porretta situation as "what had befallen me abroad" is grateful to Mrs Shirley for releasing him from such metonymic speech with:

One favour I have to beg of you, Sir...It is, that you will never use the word abroad, or express persons by their countries; in fine, that you will never speak with reserve, when the admirable Clementina is in your thoughts.... (SCG VI:79)

Despite Mrs. Shirley’s request, Harriet and Sir Charles continue to refer to letters from Italy, not to letters from the della Porrettas, which is what they mean. These characters substitute countries and cities for specific situations or names out of delicacy or to achieve emotional distance, but such usage also underlines the metonymic function of characters such as Olivia and Clementina, and of situations such as the one Grandison finds himself in with the della Porrettas.

The temptation presented by Clementina to convert is put in the plainest terms by her brother the Bishop when the alliance is first proposed, the conditions of which would be Grandison’s formal renunciation of Protestantism and his permanent residence in Italy:

You hesitate. What, Sir! Is a proposal of a daughter of one of the noblest families in Italy; that daughter a Clementina; to be slighted by a man of a private family; a foreigner; of dependent fortunes; her dowry not unworthy of a Prince’s acceptance? Do you hesitate upon such a proposal as this, Sir? (SCG III:182)
In recounting the scene to Harriet, Sir Charles responds to her question of how he could "resist" by enumerating the same enticements the Bishop had. In doing so, he underlines the reality of the temptation presented by what Clementina offers. The advantages of an alliance with Clementina, though perhaps destructive to the well-being of the perfect Englishman, are not easily dismissed. When Sir Charles ruminates on the family's proposal in the privacy of his own lodgings, he exclaims:

But, O my Religion and my Country! I cannot, cannot renounce you! What can this short life give, what can it promise, to warrant such a sacrifice! (SCG III:177)

He writes this to Dr. Bartlett, who copies it for Harriet, who relays it to her extensive circle of family and friends. At the time, Sir Charles responds to the della Porrettas' offer by proposing a mixed-faith family and household. On his proposal Grandison is initially rejected and sent away. Lady Clementina then goes mad, the family relents, and sends for Grandison from England. But when Clementina has partially recovered her reason, she refuses him on religious grounds. After countless scenes designed to engage the reader's sympathy for the vehemence of her love of Grandison, Clementina re-proposes his conversion as the only way that they can marry. Her extended family, convinced that Clementina's sanity depends upon her union with Grandison, literally beg him to accept her:

On my knees, Chevalier, said Father Marescotti, I will entreat you!
O Chevalier, said the Bishop, how happy is it in your power to make us all!
Surely you can, you will, you must, Chevalier! said the Count, if you love the dear creature....

and on through the catalogue of her whole family, ending with:

Dearest Grandison! rejoined the Bishop, Refuse not my sister: Refuse not the daughter of the Marchese and Marchesa della Porretta: Refuse not the
assenting Clementina. (SCG V:581-582)

Catholicism and Clementina have become the same thing. They are asking him to accept not Clementina, whom he never refuses, but their religion. Though an alliance with Clementina would give Grandison wealth, a virtuous wife he loves, enormously powerful connections, and though an entire family repeatedly plead with him to accept their daughter (that is, to convert) in the most pathetic manner possible, he resists the temptation.

The della Porretta function as a form of temptation is reinforced in Richardson's use of Milton's Paradise Lost. It is over this work that Clementina falls in love with her English tutor, Charles Grandison. Harriet, in a letter to Charlotte, gives the key to the significance of this particular reading material when she responds to Charles' final resistance:

But is not his conduct such, as would make a considerate person, who has any connexions with him, tremble? Since if there be a fault between them, it must be all that person's...? Do you think...that had he been the first man, he would have been so complaisant to his Eve as Milton makes Adam...--To taste the forbidden fruit, because he would not be separated from her, in her punishment, tho' all posterity were to suffer by it?--No; it is my opinion, that your brother would have had gallantry enough to his fallen spouse, to have made him extremely regret her lapse; but that he would have done his own duty...and left it to the Almighty...to have annihilated his first Eve, and given him a second--(SCG V:609)

Unlike the Adam of Milton's Paradise Lost, this one rejects the proffered fruit--whether that fruit be understood as continental Catholicism or Jacobitism. By referring the reader to Paradise Lost on so many occasions, but especially in Harriet's reference to it, Richardson implies that Grandison, unlike Adam, can resist ideas pernicious to his well-being though they enter his life embodied in a woman he loves. He would prefer to be separated from Eve than "taste the forbidden fruit." Whatever God might do for a second, perfected Adam, Richardson has provided Grandison with a second Eve--one that, he repeatedly stresses, is exactly the same as Clementina
except in country and religion.

The courtship and marriage volumes are saturated with comments such as Sir Charles' to Harriet Byron: "Exalted creature!—Angelic goodness! You are Clementina and Harriet, both in one: One mind certainly informs you both" (SCG VI:191) or, "There spoke Miss Byron, and Clementina, both in one! Surely you two are informed by one mind! What is distance of countries! What obstacles can there be, to dissever Souls so paired!" (SCG VI:145). Charlotte comments to Harriet, admiring this oddness: "How great is his compliment to both Ladies, when he calls Clementina the Miss Byron of Italy! Who, my dear, ever courted woman as my brother courts you?" (SCG VI:66). Who indeed? However, it is not only Sir Charles Grandison who conceives of the two women as one. As Lady G. complains after Clementina and Harriet finally meet:

--Heroines both, I suppose; and they are mirrors to each other; each admiring herself in the other. No wonder they are engaged insensibly by a vanity, which carries with it, to each, so generous an appearance; for, all the while, Harriet thinks she is only admiring Clementina; Clementina, that she's applauding Harriet. (SCG VII:418)

In Volumes VI and VII we are faced with the peculiar phenomenon of a one-souled, one-minded woman looking at herself in the mirror, and calling her reflection by another name.

The language that insists on the one-ness of the two women conceals a number of things. One of these is shrewdly identified by Tassie Gwilliam:

...Sir Charles' apparently simultaneous love for two women must be seen to signal his superior sensibility, rather than double-dealing....Everyone, including Grandison, agrees that he must love Clementina out of gratitude, pity, and admiration, but direct expression of that love is markedly absent. The problem of the duplicity in a 'double Love' is partly solved by making the first love impossible to pin down—or to pin on Sir Charles. And, further, the duplicity that might seem to adhere to the man's self-division is off-loaded onto the women. Harriet and Clementina embody Sir Charles' 'double Love' so that it
is not his and is not duplicitous.40

For Richardson’s project to be successful, Sir Charles’ virtue and uprightness cannot be undermined by his dealings with women. Harriet and Clementina have one identity in Sir Charles’ heart, and Harriet includes Clementina by knowing her story and emulating her. Since Harriet then becomes both women in one, no one is excluded in her marriage to Grandison and the union can be guiltless.41

But if Harriet and Clementina have one identity in the subjective space of Sir Charles’ heart, they do not in the more objective space of the geographical and social world. In sympathizing with Clementina’s story, and in emulating her and using her as a "pattern," Harriet undergoes a transformation analogous to the one from which tourists were supposed to benefit. She accepts Clementina as valid and emulates the good in her foreign "pattern." In contrast Clementina’s world view is shattered by the bare possibility that English Protestantism has parity with Italian Catholicism. Harriet Byron’s English Protestantism can accept the good of Roman Catholicism without seeing it as undermining her own identity. As with Sir Charles, her toleration and judicious emulation confirms and bolsters her Englishness. Unlike Clementina, she does not go mad when faced with difference and she does not reject others on the basis of religious disagreement. Harriet Byron has the English goodness, but her knowledge of Clementina and her willingness to emulate Clementina’s exotic good qualities are those of a good English tourist. Such tourists absorb only the good of all they encounter, thereby becoming the perfectly English. In her response to Clementina, Harriet Byron proves herself to be the perfect match to Sir Charles Grandison, the good tourist.

The novel is structured through a long series of angelic and demonic doubles. For instance, Beauchamp is "a second Sir Charles Grandison" (SCG II:440); Emily’s

40 Samuel Richardson’s Fictions of Gender, 149.

41 Gwilliam, Samuel Richardson’s Fictions of Gender, makes a similar point, 158.
friendship gives Lucy "two Harriets instead of one" (SCG VII:363); Pollexfen is Grandison's opposite; Creutzer Bartlett's. But it is the doubling between Harriet and Clementina which generates most of the plot. Without it, the narrative would end after Harriet is dramatically rescued from Sir Hargrave Pollexfen by Sir Charles Grandison. Of course, the doubling is partially a rhetorical move meant to create a polite avenue by which to solve the problem of Sir Charles' "divided" or "double" love. By making both women one in Grandison's language and heart, rhetorically and subjectively he only loves one woman, and therefore Harriet's scruples about not being his first love are answered. The two women are even more necessary, however, because of the difference in what they stand for. Though there are two women, the boundary between them is simultaneously collapsed (they are fundamentally the same in goodness and beauty) and rigorously insisted upon (they are fundamentally different in religion and national origin). Richardson's respect for what both women stand for means that Charles' virtue will not allow him to recognize the difference between the two women—he can only recognize that the one rejects him from virtuous motives, and the other accepts him from equally virtuous motives.

The plot of the novel springs from the instability of the boundary between England and the continent, though, as a moral work, the boundary is reassuringly re-established by the end of the novel. The temptation posed by the continent comes to Sir Charles in the form of a beautiful, virtuous, pious, and highborn Italian Catholic woman. Her claims and what she stands for are presented as legitimate. They are never demoted or questioned by either Sir Charles Grandison or Harriet Byron. Clementina cannot be easily dismissed—in fact, some early readers thought the novel more her story than any other character's. But Clementina's virtue is structured so that her acceptance of Sir Charles Grandison on his terms would prove her to be flawed, just as his acceptance of her on her terms would show him to be flawed. Their perfection keeps them apart. Whatever may be the attractiveness of things on the continent, if legitimately virtuous, as Clementina is, they must forever remain outside Britain.
CONCLUSION

The previous chapters have suggested the complexity and diversity of the themes and performance traditions at work when the novel and the culture of tourism come together. In particular, the works that have been addressed here demonstrate the way the novel could be used to harness tourism's capacity to modify and regenerate systems of knowledge, adapting them to establish or maintain identities in a changing world. An unanticipated result of my research was the frequency with which the anatomy form would be combined with the novel and the culture of tourism. Tourism's cultural function of organizing reality to fit a pattern—which a vision of the nation, the meaning of gender differentiation, the best ways of isolating the sick and the criminal, or what Dean MacCannell called in a very different context a cohesive world-view—meant that it is structurally akin to the literary anatomy. In novelistic narratives that are particularly close in form to the anatomy, the two cultural forms—literature and tourism—could be used together to imagine alternative versions of reality controlled and structured by new and sometimes transgressive ideas and concepts.

In the texts examined, women's position within a "separate sphere" is both insisted upon and undermined. Because of the traditional habit of separating considerations of women from considerations of the social order as a whole, women could be isolated to consider, paradoxically, entire systems. They could be used to constitute alternatives which were then applicable to matters as small as the encounter between two people or as large as the whole social order. The way women were both constituted by and constituted different communities—ranging from the family to the nation—could be either profoundly disturbing or appropriated without self-consciousness. Sterne offers a new model for men to manage their sexuality in encounters with women who were significantly below them in social standing. It was widely adopted for about three decades, and was still wishfully employed by Wordsworth for what it once could do well after the tour form had been almost forgotten. Amory and Scott describe all-female communities which are ordered quite
differently from the mainstream social system, not least in their virtual exclusion of
men from positions of power (each of the communities does have male labourers and
servants). The communities’ success implicitly criticizes the actual social order and its
systemic disempowerment of women. The sequels both writers then wrote to give the
male tourists’ life stories indicate a profound discomfort with the implications of the
all-female communities the authors had projected. The way Erskine’s work uses
tourism to attack women as a group turns on itself to suggest that, though men and
women might be physically different, everything beyond that difference is socially
constructed. Last, but not least, women in Richardson embody the larger political,
nationalist, and religious alternatives available to the English.

This dissertation has gone some way, I hope, to suggest how literature both
shapes wider cultural practice and is shaped by it. Literary works (like women) have
often been isolated from the social order and practices which produced them. If the
wider culture is referred to by literary scholars, it is often treated as an external data
bank which will "explain" mysterious parts of a text. Another common approach (and
one which I find more intriguing) is to "read" cultural artifacts (such as political
cartoons) using the techniques of literary criticism. This approach, too, implicitly
isolates literature from the culture that produces it, though it implies that the practices
and techniques of reading and interpreting literary texts are transferrable and broadly
applicable. Similarly, disciplines such as history and sociology often isolate the wider
culture from literature and other art forms, though individual scholars draw on literary
works for decontextualized quotations which support a given argument. These
approaches rarely address the reciprocity between literary and other cultural forms--
how they weave together and shape one another. However, investigating the ways and
the reasons two such powerful and pervasive cultural forms as tourism and the novel
are linked illustrates how culture works as both a way of life, and as Art and learning.
This dissertation suggests some of the ways the imagination of writers and readers
creates and is created by culture in all its complex, unpredictable, and fertile richness.
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