

Jeremy Black

British Travellers in Europe in the Early Eighteenth Century

For the wealthy and powerful, travel abroad in the first half of the eighteenth century was a means of education and of enjoyment. War and trade ensured that travel was open to large sections of the community, but the opinions of most soldiers and seamen are impossible to discover. It is the intention of this paper to examine the records of a few prominent British travellers of the period, and to consider whether their travels caused them to question the prevalent British views of Europe.

The whole of Europe was open to the enterprising traveller, and the British flocked abroad. Paris 'swarms with English,' Earl Waldegrave noted in 1732. Some travellers were fairly enterprising. Lord Baltimore visited Russia, Prussia, and Poland, using a yacht to travel in the Baltic. The Scottish traveller John Bell began his memoirs, "In my youth I had a strong desire of seeing foreign parts," and he managed to visit Russia, China and Persia.¹ Spain was visited by the Earl of Essex in 1718, the Duke of Richmond in 1728, the Earl of Radnor the following year and by George Thedington, a relation of the Duke of Bridgewater in the 1730s. Radnor also travelled extensively in Eastern Europe, going down the Danube from Vienna to Constantinople in 1730, whilst Sir Francis Dashwood visited Constantinople, St. Petersburg, Warsaw and Vienna.

Habit and ease restricted most travellers, however, to several well worn routes, where the wishes and whims of those who travelled for pleasure were appreciated. The roads and inns of most of Europe were far from comfortable. The roads of most of the Empire, and, in particular of Westphalia and Saxony, were notoriously bad. The Baron de Pöllnitz, who published an account of his journeys in 1729 and 1730 through the Empire, was particularly scathing about the German roads. Pöllnitz's account was published in English and widely circulated and advertised, serving as a sourcebook for information about Europe for such periodicals as the *Daily Gazetteer*. If German

roads were bad, it was even harder to find a safe route further east. Radnor's journey to Constantinople took on some of the attributes of a military expedition, whilst the routes to Russia were very affected by the weather.²

Most inns were also bad. The filthy inns of Westphalia were proverbial, although George Woodward found that those of Poland were even worse:

There is not an inn in Poland, that I have yet seen fit to lodge a dog, I'll only compare them to the worst in Westphalia and leave you to judge of them.³

These problems did not prevent travel off the beaten track. The frequency with which the Hanoverians visited Hanover, and the existence of a court there receptive to British travellers, helped to lead a certain number of travellers across Westphalia. From Hanover some then pressed on to Italy via Saxony, Prague and Vienna. Very few however ventured east of this route. The Carpathian lands and Poland saw few British travellers. Equally few went to Scandinavia and Iberia. Tyrawley informed Richmond,

Point du point, I think Spain and Portugal excite ones curiosity more than any other countries, as being the least known, and quite out of the Old John Trott beaten, pack horse road of all travellers, and will make you as famous to latest Posterity, as Dampier, Sir John Mandeville, Hacklyut, or Fernand Mendez Pinto.⁴

Few others sought such fame, and most British tourists favoured a tour that included the Low Countries, France, Italy, and possibly the Rhineland. Compared to the atrocious roads of Westphalia, those from Lyons to Marseilles, or the Via Emilia were splendid. Drifting in a felucca along the Genoese littoral was very different from a trip in the Gulf of Bothnia. Aside from ease, there were clearly other important reasons for the relative lack of variety that travellers displayed in the routes they chose. Fashion was of great significance, as was the habit of sticking together and travelling in groups, a habit that owed as much to the desire for company as to any needs of security. "Here are at present more of our country than French," noted the second Earl Cowper of Paris in 1729, and many commented on the manner in which British travellers stuck together.⁵

Travelling in the early eighteenth century was essentially a matter of moving as fast as possible from town to town, court to court.⁶ Where towns were widely dispersed and courts few there was little incentive to travel, and this was particularly so if the court had a reputation for dullness as the Spanish one did. Few British travellers stayed long at Turin which had a similar reputation.

Travel to Europe meant travel to Italy and a stay in Paris. There were only a small number of obvious routes that could be followed to encompass easily the two. Most British travellers used one or both of the routes down the Rhone and down the Rhine, and the same towns recur in their journals. Travellers' itineraries reveal much about the purpose of their travels. The overwhelming importance, in most itineraries, of a long stay in Paris indicates the importance attached to a town and a court regarded as the most fashionable in Europe, where aristocratic manners could be acquired and a gentleman could be trained in essential social skills, dancing, fencing, card-playing, riding and an ability to speak French. Second only to Paris was Italy, and, in particular, the cities of Venice, Rome, Naples and Florence. The importance of Italy was a tribute to the respect felt to the classical past, and to the pleasures of the peninsula. The importance of Venice was a clear reflection of the latter.

Travellers' journals and correspondence for this period are reasonably numerous, and most have received little scholarly attention. They appear to have been intended as a personal record of places visited and not to have been written for publication. They indicate the degree of interest among travellers in the places they visited. There is little sense of self-conscious literary endeavour, and they are an interesting indication of the relatively widespread habit of keeping a personal diary of some form.⁷

Aside from the personal papers of travellers there is also much information about travel and travellers in the Public Record Office. Diplomats had to travel both to reach their posts and during the course of their duties. The Earl of Kinnoull on his way, by sea, to the embassy at Constantinople, visited Lisbon, on which he made some tart comments. The peripatetic activities of various monarchs took Benjamin Keene to the Portuguese border and Cadiz, Earl Waldegrave to Styria, Thomas Robinson to Prague and George Woodward to Grodno. Some diplomats used their postings as an opportunity for tourism. The Earl of Essex found the court and women of Turin tedious and absented himself in order to visit the sights and carnivals of north Italy. In addition, the diplomatic papers contain many comments upon British travellers, whom envoys were ordered to aid and, in the case of suspected Jacobites, report upon.

There is therefore a mass of information in existence dealing with British travellers in Europe in the first half of the eighteenth century. Given the relatively circumscribed nature of the political public in the first half of the century it is clearly of great importance to consider any guides that exist to the attitudes of this group. The massive expansion of the peerage under George III and the struggles that attended moves

for reform under that monarch increased the size of the political nation, but for the reign of George II the opinions of a few earls is of more than curiosity value. In particular it is important to ascertain whether the popular prejudices, expressed in print or with great vigour by the Londoners who assaulted foreign envoys and their servants, were shared by those who had had an opportunity to travel.

Anti-Catholicism was the leading ideological commitment and pre-conception of the British in the first half of the eighteenth century. The increased religious tension in Europe in the 1720s and 1730s associated with the religious quarrels in the Empire, the persecution of Protestants in Poland and, in particular, the Thorn massacre of 1724, the passage of harsher anti-Protestant legislation in France in 1725, and the expulsion of the Salzburg Protestants in 1731-2 sharpened awareness of confessional conflict. The British press devoted much coverage to these issues and adopted a stridently anti-Catholic attitude. Anti-Catholicism was also a view, and a means of analysing Europe, that was shared by most British travellers. Quarendon might find that the crosses and friars that greeted his eyes at Calais later grew familiar, but they did not become acceptable. He thought the Jesuits "money getting Preists" (sic), the inhabitants of Brussels "superstitiously devout," was sufficiently moved by the miracle of the blood of St. Janusarius at Naples to compose a blasphemous and witty poem, and he recorded of his trip to Saumur in June 1739, "nothing worth observation except a chapell (sic) to the Virgin which does great miracles, the walls are all surrounded with the Tabulae Votivae of persons sav'd from eminent dangers, the whole quarter of the town consists of people whose only trade is to make chaplets, these when rubb'd over the Virgin's lap are greatly efficacious, the Peres de l'Oratorie are the actors of this comedy which indeed they perform as if they themselves believe it."⁸

The significant fact about Quarendon's observations is that he was a zealous Tory and a prominent Jacobite who, in August 1745, was to be one of the signators of the request for French military help for a Jacobite insurrection.⁹ Andrew Mitchell, on the other hand, was of a more orthodox political background. He toured Italy in 1732, and disliked what he regarded as the consequences of Catholicism. He associated the desolation of Ferrara, the profusion of monks and friars in its streets and the regulation of strangers there with the town's Papal government. Admiring the paintings he saw he nevertheless noted,

"one cannot help regretting (after seeing the vast profusion of paintings in these churches, by the ablest masters), the bestowing so much industry and art upon so silly subjects as the life and actions of one enthusiast and the fabulous martyrdom of a bigot. Corporeal and ridiculous

representation of the Diety serve to corrupt and debauch our ideas of him...."¹⁰

Atwell was equally scathing. In a letter sent in 1729 from Munich to Lady Sarah Cowper he recorded his views of the Empire and the Low Countries. "The paradise of priests," Liege, he had disliked, but as with so many other British visitors, it was the cult of relics that particularly irritated him. Those at Aix-la-Chapelle included,

'Some of the Virgin Mary's shifts (which by the way were not very clean) some of Jesus' swadling cloaths....some of the manna that fell in the wilderness and such trompery as would not be worth seeing, if it was not for the silver and jewels with which they are adorn'd.'

The relics of the eleven thousand virgins at Cologne seemed to him to include the skulls of sixty-year-old women.¹¹ Despite his long experience of Portugal, Lord Tyrawley did not acquire much sympathy for Portuguese customs, and he wrote to Richmond in 1729,

'Messieurs les Hidalgos are just as pretty fellows as ever, onely at present, they are if possible, greater fooles, than the rest of the year, for one sees such processions, such penitents, and such nonsense, as is enough to give one ye gripes. Some of them whip themselves through the streets, and I think them the most reasonable people amongst them, and I believe if they were all served so, it might doe them a great deal of good'.¹²

To the British travellers Catholic customs, and in particular the cult of relics, were obvious proofs of the irrational nature of the religion, and symbolised the degree to which Catholicism represented a total inversion of the laws of reason. Credulity and superstition were seen both as the essential supports of a Catholic ascendancy and as the products of it. By means of a tight control over education and the propagation of religious practices that ensnared reason and deluded the senses, the Catholic church wove a poisonous web that entrapped the people of Catholic Europe. Very few British travellers doubted this picture and most of them interpreted what they saw in terms of these images which were strongly propagated in Britain in print and sermon.¹³

Attacks upon Catholicism were only part of a more wide-ranging critique of European society. Autocracy and Catholicism were regarded as closely linked, and as conducive to depravity, licentiousness and misery.¹⁴ The irrationalism that produced and was produced by Catholicism was associated with a lack of self-control and an absence of personal morality. This produced an oscillating character that alternated between the depths of licentiousness and the masochistic self-abasement noted by Tyrawley. It was standard in eighteenth-

century Britain to praise balance, whether a balance of power in Europe and in the British constitution, or a balance in individual temperament. Catholicism was destructive of all balance.

British travellers were not averse to praising individual Catholic customs. Dr. Swinton, visiting Lisbon in October 1730, noted in his journal,

‘I met a priest near the Terra de Pas repeating the Ave Maria, at which above 300 people fell down all at once on their knees to return God thanks for the mercies of the Past day—This is done every day, and must confess I think it very just and am pleased with it.

However, Swinton, in common with other travellers, identified Catholicism as the cause of defects in national characters, for him, in the case of the Portuguese, bigotry, ignorance, sodomy and immorality,¹⁵ or, for *The Universal Pocket Companion*, a compendium of 1741, the slavery of the Italians, and their failure to cultivate their fruitful soil.¹⁶ Preserved in Lady Sarah Cowper’s notebook is “A Political Ballad said to be writ by Mr. Pultney,” dated June 1731, that refers to France as a country

where men reform’d religion hate,
And women wear no stay.¹⁷

Catholic countries were noted for their immorality. This was a point made not only in the British press but also in the journals of British travellers. Sexual perversions and misdemeanours were held to be very common in Catholic Europe.¹⁸ Pöllnitz described Venice as the centre of all debaucheries, France was associated with venereal disease and Italy with sodomy. Sexual customs were held to be looser on the Continent, and an obvious sign of this was believed to be the revealing nature of French dresses, an issue that was much ventilated in the late 1730s when a company of French players visited London. Atwell was appalled to see English women in French dresses at Spa,¹⁹ whilst Earl Cowper’s response to the opera at Rome was that it was very disagreeable to see men dressed in women’s cloaths,” a view shared by Pöllnitz.²⁰

For some British travellers the relative licence of life in Europe was a great attraction. Sexual opportunities were readily present as Swinton noted in Lisbon.²¹ Many clearly enjoyed the opportunity to free themselves from the surveillance by others that marked so much of life in Britain. Viscount Weymouth carried off the leading dancer at the Paris opera as his mistress and remunerated her generously when her pregnancy was held to prove his virility.²² Viscount Harcourt met an Englishman in the Loire valley publicly living with his mistress as his wife in a fashion that would have been more difficult in Britain.²³

Travel and life abroad could be a means to sexual education and enjoyment, and as such it aroused the ire of moralists. The influential London weekly, the *Universal Spectator*, and *Weekly Journal* referred in 1742 to "our Petit Maitres, and their polite Governors who make the tour of Europe only to glean every vice and folly they meet with."²⁴ Five years earlier the *Daily Gazetteer* referred to Imperial attempts to prevent the travels of the young Austrian nobility from continuing as a course in debauchery and prodigality as "a lesson for the Gentry of our own Nation."²⁵

What really disturbed so many of the essayists who debated the virtues of foreign travel was that abroad Englishmen forgot both their catechism and their loyalty. In particular, the Jacobite court which, though less peripatetic than the Carolingians, spent time in Avignon, Bologna and Rome, as well as the large number of Jacobites in such centres as Paris, were held by the British government to represent a threat to the loyalty of travellers. The Lord Chancellor the first Earl of Macclesfield, had clearly warned his son about this danger, though the latter hastened to assure him from Rome, that the Jacobites were not ensnarers,

As for your lordship's orders not to speak about religion or our government in England, I have always taken care to avoid talking of these matters, and have always behaved myself so here as not to give offence to anybody, and I must do my unfortunate countrymen the justice to own, that whenever I have happen'd to be in their company they have behaved themselves very much like gentlemen, and have avoided any discourse that might make me uneasy.

Others had a less charitable view, and many British travellers who had visited Italy hastened to deny that they had visited Rome or met the Pretender. Augustus fourth Earl of Berkeley was abroad in Europe when his father died in 1736 and a correspondent of Richmond's wrote,

I cannot help apprehending that the people he must converse most with there, may at this critical time of life give him a turn even in his politicks.

Colonel Burges, the consul at Venice reported to the Duke of Newcastle in 1733,

Italy swarms of late with English gentlemen and ladies: many of which, I doubt, are little the wiser or better for travelling, but return home worse subjects than they came out, and less affected to His Majesty's service than they ought to be. Some of 'em, I am told, have been privately introduced to the Pretender and it is almost impossible to be any time at Rome without meeting him at all the publick places, churches and assemblies.²⁶

Some travellers clearly flirted with Jacobitism, and for a few Jacobites such as Lord Cornbury, who visited Rome in 1731, travel provided an opportunity to actively intrigue for a Stuart restoration.²⁷ However, the majority of travellers, however ill affected they might be towards the Walpolean system, clearly disliked not only the Catholicism of much of Europe, but also the political situation that pertained through most of the Continent. It is important to note that this was not true of all travellers. Mildmay praised the quality of the major French highways and cited them in 1748 as an example of the efficiency of a strong centralised government. Earl Waldegrave, the British envoy in Paris, wrote to George Tilson in 1732,

I was surprised the other day with a visit from mylord Onslow, and you will be more surprised when I tell you his Ld. is already half a Frenchman....he says he never saw such a country in his life and can't praise this, without reflecting on his own.

Onslow told Waldegrave that after two days in France his prejudices against it had disappeared. Onslow's change of heart is the most clear example I have found of travel altering perceptions, and it is pity that information about his trip is so difficult to find. Possibly he, like Mitchell and Waldegrave himself, was delighted by the freer sexual customs of the French.²⁸ Whatever the causes, his change of heart was atypical though it serves to throw doubt upon John Stoye's characterisation of British travellers, albeit of the previous century, as monotonous, conventional, "receiving the same memories or images, learning to share the same stock of historical commonplaces."²⁹ Such a conclusion is too harsh and it pays insufficient attention to the undoubted intelligence of many of the travellers. It was not for the sake of tritely repeating xenophobic formulae and Whiggish doctrines, that Mitchell commented on the destruction of French liberties, and argued that liberty and prosperity were inseparable,

I do not think there had been private people in France in possession of so much riches, as the subjects of a commonwealth or limited government are, where liberty flourishes, and where property is assured, for without that let the advantages of climate be what you will the security of property being the spur to industry, which may be looked on as the father of trade and commerce, where that is wanting the particular persons, especially the trading part of the nation, chuse rather to sit still contented with a moderate fortune, than run the risk of exposing themselves to the justice of an arbitrary government, for having amassed large sums of money.

Mitchell based his statements about a relatively sophisticated assessment of French society and government. He noted in his journal the abuses of the French system of revenue farming, the disputes

between Louis XV and the Parlements, the royal despoilation of a monastic foundation at Dijon and the general insecurity of property rights in an autocratic realm.³⁰ Far from producing an automatic conventional response, Mitchell, in common with most of the British aristocratic travellers of the period, based his conclusions upon a thoughtful assessment of what he saw. This was aided by the manner in which British aristocratic travellers were received with ease into continental society. Whereas in the second half of the century most of the British travellers in Europe were not men of great rank and distinction, and were therefore forced largely to speculate upon the courts and countries they visited, in the first half of the century travel was more exclusive, travellers less numerous, and the routes and responses that were to guide so many travellers in the second half of the century less defined. Many of the travellers in the first half of the century found no difficulty in moving easily in social circles in the countries they visited. For some this was aided by being members of families with strong European connections. The Duke of Richmond and Lennox, also held the French Duchy of D'Aubigny, and visited his French relatives on several occasions. The Portlands, Albemarle and Rochfords were part of an Anglo-Dutch aristocracy. Other aristocratic British travellers found little difficulty in mixing with the great. The Duke of Kent's son, Lord Harrold, passing through Paris in January 1715, was introduced to Louis XIV, supped with the Duke of Noailles and was received by the Duke of Orleans. The French court was a very accessible one, and little difficulty was made about receiving British visitors. The same was true of Parisian society. Mitchell visiting Paris in 1735 found little difficulty in joining Madame Tencin's salon and dining with the society of savants and politicians, that made Paris so stimulating for him.

Most of the German courts were also regarded as easy of access. Churchill wrote from Cassel in 1741, "A German court is very agreeable for as soon as you are once introduced there you may go to any house in the town and be very well received without wanting any further introduction. Besides a stranger is always admitted to all the Prince's diversions; I have been invited at this court even to private parties of Prince William."

Writing of the court of Vienna, Pöllnitz qualified Churchill's statement, by showing that it related to men of quality,

un Etranger de qualité (car il faut ici de la naissance) trouve des agrémens dans cette cour, qu'il ne trouve ni à Paris ni à Londres: je parle de la facilité de faire des connoissances. Après qu'on a salué leurs Majestés Impériales, il n'y a qu'à être introduit dans une seule maison,

pour l'être bien-tôt dans toutes les autres.....Les ministres et les grands seigneurs de la cour sont civils, honnêtes, et de facile accès....

Such a situation was not true of all countries. The Portuguese aristocracy were seen as hostile to foreigners, and Swinton recorded that the Genoese nobles were very insolent to strangers.³¹ However, it was generally the case that however hostile a court might be to Britain, aristocratic British travellers found little difficulty in being received.³² The Duke of Richmond visited Spain in 1728 during a period of acute Anglo-Spanish diplomatic tension, but he was still received by Philip V, and was even granted a coveted licence to export Andalusian horses.

The actual outbreak of hostilities involving Britain affected the situation to a certain extent. A newspaper noted in 1744, "The Right Hon. the Earl of Ashburnham, and several young noblemen, who were setting out on their travels into foreign parts, have postpon'd their journeys on account of a war breaking out with France." In 1734 Dr. Richard Pococke was worried that his return from Italy would be affected by Anglo-French hostilities.³³ War between other states was less of a problem. Mitchell in 1734 and Clephane in 1742 found no difficulty in passing through contending armies in Italy.

It was the access granted to British aristocratic and well connected travellers that make their observations so valuable, and this was recognised by contemporaries. There were, as was to be expected, attacks on the developing practice of tourism. One paper in 1724, alleged that

Our young men of quality who visit Rome, generally during their continuance there, are so charm'd and taken up with the magnificance of the buildings, and the beauties of the fine paintings, and other curiosities of that city, that scarce any of them ever think of examining into its government.³⁴

Such a statement is false. The journals referred to in this article often contain long, and sometimes rather boring, accounts of the constitutions and governmental systems encountered. There was particular interest in those Italian states whose constitution included a republican component, and comments were made about their effectiveness. Mitchell described the governments of Bologna and Venice, whilst Macclesfield produced detailed accounts for Bologna and Lucca. Indeed not all commentators agreed with the newspaper cited above. A week earlier the *Universal Journal* had launched an attack on the British universities and on the content of British education, the classics and ancient history. The paper argued that it was essential to know modern European history, "by which means they might have a pretty just idea of the manner, temper, and inclinations of the different

people of Europe." In this account travel was held to be of great importance for educational purposes,

In his travels a young Gentleman ought carefully, whilst abroad, to seek the conversation of those of greater experience in the affairs of the world, and carefully enquire into the nature, strength, and weakness of each country, and its form of government. A man thus qualified, can never fail of introducing himself at his return.

Eighteen years later another paper attacked the bulk of British tourists, but noted,

we have, however, some exceptions, and some young noblemen who have done an honour to their country abroad; and by acquiring a knowledge of men, of commerce, of the interests and tempers of foreign courts, with the different policies of different nations, will be of service to their country at home. Lord Halifax, in the House of Peers, and Lord Quarendon, in the Commons, are illustrious examples for the young British gentry.³⁵

From an examination of the journals mentioned it is clear that the platitude that travel affected people differently is of considerable importance. There was no stereotyped response to the society and culture of Catholic Europe. Some, for example, noted the tribulations which autocracy and Catholicism brought upon the French, but nevertheless added that they seemed to glory in their monarchy and enjoy life. Others displayed the attitudes prevalent in Britain, and despised much of what they saw. In 1730 Mildmay noted in his journal, "Tis so natural for travellers to have an honest partiality to what their own country countains."³⁶ It was even more natural for travellers who had grown up with a particular view of Catholic Europe to interpret much of what they saw in this light. However, it is clear that individual views and experiences counted for much, and that in the case of well-connected travellers able to mingle freely in European society, travel could be very educational. The impact of so many well travelled young aristocrats for whom tourism was a lengthy and essential part of their adolescence is difficult to assess. The political impact was probably marginal, and interest in European affairs owed far more to the Hanoverian interests of the monarch. However, in cultural and social matters the influence of tourism was greater. To it can be attributed much of the vogue for foreign music, cooking, architecture, statuary, clothes and fashions,³⁷ that became so important in eighteenth-century Britain. In its upper reaches, British society became less provincial and more cosmopolitan and this owed much to the experience of tourism. Tourism did not shake the widespread conviction that Britain was a

better country to live in, but it is possible that in this period such an assumption was correct.

NOTES

I would like to thank Lady Lucas for kindly giving permission to consult the Lucas papers. There is an extensive secondary literature on the Grand Tour. Among the works that may be cited are, L. Lewis, *Connoisseurs and Secret Agents*, (London, 1961); B. Moloney, *Florence and England* (Florence, 1969); S. Rice, 'The Satiric Persona of Smollett's Travels', *Studies in Scottish Literature* (1972-3), X, pp. 33-47; O. Sitwell, *Sing High! Sing Low!* (London, 1944); J. Black, 'An Englishman Abroad in the 1730's', *Postmaster*, VI, (1980), 18-21. Also of interest is D. MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (New York, 1976).

Unless otherwise stated all dates are given in new style.

1. Waldegrave to Charles Delafaye, 2 Aug. 1732, Public Record Office, State Papers; (hereafter PRO.) 781200, f. 278; J. Bell, *Travels from St. Petersburg in Russia to Divers Parts of Asia* (2 vols., Glasgow, 1763), I; xiii.
2. *Lettres et Memoires du Baron de Pöllnitz, contenant les observations qu'il a faites dans ses voyages, et la caractere des personnes qui composent les principales cours de l'Europe*, (5th ed., 3 vols., Frankfurt, 1738, I, 82, 167, 276.) Radnor to Thomas Robinson, 11 Nov. 1730, British Library, Additional Manuscripts, (hereafter BL.Add.) 23780, f. 328.
3. Woodward to George Tilson, 28 May 1729, PRO.SP. 88/35.
4. Earl of March, *A Duke and his friends: The life and letters of the second Duke of Richmond* (London, 1911), p. 171.
5. Cowper to his sister, Lady Sarah Cowper, 8 Sept. 1729, Hertfordshire County Record Office, Panshanger MSS. D/EPF 237, f. 32. Bowman, tutor of Simon, second Viscount Harcourt, to Simon's mother, Lady Harcourt, 20 Aug. 1732, *The Harcourt Papers* edited by Edward Harcourt, (Oxford, no date) III, 8-9.
6. Duchess of Queensberry to the Hon. Mrs. Herbert, 4 Aug. 1734, BL.Add. 22626, Suffolk Papers, Vol. 2, f. 69; William Blair to Sir Horace Mann, 9 Sept. 1740, PRO. 105/281 f. 97.
7. Good examples of important overlooked travellers' records include the correspondence of the second Earl Cowper, and his tutor Dr. Joseph Atwell, later Rector of Exeter College, Oxford, (Hertfordshire County Record Office, Panshanger MSS. D/EPF 234, D/EPF 237, hereafter Panshanger), the travel journal of Lord Quarendon, who visited Italy, France and the Netherlands in 1738-40, (Oxfordshire County Record Office, Dillon papers, XX/a/7a, hereafter Dillon), the journals of Sir William Mildmay, (Essex County Record Office, Mildmay MSS., D/DM, hereafter Mildmay, Hampshire County Record Office, 15M50/1302-3, hereafter Mildmay, Hampshire), the letters of Philip Yorke, second Earl Hardwicke and of Lord Henry Kent, (Bedfordshire County Record Office, Lucas papers, L30, hereafter Lucas), the diary of the noted orientalist Swinton (Wadham College Library, Oxford, A4 CAJ 10-11 C, hereafter Swinton), the journal of the future diplomat Andrew Mitchell (BL.Add. 58314-58320, hereafter Mitchell), and the correspondence of the future second Earl of Macclesfield (BL. Stowe MSS. 750, hereafter Macclesfield).
8. Dillon, notebook, I, f. 1; 2 f. 4; 5; 4; notebook, 2, f. 2. Mildmay noted the same practice in Avignon, Mildmay, Hampshire, 1303, p. 38.
9. Eveline Cruickshanks, *Political Untouchables, The Tories and the '45* (London, 1979), p. 77.
10. Mitchell, BL.Add. 58316 f. 14; f. 40. William Mildmay was similarly unhappy with Catholic art, Mildmay, Hampshire, 1302, p. 7.
11. Atwell to Lady Cowper, 28 October 1729, Panshanger D/EP 234, p. 2, 7, 22.
12. March, pp. 175-6. Swinton was also appalled by the scourings attendant on Catholic processions. Swinton, A4.(A)11, 12 March (o.s.) 1731.
13. For examples of the strong anti-Catholic nature of the British press, *British Journal*, 20 June (o.s.) 1724, No. XCII; *St. James's Evening Post*, 1 February (o.s.) 1728, No. 1985; *The Flying-Post; or, Post-Master*, 15-17 December (o.s.) 1724, No. 4975.
14. These connections were drawn by the Earl of Kinnoull describing Lisbon in 1730, Kinnoull to Delafaye, 14 January 1730, P.R.O. 97/26. There is an anonymous, well-written and lengthy attack on the practices and consequences of Catholicism, in the Lucas papers. It is dated Florence, 28 December 1726, Lucas, L30/8/1. William Mildmay saw no difference between

- Catholicism and paganism, Mildmay, Hampshire, 1302, p. 53, 1303, p. 43. Charles Brockwell in his *The Natural and Political History of Portugal* (London, 1726), drew causal connections between Catholicism, autocracy, want, poverty, and 'the constant concomitants of sloth and idleness,' p. 149.
15. Swinton, A4(A)10, 8, 13, 16, 18, 24 October (o.s.) 1730.
 16. *The Universal Pocket Companion*, (London, 1741) p. 14.
 17. Panshanger D/EP 234 f. 140 verse IV.
 18. Henry Fielding *The Debauchees: Or The Jesuit Caught*, (London, 1746). For the sexual transgressions of the Catholic clergy, Anon. *The Case of Mary-Katherine Cadere*, (London, 1731), *St. James's Evening Post*, 3 December (o.s.) 1718, No. 604, *St. James's Evening Post*, 11 November (o.s.) 1731, No. 2573, *Fog's Weekly Journal* 13 November (o.s.) 1731, No. 158. Thomas Barrett wrote from Florence in 1749, "ladies are as well known by the names of their lovers as of their husbands," to Nicholas Hardinge, 30 July 1749, Essex County Record Office, letters from Barrett on his visit to France and Italy, D/DL C43/3/221-8.
 19. Atwell to Lady Sarah Cowper, 28 October 1729, Panshanger, D/EP 234 f.7.
 20. Cowper to Lady Sarah Cowper, 10 March 1730, Panshanger D/EP 234 f. 55.
 21. Swinton, A4(A)10, 2 November (o.s.) 1730.
 22. The antics of Weymouth and 'Petit-Pas' can be followed in the 'Archives de la Bastille' now held in the Bibliotheque de l'Arseanal.
 23. Bowman to Lady Harcourt, 3 October 1730, *The Harcourt Papers*, III, 3. The Englishman in question was the former M. P. Cresswell. Glenorchy noted of Copenhagen, 'The Ladies are much in the French way, extremely free,' Glenorchy to the Duke of Kent, 13 January 1721, Lucas L30/8/10/8.
 24. *Universal Spectator, and Weekly Journal* 3 April (o.s.) 1742, No. 704. Bowman wrote to Lady Harcourt from Genoa of "the low vices of our countrymen in Italy," 18 February 1733, *The Harcourt Papers*, III, 13.
 25. *Daily Gazetteer* 18 April (o.s.) 1737, No. 567.
 26. George Parker to Earl of Macclesfield, 8 March 1720, 28 June 1721 (quote), Macclesfield, f. 342, 376. Another, though lesser danger for British travellers, was that at Turin the Queen of Sardinia liked them to kiss her hand, "the practice of it seems to admit of Her Majesty's pretensions to the Crown of Great Britain," Molesworth to Stanyan, 27 November 1720, P.R.O. 92/30. Germain to Richmond, 12 Sept. (o.s.) 1736, West Sussex Record Office, Goodwood MSS. 108. No. 779. Burges to Newcastle, 17 July 1733, PRO. 99/63, f. 230.
 27. Cruickshanks, *Political Untouchables*, p. 12.
 28. Mildmay to Lord Fitzwalter, 10 Nov. 1748, Mildmay, D/DM.01/41. Waldegrave to Delafaye, to Essex, to Tilson (quote), 9, 12, 15 Aug. 1732, PR. 78/200, f. 288, BL. Add. 58314, f. 8.
 29. J. Stoye, *English Travellers Aboard, 1604-1667* (New York, 1968) p. 18.
 30. Mitchell, 58314, f. 37, 38, 23, 48.
 31. Brigadier Churchill to Richard Aldworth Neville, 11 Jan. 1741, Essex County Record Office, Neville Correspondence, D/D By Cl. Pöllnitz, *Lettres et Memoires*, I, 213. 6 Feb. (o.s.) 1731, Swinton, A4(A)10.
 32. Guy Dickins to Tilson, 7 Jan. 1736, PRO. PO/41.
 33. *Old England: Or, The Constitutional Journal* 31 March (o.s.) 1744, No. 61. Poccocke to Mrs. Poccocke, his mother, 11 May 1734, BL. Add. MSS. 22978 f. 71.
 34. *The Weekly Journal or Saturday Post* 4 July (o.s.) 1724, No. 297.
 35. Mitchell, 53816 f. 61-64, 53815 f. 25-41; Macclesfield, f. 356, 390. *The Universal Journal* 27 June (o.s.) 1724, No. XXIX. *The Universal Spectator, and Weekly Journal*, 3 April (o.s.) 1742, No. 704.
 36. Mildmay, Hampshire, 1303, P. 12, 60. *The Hyp-Doctor* 26 April 1737 made the same point.
 37. *The Nonsense of Common Sense* 3 January 1738, No. 3.