Politics and Civility in Early Modern England 1531-1774

Kimura, Toshimichi
Faculty of Law, Kyushu University : Associate Professor : History of Political Thought

Politics and Civility in Early Modern England 1531-1774[1]
TOSHIMICHI KIMURA

Kyushu University

Contents

Introduction

1. From court to civil society
2. The world of courtesy books
3. Civility, foreign travel, and the political education
4. Civility, negotiation, and diplomacy
5. The world of Chesterfield

Conclusion

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to explore one of the 'traditions of civility'[2] in terms of the history of English political thought. Civility is a form of conduct to make it possible to converse with others. It is usually called 'reigi' or 'sahou' in Japanese. In the cultural traditions of East Asia, it has been one of the most important moral and philosophical topoi, especially within Confucianism. It does not mean, however, that civility is an isolated and unfamiliar habitus which was common only in the Eastern World.

Civility is practiced and repeated in daily life. As a cultural capital to preserve and create traditions of human activity, it has been incessantly refined and reproduced in the royal courts and civil societies of the Western World, especially in the period before the French and Industrial Revolutions.

In early modern England, there were a variety of terms used to refer to a code of conduct. They include 'courtesy', 'civility', 'politeness', 'manners', and 'etiquette'. All are foreign words imported from the European Continent, especially France. Each original meaning is 'court', 'city', 'polis', 'manual', and 'ticket'. 'Civility' also means 'civilisation'. This clearly shows the historical relationship between the formation of human conduct and 'the civilizing process' (Norbert Elias).[3] Instead of the term of 'civilisation', Samuel Johnson's *English Dictionary* (1755) had registered that of 'civility' to express both 'the state of being civilized' and 'elegance of behaviour'.

Civility is also needed in politics. A system of ceremonies and rituals can introduce a fictional political order. Indeed, it is easy to find an element of exclusive power in this highly governmental aspect of civility. But the established order of civilities has also a power to control and restrain the direct realization of violence and the excesses of human passion. It makes our world predictable,

---

[1] This paper was delivered at the International Symposium（Political Theory in the Context of Globalization and Multiculturalism）, held at Kyushu University, Japan, in 11 July 2006. I am most grateful to those who discussed it and inspired me, especially Professor Masashi Sekiguchi (Convenor, Kyushu University), Professor Nobuo Okawara (Chair, Kyushu University), Professor John Dunn (Cambridge University), Dr. Mark Fenwick (Kyushu University).

[2] Sir Earnest Barker, *Traditions of Civility* (Cambridge, 1948).

[3] Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, 2 vols, tr. E. Jephcott (Oxford, 1978, 1982); *The Court Society*, tr. E. Jephcott (Oxford, 1983).

excludes something arbitrary, and prevents agitation and anarchy. We are able to make politics open and artificial through the rules of civility as a common capital with others.

In addition, civility is able to alleviate the tension between real politics and political ideas. As David Hume pointed out, the world of politics is founded on opinion.[4] However, a diversity of ideas and opinions are rarely compatible. On the contrary, civility is an outer form of conduct, which could be divided from inner self. As indicated below, civility is, indeed, the by-product of a particular historical and intellectual condition (but, could not be simply reduced to the modern dualism of mind and body). Yet, it is certain that civility has been one of the effective devices to conciliate the conflicts of our opinions, and to make our communications more concise.

A tradition of civility is, therefore, a history of 'practical knowledge' (Michael Oakeshott)[5]. It mediates between the politics and ideas, restrains violence and the passions, and makes possible our daily conversation and mutual negotiation. In early modern England, it had been a necessary condition not only to achieve human perfection (in the sense of the Renaissance humanism), but also to educate political elites, and to sustain both the English and European Commonwealths.

This paper will articulate the historical process of the English civility in terms of (1) court society, (2) courtesy books, (3) foreign travel, (4) diplomatic negotiation, and (5) the ideas of Chesterfield. Following this investigation, it will be indicated that the tradition of civility changed substantially in the age of modern civilization: that is the age of nationalism and democracy after the nineteenth century.

1. From court to civil society

In the Early Modern Europe, it was the court society in which civility had been highly developed and refined. As Elias pointed out in his *The Civilizing Process* and *The Court Society*, the court was 'a source of models of behaviour'.[6] It had been also the knot of the 'international' human conversation.[7] Before the rise of nation states, many ceremonies and attractions were always held in the court society: receptions of foreign ambassadors, magnificent pageants, and dazzling balls. Even kings and princesses were often from other countries. In addition, the early modern court was one of 'the points of contact' (G. R. Elton)[8]. In the age without annual parliaments and standing bureaucracy, it was a political center to govern a whole commonwealth: not only through the advice of the privy councillors, but also by distribution of the patronage, receiving of petitions, and diplomatic negotiations.

---

[4] David Hume, *Political Essays*, ed. Knud Haakonssen (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 16, 30. Cf. Sir William Temple, *An Essay upon the Original and Nature of Government* (1680; New York: AMS Press, 1993), p. 54.

[5] Michael Oakeshott, *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays* (1962: Indianapolis, Liberty Fund, 1991).

[6] Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, vol. 2, p. 5.

[7] R. M. Smuts, ed. *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1996).

[8] G. R. Elton, 'Tudor Government: The Points of Contact III: The Court', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (1976), pp. 211-28; David Starkey, ed. *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London, 1987); R. M. Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origines of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 1987); L. L. Peck, ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991); Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Houndmills, 1994); Eveline Cruickshanks ed. *The Stuart Courts* (Phoenix Hill, Stroud, Gloucestershire, 2000).

According to James Howell, a courtier in the age of Restoration, the royal court was 'the epitome of the whole country'.[9] The term of 'courtesy' shows clearly that the forms of human conduct had been polished in the court as a focal point of both civilization and politics. On the other hand, the new vocabulary of 'civility', of which the etymological origin is 'city', became increasingly important instead of the medieval term 'courtesy'[10]. But, with the decline of the Italian city republics, this 'civility' also referred to courtly behavior.[11] For example, Stefano Guazzo, an Italian courtier, understood that 'civil conversation' is 'not said in respect of the city, but of the qualities of the mind'[12]. In the seventeenth century, Antoine de Courtin's courtesy book, which had been highly estimated in the court society of the Louis XIV, was translated as *The Rules of Civility* in 1671. He argued that civility is 'so indispensably necessary in the conversation of the world'. It is 'nothing but the modesty and decorum that every man ought to observe both in his words and his actions'. And the court is 'proper school' to learn 'these rudiments of civility'.[13]

In the eighteenth century, however, the points of conversation overflowed 'the court', and then diffused into 'civil society' with the the advent of the commercial society.[14] As J. G. A. Pocock and Lawrence Klein repeatedly has shown, the terms to signify such a social and cultural change are 'politeness' and 'manners'.[15] For example, the third Earl of Shaftesbury insisted, in *Sensus Communis* (1709), that 'all politeness is owing to liberty'. The reason is that 'we polish one another and rub off our corners and rough sides by a sort of amicable collision'.[16] At the end of this century, Edmund Burke emphasized that 'manners are of more importance than laws'. Because 'manners are what vex or sooth, corrupt or purify, exalt or debase, barbarize or refine us, by a constant, steady, uniform, insensible operation, like that of the air we breathe in'. In short, 'they give their whole form and colour to our lives'.[17]

---

[9] James Howell, *A Discourse concerning the Precedency of Kings,* (London, 1664), p. 47.

[10] M. B. Becker*, Civility and Society in Western Europe, 1300-1600* (Bloomington: Indiana U. P, 1988). John Hale, *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance* (1994; NY: Touchstone, 1995), part 3.

[11] Peter Burke, 'A Civil Tongue: Language and Politeness in Early Modern Europe', in Peter Burke, Brian Harrison, and Paul Slack eds. *Civil Histories: Essays presented to Sir Keith Thomas* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 31-48, esp. p. 36. Anna Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1998), ch. 2.

[12] Steeven Guazzo, *The Civile Conversation*, vol. 1, ed. Sir Edward Sullivan (New York, 1967), p. 56; Stefano Guazzo, *La civil conversatione*, a cura di Amendo Quondam (Modena, 1993), p. 40.

[13] Antoine de Courtin, *The Rules of Civility*, tr. Anon (1671; London, 1678), A3ᵛ, B1ʳ, A4ʳ. Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 62.

[14] John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Lndon, 1997), ch. 1.

[15] J. G. A. Pocock, 'Virtues, Rights, and Manners: A Model for Historians of Political Thought', in his *Virtue, Commerce, and History* (Cambridge,1985), pp. 37-50. L. E. Klein, *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness* (Cambridge, 1994); 'The Third Earl of Shaftesbury and the Progress of Politeness', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 18 (1985), pp. 186-214; 'Liberty, Manners, and Politeness in Early Eighteenth-Century England', *The Historical Journal* 32 (1989), pp. 583-605; 'Shaftesbury, Politeness and the Politics of Religion', in N. Phillipson and Q. Skinner, eds. *Political Discourses in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 283-301.

[16] Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, *Sensus Communis, an Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour in a Letter to a Friend*, in his *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, ed. L. E. Klein(Cambridge, 1999), p. 31.

[17] Edmund Burke, *First Letter on a Regicide Peace*, in *The Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke*, vol. 9, ed. R. B. McDowell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 242

Joseph Addison observed 'a very great Revolution' of human behaviour. As he said in his article in the *Spectator*, 'unconstrained carriage, and a certain openness of behaviour, are the height of good breeding'. Against the formal ceremonies of the last age, 'the fashionable world is grown free and easy; our manners sit more loose upon us'.[18] This age of politeness, often associated with coffee houses and clubs in London, is also explained as the age of 'the structural transformation of the public sphere' (Habermas).[19] As Klein pointed out, preceding such an urban cultural change, Shaftesbury strongly criticized the lack of the public spirit in the royal court, and deprived the Court (and the Tory) of the guardianship of politeness.[20] According to his polite Whiggism, 'it was difficult to apprehend what community subsisted among courtiers or what public between an absolute prince and his slave-subjects'.[21]

Even in this civil society, however, the court remained the center of the civility. For example, Hume appreciated well the importance of civility. He was also an actor playing a part of 'ambassador' who is sent 'from the dominions of learning to those of conversation'.[22] As he said, 'we are commonly proud and selfish, and apt to assume the preference above others'. Therefore, 'mutual deference and civility' are necessary 'to resign our own inclinations to those of our companion, and to curb and conceal that presumption and arrogance, so natural to the human mind'. Again, 'refined breeding has taught men to throw the bias on the opposite side, and to preserve, in all their behaviour, the appearance of sentiments different from those to which they naturally incline'.[23]

It is to be noted that Hume pointed out the internal relationship between such a refinement of civility and social structure. Compared with the civilized monarchies, he said, 'the republics in Europe are at present noted for want of politeness'. In the republics, 'where power rises upwards from the people to the great', 'such refinements of civility are apt to be little practised'. Since 'the whole state is, by that means, brought near to a level, and every member of it is rendered, in a great measure, independent of another'. On the contrary, 'in a civilized monarchy, there is a long train of dependence from the prince to the peasant'. It is 'sufficient to beget in every one an inclination to please his superiors, and to form himself upon those models, which are most acceptable to people of condition and education'. As an ambassador from the world of learning, he eventually concluded that 'politeness of manners, therefore, arises most naturally in monarchies and courts'.[24]

2. The world of courtesy books
As we have seen, civility had been refined on the stages of the royal courts and civil societies in

---

[18] Joseph Addison, Richard Steele, and others, *The Spectator*, vol. 1, eds. C. G. Smith (London, Everyman's Library, 1907; 1967), pp. 361-2 (no. 119).
[19] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere : An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, tr. Thomas Burge (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).
[20] Klein, *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness*, ch. 7.
[21] Shaftesbury, *Sensus Communis*, p. 49.
[22] Hume, 'Of Essay Writing', in his *Essays Moral, Political and Literary* (London, 1903), p. 570. Nicholas Phillipson, *Hume* (London, 1989), ch. 2; 'Propriety, Property and Prudence: David Hume and the Defence of the Revolution', in idem and Q. Skinner eds. *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 302-20; 'Politeness and Politics in the Reigns of Anne and the Early Hanoverians', in J. G. A. Pocock ed., *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 211-45.
[23] Hume, *Political Essays*, pp 73, 69-70.
[24] *Ibid*, p. 70.

hierarchical early modern Europe. Such a civilizing process, especially in England, can be also observed through the educational programs for the political elite: the reception of courtesy books and the experience of foreign travel.

Renaissance England was a developing country at the periphery of Europe. On the contrary, the continental courts were the ultimate symbol of the civility. An anonymous author of *Cyuile and Vncyuile Life* (1579), for example, compared 'foreign manners' in the court with 'barbarous behaviour' in the country.[25] As shown below, it was a series of courtesy books to have introduced the civility to this northern island.[26] Especially in the Renaissance, Italian courtesy books were incessantly translated, including Baldassare Castiglione *Il cortegiano* (1528), Della Casa *Galateo* (1558), and Guazzo *La civil conversatione* (1574).[27] Thomas Hoby, who translated *Il cortegiano* in 1561, emphasized that this book already 'haunted all the courts of Christendom' for a long time. For him, *The Courtier* was 'a storehouse of most necessary implements for the conversation, use, and training up of mans life with courtly demeanors'. In this point of civility, however, 'Englishmen are much inferior to well most all other nations'.[28]

In these courtesy books, the human being was understood not as an autonomous creature but as a mutually dependent one. To be human, we need others. In *Galateo*, translated in 1576, Della Casa insisted that 'the courteous behaviour and entertainment with good manners and words, help no less, him that has them'. Because 'a man must necessarily be familiar with men at all times, and ever have talk and communication'.[29] As Guazzo said, 'conversation is not only profitable, but moreover necessary to the perfection of man, who must confess that he is like the bee which cannot live alone'.[30] Therefore, he described comprehensively the manner of conversation 'to teach, to demand, to confer, to traffic, to counsel, to correct, to dispute, to judge, and to express the affection of our heart'. As the title page of English version (1581) shows, such manners are needed 'between young men and old, gentlemen and yeomen, princes and private persons, learned and unlearned, citizens and strangers, religious and secular, men and women'.[31]

This world of the courtesy book was formed in the tradition of Renaissance humanism. In *De*

---

[25] Anon, *Cyuile and Vncyuile Life* (London, 1579), B1ᵛ, N1ʳ.
[26] J. E. Mason, *Gentlefolk in the Making: Studies in the History of English Courtesy Literature and Related Topics from 1531-1774* (1935; New York, 1971); Ruth Kelso, *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century* (1929; Gloucester, Mass., 1964); Philip Mason, *The English Gentleman: The Rise and Fall of an Ideal* (London, 1982). Among recent studies, especially, Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*; Markku Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness and Honour* (Cambridge, 2003); Daniel Javitch, 'Rival Arts of Conduct in Elizabethan England: Guazzo's *Civile Conversation* and Castiglione's *Courtier*', *Year Book of Italian Studies*, 1 (1971), pp. 178-98; idem, *Poetry and Courtliness in Renaissance England* (Princeton, 1978); Sidney Anglo, 'The Courtier: The Renaissance and Changing Ideals', in A. G. Dickens ed., *The Courts of Europe: Politics, Patronage and Royalty· 1400-1800* (London, 1977), pp. 33-53; Frank Whigham, *Ambition and Priviledge: The Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory* (Berkeley, 1984); Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England* (Chicago, 1994).
[27] Peter Burke, *The Fortunes of the Courtier* (Cambridge, 1995); J. E. Lievsay, *Stefano Guazzo and the English Renaissance 1575-1675* (Chapel Hill, 1961).
[28] Castiglione, *The Book of Courtier*, tr. Sir Thomas Hoby, intro. Walter Raleigh (New York, 1967), pp. 5-8.
[29] Giovanni della Casa, *Galateo*, tr. Robert Peterson (London, 1576), p. 2.
[30] Guazzo, *The Civile Conversation*, vol. 1, p. 35; *La civil conversatione*, p. 27.
[31] Guazzo, *The Civile Conversation*, vol. 1, pp. 35, 1.

Civilitate Morum Puerilium (1530), Erasmus recognized that external decorum is 'very conductive to winning good will and to commending those illustrious gifts of the intellect to the eyes of men'. He regarded 'good manners' as one of the four main pillars of youth education with piety, the liberal arts, and the duties of life.[32] From this humanistic point of view, Cicero's *De Officiis* is to be reviewed as one of the classics on civility.[33] In Book I of this *On Duties*, Cicero discoursed on decorum. Decorum, he explained, 'that which agrees with the excellence of man', and its subordinate definition is 'that which agrees with the nature in such away that moderation and restrain appear in it, along with the appearance of a gentleman' (1:96). It also 'can be seen in every deed and word, and indeed in every bodily movement or state, and latter depend upon three things, beauty, order and embellishment that is suited to action' (1:126).[34]

On Duties has, of course, another aspect being received as a classic of republicanism, which would be sharply contrasted to this tradition of civility. On the other hand, it is Castiglione's *The Courtier* that provided a practical model of the early modern decorum. In this book, he described 'the perfect courtier' and provided the standard of the European civility. He repeated that 'the courtier has to imbue with grace his movements, his gestures, his way of doing things and in short, his every action'. Especially, it is 'sprezzatura' from which such a grace springs. As he explained, it 'conceals all artistry and makes whatever one says or does seem uncontrived and effortless'. It is 'true art' what 'does not seem to be art'. The courtier, therefore, should 'above all avoid affection'. 'Next let him consider well whatever he does or says, the place where he does it, in whose presence, its timing, why he is doing it, his own age, his profession, the end he is aiming at, and the means that are suitable'.[35]

As discussed above, Renaissance England was civilized by the reception and translation of foreign courtesy books. Its political importance was recognized even by Francis Bacon who investigated the present conditions of all studies in his *Advancement of Learning* (1605). As one of the three parts of civil knowledge, 'the wisdom of conversation ought not to be over much affected, but much less despised'. 'For it has not only an honour in it self, but an influence also into business and government'. Following his observation on politics, he stated that 'this part of knowledge 'has been elegantly handled, and therefore I cannot report it for deficient'.[36] The reproduction of this

---

[32] Erasmus, *De Civilitate Morum Puerilium*, tr. Brian McGregor, in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 35, ed., J. K. Sowards (Toronto, 1985), p. 273.

[33] For Grimald who translated this school canon in 1564, it is 'a treasure' for the fashioning one's life in terms of civility and humanity. Cicero, *Marcus Tullius Ciceroes Thre Bokes of Duties, to Marcus his Sonne, turned oute of Latine into English, by Nicolas Grimalde*, ed. Gerald O'Gorman (Washington, 1990), p. 38.

[34] Cicero, *On Duties*, eds. M. T. Griffin and E M. Atkins (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 38, 49. For example, conversation 'ought therefore to be gentle and without a trace of intransigence'. 'Nor should any one speaker exclude all others'. 'He should think it fair in shared conversation, just as in other things, for everyone to have a turn' (1:134). Lastly, 'we must take particular care to be seen to respect and have affection for those with whom we share conversation' (1:136). *Ibid*., pp.52, 53.

[35] Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, tr. George Bull (Penguin Books, 1976), pp. 65, 115. One of the true arts is, for example, 'eloquence adapted to those with whom he is talking'. It is an art 'how to refresh and charm the minds of his listeners, and move them to merriment and laughter with his agreeable pleasantries and witticisms, in such a way that, without ever being tedious or boring, he is always a source of pleasure' (p.151).

[36] Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning*, ed. Michael Kiernan, in *The Oxford Francis*

tradition of civility was to be continued even after the Civil War and the Revolution of the seventeenth century.

3. Civility, foreign travel, and the political education

The English civilizing process was, however, not only due to the translation of manuals of civility. But also, young gentlemen were expected to acquire European civility by traveling amongst the continental courts[37].

Thomas Hoby, who translated *Il cortegiano* in Paris, was one of the typical humanistic courtiers who had a long experience of traveling abroad. As he noted in his autobiography, he visited a lot of cities and courts (including a monument of Titus Livius in Venice), conversed with foreign nobilities, and learned the divinity, humanities, Hebrew, Greek, and Italian.[38] In case of James Howell,[39] who called himself 'a true Cosmopolite',[40] he had been 'in most of the great Courts of Christendom' including Spain, Denmark, Germany, France, and Italy.[41] Learning from these circulations, he insisted, in *Instructions for Forreine Travell* (1642), that it is highly conducive 'to enrich the mind with knowledge, to rectify the judgement, and compose outward manners'.[42]

The Voyage of Italy (1670), written by Richard Lassel, was one of the standard books for foreign travel.[43] He described the model route of it as follows. First, young nobleman ought to go immediately to Italy at the age of 15 or 16, and stay there for two or three years. It is not only necessary for learning foreign languages and several arts (music, painting, architecture, and mathematics), but also for 'visiting the several courts, studying their maxims, and imitating their gentle conversation'. After that, he has to spend three years more in France to learn fencing, dancing, riding, map, history, policy and so on.[44] As for civility, he admired Italian manners, and pointed out that all Europe 'owes its civility unto the Italians' with referring to the names of Della

Bacon IV (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 157,158. On the relationship Bacon and the contemporary court society, see Toshimichi Kimura, *Politics of Counsellor: Francis Bacon and the Renaissance England* (Tokyo: Bokutakusha, 2003), ch. 5 (in Japanese).

[37] James Buzard, 'The Grand Tour and After (1660-1840)', in *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*, eds. Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 37-52. Especially on the travel of the sixteenth century, Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour* (London, 1998); Kenneth Charlton, *Education in Renaissance England* (London, 1965), pp. 215-26. On the seventeenth cenury, John Stoye, *English Travellers Abroad 1604-1667* (1952; Rev ed., New Heaven, 1989) ; G. B. Parks, 'Travel as Education', in R. F. Jones et al., *The Seventeenth Century: Studies in the History of English Thought and Literature from Bacon to Pope* (1951; Stanford, 1965), pp. 264-90.

[38] Hoby, 'A Booke of the Travaile and Life of me Thomas Hoby', ed. Edgar Powell, in *The Camden Miscellany*, vol. 10 (London, 1902). Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour* (London, 1998), esp. pp. 62-6.

[39] Daniel Woolf, 'Conscience, Constancy, and Ambition in the Career and Writings of James Howell', in John Morrill, Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf, *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays Presented to G. E. Aylmer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 243-78; Michael Nutkiewicz, 'A Rapporteur of the English Civil War: The Courtly Politics of James Howell (1594?-1666)', *Canadian Journal of History* 25 (1990), pp. 21-40.

[40] Howell, *Epistolae Ho-Elianae: The Familiar Letters of James Howell*, ed. Joseph Jacobs (London, 1890), p. 373.

[41] Howell, *A Discourse concerning the Precedency of Kings* (London, 1664), To the King.

[42] Howell, *Instructions for Forreine Travell* (London, 1642), p. 1.

[43] Edward Chaney, *The Grand Tour and the Great Rebellion* (Geneve, 1985).

[44] Richard Lassels, *The Voyage of Italy* (Paris, 1670), é iv ᵛ-ĩ i ʳ.

Casa, Guazzo, and Castiglione. He noted that the Italians 'never affront strangers in what habit so ever they appear; and if the strangeness of the habit draw the Italians eye to it, yet he will never draw in his mouth to laugh at it'.[45] Therefore, the traveling young Lord would become to be 'far more modest and civil to his inferiors, and far less puff up with the empty conceit of his own greatness'. Such a man who 'has seen so many greater men' is very contrary to the country Lord who 'thinks lands-end as worlds-end'.[46]

The foreign world was a school for acquiring European civility. The eighteenth century was also the age of the Grand Tour. At the same time, however, the foreign travel had been repeatedly criticized that traveling gentleman returned home as a 'fop'. Indeed, to send the promising elite to 'Mounsieurs of Paris' (Milton)[47] had been reputed 'so very absurd a practice' (Adam Smith).[48] In *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693), John Locke confessed that it is 'to little purpose' to go abroad especially at young age.[49]

In the long eighteenth century, both civility and foreign travel were strongly attacked by the rise of Romanticism[50] and Englishness movement.[51] It is well known that Jean-Jacque Rousseau turned his eyes to the inner innocent self, and disgusted outer civility and civilized society. On the other side, to the English common-lawyers, the country gentlemen, and the commonwealthmen who had insisted the English liberty and manly virtue,[52] it seemed that such a civility was only 'French' or 'effeminate'.[53]

Against this current of the age, the defenders of civility emphasized its universal nature that was not confined to England.[54] In *Of Education* (1673), Obadiah Walker repeated the common sense of civility: 'conforming himself to the innocent humours, and infirmities, sometimes, of others; readiness to do courtesies for all, speaking well of all behind their backs'. For him, the rules of this

---

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 12. Cf. Lassels, 'Description of Italy', in Chaney, *The Grand Tour*, p. 151.

[46] Lassels, *The Voyage of Italy*, á iiij ᵛ.

[47] John Milton, *Of Education* (1644), in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, vol. 2 (New Heaven, 1959), p. 414.

[48] Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, vol. 2 (London, 1776), p. 358.

[49] John Locke, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, eds. J. W. and J. S. Yolton (Oxford, 1989), p. 264.

[50] Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800* (Harlow, 2001); Gerald Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History 1740-1830* (London, 1987), ch. 6; Leon Guilhamet, *The Sincere Ideal: Studies on Sincerity in Eighteenth-Century English Literature* (Montreal, 1974).

[51] Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism*, chs. 4-8; Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (1992; London, 2003), ch. 4.

[52] Cf. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, 'A Dialogue between the same Persons and a Bishop, concerning Education', in his *Two Dialogues: Of the Want of Respect due to Age and Concerning Education*, intro. M. W. Brownley (Los Angeles, The Augustan Reprint Society, 1984); Robert Molesworth, *An Account of Denmark, as It was in the Year 1692* (London, 3rd ed. 1694), The Preface.

[53] Michèle Cohen, 'The Grand Tour: Constructing the English Gentleman in Eighteenth-Century France', *History of Education* 21 (1992), pp. 241-57; 'Manliness, Effeminacy and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-Century England', in Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen eds. *English Masculinities 1660-1800* (London, 1999), pp. 44-61; Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society*, ch. 4.

[54] Brauer, *The Education of a Gentleman*, pp. 137-9.

civility are 'to perpetuity unchangeable'.[55] Oliver Goldsmith, in his *The Citizen of the World* (1760-2), asked as below: 'how would a Chinese, bred up in the formalities of an Eastern court, be regarded should he carry all his good manners beyond the Great Wall? How would an Englishman, skilled in all the decorums of Western good breeding, appear at an Eastern entertainment?' In a fictional letter from a Chinese to a merchant in Amsterdam, he answered that 'he is truly well-bred, who knows when to value and when to despise those national peculiarities'. 'The wise are polite all the world over', as 'ceremonies are different in every country; but true politeness in every where the same'.[56]

Richard Hurd's *On the Uses of Foreign Travel* (1764) is a dialogue to describe this tension typically with figures of Shaftesbury and Locke. In this fictional dialogue, the figure of Shaftesbury strongly supported foreign travel. For him, 'travel is, of all others, the most important and essential part of education'. In particular, he emphasized the need of 'knowledge of the world' acquired 'in the way of society, and general conversation'. 'Native barbarism', he said, 'requires to be loosed and worn off by a more social habit, by the experience of a still wider and more thorough communication'. From this point of view, he criticized the Englishness movement: 'our country has never been famous for the civility of its inhabitants. We have, rather, been stigmatized in all ages, and are still considered by the rest of Europe, as proud, churlish, and unsocial'.[57]

The figure of Locke, however, attacked Shaftesbury exhaustibly. His opinion was that 'the business of education is to form the understanding, and regulate the heart'. On the contrary, the forms of breeding and foreign languages are 'things either frivolous or unimportant'. Besides, young countryman 'may easily wear himself into the contrary defect, an effeminate and unmanly foppery'. In short, travel is 'the worst' for young education. Therefore, he defied European civility as a product of the absolute monarchies, and urged 'our countrymen' to 'be indulged in the plainness, nay, the roughness of their manners'. 'An English citizen', he said, ought to discharge 'the duties he owes his country', season with 'the principles of virtue and religion', direct their mind to 'the public good', and have 'a reverence for the legal constitution of his country'. What is important for English citizens is nothing but 'their public spirit, and above all, 'their unpolished integrity'.[58]

Civility was a practical and bodily knowledge, which had been induced through the experience of foreign travel. But, in the eighteenth century, it involved a tension concerning the separation of the inner and outer self, or the problem of national identity. As we will make clear below, the European world of diplomacy also faced the same crisis at the same time.

4. Civility, negotiation, and diplomacy

Diplomacy, an activity to negotiate with others, has a close relationship with civility. In the early

---

[55] Obadiah Walker, *Of Education* (1673; Menston: The Scolar Press, 1970), pp.225-6, 212.

[56] Oliver Goldsmith, *The Citizen of the World*, in *The Miscellaneous Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, intro. David Masson (London, 1878), p. 148 (Letter XXXIX).

[57] Richard Hurd, *Moral and Political Dialogues with Letters on Chivalry and Romance*, vol. 3 (London, 3rd ed. 1765; Farnborough, 1972), pp. 32, 28, 33. Cf. Shaftesbury, *Characteristics*, pp. 403-5.

[58] Hurd, *Moral and Political Dialogues*, vol. 3, pp. 67, 79, 96, 81, 149-50, 69-70. Cf. Paul Langford, 'Manners and the Eighteenth-Century State: The Case of the Unsociable Englishman', John Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth eds. *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 281-316.

modern England, 'negotiation' had been used as a word to mean diplomacy.[59] If we emphasize this aspect of diplomacy, it would be also understood as an activity ubiquitous in human life. In *Discourse on the Art of Negotiation* (1737), Antoine Pecquet, a diplomat of Louis XV, said that 'every thing is, so to speak, commerce or negotiation in life'.[60] As Harold Nicolson pointed out later, diplomacy is 'an essential element in any reasonable relation between man and man and between nation and nation'.[61]

Diplomacy is an art of negotiation, not only a function of reason of state or power politics. If it aims to coexist with the others, it needs common civility to converse with them. As we will show below, the early modern diplomacy was the very practice of civility, which was cultivated through courtesy books and foreign travel.

Machiavelli is often referred to as a classical author on diplomacy. However, as Sir Herbert Butterfield pointed out, there remains little room for negotiation in his political thought.[62] Questing for an empire modelled on the ancient Roman republic for expansion, Machiavelli did not hesitate to conquer and destroy other republics.[63] On the contrary, the aim of civility was to preserve and reproduce a given network of European court society. For example, in his *The Embassador and his Functions* (1681), Abraham de Wicquefort, a Dutch diplomat of the second rank who spent his career mostly in Paris, referred to Castiglione as well as Machiavelli. The ambassador is, he said, 'a great theatrical personage', and 'it is impossible for him to be so, or act the part, unless he forms himself by the rules of civility and good-breeding'. 'Considering the corruption of the present age', he was not afraid to say, 'it suffices, that an embassador have a noble exterior and a fine appearance, from whence he shall draw more notable advantages than from virtue'. In short, an ambassador ought to be 'a man framed to the mode of the court'.[64]

The European court was a stage of both civility and negotiation. 'There is not a more illustrious theatre than a court'. So the court ceremony must not be neglected. As Wicquefort emphasized, 'the civilities and ceremonies that are done to embassadors' make 'one of the most essential parts of embassy'. In several chapters, he explained the detail of these civilities 'regulated now almost in all courts'. Moreover, he observed that such a system of civility also had an important part to establish an international order. In particular, 'there has not been any negotiation', as at the congress of Westphalia, where so many monarchs, potentates and princes were concerned; where so many difficulties were to be overcome; where so many different and opposite interests met'. Nevertheless, it is also to be noted that, at this congress which decided the framework of early

---

[59] Harold Nicholson, *Diplomacy* (Oxford, 3rd ed. 1963), ch. 1.

[60] Antoine Pecquet, *Discourse on the Art of Negotiation*, tr. Aleksandra Gruzinska and M. D. Sirkis (New York: Peter Lang, 2004), p. 5.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[62] Sir Herbert Butterfield, 'Diplomacy', in Ragnhild Hatton and M. S. Anderson eds. *Studies in Diplomatic History: Essays in Memory of David Bayne Horn* (Archon Books, 1970), pp. 357-72; 'The Balance of Power', in Butterfield and Martin Wight eds. *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1966), pp. 132-75, esp. pp. 134-5; G. R. Berridge, 'Machiavelli', in Berridge, Keens-Soper and Otte eds. *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), pp. 7-32.

[63] Mikael Hörnqvist, *Machiavelli and Empire* (Cambridge, 2004).

[64] Abraham de Wicquefort, *The Embassador and His Functions*, tr. Mr. Digby (London, 1716; Leicester: The Center for the Study of Diplomacy, 1997), pp. 4, 53, 4, 294.

modern Europe, 'the rules of civility were observed with the utmost punctuality'.[65]

As this case of Westphalia indicates, a system of civility assumed, not Machiavellian imperial expansion or Hobbesian natural condition, but a world of mutual dependence and the balance of power. François de Callières, a diplomat in the age of Louis XIV, said in his *The Art of Diplomacy* (1716), that 'when a prince, or a state, is powerful enough to give the law to all his neighbours, the art of negotiation becomes useless'. On the contrary, 'all the states of Europe have necessary ties and commerces one with another, which makes them to be looked upon as members of one and the same Commonwealth'. And that 'there hardly happen any considerable change in some of its members, but what is capable of disturbing the quiet of all the others'. The art of negotiating is, therefore, 'of so great importance', and it is necessary to sovereigns 'to keep on foot constant negotiations, both in countries near at hand and remote, either openly or secretly, in time of peace, and also in time of war'.[66]

Such a civility of negotiation had been also imported to the British island through various 'European experiences'. According to Izaak Walton, for example, when Sir Henry Wotton returned out of Italy, he was noted by 'a most persuasive behaviour; which was so mixed with sweet discourse, and civilities'.[67] Especially at Siena, this Wotton, late ambassador of James I in Venice, was endowed 'Delphian oracle' by an old Roman courtier. It was a maxim to carry him safe through the whole world: '*I pensieri stretti, e il viso sciolto* (Your thoughts close, and your countenance loose)'.[68] On the other hand, Callières' *The Art of Diplomacy* was translated in 1716, and Wicquefort's *The Embassador* in the next year[69]. In the articles of *Craftsman* (1727), both books were reviewed, and especially *The Embassador* was highly estimated that 'no modern ambassador can want any recommendation of so useful a work'.[70]

Thus the international order in the early modern Europe was formed by the spread of civility. Edward Gibbon considered Europe as 'civilized society' maintained by 'the balance of power'. And it was 'one great republic, whose various inhabitants have attained almost the same level of politeness and cultivation'.[71] However, in the late of the eighteenth century, the *raison d'etre* of this 'one great republic' was internally threatened by the advent of a new republic: the French revolution. Needless to say, a man who radically criticized the progress of this revolution was

---

[65] *Ibid*., 127, 128, 385, 144.

[66] François de Callières, *The Art of Diplomacy*, eds. H. M. A. Keens-Soper and K. W. Schweizer (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983), pp.111, 68, 65. On Callières, see Keens-Soper, 'Francois de Callieres and Diplomatic Theory', *The Historical Journal*, 16 (1973), pp. 485-508; 'Callieres', in Berridge, Keens-Soper and Otte eds. *Diplomatic Theory*, pp. 106-24; K. W. Schweizer, *François de Callières: Diplomat and Man of Letters, 1645-1717* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995).

[67] Izaak Walton, 'The Life of Sir Henry Wotton', in his *The Lives* (London: Oxford U. P, The World Classics, 1927; 1950), p. 107. But, L. P. Smith ed. *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), vol. 1, pp. 27-8.

[68] Smith ed. *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, vol. 1, p. 22; vol. 2, pp. 364, 382. Cf. Sir Henry Wotton, *A Philosophical Survey of Education*, ed, H. S. Kermode (London: Liverpool U. P, 1938), p. 4.

[69] D. B. Horn, *The British Diplomatic Service 1689-1789* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), p. 125.

[70] Caleb D'Anvers, *The Craftsman*, vol. 2　(London, 1731), p. 131.

[71] Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury (1897; London: Methuen, 1925), vol. 4, p. 165. But, on Gibbon's optimism, see Jeremy Black, 'Empire and Enlightenment in Edward Gibbon's Treatment of International Relations', *The International History Review*, vol. 17, no. 3 (August, 1995), pp. 441-58.

Edmund Burke.

According to Burke, the revolution was 'a considerable revolution in their ideas of politeness',[72] and was to destroy 'the European commonwealth' with violence. He called this revolutionary France 'regicide commonwealth', which 'lays it down as a fixed law of nature, and a fundamental right of man, that all government, not being a democracy, is an usurpation'. So, being 'in a state of hostility with us, and with all civilized people', it would abolish the tradition of negotiation.[73] From his point of view, 'the very idea of a negotiation for peace, whatever the inward sentiments of the parties may be, implies some confidence in their faith, some degree of belief in the professions which are made concerning it'. On the contrary, the regicide republic assumed 'the ill faith and treachery of those they have to deal with', imposed 'this new-discovered system of negotiation', and invaded the neighbour countries 'without the least ceremony or compliment'.[74] It was the very 'extensive empire', for which was agitated by 'the discontented diplomatic politicians' who 'had continually in their hands the observations of Machiavel on Livy'.[75]

Moreover, Burke found out the collapse of the European civility itself with this crisis of negotiation. He turned his focus to the manners, which had been changed drastically by events in France. As he pointed out, 'men are never in a state of *total* independence of each other'. It is also true that 'nothing is so strong a tie of amity between nation and nation as correspondence in laws, customs, manners, and habits of life'. Such conformity and analogy have 'a strong tendency to facilitate accommodation, and to produce a generous oblivion of the rancor of their quarrels'. In this sense, Europe had been 'a Commonwealth', which had the same basis of general law, Christian religion, and especially 'the spirit of European monarchy'. Therefore, 'from this resemblance in the modes of intercourse, and in the whole form and fashion of the life, no citizen of Europe could be altogether an exile in any part of it'.[76]

However, this Jacobean republic made 'a schism with the whole universe'. 'Nothing is in the revolution', he said, 'no, not to a phase or a gesture, not to the fashion of a hat or a shoe, was left to accident'. In the end, 'the new French legislators' settled a system of manners, which was 'the most licentious, prostitute, and abandoned that ever has been known, and at the same time the most coarse, rude, savage, and ferocious'. At last, he even declared that 'the Regicides in France are not France'.[77]

---

[72] Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, in *The Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke*, vol. 8, ed. L. G. Mitchell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 120. Cf. p. 131

[73] Black, *British Diplomats and Diplomacy*, pp. 163-6; Linda Frey and Marsha Frey, ' "The Reign of the Charlatans is Over": The French Revolutionary Attack on Diplomatic Practice', *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 65, no. 4 (Dec., 1993), pp. 706-44.

[74] Burke, *First Letter on a Regicide Peace*, in *The Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke*, vol. 9, ed. R. B. McDowell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 240, 216, 221, 212. Cf. Harold Temperley and L. M. Penson eds. *Foundations of British Foreign Policy: From Pitt (1792) to Salisbury (1902)*, (1938; London: Frank Cass, 1966), pp. 4-5.

[75] Burke, *Second Letter on a Regicide Peace*, in *The Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke*, vol. 9, p. 282. It is to be noted that, while Burke may be the first to pick up the term 'diplomacy' concerning the international relationship (see *ODE*), he did not necessarily used it as positive term especially in this *Regicide Peace*. It seems to me to symbolize the change of age from negotiation to diplomacy as well as that from civility to civilization.

[76] Burke, *First Letter on a Regicide Peace*, pp. 249, 247-9.

[77] Burke, *First Letter on a Regicide Peace*, pp. 249, 242, 253.

5. The World of Chesterfield

As discussed above, the tradition of civility had been deeply concerned with the formation of the European international order maintained by the art of negotiation. At the same time with the advent of criticism to foreign travel, however, this civility of negotiation confronted with the crisis in the late eighteenth century. The fourth Earl of Chesterfield (1694-1773) was an aristocratic courtier, who would be the last master of this long-standing tradition of civility from Castiglione.

Chesterfield's career shows that he had been an ideal of 'the perfect courtier'. Although he was once expelled from the court owing to the opposition to Walpole, he held various posts successively; Lord of the Bedchamber of George II; Lord Steward of the Household, which had been the first dignity of the court; and later, Secretary of State for the North Department, which had been a head of the office to deal with foreign affairs. He also had been one of 'the most impressive diplomats', who was sent twice to The Hague.[78] So, his *Letters to His Son* (1774),[79] which had been written from 1737 onwards, must be never 'the morals of a whore and the manners of a dancing master' (Samuel Johnson). As shown below, it was a true masterpiece, which repeatedly instructed a whole system of European civility to Philip Stanhope, his natural son, who was just on the way of the European travel. According to Basil Willey, this *Letters* had 'the same ethos' as Hume. It 'may usefully show the kind of thing to which Hume's principles logically and naturally lead'.[80]

In these letters, Chesterfield admonished that 'manner is all in everything: it is by manner only that you can please, and consequently rise'. It is of importance no less than moral, and is the universal standard of the civil condition. Indeed 'moral virtues are the foundation of society in general', but 'attentions, manners, and graces both adorn and strengthen them'. And it is certain that the modes of such a civility 'vary according to persons, places, and circumstances, and are only to be acquired by observation and experience'. But, 'the substance of it is every where and eternally the same'.[81] He also pointed out that 'mutual complaisances, attentions, and sacrifices of little conveniences, are as natural an implied compact between civilized people, as protection and obedience are between kings and subjects'.[82]

It was required to master this civility for the European political elites. Especially for the diplomats, 'thorough knowledge of the world, polite manners, and an engaging address, are absolutely necessary'.[83] As Chesterfield taught, 'he has that to do every day, and every hour of the day, which is necessary to prepare and smooth the way for his business; that is to insinuate himself by his manners, not only into the houses, but into the confidence of the most considerable people of that place: to contribute to their pleasures, and insensibly not to be looked upon as a stranger

---

[78] Black, *British Diplomats and Diplomacy 1688-1800* (Exeter, Exeter U. P, 2001), p. 7.

[79] Chesterfield, *The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope 4th Earl of Chesterfield*, 6 vols, ed. Bonamy Dobrée (London, 1932).

[80] Basil Willey, *The English Moralists* (London: Chatto & Winds, 1964), p. 269.

[81] Cf. Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Discourses on Art*, ed. R. R. Wark (1797; New Haven, 1997). As he said, 'the general principles of urbanity, politeness, or civility, have been ever the same in all nations; but the mode in which they are dressed, is continually varying' (pp. 134-5, Discourse VII).

[82] Chesterfield, *The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope 4th Earl of Chesterfield*, 6 vols, ed. Bonamy Dobrée (London, 1932), pp. 1700, 1371, 1428-9.

[83] On this point, even Mrs. Montagu, one of the most severe critics, admitted the utility of his teaching. Elizabeth Montagu, *Mrs. Montagu "Queen of the Blues": Her Letters and Friendships from 1762 to 1800*, vol. 1, ed. Reginald Blunt (London: Constable and Company, 1923), p. 285.

himself'. And dancing, which is one of the skill to be acquired through the foreign travel, is very useful to learn 'the Graces'. 'The greatest advantage of dancing well is', he said, 'that it necessarily teaches you to present yourself, to sit, stand, and walk genteely'. One of the good examples is the first Duke of Marlborough, whose manner is 'irresistible, by either man or woman'. 'It was by this engaging, graceful manner, that he was enabled, during all his war, to connect the various and jarring powers of the Grand Alliance, and to carry them to the main object of the war, notwithstanding their private and separate views, jealousies, and wrong-headednesses'.[84]

The *Letters* was not only 'a veritable eighteenth-century courtesy-book', but also 'a worthy successor to the Renaissance manuals of deportment' (Willy).[85] Following the tradition of humanists and moralists, Chesterfield repeatedly emphasized the importance of decorum, the concept that had originated in Cicero.[86] As Chesterfield succeeded to say, this decorum, 'to do what is proper, and where it is proper', is 'the most important points of life'. Therefore, he recommended Cicero's *On Office* that 'contains whatever is necessary for dignity of manners'.[87] As other examples, he also referred to La Rochefoucault and La Bruyère to understand human characters, Bacon's aphorism that good forms are 'perpetual letters commendatory',[88] and Wotton's maxim '*I pensieri stretti, e il viso sciolto*'.[89]

Needless to say, the court was 'the best school for manners' for Chesterfield as well as for Hume. Chesterfield said that 'a man of parts and knowledge, who acquires the easy and noble manners of a court, is the most perfect '. Indeed, 'nothing in courts is exactly as it appears to be; often different, sometimes directly contrary'. But both for shepherds and ministers, 'human nature is the same everywhere, the modes only are different'[90]. As he explained below, politeness in the court is not a peculiar vice, but a necessary 'mode' to avoid violence.

'Courts are unquestionably the seats of politeness and good-breeding; were they not so, they would be the seats of slaughter and desolation. Those who now smile upon and embrace, would affront and stab each other if manners did not interpose'.[91]

The *Letters* is the complete book of civility which had been polished in European court society. As a fruit of the civilizing process from the Renaissance onward, it went through many editions. Including various abridgements, adaptations, translations, and unauthorized versions, it amounted to over one hundred editions by the end of the century.[92]

---

[84] Chesterfield, *The Letters,* pp.1704, 1895, 1234-5, 1262*.*
[85] Willey, *The English Moralist*, pp. 277-8.
[86] This topic was repeated again in *The World*（no. 189, August 12, 1756）. Adam Fitz-Adam, *The World* (London, New ed. 1782), pp. 207-14. Cf. Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, in his *Political Writings*, ed. David Armitage (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 280-92.
[87] Chesterfield, *The Letters,* pp.367, 1381.
[88] Bacon, *The Essayes or Ccunsels, Civill and Morall*, ed. Michael Kiernan, in *Oxford Francis Bacon XV* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), p. 157.
[89] Chesterfield, *The Letters,* pp.1207, 1404, 1867. But Chesterfierd mistook Wooton's Maxim with Machiavelli's.
[90] *Ibid*., pp. 2944, 1145, 1382, 1146, 2944.
[91] *Ibid*., p. 1383.
[92] S. L. Gulick, *A Chesterfield Bibliography to 1800* (1935; Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia, 1979).

As Johnson's criticism already indicated, however, the *Letters* has been attacked as strongly as Machiavelli's *The Prince*[93]. For example, Vicesimus Knox[94] insisted on 'the true Englishman' as Richard Hurd did, and quested for 'the spirit of truth, liberty, and virtue, public as well as private, chiefly to be found in the middle class'.[95] From his point of view, Chesterfield was a well-suited scapegoat for the effeminate and corrupted European court. According to Knox, the civility that was widely instructed in the *Letters* is only 'a variety of masks and disguises at hand, for all the purposes of selfish and knavish deceit'.[96]

Considering the current of the age toward nationalism and democracy, especially after the French revolution, it cannot be denied that the exceptional popularity of the *Letters* contained a great historical paradox. Especially the abridgements and adaptations of the *Letters* were inevitably inclined to be the convenient how-to manuals, rather than instructions for human perfection. It is easy to identify here the rise of the English middle class. But this does not mean only the decline of an *ancien régime* and an aristocracy. Civility was increasingly divided from the political world. The courtesy books were transformed to detailed lists of technical knowledge. As soon as the range of the reading public became wider, the main targets were shifted to 'home' and 'ladies'.[97] New terms of 'civilization' and 'etiquette' show this essential change of the age clearly. Probably they also tell the story of the decline of civility itself continuing to the present age.

Conclusion

As explored above, the tradition of European civility that had originated in the Renaissance court had been enduringly reproduced in early modern England, by the reception of courtesy books, the experience of foreign travel, and the practice of diplomatic negotiation. Chesterfield's *Letters* was a summa of this tradition of practical knowledge.

Civility had made it possible to converse with others both in daily life and political world. At Vienna in 1814-5, the Congress was still dancing. Civility had mediated between the different opinions and values, or ranks, ages, sexes, and nations, while it consolidated both the hierarchical and international order. It would alleviate, I think, 'some of the central anomalies… in what we value politically and what we suppose to be politically possible' (John Dunn).[98] In the case of

---

[93] Against this current, see J. C. Collins, *Essays and Studies* (London, 1895), pp. 193-262; Roger Coxton, *Chesterfield and His Critics* (London, 1925). But, J. R. Woodhouse, *From Castiglione to Chesterfield: The Decline in the Courtier's Manual*, An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 25 October 1990 (Oxford, 1991).

[94] R. W. Uphaus, 'Vicesimus Knox and the Canon of Eighteenth-Century Literature', in P. J. Korshin ed. *The Age of Johnson: A Scholarly Annual* 4 (New York, AMS Press, 1991), pp. 345-61.

[95] Vicesimus Knox, *Liberal Education: or, A Practical Treatise on the Methods of Acquiring Useful and Polite Learning* (London, 3rd ed.1781), pp.301-2; *The Spirit of Despotism* (4th ed. 1821), p. 39 (Section 16).

[96] Knox, *Personal Nobility or Letters to a Nobleman on the Conduct of His Studies and the Dignity of the Peerage* (London, 1793), p. 317. Cf. Knox, 'On the Superior Value of Solid Accomplishments: A Dialogue between Cicero and Lord Chesterfield', in his *Essays Moral and Literary*, vol. 2 (London, 1778), pp. 275-8.

[97] Michael Curtin, 'A Question of Manners: Status and Gender in Etiquette and Courtesy', *Journal of Modern History* 57 (1985), pp. 395-423; *Propriety and Position: A Study of Victorian Manners* (New York, 1987); Marjorie Morgan, *Manners, Morals and Class in England, 1774-1858* (Basingstoke, 1994).

[98] John Dunn, *Western Political Theory in the Face of the Future* (Cambridge U. P, 1979), p. vii.

Hume who played the role of an ambassador sent to the world of conversation, he supposed 'the ladies' as his 'sovereigns'.[99] In addition, he regarded 'old men' and 'strangers and foreigners' as those who 'receive the highest civilities' in all polite countries.[100]

In 1600, a Dutch vessel 'De Liefde' whose stern figure was Erasmus shipwrecked on the coast of Kyushu island, Japan. Among the survivors, Jan Joosten and William Adams were employed later as foreign advisors by the Tokugawa government. In a letter written in 1611, Adams reported that 'the people of this island of Japon are good of nature, courteous above measure, and valiant in war'. And he added that 'they are governed in great civility. I mean, not a land better governed in the world by civil policy'.[101] In spite of a tincture of the Orientalism, the early modern Japan was often recognized as 'a school of civility and good manners'.[102] In *The Capital of the Tycoon* (1863), Sir Rutherford Alcock, the first English ambassador, still noted that 'the Japanese are as perfect gentleman as could be found in any part of the world'.[103]

Such a mutual recognition of civility made these conversations between others possible. However, the progress (or decline) from civility to etiquette after the nineteenth century indicates that a certain historical cleavage was in the European civilisation. The historical process toward leveling and independence, but also toward the enclosed nation-states and empires for expansion was irreversible. In 1853, the modern conversation between the Western world and Japan was to be restarted suddenly by the American steam gunboats. If we are in need of mutual civility for democracy especially in the context of globalization and multiculturalism, it is also true that we lost one tradition of civility at the same time that the age of modern democracy just started.[104]

---

[99] Hume, 'Of Essay Writing', pp. 570-1.

[100] Hume, *Political Essays*, p. 74.

[101] Thomas Rundall ed. *Memorials of the Empire of Japon: in the XVI and XVII Centuries* (London, 1850), p. 32.

[102] Eiko Ikegami, *Bonds of Civility: Aesthetic Networks and the Political Origins of Japanese Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. P, 2005), pp. 19-21.

[103] Sir Rutherford Alcock, *The Capital of the Tycoon: A Narrative of a Three Year's Residence in Japan*, vol. 1 (London, 1863), p. 196. In 1858, Lord Elgin, an envoy to China and formerly Governor-General of Canada, noted on Japanese system of civility as follows. 'Every man from the Emperor (who never leave his palace) to the humblest labourer, lives under a rigid rule, prescribed by law and custom combined … but, in so far as one can judge, this system is not felt to be burdensome by any. All seem to think it the most natural thing in the world that they should move in the orbit in which they are placed'. Theodore Walrond ed. *Letters and Journals of James, Eighth Earl of Elgin* (London, 1872), p.270.

[104] After that, we have faced a historical paradox that 'baffled Mr. Jefferson', that is 'how to adapt European systems of etiquette and protocol, based on court life and hereditary social classes, in order to make them appropriate for a democracy'. Judith Martin, *Common Courtesy: In which Miss Manners Solves the Problem that Baffled Mr. Jefferson* (New York: Atheneum, 1985), pp. 3-4. On the problem of 'civilizing the republic', see Philip Pettit, *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government* (Oxford: Oxford U. P, 1997), ch. 8.