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Abstract: Although modern geotourism, as a form of sustainable geoheritage tourism, was only recognized as such in the 1990s, its roots lie in the seventeenth century and the Grand Tour with its domestic equivalents. At that time, a few elite travellers recorded their experiences of landscapes, natural wonders, quarries and mines. Such travellers’ observations were supplemented by those of the antiquarians for much of the eighteenth century; at that century’s close, the first modern geologists were recording their observations. The nineteenth century witnessed an explosion in public interest and engagement with geology, and field excursions were provided by the burgeoning natural history and geology societies. By the close of the nineteenth century, the Romantic movement had successfully promoted wild landscapes to a newly expanding urban population. The development of the Grand Tour and the landscape aesthetic movements, the various influential institutions, key personalities and locations are considered insofar as they provide an overview of the background to historical geotourism. All are underpinned by a theoretical consideration of the geotourism paradigm and how geotourism historical studies can contextualize modern geotourism.

Many of those who go into this field are fundamentally romantics – about being close to nature in their field work, or about pondering the great events that took place millions of years ago and the evolution of the scenery that we are now privileged to walk in. Interest in most of us is quickened by the very idea of the vast panorama of organic evolution: the feeling of being witness to a brief glimpse of a tremendous story encompassing some 5000 million years of earth history, the feeling of being close to forces powerful enough to thrust up mountain ranges and pull apart the ocean basins. (Baird 1968, p. 223)

Many Earth scientists journey and spend time ‘in the field’ for the purposes of their employment and, if they are fortunate, sometimes in places that have some grandeur. Even their holidays might partly be spent ‘in the field’ in pursuit of their interests. However, few will consider how their holiday activities align with patterns of leisure travel, to common locations, established some considerable time ago. Most will know little of the development of their disciplines, although they will be familiar with some locality names in the, especially stratigraphical, nomenclature. No more than a handful will make any connection between, say, geology and tourism and being ‘in the field’. Again, only a handful will recognize the nature and value of the data on Earth science localities and phenomena within the accounts of travellers and tourists intent on recording their impressions (in print and image), to inform others about what they had seen and done, rather than empirical observation. Some Earth scientists will have heard about ‘geotourism’, even if they do not understand its historical and cultural implications; they will, if coming to it for the first time, deduce it has ‘something’ to do with tourism and either geology or geography.

It was with that knowledge and understanding gap and the general lack of historical geotourism literature in mind that the Appreciating Physical Landscapes: Geotourism 1670–1970 conference was organized by the History of Geology Group, or HOGG. Its presentations and posters, although not all are represented herein, form the basis of this volume, which is also supplemented by commissioned papers. The conference particularly sought material that moved beyond mere description of past events to provide critical analysis and contextualization of modern geotourism provision. Inevitably, the material has a western European bias (Fig. 1), but the places considered and the approaches adopted by various authors have a wider interest and application. Given the eclectic mix of papers and locations, coupled with the likelihood that many of the volume’s readers will possess limited knowledge and understanding of the development of tourism in aesthetically attractive landscapes, this introductory paper seeks to provide that essential background; its time frame reflects major political, social, cultural and scientific events in Britain and Europe (Fig. 2) and the countries over which they had influence elsewhere in the world.

Although there has been increasing interest in tourism as a practical and an academic discipline since its emergence from geography in the mid-1970s (Hall & Page 2008), the literature on the historical study of tourism is surprisingly sparse (Towner 1984, p. 215) and naturally more so for...
geotourism. However, a recent volume (Wyse-Jackson 2007) has explored the historical travel component of geological inquiries. This sparseness is despite widely available textual and visual sources that, once their limitations are accepted, can be used to reconstruct key phases of past landscape tourism provision and experiences. It was particularly to promote the potential of such sources that Appreciating Physical Landscapes: Geotourism 1670–1970 was organized; the introduction to its abstracts volume (Hose 2012a) noted that ‘Travellers, tourists and scientists practised activities nowadays subsumed within the modern geotourism paradigm long before geotourism itself was formally recognised’, and the papers in this volume underscore this truth.

Defining geotourism: a new geological paradigm

The long engagement of some countries in mainland Europe and the British Isles in geological study has resulted in many of their geosites and geomorphosites, rocks, minerals and fossil (or geodiversity) prominently featuring in modern Earth sciences literature – particularly as type material and global stratotypes. Their museums, libraries, archives and universities house the legacy of much of this collected and published geological study. Today, this material is sometimes poorly regarded and even considered a costly liability with no practical use by the stakeholders of the institutions in which it is housed. It was partly to address such issues that geotourism was developed. Geotourism was first employed as a discrete term in the mid-1990s for ‘The provision of interpretive and service facilities to enable tourists to acquire knowledge and understanding of the geology and geomorphology of a site (including its contribution to the development of the Earth sciences) beyond the level of mere aesthetic appreciation’ (Hose 1995a, p. 17). Hence, it is expected that its participants (or ‘geotourists’) have some interest, however limited, in understanding what they have seen. Its initial recognition and definition followed studies (Hose 1995a) on some geosites with interpretation funded by English Nature (the precursor of Natural England). Whilst several European geologists had fleetingly mentioned tourism and geology (De Bastion 1994;

![Fig. 1. Map of Europe and the regions covered in this volume’s papers. This map shows the main areas (excepting northern Norway and Australia) encompassed by the volume’s papers.](http://sp.lyellcollection.org/Downloaded-from/http://sp.lyellcollection.org/ by guest on August 31, 2021)
Martini 1994; Spiteri 1994; Page 1998), they had neither defined their understanding of geotourism nor discussed its participants (that is, geotourists).

Hence, the first published definition, with some of its associated concepts, was that which was fittingly cited in the Geoparks Programme Feasibility Study (Patzak & Eder 1998; UNESCO 2000); the study also included the essential elements of the later redefinition to ‘The provision of interpretative facilities and services to promote the value and societal benefit of geologic and geomorphologic sites and their materials, and ensure their conservation, for the use of students, tourists and other recreationalists’ (Hose 2000, p. 136). Thus, at the outset, geotourism encompassed geosite interpretative and promotional provision, together with the artefacts, places and memorials of their associated Earth scientists; these were intended to underpin the conservation of geosites and geomorphosites, as well as geological collections and archives. This approach was incorporated, demonstrably building upon the previously widely accepted and cited definitions (Hose 1995b, 2000), including recent landscape studies (Hose 2008, 2010a, 2010b), in the updated definition of geotourism as ‘The provision of interpretative and service facilities for geosites and geomorphosites and their encompassing topography, together with their associated In situ and Ex situ artefacts, to constituency-build for their conservation by generating appreciation, learning and research by and for current and future generations’ (Hose 2012b, p. 11); it employs an easily and globally accurately translatable vocabulary for the nature, focus and location of modern geology-based geotourism with a geoconservation purpose; see Wilson (1994) for a summary and Burek & Prosser (2008) for a history of geoconservation.

This approach (Hose 2012b) and its development
have already been examined (Hose 2011) and need not be covered in detail herein, but it is re-presented as the ‘4Gs model of geotourism’ (Fig. 3).

Other European authors have employed broader geotourism definitions. For English Nature’s geologists, it was ‘travelling in order to experience, learn from and enjoy our Earth heritage’ (Larwood & Prosser 1998, p. 98). Frey and her colleagues, from experience in Germany’s Vulkaneifel Geopark (where geoscientific, economic and political considerations combined to develop a somewhat commercially orientated approach) suggested, ‘Geotourism means interdisciplinary cooperation within an economic, success-orientated and fast moving discipline that speaks its own language. Geotourism is a new occupational and business sector. The main tasks of geotourism are the transfer and communication of geoscientific knowledge and ideas to the general public’ (Frey et al. 2008, pp. 97–98). The introductory paper of the inaugural issue of Poland’s Geoturystyka defined geotourism as an ‘offshoot of cognitive tourism and/or adventure tourism based upon visits to geological objects (geosites) and recognition of geological processes integrated with aesthetic experiences gained by the contact with a geosite’ (Slomka & Kicinska-Swiderska 2004, p. 6). As Gray noted, ‘The fundamental principle of tourism is that places are different and provide different experiences and changes of environment. It follows, therefore, that geotourism must be based on geodiversity, i.e. geotourism provides the opportunity to experience different geologies, geological environments and landscapes and/or take part in geological activities’ (Gray 2008, p. 295). However, his definition of geotourism as ‘Tourism based on an area’s geological or geomorphological resources that attempts to minimise the impacts of this tourism through geoconservation management’ (Gray 2008, p. 295) seemingly excludes secondary geosites (Hose 2003; Hose & Vasiljevic 2012) typically displaying material collected from many sources.

In Australia, Dowling & Newsome (2008) produced the first text entitled Geotourism and clearly promoted geotourism’s geological approach. Their later text, Geotourism: The Tourism of Geology and Landscape (Newsome & Dowling 2010), noted ‘Geotourism is a form of natural area tourism that specifically focuses on geology and landscape. It promotes tourism to geosites and the conservation of geo-diversity and an understanding of earth sciences through appreciation and learning. This is achieved through independent visits to geological features, use of geo-trails and view points, guided tours, geoactivities and patronage of geosite visitor centres’, p. 232. Dowling (2013) promoted geotourism as an emerging form of sustainable tourism but emphasized its geological basis. In the USA, a more geographical approach to geotourism has developed; this is due to National Geographic ignoring the significant volume of published European
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**Fig. 3.** The four Gs of geotourism model. In this visualization of geotourism, the locations and areas of the individual elements, together with their linking pointers, indicate their interrelationships and relative significances. It is a development of that published as the three Gs in Hose (2012b) but now includes geoconservation, geohistory, geo-interpretation and geosites/geomorphosites (or scenery).
geotourism work and then erroneously claiming to have singularly coined the term as a ‘destination’s geographic character – the entire combination of natural and human attributes that make one place distinct from another’ (Stueve et al. 2002, p. 1); this approach is essentially sustainable tourism with a holistic approach to aesthetic landscapes.

In Europe, some confusion ensued when some members of the European Geoparks Network issued, without consulting any other interested parties, the Arouca Declaration in 2011; this accepted the National Geographic approach, with a geoheritage emphasis, when its organizing committee indicated ‘that there is a need to clarify the concept of geotourism. We therefore believe that geotourism should be defined as tourism which sustains and enhances the identity of a territory, taking into consideration its geology, environment, culture, aesthetics, heritage and the well-being of its residents. Geological tourism is one of the multiple components of geotourism.’ The committee, probably unwittingly, had actually embraced ‘ecotourism’. Ecotourism is defined by the World Tourism Organization (WTO) as ‘tourism which leads to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems’ (WTO 1997). It was a somewhat disputed break with the purely geological approach adopted by the majority of Europe’s governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and authorities. Such fragmentation of the established consensus on geotourism is at best unhelpful to its stakeholders, and at worst divisive; it is also confusing to governments and funding bodies. Many geotourism practitioners and researchers, whilst accepting its geological focus, appreciate the benefits of cooperating with other heritage and nature conservation parties; geotourism’s encompassing of aesthetic landscapes, or scenery (Hose 2010b), would seem to make this inevitable.

Geotourism, however and by whomsoever it is defined (see Fig. 4), is a form of ‘niche’ (Hose 2005; Novelli 2005) or ‘special interest’ (Weiler & Hall 1992) tourism in which the ‘traveller’s motivation and decision-making are primarily determined by a particular special interest...[that] implies “active” or “experiential” travel’ (Hall & Weiler 1992, p. 5). There is an obvious link with special interest travel (such as was required for the Grand Tour) which is for ‘people who are going somewhere because they have a particular interest that can be pursued in a particular region or at a particular destination’ (Read 1980, p. 195). As an element of niche tourism it offers participants a ‘meaningful set of experiences in the knowledge that their needs and wants are being met’ (Novelli 2005, p. 1). Modern geotourism provision meets geotourists’ needs by attracting them to particular localities with spectacular or readily appreciated, and usually (on-site and/or off-site) interpreted, geological and/or geomorphological features. At the participant level, it is ‘recreational geology’ that, unlike many forms of countryside (and for that matter, urban) recreation, is not limited by the seasons (Hose 1996, p. 211).

It is relatively easy to define and categorize geotourists on their level of engagement, together with what and where they undertake an expressed (that, is observable and recordable) geotouristic activity. Simplistically, two geotourist groups can be recognized, ‘casual’ and ‘dedicated’ (Hose 2000). The former occasionally visit geosites mainly for recreation, pleasure and some limited intellectual stimulation; provision for them in the form of populist guides, trails and visitor centres is relatively recent. The latter intentionally visit geosites for the purpose of personal educational or intellectual improvement and enjoyment; provision for them in the
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<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>Urban</th>
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<th>Appreciation</th>
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<th>Geo-conservation</th>
<th>Geo-interpretation</th>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Fry et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Newsome &amp; Dowling</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012b</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Fig. 4. Table of the summarized content of some geotourism definitions and their associated discussions. The summary, because it is necessarily based upon an interpretation of the associated discussions, is a subjective evaluation. It was developed by examining the definitions and any supporting or explanatory texts. The sources for the definitions can be found in the references. The shaded definition (Hose 2012b) is that which has been adopted for this volume. An extended summary table of definitions can be found in Hose (2012b, table 1).
form of field guides and journal papers is long-standing. Geotourists can also be split into ‘recreational’ and ‘educational’ geotourists (Hose 1997). A typology of field excursionists, based upon their expressed behaviour, has been published (Hose 2006) and in modified form is re-presented herein (Fig. 5); it suggests how, with further refinement, historic geotourists might be categorized. In terms of location, we can split them into ‘rural’ and ‘urban’ geotourists and then refine the localities they visit on their physiographical characteristics.

The locations visited by the various categories can overlap, although their usages and understandings are often very different, and can be chiefly split into ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ geosites (Hose 2003). Primary geosites have geological and/or geomorphological features, either natural or artificial and generally permanently exposed, within a delimited area and of some significance for their scientific, educational or interpretative value; they range from quarries and natural cliffs to mines and caves (Cope 2014) requiring husbandry rather than strict preservation, for much of their value lies in the access they provide to in situ rocks and their fossils and minerals. They can be refined on the nature of the localities at which geotouristic activities are focussed; for example coastal (van den Ancker & Jungerius, this volume, in press), mountainous/alpine (Cayla et al. 2015; Gordon & Baker 2015; Migon 2014; Whalley, this volume, in press), volcanic (Hose 2010a; Pullin 2014) and mining localities (Bristow 2015), and waterfalls (Hudson 2015). Tourists visiting waterfalls have a long history, and in the eighteenth century they were briefly termed ‘cataractists’, perhaps an interesting descriptor worth resurrecting. Secondary geosites have some feature(s) and/or item(s), within or on a structure or delimited area, of at least local significance to the history, development, presentation or interpretation of geology or geomorphology; these include museum, library and archive (Larwood 2014) collections, heritage/visitor centres, geologists’ residences, memorials along with commemorative plaques and monuments.

What is much harder to determine is why, unless they record their reasons for particular actions, geotourists undertake a specific activity. However, inferences from their previous actions or from the context of their visits can be made. Thus, it might (probably erroneously) be inferred that participants on geology field trips are intent on learning about geology, when the prime motive might well be social, as Hose (2006) has suggested in drawing attention to the expressed, and possible motivations for, the behaviours of geology excursionists. It could be argued that geotourism, particularly of a more dedicated nature (Hose 2000, p. 136), is a restricted market dependent upon better-educated and wealthier tourists, broadly corresponding to Plog’s (1974) ‘allocentric’ tourists (Hall & Weiler 1992, p. 4), since their interest in geosites is mainly self-education and intellectual improvement. Alternatively, casual geotourists are drawn to geosites
for pleasure and social interaction; they commonly visit for informal educational experiences for themselves and accompanying children (Hose 1996).

It was almost solely due to European academics and practitioners that geotourism emerged in the 1990s as a field of study, publication and practice (Hose 2008). Due to the volume of published material, general usage (especially in policy documents), practice and growth (Dowling 2011 2013), it can be argued that geotourism has a substantial enough theoretical and conceptual status that it now qualifies as a new geological paradigm. The Oxford English Dictionary defines it as ‘a paradigm as ‘a typical example or pattern of something; a pattern or model’, whilst the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary defines it as ‘a philosophical and theoretical framework of a scientific school or discipline within which theories, laws, and generalizations and the experiments performed in support of them are formulated; broadly: a philosophical or theoretical framework of any kind’. In planning the Appreciating Physical Landscapes: Geotourism 1670–1970 conference, and in editing this volume, the author considers that in accepting such definitions ‘geotourism’ unquestionably has attained the status of a modern geological paradigm. It has benefitted from several quite recent volumes (Dowling & Newsome 2008; Erfurt-Cooper & Cooper 2010; Newsome & Dowling 2010; Hose in press) and widely published, if sometimes divergent or vague, definitions. As a geologically based contemporary approach to essentially aesthetic landscape promotion, geotourism was first recognized and defined in England (Hose 1995a 2011). It was developed partly as a response to the loss, for geological field study, of an increasing number of the UK’s quarries and mines due to landfill and reclamation schemes (Ellis 1996, p. 83), as well as unsympathetic after uses that sought to recreate aesthetically pleasing vistas. Natural geosites and geomorphosites were concomitantly facing losses consequent upon planning decisions and design considerations for road and coastal defence construction (Ellis 1996, p. 83). For the former, soil covering and netting cuttings (Baird 1994), and for the latter, the pouring of much concrete (Leafe 1998), were particular problems. Similarly, changing agricultural practices in the UK’s uplands, such as drainage improvements and afforestation (Ellis 1996, p. 83) and new active leisure provision such as skiing and mountain biking (Ruff & Mellors 1993) have, or at least have been perceived to (Brown 2014), deleteriously affect geomorphosites.

Gray (2008) has noted that ‘Just as “geodiversity” was developed as the abiotic equivalent of “biodiversity”, so “geotourism” has become a popular topic in recent years as the abiotic parallel of “ecotourism”. Many definitions of “ecotourism” exist, including: “A tourism market based on an area’s natural resources that attempts to minimize the ecological impact of the tourism” and “Tourism supported by natural ecological attributes of an area’.” (Gray 2008, p. 295). Hence, geotourism is a geoheritage promotional approach with parallels in ecotourism. Further, its antecedents lie in the landscape aesthetic movements that promoted travel, especially into ‘wild’ areas, popularly followed from the mid-eighteenth century onwards (Hose 2008) by the social elite of the UK and Europe. These movements partly built upon the experiences and publications that had arisen from the Grand Tour. On this, Stoye (1989) has noted the increasing number of travellers who, as part of their employment, accompanied merchants and the gentry but neglected the artisan journeymen; this omission undoubtedly reflected the nature of the available written resources and the limited market for travel publications – a constraint to consider when the Grand Tour is examined.

Dann (1999) has suggested that, prior to the twentieth century, travel writing was essentially real-world reportage; this was usually a narrative of an actual journey in a foreign setting, ideally suited to the, especially imperial, explorations of the late Victorian age. Hence the travel book dealt with facts, and this scientific emphasis was confirmed by an index, footnotes and a bibliography, similar to a treatise in geography, history or some allied discipline’ (Dann 1999, p. 162). He further suggested that such reportage lacked interest because it was merely a precise chronicle of observations and discoveries, lacking a critical or interpretative element. In 1811, the architect Henry Holland (1745–1806) disparagingly commented that ‘nobody you know, travels now a days without writing a quarto to tell the world where he has been, etcetera, what he has beheld’ (in Barton 1998, p. 3) and clearly would have welcomed the well-researched focussed accounts that began to appear within a decade – especially for England’s Lake District, if not for the Grand Tour.

The Grand Tour: the precursor to aesthetic landscape tourism

The Grand Tour is Europe’s first widespread tourism phenomenon for which there is a considerable written and published record in the form of personal artwork, diaries, journals and letters; the information quality varies widely but usually does enable the elucidation of tourists’ itineraries, their impressions of the countries through which they passed, and details of the people, customs and accommodations. The Grand Tour’s accounts (Towner 1984), its
participants and the possible reasons for its demise have been critically discussed by Towner (1985), who traced some 900. He cautioned that plagiarism, with the incorporation of material from guidebooks and journals written by other travellers suggesting thoroughness of observation but without any actual first-hand study, is an issue in both published journals and unpublished diaries and journals of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. An illustrated, mainly descriptive introductory history has been published (Hibbert 1969) and further accounts cover its Italian (Black 1993; Wilton & Bignamini 1996) component and its cities (Sweet 2012), landscapes (Chard 1999) and British participants (Black 2003) in some detail. Its female participants (Chard 1999; Dolan 2001) have also been considered.

The journey was first described by the Roman Catholic priest Lassels; he had tutored several young English noblemen with whom he travelled through Italy on five separate tours. His book’s introduction listed four arenas in which travelling through France and Italy would benefit young noblemen: the intellectual; the social; the political; and the ethical – by drawing moral instruction from what was seen. Thomas Nugent’s four-volume *The Grand Tour* ... of 1749 was perhaps unusual for such a text in that it included topographical and geomorphological information; for example, volume 1, on Holland, has the sort of agrarian reportage – ‘The soil of Holland is hollow, soft and fenny, and not very fit for the plough; the country is flat and even, for that one sees neither hill nor mountain, except those little sandy hillocks, which are a barrier against the ocean’ (Nugent 1749, p.8) – that would have interested Arthur Young. In volume 3, on Italy, he notes on Naples that ‘there cannot in all respects be a more agreeable place to live in, did not the eruptions of neighbouring mount Vesuvius, together with the earthquakes sometimes disturb their quiet’ (Nugent 1749, p. 353). His preface to the four volumes stated that ‘Tho’ most gentlemen are presumed to have some knowledge of geography, yet as this is not always the case, a general description of the several countries is prefixed to each volume, with an account of the situation, extent, climate, soil, seas, rivers, and mountains’ (Nugent 1749, p. iv). Thomas Nugent (c. 1700–1772) was an Anglo-Irish antiquary who also published *Travels through Germany* ... in 1768 following a 1766 journey. His accounts include much about antiquities, customs, fashions, manufactures and politics, together with sound practical advice to travellers.

The Grand Tourists primarily visited those European cities considered major centres of culture, especially, Paris, Rome, and Venice; however, Florence and Naples were also popular destinations. The latter meant a visit to Mount Vesuvius was inevitable; when antiquarians began to excavate Herculaneum and Pompeii, in 1738 and 1748, respectively, they became major destinations. A classic account, in the form of published letters, of a geographically extended (to Greece and Turkey) 1794–96 Grand Tour by John Bacon Sawrey Morriss (1985) is significant for its mention of Naples. Whilst his observations are mainly on cultural heritage and practical matters, he provides brief but useful information on the effect of the volcanic activity of Vesuvius on Torre del Greco, where ‘The place smokes still, and six months after the eruption the fire was seen running under it’ (Morritt 1985, p. 267). Of course, Vesuvius is where the origins of modern vulcanology can be traced. Sir William Hamilton (1731–1803), an antiquarian who studied both Vesuvius and Etna, was awarded the Copley Medal by the Royal Society in 1770 for ‘An Account of a Journey to Mount Etna’. He was posted to Naples as a diplomat from 1764 to 1800; his early years there coincided with Vesuvius becoming quite active. In 1766 he sent an account of the eruption, together with drawings and samples of salts and sulphurs, to the Royal Society, following which he was elected a Fellow. In 1767 Vesuvius again erupted and he duly sent a second report to the Royal Society; the two reports were published in the Society’s *Philosophical Transactions*. A recent biography (Constantine 2001) provides a summary of his vulcanological activities.

The Grand Tour of some 2 to 4 years, as described by Lassels and Nugent, had begun in the sixteenth century and reached its acme in the eighteenth century. Its most popular itinerary, followed for some 300 years, began in Paris, thence through the Rhone valley and southern France to view classical Roman remains, after which came a crossing of the Alps followed by a tour of the cities of northern Italy (including Turin, Milan and Venice) before visiting Florence, Rome and Naples, and returning through Germany, the Rhine and Holland to England. However, whilst initially the tourists were chiefly focussed on art objects and architecture, by the late eighteenth century their interests and recorded responses had shifted towards the Romantic consideration of townscapes and landscapes; they were passionate about medieval structures and wild nature with its sublime and picturesque scenery. Indeed, much of the revised tour route can now be viewed as a form of ‘scenic tourism’; that is, early or historical geotourism – the focus of this volume. The tourists were mainly, but not exclusively, young English bachelors and a few women (Dolan 2001) of means; they were seeking to broaden their horizons whilst specifically learning about architecture, art, geography and...
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culture. Lady Mary Coke (1727–1811) undertook various European tours between 1756 and 1791 and despite subsequently publishing a 26-volume journal (recounting her experiences between 1766 and 1774), much of her observations remains in private hands and unpublished. She was not, as perusal of her gossip-ridden private life indicates, a typical Grand Tourist – most only did the one tour. Like the journals of Celia Fiennes, the great English domestic grand tourist, hers were originally intended only for family consumption.

Unlike art and social reportage, landscape appreciation was initially a minor, generally accidental, commonly ignored element of the Tour. However, journal entries and letters provide much useful information on the perceptions and perils, particularly of mountainous country travel. As Towner (1985) has noted, the influence of the general cultural environment on travel motives can be seen through the increasing interest in the seventeenth century of Europe’s fine and decorative arts. Similarly there was an increase from the seventeenth century in the number of scientific travellers. Empirical factual accounts padded out many travel journal entries. This was especially stimulated in England by the establishment of the Royal Society in 1662. Following the rise of the professional, or at least gentlemanly, scientist this aspect of the tour declined after the 1780s. However, ‘An interest in natural scenery was of little consequence for the spatial pattern of the Grand Tour in the seventeenth century. While some interest was shown in rural scenery (particularly fertile, humanized landscapes), these sentiments were mainly confined to incidental observations while traveling to the major cultural centers’ (Towner 1985, p. 314). The principal cultural centre was Rome.

It is to Rome that the beginnings of antiquarianism, the systematic study of sites and their artefacts, can be traced, which would later help to underpin geological discovery and reportage. Of course, getting to Italy meant a crossing of the Alps, and it is accounts of these crossings that give cultural historians the first glimpses of attitudes to and perceptions of such wild ‘frightful’ places. Other locations visited by the more adventurous Grand Tourists included Germany and east Europe, the Balkans and the Baltic, and Spain and Portugal. As Towner (1985) has noted the quest for reliable routes between the major centres that also provided scenic vistas explains why many focussed on the Rhine valley, especially between Mainz and Cologne, and its major tributary valleys such as the Moselle; indeed, such valley routes evolved from a convenient route to a scenic attraction in their own right. Further, ‘The desire to reach the Rhine quickly can be seen in the development of routes from Ostend to Brussels and Cologne’ (Towner 1985, p. 314). This, along with changing tastes, might well explain the virtual abandonment of some formerly popular routes and areas, such as the Loire valley in the seventeenth and Holland in the eighteenth century.

In alpine Europe, the significance of road improvements can be especially noted when ‘Wild scenery could be appreciated in the Jura and Italy and its northern lakes reached via a route made fit for carriages by Napoleon in the early 1800s’ (Towner 1985, p. 314). For those Grand Tourists sojourning in Switzerland, Lake Geneva was a focal point for tours to Chamonix and Lauterbrunnen and Grindelwald. Lake Lucerne was the centre from which an ascent of Mount Rigi (1798 m) commenced, a key element of the Grand Tour itinerary. Interestingly from an historical geotourism perspective, the mountain’s name is derived from ‘rigenen’ which is the stratification clearly visible on its northern aspect. The principal route across the Alps into Italy was the Simplon Pass. This was the route taken by Wordsworth and a companion in 1790, after they had visited Chamonix, and described in letters to his sister and in the much later posthumously published The Prelude of 1850. Their mid-August crossing was prior to the Napoleonic widening, and they initially took the wrong route. Until the widespread publication of reliable topographic maps and detailed guidebooks (with instructions other than to hire a local guide!) such confusions were not uncommon. Wordsworth’s poetical account in book VI of The Prelude of his alpine ramblings is a little confusing, and the note to his sister that ‘At Brig we quitted the Valais, and passed the Alps at Simpion, in order to visit part of Italy. The impressions of three hours of our walk among the Alps will never be effaced‘, at least makes it clear he found the journey memorable despite the low cloud and mist that made his route finding difficult.

The Grand Tour was an institution that survived virtually unchanged until the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, from 1789 to 1815, made it particularly hazardous for young British aristocrats, as well as the offspring of the rich mercantile class, to venture abroad. The effective closure of continental Europe to the British Grand Tourists provided the stimulus for the discovery and literary promotion of Britain’s upland landscapes; these were then promoted, perhaps astonishingly to the modern mind, as substitutes for the Alps with which Wordsworth and his literary and artistic contemporaries were themselves familiar from their own Grand Tours. At the same time the south and southwest coasts of England were promoted as the new Riviera, and Italianate villas and formal, often terraced, gardens were constructed; the beginnings of the English scenic tour
had been established. Following the peace and relative political stability brought to Europe by the outcome of the Battle of Waterloo in 1815 and the rapid development of railways from the 1840s, the equivalent of the Grand Tour experience was available in a much shorter time frame to a much wider range of participants; elite tourism was giving way to the first wave of mass tourism.

**Geotourism contextualized within European landscape tourism**

The first published history of UK geotourism (Hose 2008), although an earlier consideration of the historical aspects of Europe’s published geoheritage had been provided (Hose 2000), noted that ‘Since many of the activities it encompasses have antecedents in considerably earlier natural science and aesthetic movements, the development of tourism that can be directly attributed to the promotion of landscape and geology must be examined; the former dating from the late seventeenth and the latter from the early nineteenth centuries’ (Hose 2008, p. 37). The second such account (Hose 2010a), focussed on volcanic geotourism on Scotland’s west coast, also noted that ‘From the early 19th century, commercial tourist literature generated specific expectations of landscapes. Landscapes are social and cultural constructs with tourists’ perceptions and their values ascribed to them an admixture of direct observation and cultural interpretation’ (Hose 2010a, p. 260). It has been specifically noted that mining locations ‘must be analyzed within the context of the scenery that surrounds them, not only in terms of monuments or buildings, but also as part of a series of relics that indicate a continuous process of change, which in turn is a result of the inevitable interaction of all human activities with the surrounding environment. In other words, scenery is the mirror of society, and it expresses the physical and symbolic effects of successive human actions on nature. However, at the same time, this scenery is not neutral, for each person adopts his/her own point of view. One consequence of this is the reductive and unilateral attitude that interprets and values scenery from a strictly visual and aesthetic perspective’ (Edwards & Llurdes 1996, p. 358). Accordingly, this paper touches upon these, particularly insofar as they are explored by other papers in this volume. Encompassing some 300 years of landscape-focussed tourism it is best approached by examining locations, personalities, publications and images key to its development. From the Renaissance, leisure travellers in Europe and farther afield selected the landscapes that best matched their quest for the novel, exotic and authentic. Specific expectations about the places and landscapes they planned to or did visit were created and influenced by images in art galleries and their reproduction in postcards and guidebooks together with the latter’s place descriptions and instructions for travellers.

The perceptions of landscapes and the values ascribed to them by travellers are a combination of their processing of direct observation and subsequent interpretation influenced by their education and expectations, the cultural filter of the ‘tourist gaze’. This model of the tourist gaze, developed from that published in Hose (2010a, 2010b), notes the input of artistic and literary material that influences the content of tourist guidebooks; it also notes that artists and authors are partially a subset of travellers and tourists. It stresses the significance of the tourist guidebook acting as a cultural filter on what the tourist sees and understands about landscape. It emphasizes that what the tourist actually sees lies beyond the mere physical landscape that is viewed, suggesting for some an aesthetic spiritual element – much as was envisaged by the Picturesque movement.

![Fig. 6. Model of the tourist gaze.](http://sp.lyellcollection.org/) This model, developed from that published in Hose (2010a, 2010b), notes the input of artistic and literary material that influences the content of tourist guidebooks; it also notes that artists and authors are partially a subset of travellers and tourists. It stresses the significance of the tourist guidebook acting as a cultural filter on what the tourist sees and understands about landscape. It emphasizes that what the tourist actually sees lies beyond the mere physical landscape that is viewed, suggesting for some an aesthetic spiritual element – much as was envisaged by the Picturesque movement.
gaze’ (Fig. 6). Landscapes are an admixture of elements ordered and bounded by travellers’ knowledge and experiences. Across Europe and elsewhere different regions with similar landscapes were visited and recorded by travellers (Bristow 2015; Hudson 2015; Mather 2014; Vasiljević et al. 2014), tourists (Cayla et al. 2015), artists (Ancker & Jungerius, this volume, in press; Pullin 2014), writers and poets (this paper), geographers (Henry & Hose 2015), geologists and geomorphologists (Bristow 2015; Larwood 2014; Whalley, this volume, in press), and naturalists (Burek & Hose 2015) who defined, delineated, described and depicted landscapes from their different mindsets. Within Britain three mountainous areas (the Peak District, the Lake District and the Scottish Highlands) and one coastal area (central southern England) were significant in the development of geotourism. Within mainland Europe the key areas were mainly mountainous, not necessarily truly alpine, volcanic and latterly coastal places that were initially visited as a component of the Grand Tour (Hibbert 1969). Whilst the historical approaches to landscape-based tourism are well covered for the UK, elsewhere in Europe and beyond the coverage is rather patchy. Meanwhile, it is worth noting that the term ‘tourist’ first appeared as an English synonym for ‘traveller’ in the late eighteenth century; it has been asserted that ‘The traveller exhibits boldness and gritty endurance under all conditions (being true to the etymology of “travel” in the word “travail”); the tourist is the cautious, pampered unit of a leisure industry’ (Buzzard 1993, p. 2). It was incorporated within the title of what is probably the UK’s first national guidebook, Mavor’s multi-volume The British Tourists; or, Traveller’s Pocket Companion, through England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland published between 1798 and 1800 (although the guidebook proper was only established in the early nineteenth century).

More adventurous travellers did venture to Scandinavia; Barton (1998) provides an account of those who visited between 1765 and 1815 through the accounts of some 30 travellers of whom three were Scots and 11 English. Amongst the former was the mineralogist Thomas Thomson (1773–1852); he visited Sweden in 1812 and made detailed geological observations. Amongst the latter was the accomplished amateur artist John Thomas James (1786–1828); he visited Sweden for much of 1813 and 1814 and provided an illustrated account of his travels. Both recorded aspects of Swedish life and customs, as well as the landscapes in which they travelled – not unlike the mid-nineteenth-century visitors to northern Norway reported by Whalley (this volume, in press), who also notes the mineralogist Leopold von Buch’s 1810 Reise durch Norwegen und Lappland. Buch (1774–1853) was the first foreign member of the Geological Society of London and introduced the term ‘caldera’ into the geological literature. He visited Norway and Sweden between 1806 and 1808. As Barton (1998) has noted, his travellers were mainly British and ‘Wealth and leisure… had made them pioneers of tourism. So that the foreign traveler abroad would be almost axiomatically taken for an English milord’ (Barton 1998, p. 13).

The opening years of the 1670s were a period of political turmoil within Europe, with numerous wars; by their end at least, through the Treaties of Nijmegen, the Franco-Dutch war was ended and touring Europe for pleasure became somewhat safer. By then, the Grand Tour was an established feature of European travel, although the term was only introduced into the literature in 1670; this was by Richard Lassels in his posthumously published (initially in Paris and later London) two-volume Voyage to Italy, which went to several editions. By then some pioneering geological work in the Italian city states had been completed and published by antiquarian scholars such as Pirro Ligorio (c. 1510–1583) and Bartolomeo Marliano (1488–1566); they had published maps and illustrations of Rome’s topography and ancient buildings. Following the 1570 Ferrara earthquake, Ligorio was placed in charge of a group summoned to the city to study seismological events and conduct earthquake research – the first such European scientific effort. Ligorio’s subsequent treatise, Rimedi contra terremoti per la sicurezza degli edifici (Remedies against earthquakes for building security), included plans for an earthquake-proof building; this was the first such design anywhere. Such Renaissance scholars did not focus on a single narrow field but followed multiple interests.

The Danish scholar Ole Worm (1588–1655), who preferred the study of antiquity, assembled at his Copenhagen home a large collection of curiosities; these ranged from American native artefacts to stuffed animals and fossils. Significantly for early geotourism he compiled engravings of his collection, along with his speculations about their meanings and origins, into the posthumously published Museum Wormianum of 1655; its frontispiece is one of the best-known illustrations of a ‘cabinet of curiosities’ – the forerunner of the modern natural history museum. By the mid-seventeenth century, antiquarians such as Worm had embarked upon the study of antiquities as a discrete discipline to generate a theoretical framework for them; progressing from merely describing monuments to explaining their functions; in a well-illustrated account Schnapp (1996) has summarized their original approach and their later adoption of methodology pioneered by geologists. It required that
they examined the ground and excavated sites as a means of envisioning the lifestyles of vanished peoples without any written history. They also toured and personally recorded sites. Their work was commonly published in county studies and then from 1751 in the Society of Antiquaries journal. In seventeenth-century England Robert Plot and Edward Lhuyd, the Ashmolean Museum’s first and second keepers, were typical of the new generation of antiquarians who regarded the study of antiquities as part of natural history. Fossils, including the first if unrecognized dinosaur bone, were amongst the antiquities illustrated in Plot’s Natural History of Oxfordshire (1677). His later Natural History of Staffordshire (1686) is noteworthy for its account of pottery clays. Published guides began to appear in the late eighteenth century.

After the mid-eighteenth century scientific the study of geology was a mainly British occupation with significant French and German contributions, although there were still some important Italian contributions. Before then, from the seventeenth century the groundwork of scientific geology was laid in the Italian city states by either native or domiciled scholars. The best known of the latter is Nicholas Steno (1638–1686), originally from Copenhagen. After dissecting in 1666 the head of a huge shark caught off Livorno he published his findings, accompanied by one of the most widely known natural history images, in Elementorum Myologiae Specimen (1667). He recognized its teeth were similar to the Glossopetrae or ‘tongue stones’ unearthed from Malta’s Miocene limestones. However, the Italian naturalist Fabio Colonna had already stated in De glossopetris dissertatio (1616) that they were sharks’ teeth. Because they seemingly looked like either the forked tongue or fangs of snakes from which Saint Paul was supposed to have removed the venom they were considered in medieval and Renaissance Europe to protect against poisoning. There was a profitable trade in Glossopetrae, and Steno’s revelations are almost certainly the first by a geologist to undermine economically significant local geotourism! Steno also suggested that rocks formed when particles in fluids, such as water, settled out into horizontal layers; any deviations from this were due to later disturbances – his ‘principle of original horizontality’. He suggested that the youngest layers must be those at the top, with the oldest at the bottom – his ‘law of superposition’. Steno noticed that in the Apennines near Florence the upper rocks were richly fossiliferous and the lower ones lacked fossils; he suggested the former were created in the biblical Flood (after the creation of life) and the latter before life existed – the first geological explanation distinguishing different periods of Earth history. This work led to his epithet – ‘Father of Stratigraphy’. His ideas were summarized in De solido intra solidum naturaliter contento dissertationis prodromus (1669), which was widely circulated and even translated into English; it was intended as an introduction to a much larger work that, due to his conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1667, was never completed.

Italian mercenaries, scholars and travellers traversed Europe, especially within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The specimens they collected and texts they published on their observations form the core of several major Italian museums and libraries. The most significant of such travellers for geotourism was the army officer, also a naturalist and hydrographer, Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli (1658–1730) from Bologna (see Vasiljević et al. 2014). His duties within the Austro-Hungarian Empire took him into what are present-day Albania, Austria, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, where he recorded and published observations on topography, rivers, lakes and natural history. His seminal geomorphological work was the mapping and description of the Danube basin, finally published in his multi-volume Danubius Pannonico-Mysicus (1726), the main reason he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. This work included the significant recognition of the thick loess deposits seen along the banks of the Danube (Vasiljević et al. 2014). He founded several art and science institutions (such as the Instituto delle Scienze), and others (especially the Museo di palazzo Poggi) now also house his natural history, art and book collections.

From the late eighteenth century onwards geology field excursions were, like those of the earlier naturalists and antiquarians such as Marsigli, almost exclusively undertaken by men of high social and economic standing, sometimes members of the Church; this indicates a shift away from the previous restrictive sociocultural conventions to permit their venturing into ‘wild’ landscapes for pleasure rather than necessity. This shift was part of a developing wider focus on natural history studies somewhat fostered by the realization that ‘even the amateur could hope to make significant contributions and participate in important national, even international scientific endeavours’ (Bedell 2001, pp. 4–5); the post-Enlightenment move towards romanticism was also a contributory factor. They generally trod in the footsteps and were guided by the publications of earlier travellers engaged in antiquarian, agricultural, industrial and socio-economic reportage. Up to the mid-eighteenth century the ‘preferred rural landscape was generally a humanised scene of cultivation, evidence of the successful control of nature’ (Towner 1996, p. 138). The ‘wild’ areas, like those geologically mapped in the
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Lake District in the nineteenth century’s first half by Otley and Sedgwick (Oldroyd 2002) and in Scotland by MacCulloch, were seen as waste places without any real economic value.

The establishment in 1830 of the Royal Geographical Society (RGS) of London followed several others in the UK devoted to promoting field study and travel; these included the Linnean Society (established in 1788), the Geological Society (1807), the Zoological Society (1826) and the Raleigh Club of Travellers (1826). The latter, at a meeting on 24th May 1830, approved the motion ‘that a new and useful Society might ... be formed, under the name of The Geographical Society of London,’ and was thus the parent body of the RGS. The Raleigh Club was a dining club, the members of which claimed collectively to have visited every part of the known world. At a special meeting of the Raleigh Club in 1854 it was dissolved and replaced by the Geographical Club with Sir Roderick Impey Murchison as its first president. Meanwhile the RGS increasingly became the main focus of global exploration partly due to its considerable and influential membership – 800 Fellows in 1850 (twice that of its Berlin and eight times that of its Paris equivalents) and 2400 in 1870. It published general advice from 1854 through its Hints to Travellers and established probably the world’s largest private topographical map collection. Its success reflected the strength of British amateur natural science, the wealth of the country’s upper middle class (which provided the bulk of the fellowship), and the emergence of professional field scientists. Most of its Fellows were amateur scholars, but some prominent scientists also joined its ranks, including Charles Darwin. Its dominant figure during the mid-nineteenth century was Murchison, who was its president in 1843–45 and thrice again in 1851–53, 1856–59 and 1862–71.

This was the same Murchison whose sole fieldwork in ‘wild’ Wales and the Welsh Borderland had established the Silurian system and whose rapid coach traverse of Russia the Permian system; he had also, following joint fieldwork with Sedgwick, established the Devonian system. Murchison was appointed director-general of the British Geological Survey and director of the Royal School of Mines and the Museum of Practical Geology in 1855, succeeding Sir Henry De la Beche, who had first held these offices. De la Beche was a prolific author of such lengthy texts on stratigraphy and geological methods as A Geological Manual (1831), How to Observe (1835) and The Geological Observer (1851). He was also well travelled, as can be seen in his Sections and Views Illustrative of Geological Phenomena (1830) with its many plates and descriptions of alpine and also exotic locations (such as Jamaica) – the geological equivalent of the ‘Grand Tour’ guidebook. However, by then the Grand Tour had almost vanished in its classical form as an education for young noblemen. Murchison was an inveterate traveller in Europe with an interest in promoting exploration for trade purposes. He was president of the Geological Society in 1831 having been its secretary for five years. It established a museum in 1808 and a library in 1809; today the museum has gone but the library is the UK’s largest such establishment. It has one the finest collections, approximately 3500 volumes, of antiquarian books on geology and related subjects; most were published after 1800, but some eighteenth-century volumes plus a few from the sixteenth century and impressive early volumes annotated by those nineteenth-century geologists who originally owned them are in the collection. In 1858 the Geologists’ Association was founded, with a more inclusive membership than the Geological Society, and from its outset promoted field excursions; at first in the London area and then, taking advantage of the expanding railway network, further afield – including the Peak District and the Lake District and eventually the Continent.

By the late eighteenth century interest and pleasure in wild areas and some geological matters are found in travellers’ writings, including those on the Grand Tour. Nineteenth-century to Great War guidebooks and travel literature for Europe, as they reflected and influenced emerging mass tourism, have been critically explored by Buzzard (1993). Withey (1998) has provided a mid-eighteenth-century to Great War overview of European leisure travellers that essentially encompasses the Grand Tour in both elite and populist forms as well as travel beyond Europe. With the various political upheavals and wars affecting Europe from the late eighteenth to the early nineteenth centuries, British travellers increasingly found their journeys restricted to the British Isles. These early leisure travellers were directed by the published selections of other travellers, diarists, poets and artists promoting various landscape aesthetic movements that had some inspiration from the experiences of the Grand Tour.

The first of these, the Sublime movement, was promoted in mid-eighteenth-century England by Edmund Burke in A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful of 1757; in this book he equated the Sublime with astonishment, fear, pain, roughness and obscurity. However, the later Romantics associated it with the tumultuous chaos of mountains lying beyond rolling foothills, deep valleys and dangerous rocky precipices. The poet William Wordsworth (1770–1850) suggested in the fifth and last edition of A Guide Through the District of the Lakes... that it was ‘the result of Nature’s first great dealings with
the supercificies of the earth’ (Wordsworth 1835, p. 35). The wild ruggedness of his beloved Lake District’s great rock masses, fells and lakes were to solicit from travellers, accustomed to appreciate southern England’s agricultural and parkland landscapes as evidence of Man’s control over Nature, awe and wonder. Travellers in search of the Picturesque movement’s landscapes sought locations that showed the softer effects of Nature’s subsequent operations that led to the variegation and harmony expressed by a meandering river’s curve or a lake shore, the grouping of their flanking trees, the interplay of light and shade and the subtle colour gradations that framed the vista.

That vista was also filtered by many artists and travellers by a Claude Glass. This was a small, slightly convex, dark-tinted mirror, carried in a fitted carrying case, which limited the breadth of the vista and reduced and simplified a landscape’s natural colours and tonal range to that which could readily be painted. From the late eighteenth century the Picturesque topographical approach was literally appreciated from scenic ‘stations’ such as those established by Thomas West (1720–1779) from 1778 in the Lake District. West advised in his A Guide to the Lakes: Dedicated to the Lovers of Landscape Studies, and to All Who Have Visited, or Intend to Visit the Lakes in Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancashire of 1778 that ‘The person using it ought always to turn his back to the object that he views. It should be suspended by the upper part of the case … holding it a little to the right or the left (as the position of the parts to be viewed require).’ The Picturesque, from around 1780 to 1850, was an all embracing aesthetic approach that sought to provoke travellers’ emotional reflections on landscapes (see Hebron 2006) and their evocation in visual art and literature. These aesthetic movements were influential in the later years of the Grand Tour. They reflected three interrelated elements: the travellers’ type and purpose; the meanings ascribed to, and understandings of, natural phenomena; the shift from an essentially agrarian to a majorly industrial society and the concomitant rise of the middle classes in numbers and influence.

From the mid-nineteenth century, European travel was increasingly opened up through, and literally speeded up by, the spread of the railway network, which wrought as much social as economic change (Faith 1994). The rail network was most conveniently centred on London and Paris; this permitted a new form of the Grand Tour in which the same locations were visited, but stays were shorter, and the tourists were mainly drawn from the middle classes. The railways also often provided the newest well-equipped hotels that accommodated the large numbers of travellers initially disgorged at their main termini. The speed and general reliability of the railways meant that as much ground could be covered in a few weeks or a month as previously would have taken tourists half a year or more. Undoubtedly, the golden age of long-distance Continental rail travel, especially aboard trains of the Compagnie Internationale des Wagons-Lits (et des grands express européens), was represented by the closing and opening decades of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Continental holidays came to an abrupt end with the outbreak of the Great War, when the railways turned to shipping troops rather than tourists. With the coming of peace the reformed political map of interwar Europe and the poor economic situation meant that British and especially German middle-class Continental travel was much reduced.

Whereas in the original Grand Tour the journey was part of the educational and cultural experience, it was no longer a significant element but a necessary evil to reach the tourist locations. These were increasingly recorded photographically, especially with the advent of roll-film cameras in 1888, rather than in sketches and water-colours. The private tutor was very much replaced by the local guide and the comprehensive illustrated tourist guidebook; few ventured afar without their Murray or Baedeker. However, the keeping of comprehensive journals declined, as did their publication – their place was taken by the commercially produced tourist guidebooks. Parsons (2007) provides a populist extended history of the guidebook. Sillitoe (1995) summarizes their nineteenth-century to Great War history and usage. Vaughn (1974) provides a well-illustrated account with some fair analysis of late eighteenth- to late nineteenth-century English guidebooks. Because the British and Germans were the first to have the money, leisure and intellectual curiosity to travel in any numbers, their needs drove the nineteenth-century development of the tourist guidebook (Sillitoe 1995).

From the 1820s, educated and elite travellers carried John Murray’s ‘handbooks’; his compendia focussed on visitors’ perspectives of what was important, including where they should bank, eat and stay. By the mid-nineteenth century, elite travellers were a less important market compared to the burgeoning middle classes of more modest means and limited, especially cultural, education; the Ward Lock Guides published from 1854 were intended to meet their less demanding needs. Karl Baedeker’s Handbuchlein, published from 1828, adopted Murray’s term rather than guidebook; they were the first to use asterisks as recommendations for significant sites and sights. By the late nineteenth century, tourists were well provided with good-quality affordable guidebooks, many of which mentioned landscape and geological features; however, such mentions were not always accurate,
as can be gauged from ‘took the ferry to northern Ireland for a day trip to the Giant’s Causeway. Formations among the huge granite [they are actually basalt!] blocks seemed like pipes of a great church organ’ (Hindley 1983, pp. 52–53).

Domestic tourism became most significant in the interwar years of the twentieth century. Across Europe an interest in the outdoors saw leisure and touring cycling in the 1930s enjoy perhaps even greater popularity than it had achieved in the 1880s and 1890s. Those two decades saw improvements in roads and recommended accommodations as well as topographical maps (Henry & Hose 2015), which would later be used by motorists, to meet the needs of touring cyclists; in the UK, the founding of the Cyclists’ Touring Club in 1883 helped to push forward these improvements. Hiking (see Marples 1959) and hostelling (see Porter 1992) were also widespread leisure pursuits in the 1930s that persisted veritably unchanged into the 1960s. The former was promoted by the laying on of special excursion trains from major towns and cities, and many of the railway companies’ publicity departments also produced hikers’ guides and pamphlets. The railways were then facing competition from the developing motor-coach routes and private motorists – the latter would eventually dominate domestic tourism in the post-war years, especially from the 1960s. By then, the middle classes could readily tour with car and caravan, especially in the scenic uplands of central and northern Britain. Contemporaneously, Watkins-Pitchford (1959) wrote and finely illustrated a classic account of a tour to Scotland completed before restrictions were placed on where caravans could be parked overnight; access to the UK’s open countryside, although better than in pre-war days, was already adapting to issues around demand and sustainable management.

In the UK, the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 led to the establishment in the 1950s of 10 national parks, with the first being the Peak District and the second the Lake District in 1951; similar provision emerged in Europe, although the first had been established as early as 1909 in Sweden and 1914 in Switzerland. From the mid-1960s there was considerable investment in the UK and Europe in environmental management for leisure (Fairbrother 1970) and interpretation, including some geological interpretation – the volume and nature of which is worthy of a volume in its own right. In the UK this was stimulated in 1963 by National Nature Week, repeated in 1966. It was by then recognized that visitors to nature reserves and the National Parks wanted information, and the managers of these lands needed to manage visitors to reduce their environmental impact. Environmental interpretation, often employing the lessons learned and applied by the US National Parks Service, were readily adopted and adapted in the UK by the Countryside Commission (Aldridge 1975), countryside NGOs (Beazley 1971), and subsequently also in Europe – the basis of modern geotourism was being established. Environmental interpretation (Knudson et al. 1995) has been shown to benefit, in terms of engaging and building empathy with its audience, by incorporating human stories and history – a practical outcome of historical geotourism studies.

British landscapes, romanticism and geotourism

Consideration of areas key to the development of British scenic tourism, such as those in northern England (Cope 2014; Henry & Hose 2015) and Scotland (Gordon & Baker 2015) is useful in elucidating generic European and global themes together with issues in historical geotourism. Initially the Peak District, considered the birthplace of British geotourism (Hose 2008), was favoured by Britons determined to venture in wild landscapes. Even the odd Continental visitor made his or her way to the Peak District. Perhaps the best known of these is Karl Phillip Moritz (1756–1793) who published Reisen eines Deutschen in England im Jahre 1782 (Journeys of a German in England in 1782) in Germany in 1783 and 1785; an English translation of 1795 was Travels, chiefly on Foot, through several parts of England in 1782, described in Letters to a Friend. Starting in London he, unusually for the times, walked via Leicester and Derby to the Peak District, where he visited Peak Cavern; he is therefore probably the earliest recorded foreign geotourist in England. England’s own first recorded geotourist was Celia Fiennes (Morris 1949), a privileged late seventeenth-century horseback traveller who visited the Ashbourne copper mines in 1698.

Whilst Fiennes can be credited as the first English geotourist in that she purposefully visited and wrote about sites of some geological interest, a few earlier travellers incidentally visited and recorded their observations on such places. One of the earliest of these is John Taylor (1580–1653), the ‘water poet’, who recorded his 1618 visit to the undersea coal mines of Culross in Scotland (Taylor 1888, pp. 43–46). The Peak District is also the region for which the first tourist guides were published; the development of its topographic and geological maps has been examined by Henry & Hose (2015). Its major attractions were organized, described and promoted by Thomas Hobbes (De Mirabilibus Pecci: Being the Wonders of the Peak in Darby-shire . . . of 1678) and Charles Cotton
(The Wonders of the Peak of 1681); both recognized seven ‘wonders’, of which five had a geological basis as caves and springs. However, the perceived and sometimes reported overt commercialization of the Peak District’s major sites led travellers to look elsewhere, at first to north Yorkshire, then the Lake District and finally the Scottish Highlands and Islands (Gordon & Baker 2015; Hose 2010a). The Lake District is particularly significant to historical geotourism because of the means by which its exploration opened up a supposedly remote wild region to leisure travellers.

Both amateur and professional artists were particularly attracted to its antiquities, lakes and mountains. Their landscape paintings and sketches were occasionally published as sets of engravings, sometimes with accompanying prose or poetry, or were included in several guidebooks. The relationship between English landscape painting and geology in the nineteenth century has been explored by Pointon (1978) in a seminal illustrated essay; she noted that travel was as important to artists as to geologists and that for the former their visual representations varied, according to purpose and employment, between accurate depiction and artistic creation. In 1806 on his sole Lake District visit John Constable (1776–1837) sketched and painted The Castle Rock, Borrowdale show some familiarity with geology. The young Joseph William Mallard Turner (1775–1851) earned a living as a topographer that facilitated the printing of reasonably priced colour reproductions. Gillett (1990) provides a summary of the characteristics of the art public, although with something of a metropolitan focus, in late nineteenth-century Britain. From the 1850s monochrome photography was increasingly employed as an art medium to record landscapes. A generally little-known, especially when compared with the Abraham brothers, Lake District photographer was Ambleside-based Moses Bowness, who operated a studio between 1856 and 1894. Apart from the usual and lucrative portraiture work he also photographed the region’s mining and industrial sites and landscapes; some of these were reproduced as postcards with one being a particularly well-known image of the Bowder Stone in Borrowdale. Joseph Lowe (1865–1934) was a Patterdale-based landscape photographer who produced and sold postcards. His particular hobby just happened to be geology, and he often gave lectures illustrated with his own lantern slides on the region’s geology. Travellers unfamiliar with the Lake District had their expectations of what they would and should see influenced by various colour original artworks and reproduced images, some of which appeared as monochrome engravings in guidebooks; from the nineteenth century’s last quarter photo postcards were also quite widely available.

Social historians, writers of literary criticisms and poets have charted the Lake District’s emergence over some 200 years from comparative obscurity to one of the UK’s most visited regions (see Victoria & Albert Museum 1984); likewise its geological exploration has been critically charted (Oldroyd 2002). Celia Fiennes had ridden through it in 1698 but thought it an unprofitable wilderness and merely recorded its potted char and some bread recipes. Daniel Defoe in the 1720s also thought it a barren and frightful place. From the 1750s travellers (popularly called ‘Lakers’ due to it also being known as The Lakes) visited the Lake District because its landscapes and antiquities were by then perceived to be of some quality. The poet Thomas Gray (1716–1771) toured in 1767 and 1769; his letters describing the 1769 tour were published in William Mason’s posthumous edition of his work in 1775 and helped to establish the region’s main visitor points, later to become tourist ‘stations’. From Penrith, Gray visited Ullswater, and from Keswick, he explored Derwentwater, Borrowdale, Bassenthwaite and the Castlerigg stone circle; then, after journeying beneath Helvellyn’s foot, he explored Ambleside, Grasmere and Windermere, before finishing at Kendal – routes followed by modern (geo)tourists. Mirroring contemporary travellers’ mindsets he wrote that the Derwentwater to Borrowdale journey, which he had undertaken on 3 October 1769, was akin to those alpine passes where travellers were imperilled by avalanches; he actually coined, reflecting his perceived peril on...
the journey, the term the ‘jaws of Borrowdale’ (Toynbee & Whibley 1971, p. 1079) for the point where the steep ice-carved slopes of Kings How and Castle Crag confine the route from Keswick into the valley.

The artist William Gilpin (1724–1804) toured in 1772, and the agrarian observer Arthur Young (1741–1820) in 1768. In his Observations on the River Wye and several parts of South Wales, etc. relative chiefly to Picturesque Beauty; made in the summer of the year 1770 of 1782, Gilpin remarked, similarly to Gray on the road into Borrowdale, that it ‘grew wilder, and more romantic . . . riding along the edge of a precipice, unguarded by any parapet, under impending rocks, which threaten above’ (Gilpin 1786, vol.1, p. 187); such an actual alpine scene is captured in Turner’s painting The Passage of the St Gothard of 1704. Young described Derwentwater as elegant but noted that its surrounding mountains were wild with dreadful chasms; likewise he observed that ‘Twelve of the fifteen miles from Shapp to Kendal are a continued chain of mountainous moors, totally uncultivated one dreary prospect’ (Young 1770, vol. 3, p. 169). Yet in 1774 William Hutchinson justified publication of An Excursion to the Lakes, in Westmoreland and Cumberland, August 1773, because ‘When ever I have read the descriptions given by travellers of foreign countries, in which their beauties and antiquities were lavishly praised, I have always regretted a neglect which has long attended the picturesque spots, which command the most delicious scenes, but which cannot be reached without the most perilous difficulty’ (Young 1770, p. 155); he further suggested the pruning or felling or trees obscuring views. Peter Crosthwaite published from 1783 maps showing his own and West’s stations. He improved access to some of his stations; for example for one of his stations above Derwentwater he had steps cut and a cross marked on the ground. Derwentwater was very popular with early tourists. West’s guidebook recorded that its view from the Cockshott Hill station was close to the ideal requirements of the Picturesque because in ‘a spacious amphitheatre, of the most picturesque mountains imaginable, an elegant sheet of water is spread out before you, shining like a mirror, and transparent as chrystal; variegated with islands . . . clothed with forest verdure’ (West 1778, pp. 89–90). Popular stations commonly had shelters provided for travellers, but they were not universally welcomed; in 1799 James Plumptree (1771–1832), the playwright and author of The Lakers: A Comic Opera in Three Acts, was of the opinion that Windermere’s first station somewhat lacked bucolic appeal.

The Lake District was promoted to elite tourists by William Green (1760–1823), who published The Tourist’s New Guide in 1819; it is a volume packed with detail and was fulsomely praised by Wordsworth in his own guidebook. Beginning as a surveyor in 1778, Green established a studio in Keswick after about 1800. As a successful topographic artist he produced a significant body of detailed scientifically observed aquatints, etchings and water-colours. Wordsworth’s innovative guidebook linked landscape features to natural history (including geology), history and people alongside descriptions of what could be seen. It evolved from his anonymous text that accompanied the Rev. Joseph Wilkinson’s (1764–1831) Select Views in Cumberland, Westmoreland and Lancashire . . . 1810 volume of engravings. In 1820 it became an appendix to his River Duddon sonnets. By 1822 it was a guidebook in its own right and was successful enough to go to several editions up to the 1840s that eventually included three geology letters commissioned from Adam Sedgwick. This was not a novel or singular natural history inclusion, since the 1842 edition also included botanical notes and John Hudson’s 1842 Complete Guide to the Lakes was supplemented by geological notes also written by Adam Sedgwick.

Wordsworth’s relationships with the leading geologists of his day, and how his poetry reflects this, has been examined by Wyatt (1995), who noted that Sedgwick had corresponded with Wordsworth, concerned that his geology letters might lack interest (Wyatt 1995, p. 169). The poet’s 1814 The Excursion has the stanza ‘He who with pockethammer smites the edge of luckless rock . . . detaching by the stroke a chip or splinter – to resolve his doubts; And, with that ready answer satisfied, he substance classes by some barbarous name, And hurries on . . .’ suggesting a familiarity with geology field practice and difficult petrological
nomenclature. Wordsworth’s approach to the picturesque as developed in his guidebook has been examined by Nabholtz (1964), who noted that its last section was an attempt to prove that the Lake District’s landscapes are better suited to painting than those of the Alps. A few geology guides to the Lake District were also published in the nineteenth century. Jonathan Otley published A Concise Description of the English Lakes … and Observations on the Mineralogy and Geology of the District, the first populist account, in 1823. The style of the region’s later guidebooks shifted from mere station descriptions to holistic accounts for landscape students. For example Charles Mackay’s (1814–1889) illustrated The Scenery and Poetry of the English Lakes: A Summer Ramble of 1846 was noteworthy for a text that focussed the readers’ attentions upon site-centred poetry and other literary allusions; he used his account of Stockghyll Force as an excuse to incorporate the waterfall description in Shelley’s 1816 Alastor; or, The Spirit of Solitude, in which the speaker recounts the life of a poet zealously pursuing the most obscure part of nature whilst seeking out the peculiar truths in obscure places. The creation of such literary landscapes was an enduring legacy of these early travel writers pervading populist tourist publications into the late twentieth century.

The Bowder Stone (a 1250-tonne perilously balanced boulder) was an early example of a commercial geotourism enterprise in the region. It was described by West as ‘a mountain in itself, the road winds round its base. Here rock riots over rock, and mountain intersecting mountain, form one grand sweep of broken pointed crags’ (West 1778, p. 100). Forty years later, in 1798, Joseph Pocklington developed it as a tourist attraction. By 1807 as well as providing a cottage for the resident guides he had also erected a druid stone and constructed a small chapel together with an affixed ladder for visitors to clamber to its top; rock fragments around its base were also cleared. Such works were not universally admired; for example:

a single rock called the Bowder Stone, a fragment of great size which has fallen from the heights. The game person who formerly disfigured the island in Keswick Lake with so many abominations, has been at work here also; has built a little mock hermitage, set up a new druidical stone, erected an ugly house for an old person who formerly disfigured the island in Keswick. The game person who formerly disfigured the island in Keswick Lake with so many abominations, has been at work here also; has built a little mock hermitage, set up a new druidical stone, erected an ugly house for an old person who formerly disfigured the island in Keswick.

Green’s guidebook noted a further deterioration of its natural appeal with the guide presenting visitors with an ‘exordium preparatory to the presentation of a written paper, specifying the weight and dimensions of the stone’ (Green 1819, vol. 2, p. 134).

The region’s mines, from the eighteenth century onwards, were popular with some travellers. For example, Defoe in his tenth letter of A tour thro’ the white island of Great Britain … mentions ‘Derwent Fells, where the ancient copper mines were found in Queen Elizabeth’s time …’ and notes that ‘Here are still mines of black lead found … the only place in Britain where it is to be had’. In Espriella’s account it was recorded that ‘Above this lies the mine of black-lead of which those pencils so famous over all Europe are made, it is the only one of the kind which has yet been discovered. We could not see it, as it is worked only occasionally, and had just been shut’ (Espriella 1814, vol. 2, 167). It was the poet Robert Southey who penned in 1808, under the pseudonym Don Manuel Alvarez Espriella, the three-volume Letters from England, with a third edition in 1814. Its second volume has various Lake District accounts and records that

We had consulted tourists and topographers in London, that we might not overpass anything worthy of notice, and our Guide to the Lakes was with us. They told us of tracts of horrible barrenness, of terrific precipices, rocks rippling upon rocks, and mountains tossed together in chaotic confusion; of stone avalanches rendering the ways impassable, the fear of some travellers who had shrunk back from this dreadful entrance into Borrowdale, and the heroism of others who had dared to penetrate into these impenetrable regions: into these regions, however, we found no difficulty in walking along a good road, which coaches of the light English make travel every summer’s day. (Espriella 1814, vol. 2, p. 162)

The last sentence is significant in that it refutes the accounts of perilous ventures into Borrowdale of only 50 years earlier by Gilpin and Gray. Southey (1774–1843), as well as being a Romantic poet, was a prolific man of letters and essayist, a biographer, literary scholar and historian – excepting the lack of geological training, a fair combination of abilities for a writer on geotourism!

The past is the key to the present

In defining modern geotourism and promoting its research, the seminal UK work underpinned the first national geotourism conference – indeed the first anywhere – held at Belfast’s Ulster Museum
THREE CENTURIES OF APPRECIATING PHYSICAL LANDSCAPES

in 1998 (Robinson 1998). Few of its wholly unpublished presentations made any attempt to define geotourism and most, perhaps with the exception of Hose (1998), were focussed on its practice and provision. This approach was reiterated a decade later by the presentations at two ‘global’ geotourism conferences in 2008 and 2010. Nowadays hardly a year passes without a geotourism conference, global or otherwise, held somewhere. However, until the 2012 conference, from which this volume is a partial record, none had examined the historical basis of geotourism. Consequently, few of modern geotourism’s practitioners and stakeholders either have knowledge of or understand the parallels and lessons than can be drawn out from historical geotourism. The papers in this volume seek to at least partially help redress this deficiency in terms of both the specific and generic.

Baird, in this paper’s opening quote, was partly reiterating a point made in an article published in 1952 in Scientific Objectives. It was republished in 1970 in the Proceedings of the Geologists’ Association, it which it was noted that geology had two purposes ‘one material, the other spiritual; it provides the raw materials of this kind of civilization, and it satisfies certain spiritual aspirations in its followers. Many more ordinary people could take advantage of its spiritual gifts’ (Read 1970, p. 420); this is perhaps a partial successor to Nicholas Steno’s maxim (see Hansen 2009, p. 6) ‘Beautiful is what we see. More beautiful is what we understand. Far most beautiful is what we are ignorant about’. published in Prooemium or Preface to a Demonstration in Copenhagen Anatomical Theater in the Year 1673 as he contemplated his own religious devotion. Read confessed that he found ‘in geology a certain satisfaction of spiritual needs that is uplifting and cultural’ and suggested that ‘this may be only an exercise of the detective instinct that is in most of us . . . And we should not ignore the actual physical pleasure that arises from hard geological fieldwork. If we can combine the mental exaltation . . . with the strenuous physical exercise that should go with it, then we have the finest life in the world’ (Read 1970, p. 414). However, such spirituality is not confined to formalized religion, and there are many accounts of travellers being emotionally affected by natural attractions and landscapes; the psychology of this has been well reviewed by Kaplan & Kaplan (1989), who noted the concept of the ‘restorative environment’ that was especially found in aesthetically attractive natural environments such as scenery (that is landscapes). As has already been argued in this paper, the engagement in geological fieldwork in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by men of considerable social and economic standing, of similar backgrounds to those who enjoyed the classic Grand Tour, indicated a fundamental shift in the prevailing social climate to permit venturing into wild places and engaging on their travels with persons of different social stature.

Historical geotourism’s development also benefitted from another fundamental shift; this was in the way in which landscapes or scenery were perceived and then exploited for tourism purposes – especially in the later years of the Grand Tour. The recognition that rugged landscapes were worthy places to visit was essential. Curiosity and aesthetic value were motivators before scientific value for travels into such landscapes. These changes can be traced through the way in which writers described and artists visualized them. Indeed, these changes influence modern geotourism up to the 1970s and beyond. The Romantic legacy left to twentieth- and twenty-first-century travellers and tourists was the established preference for participants to sojourn in attractive ‘wild’ or ‘natural’ landscapes rather than the ‘controlled’ agricultural landscapes and the ‘brutal’ locations of heavy industry and mining. Eighteenth- to nineteenth-century improvements in physical and intellectual access to encourage elite tourists to visit previously virtually inaccessible locations were developed in the twentieth century for mass tourists – a worthy field of future study, as modern geotourism (Hose 2011, 2012b), in its own right. For geotourism as a whole, unlike its parent discipline as James Hutton suggested in his ‘Principle of Uniformitarianism’, the past really is the key to the present.

The invaluable research support, especially the online access to journals, provided by the University of Bristol is most gratefully acknowledged. The perceptive review by Randell Stephenson, for which grateful thanks are extended, has helped to hone this paper’s text and to improve the clarity of some its figures.
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