

Stones of empire: allusions to ancient Rome in the physical fabric of the Victorian and Edwardian world.

© *Quentin J. Broughall, N.U.I. Maynooth.*

INTRODUCTION

Every empire in history has arguably existed in two forms: a theoretical empire of the mind and a mundane empire of reality – one edifice constructed of attitudes and opinions, feelings and thoughts; the other of bricks and mortar, marble and stone. In this brief study, I wish to interrogate the relationship between these two imperial constructs in the case of Victorian and Edwardian society's debt to ancient Rome, which provided a key inspiration to the structures of both in the British Empire at its height. I seek to explore how the theme of ancient Rome was expressed physically in the public art, architecture and town-planning of contemporary Britain and its empire – yet how the physical fabric of this Victorian and Edwardian world bore only limited relation to the vision of ancient Rome that was often extolled and propagated as an applicable theoretical model in other aspects of contemporary intellectual culture in Britain.

While the nature and terms of these parallels to ancient Rome were often disputed, I would argue that the very presence of such a powerful and resonant cultural model was of a definite and transferable intellectual value to contemporary British society. As ancient Rome and Victorian London represented the *caput mundi* of their respective eras - the chief metropolises of two vast empires, as well as the most populous and influential cities of their time –, comparisons between both were clearly viable, if much debated. Thus, I seek to portray how the cultural cachet attendant upon ancient Rome in speculative intellectual terms transferred in only a limited material manner to the art, architecture and urban planning of Victorian and Edwardian Britain.

With the rise of 'new' imperialism in the 1870s and the consequent scramble for political and territorial expansion, ancient Rome seemed to regain a relevance to European culture that it had not possessed truly since the early-to-mid eighteenth century.¹ During this previous 'Augustan' era in British history, c.1700-45, Latinate culture seemed to percolate numerous aspects of British society and became written in stone through the design and construction of Palladian mansions and neo-classical public buildings inspired by Roman architecture.² As Britain became for a period in the nineteenth century the chief international power, it seemed natural to some that it should appropriate again the singular prestige attendant upon ancient Rome as such a rich treasure-house of Western cultural value.

However, the cultural model that developed was not just a select discourse limited to Britain's intellectual elite, but also a popular one, encouraged by the use of ancient Rome in everything from contemporary paintings to poetry, from novels to theatrical productions; all of which exploited certain allusions in order to distil for themselves something of the allure and exoticism associated popularly with the Roman world.³ Although parallels to ancient Rome were not so much clear-cut as complex and often contested, the cultural cachet attendant upon them seems to have encouraged their proliferation to contextualise either positively or negatively the British imperial project.

Significantly, a number of key commentators created a specific intellectual discourse out of this comparison between the Roman and the British empires; in particular, administrators and officials such as Lord Bryce (1838-1922), Lord Cromer (1841-1917) and Sir Charles Lucas (1853-1931), who could speak from both within and without the British imperial project.⁴ Take, for example, Lucas, who held a number of high-profile positions in the Colonial Office and remarked explicitly in his *Greater Rome and Greater Britain* (1912) that 'all or nearly all the terms which indicate the political status of Greater Britain and its component parts are a legacy of Rome'; elsewhere proclaiming that '[t]he British Empire is in the main an Anglo-Saxon creation, although its political nomenclature is Latin' (Lucas 1912: 1 and 72).⁵ Indeed,

such grew the apparent standing of the Roman parallel in the late-Victorian and Edwardian period that even prominent anti-imperial commentators, such as John Mackinnon Robertson (1856-1933) and John Atkinson Hobson (1858-1940), employed the Roman parallel to argue against expansionism.⁶

Obviously, basic terms of colonialist discourse such as 'colony', 'dominion' and 'empire' all derive from Latin, but, perhaps, more crucially, many of the political concepts behind contemporary imperialism were also Roman in origin.⁷ While there may have been more differences than similarities between the Roman and British empires, crucially, both societies struggled to bind the contrary notions of *imperium* and *libertas* – imperial authority and freedom. Such shared commonalities – whether genuine or perceived – created a powerful theoretical structure upon which to cast the shadow of actual British power both at home and in the empire. Yet, if this seems to have become such an influential cultural model on paper, one might expect to find it also extrapolated into reality – as it did during the eighteenth-century 'Augustan' era –, whether at home or abroad; yet, I would argue that, for reasons that I will articulate, this did not occur.⁸

'A VAST AND FOGGY CONFUSION'? THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE BRITISH ISLES

To explore London first, it is easy to see why some divined parallels between ancient Rome and the British capital; for between the decline of Rome in late antiquity and the rise of Victorian London, there was no comparable metropolis that approached the size or status of either city. Rome and London were not only the imperial capitals of their respective empires, but, also, effectively, the chief metropolises of their eras, boasting major cultural influence far beyond the limits of their vast territories. In terms of population alone, both cities were also unique; Rome boasting a million inhabitants for most of its imperial era, while London was home to c.6.5 million in 1900 – figures that made each the most populous city in the world of their time.⁹ As London was itself also originally a Roman foundation, this offered a profound connection for those who supported the notion of a *translatio imperii* – or a passing of the torch of civilisation – between the Roman and British empires.

However, while both were imperial capitals, Rome and London differed in their public display of this status. While Rome created grand columns and statues, triumphal arches and monumental buildings to celebrate its credentials as the first city of a great empire, London never truly did – certainly not in the manner of contemporary Paris, which emulated Rome far more consciously in the redevelopments designed by Baron Haussmann.¹⁰ Indeed, the historian of the British Empire, Jan Morris, has advanced a reason for this lack of imperial commemoration in London, writing how:

London was not, like Rome, paved with the spoils and trophies of Empire, because this was only incidentally an imperial capital. The New Imperialism was too new to have planted its own monuments – and too insubstantial, for it was a gusty sort of movement, a sudden gale of emotion, swooping suddenly out of that leaden London sky (Morris 1979: 454-5).¹¹

Certainly, as will be shown, many British colonial cities exhibited their status as imperial metropolises through public buildings and monuments, but London rarely joined in the theatrics of such display. As another historian of the empire, Piers Brendon, has remarked, in particular, about Anglo-Indian architecture, it 'affirmed despotism, whereas the British capital was, in its very lack of grand design, an assertion of liberty' (Brendon 2007: 249) – in other words, *imperium* abroad, *libertas* at home. In spite of a number of historical attempts by architects as diverse as Christopher Wren (1632-1723) and John Nash (1752-1835), there was no domestic enunciation of increasing national assertion through the architectural or monumental language of ancient Rome.¹²

Indeed, if Victorian and Edwardian London did favour an 'imperial' architectural style, it was not a Roman-inspired classicism, but, if anything, a revival of English Baroque. Interestingly, the high watermark of British imperialism in this era did not lead to the creation of any

monumental arcades or avenues that glorified the acquisition and possession of an overseas empire. Certainly, a number of attempts were made to create a distinctly imperial sector in London, but these all failed due to a combination of institutional indecisiveness, endemic conservatism and a lack of suitable sites for such redevelopment. Only a few vague nods in the direction of grand imperial avenues emerged in the Victorian and Edwardian eras, such as the Victoria Embankment (1864-70) and Victoria Street (1867-71), along with the related developments of Northumberland Avenue, Shaftesbury Avenue and Charing Cross Road (1877-86) or Kingsway (1901-5). As such, nineteenth and early-twentieth-century London presented no visual singularity of imperial identity.¹³

Yet, if one looks carefully, it is possible to perceive certain slight and subtle echoes of ancient Rome in the buildings and monuments of Victorian and Edwardian London.¹⁴ Of course, the one urban feature that both ancient Rome and London had in common were the public statues that memorialised the domestic and imperial heroes of the ancient and modern eras.¹⁵ Although it boasted a plethora of these monuments to monarchs and worthy subjects, this cannot be said to represent a feature unique to London, as every European city memorialised its great and good in a similar fashion throughout this period.¹⁶ So, apart from the odd toga-ed politician or worthy standing ill-dressed for the British climate – such as Charles James Fox in Bloomsbury Square (1816) or William Huskisson in Pimlico Gardens (1836) –, there appears to have been no major Roman influence on British public statuary.

Taking next the most obvious architectural resonances of ancient Rome in any city's physical fabric, the monumental column and the triumphal arch, one can see that London boasted a number of examples of each, though, significantly, not as part of any grand scheme. Most famous, of course, was Nelson's Column (1843-7) in Trafalgar Square, which was based upon the Corinthian columns of the temple of Mars Ultor in Rome and was itself preceded a few years earlier by the Duke of York Column (1831-4) in Waterloo Place.¹⁷ Similar memorial columns were a feature of many other provincial cities and towns throughout Britain, though, so one cannot claim that these represented any unique feature of London's contemporary environment.

Similarly, a cursory glance at the urban landscape of Victorian and Edwardian London reveals only a few examples of the triumphal arch and, crucially, only one constructed in this period itself.¹⁸ While Wellington Arch (1826-30) and Marble Arch (1827-33) were constructed just before the Victorian era in commemoration of Britain's victory in the Napoleonic Wars, Admiralty Arch (1908-12) represents the only major Victorian or Edwardian attempt at anything approaching a triumphal arch in Britain.¹⁹ Crucially, this was part of the Edwardian redevelopment of the Mall by Sir Aston Webb (1849-1930), which involved a fresh *façade* for Buckingham Palace, the Victoria Memorial by Sir Thomas Brock (1847-1922) and the construction of a triumphal arch that eventually became Admiralty Arch. Since, as we have seen, London had few structured thoroughfares inlaid with major imperial monuments, this classically-inspired development proves all the more interesting.

As it remains today, the Mall provided an appropriately monumental public stage for national events, acting as a rare 'public axis of imperialism' (Driver and Gilbert 2003: 42) throughout the latter phases of the British Empire. Easily, the largest construction within this redevelopment was Admiralty Arch, which, as an 'essentially Roman' (*ibid.*, 35) structure suggested a clear resonance to the monumentalism of ancient Rome. Typically, perhaps, of the bureaucratic spirit that exercised the mindset of Victorian and Edwardian officialdom, though, Webb was forced to redraft his design for the triumphal arch at the heart of his plans, as the Admiralty demanded that the arch also contain space for offices – creating what is, in effect, an office-building posing as a triumphal arch.²⁰ Apart from this, the only other examples were temporary ceremonial ones built out of wood or other materials and constructed for specific public occasions, such as that erected at Paddington for Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee. Thus, the monuments of Victorian and Edwardian London seem to possess only a limited debt to ancient Rome in either their design or purpose.

Overall, London's officially-endorsed buildings were far too eclectic to exhibit any major architectural allusions to Rome. Significantly, none of the official buildings associated

explicitly with the administration of Britain's empire boasted anything approaching an emulation of ancient Rome.²¹ Up to 1875, the Colonial Office, the headquarters of the imperial project, were located in a set of run-down, near-shambolic offices at 13 and 14 Downing Street, though, in this year, it gained a move to the Italianate *palazzo* that now houses the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in Whitehall.²² Indeed, the Imperial Institute in South Kensington (1887-94) represented the only building expressly designed to capture a contemporary imperial spirit and even it failed to make any reference to Rome in its structure, possessing a definitively Renaissance style instead. Certainly, if London possessed an imperial pantheon, St Paul's Cathedral – often known as 'the parish church of empire' – must offer itself as the sole candidate, as the building was, not only the resting place of imperial heroes, such as Lord Nelson and the Duke of Wellington, but also the site of numerous central ceremonials related to empire, like Victoria's Diamond Jubilee.

Instead, most of the grand designs for impressive monuments, imposing buildings and ceremonial thoroughfares remained unrealised. For instance, the plans drawn up by Joseph Michael Gandy (1771-1843) for an 'Imperial Palace' in the 1820s appears to have been about as close as Britain ever got to a piece of central, domestic architecture that might have celebrated the spirit of empire in a monumentally classical style within the capital itself.²³ Perhaps, only the white Portland stone that represented the most popular material for facing important public and private buildings in Britain bore reasonable comparison to the famous Carrara marble favoured by the Romans for their own finest edifices. So, with an empire ruled for much of its existence from a modest Georgian townhouse on an ordinary London street, there seemed to be little sense of comparison to the seats of Roman power in the ancient Forum and the great villas of the Palatine in the architecture of British officialdom at home. As Piers Brendon puts it, 'the capital was less than an imperial city because it was more than an imperial city[:] London was a megalopolis of varieties' (Brendon 2007: 251).

Widening our focus a little, a building like the Royal Albert Hall (1867-71) stands out as being unusual as an official edifice, since it provided through its design a clear architectural allusion to both ancient amphitheatres and the Pantheon in Rome. Moreover, the period of its construction chimes with the beginning of the period of 'new' imperialism, which encouraged so many fresh parallels between the Roman and British empires.²⁴ However, contemporary entertainment venues that were constructed and run through the influence of private enterprise often attempted to exploit this cachet associated with ancient Rome even more explicitly than buildings like the Albert Hall, though rarely in anything except a superficial sense.

Alongside the countless music-halls and theatres elevated by titles derived from antiquity – every British city seeming to possess its fair share of Adelphis, Britannias, Odeons and Olympics –, there were a few entertainment establishments that attempted to resurrect these associations into some sort of reality.²⁵ Some of these premises attempted to capture an allusion to Rome in their titles, sizes or staging. For instance, the London Coliseum (1902-4) bore an allusion to the Flavian Amphitheatre in both its name and its dimensions, while its capacity for well over 3,000 spectators made it the largest theatre in London.

Elsewhere, the London Hippodrome (1898-1900) designed by the theatre architect, Frank Matcham (1854-1920), incorporated – along with its title – many of the technical elements of the ancient amphitheatre in order to satisfy contemporary appetites for spectacle. Inside, it boasted an oversized stage with an arena that could be converted into an eight-foot-deep water-tank capable of holding 100,000 gallons, around which were arranged concentric, steeply-tiered seating, which allowed one to gain close views of the circus performances and aquatic displays in which the theatre specialised. Undoubtedly, the audience that attended from all classes would have possessed some knowledge of the exhibitions that took place in the Flavian Amphitheatre in Rome and compared the spectacular – though happily non-fatal – entertainments of a night at the Hippodrome with its ancient equivalent.²⁶

Ironically, perhaps, the closest that Victorian and Edwardian London came to a domestic architectural or structural parallel to ancient Rome was the major urban sewerage network that was developed from 1859 to 1875 by the engineer, Sir Joseph Bazalgette (1819-91), and

which bore useful comparison to Rome's own *Cloaca Maxima* in both its guiding spirit and actual efficiency.²⁷ In many parts of the capital and other British urban conurbations at the beginning of the Victorian era, there was little or no clean, fresh water to be found, so, perhaps, almost incredibly, until this period, London probably fell behind ancient Rome in the provision of an efficient and reliable urban water supply. Indeed, the central heating known to the Romans two millennia before had only been resurrected again for domestic use in the very early nineteenth century. However, perhaps, as a result of this shortcoming, Victorian technological dynamism went on to create some of the finest intersections of British architecture and engineering in contemporary London's water and sewage pumping stations, such as the Crossness Southern Outfall Sewage Works (1859-65) or Abbey Mills Pumping Station (1865-8).

Indeed, like the Romans, the Victorians and Edwardians also constructed plenty of public baths, which were seen similarly as promoters of both health and morals.²⁸ In 1844, the Commission for Baths and Wash-Houses was established, which resulted in the creation of local committee boards in 1846 that led, in turn, to the construction of facilities like Mayfield Baths in Manchester (1856-7) and Brill's Baths in Brighton (1866-9). These institutions usually included first and second-class bathing facilities, along with specialist features such as Turkish Baths, making them quite close analogues for the original Roman bath-houses of antiquity in both their form and purpose. Indeed, London alone boasted almost thirty of these bathing establishments, including a 'Roman Bath' on the Strand near Somerset House, which was open all-year and alleged to draw its water supply from an original ancient Roman bath-house on the site.²⁹ So, in following in the hydrological heritage of the Romans in their mastery of water and waste, the Victorians and Edwardians probably came closest to their ancient counterparts – though obviously in a less glamorous fashion than some might have preferred.

In truth, a number of other British cities boasted far more Roman countenances than London ever did. While some, like Bath, possessed structures like King's Circus (1754-68) that represented monuments to eighteenth-century devotion to neo-classicism, others offered far more contemporary manifestations of the Roman architectural spirit in their urban environments. Interestingly, arguably the most defined architectural appropriations from the historical past came from the industrial cities of the Midlands and the North, which had benefitted probably most from the trade of the empire and wished to exhibit their possession of culture, as well as capital.³⁰ Since the classical world furnished the most authoritative contemporary source of cultural value, some of these cities appear to have employed the large funds they accrued from their strategic positions in British trade and industry to reconstruct some of their central urban landscapes in the image of antiquity. While Manchester opted, on the whole, to invest its funds in the creation of a largely Gothic Revival set of public buildings and Leeds produced something between a classical and Renaissance style, Liverpool and Birmingham fashioned over the Victorian era two of the most purely classical city-centres ever built in Britain – one might be tempted to call these centres *fora*, such appears to be their debt to the Roman civic ideal.³¹

Over the mid-Victorian era, Liverpool constructed a core of neo-classical civic buildings that included the William Brown Library and Museum (1857-60), the Picton Reading Room (1875-9), and the Walker Art Gallery (1875-7), as well as its three great railway termini. Undoubtedly, the *pièce-de-résistance* of this classical building programme was St George's Hall (1841-56), though, which was once described as 'the noblest classical building of the nineteenth century' (Casson 1948: 18) and fulfilled the diverse functions of public assembly rooms, concert hall and courthouse. Although it engaged Grecian elements on its exterior, the building's central, vaulted Great Hall was based on the design of the Baths of Caracalla in Rome and it boasted throughout its structure the significant embossed motto of 'SPQL' – '*Senatus populusque Liverpoolliensis*'. Similarly, Birmingham also possessed a classically-inspired civic centre to the city, represented by a group of buildings that included its Town Hall (1832-50), Midland Institute and Public Library (1855-63), Council House (1874-9), City Museum and Art Gallery (1881-5), and Post Office (1890-1).³²

So, while some other British cities of the period created cityscapes that owed seemingly much to ancient Rome, this was in contrast to London, which remained always rather diffident and eclectic in its architectural tastes, creating an urban environment that drew on the full gamut of Western building styles.³³ Indeed, as has been demonstrated, apart from a few commercial and private fancies, in general, Victorian and Edwardian Britain always remained something of 'a vast and foggy confusion' (Morris 1982: 47) architecturally and never possessed anything that might be termed a grand physical reincarnation of the ancient Roman past.

'THE MOST PECULIAR OF EMPIRES'? THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

While ancient Rome and Victorian London were largely similar in the ancient, cluttered, undesigned streetscapes that lay beyond their major imperial thoroughfares, both powers made sure to employ linear lay-outs in their empires that enunciated to their provincial subjects notions of socio-political authority, control and order. Although the British imperial project was not seen to favour any particular 'house style' of architecture – indeed, it created few of the monumental imperial buildings that other historical empires did –, the town and city planning visible in the empire bore a certain debt to ancient Rome.³⁴

Wherever they transformed colonial *rus* into *urbs*, British planners often seemed to turn to the urban planning of the Romans to create simple, but effective linear street-plans that converted virgin environments into outposts of British civilisation.³⁵ The right-angles, numerically-titled streets and basic grid structure of cities like Adelaide in Australia appear to be direct descendents of the Roman provincial town. Often, as Jan Morris has remarked, it is overlooked how many major modern capitals were either founded or developed by the British, many of which bore the traces of this Roman town-planning, citing:

Half the cities of the American East [...] most of the cities of Canada, many of the cities of Africa, all the cities of Australasia and the tremendous city-states of Singapore and Hong Kong (Morris 1994: 152).

To which one might also add the development of the Indian Presidency capitals of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras, as well as the creation of a number of capital cities from scratch, including Ottawa, Canberra and New Delhi.³⁶

As in the Roman Empire – especially in the non-'white' territories of the British Empire – military security was upmost in the minds of these urban planners. This was particularly true in India, where almost every significant settlement possessed a military cantonment and a set of 'civil lines' set apart from the native urban conurbation for security, cultural and even hygienic reasons.³⁷ The essentially despotic nature of the British *raj* depended upon military reinforcement throughout the sub-continent, which meant that British military architecture became a major feature of the landscape.

For instance, the c.175 cantonments that stood on the perimeters of a collection of key Indian cities and towns by 1870 resembled, in effect, a petrified version of a Roman military camp in their symmetrical grid-pattern structures.³⁸ Similarly, the sets of civil lines that grew up in close proximity mirrored closely the *vicus* settlements that were often developed next to a Roman military camp or *castrum*. While the classic 'playing-card' design of the Roman military camp or town was not employed in any exact manner by the British, one can divine the legacy of the Romans in the division, organisation and linearity of their cantonments and civil lines.

One does not wish to extend such a parallel too far, but some general resonances are clear. Take, for example, Lahore, a major seat of Sikh culture and capital of the British Punjab.³⁹ In any map of its urban incarnation under the British *raj*, one may perceive how the old Mughal city, crowned by its fort and surrounded by its ancient walls and crowded native districts, became surrounded by a set of leafy official suburbs and separated from the British civil and military lines further beyond. Located next to the Grand Trunk Road and the Upper Bari Doab Canal – each of which boasted another skill shared with the Romans: road and waterway construction –, the British built 'New Lahore'.

On most maps, within the civil lines of New Lahore, one can identify easily the seat of officialdom in Government House and the Secretariat, which were located beside the city's public park, Mayo Gardens. Within their vicinity, the British also constructed their chief public buildings, including the Town Hall, General Post Office, High Court, city prison, museum and university, not to mention the residential areas favoured by the administrators and officials of the *raj*. Set further apart from these civil lines, the military cantonment can be perceived delineated carefully away from the urban landscape; being further subdivided into specific military zones, including European and native infantry, cavalry and officer sectors, all surrounding a central church and park with hospitals, rifle ranges, wells and other features dotted around its perimeter. So, though only an echo of Rome, the British town-planning surrounding Lahore enunciates the ancient concept of *imperium* still very much in action – finding itself literally set in stone.

In spite of these clear Roman resonances, though, the actual architecture of imperial officialdom – whether public or domestic – bore few traces of a classical legacy. Take, for instance, the architecture of the eighty-odd Indian hill stations – of which the summer capital of British India, Simla, is the most famous –, which all bore a peculiar Alpine style from which any trace of monumental classicism was absent.⁴⁰ Yet, interestingly, it is only really in India that one finds any true architectural or monumental references to ancient Rome. From the beginnings of British rule there in the eighteenth century, one finds this Roman allusion present; as in, for example, Government House (1799-1803) in Calcutta, which was a vast neo-classical mansion that boasted a dining room modelled on a Roman *atrium* that was surrounded by busts of Suetonius' 'Twelve Caesars'. Arguably, the most Roman of the architectural projects ever created or developed by the British Empire in India or elsewhere, however, was New Delhi, which was designed and constructed by Sir Edwin Lutyens (1869-1944) and Sir Herbert Baker (1862-1946) between 1911 and 1931 – though it was alleged at the time to have been built, neither in a Roman nor an Indian style, but in a monumentally *imperial* one.⁴¹

Certainly, the scale of the project was Roman in its ambition, with Lutyens' construction of the Viceroy's House claimed at the time to have been the largest project ever undertaken by a single architect. Capped with a grand dome that seemed to suggest a debt to the Pantheon in Rome or the domes of Byzantium – though derived actually from the Buddhist *stupa* –, the building featured 300 rooms, staffed by over 6,000 servants and was larger than the Palace of Versailles with over four and a half acres of floor-space.⁴² As such, it created a particularly Roman centre-piece to the city, conjuring images of extensive ancient villas, such as Nero's infamous 'Golden House'. As what has been alleged to have been 'the one truly colonial official building erected by the British during their generations of overseas suzerainty' (Fermor-Hesketh 1986: 25), it is key that the viceregal mansion stood at the heart of New Delhi's linear, radiating urban landscape, which owed so much to the monumentalism of ancient Rome.

As mentioned already, unlike many other historical empires, the British imperial project was not known for an official architectural style, or even a profusion of similarly themed buildings dedicated to official purposes, so New Delhi was a significant and unusual project. Yet, even when imperial architecture possessed some semblance of large-scale unity – as in the Gothic Revival fantasy of the Canadian Parliament Buildings in Ottawa –, it seems to have represented merely a one-off and not a style that dictated to other colonial structures in either that territory or elsewhere. In contrast to the metropolitan aversion to imperial monumentalism, almost every colonial city boasted a large statue of Queen Victoria and usually a number of other grand imperial structures; although even this must be qualified by the fact that the territories of the British Empire never exhibited a set of standard urban features in the same way that Roman settlements often did.

For instance, one might have expected the triumphal arch to feature prominently in many major British colonial capitals, but this was simply not the case. Certainly, as in Britain, there were countless temporary arches erected for special occasions, such as viceregal or royal visits, but – with a few rare exceptions, such as Fusiliers' Arch (1906-7) in Dublin –, these

never became permanent features of the urban landscape. Arguably, the chief example of a triumphal arch in the British Empire is again to be found on the Indian sub-continent in Sir Edwin Lutyens' India Gate (1924-31) at the centre of New Delhi.⁴³ Standing 42 metres high and modelled on the Arch of Titus (c.A.D.82) in Rome, the India Gate was designed to create a monumental centre-piece to New Delhi. However, perhaps, crucially, the arch was built not to glorify British triumph, but to memorialise tragedy; commemorating the 70,000 Indians who died fighting in the Great War (1914-18) and the 13,500 British and Indian soldiers who died in the Third Afghan War (1919). In this, it appears to belong more to Lutyens' commemorative architectural oeuvre, which saw him design some of the chief memorials to the Great War, including the Cenotaph (1919-20) in London and the Thiepval Memorial (1928-32) in France. Thus, even when one finds these apparently unproblematic allusions to ancient Rome throughout the vast territories of the British Empire, they appear complicated in some way that undermines their credentials as heirs to Roman monumentalism.

So, although there were explicit debts to ancient Rome in some of the buildings and monuments of the British Empire, they were often too occluded by the sheer eclecticism of the imperial project to possess any major cultural cachet of their own. Jan Morris has written that '[n]ot since the Romans, it is probably safe to say, had an imperial people erected such a grand range of structures in a subject land' (Morris 1994: 8); however, these constructions – excepting, perhaps, New Delhi – bore only a fraction of Rome's monumentalism. Instead, the British imperial project was too seemingly commonsensical and utilitarian an institution to project itself fully into the architectural shadow of Rome. In other words, the grand features of the Roman Empire were largely absent from its British counterpart, which turned to its monumental spirit only half-heartedly at certain junctures without being part of an overall imperialist discourse.

Instead, as the art critic, Robert Byron, once suggested, British imperial architecture was like 'a permanent nineteenth century' (Fermor-Hesketh 1986: 30) – eclectic, excessive and intense; indeed, apparently, far too much so to occupy or to project the physical spirit of ancient Rome. What Benjamin Disraeli once termed 'the most peculiar of empires' (ibid., 11) seemed to possess all of the theoretical hallmarks of Rome – its territorial extent, its military power and its cultural influence – , but none of the concrete symbols of that seemingly shared *imperium*. Instead, the manifestation of the ancient Roman spirit in the architecture of the British imperial project seems to have been warped by layers of bureaucracy, which distorted and obscured its chief features; making it a far less potent cultural spectre than it seems at first glance and much like one encounters in Britain's domestic architecture.

CONCLUSION

So, when one surveys the actual stones of empire that made up the physical metropolitan and provincial fabric of the British Empire, one discovers a far more superficial debt to the monumental spirit of ancient Rome than one might suspect originally. As we have seen, even at the height of its empire, London always remained too fissured and fragmented a cultural entity to project a distinctly and singularly Roman appearance. Certainly, there were occasional architectural spectres of Rome amid the diverse urban fabric of the British capital, but these rarely met the grand monumental standards of the Roman world.

Where there was a concerted effort to project an image of Roman grandeur onto an official British construction at home – as in the example of Admiralty Arch –, it was diluted by bureaucracy into a far more opaque vision. Instead, it was the private and commercial spirit that seemed to animate any major Victorian or Edwardian emulations of ancient Rome in bricks and mortar. Only occasionally was London 'dressed up' as an imperial city – for instance, during Victoria's jubilee celebrations in 1887 and 1897 or at the coronations of Edward VII or George V –, but whatever ceremonial gilding the city received for these events was only superficial and transitory.⁴⁴ In contrast, other British cities – such as Liverpool and Birmingham – boasted arguably a finer set of neo-classical buildings and monuments that owed an explicit debt to their Roman forebears.

One must explore further afield, in the British imperial project, to discover any concrete resonances of ancient Rome; yet, as we have seen, even these appear to resolve into the similar cultural landscape that one finds exhibited domestically. Certainly, there are clearer parallels – whether in the urban planning of British colonial cities like New Delhi or the grander monuments erected in them like the India Gate –, but much the same trend seemed to prevail in the provinces as at the metropolitan heart of the empire: Rome was present, but not privileged.

Therefore, one is compelled to the conclusion that the *genius loci* of Victorian and Edwardian Britain and the empire it commanded were not animated by any spirit of Rome in anything more than a superficial sense. Instead, there was simply an ephemeral ‘feeling’ that the British Empire was a new Rome – as one finds in the opening of Henry James’ novel, *The golden bowl* (1904) –, which did not derive from any structural or even physical realisation of such a parallel, but, rather, from a theoretical conceit. Residing chiefly in the minds of colonial advocates and adherents, such as Sir Charles Lucas, who sought to interrogate the British imperial project through comparison to the greatest empire of the ancient world, one is driven to the conclusion that the intellectual cachet that ancient Rome achieved as a cultural comparative in this period was never transferred directly into anything approaching reality.

Commentators such as Lord Bryce or Lord Cromer might employ the Roman parallel in a qualified fashion as a model either to emulate or to avoid, but a like-for-like physical comparison between the Roman and British empires was never more than an attractive pretence. In other words, with Victorian and Edwardian appropriations of ancient Rome, allusion always seemed to remain illusion – if not occasional delusion. Indeed, often, this paper parallel turned into a paper structure – as we have seen, often literally being made of cardboard or *papier mâché* in the case of many temporary triumphal arches.

Instead, the use of the Roman allusion in architectural reality seemed to take the form of merely a superficial theatrical effect, a piece of imperial stagecraft, which is probably why it seemed so ideally adapted to the needs of the contemporary entertainment industry. Thus, for better or worse, the historical stones that English commentators used to construct imaginatively the British imperial project have been revealed to be not the same ones that they employed to build its physical portals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, E. 2008. ‘Late Victorian and Edwardian views of Rome and the nature of ‘defensive imperialism’ in the *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 15/2:187-216.
- Amery, C. and Stamp, G. 1980. *Victorian buildings of London, 1837-87: an illustrated guide*. Architectural Press: London.
- Amery, C. 1988. *Wren’s London*. Headline: London.
- Atkinson, D., Cosgrove, D. and Notaro, A. ‘Empire in modern Rome: shaping and remembering an imperial city, 1870-1911’ in Driver and Gilbert 2003, 40-63.
- Architectural Review, The*. November 1909:26.
- Baker, M. 1968; 2002. *Discovering London statues and monuments*. Shire: London.
- Barton, S. 1972. *Monumental follies: an exposition on the eccentric edifices of Britain*. Lyle: Worthing.
- Baths and Wash-Houses Historical Archive: <http://www.bathsandwashhouses.co.uk/> [Last accessed 1 June 2013].
- Beavan, A.H. 1901. *Imperial London*. J.M. Dent: London.
- Betts, R.F. 1971. ‘The allusion to Rome in British imperialist thought in the late nineteenth and

- early twentieth centuries' in *Victorian Studies*, 15:149-59.
- Bradley, M., (ed.). 2010. *Classics and imperialism in the British Empire*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Brendon, P. 2007. *The decline and fall of the British Empire, 1781-1997*. Jonathan Cape: London.
- Bryce, J.; Viscount. 1901. *Studies in history and jurisprudence*, 2 vols. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Casson, H.M. 1948. *An introduction to Victorian architecture*. Art and Technics: London.
- Champion, C.B., (ed.). 2004. *Roman imperialism: readings and sources*. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford
- Cromer, E. Baring; Earl of. 1910. *Ancient and modern imperialism*. John Murray: London.
- Crooke, T. 2006. 'Schools for the moral training of the people: public baths, liberalism and the promotion of cleanliness in Victorian Britain' in the *European Review of History*, 13/1:21-47.
- Daljeet, P.C.J. 2002. *The monuments of India*. Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: New Delhi.
- Davies, T. 1966. *John Nash: the Prince Regent's architect*. Country Life: London.
- Dennis, R. 1984. *English industrial cities of the nineteenth century: a social geography*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Dickens Jr., C. 1888; 1993. *Dickens' dictionary of London, 1888*. Old House: Moretonhampstead.
- Driver, F., and Gilbert, D., (eds). 2003. *Imperial cities: landscape, display and identity*. Manchester University Press: Manchester.
- Dyos, H.J. and Wolff, M., (eds). 1973. *The Victorian city: images and realities*, 2 vols. Routledge: London.
- Fermor-Hesketh, R. 1986. *Architecture of the British Empire*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson: London.
- Garnsey, P.D.A., and Whittaker, C.R., (eds). 1978. *Imperialism in the ancient world*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Glasstone, V. 1975. *Victorian and Edwardian theatres*. Thames and Hudson: London.
- Glover, W.J. 2008. *Making Lahore modern: constructing and imagining a colonial city*. University of Minnesota Press: Minnesota MN.
- Goff, B., (ed.). 2005. *Classics and colonialism*. Duckworth: London.
- Halliday, S. 1997. *Sir Joseph Bazalgette and the main drainage of London*. London Guildhall University: London.
- _____. 2003. *Making the metropolis: creators of Victoria's London*. Breedon Books: Derby.
- Hingley, R. 2000. *Roman officers and English gentlemen: the imperial origins of Roman archaeology*. Routledge: Oxford.

- Hobson, J.A. 1902. *Imperialism: a study*. James Nisbet: London.
- Home, R. 1996. *Of planting and planning: the making of British colonial cities*. Spon: London.
- Hood, T.L., (ed.). 1933. *The letters of Robert Browning, collected by T.J. Wise*. John Murray: London.
- Hughes, Q. 1964. *Seaport: architecture and townscape of Liverpool*. Humphries: London.
- Hunt, T. 2004. *Building Jerusalem: the rise and fall of the Victorian city*. Henry Holt and Co.: London.
- Irving, R.G. 1981. *Indian summer: Lutyens, Baker and imperial Delhi*. Yale University Press: New Haven CT.
- Johnson, J.H. and Pooley, C.G., (eds). 1982. *The structure of nineteenth-century cities*. St Martin's Press: Basingstoke.
- Jordan, D.P. 1995. *Transforming Paris: the life and labours of Baron Haussmann*. Free Press: New York NY.
- Kail, K.D. 1966. *Some examples of Victorian civic architecture in London*. Camberwell School of Arts and Crafts: London.
- Kanwar, P. 1990. *Imperial Simla: the political culture of the raj*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi.
- Kennedy, D. 1996. *The magic mountains: Indian hill stations and the British raj*. University of California Press: Berkeley CA.
- Little, B.D.G. 1971. *Birmingham buildings: the architecture of a midland city*. David and Charles: London.
- Lucas, C.P. 1912. *Greater Rome and Greater Britain*. Clarendon: Oxford.
- Mace, R. 1976. *Trafalgar Square: emblem of empire*. Lawrence and Wishart: London.
- Metcalf, P. 1972. *Victorian London*. Cassell: London.
- Metcalf, T.R. 1989. *An imperial vision: Indian architecture and Britain's raj*. University of California Press: Berkeley CA.
- Morris, J. 1968; 1979. *Pax Britannica*. Penguin: Harmondsworth.
- _____. 1982. *The spectacle of empire: style, effect and the pax Britannica*. Doubleday: London.
- _____. 1983; 1994. *Stones of empire: the buildings of British India*. Penguin: Harmondsworth.
- _____. 'In quest of the imperial style' in Fermor-Hesketh 1986, 10-31.
- Nath, A. 2002. *A dome over India: Rashtrapati Bhavan*. India Book House: Mumbai.
- Olsen, D.J. 1976. *The growth of Victorian London*. Batsford: London.
- Port, M.H. 1995. *Imperial London: civil government building in London, 1851-1915*. Yale University Press: New Haven CT.
- Porter, B. 2011. *The battle of the styles: society, culture and the design of the new Foreign Office, 1855-61*. Continuum: London.
- Robertson, J.M. 1899. *Patriotism and empire*. Grant Richards: London.

- Robinson, O.F. 1922; 1994. *Ancient Rome: city planning and administration*. Routledge: London.
- Rogers, P. 1974. *The Augustan vision*. Littlehampton Book Services: Worthing.
- Ryan, D.S. 'Staging the imperial city: the Pageant of London, 1911' in Driver and Gilbert, 2003, 21-39.
- Salmon, F. 2001. *Building on ruins: the rediscovery of Rome and English architecture*. Ashgate: Farnham.
- Schneer, J. 1999. *London, 1900: the imperial metropolis*. Yale University Press: New Haven CT.
- Seeley, J.R. 1883. *The expansion of England: two courses of lectures*. Macmillan: London.
- Sharada Prasad, H.Y. 1992. *Rashtrapati Bhavan: the story of the president's house*. Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: New Delhi.
- Sheard, S. 2000. 'Profit is a dirty word: the development of public baths and wash-houses in Britain, 1847-1915' in *Social History of Medicine*, 13/1:63-85.
- Smith, T. 'A grand work of noble conception': the Victoria Memorial and imperial London' in Driver and Gilbert 2005, 117-135.
- Stambaugh, J.E. 1988. *The ancient Roman city*. Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore MD.
- Stamp, G. 1981. 'British architecture in India, 1857-1947' in *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 129/5298, 357-79.
- Stewart, C. 1956. *The stones of Manchester*. Arnold: London.
- Stillman, D. 1988. *English neo-classical architecture*, 2 vols. Zwemmer: London.
- Summerson, J. 1976. *The architecture of Victorian London*. University of Virginia Press: Charlottesville VA.
- Tyack, G. 1992. *Sir James Pennethorne and the making of Victorian London*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Vance, N. 1997. *The Victorians and ancient Rome*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- _____. 2011. 'Anxieties of empire and the moral tradition: Rome and Britain' in the *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 18:2, 246-61.
- Vasunia, P. 'Greater Rome and Greater Britain' in Goff 2005, 38-64.
- _____. 2013. *The classics and colonial India*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Volwahren, A. 2002. *Imperial Delhi: the British capital of the Indian Empire*. Prestel: London.
- _____. 2004. *Splendours of imperial India: British architecture in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries*. Prestel: London.
- Watkin, D. 2010. *The classical country house: from the archives of Country Life*. Country Life: London.
- Wilkes, L. and G. Dodds, G. 1964. *Tyneside classical: the Newcastle of Grainger, Dobson and Clayton*. John Murray: London.

¹ On the intersections between 'new' imperialism and contemporary parallels to ancient Rome, see R.F. Betts, 'The allusion to Rome in British imperialist thought in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries' in *Victorian Studies*, 15:149-59 and N. Vance, *The Victorians and ancient Rome*, ch. 10, (1997: 222-46). The ways in which antiquity was employed to inform imperialism is contextualised in the introductory essays of Barbara Goff in *Classics and colonialism* (2005: 1-24) and Mark Bradley in *Classics and imperialism in the British Empire* (2010: 1-25).

² See P. Rogers *The Augustan vision* (Worthing, 1974) and D. Stillman, *English neo-classical architecture*, 2 vols (London, 1988).

³ For a good starting-point on the reception of ancient Rome in this period, see N. Vance, *The Victorians and ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1997). Although much recent research has been completed on specific intersections between the Roman and British empires, for a useful introduction to their general relation, see P. Brendon, *The decline and fall of the British Empire* (London, 2007).

⁴ Although deployed in a number of influential late-Victorian works – such as John Robert Seeley's influential polemic, *The expansion of England* (1883: 245-8) –, parallels between Roman and British imperialism seem to have developed into a sophisticated comparative model only in the Edwardian era. The writings of Bryce, Cromer and Lucas can be said to have been key to this; creating a close, comparative discourse that foregrounded the legitimisation of the British imperial project above any truly insightful considerations of Roman history. Bryce's *Studies in history and jurisprudence* (1901) focussed quite specifically upon comparisons between Roman and English law, devoting six of the work's sixteen essays to the topic. Cromer's *Ancient and modern imperialism* (1910) represented a far more cogent and extended thesis on contemporary parallels to antiquity, though he remained careful to emphasise dissimilarities such as racial assimilation in order to demonstrate the complexities of such comparativism. Lucas' *Greater Rome and Greater Britain* (1912) embodies probably the most sophisticated extended reflection of all three upon potential parallels between the Roman and British empires in particular; presenting a work in which such comparisons are compartmentalised into discrete chapters on individual analogues. As '[t]he three most sustained and elaborate comparisons of Rome and Britain', these works appear to have both encouraged and reflected late-Victorian and Edwardian interest in ancient Rome as a comparative model. (Vasunia 2013: 141) On these works and their context, see P. Vasunia, 'Greater Rome and Greater Britain' in B. Goff (ed.), *Classics and colonialism*, 38-64 and E. Adler, 'Late Victorian and Edwardian views of Rome and the nature of 'defensive imperialism' in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 15/2, 187-216.

⁵ Charles Prestwood Lucas (1853-1931) enjoyed an elite education at Winchester College and Balliol College, Oxford; emerging in 1876 with a first-class *literae humaniores* degree in classics and topping the civil service list in 1877. Called to the bar in 1885, he joined the Colonial Office soon after, rising to assistant under-secretary in 1897 and first head of the Dominions Department in 1907. After retiring, he continued to write many books and became a fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. Possessed of the finest classical education available and positioned at the heart of British colonial administration, Lucas was clearly in an ideal position to compare Roman and British imperialism.

⁶ As evidenced by the numerous references made to ancient Rome in both Robertson's *Patriotism and empire* (1899) and Hobson's *Imperialism: a study* (1902). See Robertson (1899: 151-7) and Hobson (1902: 8, 261, 324 and 387-9). On some of the contemporary arguments against ancient Rome as a valid comparative, see N. Vance, 'Anxieties of empire and the moral tradition: Rome and Britain' in the *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 18:2, 246-61. John Mackinnon Robertson (1856-1933) left school at thirteen, working as a clerk before becoming a full-time journalist. He became involved in radical politics, writing for and later editing the *National Reformer*, before serving as a Liberal M.P. from 1906 to 1918. He was involved throughout his life in various political causes and published numerous articles and books. John Atkinson Hobson (1858-1940) was educated at Derby School and Lincoln College, Oxford, before teaching classics and English at a number of schools. He also became involved in radical politics, though gravitated increasingly towards

socialism. He worked as a journalist for most of his career, producing countless articles on political and economic themes, but it as a Marxist commentator and theorist that he became best-known.

⁷ For comparison to modern imperialism, see P.D.A. Garnsey and C.R. Whittaker (eds), *Imperialism in the ancient world* (Cambridge, 1978) and C.B. Champion (ed.), *Roman imperialism: readings and sources* (Oxford, 2004).

⁸ On the ways in which ancient Rome influenced English architecture over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see F. Salmon, *Building on ruins: the rediscovery of Rome and English architecture* (Farnham, 2001).

⁹ The world did not see a city as populous as ancient Rome until London c.1800. For comparison, see O.F. Robinson, *Ancient Rome: city planning and administration* (London, 1922; 1994) and D.J. Olsen, *The growth of Victorian London* (London, 1976). For a general panorama of London in 1900, see J. Schneer, *London, 1900: the imperial metropolis* (New Haven CT, 1999).

¹⁰ See D.P. Jordan, *Transforming Paris: the life and labours of Baron Haussmann* (London, 1995).

¹¹ Morris explains elsewhere:

It was scarcely an imperial city [...] in the way that Rome had been. Indeed, it did not look as conventionally imperial as Paris, with its grandiloquent boulevards, or Berlin with its heroic trophies, or even the symbol-laden Washington. London's growth over many centuries had been scarcely interrupted by war or revolution, and only peripherally affected by the acquisition of empire. It was a profoundly organic city, unplanned, which had become almost despite itself one of the great industrial, diplomatic, financial and artistic centres of the world. London was a vast and foggy confusion. Morris (1982: 47).

¹² Following the Great Fire in 1666, Wren planned a rebuilding of the city along geometrical lines with broad thoroughfares, focal points and circular spaces surrounding important buildings such as the Guildhall and the Mint. One of the centrepieces of this design was Wren's original 'Grand Model' plan for St Paul's Cathedral, which offered a far more monumentally Roman visage than the building that was constructed eventually. Like the Great Fire of Neronian Rome, the destruction of so much of medieval London allowed for the clearing of cluttered slums and the redevelopment of large parts of the city. However, apart from Wren's city churches, which were based on the Roman basilica, none of these plans were carried out. Later, in early-nineteenth century, the Prince Regent gave the architect, John Nash, leave to complete a major redesign of London along classical lines, which allowed him to lay out Regent Street (1814-25) and the accompanying developments of Regent's Park (1818-35), St James's Park (1826-7) and Trafalgar Square (1826-44). See C. Amery, *Wren's London* (London, 1988) and T. Davies, *John Nash: the Prince Regent's architect* (London, 1966).

¹³ One might suggest another example in the area of Chelsea and South Kensington that became known colloquially as 'Albertopolis' because of the large number of streets, monuments and buildings dedicated to the memory of the dead prince consort. From above, this development represents, perhaps, the only grand space in Victorian and Edwardian London that owes a debt to the monumentalism of Rome. The arrangement of the Albert Memorial (1872) and the Royal Albert Hall (1867-71) at the top of the site above the symmetrical constructions of the Huxley Building (1867-71), Natural History Museum (1873-81), Imperial Institute (1887-93) and Victoria and Albert Museum (1859-72/1899-1909) appear to create an integrated monumental whole.

¹⁴ See K.D. Kail, *Some examples of Victorian civic architecture in London* (London, 1966), P. Metcalf, *Victorian London* (London, 1972), J. Summerson, *The architecture of Victorian London* (Charlottesville VA, 1976), C. Amery and G. Stamp, *Victorian buildings of London*,

1837-87: *an illustrated guide* (London, 1980) and S. Halliday, *Making the metropolis: creators of Victoria's London* (Derby, 2003).

¹⁵ See M. Baker, *Discovering London statues and monuments* (London, 1968; 2002).

¹⁶ After Admiralty Arch, arguably, the most 'Roman' of these was the Victoria Memorial, which was a crucial element of the redevelopment of the Mall. See T. Smith, 'A grand work of noble conception': the Victoria Memorial and imperial London' in Driver and Gilbert (2005: 117-135). The equestrian statue of the Celtic queen Boudica and her daughters (1856-85) by Thomas Thornycroft (1815-85) was designed and constructed over the years 1856-85, but only erected on the Thames Embankment in 1902. At least part of the reason for this lengthy delay may have been the controversial subject-matter of the piece, which – since it appeared to celebrate insurgency – proved an uncomfortable topic for an imperial society. See R. Hingley, *Roman officers and English gentlemen* (2000: 77 and 80-1).

¹⁷ Until the erection of Nelson's Column, London's Monument to the Great Fire (1671-7) in the City of London represented the prime example of a memorial column in the city. On Trafalgar Square as a monumental focal point of London, see R. Mace, *Trafalgar Square: emblem of empire* (London, 1976).

¹⁸ The triumphal arch entered the language of British public architecture hardly at all, but it appears to have been employed extensively in the construction of private mansions throughout the country in the eighteenth-century. One of the earliest examples of the structure in British architecture was the Gate of Honour (c.1575) at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, which also represented one of the first incursions of Italian Renaissance architecture in the country. When neo-classicism became the favoured style of the British aristocracy and gentry in the eighteenth-century, the triumphal arch became included as a major feature of Palladian architecture. For instance, Rome's Arch of Titus provided the inspiration for the entrance arch to Bleinheim Palace (1723) by Nicholas Hawksmoor (1661-1736), alongside other, contemporary examples at Mereworth Park, Kent (c.1725) and Garendon Park in Loughborough (c.1735), Harewood House, Yorkshire (c.1765), not to mention a triumphal-arch house (c.1778-81) at Berrington Park, Leominster. Other examples include the arch at Shugborough Park, Staffordshire (c.1750) by James 'Athenian' Stuart (1713-88), along with others at Parlington Hall, West Yorkshire (c.1783) and Chatsworth House (c.1820-41). All of these were privately funded and erected on landed estates, which grant them only limited influence as arbiters of public or official taste. A few rare examples do exist of privately-funded monuments such as these possessing at least some semblance of commemorative public function, as in the case of Arno's Court arch in Bristol (c.1760) – an arch built for public use in the city – and the anti-slavery arch at Paganhill Estate in Stroud, Gloucestershire (1834) – the only such memorial to the abolition of the slave trade in the country. Along with the major examples outlined, there were many more private estates that possessed monumental arches, though only in name. In other words, their version of the triumphal arch was merely an arch-shaped structure that has been fitted to the style of the rest of the buildings – as one can see, for instance, in the Tuscan arch at Bellamont House, Dorset. See D. Watkin, *The classical country house: from the archives of Country Life* (London, 2010).

¹⁹ Marble Arch represented the only general war memorial to the Napoleonic conflict, but, in spite of plans for a more ornate structure, it remained a plain affair. Although it was due to be surmounted with a statue of Victory and decorated with friezes by the sculptor, Richard Westmacott (1775-1856), in the event, the statue was abandoned and the friezes transferred to Buckingham Palace. Elsewhere, in the late-1830s, an architectural competition was opened for designs for the rebuilding of the Royal Exchange, specifying designs only in a 'Grecian, Roman or Italian style'. The entry by Charles Robert Cockerell (1788-1863) represented a design based on the Roman triumphal arch, but went unaccepted owing apparently to its ornate monumentalism. These examples all seem suggestive of a general unwillingness to assume fully the monumental legacy of ancient Rome via a construct as loaded culturally as the triumphal arch.

²⁰ As *The Architectural Review* recognised at the time, this undermined incongruously any monumental image intended originally:

The removal of the scaffolding at the east end of the Mall discloses another pitiable example of national parsimony in Art. Only in our own land would a government be found to demand the combination of a Triumphal Arch, an office building and an official residence in a block both pleasing and expressive. The new building is neither [...] no archway can soar to grandiloquence when crushed under a row of offices. *Architectural Review* (1909: 224).

²¹ As Jan Morris identifies:

[...] the imperial offices [were] embedded indistinguishably in the warren of Whitehall, and nobody seems to know which is which. No Dyaks or Zaptiehs mount guard outside St. James's Palace; no pagoda roofs or African caryatids stand in imperial symbol; among all the bright frescoes of the Houses of Parliament we shall find only one with an imperial motif – and that concerned with seventeenth-century India. Morris (1979: 436-7).

²² Among the original entries to the competition were a number with Roman titles, including 'Arcana imperii', 'Pro regina et patria semper', 'Potentatus et gloria' and 'Rome was not built in a day'. See M.H. Port, *Imperial London: civil government building in London, 1851-1915* (New Haven CT, 1995) and B. Porter, *The battle of the styles: society, culture and the design of the new Foreign Office, 1855-61* (London, 2011).

²³ One individual who hoped to create monumental edifices and spaces throughout the fabric of the capital that appeared to owe much to Roman monumentalism was the architect, James Pennethorne (1801-71). As John Nash's principal assistant, he appeared to continue much of his predecessor's work in attempting to create a more monumental London. However, although in 1832 he became the official architect retained by the Office of Works, most of his grand designs went unrealised. For example, one of these unfulfilled plans was for a major thoroughfare that would have ran the length of London from east to west, of which Nash himself would have been proud. Among Pennethorne's successful projects, though, were the layout and construction of New Oxford Street, Endell Street, Cranbourn Street and Commercial Street, among various other street and building designs, though he never achieved the monumental visions that inspired initially his personal architectural style See G. Tyack, *Sir James Pennethorne and the making of Victorian London* (Cambridge, 1992).

²⁴ *Dickens' dictionary of London* (1888) even suggested that the building appeared more designed for Roman-like exhibitions of mortal combat than a night at a Proms concert:

[The Albert Hall's] interior is amphitheatrical in construction – like, for instance, the Coliseum at Rome – is not very appropriate to any purpose for which it is ever likely to be required except musical performances on a large scale. For gladiatorial exhibitions of any kind, the central area, measuring 102 ft. by 68 ft., would, of course, though rather small, be capitally adapted. Dickens (1993: 22-3).

Other contemporary London buildings whose domes mirrored the Roman Pantheon included the Coal Exchange (1847-9) and the Round Reading Room of the British Library (1854-7). Elsewhere, the front of the new Royal Exchange (1842-4) by William Tite (1798-1873) was based on the portico of the Pantheon, though the other sides of the building possessed Renaissance visages. However, one of the most allusive commercial buildings to Rome in Britain was the Pantheon (1772) by James Wyatt (1746-1813), which was an entertainment complex constructed on Oxford Street that boasted a large, central rotunda based on the Roman Pantheon. In 1833-4, the building was redeveloped into the Pantheon Bazaar, which remained a commercial feature of Victorian and Edwardian London.

²⁵ See V. Glasstone, *Victorian and Edwardian theatres* (London, 1975).

²⁶ Arguably, the closest that Victorian or Edwardian Britain got to a monument actually resembling the Colosseum was the folly of the banker, John Stuart MacCaig (1823-1902), in Oban, Scotland, which he modelled on the Flavian Amphitheatre and personally designed and built in the years 1897-1902, leaving it unfinished upon his death. See S. Barton, *Monumental follies: an exposition on the eccentric edifices of Britain* (1972: 239-41).

²⁷ See S. Halliday, *Sir Joseph Bazalgette and the main drainage of London* (London, 1997).

²⁸ See T. Crooke, 'Schools for the moral training of the people: public baths, liberalism and the promotion of cleanliness in Victorian Britain' in *European Review of History*, 13/1:21-47 and S. Sheard, 'Profit is a dirty word: the development of public baths and wash-houses in Britain, 1847-1915' in the *Social History of Medicine*, 13/1:63-85. For an online resource, see the Baths and Wash-Houses Historical Archive: <http://www.bathsandwashhouses.co.uk/>

²⁹ The baths themselves consisted of a cold plunge-bath originally constructed by the Earl of Essex in 1588, which was located next to the remains of an actual Roman bath-house from which it drew its alleged water-supply. Evidently, the use of the word 'Roman' in the title offered a certain contemporary cultural cachet in much the same way as the capital's nearby 'Grecian Theatre' on the City Road. Dickens (1993: 34-5 and 112).

³⁰ See H.J. Dyos and M. Wolff, (eds), *The Victorian city: images and realities*, 2 vols (London, 1973), J.H. Johnson and C.G. Pooley (eds), *The structure of nineteenth-century cities* (Basingstoke, 1982) and R. Dennis, *English industrial cities of the nineteenth century: a social geography* (Cambridge, 1984). For a single extended example, see C. Stewart, *The stones of Manchester* (London, 1956). Interestingly, while these cities attempted to classicise themselves in a demonstration of their possession of culture and taste, many old Italian cities seemed to be modernising themselves over the same period through investment in railways, gas-works and electricity. For instance, the poet, Robert Browning, criticised Venice's residents for 'their obstinate determination to Liverpoolise' the city. Hood (1933: 224).

³¹ See Q. Hughes, *Seaport: architecture and townscape of Liverpool* (London, 1964) and B.D.G. Little, *Birmingham buildings: the architecture of a midland city* (London, 1971).

³² Occasionally, there was a nod to antiquity in the informal nomenclature of these industrial giants in reference to their chief produce, such as Manchester as 'Cottonopolis' or Dundee as 'Juteopolis'.

³³ For a smaller scale example of the construction of a classical civic centre, see L. Wilkes and G. Dodds, *Tyneside classical: the Newcastle of Grainger, Dobson and Clayton* (London, 1964). For more on the urban fabric of cities in this period, see T. Hunt, *Building Jerusalem: the rise and fall of the Victorian city* (London, 2004).

³⁴ Jan Morris outlines some of the differences between British colonial architecture and other historical examples:

The British were not great builders in the Roman or the Spanish kind – they erected few colossal memorials to their own grandeur, few triumphal staircases or epic temples. That was not their way. Their Colosseum was only their station racecourse, their Pantheon the modest Anglican cathedral, and the palaces of their pro-consuls were, by and large, hardly more than comfortable gentlemen's residences. Morris (1982: 92-3).

See R. Fermor-Hesketh (ed.), *Architecture of the British Empire* (London, 1986), which remains the only scholarly work to examine the broad trends of colonial architecture throughout the diverse territories of the British Empire.

³⁵ See J.E. Stambaugh, *The ancient Roman city* (Baltimore MD, 1988).

³⁶ See R. Home, *Of planting and planning: the making of British colonial cities* (London, 1996).

³⁷ See G. Stamp, 'British architecture in India, 1857-1947' in the *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 129/5298 (May 1981), 357-79, J. Morris, *Stones of empire: the buildings of the raj* (Oxford, 1983), T.R. Metcalf, *An imperial vision: Indian architecture and Britain's raj* (Berkeley CA, 1989) and A. Volwahren, *Splendours of imperial India: British architecture in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries* (London, 2004).

³⁸ See Morris (1994: 65-8).

³⁹ See W.J. Glover, *Making Lahore modern: constructing and imagining a colonial city* (Minneapolis MN, 2008).

⁴⁰ See P. Kanwar, *Imperial Simla: the political culture of the raj* (London, 1990) and D. Kennedy, *The magic mountains: Indian hill stations and the British raj* (Berkeley CA, 1996).

⁴¹ See R.G. Irving, *Indian summer: Lutyens, Baker and imperial Delhi* (London, 1981) and A. Volwahren, *Imperial Delhi: the British capital of the Indian Empire* (London, 2002).

⁴² Upon Indian independence in 1947, the building became the presidential palace and is known now as the *Rashtrapati Bhavan*. See H.Y. Sharada Prasad, *Rashtrapati Bhavan: the story of the president's house* (New Delhi, 1992) and A. Nath, *A dome over India: Rashtrapati Bhavan* (Mumbai, 2002).

⁴³ Similarly, the Gateway of India (1920-4) in Bombay was a temporary structure erected originally for the visit of George V in 1911 that was designed subsequently as a permanent monument by George Wittet (1878-1926). Yet, like Admiralty Arch in London, this triumphal arch was made to serve an additional use beyond its essential purpose as an imperial monument by having included within its design a reception hall of high, domed chambers to cater for a couple of hundred guests. Significantly, the arch was styled, not on a particularly Roman model, but, rather, on a sixteenth-century Gujarati type, which made it almost wholly native in design and execution. See P.C.J. Daljeet, *The monuments of India* (2002: 110-11).

⁴⁴ See, for example, D.S. Ryan, 'Staging the imperial city: the Pageant of London, 1911' in Driver and Gilbert (2003, 21-39). For a contemporary view, see A.H. Beavan, *Imperial London* (London, 1901).