

The Development of Roman Military Costume on English Church Monuments

Clive J Easter¹

Abstract

This paper considers the development of the portrayal of Roman military costume on English church monuments of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The uses of such costume were rooted in the wider European Renaissance, the effects of which were felt in England from the early sixteenth century. Later Elizabethan and early Jacobean literature employed a wide variety of classical references, the culmination of which were the masques performed for the Jacobean and Caroline Courts which were the ultimate expression of classical ideas and ideals. The early seventeenth century saw the tentative uses of Roman military costume for commemorative sculpture but it was not until the post Restoration period that such costume became commonplace on the memorials of the social elites. The political significance of this dress is further explored as are the corresponding moral and civic associations. The paper concludes with the idea that by the mid eighteenth century such a costume style had become an anachronism and no longer appropriate for the monuments of the gentry.

Introduction

Most discussions of medieval commemorative monuments include some references to costume and these often focus on developments in defensive armour. By contrast, meaningful discussions of costume on monuments of the early modern period are very few indeed and are again limited to armour and, occasionally, female dress. By the time of the post-Restoration period, costume on church monuments is virtually ignored despite there being a prevailing style for men in the form of Roman military dress. In referencing the antique, this style makes a specific point. Not only does it have a deep political meaning it also suggest adherence to a particular social and moral code as will be shown while at a practical level it offers a continuity of style at a time of rapidly changing fashions. The antique reference was no mere whim of fancy or passing fashionable trend but was the product of a long development whose origins lay in the European Renaissance.

Classical sources, exemplars and iconography were lauded since late antique period while the emergence of the Renaissance in western European art and culture, along with the renewed interest in antiquity, provided an ideal opportunity in which to compare victorious generals and princes with distinguished ancient leaders. This comparison extended to literature, painting and sculpture with the use of Roman-inspired armour as the male costume of choice. Such was the popularity of this dress that its use rapidly increased throughout the sixteenth century to the extent that the format became virtually standard.

As an early example of Roman military dress used to emphasize the political ideals and heroic qualities of a Renaissance ruler, one need look no further than the sculpted and painted images of Cosimo I Grand Duke of Tuscany. *The Apotheosis of Cosimo I* painted between 1563/65 by Vasari in the Sala Grande of the Palazzo Vecchio museum, Florence (Fig 1), is the ultimate expression of Cosimo's person.²

As Cosimo's power increased, so did the visual propaganda associated with him and throughout his reign there was increasing emphasis on the glorification of his person as founder of the new Tuscan State. This glorification finds its greatest expression in the Apotheosis, the ultimate accolade.

¹ Independent Scholar, Plymouth Devon UK. clivejester@gmail.com

² The costume shown in the painting is not an accurate representation of Roman military dress but more an adaptation of quasi-antique footwear and shoulder pieces worn with trunk hose. For a fuller explanation of the development of Renaissance period uses of Roman military costume see D De Marly *The establishment of Roman Dress in seventeenth century portraiture*. Burlington Magazine Vol. 117 July 1975 pp442-451



Fig 1 Apotheosis of Cosimo 1 by Georgio Vasari Palazzo Vecchio, Florence

Within the *Apotheosis*, a personification of Florence was originally intended as the central image, but Cosimo instructed Vasari to replace it with a portrait of himself, where he is placed in a celestial world, accompanied by putti and the arms of the key Florentine families. A heavenly figure, possibly intended as a more modest personification of Florence, awards the Duke the civic crown. By being dressed in Roman military costume Cosimo is directly comparing himself with ancient heroic rulers and victorious generals. However, the painting is also making a wider political statement. The use of Roman military costume and its association with the perceived stability of the classical world reinforces the nostalgic view of the republican ideal as was believed to have been practised in ancient Rome and, by extension, the legitimacy of Cosimo's regime. Vasari's *Apotheosis* is the culmination of the cult of Cosimo that had started when he assumed the Duchy but it is also a celebration of the high ideal he wanted to emulate and promulgate. Sculpted and cast busts by Baccio Bandinelli and Benvenuto Cellini from the beginning of his reign all show Cosimo in Roman armour, suggesting a deliberate move to continually associate him with the ideals of the classical world. Contemporary spectators looking for a deeper meaning would have seen the *Apotheosis* as a celebration of ideal government embodied by Cosimo rather than of Cosimo himself.

The ideals that Cosimo is attempting to associate himself with are essentially those of the Roman republican aristocrats. This privileged group possessed a particular set of elite values and objectives that would have included achieving, and maintaining, high civic office, the initiation and continued involvement in virtuous deeds and the possession of a persuasive oratory, all set against a backdrop of ambitious military and political careers. These men were concerned not only with morality but the pursuit of power, glory, prestige and social position gained through dedicated service to the state and its traditions.

The second half of the sixteenth century saw the popularity of Roman armour for the portrait busts of rulers and the military elite increase rapidly, the format used by Cellini being almost universally adopted. As an example, the bust of Charles IX in the Wallace Collection, London by Germain Pilon and executed c1570-79 clearly follows on from that by Cellini, although this specimen lacks the vibrancy of the earlier examples.

Roman military costume and church monuments in England – the early seventeenth century

The outlook of the English Court had been influenced by the study and articulation of classical civilization since the 1530s. The main vehicles for the expression of classical ideals were the historical and romantic plays and poetry popular amongst the Tudor elite; the plays being increasingly popular and seen as a substitute for the old medieval mystery plays. There are many references to ancient Rome and the classical world in plays by both Shakespeare and Ben Jonson amongst others, while within the Elizabethan and Jacobean intellectual elite there were numerous biographies, histories and commentaries from which to draw inspiration.³ A knowledge of classical literature was the basis of an elite education with Vergil's Aeneid being the most translated and imitated classical epic in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. However, despite the abundance of classical references, figures in painting and sculpture wearing classical costume are few indeed, patrons preferring rich contemporary dress as a vehicle for the expression of wealth and power.

The early seventeenth century saw the court masque playing an important role in elite culture, where it acted as a conduit for the endorsement of the ideals of classical antiquity. The court masque under James I became both an extension and an expression of the Stuart mind where it developed into an ambitious and sophisticated articulation of royal values including theories of the divine right and the virtues of the monarchy. Within the early Stuart court, classical forms of literature and art helped to convey a distinctive attitude to court life: the culture of the Roman republic appealed to poets and artists alike because it embodied not only elegant stylistic principles but also a moral outlook. The simplicity and restraint of the Latin traditions that most influenced the court injected a sense of order and dignity into a society some thought to be too prone to extravagance and licentiousness.

Many of the masques performed for the Court had costumes designed by Inigo Jones. A number of these performances showed men in Roman-inspired armour while other costumes were derived from classical antiquity: these all helped give a dignity to the masque while simultaneously presenting an image of timeless grandeur.⁴ Although the masque had limited spectators, its messages were adopted by and disseminated to a wider audience who, wanting to appear fashionable, began, albeit tentatively, to embrace classical costume. Under James I, masques became the focus of extraordinary levels of artistic effort. Although usually performed only once and before an audience drawn from the social and cultural elite, they aided the dissemination of royal authority into the realm at large. The whole *raison d'être* of the masque was shaped around the monarch in whose service it was prepared and the elaborate costumes played an integral part in promoting the ideals of the classical world to which the productions alluded. These costume ideas had limited appeal beyond the rarefied atmosphere of the court and it was extremely rare for classical military costume to be shown in a portrait but, early in the seventeenth century, figures wearing Roman armour begin to appear within English commemorative sculpture.

Possibly the earliest example of a figure in Roman military costume can be seen on a pedestal, topped by a figure of Fame, above the tester canopy on the monument to Henry Lord Norris (1525-1601) and his wife Margery Williams (1521-1599) in Westminster Abbey.

The pedestal panels depict a variety of military scenes with one showing cavalry in the field and with a figure standing outside a tent wearing a helmet, a muscled breastplate with a scalloped edge and a skirt of strips indicative of Roman armour. Other figures within the composition appear to be similarly dressed but their costume is less discernible. Lord Norris died in 1601 and the monument, by Isaac James, was erected by his grandson Francis Lord Norris, 1st Earl of Berkshire (1579- 1622) c1606, possibly as late as 1610.⁵ Six of Norris's sons became soldiers and appear as kneeling figures surrounding their parents and only one, Edward, outlived his father. In creating the monument, the grandson is also commemorating the military exploits of his father and uncles: the inclusion of a figure in Roman military costume suggesting that the military exploits of his relatives can be associated with those of ancient generals.

³ As an example, see the frontispieces of the 1604 and 1609 editions of Clement Edmundes, *Observations upon Caesar's Commentaries* which include figures in Roman armour. I am grateful to Lucy Gent for providing this reference. For a further discussion of this topic see M Corbet and R Lightbown *The Comely Frontispiece* (1979) Routledge and Keegan Paul

⁴ Jones may well have been inspired by the published engravings of Robert Boissard after Jean-Jacques Boissard for *Masquerades* of 1597

⁵ The monument is a documented work by James. See A White *A biographical dictionary of London tomb sculptors c1560-c1660* Walpole Society Vol 61 1999 p61-62



Fig 2 Panel on pedestal of monument to Henry Lord Norris and wife erected c1606-1610 Westminster Abbey. Copyright: Dean and Chapter of Westminster.

The first complete monuments to display Roman military costume are also in Westminster Abbey and commemorate Francis Holles (1604-1622) (Fig 3) and his uncle Sir George Holles (1576-1626). Both monuments are the work of Nicholas Stone, that to Francis being unique for its time in that it shows the young warrior as a life-sized figure in Roman armour seated on a circular pedestal. Both the design and the costume is an amalgam of Michelangelo's monuments to Giuliano and Lorenzo di Medici in San Lorenzo, Florence. Francis's footwear appears more convincingly antique than seen on Lorenzo's figure while the cuirass, with its reinforcing plates and swirling arabesque decoration, lacks any real classical authenticity. The treatment of the arms remains similar on both figures, as does the skirt of leather strips. The pose however has parallels with that of Giuliano di Medici but while the latter has energetic *contrapposto*, this is totally lacking on Francis's figure which appears clumsy by comparison.

The standing figure of Sir George Holles (Fig 4) wears armour very similar to that seen on Francis's monument, the main additions being a knotted bow on the front of the cuirass, his handling of the shield and the cane in his right hand. The figure is placed on a plinth, itself positioned between two mourning figures and although Sir George's figure is somewhat remote from anything by Michelangelo, the mourning figures owe something to the reclining figures of Night and Day on the tomb of Giuliano de Medici.

The two Holles monuments, for all their faults, are a landmark in English commemorative sculpture and are the first to attempt a portrayal of authentic Roman costume. The influence of Michelangelo and of wider Italian sculpture is not in doubt but the individual responsible for the actual design remains speculative although, as Horace Walpole states, the design for Francis's monument was given to Nicholas Stone by John Holles 1st Earl of Clare, father of Francis and brother to Sir George.⁶ However, the Earl, a known student of architecture, never visited Italy but Inigo Jones did, between 1613-14 in the company of Thomas Howard 14th Earl of Arundel. It is known that their tour included visits to Rome, Padua, Florence and elsewhere and it is entirely feasible that Jones or Arundel made drawings of the Medici tombs while in Florence or acquired prints of them by other artists.

⁶ Both monuments were ordered and paid for by the Earl of Clare. That to Francis, his son, cost £50 and that to his brother Sir George cost £100. See Horace Walpole *Anecdotes of Painting* 1782 Vol 2 p27.

There was some involvement between Nicholas Stone and Inigo Jones as early as 1617 and Jones's experiences in Italy may well have informed Stone, or John Holles, in the design of the family monuments.⁷



Fig 3 Francis Holles 1622



Fig 4 Sir George Holles 1626

Copyright: Dean and Chapter of Westminster.

The monument at Edensor, Derbyshire commemorating William Cavendish (1552-1626) and his brother Henry (1550-1616) was erected c1626.⁸ The brothers are represented by a skeleton and a shrouded body positioned beneath a table, while two imposing martial figures stand at the extremities of the upper section. That on the left, holding a raised sword in his right hand and an impressa shield in the left hand, (fig 5) stands next to the armour of Henry Cavendish while the figure on the right, with the lance, (fig 6) stands beside the robe, coronet and sword of William, the Earl. Both these figures wear classically inspired armour that was probably derived from court masque costumes.⁹ The source for the design of the standing figures is unknown but was very probably given to the sculptor at the time the contract was negotiated. Apart from the footwear, there is little similarity between these figures and the Holles effigies, but the Cavendish monument is noteworthy because the costume is more closely related to court culture and was possibly influenced by it.¹⁰

⁷ For further discussion of the Holles monuments and of related classical influences on monuments of the early seventeenth century see A White 'Classical Learning and the early Stuart Renaissance' *Church Monuments*, Journal of the Church Monuments Society Vol. 1 Part 1 (1985) pp20-33

⁸ Their father was Sir William Cavendish (died 1557) who married Bess of Hardwick on 20 August 1547

⁹ If these are personifications associated with particular personal qualities of the brothers, then they remain unidentified.

¹⁰ William Cavendish was a courtier and may have witnessed court masques first hand. The monument is attributed to William Wright of Charring Cross.



Fig 5

Fig 6

Cavendish monument 1626 Edensor Derbyshire.

Photo's courtesy of Canon David Perkins

An important figure dating from the Commonwealth period that wears a version of Roman military dress is that seen at Ross on Wye, Herefordshire to Colonel William Rudhall (c1589 – 1651). Colonel Rudhall's costume (fig 7) is more theatrical than the types seen on the earlier Holles monuments and has some affinity with the Cavendish monument despite the difference in dates between them. Colonel Rudhall's dress is unlikely to be directly related to masque costume, but it might have been inspired by it, albeit indirectly. That the figure is shown standing is unusual and the overall pose is one of defiance and readiness for combat as befits a soldier who served on the Royalist side in the Civil War and died fighting in a skirmish¹¹. The monument subtly suggests his martial efforts and portrays him as the classical hero who died defending his beliefs.¹²

Roman military costume and church monuments in England – the later seventeenth century

During the Civil war and subsequent Interregnum, the more extravagant clothing styles worn by the social elites in the 1630s were toned down to create a more serious style where excess was considered inappropriate. Such restraint was abandoned at the

¹¹ Two monuments in Wiltshire dated 1645 show standing figures - at Broad Hinton to Col William Glanville 1645 (possibly by William Wright) and at Lydiard Tregoze to Edward St John, 1645

¹² It is not known who commissioned the monument to Colonel Rudhall but it was probably carved by Stephen Baldwin, son of Samuel Baldwin of Gloucester. Colonel Rudhall's brother, John died in 1636 and his monument, also in the church, was erected by his wife Mary, died 1668. This monument has also been identified as a product of the Baldwin workshop. See John Broome Samuel Baldwin: Carver of Gloucester' *Church Monuments*, Journal of the Church Monuments Society Vol X (1995) p37-54



Fig 7 Col William Rudhall 1651 Ross on Wye Herefordshire. Photo author

Restoration but any return of sartorial excesses was short lived as by the mid-1660s, with the combined effects of the plague and Great Fire all too evident, elaborate clothing for both men and women was again deemed unfitting. However, difficult questions remained as to how dress should be shown in portraiture and sculpture. Because commemorative monuments were placed in the church and therefore intended for public consumption rather than the private contemplation of a portrait, there was a problem regarding what costume should be employed.

The rapidly changing fashions of the post Restoration period dictated the need for a style that would be both fashionable and less susceptible to changing tastes. For men, the solution was to portray them wearing Roman military costume. This met the criteria of being a consistent style, was fashionable in its own way since masques, tragedies and comedies had returned as elite cultural entertainment and, for those who had fought for the Royalist side, it was seen as the armour of heroes. Although the wearing of Roman armour, and by extension its associations with the ideals of the classical world, were initially the preserve of monarchs and rulers, it gradually descended the social scale from the aristocratic elite to the gentry.

Amongst the earliest post restoration public examples of figures wearing Roman armour are those by John Bushnell to Charles I and Charles II on Temple Bar, London dating from 1670. Produced early in Bushnell's career, they have all the swaggering confidence of the Baroque complete with billowing drapery and regal postures while a year later Bushnell carved similar statues of Charles I and Charles II accompanied by Sir Thomas Gresham for the Royal Exchange, now at the Old Bailey.

The previously swaggering figure of Charles I has been reduced to a pathetic figure whose left hand is drawn to his breast as an indication of his suffering and his Roman armour is almost totally concealed beneath a loose cloak. The figure of Charles II by contrast is, understandably, more heroic as befits a restored monarch.

By 1674 the Monument to the Great Fire of London was well under way and a panel on the plinth, sculpted by CG Cibber, shows Charles II in Roman armour and wearing a periwig as the heroic rebuilder of the city, directing personifications of Architecture and Science to give succour to the mourning figure symbolizing the City of London (fig 8). The use of Roman armour for an image such as this was as symbolic as it was fashionable, in that it was placed on a highly visible public monument but that it also provided an opportunity for the restored House of Stuart to be directly and publically associated with the heroic ideal.

Painted c1672/3, by Henri Gascars, the full-length portrait of James, Duke of York as Lord High Admiral is another example of Royalty portrayed in full Roman military costume with the Duke, shown under an ornate canopy and with ships in the background (fig 9)



Fig 8 Panel on the plinth to the Monument of the Great Fire of London 1674. Photo author

The more modernist elements of the picture are enhanced by the abandonment of traditional armour, seen in the lower left corner and which probably belonged to either his father or Prince Henry, in favour of classical attire. This rejection of the traditional invites comparison between the earlier Stuart reign and the more classically influenced and heroic contemporary regime. The bright red cloak worn over gold armour and the swaggering pose all suggest a regal authority that would be quite at home in Louis XIV's France. Louis, the preeminent European monarch of the period, took self-glorification to new heights, comparing himself with Apollo the sun god while simultaneously imaging himself as a latter-day Roman emperor. As such, Louis was emulated throughout Europe, including England where Charles II, and, more importantly James II, while being portrayed by Gascars as Caesar and clearly wishing to imitate him, were not able to realise their absolutist ambitions due to a restrictive and suspicious parliament.

The Roman armour that is most commonly seen on portraiture and most examples of public and commemorative sculpture mainly consists of a close fitting breastplate or *lorica* fashioned to appear as a muscled torso (*lorica musculatum*). This is usually accompanied by a skirt of reinforced leather strips or pteruges worn over the upper thighs.



Fig 9 James Duke of York by Henri Gascars c1672/3 National Maritime Museum
<https://www.artuk.org/discover/artworks/james-duke-of-york-16331701-174649>

Similar strips, of either leather or fabric, are seen at the shoulders and which are given additional protection by lion's head masks. A cloak is normally worn over the lorica. The first commemorative monument to show Roman armour after the Restoration is that at Ashburnham, Sussex to William Ashburnham (1604-1679) by John Bushnell (fig 10).¹³

The armour in this example is mostly concealed beneath a voluminous cloak, only the left breast and shoulder being visible on the upper body and some of the pteruges are shown falling over the cushion on which the figure kneels. This monument marks a watershed in the development of English commemorative sculpture. The pathos exhibited by the pose – kneeling, gazing at his dying wife and with hands held out in a gesture of despair - is however strangely at odds with the heroic masculinity inherent in the use of Roman armour (fig 11).¹⁴ With this depiction of the male figure Bushnell was trying something new and radical, the exhibition of grief by a man who wanted to be remembered as a hero. Although William Ashburnham was not aristocratic by birth, he married into the aristocracy and achieved the role of a courtier as well as being cofferer to Charles II.¹⁵ His exploits in the Civil War on the Royalist side would have qualified him for heroic status and because he died childless, he himself might have erected the monument to the memory of his wife who had died in 1672. Because of his Royal connections, it is highly likely that William was aware of the Gascars painting of the Duke of York and this may have influenced his decision to be portrayed as a Roman.

Some possible input from Bushnell cannot be ignored as he was familiar with portraying people in this way. Within the context of this paper, the relevance of this monument lies not only in it being an early display of Roman costume, but that it is the first post Restoration example of a non-royal person being shown wearing Roman armour: The costume has successfully descended the social orders to include a non-titled person, albeit one in the service of the royal household.



Fig 10 Monument to William Ashburnham 1679 Ashburnham Sussex



Fig 11 Detail of male figure

Photos - author

¹³William Ashburnham was expelled from the Long Parliament in 1641, fought in the Civil War on the Royalist side, raised a regiment of horse fighting in skirmishes in Devon and in 1644 Governor of Weymouth.

¹⁴ There are numerous references to Bushnell and the Ashburnham monument in particular. See *Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830* Margaret Whinney, revised by John Physick Penguin Books 1998 p99

¹⁵ See Arthur Collins *Peerage of England* Vol V. London 1768 pp 107-109.

The monument to Denzil Holles, 1st Baron Holles (1599-1680) at Dorchester, Dorset shows a figure in Roman armour and wearing a full bottomed wig reclining on a sarcophagus and commemorates one of the most politically active men of the seventeenth century. Holles was the brother to Francis Holles and son of John Holles, 1st Earl of Clare mentioned above. An important political leader of the 1640s, Holles was one of the 'Five Members' of the House of Commons whose attempted arrest by Charles I in 1642 helped spark the Civil War. Although a Royalist, Holles opposed many of Charles I's ideas and pursued peace while seeking a limited monarchy with a Presbyterian form of church government. Later, Holles fled to France in 1648 but was allowed to return during the Protectorate and he played a leading role in the Restoration of Charles II. He was created Baron Ifield in 1661 and died in 1680. Holles was highly influenced in his political thoughts by the effects of the arbitrary government of Charles I and Charles's actions during the Civil War. Following the Restoration, he supported the Whig party and advocated the supremacy of Parliament while championing the need for a constitutional monarchy. His kinsman the Duke of Newcastle erected the monument in 1699 and it is his arms that appear on the frieze and the tomb chest (fig 12)



Fig 12 Monument to Denzil Holles d1680 erected c1700 Dorchester Dorset Photo author

During an embassy to Paris, Holles got to know Bishop Gilbert Burnet (1643- 1715) who wrote of his character that.

*Holles was a man of great courage, and of as great pride. ... He was faithful and firm to his side, and never changed through the whole course of his life. ... He was well versed in the records of Parliament, and argued well, but too vehemently; for he could not bear contradiction. He had the soul of an old stubborn Roman in him. He was a faithful but a rough friend, and a severe but fair enemy. He had a true sense of religion, and was a man of unblamable course of life, and of a sound judgment when it was not biased by passion.*¹⁶

¹⁶ Gilbert Burnet *History of my Own Time* 1897 Clarendon Press p175

Such was Holles's belief in the style of government of the Roman Old Republic and its ability to safeguard the state against oppression by any single individual, in this case the Stuart kings.

Sculpted by Grinling Gibbons, the monument shows no visible breastplate and the legs are shown with a skirt beneath the pteruges. However, the employment of Roman military costume in this instance is also making a purposeful political point and serves two purposes. Firstly, it alludes directly to his political ideals. Secondly it provides a lasting honouring of those ideals and, by extension, the Whig cause as a whole in a period of changing political fortunes. The involvement of the Duke of Newcastle is not without relevance in that Newcastle himself was a Whig and by placing his arms in two prominent positions on the monument he is not only allying himself with Holles's ideals but also that he is reminding the contemporary spectator that he was responsible for the creation of the monument

Nearly all examples of Roman military costume show the *lorica musculatum* but another type, far less commonly found, was the *lorica squamata*. This has armour for the torso made up of small metal scales sewn onto a fabric backing. An early example of this type of dress can be seen on the bronze statue of James II by Grinling Gibbons in Trafalgar Square, London made in 1686. This armour was common during the Roman Republic and can be seen on depictions of standard-bearers and legionaries and its use here for a Royal figure may be an oblique reference to Republican ideals. A rare instance of the *lorica squamata* on a monument can be seen at Holme Lacy, Herefordshire, on the figure of James Scudamore (1624-1668), (fig 13) erected c1700. Scudamore was a Royalist but he was not known to have seen action in the Civil War and the monument, erected by his widow Jane (née Bennet) (1628-1699) shows him in Roman armour possibly more out of fashion than of any known Republican or heroic qualities.



Fig 13 Effigy of James Scudamore, died 1668 erected c1700 Holme Lacy, Herefordshire
Photo author

The depiction of non-royal persons in Roman costume becomes increasingly common after the Glorious Revolution (1688). It was only to be expected that the nobility, gentry and Members of Parliament, with their newly enhanced status securely based on the Bill of Rights, should image themselves as representatives and defenders of the classical principles of political liberty and civic virtue. The commemorative monument therefore, erected in the public space of the parish church, thus became the vehicle for imagery, via costume, that was intended to suggest their qualifications for the authority and privileges they enjoyed and saw as their right while indicating their adherence to high moral and civil standards.

In the decades following the Glorious Revolution, the popularity of Roman military dress on church monuments increased to the extent that it became little more than a masquerade costume. As this degradation of the style continued, it soon became the case that anyone who could afford a monument might be shown as a Roman general despite having no heroic qualifications whatsoever.

One of the great advantages of using Roman military costume for men was that it did not vary and therefore less likely to go out of fashion. Joseph Addison summed up the current attitudes thus

*Great Masters in Painting never care for drawing People in the Fashion; as very well knowing that the Headdress, or Periwig, that now prevails, and gives a Grace to their Portraits at present, will make a very odd Figure, and perhaps look monstrous in the Eyes of Posterity. For this Reason they often represent an illustrious Person in a Roman Habit, or in some other Dress that never varies.*¹⁷

The 1730s saw the continuation of Whig control under Walpole and with it the ideals of the Old Republic to such an extent that Voltaire commented that

*The members of the English Parliament are fond of comparing themselves to the old Romans*¹⁸

Like the Roman republican heroes that they sought to emulate, public figures believed they were acting within a state and whose political exploits were not necessarily individualistic but as functioning civically and within a community of shared moral, political and spiritual values.

The self-imaging of the social elites as Romans did not simply survive into the eighteenth century, it flourished. The employment of Roman military costume, especially for commemorative sculpture, continued as it was relevant to those concerned as long as the Glorious Revolution remained in living memory.

The continuation of Roman military costume well into the eighteenth century is amply illustrated by Roubiliac's monument to John Campbell, second Duke of Argyll in Westminster Abbey. Campbell died in 1743 and the monument, drawing on seventeenth century French style but with a distinctly British political message, was erected in 1749. As a soldier under Marlborough, Campbell distinguished himself at Ramilles, Ostend, Oudenard and Malplaquet but Marlborough's ambition, which unsettled Campbell, was such that he was already seen by his enemies as a latter day Caesar, something his own monument at Blenheim clearly alludes to. In Parliament, Campbell's political skills were overshadowed by his military exploits but he was an effective orator despite being swayed more by passion than reason. His monument is largely classical in inspiration which would be entirely appropriate to a man whose education was steeped in the classics. The accompanying figures of Eloquence and of Minerva, a personification of wisdom, are entirely in keeping with his personality.

The employment of Roman military dress is entirely appropriate for a man with a distinguished military and political career but also for someone of high moral standards and who was recognized as a defender of liberty

The Jacobite invasions of 1715 and 1745 were the most tangible manifestations of a continuing threat to political liberty but after 1746 the political tensions that existed in the pursuit of liberty had largely evaporated. As the eighteenth century progressed, the employment of Roman military costume on monuments became increasingly less popular as the original reasons for its depiction were fading rapidly. Joseph Wilton's monument to Admiral Charles Holmes (d1761) in Westminster Abbey shows him in Roman armour, an obvious anachronism, against a background of an obelisk and very up to date naval equipment. However, there is a deeper meaning to the choice of costume on this monument. The monument, sculpted by Joseph Wilton, flatters Britain at the expense of Rome and makes the point that while Rome's navy was an important factor in the development of her empire, it has been recreated in Britannia's expanding navy, a key component in the growing empire.

In conclusion, since the sixteenth century Roman military costume was seen as *de rigueur* for military and political leaders who wished to associate themselves with what were seen as the ideals of the Roman Republic. The development and continued use of Roman military costume on the monuments of the social elites from the seventeenth century, while popular for a while, increasingly became something of an anachronism, a remnant of a past age and a past political ideal that was increasingly out of place in a rapidly industrializing nation.

I am grateful to Dr Susan Vincent for her thoughtful comments on a draft of this article

Books/articles

A White *A biographical dictionary of London tomb sculptors c1560-c1660* (1999) Walpole Society Vol 61 p61-62

A White *Classical Learning and the early Stuart Renaissance* (1985) Church Monuments, Journal of the Church Monuments Society Vol. 1 Part 1 pp20-33

Arthur Collins *Peerage of England* (1768) Vol V pp 107-109.

D De Marly (1975) *The establishment of Roman Dress in seventeenth century portraiture*. Burlington Magazine Vol. 117 July pp442-451

D Flower *Voltaire's England*. (1950) The Folio Society p37

¹⁷ The Spectator. No. 129 Saturday, July 28, 1711

¹⁸ See D Flower *Voltaire's England*. The Folio Society 1950 p37

Eric Mercer *English Art 1553-1625* (1962) Oxford University Press

John Broome *Samuel Baldwin: Carver of Gloucester* (1995) Church Monuments, Journal of the Church Monuments Society Vol X p37-54

Gilbert Burnet *History of my Own Time* 1897 Clarendon Press p175

H Walpole (1782) *Anecdotes of Painting* Vol 2 p27.

Joseph Addison *The Spectator* (1711) No. 129 Saturday, July 28,

Lucy Gent (ed) *Albion's Classicism – The visual arts in Britain 1550-1660* (1995) Yale University Press

M Corbet and R Lightbown (1979) *The Comely Frontispiece*. Routledge and Keegan Paul

Margaret Whinney, revised by John Physick (1998) *Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830* Penguin Books p99

Philip Ayres *Classical Culture and the idea of Rome* (1997) Cambridge University Press