“New Men” Rising: Landed Emulation in the English Country House, 1700 to 1860

John Young

History 194B: History Senior Honors Thesis

Course Instructor: Brad Bouley

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Jarett Henderson

18 March 2022

Acknowledgments:

I would like to thank the following people for their contributions to this thesis. First, to my thesis advisor Dr. Jarett Henderson: thank you so much for advising me throughout this long process and providing invaluable advice, sources, and for pushing me to make this project the best thesis that it could be. Your unwavering support and friendship were instrumental in this project. Second, thank you to Professor Brad Bouley for teaching the senior honors thesis class and wrangling in all of our ambitious plans. I would also like to thank James Scherrer and Sydney Evans, my two thesis group members, for reading my many ramblings throughout these last six months and always providing me with important feedback and constructive criticism. Thank you also to my family and especially my girlfriend Katia for all the love and support throughout this process. This thesis could not have been completed without all of your combined support.

Introduction:

In 1807, Charles Grant Esq. stood out like a sore thumb in the English House of Commons. Like all of its other members, Grant was extremely wealthy and lived in a large country house, in his case known as Waternish.[1] However, there was one key difference between Grant and most of the House's other members: Whereas many of Grant's counterparts had enjoyed wealth, prestige, lands, and titles for generations, Grant was an unlanded first generation upstart who made a fortune in the British empire.[2] Men like Grant had no discernable titles or lands. Charles Grant and men like him were part of a new class in English society: "new men." These "new men" came from non-traditional backgrounds like the upper-middle-class compared to landed elites. Starting in the mid-18th century, their meteoric rise to power threatened to upset England's traditional balance of power. For the first time, a class of people other than the landed elite was able to occupy the English country house and exert their power in the British government. These "new men" threatened the landed elites who ruled England for centuries through a political power rooted in their historic country estates and Parliament. As such, many landed elites lamented that "the lords have felt their political power slipping slowly from them."[3] Although the replacement of landed elites by "new men" has emerged as the dominant historical narrative, I seek to paint a new picture of the rise of "new men," specifically through their use of the English country house.

---

[1] Joshua Wilson, *A Biographical Index to the Present House of Commons. Carefully Compiled by Joshua Wilson ... Corrected to April, 1807.* (London, England: R. Phillips, 1807), p. 209, https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.aa0001330562&view=1up&seq=231&skin=2021&q1=India.

[2] Joshua Wilson, *A Biographical Index to the Present House of Commons. Carefully Compiled by Joshua Wilson ... Corrected to April, 1807,* p. 209.

[3] Auguste Laugel, *England, Political and Social*. Translated by James Morgan Hart. (New York, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1874), p. 113-114, https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044081173619.

Who were "New Men"

In the context of this thesis, one must first understand "new men" and their rapid rise to power. I have defined three stipulations for being a "new man." First, these men did not enjoy titles such as "duke" or "earl" that other families had passed down to male heirs for generations. Instead, "new men" were often born untitled into the families of the rising middle class and did not enjoy hereditary wealth: they often made their fortunes through commercial and colonial enterprises. The second factor required to qualify as a "new man" was an interest in British domestic and imperial politics. After making their fortune, all "new men" expressed some desire to participate in British politics, the exclusive domain of England's titled and landed aristocracy. Lastly, all "new men" purchased, built, or otherwise dwelt in an English Country house, the site that transformed domestic authority into political power. Although these three criteria may seem self-serving for this paper's argument, the reality is that the overwhelming majority of unlanded English men who somehow procured a great fortune in the 18th and 19th centuries followed this exact mold.

Regarding "new men's" rise to power, by the mid-18th century, multiple new opportunities around Britain and her empire allowed "new men" to gain power and influence on an almost unprecedented scale. Historian Mark Girouard notes that because of the British empire and later the industrial revolution, "the number of newly rich people who were able to invest in landed property, to buy or build a house, and to set up as landed gentry was greater than it ever had been."[4] The political rise of "new men" can be charted through 18th-19th century Parliamentary records. Here, one can see the rise of many "new men" in politics, including the aforementioned Charles Grant.[5] One also sees men like George Barclay, an unlanded man who

[4] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*. (London, England: Yale University Press, 1978), p. 268.
[5] Joshua Wilson, *A Biographical Index to the Present House of Commons. Carefully Compiled by Joshua Wilson ... Corrected to April, 1807*, p. 209.

made his fortune in the West Indies as a plantation owner before returning to England, investing in a country house, and becoming a member of Parliament.[6] As evidenced by the UK Parliament's official website, which contains biographies of all those who served in Parliament, by the 1820s, "new men" made up a noticeable portion of those serving in government.[7]

Landed Elites and Country Houses

A basic understanding of England's landed elites and their use of the country house is necessary to comprehend this thesis. England's landed elites were a class of Britons nearly as old as the country itself. They were the "titled" class, that is to say, at some point in England's history, a monarch had bestowed a title and lands upon a family. These were often handed out for loyalty or service to the Crown. By the nineteenth century, most landed families had enjoyed the privileges of their titles and lands for centuries. Notably, both lands and titles were automatically passed down through generations. Many titled elites were colloquially referred to as Lords, so the "Duke of Devonshire" could be interchangeably known as "Lord Devonshire." Because of their privileged position and England's political system, up until the rise of "new men" in the 18th and 19th centuries, landed elites were the sole occupants of power and government office in Britain.

The "landed" aspect of being a landed elite comes from the lands bestowed upon a family as part of their title. Under the medieval feudal system, these families were the sole landowning class in England, and all those who lived on their land had to pay rent in either money or kind. As summed up by historian Mark Girouard, for landed elites, "the point of land was the tenants and rent that came with it," because "for many centuries the ownership of land was not just the

[6] Joshua Wilson, *A Biographical Index to the Present House of Commons. Carefully Compiled by Joshua Wilson ... Corrected to April, 1807,* p. 33.
[7] "Members 1790-1820," The History of Parliament Online (UK Parliament, 1986), https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/research/members/members-1790-1820.

main but the only sure basis of power" in England.[8] Thus, being a landed elite gave one immense power as the owner of often massive tracts of land.

Duke William of Powis is a perfect example of a 'typical' landed elite. A catalog of Lord Powis' holdings show that he was the owner of at least three country houses, including Upper Heyford, Glasthorpe, and Newbold manors.[9] However, because he was a "landed" elite, the Duke of Powis also owned essentially the entire towns surrounding his estates, which amounted to thousands of acres. Ruling his lands from various country estates, the Duke of Powis exacted rent upon those living in his lands. At one 34 acre farm in Upper Heyford, the rent was listed at £29 per annum.[10] Because Duke Powis owned so much land and lacked living relatives, upon his death, his lands were auctioned off as thirty-nine separate lots.[11] This meant that Duke Powis and other landed elites had incomes that would make them millionaires today.

Using these vast incomes, landed elite families traditionally built lavish country houses on the land they owned. Owning a country house gave landed elites "power, influence, economic security, independence, and an established position in society."[12] Historian Mark Girouard notes that "Land was little use without one or more country houses on it. The land provided the fuel, a country house the engine which made it effective."[13] Girouard further mentions that initially, under the medieval feudal system, the English country house "was the headquarters from which land was administered and power organised."[14] As "new men" rose and the feudal system waned,

---

[8] "Members 1790-1820," The History of Parliament Online.
[9] Abraham Langford, *A Catalogue of the Large and Valuable Freehold Estate of the Most Noble William, Duke of Powis, Deceased, Situate in the County of Northampton.* (London, England, 1758) p. I.
[10] Abraham Langford, *A Catalogue of the Large and Valuable Freehold Estate of the Most Noble William, Duke of Powis, Deceased, Situate in the County of Northampton,* p. 17.
[11] Abraham Langford, *A Catalogue of the Large and Valuable Freehold Estate of the Most Noble William, Duke of Powis, Deceased, Situate in the County of Northampton,* p. I.
[12] John Martin Robinson, "The Function, Planning, & Social Use of the English Country House." In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life*, ed. Mary Miers (New York, New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 2009), p. 73.
[13] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 3.
[14] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 3.

the English country house remained "a show-case, in which to exhibit and entertain supporters and good connections."[15]

Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill is a typical example of a landed elite's country house. Built in the 18th century in the Gothic Revival style, the house seems impossibly large by today's standards. Floorplans of Strawberry Hill show that there are over thirty rooms, including almost a dozen that were for the exclusive use of an army of servants.[16] Depictions of the gallery at Strawberry Hill show dozens of marble busts, ornate carpets, couches, chandeliers, and other luxurious touches all in a single room.[17] Such country houses contained tens of thousands of square feet of living space and immense formal gardens, often more comparable to a palace than any mansions seen today.

Questions and Sources

I seek to answer the following questions: First, how did "new men" use the country house compared to traditional landed elites? Second, why did "new men" end up emulating landed elites?" Finally, why did "new men" specifically choose the country house to aid in their emulation of landed elites? I answer these questions by investigating specific "new men" and how they used the country house, using my findings to draw conclusions about "new men's" rise and what I argue is the emulation of landed elites. These questions and their answers matter because as will be shown, unlanded "new men" have been largely overlooked in the historical narrative surrounding country houses. By focusing on how "new men" used the country house in

---

[15] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 3.
[16] BL King's Topographical Collection, *A Description of Strawberry Hill.* (London, England: Thomas Kirgate, 1784), "Ground Plan of Strawberry Hill. 1781.," https://www.flickr.com/photos/britishlibrary/51193374326/in/album-72157719566258020/.
[17] BL King's Topographical Collection, *A Description of Strawberry Hill.* (London, England: Thomas Kirgate, 1784), "The Gallery," https://www.flickr.com/photos/britishlibrary/51193376291/in/album-72157719566258020/lightbox/.

their own right, this thesis provides a fresh perspective on the study of British elites and the country house.

To achieve this end, I employ a broad spectrum of sources. First, 18th and 19th century British newspaper articles chronicle developments in the English aristocracy and track the lives of specific "new men" in their country houses. These articles illustrate the public perception of "new men" in the country house and have been accessed from the British Newspaper Archive. Second, 19th-century "country house books" chronicle the ancient dwellings of landed elites, thus serving as a window into the long-held country house traditions emulated by "new men." These sources were created for curious travelers and the public alike and are found online at the Hathi Trust Digital Library. Third, ancient Parliamentary Papers, the Directory of National Biography, and the official UK Parliament's website are utilized in conjunction to track the political and social careers of various "new men." These sources were created to chronicle Britain's multiple members of Parliament and can be accessed via the Internet Archive and original manuscripts. By intertwining these sources, this thesis tracks "new men's" use of the English country house in novel ways.

Historiography

Regarding the rise of "new men" and their use of the English country house, many historians have largely centered their arguments on how these developments affected landed elites. That is to say, the dominant historical narrative surrounding this subject has largely left out how "new men" actually used the country house and why. Historians such as David Cannadine and Jeremy Musson have suggested that while landed elites had used their country houses as

"power houses"[18] to rule their feudal lands for centuries, the rise of "new men" and the waning nature of the feudal system in the 19th century led landed elites to shift the country house into a more symbolic "prodigious canvas for further ornamentation" to show off one's political power and wealth.[19] This landed-centric argument omits how "new men" used their own country houses.

This same fault is visible in discussions surrounding the identity and masculinity of "new men." Historians such as John Tosh remark that the rise of "new men" can be charted as "the transition from a landed to a commercial society," where "the rise of a bourgeois masculinity…eclipsed - without ever entirely displacing - its aristocratic predecessor."[20] Again, this type of argument has led to a historiography that ultimately charts the rise of "new men" and their use of the country house in terms of how it affected landed elites, once again mostly leaving out "new men" from the historical narrative. Here, I seek to shift this narrative by centering the rise of "new men" and their usage of the English countryside around the actual "new men" themselves. This means I focus solely on how "new men" used the English country house with their unique means and what this meant for them, not for landed elites. As a result, I give "new men" agency in their own rise, viewing them in terms of competing with landed elites in their own right.

The few historians that have engaged with "new men's" use of the country house and separately from landed elites suggest that "new men" wrested the country house from the grasp of landed elites, setting their own trends. Essentially, many historians believe that in their rise, "new men" were the ones who set trends for the country house as a whole. To this end, historian

---

[18] David Cannadine and Jeremy Musson, *The Country House Past, Present, Future: Great Houses of the British Isles*. (New York City, New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 2018), p. 81.
[19] David Cannadine and Jeremy Musson, *The Country House Past, Present, Future: Great Houses of the British Isles*, p. 132.
[20] John Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family, and Empire*, 1st ed. (United Kingdom: Taylor and Francis, 2006), p. 140.

Mark Girouard writes that "So much new money… tended to make the country-house world competitive. The old families built to keep up with the new ones."[21] This type of argument ignores landed elites' vested political and societal power. I seek to retell this narrative by suggesting that the exact opposite is true. I argue that new families made concerted efforts to keep up with old ones in the country house.

In regards to how "new men" interacted with landed elites, historians further argue that in the 18th and 19th centuries, "New families were eager to join the landed upper classes because of the power and prestige which still remained to them," yet this is a power which "was gradually dwindling."[22] The first part of this argument holds true in this thesis: the incumbent power of landed elites cannot be overlooked in terms of how "new men" used the country house and why. Here I seek to add to the historical narrative by arguing that the power of landed elites was not gradually dwindling in the 18th and 19th centuries. While some historians claim that during this time, the "shifting sands of agricultural depression, inflation, and taxation of inherited wealth" led to the downfall of traditional landed families, I instead argue that the failure of the Reform Act of 1832 and other unique factors meant that the power of landed elites was anything but dwindling in the 18th-19th centuries.[23] I add to this by suggesting that this equilibrium of power was a major driving factor behind why "new men" used the country house at all.

Roadmap and Thesis Statement

This thesis shows that in their country houses, "new men" emulated practices long associated with the country houses of landed elites using "different means to the same ends." Because of their non-traditional backgrounds, "new men" lacked the means to mirror the country

[21] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 268.
[22] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 270.
[23] David Cannadine and Jeremy Musson, *The Country House Past, Present, Future: Great Houses of the British Isles*, p. 356.

house traditions they sought to replicate perfectly. As a result, they utilized "different means" in their own country houses to achieve the "same ends" as landed elites had for centuries in their estates. Chapter one of this thesis begins with a discussion into how Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel and other "new men" in his cabinet utilized "different means to the same ends" to copy the country house traditions of picture galleries and dwelling in ancient monasteries, which were designed to illustrate landed elites' connection to British history. Like landed elites, these "new men" sought to use these traditions to connect themselves to British history, but with their own unique unlanded means. The successes of these men are noted in the reactions of various landed aristocratic visitors to their country houses. In the second chapter, I delve into how "new men," Charles Cockerell and Sir Robert Clive, used "different means to the same ends" in their bastardization of the ancient Grand Tour. While landed elites used the Grand Tour in Europe to influence the architecture and collections of their country houses, "new men" Cockerell and Clive mirrored this tradition with their time in India. Then, Cockerell's success and Clive's struggles in using India as a Grand Tour are discussed. Finally, in the third chapter, I delve into why "new men" emulated landed elites and why "new men" chose the English country house as the vehicle for this emulation. This two-part chapter first breaks down the political necessity behind "new men's" emulation of landed elites, centering around the failure of the Reform Act of 1832 to bring about meaningful political change. Second, the balance of power and the middle classes' self-fashioning of landed identities are given as the two reasons why "new men" were explicitly drawn to the country house in their emulation of landed elites.

Chapter 1. "New Men's" Impersonal Connections to History:

The first aspect in which "new men" emulated the country houses of landed elites using "different means to the same ends" is in the layout and structures of country houses that were specifically designed to invoke a personal connection with British history. For traditional landed families, displaying a personal link to the British past had long been an important way of proving the legitimacy of one's aristocratic standing. The emulation of this practice by "new men" is best viewed in the cabinet of the Second Peel ministry in the early 1840s. After being "summoned to form a cabinet," in 1841, and submitting "a list which the queen approved," Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel, himself a "new man," chose both traditional landed and non-traditional unlanded elites to compose his ministry.[24] In his choices, Peel used the "vigorous discrimination and magnanimous to prejudice which characterised his official appointments to fill high offices," an elaborate way of implying that to the dismay of many, he made little difference in choosing between "the heir of a dukedom" (landed elites) and those with "a princely revenue" who "may one day be an earl," ("new men").[25] In his quest for a connection to British history, Sir Robert Peel copied the country house tradition of portrait galleries, which landed families had used as a tangible example of their aristocratic lineage for generations. Peel's "different means" were that he lacked any important British ancestors, so he deliberately displayed art of significant British figures. But, the ends were the same: in both landed and unlanded cases, picture galleries were used in the hopes of forging a connection to the British past. Peel's use of "different means to the same ends" was confirmed most spectacularly through a royal visit to Drayton Manor by Queen Victoria in 1843, where she raved about his art collection. Peel's chosen Junior Lord of the

[24] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols. (New York Macmillan, 1885), p. 15, https://archive.org/details/dictionaryofnati44stepuoft/page/212/mode/2up.
[25] "THE ARISTOCRACY OF RANK: IS IT THE ARISTOCRACY OF TALENT?" *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country, 1830-1869* 34, no. 200 (08, 1846): p. 164, https://www.proquest.com/historical-periodicals/aristocracy-rank-is-talent/docview/2617693/se-2?accountid=14522.

Treasury, James Milnes Gaskell, attempted to copy the landed tradition of occupying ancient buildings as a means of being associated with the local history of a space. Gaskell's means were different: he purchased the ancient Wenlock Abbey instead of occupying a monastery for generations after it was bestowed upon his family. He integrated his modern house among its ruins. Nonetheless, the ends were the same: Gaskell and landed elites attempted to use ancient buildings to prove their connections to the British past. Gaskell's successful use of "different means to the same ends" is confirmed by visits from famed poet Henry James, whose letters from Wenlock Abbey reveal how Gaskell successfully used Wenlock Abbey to appear as if he was genuinely connected to its storied past.

Historiography

Historians have long contended that landed elites used their country houses to display their wealth and connections to the past to visitors in the hopes of fostering a connection to British history. Yet, they fail to extend this connection to "new men." In terms of basic display, historians David Cannadine and Jeremy Musson contend that landed elites often used their estates as a "prodigious canvas for further ornamentation" to show off their wealth and connection to the past.[26] While accurate, this leaves "new men" out of the historical narrative. Similarly, Jeremy Musson has mentioned that many objects found in the country houses of landed elites were "objects of display," which were intended to represent "the culture and dynastic status of the house."[27] Mark Girouard follows this up by remarking that the English country house showed the "credentials" of its owner, as "trophies in the hall, coats of arms over

[26] David Cannadine and Jeremy Musson, *The Country House Past, Present, Future: Great Houses of the British Isles*, p. 132.
[27] Jeremy Musson, "The English Country House and its Collections" In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life*, ed. Mary Miers (New York, New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 2009), p. 225.

the chimney-pieces, books in the library and temples in the park could suggest that he was discriminating, intelligent, bred to rule, and brave."[28] These historians are correct in their assertions that landed elites had long used the country house as a vehicle to display their connections to the British past. As should be no surprise, displaying tangible links to the past was an essential part of affirming oneself as a landed elite. However, in this chapter, I extend these conclusions previously reserved for landed elites to "new men," showing that "new men" used "different means to the same ends" through concerted efforts to emulate practices that landed elites had used to display historical connections in their country houses.

Different Portraits, Same Idea

Sir Robert Peel, Prime Minister of the Second Peel ministry, was the ultimate "new man" social climber. Peel re-engineered the long-standing country house tradition of portrait galleries using "different means to the same ends" in his Drayton Manor. According to his entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography,* Peel was born in 1788 at "Chamber Hall" in Lancashire.[29] Peel lacked British aristocratic blood, as his family, "which has been obscurely traced to a Danish origin, had emigrated early in the seventeenth century from the district of Craven in Yorkshire to the neighbouring town of Blackburn in Lancashire."[30] Sir Robert Peel was the eldest son of the first baronet[31] Robert Peel, who achieved a fortune through the industrial revolution, and his mother was Ellen Yates, the daughter of a prominent cotton manufacturer.[32] Although both were wealthy in their own right, neither of Peel's parents could claim any aristocratic

[28] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 3.
[29] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols, p. 209.
[30] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols, p. 209.
[31] "Baronets, as distinct from barons, are neither members of the peerage nor of the knightage," meaning they are not members of England's landed elite class. ("The Baronetage • Debretts," Debretts (Debretts London, 1769), accessed March 1, 2022, https://debretts.com/peerage/the-baronetage/.)
[32] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols, p. 210.

heritage or connection to England's landed aristocracy. During Peel's childhood, their fortunes slightly increased, and Peel "moved with his family to Drayton Manor, near Tamworth in Staffordshire."[33] At this point, Drayton was more of an ancient ruin than a proper manor house. It was then that Peel's political career took off. In 1819, after serving in the House of Commons for nearly a decade, Peel was chosen as the chairman of a committee concerning the Bank of England.[34] Peel then revolutionized policing in Britain by creating the Metropolitan Police force in 1829. Eventually, even though he was an unlanded "new man," Peel's repeated siding with the Tory party (recognized as the party made up of landed elites) won him "the Tory allegiance."[35] Eventually, this helped Peel secure his aforementioned bid for Prime Minister in 1840.

As Peel's ambitions and political power simultaneously grew, he gained the means to transform Drayton Manor into a proper English country house. According to *A Survey of Staffordshire: Containing the Antiquities of that County*, after the death of Peel's father in 1830, Sir Robert Peel replaced the Drayton Manor in which he had spent most of his childhood with a "modern structure."[36] This was where Peel used "different means to the same ends."

In his mid-19th century remodeling of Drayton Manor, Sir Robert Peel installed a "magnificent picture gallery" which "has not its equal in this country."[37] This meant that Peel displayed over fifty portraits of significant British figures such as "Shakespeare" and "Viscount Hardinge."[38] In addition, Peel also included many paintings by famous British artists such as Sir

[33] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols, p. 210.
[34] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols, p. 210.
[35] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols, p. 214.
[36] Thomas Harwood and Sampson Erdeswicke, *A Survey of Staffordshire: Containing the Antiquities of that County.* (United Kingdom: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1820), p. 311, https://books.google.com/books?id=DEgJAAAAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q=drayton&f=false.
[37] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*. January 2, 1847, LIII edition, sec. 8. https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000252/18470102/084/0008?browse=true.
[38] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.

Thomas Lawrence, of whose work Peel supposedly had more than anyone "with the exception of the royal collection."[39] Peel's gallery was designed to inspire awe in his guests. He built an entire new wing solely to house the portraits, in a "100 feet long" extension on the north side of Drayton Manor.[40] Upon entering the gallery, one was instantly reminded of who it belonged to: Peel had his and his family's initials displayed "in a cove with thirty heraldic lions with shields."[41] Peel went to great lengths to imitate elements such as "trusses, frets, pendants, and panelling which characterize Elizabethan architecture."[42] This was because Peel did not create this picture gallery in a vacuum. Instead, Peel's portrait gallery was his unlanded version of the portrait galleries that had served as important markers of aristocratic heritage in the country houses of landed elites for centuries.

In his portrait gallery, Peel sought to copy the portrait galleries of landed elites. Landed elites had long used picture galleries to display "the culture and dynastic status of the house."[43] In other words, looking at a family's picture gallery, any visitor would be left with no doubt about the family's aristocratic heritage and connection to British history. This was accomplished through two avenues: First, many country houses of landed elites contained "portraits" of the "lineage of the family" or of "its royal or military service."[44] For a typical example, consider the ancient "Cholmley" family of the Howsham Hall, who had over a dozen family portraits

[39] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.
[40] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.
[41] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.
[42] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.
[43] Jeremy Musson, "The English Country House and its Collections" In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life*, ed. Mary Miers, p. 225.
[44] Jeremy Musson, "The English Country House and its Collections" In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life*, ed. Mary Miers, p. 225.

stretching back for generations.[45] According to the author, "There are a number of fine and valuable portraits and other paintings at Howsham, among which are the following:... Sir Hugh Cholmley, Governor of Scarborough Castle, by Lely. Sir Hugh Cholmley, of Whitby, fourth baronet, Governor of Tangiers, by Lely."[46] These family portraits provided an obvious connection that secured the aristocratic heritage of the Cholmely family.

The second way that landed elites used portrait galleries as methods of dynastic status was by including works by famous foreign masters.[47] Historian Jeremy Musson has further detailed that these were often "heirlooms bound to pass with the house by inheritance, be they Jacobean full-lengths, or the works of Van Dyck in the seventeenth century."[48] One of the best examples of this is the collection of the landed Earl of Ellesmere. In his Bridgewater House, the Earl displayed over three hundred portraits.[49] Reading through the 19th century catalogs of his collection, one finds works from masters such as Tintoretto and Titian, but more strikingly, at least one work each from Da Vinci, Raphael, and Rembrandt.[50] Although not directly connected to the British past in the same way as paintings of one's British ancestors, such works were still very important for landed families who desired to display their power, wealth, and aristocratic prestige to outside visitors. Obviously, even in the 19th century, anyone wealthy and powerful enough to display a piece by Leonardo Da Vinci was a compelling figure.

---

[45] F. O. Morris,*The County Seats of the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Great Britain and Ireland. vol. 1. (Vol. 3-5. A Series of Picturesque Views of Seats of the Noblemen ... of Great Britain and Ireland. With descriptive letterpress.) Vol. 1*, (London: Longmans & Co, 1866-80), p. 14, http://access.bl.uk/item/viewer/ark:/81055/vdc_00000005823C.
[46] F. O. Morris,*The County Seats of the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Great Britain and Ireland. vol. 1. (Vol. 3-5. A Series of Picturesque Views of Seats of the Noblemen ... of Great Britain and Ireland. With descriptive letterpress.) Vol. 1*, p. 14.
[47] Jeremy Musson, "The English Country House and its Collections" In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life,* p. 225.
[48] Jeremy Musson, "The English Country House and its Collections" In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life,* p. 225.
[49] Francis Egerton, *Catalogue of the Bridgewater Collection of Pictures Belonging to the Earl of Ellesmere, at Bridgewater House, Cleveland Square, St. James's.* (London, England: J.M. and S.M. Smith, 1851).
[50] Francis Egerton, *Catalogue of the Bridgewater Collection of Pictures Belonging to the Earl of Ellesmere, at Bridgewater House, Cleveland Square, St. James's,* p. 5-20.

Peel's use of "different means to the same ends" is most visible in his attempts to recreate these portrait galleries. As mentioned before, even though he came from an unlanded background, due to his now abundant wealth, Peel had no problem filling his picture gallery with paintings from great artists. Other than his Lawrence collection, Peel displayed "ten or a dozen original works by eminent artists."[51] He even included lifelike statues of "Rubens and Vandyke."[52] However, regarding the landed practice of filling portrait galleries with storied historical relatives, Peel needed to use his own uniquely unlanded means. Since he was born unlanded, Peel had no ancestors of any great aristocratic merit to connect himself to British history. In fact, the only image of any ancestors included by Peel in his portrait gallery was a large portrait of his father, also named Robert Peel.[53] But, as a rising star in Britain's politics who often brushed shoulders with England's landed elites, Peel needed some sort of callback to English history. So, instead of using portraits of his landed ancestors, Peel displayed "portraits of eminent statesmen and men of celebrity in literature and the arts and sciences" in the hopes of garnering the same effect.[54] In this way, although Peel's means in creating his portrait gallery were different than landed elites in that Peel lacked any ancestors for display, his ends were the same: Peel hoped to evoke his connection to British history just like the Chomley family and other elite families had for generations.

---

[51] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.
[52] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.
[53] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.
[54] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.

The Royal Visit to Drayton

Further evidence for Peel's motives and successes in using his portrait gallery to the same ends as landed elites comes from visitors' thoughts to his gallery. On a basic level, according to *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, "Those personages who have had the opportunity to inspect the collection have been unanimous in their admiration of the general elegance and consummate taste which pervade the whole arrangements."[55] However, the most obvious evidence for the success of Peel's use of "different means to the same ends" comes courtesy of a royal visit from Queen Victoria, where she specifically mentioned her admiration of Peel's portrait gallery.

The importance of a royal visit to a country house in confirming one's aristocratic identity cannot be overstated. For hundreds of years, many English country houses had been lavishly designed and ornamented in the hopes that a royal visit would grace their halls. After all, the Queen of England did not just visit any run-of-the-mill mansion. A visit from the monarch meant that one had achieved certified landed status. In *Life in the English Country House*, historian Mark Girouard writes of how entire country houses were often designed with royal visits in mind, noting that after the materialization of the "formal plan" in the 1600s, country houses were often explicitly "planned for the entertainment of royalty."[56] This is perhaps best exemplified at Hatfield House, where Girouard claims that "The new house was built as, in effect, an immensely grand pavilion containing little but lodgings for the family and for the king and queen."[57] The owner of Hatfield, Lord Salisbury, put his own much less grand lodgings directly below those that were reserved for the royal family, in the event that they may one day

[55] "Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*, sec. 8.
[56] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 120.
[57] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 115.

visit.[58] This shows the importance of a royal visit to a country estate. In Robert Peel's case, his use of art specifically caused the royal visit to Drayton Manor to be so successful.

According to *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*, in early December 1843, "the Queen and Prince Albert left Windsor on a visit to Sir R. Peel at Drayton Manor."[59] As evidenced by the chronicles of the queen's visit, Peel's efforts to use art to impress aristocratic visitors did not go to waste. The multitude of newspapers that detailed Queen Victoria's visit to Drayton all tell more or less the same story: Queen Victoria was particularly impressed by Robert Peel's use of art. What's more, her visit took place while the portrait gallery was still nearing completion, although Peel already had the vast majority of the pictures on display in the gallery. As noted in *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper*, after Queen Victoria and Prince Albert spent the day at Drayton Manor, "her Majesty spent some time in admiring" the chefs d'œuvres of modem art in painting and sculpture."[60] The newspaper then describes how Peel's use of art caused the Queen and her company to recognize Peel as "a munificent and steady patron of the arts."[61] Importantly, while Her Majesty "much admired" Peel's "many portraits" painted by "the greatest masters of the art, as well as by eminent living painters" including "two by Vandyke, of the Spinola family, which were purchased for Sir R. Peel at Genoa, by the late Sir D. Wilkie" and "Haydon's picture " Napoleon at St. Helens,"" she also favorably remarked upon Peel's connection to British history specifically through his use of men who he was not even related to.[62] Queen Victoria immensely enjoyed busts of "Mr. Perceval, Mr. Pitt, the late Lord Londonderry, Sir Walter Scott,...Sir Thomas Lawrence, by Bailey, and of Mr. Croker, by Rich. There is also a bust of Dryden, and the

---

[58] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 115.
[59] "The Royal Progress to Drayton Manor." *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*, December 3, 1843, 54 edition, p. 3, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000077/18431203/006/0003?browse=true.
[60] "The Royal Progress to Drayton Manor." *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*, p. 3.
[61] "The Royal Progress to Drayton Manor." *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*, p. 3.
[62] "The Royal Progress to Drayton Manor." *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*, p. 3.

original bust of Pope, made by Roubiliac for Lord Bolingbroke."[63] Another newspaper, the *Newcastle Courant*, tells a very similar story. After being "received at the entrance of the mansion by Lady Peel," and "attended to her private apartments," the queen ate dinner and then allegedly "spent some time in enjoying" Peel's many great works of art.[64] Crucially, Queen Victoria viewed Peel's gallery as a marker of his aristocratic connection, even though his gallery was wholly composed of men to whom he had no relation. Thus, it is the fact that Queen Victoria treated Peel's gallery like that of any other landed elite despite his use of "different means" that both confirms his goal of the "same ends" as landed families and illustrates his success in doing so.

Ultimately, through his extensive use of art in the remodeling of his Drayton Manor, Peel was able to successfully evoke the same sense of belonging to a great British past that more traditional landed families had done for generations through their picture galleries, except that Peel used portraits of significant British figures to make up for his lack of landed British ancestors. As a result, Peel was able to impress the most discerning of all aristocratic visitors, the Queen of England. Peel was not the only "new man" to emulate such trends in their country houses using "different means to the same ends." In fact, one of the men that Peel chose for his cabinet as Prime Minister in 1840, "new man" James Milnes Gaskell, used "different means to the same ends" in his emulation of the country house trend of occupying ancient buildings to foster a connection to the British past.

---

[63] "The Royal Progress to Drayton Manor." *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*, p. 3..
[64] "The Royal Progress to Drayton Manor." *Newcastle Courant*, December 1, 1843, 8817 edition, p. 7, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000085/18431201/019/0007?browse=true.

Gaskell's Wenlock Abbey

While Sir Robert Peel used art in his "different means to the same ends," one of his chosen Junior Lords of the Treasury, James Milnes Gaskell, uniquely emulated the landed elite practice of living in an ancient monastery to be connected to the land and its history through his purchase and remodeling of Wenlock Abbey. According to *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society, Third Series, Volume II*, James Milnes Gaskell was "born on the 10th October 1810," being "the only son of Benjamin Gaskell of Thornes House, Wakefield, Yorkshire."[65] He was educated at Eton College and was the "M.P. for Much Wenlock" from 1832 until 1868.[66] He also served as a Lord of the Treasury to Sir Robert Peel under the Second Peel ministry in 1841.[67] Compared to Robert Peel, fellow "new man" Gaskell's political career was less spectacular, and little survives about his later life in the historical record. After the death of Gaskell's father in 1856, James Milnes Gaskell inherited Thomas House, a small yet comfortable abode.[68] However, this small manor was not befitting for a "new man" like James Milnes Gaskell. So, in 1857, Gaskell contracted to "buy Wenlock Abbey and estate for the sum of £110,000."[69] It was at Wenlock that Gaskell "began that judicious restoration which has preserved so much of the old Abbey from ruin, and which has made of the Prior's House, now

---

[65] Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society (Great Britain), *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, vol. 2 (Shrewsbury [etc.] Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, 1902), p. 353, https://archive.org/details/transactionsofsh32shro/page/n759/mode/2up?view=theater.
[66] Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society (Great Britain), *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, p. 353.
[67] Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society (Great Britain), *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, p. 353.
[68] Cynthia J. Gamble, *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family* (Much Wenlock, Shropshire: Ellingham Press, 2015), p. 9.
[69] Cynthia J. Gamble, *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family*, p. 9.

occupied by his heir, Mr. C. G. Milnes Gaskell, one of the most beautiful residences in Shropshire."[70]

On his purchase of Wenlock, historian and author Cynthia Gamble has suggested that Gaskell desired a "foothold" in the Shropshire countryside to aid his political career.[71] While accurate, this assessment does not explain how Gaskell accomplished this through his purchase. In another vein, historians such as Gamble have also suggested that Gaskell's wife, Mary, was somewhat eccentric and wished for a change of pace, which motivated James Milnes Gaskell's purchase.[72] However, even if this is true, Gaskell's use of the spaces in Wenlock Abbey suggests a different motivation.

Crucially, one must understand that Wenlock was no pre-built country estate ready for purchase. Instead, it was the ruin of an ancient monastery containing important local archeological artifacts.[73] Gaskell's chosen site for his home contained hundreds of years of crucial British history and was a site of archaeological interest for many scholars. Importantly, Wenlock Abbey was an essential fixture in the local archaeological record, often featured prominently in meetings for the Shropshire Archaeological society. According to "Wenlock Priory," an 1853 article appearing in the *Archaeologia cambrensis; London* journal, Wenlock Priory had initially been an offshoot of the famed "Burgundian abbey of Clugny," and was the "oldest and most privileged, perhaps the wealthiest and most magnificent, of the religious houses of Shropshire."[74] Wenlock Priory had been founded sometime before the year 874, when it was

---

[70] Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society (Great Britain), *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society,* p. 354.
[71] Cynthia J. Gamble, *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family,* p. 9.
[72] Cynthia J. Gamble, *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family,* p. 9.
[73] Henry H Vale, "The Abbey Ruins of the Severn Valley." *The Wellington Journal Shrewsbury News*, August 15, 1868, p. 3, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000405/18680815/027/0003.
[74] E S A. "Wenlock Priory." Edited by Henry Longueville Jones and John Williams. *Archaeologia cambrensis; London* 4, no. 14 (April 1853): p. 99, https://www.proquest.com/docview/6687339/fulltext/BCF9E9AD09C046A0PQ/1?accountid=14522&imgSeq=1.

destroyed for the first time by the Danes as part of their "conquest of Mercia."[75] Another archaeological article from 1868 entitled "The Abbey Ruins of the Severn Valley" extensively details how the ruins of Wenlock Abbey represented a unique blend of "Norman," "cyclopean," and "Saxon" styles all built on top of each other over the years.[76] This article also indicates how the site represented many contemporary archaeological debates, as Wenlock had some of the only surviving examples of particular architectural styles.[77] Thus, although a ruin, Wenlock Abbey represented a critical piece of local Shropshire history.

When Gaskell and his family moved into Wenlock Abbey, they immediately integrated into this local history through their remodeling. The family did not demolish ancient parts of the building deemed uninhabitable. According to James Gaskell's sister-in-law, staying at the Abbey meant "literally living in the ruins -- in the rooms of the abbot, with the ambulatory for the monks opening out of them."[78] She further went on to describe how even after the remodel was completed, "the heavy, massive doors, the stone floors, and windows, and shutters, are all the old ones."[79] The family even began to sponsor archaeological excavations on their land, which often turned up important finds such as skeletons of ancient and unknown men. These were promptly displayed in the family's on-site museum.[80] In *Portraits of Places,* Henry James, a frequent visitor to Wenlock, mentions how one enters the house "through an old Norman portal, massively arched and quaintly sculptured, across whose hollow threshold the eye of fancy might

[75] E S A. "Wenlock Priory." Edited by Henry Longueville Jones and John Williams. *Archaeologia cambrensis; London*, p. 100.
[76] Henry H Vale, "The Abbey Ruins of the Severn Valley," p. 3.
[77] Henry H Vale, "The Abbey Ruins of the Severn Valley," p. 3.
[78] "Memorials of Charlotte Williams Wynn," p. 299, in Cynthia J. Gamble, *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family*, p. 20.
[79] "Memorials of Charlotte Williams Wynn," p. 299, in Cynthia J. Gamble, *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family*, p. 20.
[80] CCMG's large Abbey book, fols 20-21 in Cynthia J. Gamble, *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family* (Much Wenlock, Shropshire: Ellingham Press, 2015), p. 20.

see the ghosts of monks and the shadows of abbots pass noiselessly to and fro."[81] James then comments that "This aperture admits you to a beautiful ambulatory of the thirteenth century — a long stone gallery or cloister, repeated in two stories, with the interstices of its traceries now glazed, but with its long, low, narrow, charming vista still perfect and picturesque."[82] At face value, it may seem odd that a family who could afford to purchase Wenlock Abbey for a massive sum would choose to live like its ancient monks and incorporate modern elements within the ruins instead of demolishing the ruins for a more comfortable experience. However, when Gaskell's actions of buying the ancient abbey and living like its ancient monks are viewed in the context of the landed practice of using ancient monasteries for a connection to local history, Gaskell's use of "different means to the same ends" becomes clear.

In his seemingly strange choice of Wenlock, Gaskell was trying to accomplish an unlanded emulation of the landed practice of living in ancient monasteries and buildings to connect to the local land, people, and history. Landed elites had long inhabited ancient abbeys and buildings to connect to local history. As should be no surprise, claims to be a part of local history were vital for landed elite families who wished to be viewed as "lords" over local areas. This plays into historian Jeremy Musson's argument of "objects for display" in country houses.[83] In this case, the ancient country house itself was an object of display, intended to illustrate to visitors that the inhabiting family had been an integral part of local history for many generations and was thus deserving of aristocratic status.

The Combermere family's Combermere Abbey serves as a practical example of this. Combermere Abbey was originally "an abbey of Benedictine monks, founded by one Hugh de

---

[81] Henry James, *Portraits of Places*. pt. 919. Vol. pt. 919. (London, England: Macmillan, 1883,) p. 277, https://archive.org/details/portraitsplaces03jamegoog/page/n221/mode/2up.
[82] Henry James, *Portraits of Places*. pt. 919. Vol. pt. 919, p. 277.
[83] Jeremy Musson, "The English Country House and its Collections" In T*he English Country House From the Archives of Country Life*, p. 225.

Malbank in the year 1133."[84] Just like Wenlock, the Combermere family made sure to showcase the ancient aspects of their home: "The library has been adapted from the refectory" and "The ancient oak roof is still preserved."[85] However, the primary way that landed families used these ancient spaces as connections to British history was by simply inhabiting such spaces in the first place. Recall that a monarch always gifted families their lands; they did not purchase them. This meant that any landed family living in an abbey had been given said space by a British monarch, often at the expense of the monks or nuns. This automatically resulted in a connection to British history because by the 19th century, British monarchs no longer engaged in the dissolution of monasteries.[86] In the case of the Lords of Combermere, they and many other landed families had been gifted their abbeys under Henry VIII in the 16th century after he kicked out the monks and gave it to their ancestor, George Cotton, as part of the monarch's habit of dissolving monasteries.[87] Thus, for a landed family, inhabiting an ancient monastery meant that said family must have been important for some large period of history, as they would have had to have been given the space centuries ago. This was impossible for James Milnes Gaskell, whose ancestors had no real wealth or aristocratic connection until him.

This is where Gaskell ran into an issue whereby he had to use "different means" in his attempt to copy landed elites inhabiting ancient monasteries. Just like how Peel had no blood ancestors to show off in his portrait gallery, Gaskell had no actual connection to the history of

---

[84] F. O. Morris, *The County Seats of the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Great Britain and Ireland. vol. 2. (Vol. 3-5. A Series of Picturesque Views of Seats of the Noblemen ... of Great Britain and Ireland. With descriptive letterpress.) vol. 2*, (London: Longmans & Co, 1866-80), p. 43, http://access.bl.uk/item/viewer/ark:/81055/vdc_00000005823C.
[85] F. O. Morris, *The County Seats of the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Great Britain and Ireland. vol. 2. (Vol. 3-5. A Series of Picturesque Views of Seats of the Noblemen ... of Great Britain and Ireland. With descriptive letterpress.) vol. 2,* p. 43.
[86] Ben Johnson, "Dissolution of the Monasteries," Historic UK (Historic UK Ltd.), accessed February 4, 2022, https://www.historic-uk.com/HistoryUK/HistoryofEngland/Dissolution-of-the-Monasteries/.
[87] F. O. Morris, *The County Seats of the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Great Britain and Ireland. vol. 2. (Vol. 3-5. A Series of Picturesque Views of Seats of the Noblemen ... of Great Britain and Ireland. With descriptive letterpress, vol. 2, p.* 43.

Wenlock or the town of Shropshire. While the Combermere family was able to seamlessly mesh into the history of Combermere Abbey and the local area because their continuous inhabitation and landed status implied such a connection, Gaskell had to use his own, uniquely unlanded means to manufacture his connection into history through Wenlock Abbey. Gaskell did this by purchasing the abbey and remodeling it in a way that suggested his family had also been involved in the history of the space for generations. In other words, since Gaskell lacked aristocratic ancestors to be gifted an abbey, he had to purchase his own. Now, Gaskell's seemingly curious choice to buy an ancient rundown abbey of great historical importance and then remodel it in such a way that he was living in and amongst Wenlock's history makes sense. In reality, when Gaskell was "living in the ruins" of Wenlock, he was trying to associate himself with its history like the Combermere family, but in his unlanded way.[88] Ultimately, in this pursuit, Gaskell was highly successful. Evidence of this and further confirmation that Gaskell was attempting to achieve the "same ends" as his landed counterparts are best charted through the multiple visits to Wenlock by famed British poet Henry James. Here, James automatically associated Gaskell with Wenlock's long history.

Blurred Lines at Wenlock

Henry James' multiple stays at Wenlock highlight Gaskell's intentions in inserting himself into Wenlock's history and showcase his success in doing so. Although himself not a member of the landed elite, Henry James was undoubtedly a capable judge of aristocratic houses and heritage, as he spent a large portion of his career, as he called it, "staying," essentially jumping from landed estate to landed estate.[89] If any visitor had been able to see through

[88] "Memorials of Charlotte Williams Wynn," p. 299, in Cynthia J. Gamble, *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family*, p. 20.
[89] Henry James, *Portraits of Places*. pt. 919. Vol. pt. 919, p. 277.

Gaskell's manufactured connection to Wenlock's history, it would have been James. However, James instead connected Gaskell with Wenlock's history as if he had inhabited the space for centuries. As mentioned above, Henry James describes how Gaskell's remodeling meshed together with the abbey's ancient spaces. Crucially, James seamlessly intertwines these ancient artifacts with the modern parts of the house added by Gaskell, such as the "drawing room" and the "lawn" and "park."[90] James goes as far as to claim that "when you turn into the drawing-room, where you find modem conversation and late publications and the prospect of dinner," then "The new life and the old have melted together; there is no dividing-line."[91] The fact that James cannot see a dividing line between the old and the new at Wenlock is critical because it suggests that Gaskell successfully intertwined himself into Wenlock's history enough to trick his visitors into associating him with the history of the place. Even more strikingly, James went on to claim that "It is not too much to say that after spending twenty-four hours in a house that is six hundred years old, you seem yourself to have lived in it for six hundred years."[92] Here, James calls the house six hundred years old, even though it was a twenty-year-old building incorporating elements of six hundred-year-old ruins at the time of his visit. This perfectly encapsulates Gaskell's success in using "different means to the same ends." At Wenlock, Gaskell was able to copy the connections to history fostered by landed elites living in ancient abbeys like the Combermeres' through his unlanded means of purchasing an ancient abbey and remodeling it. Visitors such as James could not distinguish this fact and now associated Gaskell with the Abbey's ancient history because of his use of "different means to the same ends."

Gaskell's efforts should not be viewed in a vacuum. Rather, Gaskell represents one example of multiple "new men" who used "different means to the same ends" in remarkably

[90] Henry James, *Portraits of Places*. pt. 919. Vol. pt. 919, p. 277.
[91] Henry James, *Portraits of Places*. pt. 919. Vol. pt. 919, p. 280.
[92] Henry James, *Portraits of Places*. pt. 919. Vol. pt. 919, p. 280.

similar ways to manufacture connections to the British past through the emulation of aspects of the country houses of landed elites. In the context of this thesis, Gaskell simply serves as one concrete example of a "new man" who was able to successfully emulate the historical provenance associated with practices such as inhabiting ancient abbeys through "different," uniquely unlanded means.

Chapter 2. India: The 'Nabob's' Grand Tour:

In a typical example of the phrase "different means to the same ends," a group of "new men" bastardized the longstanding gentry tradition of the Grand Tour and the collection of both ideas and objects that were associated with it. This was part of their quest to become certified members of the aristocracy. Due to their status as "new men," their means had to be different: While most landed men enjoyed a Grand Tour in locales such as Rome, "new men" like Charles Cockerell and Robert Clive went to India. In addition, while landed Grand Tours were undertaken under an individual's own wealth, travels to the British empire were undertaken as work and a source of wealth. Nevertheless, the ends were the same. Like their landed counterparts, Cockerell and Clive brought back both ideas and material objects from their time abroad in the empire, which were displayed in their country houses and used to further themselves as legitimate members of the aristocracy. Both men were successful in their ends to varying degrees, as both Cockerell and Clive were ultimately viewed as landed individuals by the later periods of their lives. After his time in India, Charles Cockerell put on a carefully curated display of the architecture he had experienced in the empire on the exterior of his Sezincote House. Cockerell's actions are best interpreted as his own bastardized version of the contemporary Italian Palazzo style of the early-to-mid 19th century. Cockerell's means were different: his landed counterparts often traveled to Florence while he went to India. However, the ends were the same: In both cases, travel to a foreign territory prompted non-British designs to appear on the exteriors of country houses, while the interiors remained purely classical. In the end, Cockerell was successful in his attempts to use his time in India as his own unlanded version of a Grand Tour, as despite great British mistrust of wealth deriving from India,

Cockerell and his Sezincote house were ultimately accepted and treated as if their Indian displays were no different than more traditional ones.

On the other hand, in the mid-18th century, Robert Clive collected copious amounts of objects and artifacts in India. He displayed them in his many country estates, as part of his use of "different means to the same ends" to copy the material collection and downright plundering that often occurred during the Grand Tour of more landed individuals. Again, the means were different in that landed men often traveled to places like Pompeii, while Clive had to settle for India. But once again, the ends were eerily similar: Both landed men and Clive pilfered artifacts from ancient locations and displayed them in their country houses in a nearly identical fashion. While Cockerell's aristocratic integration was seamless, Robert Clive's relationship with his Grand Tour in India proved a contentious point with which Clive had to wrestle with in his journey to become a landed elite. Although just two examples, these two "new men" are ideal representations of the effort that many "new men" went to use their travels in the British empire in much the same way that traditionally landed men used the Grand Tour.

Historiography

Historians have long posited that the Grand Tour and the collecting associated with it were influential in developing the English Country house and essential to the social prestige of the traditional landed aristocracy. However, previous historiographies have not connected the Grand Tour, its collections, and the empire-themed displays of "new men" in their country homes. Historian Jeremy Musson writes that "many paintings and works of art collected in the mid-to-late eighteenth century" in country houses reflected "the well-established conventions of the Grand Tour, the period of travel through Europe and particularly to Rome which represented

the final part of the education of a gentleman."[93] As a result, according to Musson, "Classical sculpture and Romantic landscapes dotted with classical ruins, and portraits painted by artists based in Rome, become a defining feature of the country house interior."[94] On the social prestige of these collections, Musson writes that "collections were not developed just for private enjoyment; visiting other country houses was a long-established social convention amongst the gentry from the seventeenth century onwards."[95] Crucially, Musson does not connect the Grand Tour to "new men," only the ancient English landed aristocracy.

Of the collections of "new men" and the influence of empire in the English Country House, historian Stephanie Barczewski mentions in *Country Houses and the British Empire, 1730-1900* that the collections of "new men" were "largely the product of a desire to display exotic objects, animals and plants to enhance the social prestige of the collector."[96] Maya Jasanoff argues that collecting became "a form of self-fashioning" for "new men."[97] However, neither Barczewski nor Jasanoff connect these collections or their accompanying wish for greater social prestige to collections undertaken as part of the bastardized Grand Tour tradition. Others like Barczewski contend that "new men" like "Warren Hastings" used his country estate as "a showcase" of his "Indian career," not shying away from the fact that "India had altered not only his finances and his social status, but his conception of himself."[98] Jasanoff's discussion of Claude Martin is similar; she claims he used his Indian collection as a means to "transform

---

[93] Jeremy Musson, "The English Country House and its Collections" In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life,* p. 226.
[94] Jeremy Musson, "The English Country House and its Collections" In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life,* p. 226.
[95]Jeremy Musson, "The English Country House and its Collections" In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life,* p. 225.
[96] Stephanie Barczewski, *Country Houses and the British Empire, 1730-1900*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), p. 227.
[97] Maya Jasanoff, "Collectors of Empire: Objects, Conquests and Imperial Self-Fashioning." *Past & Present*, no. 184 (2004): p. 111, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3600699.
[98] Stephanie Barczewski, *Country Houses and the British Empire,* p. 148.

himself, in his own eyes at least, into a cosmopolitan gentleman-connoisseur."[99] Barczewski and Jasanoff are again correct in that some measure of the influence of places like India seen in the country houses of "new men" is a natural occurrence because their entire fortunes were made and shaped in those locales. However, even with this in mind, both historians overlook the agency of many "new men" in their concerted efforts to use these collections in the same way that members of the old aristocracy used their Grand Tour collections.

As a final note, Barczewski claims that places like India were disproportionately represented in the country houses of "new men" who made their fortune in the empire. "The British empire consisted of a variety of locales," writes Barczewski, that "operated and were perceived in different ways at different times," and these "differing operations and perceptions influenced the ways in which the Empire appeared in country houses."[100] Moreover, as Kirsten McKenzie notes, by the end of the 18th century, "Criticism mounted against morally suspect wealth."[101] This made West Indian planters, whose wealth had often derived from slavery, markedly more unpopular than those whose wealth derived from India. As such, West Indian "new men" rarely displayed the ideas and physical collections they gathered in the empire in their country estates. Yet, this chapter shows the argument of "new men" in the empire and their copying of the Grand Tour still stands, with the critical exception that this argument only fully holds for "new men" who made their fortune in what the British public viewed as less offensive parts of the empire.

---

[99] Maya Jasanoff, "Collectors of Empire: Objects, Conquests and Imperial Self-Fashioning," p. 110
[100] Stephanie Barczewski, *Country Houses and the British Empire,* p. 139.
[101] Kirsten McKenzie, *A Swindler's Progress: Nobles and Convicts in the Age of Liberty* (Harvard University Press, 2010), p. 8.

Cockerell at Sezincote

Charles Cockerell was born on 18 February 1755 to unlanded, upper-middle-class parents.[102] Not to be confused with the nineteenth-century archeologist, writer, and architect extraordinaire Charles Robert Cockerell, almost nothing is known about our Charles Cockerell's childhood, save for the fact that he "received his commercial education at Sharpe's school at Bromley by Bow."[103] Eventually, Cockerell ended up in Bengal, India, in 1776, as a relatively minor employee of the East India Company.[104] According to The UK Parliament's official website on the histories of its various members, while in India, Cockerell befriended two significant British colonial figures: Warren Hastings and Lord Wellesly.[105] This proved pivotal in his becoming an unlanded member of the British aristocracy. Cockerell used this connection to assist Lord Wellesley during the Mysore war of 1798-1799, which won him the respect of the British administration and helped him secure a large fortune, prompting Cockerell to return to England by the turn of the 19th century to enter into British politics as an unlanded "new man."[106] Cockerell's political career was less spectacular than some of his fellow Indian nabobs and "new men" contemporaries. Cockerell "came into Parliament for Tregony as a guest of Richard Barwell, a fellow nabob," and never rose above holding basic offices in the House of Commons. Cockerell's political career was shaped mainly by his almost blind devotion to his former patron and comrade Lord Wellesley, who eventually helped Cockerell secure for himself the title of Baronet in 1809.[107] Finally, Cockerell used the wealth and influence that he derived from India to become "a partner in the house of Paxton, Cockerell, Trail, and Co. East India

[102] "History of Parliament Online," COCKERELL, Charles (1755-1837), of Sezincote, Glos. | History of Parliament Online (UK Parliament), accessed December 12, 2021, https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1790-1820/member/cockerell-charles-1755-1837.
[103] "History of Parliament Online," COCKERELL, Charles (1755-1837), of Sezincote, Glos.
[104] "History of Parliament Online," COCKERELL, Charles (1755-1837), of Sezincote, Glos.
[105] "History of Parliament Online," COCKERELL, Charles (1755-1837), of Sezincote, Glos.
[106] "History of Parliament Online," COCKERELL, Charles (1755-1837), of Sezincote, Glos.
[107] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11. 63 vols. p. 199.

Agents, Pall mall," and stayed a member of Parliament and partner in this house until shortly before his death in 1837.[108] Likely due to this uneventful political career, Cockerell's entry into the 1807 edition of *A Biographical Index to the Present House of Commons* is relatively brief, with the only mention of his time in the empire being that he "resided during many years in Asia."[109] But Cockerell's time in India was crucial. It was there that he discovered the architecture that would later shape the remodeling of his country house, Sezincote, in much the same way that his landed contemporaries picked up architectural views from Italy and used them in their country houses as part of the Italian Palazzo period.

Charles Cockerell's remodeling at Sezincote incorporated many elements that he had derived from his time in India. According to the UK Parliament's official history on Cockerell, "On his return to England in 1801, he [Charles Cockerell] resided at Sezincote, which had belonged to his late brother John, a colonel in the Company service."[110] After coming into possession of Sezincote, Charles Cockerell hired his brother and budding architect Samuel Pepys Cockerell to help him design a new, decidedly Indian-inspired house.[111] Accordingly, Cockerell "embellished it [Sezincote] in the oriental style."[112] The official listing designating Sezincote as a Grade I listed English building states that after Cockerell inherited Sezincote, rather than keeping his late brother John's designs, he "had a new house built at Sezincote, around the original house."[113] The architecture of Sezincote is mainly intact to this day and is described in its historic listing as follows:

---

[108] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11. 63 vols. p. 199.
[109] Joshua Wilson, *A Biographical Index to the Present House of Commons. Carefully Compiled by Joshua Wilson ... Corrected to April, 1807,* p. 106.
[110] Joshua Wilson, *A Biographical Index to the Present House of Commons. Carefully Compiled by Joshua Wilson ... Corrected to April, 1807,* p. 106.
[111] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11, p. 199.
[112] Joshua Wilson, *A Biographical Index to the Present House of Commons. Carefully Compiled by Joshua Wilson ... Corrected to April, 1807,* p. 106.
[113] "Sezincote - 1000433: Historic England," Historic England, 1986, https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1000433?section=official-listing.

> The main block is a rectangular, two-storey building, of orange-stained ashlar limestone with a slate roof and copper dome. Mogul and Hindu elements of architecture are combined in the design, including octagonal corner minarets with copper domes, a chaja (projecting cornice with deep brackets below) and 'peacock tail' arches crowning the first-floor windows on the south front. The main door is in the centre of the eleven-bay east front and is contained by an arched porch which reaches to the eaves.
>
> The main block of the house is asymmetrically extended by the curving orangery wing (listed grade I) to the south and to the north by another extension (listed grade I), ending in the Tent Room, a pavilion originally occupied by Sir Charles Cockerell's bedroom. The facade of the orangery comprises an arcade of fifteen pointed arches, each with double glass doors. Stone steps lead up to the far right (north) of the conservatory wing and to the octagonal former aviary at the far left.[114]

The gardens of Sezincote also contain influences derived from India and include elements such as a bridge named "the Indian bridge" and the "Temple of Surya."[115] The temple was "a small square building of grey marble with a stepped pyramidal roof and an open front, containing a figure of the sun god Surya, in relief against the rear wall."[116] Surya is both "the Sun and the Sun god" in Hinduism.[117] On Sezincote's official tourist-oriented website, modern images of the home further confirm the evident Indian influence on the house's architecture. Among descriptions of the home's architecture, one can clearly see the "minarets" and "peacock-tail windows," which ostensibly cast an Indian light on Sezincote's exterior architecture.[118]

Notably, while the exterior and gardens of Sezincote have evident Indian influence, Cockerell ensured that the interior remained purely classical. An interior photo of Sezincote's drawing room shows clear evidence of "French Neo-Classical" architecture, with deep cornices, gilt eagles, and other features typical of "Regency interiors."[119] Some, such as Sezincote's

---

[114] "Sezincote - 1000433: Historic England," Historic England.
[115] "Sezincote - 1000433: Historic England," Historic England.
[116] "Sezincote - 1000433: Historic England," Historic England.
[117] "Lord Surya - Info, Festivals, Temples, Iconography, Story, Names," Temple Purohit, accessed February 9, 2022, https://www.templepurohit.com/hindu-gods-and-deities/lord-surya/.
[118] "Sezincote House," SEZINCOTE, accessed January 7, 2022, https://www.sezincote.co.uk/sezincote-house.
[119] Paul Highman, Country Life Picture library: 301, in John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life* (New York, New York: Rizzoli International Publications Inc., 2019), p. 301.

modern caretakers, argue that Cockerell deliberately chose not to 'Indianize' the interiors of Sezincote because "by the time Sezincote was constructed British attitudes were changing" towards those who had made their fortune in the empire.[120] As will be shown later, it is true that during the early years of the 19th century, the "British public mistrusted the wealth won by 'nabobs' such as the Cockerells and suspected them of decadence."[121] However, the argument that "this explains perhaps why both the interior and the domestic parts of the garden needed to be unambiguously English" does not tell the whole story.[122] The interior of Sezincote, while indeed classical and found in contemporary houses, was not 'unambiguously English,' as it mainly contained elements of "French Neo-classical" architecture imported from France, not England.[123] In reality, Cockerell's choice to include Indian influences only on the exterior of his home is further proof that his Sezincote house represents the perfect example of an unlanded "new man's" remaking of the Grand Tour, more specifically, its Italian Palazzo style, which occurred at precisely the same time as Cockerell's Sezincote.

The similarities between Cockerell's work at Sezincote and many landed men who participated in the Italian Palazzo phase of the Grand Tour are striking. Although Charles Cockerell likely did not intend to specifically copy Italian Palazzo style, in his design of Sezincote, he acted in exactly the same way as a more traditional landed man who participated in the Grand Tour would have done. The Palazzo phase began simultaneously with Charles Cockerell construction of Sezincote, eventually reaching its zenith around the 1820s.[124] John Goodall characterizes the Italian Palazzo phase of English country houses as the period when landed British men traveled specifically to Florence and Venice in search of inspiration for their

[120] "Sezincote House," SEZINCOTE.
[121] "Sezincote House," SEZINCOTE.
[122] "Sezincote House," SEZINCOTE.
[123] Paul Highman, Country Life Picture library: 301, in John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life*, p. 301.
[124] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life* p. 320.

country homes as part of their Grand Tour.[125] They subsequently brought back architectural ideas that were then depicted in constructing their country estates.[126] Examples of Italian Palazzo style can be seen in country houses such as Ballywalter Park, whose architecture evokes "design in the Italian renaissance manner."[127] The first parallels between Cockerell's work at Sezincote and Italian Palazzo emerge: in the same fashion that landed men brought back Italian designs for their country houses after traveling to Italy, Charles Cockerell brought back Indian designs for his country house after his travels to India.

However, the connection runs deeper. Italian Palazzo's almost exclusive focus on the exterior is one facet of its design that sets it apart from other *en vogue* country house phases. "While British patrons constructed Italianate buildings," writes Goodall, "the furniture of the domestic interiors within these buildings was generally of a different character."[128] Essentially, while the exterior and architectural bits of Italianate houses, such as main staircases, might reflect outside influence, the interiors seldom did. One stark example is the Travelers Club, a building lauded as one of the purest examples of Italian Palazzo style.[129] Here, while the exterior and layout "essentially took the form of a Florentine palazzo," architect Charles Barry "designed furniture that was entirely appropriate to an English country house of the period."[130] This has a striking similarity to Cockerell's choice of interiors, which did not at all match his Indian exterior. While not British, Cockerell's aforementioned Neo-Classical French interiors were still appropriate to a house mimicking the Palazzo Style. In this way, through his travel-influenced exterior and acceptable English interior, Charles Cockerell was performing the "new man's" version of the Italian Palazzo style.

---

[125] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life* p. 320.
[126] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life* p. 320.
[127] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life* p. 322.
[128] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life* p. 321.
[129] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life* p. 321.
[130] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life* p. 321.

Again, there is no evidence that Cockerell built Sezincote with Italian Palazzo on his mind. Nonetheless, the fact that the unlanded Cockerell's actions at Sezincote after his time in India closely parallel the actions of what a more traditionally landed man would have done after their Grand Tour suggests that Cockerell's actions, (and other new men who had similar country house design philosophies), should be viewed as an attempt to replicate landed designs in an unlanded way. In this light, the phrase "different means to the same ends" becomes fully illuminated. The means of Cockerell and other similar "new men" had to be different -- since they were unlanded and born without significant wealth, these men never got to travel to Florence or Venice and "fall in love" with the architecture of "late medieval and Renaissance Italy."[131] Cockerell instead had to make his fortune in India, toiling away as an employee of the East India Company. Yet, the ends were the same: although Cockerell and his landed contemporaries traveled abroad and returned to England with architectural influence that was then integrated into the design of their country houses, their interiors remained classical. Cockerell was not unique in his actions at Sezincote -- he merely represents the most accessible example in the context of this project.

The "Landed" Cockerell

Cockerell's success in using "different means to the same ends" can be witnessed and evaluated by viewing contemporary newspaper articles that discuss Cockerell's life at Sezincote in the years following its remodeling. All depictions of Cockerell view him as a wholly-landed individual. To understand how successful Cockerell was, one must first confront the overwhelming British mistrust of Indian wealth like Cockerell's from the 18th century onwards. When Cockerell and his fellow "new men" made their fortunes in the empire, they established

[131] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life* p. 320.

themselves as pseudo landed elites in Britain. Yet, as historian Kirsten Mckenzie notes, this also led to criticism "against morally suspect wealth."[132] For example, 'nabob,' once meant as a mere description of an unlanded man who became rich in an exotic locale like India, increasingly became synonymous with flashy and tasteless wealth. An 1836 article appearing in the *Kendal Mercury* sums up the distrustful British attitude towards Indian nabobs:

> A nabob, as all the world knows, was a man of almost unbounded wealth. The very tingo of his complexion was respected as the reflection of mohurs and pagodas. But while his wealth secured to him influence and consideration, there was, nevertheless, something mysterious and questionable about the man. The son of a tradesman, a yeoman, or gentleman of limited fortune, or the result of some indiscretion in a higher circle—probably the scapegrace tho school, the plague of the parish—he had been shipped off for India the most obvious mode of providing for him when there was no longer the smallest hope of his ever doing any good home. After an absence of some years, he returned, rich enough to purchase the properties of half the ruined 'squires whose orchards and poultry-yards had been the scenes of his early depredations.' Yet, with all his wealth, the nabob was obviously not a happy man. Valued for his money, and hated for his success,—too proud to court the society of those to whose level he was believed to have been raised, and too vain to descend to that of the class from which he sprung.[133]

The language used by the *Kendal Mercury* is damning and yet captures the lifestyles of men like Charles Cockerell, who had indeed been shipped off to India, made his fortune, and came back as a "new man." Importantly, it was explicitly many landed elites who began to question the validity of so-called 'Indian nabobs.' As far back as the mid-18th century, the legendary statesman Horace Walpole, 4th earl of Orford, was wont to say that "West Indians, nabobs, and conquerors" threatened to overturn Britain's political hegemony with their *nouveau riche* nature.[134] As mentioned earlier, some have even suggested that Cockerell kept the interior of Sezincote classical due to his fears over the mistrust of Indian nabob wealth, which was seen as

---

[132] Kirsten McKenzie, *A Swindler's Progress: Nobles and Convicts in the Age of Liberty,* p. 8.
[133] "The Nabobs (From the Quarterly Review)," *Kendal Mercury and Westmorland Advertiser*, January 2, 1836, 86 edition, pp. 1-1, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000429/18360102/003/0001.
[134] Horace Walpole, *Correspondences,* quoted in C. H. Philips, "Clive in the English Political World, 1761-64." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 12, no. 3/4 (1948): p. 695, http://www.jstor.org/stable/608728.

decadent and extravagant. But, it is important to recognize that much of the distrust and hatred of 'nabobs' like Cockerell was likely politically motivated and vastly overplayed by landed elites like Horace Walpole. These men were concerned that nabobs, with their lack of previous political ties, had the power to displace the political efficacy of incumbent landed men. In this vein, historian C.H. Philips concedes that despite the great hubbub about distrusting Indian wealth, "the evidence of contemporary newspapers shows that the complaint about the *nouveau riche* arose at every general election."[135]

Nonetheless, despite all of this distrust, contemporary newspaper articles concerning Cockerell's years at Sezincote show that he was incredibly successful in using his botched copying of the Italian Palazzo style to the same effects as the prestige established by a more traditional Grand Tour for a landed individual. One caveat is that, unlike some "new men," Cockerell's earlier mentioned friendship with Warren Hastings in India eventually landed him a Baronetcy in 1809, which was specially created for him.[136] However, a baronetcy is not a title which evokes landed status.[137] Thus, all of the negative predispositions against nabob wealth still applied. Cockerell's status as a landed elite in the newspapers owes itself in no small part to Cockerell's Sezincote estate, which plays a central role in all depictions of him available to the general public. One of the many hunting parties that Cockerell held at Sezincote for landed elites is described as follows:

> Lord Redesdale's hounds took place this day on the lawn of Sezincot House, the seat of Sir Charles Cockerell, the last regular hunting day of the season. The gilded domes and minarets of Sezincot glittered in all the glorious lustre of an eastern clime; here, indeed, we found every English comfort, combined with

[135] C. H. Philips, "Clive in the English Political World, 1761-64," p. 695.
[136] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11, p. 199.
[137] "The Baronetage • Debretts."

> oriental magnificence. We cannot give the names of all the illustrious fair who graced the mansion and the drive with their presence.[138]

Here, as with all descriptions of Cockerell's hunts, Sezincote is treated as if it is the ancient landed estate of some great noble, not the recently purchased house of a "new man." In addition, Cockerell is shown in newspapers as giving sumptuous feasts to "upwards of 200 persons," full of dancing and landed guests.[139] Here, Cockerell and his Sezincote are treated no differently than the landed guests whom they entertained. As further evidence and despite the mistrust of Indian nabobs mostly put forth by landed individuals, Charles Cockerell used Sezincote to become extremely close with certified landed members of the English aristocracy. Lord Deerhurst, the Earl of Coventry, frequents accounts of Cockerell at Sezincote. Cockerell and Deerhurst became so close that even after a fellow member of Cockerell's hunting party accidentally shot the Earl in "the upper part of Lord Deerhurst's right eye," with shrapnel entering "the hip and knee on the right," the landed Lord Deerhurst stuck around long enough that he ended up marrying Cockerell's daughter the following winter.[140] As per *Saunder's Newsletter* on 11 January 1836, "We are informed that a marriage is on the tapis between Lord Deerhurst and Miss Cockerell, daughter of Sir Charles Cockerell."[141] This marriage seems unlikely when the aforementioned gross mistrust of Indian wealth is considered. And yet, despite this mistrust, Cockerell was able to successfully use "different means to the same ends" to become intimate with the same people who feared his nabob wealth.

---

[138] "Hunting. The Close of the Season.--April 10.," *Home News for India, China and the Colonies*, April 24, 1847, 8 edition, p. 25, accessed November 12, 2021, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0002946/18470424/083/0025?browse=true.
[139] "Wednesday's Post," *Worcester Journal*, March 12, 1812, 5700 edition, p. 3, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000150/18120305/012/0003?browse=true.
[140] "Fatal Accidents on the River," *The Morning Post*, September 17, 1834, 19899 edition, p. 4, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000174/18340917/031/0004?browse=true.
[141] "The Funds," *Saunders's News-Letter, and Daily Advertiser*, January 8, 1836, 29410 edition, p. 1, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0001057/18360111/003/0001.

The best way to view the class of “new men” like Charles Cockerell is reflected in his Sezincote estate. Sezincote, with its foreign appearance courtesy of onion domes and external architectural influences, mirrors this class of “new men” who made their fortune in India and used their outside influence in their country house to great success: both appear to be foreign, different, and to some, even dangerous. Even one who is no expert in English country houses can look at the architecture of Sezincote and surmise something is quite different compared to the norm. However, when one inspects the interior of Sezincote, it is realized that there is nothing out of place compared to the country house of a more traditionally landed aristocrat. The same can be said for these “new men” like Cockerell. These “new men” were able to use “different means to the same ends” to give themselves an interior that is strikingly similar to what one might find inside a traditional British landed elite. In other words, just like his estate, Cockerell’s time in India is only visible on his exterior -- his interior remained acceptably British and remarkably similar to the landed elites of his time. In the end, if one were only to view contemporary newspaper articles about Cockerell, they would almost certainly never guess that he was any different from the traditional landed elite with whom he frequently mingled. This ultimately meant smooth sailing through aristocratic circles for men like Cockerell despite the great deal of mistrust towards men with Indian wealth. However, not all “new men” who embarked on their own Grand Tour in India and returned influenced by their time abroad had such an easy time fitting in with the landed elites. For men like Robert Clive, their battle with “different means to the same ends” was more complicated.

Clive of India, Depending on Who you Ask

Robert Clive, and many other “new men” like him, took their Grand Tour to India like Charles Cockerell. However, unlike Cockerell, Clive copied the longstanding Grand Tour

tradition of pilfering many precious objects from his travels abroad and displaying them in his country houses. While Cockerell's time in India helped him fit in with landed elites, their relationship with their Indian Grand Tour was a source of strife for Clive and others like him.

According to Robert Clive's official entry in the Dictionary of National Biography, he was born the eldest son of Richard Clive of Styche, the unlanded patriarch of an upper-middle-class family.[142] Although the Clive's were somewhat prominent during the 1600s, they had fallen to near bankruptcy by the time of Robert Clive's childhood.[143] Clive stood out among his pupils at school for his cunning and genius. "When still very young he was sent to a school at Lostock, Cheshire, kept by a Dr. Eaton, who predicted that 'if his scholar lived to be a man, and if opportunity enabled him to exert his talents, few names would be greater than his.'"[144] Afterwards, Clive jumped from school to school until "he was appointed in 1743, at the age of eighteen, a writer in the service of the East India Company at Madras."[145] Here, Robert Clive would leave his most significant mark on British history.

Clive's exploits in India remain some of the most extensive and legendary in the entirety of British imperial history. From his starting point as a simple writer and salaried employee of the East India Company, Robert Clive eventually became the appointed governor of the entire British-controlled Indian province of Bengal.[146] As part of his exploits, Clive procured for himself a massive fortune. After falling extremely ill in 1753, Clive briefly returned to England. "He had received considerable sums in prize money, and had brought home a moderate fortune, a portion of which he expended in extricating his father from pecuniary difficulties, and in redeeming the family estate."[147] However, after healing from his illness, Clive returned to India

[142] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11, p. 108.
[143] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11, p. 108.
[144] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11, p. 109.
[145] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11, p. 109.
[146] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11, p. 108.
[147] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11, p. 113.

once more, garnering even more wealth and more fame, and importantly, a "jaghire," which was a massive stipend of millions of dollars in today's money that Clive was destined to receive from India for many years.[148] After his second and final return to England, Clive had an illustrious and well known career in British politics. Political career aside, Robert Clive used "different means to the same ends" in his massive collection of Indian objects, which he proudly displayed in his multiple country estates, most notably Powis castle. Clive was not unique in his actions -- many other "new men" who made fortunes in India exhibited similar material collections. However, Clive was one of the first and arguably the most prolific "new man" collectors. Crucially, compared to landed elites, Clive's material collecting was not new. Instead, Clive used India like his version of a Grand Tour, in the vein of the phrase "different means to the same ends," and his collecting and pilfering of precious objects from his travels has striking similarities to what many landed men did as part of their Grand Tours.

To fully grasp Clive's use of India as his Grand Tour and "different means to the same ends," one must first recognize the scope of Clive's collection and how he acquired most of his precious items. According to the website UK National Trust, which manages Clive's artifacts, his surviving collection contains "more than 1000 items."[149] It includes "ivories, textiles, statues of Hindu gods, ornamental silver and gold, weapons and ceremonial armour."[150] The National Trust notes that the bulk of the items Clive collected in India was "invested in renovating Powis Castle and Gardens."[151] Most are still stored at Powis Castle to this day.[152] As told in Clive's own words, much of his material collection from India resulted from lavish gifts bestowed upon him by

[148] John Malcom, *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*, vol. 2 (London, England: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1836), p. 195, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/54633/54633-h/54633-h.htm#f157.
[149] "Powis Castle and Colonialism: The Clive Museum," National Trust (National Trust, October 10, 2015), https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/powis-castle-and-garden/features/the-clive-museum-at-powis.
[150] "Powis Castle and Colonialism: The Clive Museum," National Trust.
[151] "Powis Castle and Colonialism: The Clive Museum," National Trust
[152] "Powis Castle and Colonialism: The Clive Museum," National Trust.

Indian officials as thanks for various services: in one such instance, Clive claims "The Nabob,[153] of his own free will, for the service rendered him, made me a present much beyond my expectations."[154] In a similar instance, Clive recounts how "The Nabob, then, agreeable to the known and usual custom of Eastern princes, made presents, both to those of his own court, and to such of the English who, by their rank and abilities, had been instrumental in the happy success of so hazardous an enterprise, suitable to the rank and dignity of a great prince. I was one, amongst the many, who benefited by his Favour."[155] In perhaps the most striking account, a friend of Robert Clive recalled how Clive once claimed, "'but when I recollect entering the Nabob's treasury at Moorshedabad, with heaps of gold and silver to the right and left, and these crowned with jewels,'" Clive thought to himself, "'by God, at this moment, do I stand astonished at my own moderation.'"[156] As can be seen here, in many of his later accounts about his wealth and collection, Clive is intentionally vague about the nature and scope of the material gifts which he was given. The specifics for this will be delved into later. Nonetheless, Clive truly believed he merely exploited the "advantageous opportunities that presented themselves" during his time in India.[157]

Although Clive's own impression of his collection was benign, historians have shown that most of his large items resulted from plunder. The UK National Trust has proven many of Clive's most important items, such as the "Palanquin, or covered travelling couch, belonging to Siraj ud-Daulah" to have been either strong-armed, stolen, or outright taken with little accord for

---

[153] In this context, 'nabob' refers to an Indian official, not to a "new man" who made his fortune in India.
[154] Robert Clive, *Letter to Mr. Payne,* December 25, 1757, quoted in John Malcom, *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*, vol. 1 (London, England: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1836), p. 307, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/53424/53424-h/53424-h.htm#Footnote_189_189.
[155] Robert Clive, *Letter to the Court of Proprietors,* quoted in John Malcom, *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*, vol. 1, p. 309.
[156] *Anonymous Letter to the Lord of Powis,* quoted in John Malcom, *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*, vol. 1, p. 313.
[157] Robert Clive, *Letter to the Court of Proprietors,* quoted in John Malcom, *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*, vol. 1, p. 310.

their histories.[158] Plaques at the National Trust's Museum of Clive at Powis Castle proclaim, "'Recent research shows that most of the collection was either purchased or received as gifts from Indian connections, but a significant portion was pillaged. The tiger's head finial from the throne of Tipu Sultan is the most famous example.'"[159] This fact remains true for many unlanded collectors of Indian artifacts beyond Robert Clive. In the end, the fact that most objects collected by Clive were plundered from India actually further proves that Clive's actions were merely an unlanded version of the long-held practice of pilfering precious objects on the Grand Tour.

The similarities between Clive's collection and the collections of many landed individuals assembled on their European Grand Tours are striking. On a basic level, both Clive and landed individuals often stole items for their collections during their Grand Tour. Historian John Goodall writes that "As early as the fifteenth century," there is evidence of Englishmen exploring abroad as part of their Grand Tour searching for "valuable discoveries."[160] This often occurred in locations such as the ancient ruins of Pompeii. Here, as part of their Grand Tour, landed men "made their way to the sites of excavation" and looted whatever valuable items they could find, meaning "by the early nineteenth century substantial areas of the city were cleared."[161] Goodall claims that "Every find was jealously removed and guarded," and "the most important finds" were eagerly acquired as prize possessions by wealthy collectors."[162] This is very close to what Clive did -- just like these landed collectors, Clive eagerly snapped up all precious objects that he found in his time abroad in India, with little regard for historical provenance or preservation. However, the connection runs even deeper: in both Clive's case and

---

[158] "Powis Castle and Colonialism: The Clive Museum," National Trust.
[159] "The Clives: Looters or Art Collectors?," Restore Trust (Restore Trust, September 12, 2021), https://www.restoretrust.org.uk/restore-trust-issues/the-clives-looters-or-art-collectors.
[160] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life*, p. 210.
[161] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life*, p. 210.
[162] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life*, p. 210.

that of his landed counterparts, objects stolen during the Grand Tour were explicitly meant to be displayed in the country house.

Evidence of this can be seen in images of the sculpture gallery at Chatsworth House, which the landed 6th Duke of Devonshire specifically built to display the dozens of classical marbles that he had taken during his trips to Rome.[163] Images of Claydon House, owned by Sir Harvey Verney, depict a purpose-built "museum" containing totem poles, weapons, and other items of interest that Verney and his son had collected during their travels abroad to Newfoundland.[164] In my own personal travels to Ballyfin Demesne, once the home of Sir Charles and Lady Coote, pilfering during the Grand Tour is further realized. Upon entering the house, one is immediately greeted by a mosaic stolen from an ancient villa in Italy and sent back to the home. This mosaic is built into the design of the house and is the first thing that one sees when entering the doors of Ballyfin.[165] In the eyes of landed elites, such pieces were obviously meant for grand display. As has been detailed above, like landed collectors who went to Rome or Greece, the items which Clive brought back to England from India were displayed lavishly at Clive's Powis Castle.

Here, the phrase "different means to the same ends" returns. Just like how Charles Cockerell modified Italianate country house designs with Indian influence in the hopes of a similar effect, so too did Clive alter the means of a collection acquired from the Grand Tour. Obviously, due to his unlanded nature, Clive's means had to be different from his landed counterparts. Because he was not born into generational wealth, Clive and many "new men" like him could not take a Grand Tour in mainland Europe. Instead, these "new men" had to forge

[163] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life*, pp. 282-3.
[164] John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life*, p. 72.
[165] An image of this mosaic can be seen in John Goodall, *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life*, p. 285.

their path through India. And yet, the end outcome for Clive was the same as his landed counterparts. Both emerged with collections of items they had taken, bought, or stolen from abroad and brought to England for display in their country houses. In this way, Clive's collections from India can be viewed as his use of "different means to the same ends" in his unlanded version of the Grand Tour.

Clive's Landed Struggle

In the end, Robert Clive was successful in using his "different means to the same ends" to secure himself as a landed elite, but only at the cost of great personal struggle. In fact, Clive's landed status was largely due to his career in India being instrumental to the British nation, as opposed to his use of "different means to the same ends," which, in the end, proved detrimental in his becoming a landed elite.

Upon his second and final arrival back to England from India in 1760, Clive's entry into the Dictionary of National biography describes how he was "received with distinction by the king and by his ministers, and also by the court of directors."[166] Because of his highly successful and primarily military-oriented career in India, Clive was in line to receive both pensions and titles from the English Crown as part of a long tradition of rewarding the nation's best military figures and ensuring their landed status. This tradition can be seen in the life of Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington, who, after proving instrumental in the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte at Waterloo, was awarded land, titles, around one million pounds of prize money, and a pension of "4,000 per annum" for the rest of his life.[167] Clive did end up receiving many of these honors. For this reason, Clive was seen as a landed elite. As evidence, consider that when Clive's eldest

[166] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols, p. 116.
[167] Alice Mann, *Mann's Black Book of the British Aristocracy, or, An Exposure of the More Monstrous Abuses in the State and the Church : with Black Lists of Pensioners, Royal, Aristocratic, Legal, Civil, Diplomatic, Hereditary, Military, Clerical, Etc…,* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: H. Hooker, 1848), p. 50.

daughter was baptized on 5 March 1762, "Their majesties and Princess Amelia" attended and were her sponsors."[168] However, Clive's use of "different means to the same ends" was detrimental in positioning him as a member of the landed elite. Because of the great and personal connection to India which this fostered, many landed elites went out of their way to question Clive's status and the nature of his wealth.

One important caveat is that Clive was one of the first and most prolific Indian nabob collectors in British history. Historian C.H. Philips writes that Clive was one of only two large nabobs in British politics at the height of the mistrust mentioned above of his wealth.[169] Because of this, the distrust of Indian wealth was much more focused on Clive than on men like Cockerell, for the simple reason that there were many more important nabobs at Cockerell's time than at the time of Clive. However, the fact that Clive's use of "different means to the same ends" was detrimental in his journey to becoming a landed elite still stands.

Shortly after his second return to England, where Clive was supposedly welcomed by landed elites with open arms, he wrote a letter to his comrade back in India. Clive stated that himself and many other "gentlemen who are lately come from India, particularly those from Bengal," (like himself), had been "exasperated" by the "political behaviour" of the same landed elites who were supposedly going to accept him into their folds.[170] Clive was referring to his frustration over the fact that he was given a very minor Irish landed title upon his return to England in 1760; writing to Henry Vansittart that he "might have been an English Earl with a Blue Ribbon, instead of an Irish Peer (with the promise of a Red one)" but for the nature of his

---

[168] "London, March 4.," *The Derby Mercury*, March 5, 1762, 53 edition, p. 1, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000189/17620305/005/0001.
[169] C. H. Philips, "Clive in the English Political World, 1761-64," p. 695.
[170] Robert Clive, *Letter to Mr. Pybus at Madras,* February 27, 1762, quoted in John Malcom, *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*, vol. 2, p. 195.

Indian wealth.[171] Clive was repeatedly unwilling to distance himself from his Indian connections: "My future power, my future grandeur" were reliant on his "immense stake in India."[172] This realization by Clive only further drew the heat of landed elites.

Clive's landed detractors even went as far as to question the source of his Indian wealth and collection publicly. Political cartoons began to appear, such as one belonging to the British Museum depicting an evil looking Clive holding and running with bags of money from India.[173] In a series of hearings designed to expose his wealth as evil and illegitimate, Clive was forced to explain many of his lavish collectors' items and monetary gifts in front of committees. Clive felt that this was an attack on the source of his wealth, as seen when he remarked, "among some it may be considered as a crime my being rich. If it be a crime, you, Sir, are truly acquainted with the nature of it."[174] Even more strikingly, Clive allegedly remarked,

> What pretence could the Company have to expect, that I, after having risked my life so often in their service, should deny myself the only honourable opportunity that ever offered of acquiring a fortune without prejudice to them, who, it is evident, could not have had more for my having less? When the Company had acquired 1,500,000*l.* sterling, and a revenue of near 100,000*l.* per annum, from the success of their forces under my command,—when ample restoration had been made to those whose fortunes suffered by the calamity of Calcutta,—and when individuals had, in consequence of that success, acquired large estates,—what would the world have said, had I come home and rested upon the generosity of the present Court of Directors? It is well known to every gentleman in Bengal, that the honour of my country and the interest of the Company were the principles that governed all my actions; and that had I only taken the advantageous opportunities that presented themselves, by my being

---

[171] Robert Clive, *Letter to Henry Vansittart*, February 3, 1762, quoted in "CLIVE, Robert (1725-74), of Styche Hall, nr. Market Drayton, Salop; subsequently of Walcot Park, Salop; Claremont, Surr.; and Oakley Park, Salop," The History of Parliament Online (UK Parliament, 1986), https://historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1754-1790/member/clive-robert-1725-74#footnote4_jqgoo1q.
[172] Robert Clive, *Letter to Mr. Pybus at Madras,* February 27, 1762, quoted in John Malcom, *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*, vol. 2, p. 195.
[173] "Print; Satirical Print; Book-Illustration: British Museum," The British Museum (The British Museum, February 11, 2021), https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1868-0808-10039.
[174] Robert Clive, *Letter to Mr. Payne,* December 25, 1757, quoted in John Malcom, *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*, vol. 1, pp. 307-308.

> Commander-in-chief, at the head of a victorious army, and what by the custom of that country I was entitled to.[175]

From this excerpt, it is easy to see the trouble Clive's Indian wealth brought him. Although his foreign money and collections were gained in the same manner as his landed counterparts, Clive was scorned for this. Here, one can best see how Clive's use of "different means to the same ends" was a thorn in his side in terms of becoming and staying a landed elite.

Overall, Robert Clive's use of India as a Grand Tour and "different means to the same ends" simultaneously parallels and contradicts men like Cockerell. Their stories are parallel in that both men and their unlanded compatriots copied landed Grand Tour practices with their unique means to end up at remarkably similar ends. However, Clive's life contradicts Cockerell's. This is partly due to the different scales and circumstances of the two. Nonetheless, while Cockerell used his Indian influence at Sezincote to garner significant influence with landed elites, Clive's Indian influence hindered his landed status. If then, Cockerell is best viewed as a mirror of his Sezincote estate, with his exotic exterior and British interior, Clive is perhaps best viewed oppositely. From the outset, anyone looking at Robert Clive would see him as a *bonafide* landed elite with political power, titles, and prestige. The same can be said about Clive's Powis Castle. However, inside, both Robert Clive and Powis Castle were deeply connected to India through "different means to the same ends." The influence that this carried throughout his life ultimately undermined many of his landed advances.

---

[175] Robert Clive, *Letter to the Court of Proprietors,* quoted in John Malcom, *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*, vol. 1, p. 309-311.

Chapter 3. Everybody Wants to Rule the World:

As we have seen, "new men" made many concerted efforts to copy country house practices associated with England's landed aristocracy, such as picture galleries and foreign collections through "different means to the same ends." Yet, questions remain: why did these "new men" engage in such emulation? And, why did "new men" choose the country house as the object for this emulation? This chapter seeks to answer these two questions by exploring why "new men" emulated the landed aristocracy. I argue that the answer is connected to political necessity and rooted in the Great Reform Act of 1832 that supposedly forced the landed aristocracy to share its political and social power. Before 1832, England's landed aristocracy controlled the levers of political power. This meant that any "new men" wanting to enter politics needed to demonstrate that they were similar to a member of the landed elite. Copying elements of their social and political practices was one method used to achieve this end. Despite the hopes of many, it became very clear in the decades that followed the Reform Act that while England's landed elites had *reformed* Parliament, they managed to retain much of their political power. This created a political vacuum of sorts whereby any "new man" hoping to enter the public world of politics and assert his social and cultural power in England still needed to emulate the landed elites.

But why was the country house the terrain in which this elite power battle played itself out? I argue that part of the answer was that power remained in the English countryside. England's ancient and complicated voting system meant that despite growing urbanization in the 18th and 19th centuries and the Reform Act of 1832, political power remained almost exclusively in the English countryside, and was therefore rooted in the domain of the country house. Evidence suggests that the most direct way for "new men" to enter the political realm was

to use their wealth to establish themselves as prominent landowners in a far-off country town. This required a country house. The final answer that helps us understand - "why the country house" - is connected to questions of masculine identity and reputation. As historians have shown, men and their middle-class families starting in the late 18th century often attempted to reproduce facets of the domestic masculinity and other practices of landed elites' country houses in their own more modest homes. As "new men" rose to fortune from the middle classes they continued a practice they knew well: replicating as best they could the masculinity and identity of the country houses of landed elites, with the fundamental change being that these "new men" now had the monetary means to meet these same ends.

Historiography

Historians and chroniclers alike have given multiple interpretations to both gentry emulation and the popularity of country houses. Some historians have argued that country houses were so popular amongst those with wealth in England due to the power of land ownership in English society. John Martin Robinson writes that "Ownership of a landed estate gave its proprietors power and influence, economic security, independence, and an established position in society, as well as retirement, recreation, and sport."[176] Therefore, "anyone who made money by whatever means" most often "invested the proceeds in a country estate and country house."[177] In this same vein, 19th century chronicler Auguste Laugel pointed out that since the land was "the only capital" in England from the feudal era onwards, it was natural that the country house was an aim for those with wealth.[178] Both of these arguments demonstrate that the ownership of land

[176] John Martin Robinson, "The Function, Planning, & Social Use of the English Country House." In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life*, ed. Mary Miers p. 73.
[177]John Martin Robinson, "The Function, Planning, & Social Use of the English Country House." In *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life*, ed. Mary Miers p. 73.
[178] Auguste Laugel, *England, Political and Social*, p. 90.

was a compelling and powerful idea in the minds of those with the means to purchase a country house. But, this really only holds true for England's traditional landed aristocracy, who had used the land as the base of their wealth and prestige under the feudal system. The medieval feudal system of land distribution, which saw country house occupants owning large swaths of land around their estates and charging peasants to farm and live on it, had largely become obsolete by the 19th century. Indeed, many "new men" who purchased country houses showed relatively little interest in owning lands beyond their estates. As evidence, consider that James Milnes Gaskell, in his purchase of the then run-down Wenlock Abbey in the mid-19th century, actually sold off nearly 800 acres of the surrounding farmland to a landed elite neighbor.[179] Gaskell was not alone in this act. Thus, the supposition of land ownership overlooks the fact that many of England's "new men" were primarily motivated to occupy country houses by a wish to emulate the traditional aristocracy for political and social reasons.

Some contemporary 19th century sources claimed that those who emulated England's aristocracy did so because the titled aristocracy had an enticing aura surrounding them. Isaac Tomkins makes this case in his 1835 book *Thoughts upon the Aristocracy of England*. Tomkins asserts that "admission into the Aristocratic society" was "so very highly prized" because he landed aristocracy was simply alluring to those not of its ranks.[180] Tomkins claims that "it must be admitted that there is a very great, a very real charm, in those circles of society," in part because "The elegance of manners which there prevails is perfect; the taste which reigns over all is complete; the tone of conversation is highly agreeable."[181] Tomkins surmises that this, along with the "lightness," "ease," and "gaiety" with which landed elites conducted themselves as

[179] Cynthia J. Gamble, *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family,* p. 10.
[180] Isaac Tomkins and Henry Brougham, *Thoughts Upon the Aristocracy of England*, 12th ed., vol. 1 (London, England: H Hooper, 1835), pp. 11-12.
[181] Isaac Tomkins and Henry Brougham, *Thoughts Upon the Aristocracy of England*,, 12th ed., vol. 1, p. 12.

"most attractive" to "the middle classes."[182] Although largely speculatory in its construct, Tomkins' argument about the alluring nature of living like a landed elite is accurate to a point. Indeed, those in the middle classes who rose to become "new men" and fashioned themselves after landed elites lacked any other model on which to base their newfound wealth. It is true that for many generations, England's landed elites had been "the exclusive masters of the country."[183] In this light, it can be argued that it is unsurprising that upon receiving great wealth, "new men" copied the only other class of men in England who had any semblance of wealth, and that this logically led "new men" to emulating practices associated with the country house through "different means to the same ends." However, this supposition removes the political agency of "new men." Allure can undoubtedly help drive one's choices. However, as will be shown in this chapter, "new men" consciously emulated aspects of landed elites for precisely political gains. In addition, this "allurement" argument also forgets that "new men" had little choice but to emulate landed elites in the face of political fallout over the Reform Act of 1832.

Pre-Reform Necessity

Before the 1832 Reform Act, "new men" such as Robert Clive and Charles Cockerell were already emulating the landed aristocracy out of political necessity. This necessity was driven by the fact that England's landed elites exhibited total political and social control over the country from the dawn of the first "new men" in the 18th century up until the Reform Act in the mid-19th century. Because these landed elites did not want "new men" in positions of political power, "new men" had to engage in the very practices from which landed elites drew and kept their political authority.

---

[182] Isaac Tomkins and Henry Brougham, *Thoughts Upon the Aristocracy of England*,, 12th ed., vol. 1, pp. 11-12.
[183] Auguste Laugel, *England, Political and Social*, p. 90.

Contemporary primary and modern sources alike provide evidence of the overwhelming amount of control England's landed elites had on the country's politics. On the surface level, before the 19th century, England's government was made up almost exclusively of landed elites. Looking back, author John Austin wrote in 1859 that a substantial portion of landed elites had always been either themselves or directly connected to "members of the upper house."[184] Despite England's two house system, which included a House of Commons, before the Reform Act, England's House of Lords exhibited overwhelming control over the country's politics. This led many contemporary commentators to write articles with such titles as "The great Proprietors, having the control of legislation, devised laws which tended to their own aggrandisement," and "Additional Acts Parliament passed" to "exempt themselves from taxation."[185] Some even went as far as to suggest that prior to reform, England's landed elites "governed the house of commons indirectly," often by paying off members of the House of Commons to accomplish their bidding.[186] Thus, England's landed elites held total power over the English government. Beyond this, the negative attitudes of incumbent landed elites in the British government directly drove "new men" to emulate landed elites.

England's landed elites were not open to the possibility of sharing their political power with anyone different than themselves, especially not "new men." At the same time as "new men" like Robert Clive began expressing their wishes to enter into England's politics, incumbent landed elites wailed that "A new class of candidates appeared, men without party connexion or

---

[184] John Austin, *A Plea for the Constitution* (London: J. Murray, 1859), p. 12, https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101068558483&view=1up&seq=1.
[185] Passy, "The Great Proprietors, having control of legislation, devised laws which tended to their own aggrandisement," "Additional Acts of Parliament passed by the owners of the soil, assembled in Parliament, to exempt themselves from taxation," in *The Aristocracy of Britain and the Laws of Entail and Primogeniture, Judged by Recent French Writers; Being Selections from the Works of Passy, Beaumont, O'Connor, Sismondi, Buret, Guizot, Constant, Dupin, Say, Blanqui, and Mignet: Showing the Advantage of the Law of Equal Succession. With Explanatory and Statistical Notes.*, trans. Anonymous, (London: G. & J. Dyer, 1844), p. i-ii, https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=chi.13420812&view=1up&seq=7.
[186] Auguste Laugel, *England, Political and Social,* p. 136.

local interest, who had lately become rich, . . . 'nabobs' gorged with the spoils of the East, shareholders of the East India Company."[187] These elites were ostensibly against unlanded "new men" coming into the English Parliament. So, in order to counter this and secure themselves a place in the government, Clive and other "new men" bought up influence in the House of Commons in precisely the same way that landed elites had done for generations.

For "new men" like Clive with disposable wealth at their fingertips, this most often occurred by purchasing "rotten boroughs." For decades, landed elites had engaged in purchasing "rotten boroughs," a practice whereby a landed elite would buy up ancient "boroughs," or places with parliamentary representation that had few people still living in them.[188] This was done to literally purchase political support. After purchasing such a place, "a great lord" would either give the borough "to a poor relative or sell to a rich one," thus ensuring themselves political allies.[189] To bypass the scorn of landed elites like Horace Walpole, "new men" like Clive engaged in this same practice. Historian C.H. Philips has noted that just two years after the above anti-nabob comments, Clive "set about buying land in the neighbourhood of Bishop's Castle, probably the most corrupt borough in Shropshire" to "extend his own influence" in Parliament.[190] Robert Clive then gifted the "rotten borough" to his cousin, George Clive, nominating him to be the representative in Parliament.[191] This was a direct emulation of landed elites out of political necessity. Clive was not alone in this act -- himself and other "new men" who lived before the Reform Act of 1832 engaged in this practice a staggering number of times, all because they had to before the Reform Act of 1832. Even after the passage of this supposedly watershed act, little of this political necessity went away.

---

[187] C. H. Philips, "Clive in the English Political World, 1761-64," p. 695.
[188] "The National Archives Learning Curve: Power, Politics and Protest: The Great Reform Act," The National Archives (UK Government), accessed March 15, 2022, https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/politics/g6/.
[189] Auguste Laugel, *England, Political and Social,* pp. 113-114.
[190] C. H. Philips, "Clive in the English Political World, 1761-64, p. 698.
[191] C. H. Philips, "Clive in the English Political World, 1761-64, p. 698.

The Reform Act was a Fraud!

The 1832 Reform Act serves as the splitting point in political necessity driving "new men's" emulation of landed elites. While the Reform Act accomplished much in terms of voter enfranchisement, it did not curb the power of landed elites. Instead, it allowed landed elites to cement their power, which then cemented the political necessity that drove "new men's" emulation of landed elites. This Post-Reform Act emulation can best be seen through the journeys of Robert Peel and James Milnes Gaskell.

What were the basic tenets of the Reform Act? According to the UK Parliament's official website, the 1832 Reform Act "disenfranchised 56 boroughs in England and Wales and reduced another 31 to only one MP," "created 67 new constituencies," and "broadened the franchise's property qualification in the counties, to include small landowners, tenant farmers, and shopkeepers."[192] These changes were intended to fix the broken "rotten borough" system and allow more men the right to vote in general elections. In theory, this was all supposed to herald in a new era whereby landed elites could no longer control England's government on such a grand scale. Evidence of this hope comes from many contemporary sources. Shortly after its passage, writers such as Auguste Laugel claimed that due to the Reform Act, "the lords have felt their political power slipping slowly from them."[193] This directly echoes the sentiment that the Reform Act might curb landed elites. Others, such as an author writing for *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country*, noted that due to the Reform Act, "Our leading statesmen" must "pay an

[192] "The Reform Act 1832 - UK Parliament," UK Parliament (UK Parliament), accessed February 10, 2022, https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/houseofcommons/reformacts/overview/reformact1832/.
[193] Auguste Laugel, *England, Political and Social*, p. 113-114.

ostentatious homage to the middle classes, extolling their wisdom and fitness to hold the balance of power."[194] In the end, however, these sentiments proved false.

It must be noted that from the perspective of the enfranchisement of more male voters, the Reform Act was a success. However, the Reform Act removed no landed elites from power, instead forcing "new men" to continue to emulate them if they sought to be included among this minority. This was mainly because the Reform Act alone was not enough to make a lasting indent on the power of landed elites. In *Thoughts upon the Aristocracy of England*, Isaac Tomkins explained: "Now let me not be mistaken when I say that the reforms which have been obtained since the Bill of 1832 are, however valuable, only of use prospectively, and as a laying a foundation to build upon."[195] Tomkins then went on to note that: "The next reform (the lowering of qualification)" is really what "must be carried out" for political power-sharing to occur.[196] Although complex and myriad in nature, the tenets of the Reform Act had little real power to change things. There are two reasons for this. First, landed elites could easily skirt around the provisions that banned "rotten boroughs," (the chief part of the Reform Act that threatened their claims to power). Voting data compiled in the 1840s shows that despite the Reform Act, little "rotten boroughs" such as the tiny town of Andover, with only 240 voters, still had two members in Parliament, which was the same amount of Parliamentary members as multiple cities with well over 10,000 voters, including Finsbury, Marylebone, Towerhamlets, and Westminster.[197] This meant that even ten years after the Reform Act passed, a country population of 132,633 persons had the same amount of representation in Parliament as 3,018,109 people

---

[194] "THE ARISTOCRACY OF RANK: IS IT THE ARISTOCRACY OF TALENT?," *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country,* p. 159.
[195] Isaac Tomkins and Henry Brougham, *Thoughts Upon the Aristocracy of England*, 12th ed., vol. 2 (London, England: H Hooper, 1835), pp. 7-8.
[196] Isaac Tomkins and Henry Brougham, *Thoughts Upon the Aristocracy of England*, 12th ed., vol. 2, pp. 7-8.
[197] Alice Mann, *Mann's Black Book of the British Aristocracy, or, An Exposure of the More Monstrous Abuses in the State and the Church : with Black Lists of Pensioners, Royal, Aristocratic, Legal, Civil, Diplomatic, Hereditary, Military, Clerical, Etc…,* p. 6.

who lived in cities.[198] Since landed elites had long dominated the country in their country houses and estates, this meant that even after the Reform Act, it was all too easy for them to be grossly overrepresented in the government.

The second reason that the Reform Act did not take landed elites out of power is because of the unwillingness of the Whig Party, who had championed the Reform Act, to actually see any lasting change occur. Isaac Tomkins illustrates the best evidence of this unwillingness:

> They who carried it had no small interest in the measure; they shut out their political adversaries from office, and secured it to themselves. By the destruction of close boroughs, they made it impossible for the Tories to govern as they had been wont to do; they raised up…a power more likely to favour the Whig party than the Tory…So the Whig has overcome the Tory by help of the Man of England…I fear much that the liberal party--their leaders certainly--but even the bulk of the party, care little for reforms, except as the means of keeping them-selves in and the Tories out, and will give their ally, the people, only just as much as is wanted for that purpose; will not quarrel with the court, will not face the nobility.[199]

Basically, those in Parliament who championed the Reform Act quickly stopped once they had been voted into power. This changed the narrative surrounding the Reform Act, with some writing that now, "The landed aristocracy have the exclusive possession of the legislature; and Lord John Russel has not scrupled to affirm that the Reform Bill was so devised "*as to secure the preponderance of the landed interest in Parliament.*"'[200] All of this meant that landed elites easily stayed in power post-Reform Act, and thus the political emulation of landed elites needed to continue for "new men."

Robert Peel's political journey serves as evidence that because of the failure of the Reform Act, post-Reform Act "new men" still needed to emulate landed elites to have any share

---

[198] Alice Mann, *Mann's Black Book of the British Aristocracy, or, An Exposure of the More Monstrous Abuses in the State and the Church : with Black Lists of Pensioners, Royal, Aristocratic, Legal, Civil, Diplomatic, Hereditary, Military, Clerical, Etc…,* p. 6.
[199] Isaac Tomkins and Henry Brougham, *Thoughts Upon the Aristocracy of England*, 12th ed., vol. 2, pp. 15-16.
[200] Alice Mann, *Mann's Black Book of the British Aristocracy, or, An Exposure of the More Monstrous Abuses in the State and the Church : with Black Lists of Pensioners, Royal, Aristocratic, Legal, Civil, Diplomatic, Hereditary, Military, Clerical, Etc…,* p. 3.

of England's political power. Crucially, "new men" like Peel and Gaskell repeatedly sided with landed elites even after the Reform Act was supposed to allow outsiders to have their political power. In the 1830s, Peel was rising through the ranks of the Tory party, which was dominated by landed elites.[201] Peel made no qualms about wanting to impress landed elites: in Peel's 1834 "Tamworth Manifesto," he repeatedly stressed the importance of landed interests.[202] This meant as a staunch Tory, Peel frequently sided against the Reform Act of 1832 with his landed elite constituents. Due to his unwavering support of landed elites, Peel entered into the 1833 Parliament as "the first man in the House of Commons" for their party.[203] And yet, his position was still not secure. The men that Peel had constantly fought for, and now, had the opportunity to lead, were the "distinguished men" who had been supposedly disenfranchised by the Reform Act of 1832.[204] Compared to most of these traditional, landed men, Peel still remained an outsider -- he had come from generational wealth and was not otherwise connected to the English aristocracy. So, Peel needed to become one of them on an even grander scale. That is precisely what Peel did, as seen in his Drayton Manor. As a result, Peel was chosen to be Prime Minister when the landed Tory party almost inevitably retook control of Parliament in 1841. In this way, Peel's emulation of landed elites directly paved his way towards political power after the Reform Act of 1832.

This need for political emulation by "new men" was further compounded by the fact that Robert Peel, a "new man," only chose either landed elites or "new men" who emulated landed elites for his cabinet once in power. This included James Milnes Gaskell, who had emulated landed elites through his Wenlock Abbey. Many were frustrated that Peel had chosen only elites

---

[201] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44, p. 214.
[202] Robert Peel, "The Peel Web, The Tamworth Manifesto: Text," ed. Marjorie Bloy, A Web of English History (Dr. Marjorie Bloy, March 2016), http://www.historyhome.co.uk/peel/politics/tam2.htm.
[203] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44, p. 214.
[204] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44, p. 214.

or their emulators like Gaskell over men like "John Brown or Peter Martineau of Manchester," who "would have been much better ministers, only, as they are not aristocrats, they do not get the chance."[205] Thus, after the Reform Act, regardless of whether it was landed elites or "new men" who were in power, emulating landed elites was simply necessary to have any share of the political power in England.

That the landed elites who dominated the Tory party were so easily able to regain control of Parliament just nine years after the passage of the Reform Act serves to hit home the fact that the emulation of landed elites was indeed a political necessity. "New men" like Peel and Gaskell easily could have jumped ship after the Reform Act -- and yet, they decided to stay in the good graces of landed elites. These men knew that they still needed to emulate landed elites because England's traditional aristocracy would not be sharing their political power anytime soon, regardless of the Reform Act.

Part Two: Why the House?

One final question remains: why did "new men" choose to emulate the English country house? This section argues that two things were at play: that power remained in the country, and the middle classes had long been emulating practices associated with the identity and masculinity of landed country houses in their own homes.

As a precursor, it is easy to argue that the true reason behind "new men's" emulation of the country house is that having a country house was an integral part of being a landed elite. After all, genuinely fashioning oneself into a landed elite would involve being "landed," which meant that one needed "lands" and presumably some sort of country seat through which to rule

[205] "THE ARISTOCRACY OF RANK: IS IT THE ARISTOCRACY OF TALENT?," *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country,* p. 164.

said lands. To this end, historians such as Mark Girouard have suggested that in their emulation of country houses, "new men" were simply trying to fit in with the "rules" set by landed elites to fashion themselves into the consummate English country gentlemen.[206] To some degree, this argument cannot be denied. However, this does not fully satisfy the question of why "new men" went to such great lengths to emulate the country houses of landed elites: it overlooks the nuances of masculinity and power that came with owning a country house. Furthermore, the country house itself was not a monolith for landed elites. Historians have long chronicled that "from the sixteenth century onwards the upper classes were spending more and more time in London," with many landed elites purchasing "permanent houses in London" and spending less and less time in the countryside.[207] This undermines the argument that "new men" emulated the country house simply because it was a natural part of fashioning themselves into landed elites. If this argument were true, then "new men" would have had little reason to spend so much time and effort on their country houses, and would have instead focused their efforts on the capital. But, this is not what occurred for "new men." They consciously went to extreme lengths to emulate the traditional country houses of landed elites in their own unique means.

Power Remained in the Country

The first reason behind this emulation is that power remained in the English countryside well beyond the efforts of acts such as the Reform Act of 1832. Both before and after the Reform Act, England's ancient and often confusing political system meant that the easiest way for "new men" to come into power was to settle in the countryside. This has been briefly discussed in the previous section, but a more nuanced picture is necessary.

---

[206] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 268-269.
[207] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 5.

Essentially, at the time of "new men," England's political representation in Parliament was supposed to be calculated by population density and available voters. That is to say, London or other large cities should have had vastly more Parliamentary seats than small towns. But, as aforementioned, this system was broken in that it ultimately favored the countryside. For instance, in the 1840s, the country town of Thetford, with 3,844 residents and 192 electors, had two representatives in Parliament, which was the same amount of representatives as Bristol, a massive city with 123,188 residents and 10,146 electors.[208] These ancient laws came about when the country had many more residents than cities. Yet, despite urbanization, which saw cities greatly surpass the populations and electors of country towns, these laws never changed. It has already been discussed how landed elites effectively kept political control over the country. Still another effect of this was that "new men" were able to use the country house in these places to secure themselves representation in Parliament.

At its core, this ancient system meant that the easiest way for "new men" to enter politics was to purchase or build a country house in a tiny town such as Thetford. Once doing so, these "new men" could use their country house to garner local support, which would then see them being elected as a representative to Parliament. This act can be seen in employment by "new men" such as Charles Cockerell in his Sezincote House. After building Sezincote, Cockerell used the house on multiple occasions to garner support from the tiny local community and thus ensure himself as their choice for Parliament. In one such instance, as told by the *Worcester Journal* in 1812, Cockerell opened the doors of Sezincote to "upwards of 50 labourers" from the surrounding area.[209] Cockerell gave them "a good dinner, with plenty of strong beer."[210] In

---

[208] Alice Mann, *Mann's Black Book of the British Aristocracy, or, An Exposure of the More Monstrous Abuses in the State and the Church : with Black Lists of Pensioners, Royal, Aristocratic, Legal, Civil, Diplomatic, Hereditary, Military, Clerical, Etc…,* p. 6.
[209] "Wednesday's Post," *Worcester Journal*, March 12, 1812, 5700 edition, p. 3.
[210] "Wednesday's Post," *Worcester Journal*, March 12, 1812, 5700 edition, p. 3.

addition to supplying them with free food, Cockerell also met each guest "with the utmost affability."[211] There are countless records of various other "new men" engaging in similar acts designed to garner the support of their new constituents, who would then dutifully elect them into Parliament. Historians such as Mark Girouard have written that such acts helped "form an alliance" with the local people and even "repress anyone in the locality who showed radical or even independent views."[212] It was much easier to win the support of a small country town with a few hundred electors than a large city.

For "new men," the country house was a necessary part of this, as it allowed men like Cockerell the means by which to garner this local support. Guests like those at Cockerell's feast were allowed to enter into the "entrance hall" of Sezincote house and marvel at its luxury.[213] As should be no surprise, landed elites did the same exact thing. One image drawing of a party at Ham House shows the Lord and Lady walking amongst hundreds of local people feasting on trestle tables erected in front of the house.[214] In all cases, due to the broken system of representation in England's Parliament, it made great sense for "new men" to occupy old country towns and use the country house as a means to garner local support in order to gain a political foothold.

Whose Identity and Masculinity was it Anyway?

The final reason that "new men" chose to emulate the English country house concerns identity and self-fashioning emulation by the middle classes. While some historians have argued that the rise of "new men" resulted in an identity and masculinity shift in England, in reality,

---

[211] "Wednesday's Post," *Worcester Journal*, March 12, 1812, 5700 edition, p. 3.
[212] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 242.
[213] "Wednesday's Post," *Worcester Journal*, March 12, 1812, 5700 edition, p. 3.
[214] "A party in the grounds at Ham House, Surrey. By Thomas Rowlandson., (Victoria and Albert Museum, London), in Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 241.

England's middle classes had been copying the country houses of landed elites in their own homes for decades as part of an effort to fashion themselves as pseudo-elites. When certain middle-class members eventually rose to become "new men," they now had the means to complete this self-fashioning: occupying their own 'proper' country houses.

One of the most popular viewpoints concerning English aristocratic masculinity and identity in the 18th and 19th centuries centers around a supposed "transition from a genteel masculinity grounded in land ownership to a bourgeois masculinity."[215] This implies the "rise to ascendancy of a bourgeois masculinity which eclipsed - without ever entirely displacing - its aristocratic predecessor."[216] As part of this, "by the mid-nineteenth century, middle-class masculinity was firmly in the ascendant," while at the same time, "The expansive sociability, luxury and sexual laxity associated with the aristocracy had become a vestige of the past as more and more men from the landed classes conformed to the new pattern."[217] Elements of this argument put forth by historians such as John Tosh are true in the context of this thesis. The middle classes and their unique masculinity and identity were on the rise during the 18th and 19th centuries. In addition, Tosh is correct in his statement that bourgeois masculinity and identity never displaced that of landed elites. However, where Tosh and other historians miss the mark is when they claim that as a result of this "bourgeois ascendency," the masculinity and identity of England's landed elites took a backseat to that of "new men." In reality, England's middle classes, the birthplace of bourgeois "new men," had been occupied with attempting to fashion themselves as miniature versions of landed elites by copying tenets of country houses for

---

[215] John Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family, and Empire*, p. 141.
[216] John Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family, and Empire*, p. 140.
[217] John Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family, and Empire*, pp. 137-138.

generations. This cannot have resulted in the departure of landed identity and masculinity in favor of that of "new men."

Historians Catherine Hall and Lenore Davidoff have developed the notion that in their own homes, members of the rising English middle class began to increasingly emulate the country homes of landed elites. However, these historians do not make the connection that when people from these middle classes rose to become "new men" with the same means as landed elites, they continued this emulation. Davidoff and Hall claim that "some details in housing and furnishing" of the middle class "came from gentry emulation."[218] This included practices such as "adding halls and corridors in the seventeenth century to give more privacy and mark the family from the public domain."[219] Beyond physical rooms, the middle classes emulated the ways in which these gentry spaces were used. This can be seen regarding the separate social intercourse often seen in gentry houses. According to Davidoff and Hall, "the most important late eighteenth-century innovation" in the homes of the middle class "was setting aside one room specifically for social intercourse," something which had again long been present in landed elites' country homes. This resulted in the parlour, which was "the middle-class equivalent to the (with) drawing room" of landed estates.[220] When the middle classes engaged in this emulation, they attempted to fashion themselves into miniature versions of landed elites.

When "new men" rose from the middle classes, they continued in this self-fashioning through country house emulation. The critical difference was that "new men" had the monetary means to fulfill this vision. Evidence for this comes from books such as William Wilkinson's *Forty-Five Views and Plans of Recently Erected Mansions, Private Residences, Parsonage*

[218] Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*, 3rd ed. (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2019), p. 362.
[219] Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*, p. 377.
[220] Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*, p. 377.

Houses, Farm Houses, Lodges, and Cottages. Here, in a direct attempt to continue middle-class country house emulation, James Haughton Langston, a "new man" member of Parliament, built a near-identical copy to the great country houses of landed elites. The plans of Langston's Chadlington House include a separate servant's hall, scullery, and kitchens, all of which directly echoes Davidoff and Hall's claim that the middle classes had long copied the identity and masculinity of these spaces.[221] In another example, "new man," John Rowland's Wotton House contains a prominent drawing room, which again directly calls back to middle-class attempts to copy rooms that had once been reserved for the country houses of landed elites.[222]

These connections can also be seen in the lives of "new men" such as Robert Peel who were born of the upper-middle class. Although both of his parents were wealthy, Peel was by no means a member of the upper echelons of society. As a child, Robert Peel "moved with his family to Drayton Manor, near Tamworth in Staffordshire," which was at this point a rundown and small country house.[223] This move was an attempt by Peel's family to fashion themselves into landed elites through the country house, albeit on a smaller scale. In accordance with middle-class country house emulation, when Peel became a "new man" oozing money, he remodeled Drayton and turned it into a proper manor house. In this example, one can see how Peel was able to tangibly carry out his upper-middle class family's wish of fashioning themselves into landed elites through emulation of the country house.

As with Peel's example, when "new men" suddenly came into great wealth from the middle class, they continued the middle-class emulation of country houses with the critical

---

[221] William Wilkinson, *English Country Houses : Forty-Five Views and Plans of Recently Erected Mansions, Private Residences, Parsonage-Houses, Farm-Houses, Lodges, and Cottages : with a Practical Treatise on House-Building.* (London: James Parker and Co., 1870), plates 1-2, https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=gri.ark:/13960/t9b595r4c&view=1up&seq=5.

[222] William Wilkinson, *English Country Houses : Forty-Five Views and Plans of Recently Erected Mansions, Private Residences, Parsonage-Houses, Farm-Houses, Lodges, and Cottages : with a Practical Treatise on House-Building*, plates 3-4.

[223] Stephen Leslie, *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols, p. 210.

difference that they now had the means with which to realize this vision fully. This resulted in "new men" overwhelmingly choosing to purchase and construct country houses of their own.

Conclusion:

From their onset in the 18th century and onward, "new men" emulated members of England's old landed aristocracy. This thesis argues that they did this specifically through the medium of the English country house using "different means to the same ends." Some "new men" accomplished this by copying the layouts of aristocratic country houses with their unlanded twists. In the 1840s, "new man" Robert Peel sought to use his Drayton Manor to emulate the longstanding country house tradition of portrait galleries. For centuries, portrait galleries proved to be a vital legitimizer of aristocratic status, as they offered an opportunity to showcase one's illustrious ancestors and display works from great masters. Peel sought aristocratic legitimization from this addition to Drayton Manor but lacked any illustrious ancestors. So, he used his own "different means" by solely including paintings illustrating significant British figures and masters. Evidence of Peel's success in using "different means to the same ends" comes from a successful royal visit from Queen Victoria, wherein she marveled at his portrait gallery.

James Milnes Gaskell also sought to emulate longstanding country house traditions in the layout of his Wenlock Abbey. A "new man" chosen by Sir Robert Peel in his ministerial cabinet in 1857, Gaskell bought Wenlock Abbey. Wenlock was on the site of an important ancient monastery, and Gaskell attempted to insert himself into the local history through its purchase and reconstruction. Gaskell and other "new men" like him sought to emulate the landed tradition of living in ancient monasteries and buildings. Under King Henry VIII in the 1500s, many landed families were given dissolved monasteries and their lands to live in as a country seat. Centuries later, this served as an important measure of a landed family's history and connection to local history, with families using ancient buildings to demonstrate their landed history. In this case,

James Gaskell's "different means" were that instead of living in the monastery for hundreds of years, he moved in during the 1850s and attempted to insert himself into its history as if he had been there all along. Yet, Gaskell's ends were the same. This is revealed by accounts of visitors to Wenlock such as famed poet Henry James. Although Henry James was well-versed in legitimate landed country houses, he saw Gaskell as intimately connected to the ancient history of Wenlock Abbey, even though Gaskell had only been associated with that space since his purchase of Wenlock twenty years prior.

Some "new men" copied aspects of the European Grand Tour that could be seen reflected in the country houses of landed elites, with the unique twist that these "new men" undertook their journey in India. As the first example, Charles Cockerell was a "new man" who, after securing a fortune in India, brought back architectural ideas that he would display in the exterior of his Sezincote House in 1809. This was Cockerel's attempt at using "different means to the same ends" to emulate the landed practice of using the Grand Tour as an inspiration for the designs of country houses. This can be best witnessed in Cockerell's emulation of the contemporaneous Italian Palazzo style. Here, landed men would travel to locales such as Venice or Florence as part of their Grand Tour and bring back architectural ideas displayed on the exterior architecture of their country houses. Importantly, these landed men did not allow this outside influence to extend to the interiors of their homes. In his own, unlanded version of the Grand Tour, Cockerell traveled to India and brought back architectural ideas which still pepper the exterior of Sezincote to this day. Like the Italian Palazzo style of landed men, Cockerell did not allow this external influence to extend to the interior of his home, instead opting for a classical style.

Viewed in the context of the gross amounts of mistrust of Indian wealth that characterized landed elite attitudes during the 1800s, Cockerell's virtually unanimous acceptance into the aristocratic folds as a direct result of his Sezincote house reveals the success with which he was able to utilize "different means to the same ends" in his quest to emulate the country houses of landed elites. Multiple newspaper articles describe how Cockerell used Sezincote and its Indian architecture to woo aristocratic guests, leading dozens of hunting parties full of notable landed Britons. Even though Cockerell's influence for Sezincote came from India instead of Europe, in the eyes of both the public and landed aristocracy, Cockerell and his Sezincote House were no different than an actual landed elite with a country house inspired from a real European Grand Tour.

In this same vein, the unlanded Robert Clive, better known as Clive of India, emulated the Grand-Tour-related country house practice of stealing and displaying precious foreign objects. During his time in India, Clive pilfered and was gifted many precious artifacts he displayed in his multiple country estates. Like Cockerell, Clive did not do this in a vacuum. Instead, this was Clive's attempt to use "different means to the same ends." For generations, landed men had gone to destinations in Europe and pilfered precious objects that had been uncovered as part of the Grand Tour. In all such cases, landed elites brought back these items and displayed them in prominence at their country houses. Both Clive and landed men hoped that the displays of such objects would help confirm them as bonafide aristocratic individuals, but Clive was unique in that his items came from India and not sites such as Pompeii.

While men like Cockerell were overwhelmingly successful in using "different means to the same ends," Robert Clive represents those "new men" who struggled through this journey. Throughout his political life, Clive was haunted by his India collections. On multiple occasions,

Clive was forced to defend his use of "different means to the same ends." This was due to both Clive's monumental rise to power and the context of the mistrust of Indian wealth, which Cockerell was able to subvert.

In the end, multiple reasons emerge as to why "new men" felt the need to emulate landed elites. The first is a political necessity. This revolves around the Reform Act of 1832. Pre-Reform Act, any "new man" wanting political power was faced with a government made up almost entirely of landed elites, so they had little choice but to emulate these men. This can be seen through Robert Clive's journey to political power, which required him to copy practices such as buying "rotten boroughs," which had kept landed elites in power for centuries.

After the Reform Act of 1832, this political necessity remained. Although the Reform Act was designed to usher in an era of shared political power, landed elites were able to curb the power of reformers, and those interested in reform turned out to lose that interest once they were firmly in power. The post-reform act political journeys of Robert Peel and James Milnes Gaskell illustrate this best. The landed elite who dominated the Tory party came back into power shortly after the Reform Act, which left "new men" like Peel and Gaskell little choice but to emulate the landed elites of this party if they desired any share of England's political power.

Two answers emerge in regards to why "new men" chose to emulate the country house. First, power remained in the country. Due to the failure of the Reform Act of 1832 to bring about meaningful political power-sharing, landed elites were able to continue in their practices of skewing voting laws so that their tiny country towns had more voting power than large cities. It was all too easy for landed elites to move into one of these towns and literally purchase the goodwill of the local people, who would dutifully vote for them. The same was true for "new men." Since they had the monetary means, "new men" could also easily take up residence in a

tiny country town and harness this practice. We can see this with Charles Cockerell, who, after moving into Sezincote House, held feasts for local people designed to woo them into voting for him in upcoming elections, a tactic used by the landed elite for generations.

Second, identity and masculinity. In essence, middle-class families had been emulating the identity and masculinity associated with country houses of landed elites for generations to fashion themselves into miniature elites. This included copying rooms such as the 'parlor' and 'drawing room' and the ways these spaces were used in their own much smaller homes. Since "new men" rose almost exclusively from these same middle classes, it is not a stretch to argue that once they rose to power, "new men's" emulation of the country was a logical continuation of this identity copying. The one difference was that now, "new men" had the money and power to fully carry out the visions set forth by their middle class backgrounds. This can be seen through men like Robert Peel, whose upper-middle class family moved into Drayton Manor when it was small and shabby to copy elite country house practices. When Peel became a wealthy "new man," he completely remodeled Drayton into a country house fit for a landed elite.

Bibliography:

Primary Sources:

Austin, John. *A Plea for the Constitution*. London: J. Murray, 1859. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101068558483&view=1up&seq=1.

BL King's Topographical Collection. *A Description of Strawberry Hill.* London, England: Thomas Kirgate, 1784. https://www.flickr.com/photos/britishlibrary/51193374326/in/album-72157719566258020/.

Egerton, Francis. *Catalogue of the Bridgewater Collection of Pictures Belonging to the Earl of Ellesmere, at Bridgewater House, Cleveland Square, St. James's.* London, England: J.M. and S.M. Smith, 1851.

E S A. "Wenlock Priory." Edited by Henry Longueville Jones and John Williams. *Archaeologia cambrensis; London* 4, no. 14 (April 1853): 98–113. https://www.proquest.com/docview/6687339/fulltext/BCF9E9AD09C046A0PQ/1?accountid=14522&imgSeq=1.

"Fatal Accidents on the River." *The Morning Post*, September 17, 1834, 19899 edition. https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000174/18340917/031/0004?browse=true.

Harwood, Thomas., Erdeswicke, Sampson. A Survey of Staffordshire: Containing the Antiquities of that County. United Kingdom: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1820, 311, https://books.google.com/books?id=DEgJAAAAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q=drayton&f=false.

"Hunting. The Close of the Season.--April 10." *Home News for India, China and the Colonies*, 8 edition. Accessed November 12, 2021. https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0002946/18470424/083/0025?browse=true.

James, Henry. *Portraits of Places*. pt. 919. Vol. pt. 919. London, England: Macmillan, 1883. https://archive.org/details/portraitsplaces03jamegoog/page/n221/mode/2up.

Langford, Abraham. *A Catalogue of the Large and Valuable Freehold Estate of the Most Noble William, Duke of Powis, Deceased, Situated in the County of Northampton.* London, England, 1758.

Laugel, Auguste. *England, Political and Social*. Translated by James Morgan Hart. New York, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1874. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044081173619.

Leslie, Stephen. *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 11. 63 vols. New York Macmillan, 1885. https://archive.org/details/dictionaryofnati11stepuoft/page/198/mode/2up.

------ *Dictionary of National Biography*. 44. 1st ed. Vol. 44. 63 vols. New York Macmillan, 1885. https://archive.org/details/dictionaryofnati44stepuoft/page/212/mode/2up.

"London, March 4." *The Derby Mercury*, March 5, 1762, 53 edition. https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000189/17620305/005/0001.

Mann, Alice. *Mann's Black Book of the British Aristocracy, or, An Exposure of the More Monstrous Abuses in the State and the Church : with Black Lists of Pensioners, Royal, Aristocratic, Legal, Civil, Diplomatic, Hereditary, Military, Clerical, Etc…, .* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: H. Hooker, 1848.

Morris, F. O, *The County Seats of the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Great Britain and Ireland. vol. 1. (Vol. 3-5. A Series of Picturesque Views of Seats of the Noblemen ... of Great Britain and Ireland. With descriptive letterpress.) Volume vol. 1*. London: Longmans & Co, 1866-80. http://access.bl.uk/item/viewer/ark:/81055/vdc_00000005823C.

------ *The County Seats of the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Great Britain and Ireland. vol. 2. (Vol. 3-5. A Series of Picturesque Views of Seats of the Noblemen ... of Great Britain and Ireland. With descriptive letterpress.) Volume vol. 2*. London: Longmans & Co, 1866-80. http://access.bl.uk/item/viewer/ark:/81055/vdc_00000005823C.

Passy, and Gustave de Beaumont. Introduction. In *The Aristocracy of Britain and the Laws of Entail and Primogeniture, Judged by Recent French Writers; Being Selections from the Works of Passy, Beaumont, O'Connor, Sismondi, Buret, Guizot, Constant, Dupin, Say, Blanqui, and Mignet: Showing the Advantage of the Law of Equal Succession. With Explanatory and Statistical Notes.*, translated by Anonymous. London: G. & J. Dyer, 1844. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=chi.13420812&view=1up&seq=7.

Peel, Robert. "The Peel Web, The Tamworth Manifesto: Text." Edited by Marjorie Bloy. A Web of English History. Dr. Marjorie Bloy, March 2016. http://www.historyhome.co.uk/peel/politics/tam2.htm.

"Print; Satirical Print; Book-Illustration: British Museum." The British Museum. The British Museum, February 11, 2021. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1868-0808-10039.

Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society (Great Britain). *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*. 2. Vol. 2. 3. Shrewsbury [etc.] Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, 1902. https://archive.org/details/transactionsofsh32shro/page/n759/mode/2up?view=theater.

"Sir Robert Peel's New Portrait Gallery at Drayton Manor (From the Morning Herald)." *The Staffordshire Advertiser*. January 2, 1847, LIII edition, sec. 8.

https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000252/18470102/084/0008?browse=true.

"THE ARISTOCRACY OF RANK: IS IT THE ARISTOCRACY OF TALENT?" *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country, 1830-1869* 34, no. 200 (08, 1846): 159-166, https://www.proquest.com/historical-periodicals/aristocracy-rank-is-talent/docview/2617693/se-2?accountid=14522.

"The Funds." *Saunders's News-Letter, and Daily Advertiser*. January 8, 1836, 29410 edition. https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0001057/18360111/003/0001.

"The Nabobs (From the Quarterly Review)." *Kendal Mercury and Westmorland Advertiser*, January 2, 1836, 86 edition. https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000429/18360102/003/0001.

"The Royal Progress to Drayton Manor." *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*, December 3, 1843, 54 edition. https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000077/18431203/006/0003?browse=true.

"The Royal Progress to Drayton Manor." *Newcastle Courant*, December 1, 1843, 8817 edition, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000085/18431201/019/0007?browse=true.

Tomkins, Isaac, and Henry Brougham. *Thoughts Upon the Aristocracy of England*. 1. 12th ed. Vol. 1. 2 vols. London, England: H Hooper, 1835.

------ *Thoughts Upon the Aristocracy of England*. 2. 12th ed. Vol. 2. 2 vols. London, England: H Hooper, 1835.

Vale, Henry H. "The Abbey Ruins of the Severn Valley." *The Wellington Journal Shrewsbury News*, August 15, 1868. https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000405/18680815/027/0003, 3.

"Wednesday's Post." *Worcester Journal*, March 12, 1812, 5700 edition. https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000150/18120305/012/0003?browse=true.

Wilkinson, William. *English Country Houses: Forty-Five Views and Plans of Recently Erected Mansions, Private Residences, Parsonage-Houses, Farm-Houses, Lodges, and Cottages: with a Practical Treatise on House-Building.*London: James Parker and Co., 1870. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=gri.ark:/13960/t9b595r4c&view=1up&seq=5.

Wilson, Joshua. *A Biographical Index to the Present House of Commons. Carefully Compiled by Joshua Wilson ... Corrected to April 1807.* London, England: R. Phillips, 1807. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.aa0001330562&view=1up&seq=231&skin=2021&q1=India.

Secondary Sources:

Barczewski, Stephanie. *Country Houses and the British Empire, 1730-1900*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014, 227.

Cannadine, David, and Jeremy Musson. *The Country House Past, Present, Future: Great Houses of the British Isles*. New York City, New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 2018.

"CLIVE, Robert (1725-74), of Styche Hall, nr. Market Drayton, Salop; subsequently of Walcot Park, Salop; Claremont, Surr.; and Oakley Park, Salop," The History of Parliament Online (UK Parliament, 1986), https://historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1754-1790/member/clive-robert-1725-74#footnote4_jqgoo1q.

Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. 3rd ed. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2019.

Gamble, Cynthia J. *Wenlock Abbey: 1857-1919: A Shropshire Country House and the Milnes Gaskell Family*. Much Wenlock, Shropshire: Ellingham Press, 2015.

Girouard, Mark. *Life in the English Country House*. London, England: Yale University Press, 1978.

Goodall, John. *English House Style From the Archives of Country Life.* New York, New York: Rizzoli International Publications Inc., 2019.

"History of Parliament Online." COCKERELL, Charles (1755-1837), of Sezincote, Glos. | History of Parliament Online. UK Parliament. Accessed March 4, 2022. https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1790-1820/member/cockerell-charles-1755-1837.

Jasanoff, Maya. "Collectors of Empire: Objects, Conquests, and Imperial Self-Fashioning." *Past & Present*, no. 184 (2004): 109–35. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3600699.

Johnson, Ben. "Dissolution of the Monasteries." Historic UK. Historic UK Ltd. Accessed February 4, 2022. https://www.historic-uk.com/HistoryUK/HistoryofEngland/Dissolution-of-the-Monasteries/.

Malcolm, John. *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*. 1. Vol. 1. 3 vols. London, England: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1836. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/53424/53424-h/53424-h.htm#Footnote_189_189.

------ *The Life of Robert, Lord Clive: Collected From the Family Papers Communicated by the Earl of Powis*. 2. Vol. 2. 3 vols. London, England: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1836. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/54633/54633-h/54633-h.htm#f157.

"Lord Surya - Info, Festivals, Temples, Iconography, Story, Names." TemplePurohit. Accessed February 9, 2022. https://www.templepurohit.com/hindu-gods-and-deities/lord-surya/.

McKenzie, Kirsten. *A Swindler's Progress: Nobles and Convicts in the Age of Liberty*. Harvard University Press, 2010.

"Members 1790-1820." The History of Parliament Online. UK Parliament, 1986. https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/research/members/members-1790-1820.

Miers, Mary, *The English Country House From the Archives of Country Life*. New York, New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 2009.

Philips, C. H. "Clive in the English Political World, 1761-64." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 12, no. 3/4 (1948): 695–702. http://www.jstor.org/stable/608728.

"Powis Castle and Colonialism: The Clive Museum." National Trust. National Trust, October 10, 2015. https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/powis-castle-and-garden/features/the-clive-museum-at-powis.

"Sezincote - 1000433: Historic England." Historic England, 1986. https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1000433?section=official-listing.

"Sezincote House." SEZINCOTE. Accessed January 7, 2022. https://www.sezincote.co.uk/sezincote-house.

"The National Archives Learning Curve: Power, Politics and Protest: The Great Reform Act." The National Archives. UK Government. Accessed March 15, 2022. https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/politics/g6/.

"The Reform Act 1832 - UK Parliament." UK Parliament. UK Parliament. Accessed February 10, 2022. https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/houseofcommons/reformacts/overview/reformact1832/.

Tosh, John. *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family, and Empire*. 1st ed. United Kingdom: Taylor and Francis, 2006.

"The Baronetage • Debretts." Debretts. Debretts London, 1769. Accessed March 1, 2022. https://debretts.com/peerage/the-baronetage/.

"The Clives: Looters or Art Collectors?" Restore Trust. Restore Trust, September 12, 2021. https://www.restoretrust.org.uk/restore-trust-issues/the-clives-looters-or-art-collectors.