THE PERSISTENCE OF OLDER TRADITIONS IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY GARDENING

Mark Laird has already published the seminal work on the design of flower gardens and shrubberies in the second half of the eighteenth century, The Flowering of the Landscape Garden: English Pleasure Grounds 1720–1800 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999). This paper re-examines his central thesis that garden design was led by the introduction of new exotic species and by the adoption of graduated planting as a means of showing off these plants. It emphasizes instead the persistence of medieval gardening traditions which were not compatible with exotics or graduated planting.

FIRST, AN ENGLISH TRADITION FOR PLANTING WOODS AROUND HOUSES

Ancient tradition, rather oddly, had it that a house should have woodland round it. In the sixteenth century William Harrison remarked that in many parts of the country a man could ride for ten or twenty miles and find very few trees, save ‘where the inhabitants have planted a few elms, oaks, hazels or ashes about their dwellings for defence from the rough winds’,¹ and by the mid-seventeenth century their potential ‘for delight and pleasure’ had been recognized.² Indeed, the record for such planting in England is remarkably consistent.³ One might then ask what sort of woods these were to be and there can be no doubt that coppice played a much bigger role near the house than any other kind of woodland. At the beginning of the eighteenth century Stephen Switzer was to urge that ‘if this House is without Coppices and Woods at a reasonable Distance ... I would advise the Fencing in and sowing a Wood or Coppice of twenty or thirty Acres more or less’,⁴ and by about 1710 all the woods of the influential pleasure ground at Heythrop, including Kite Grove and the Wilderness, were coppice, described in 1789 as ‘very good’.⁵

So often, all one has to go on for the look of this coppice is a throw-away remark: ‘There is a pretty garden belonging to it w[i]th a good deal of underwood’,⁶ as a tourist commented of Compton Place, Eastbourne, in 1735 after Charles Bridgeman had worked there. How interesting it would be to know in more detail what this pleasure ground coppice was and how it was managed – for example, if cut on a fourteen-year rotation, would it be grazed? What planting was allowable there, and how was coppice tied in to the more polished parts of the pleasure ground?⁷ Switzer had recommended that instead of the clipping required for a wilderness ‘a Seythe fix’d into a Pole or Handle will ... retrench the Extravagances of Nature in a more expeditious and less expensive Method’, citing as examples Oakley Wood at Cirencester, and Wray Wood at Castle Howard.⁸ This suggests a long rotation with some annual pruning, perhaps like the pleasure ground woods at Heythrop, 17 acres of which near the House were ‘not to be cut as Underwood’.⁹

Elsewhere, we get a hint from John Parnell’s rather Switzer-like account of the Leasowes, with its ‘little enclosures of coppice or other woodlands – where at the same time flowering shrubs may be Introducd’.¹⁰ His account is broadened by references in Ashmeads House, Chalford, Gloucestershire GL6 8JL, UK
William Shenstone’s correspondence with that avid gardener Lady Luxborough of the Barrells, who developed coppice as a contrast to their new shrubberies. These references revolve around Lady Luxborough’s complaints that Shenstone never came to see her. So on the 4 June 1749 he missed ‘my Coppice in Spring; where we had even this year great variety of cowslips, primroses, ragged-robins, wild hyacinths both white and blue, violets &c. &c’. In the following year (14 March 1749–50):

he [Thomas Smith, the artist] is against planting the Service-Walk bank with flowers, or doing any thing to it; thinking its roughness is a good contrast to divide the Shrubbery from the Coppice, which is also a kind of shrubbery

and a month later (25 April 1750) she wrote:

there is … not variety enough in the Shrubbery to invite you as yet; but there will be ere Long. The Coppice has the advantage at present; for Nature has embroidered it thick with all kinds of wild flowers.¹¹

From this correspondence, it seems that both shrubbery and coppice could have wild flowers in them, but coppice could have few or no planted ones. This seems a small distinction, yet Lady Luxborough thought it clear enough to separate the two with a walk, and there was probably a further difference in the way the two were managed: that shrubs were pruned or trimmed and graduated in the way described by Laird, while coppice was not. This distinction is confirmed in Repton’s Red Book for Claybury (1791), where he proposed that:

a sort of gradation may be made betwixt the dressed walk and the wood by the choice and arrangement of the plants, excluding as we approach the forest all foreign shrubs or flowers, and only introducing those of English growth which have been improved by culture, such as double blossomed thorns and brambles etc. till we enter the thick covert of the wood.

This form of gardening remained popular throughout the second half of the eighteenth century, the poet laureate Henry Pye promoting the natural effect of ‘tangled coppices, where a few roses and lilacs may be scattered’, and adding that if he had:

a small piece of ground in the metropolis, like the gardens of Chesterfield, Devonshire, or Burlington House, however much I might offend the admirer of elegance, I would make it a rough tangled coppice, filled with hazel, hawthorn, and dog roses, without a single evergreen, or garden shrub, to break the illusion.¹²

SECOND, THE ORCHARD, WHICH EVOLVED, THROUGH THE WILDERNESS, INTO SHRUBBERY

The old word that one might most expect to find used to describe garden coppice, with its tangle of stools and naturally occurring flowers is, perhaps, wilderness. In fact, coppice was never described in those terms, and wilderness sprang from a second gardening tradition.

So far as Switzer was concerned, in his day the wilderness was a formal garden,¹³ and its style derived not from coppice but from the orchard.¹⁴ The very word ‘Orchard’ reinforces a pre-lapsarian vision of gardens as places of spontaneous abundance to gratify every sense, taste above all – a pleasure to be found in accounts of gardens that long pre-date Brown. So Kalande’s garden at the beginning of Philip Sidney’s Arcadia was ‘both
field, garden and orchard ... cunningly set with trees of the most taste-pleasing fruits'; at
Kenilworth Queen Elizabeth I could stroll through the orchards biting off apple blossoms
candied on the tree by her confectioners, and tasting of ‘delicious strawberries, cherries
and other fruits even from their stalks’.15

There can be little doubt even in the eighteenth century that the words ‘orchard’
and ‘garden’ had strongly overlapping meanings.16 The orchard was a favoured place
for walking and was planted near the house; the orchard too, while even in the sixteenth
century associated with fruit growing, derived from the Latin hortus meaning ‘garden’.17

So John Parkinson recommended plants for the orchard that do not bear fruit,18 and
William Lawson’s paean to the orchard in 1623 (‘a chief part of earthly happiness ... the
honest delight of one wearied with the work of his lawful calling?’) is really a paean to
the garden (‘What more delightsome then an infinite variety of sweet smelling flowers:
decking with sundry colours, the green mantle of the earth’). An orchard restricted to
fruit would have been ‘bare ... and but half good, so long as it wants those comely
Ornaments that should give beauty to all our labours, and make much for the honest
delight of the owner and his friends’. So Lawson suggested roses, woodbine, cowslips
various, primrose, violet, rosemary and eglantine; his orchard included ‘walks set with
great wood’, knots, and space set aside for bowling and for archery, and a maze which,
‘well framed a man’s height, may perhaps make your friend wander in gathering of
Berries, till he cannot recover himself without your help’, as well as for fishing.19

Looking at Lord Petre’s plant lists, it is clear that he valued fruit-bearing trees for
their beauty, as Joseph Spence did later – in 1748 the grove in his garden at Byfleet had
cherries, plums, almonds, apricots, and peaches growing with his laburnums, honeysuckles,
ilacs, and other ornamentals, and he recommended that they might ‘be scattered in the
S[outhern] margin of a grove, from one to four or five deep, at proper intervals, where
no convenience for an orchard’.20 In Julie’s garden, Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s St Preux
was pleased ‘to find, in ce desert artificiel, fine ripe fruit, even if the trees are scattered
and unimpressive’.21 It is not surprising, therefore, to find that many wildernesses were
developed on places that had previously been known as orchards.22 Indeed, as the word
‘wilderness’ became more popular in the early seventeenth century, it may have been
applied to ‘orchards’ without any change of use or planting (Figure 1).

Just as the traditions of the orchard were inherited by the wilderness, so they were
probably inherited in turn by the shrubbery.23 However, while we, with the distance of
time, may see one form evolving to another, it is clear that for Shenstone and Lady
Luxborough the shrubbery was something new and, following Laird, we would tend to
say that that novelty consisted in the use of exotics planted by height in tiers. However, if
we classify shrubberies by function, the planting of exotics becomes only one of the four
major forms, the others being the ornamental walk, the screen and the maze.

The last of these, the mazy shrubbery,24 will introduce a third gardening tradition
and so merits discussion here. It consisted of a series of grass paths that weaved their
way through island beds, conveying the visitor from one intensively worked high-point
to another through a scene of apparent disorder. This was Hamilton’s design around the
Temple of Bacchus itself, and designs of the kind risked criticism as meaningless and self-
indulgent, so William Shenstone described parcelling ‘a lawn into knots of shrubberies or
invest[ing] a mountain with a garb of roses’ as ‘like dressing a giant in a sarsenet gown,
or a saracen’s head in a brussels night-cap’.25 William Mason agreed:

Nor will she [Beauty], led by Fashion’s lure, select,
For objects interpos’d, the pigmy race
Of shrubs, or scatter with unmeaning hand
Their offspring o’er the lawn, scorning to patch
With many a meagre and disjointed tuft
Its sober surface.26

THIRD, THE GROVE BROUGHT SHREDDING INTO THE PLEASURE GROUND

Shredding is as ancient a practice as coppicing, and has the advantage of letting light into the understorey.27 Cassandra Willoughby saw at Wrest that:

ye Par-Terre is very large & ends wth High Trees wth meet at Top & are Cut so as to make so many Arches & to run up ye bodys of ye Trees are planted Honeysuckles & Sweet brireq28

and in fact shreds can be seen in numerous eighteenth-century garden pictures,29 for the practice has more uses than that in a pleasure ground. It can provide strong verticals for a composition, as was found in the frequent comparisons between trees and cathedrals;30 it can be used as one might use the pillars of a portico to break a view into vignettes; and it can be used to create garden groves.31 So Julie developed her Elysée from an old orchard surrounded by woods in a space that Switzer might have commended,32 encouraging flowering shrubs to grow freely among the fruit trees, and climbing plants to spread up and through them like garlands, planting fragrant herbs and flowers in the turf, and letting moss cover the paths. Such groves were the stuff of Paradise, as Admiral Anson reported of Tinian and Juan-Fernandez, ‘gently sloping clearings, covered with
fine clover, scattered with different kinds of flowers, and bordered by woods of fine large
trees, several of which bear excellent fruit'.

The word ‘grove’ itself is ancient, and medieval groves of a kind did survive into the
eighteenth century. Nonetheless, it seems unlikely that the grove of parkland and pleasure
ground was directly copied from anything in English nature. Brown’s most partisan
contemporaries may have sought to characterize the grove as a natural occurrence, but
Thomas Whately himself observed that ‘a fine open grove is unusual, except in a park or
a garden’. Although one can readily imagine them working separately, open groves were
often combined with the mazy shrubberies already mentioned. Charles Bridgeman may
have been the first to mix them at Richmond in the 1730s. Madame du Bocage described
the effect twenty years later when the planting was coming to maturity:

the numerous and pleasant thicketts present to the view a place of considerable extent,
called the Forest; where, the better to imitate nature, art has, without any order, planted
great trees, some of them erect, some of them crooked, one half withered away, another
surrounded with shrubs.

John Parnell had passed through ‘fine old forest-trees scattered irregularly, and amidst
them some plots of flowers’ at Southcote’s Wooburn, and these must have been
influential, but his rival, Shenstone, was doing something similar in Virgil’s Grove at the
Leasowes:

The whole scene is opaque and gloomy, consisting of a small deep valley or dingle, the
sides of which are enclosed with irregular tufts of hazel and other underwood; and the
whole over-shadowed with lofty trees rising out of the bottom of the dingle, through
mossy banks, enamelled with primroses, and a variety of wild wood flowers.

Chambers was among the earliest to describe the effect, and Brown undoubtedly loved
these garden groves: Petworth must have had one of his earliest examples and Horace
Walpole relished the paradox that ‘the modern style’ garden consisted of ‘oaks two
hundred years old’. However, Arthur Young described the pleasure ground at Woburn
in the same terms, and Whately described something very like it in the walk to the
cottage at Claremont, which:

though destitute of many natural advantages and eminent for none ... is yet the finest
part of the garden; for a grove is there planted, in a gently curved direction, all along the
side of the hill, and on the edge of a wood, which rises above it. ... The intervals winding
here like a glade, and widening there into broader openings, differ in extent, in figure,
and direction; but all the groups, the lines, and the intervals are collected together into
large general clumps, each of which is at the same time both compact and free, identical
and various. The whole is a place wherein to tarry with secure delight or saunter with
perpetual amusement.

There was a grove at Chatsworth, where Horace Walpole mentioned the ‘oaks and rocks’
taken into the pleasure ground around 1760, and another at Blenheim, where many of the
old oaks survive. There is an account of the style of shrub planting which, rather than being
graduated, was made up of ‘a large proportion of exotics of various heights’ the smaller of
which were put together in clumps and had ‘the appearance of a rich underwood’.

FOURTH, THE IMPORTANCE OF ANIMALS

The eighteenth-century pleasure grounds, then, extended several roots into an existing
silvicultural tradition, but several more drew from animal life. Indeed, four classes of
animals were kept or encouraged in pleasure grounds: wild birds, smaller mammals (hares in particular), grazing animals (usually sheep), and exotic animals and birds. Wild birds were much more remarked on in gardens than they were in parkland and this attitude predates the eighteenth century. So William Lawson thought of a brood of nightingales, a robin red-breast, a ‘silly’ wren, black-bird and thrum as ‘one chief grace that adorns an Orchard’, and Robert Laneham’s pleasures at Kenilworth included ‘Too her such naturall melodious music, and tunez of birds’.

English gardens in fact were known abroad for their bird-song, and Lord Temple had his ‘nightingale Bench’ in the Elysian Fields at Stowe, sitting on it long enough after sunset to give himself ‘a slight feverish Cold’, while William Shenstone talked to his friend the poet Richard Jago of ‘planting hollies, pyracanthas, and other berry-bearing greens, to attract those Blackbirds’. This liking for wild birds predates Rousseau’s description of Julie’s garden (‘here’, as she told St Preux, ‘they are our masters’, humans were their guests), and Joseph Heeley was scarcely aware of an inconsistency in the pleasure he took in the gardens and birds at Enville in 1777:

I trod on soft moss-grown carpets, listening to birds that seemed by their sweeter modulations, to be sensible of their happy situation – wherever I turned, nature looked pleased with her silky dress. – I thought she hovered on every parterre, on every group of trees, and on every smooth-shorn lawn.

The inconsistency that is there (that one might particularly go to the polished garden to hear the wild birds) suggests a degree of freedom in the garden that may be further explained if entire landscapes were graduated, so that wild creatures went unmolested and were allowed to be most plentiful in pleasure grounds, were controlled in parkland, but were not game for the shooters until beyond the pale. This would explain John Byng’s angry grief outside Blenheim’s kitchen garden:

What shock’d me much, was to hear the firing of guns, and to see a set of Jacobins arm’d against the national guards, – the birds; – O fye! – What, for a few cherries, destroy all the songsters? And here will they come to perish.

We may be familiar enough with menageries, aviaries and pheasant gardens, but more influential on the general planting style of the pleasure ground were those animals that were allowed to graze over the whole pleasure ground. Above all hares, which were regarded as garden pests, like rabbits, rats and mice, but were also petted and loved, and in the eighteenth century were to be found in Wray Wood at Castle Howard; within the Barrier at Fonthill, where William Beckford would encourage them to eat out of his hand; in 1776 even the sophisticated and highly finished gardens of Blicking and Bulstrode had hares in their pleasure grounds; and John Loveday had noted ‘hare in abundance ab’ y’ woody Garden’ at Ingestre by 1732. Even in the nineteenth century they remained an enlivening incident on the lawn outside the library at Stourhead: ‘you see every morning a hundred pheasants, intermixed with hares, playing their gambols with a confidence and familiarity that is delightful … there is no satiety, and you fancy yourself in a better world’. Hares are amongst the most voracious of feeders and some gardeners today are reluctant to treat them as serious improvements to a garden, even though an eighteenth-century garden with hares in it cannot have had the same licence in planting design as a modern restoration without. As Lady Hertford wrote of her Shepherd’s Hut to Lady Luxborough in 1748: ‘there are Sweet-Williams, Narcissus’s, Rose-Campions, and such Flowers as the Hares will not eat, in little Borders, round the Foot of every Tree’.
FIFTH, AND ALONGSIDE THESE ANIMALS THERE WAS ALSO A TRADITION FOR GRAZING IN THE PLEASURE GROUND

Thus far this paper has joined Mark Laird’s sustained attack on the commonly held idea that in the second half of the eighteenth century the country house was set down ‘in a grass-field’. However, the importance of the grass field and the truth in our inherited assumptions needs to be reasserted. Besides the hares, pleasure grounds of the second half of the eighteenth century were generally grazed by sheep, being useful close-mowers, as well as ornaments in themselves, suitably Claudean, and with the pastoral signatures of Arcadian nature and the Golden Age. As often as not, the difficulties attendant on this kind of management provide the best evidence for the practice. So Switzer having suggested keeping sheep in the main walks of the pleasure ground ‘who will serve instead of mowers’, then proposed:

little gates … fix’d wherever you enter the quarters, to keep them from going in there; and on top of the terraces that surround the building … a little grillade of iron, or a low pallisadoe of wood, to keep them from coming up too near to the house.

It seems that this way of mixing pasture and pleasure ground was still a novelty when, in 1750, Anne Temple reported his aunt’s anguish to Richard Grenville, ‘I went to my Lady Cobham yesterday and she began in a violent manner about the Sheep being put into the garden [at Stowe] … she told Brown she had cry’d all night and never slept a wink about it.’ It is hard to say how sympathetic Brown would have been: his pleasure grounds at Burton Constable, and Chatsworth were also grazed by sheep, and by 1763 Joseph Spence was to take it as read that the lawns around Old Wardour would be grazed:

The sunk fence, as in Mr Brown’s plan … only continued in a little farther at each end should be sufficient to secure the woods from whatever is to feed on the lawns about the house; and these lawns should be assisted, wherever they may want assistance, and should be kept in all the best verdure they can.

Grazing was taken for granted by William Mason in Book II of The English Garden, where he proposed using children to adorn the garden with ‘the fresh rose/ Of Innocence’ and provide a ‘living fence’ to shepherd the sheep. These lads were to be appropriately clothed ‘In such a russet garb as best befits/ Their pastoral office’. Netting was an alternative to children, shrubberies might be fenced, and both Robinson and Parnell saw nets around the shrubs near the Temple of Bacchus at Painshill, but several accounts make it clear that such an arrangement could not have protected a ‘layered’ theatrical design from the sheep, because all the trees tall enough to have carried the net would have been planted along the spine of the bed. Still stronger and more permanent fences could be used – in Repton’s early Red Book for Brondesbury (14 March 1789), he wrote about the ‘home=inclosure’ rather than the pleasure ground and his sketch of the view ‘as it will appear from the Dining room window’ shows that he intended to put the shrubberies on the north-west side of the house inside post and rail so that the pleasure ground lawn could be grazed freely.

William Mason recommended the ‘rustic balustrade’, and though not an elegant solution to the challenge of turf management in a pleasure ground, it was also adopted by William Emes, and we see similar fences at Horace Walpole’s Strawberry Hill, not when his design was first planted, but added at a time when grazing pleasure grounds had become an acceptable practice. Repton appears to have regarded post and rail as so common or garden a device that he did not comment directly on it, yet, as his illustration shows, it was not compatible with graded planting.
The medieval tradition of ‘flowery meadows’ took grass management a stage further still, allowing a similar texture of floriferous grass in the pleasure ground as in the adjacent parkland (but with more vulnerable garden plants in the former). Enamelling, or embroidering as it was also known, drew from the love of wild flowers, and the simple pleasures of innocence and childhood: ‘Retire ye Wise! Retire from towns,/ To flow’ry lawns and verdant downs;/ Shun Dissipation’s charms.’ The association between flowery lawns and innocence is a commonplace of eighteenth-century literature, licensing the ingénue Lydia Melford to her rhapsody on the Clifton Downs:

> the ground enamelled with daisies, and primroses, and cowslips; all the trees bursting into leaves, and the hedges already clothed with their vernal livery; the mountains covered with flocks of sheep, and tender bleating wanton lambkins playing, frisking, and skipping from side to side; the groves resound with the notes of blackbird, thrush, and linnet; and all night long sweet Philomel pours forth her ravishingly delightful song.

It seems perfectly likely that there was an unbroken range of planting mixes, from the embroidery of a hay meadow with wild flowers growing ‘naturally’ in the grass, through wild flower seed and plants deliberately added to the grass, to the introduction of exotics (qua plants from abroad), though there is no evidence of eighteenth-century introductions used in enamelling. Thus, at the Leasowes in 1749 Shenstone planted primroses and some (presumably more exotic) gifts from Lady Luxborough along the stream in Virgil’s Grove. This he described as ‘embroidery’, later referring to paeonies as his greatest success here. Even if the paeonies were then regarded as native they were certainly not local to Halesowen.

Sir William Chambers gave two accounts of this use of flowers in grassland. The first is in his description of spring gardens (in China of course):

> The ground, and verges of the thickets and shrubberies, are adorned with wild hyacinths, wall-flowers, daffodils, violets, primroses, polianthus’s, crocus’s, daisies, snow-drops, and various species of the iris; with such other flowers as appear in the months of March and April.

His fuller account however comes in his description of open groves (he uses the phrase in its secondary sense to mean openings in woodland, rather than woodland without an understorey):

> the grass; which, by reason of its shady situation, retains a constant verdure; and, in the spring, is adorned with a great variety of early flowers, such as violets, crocus’s, polianthus’s and primroses; hyacinths, cowslips, snow-drops, daffodils and daisies.

Influential as Chambers may have been in Europe, much earlier authors such as Giovanni Boccaccio, Geoffrey Chaucer, John Milton, Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s *La Nouvelle Héloïse* (1761) had a greater impact on eighteenth-century English design. From Spenser’s Garden of Adonis to Rousseau’s Elysée the imagery of these writers was rooted in medieval literature.

In applied horticulture, too, there are accounts of enamelling that long predate Chambers – it is implicit in Robert Castell’s account of Pliny the Younger’s ‘prata florida’ at Tuscum. Peter Aram and John James (1720 and 1731, respectively) and Philip Miller (1731) all promoted something close to it:
at the foot of them [the shrubs] at the side of the Walks may be planted Primroses, Violets, Daffodils, and many other sorts of Wood Flowers, not in a strait line, but rather to appear accidental as in a natural Wood.  

In more general terms, Oliver Goldsmith also advocated the practice (regarding it as a recent development that had ousted other forms of grass management): ‘spontaneous flowers take place of the finished parterre, and the enamelled meadow of the shaven green’.  

Outside the literature, one great eighteenth-century source for the continuing popularity of enamelling and the use of wild flowers was Wooburn Farm. Southcote’s planting, particularly with climbers on the trees, is very close to what one might imagine of the work of William Pitt and Thomas Wright at Stoke Park from 1746, Richard Woods at Audley End in 1780, or Joseph Spence. In the light of descriptions of Wooburn Farm, other groves where we know there was herbaceous planting might make further examples of enamelling (in particular William Kent’s grove at Carlton House with its periwinkle, scabious, iris, etc.), but also the Countess of Hertford’s garden at Percy Lodge (Riskins), with enamelling very much in the style advised by Miller: ‘The Rains have given us the strongest Verdure I ever saw, our Lawns and meadows are enamelled with a profusion of daisies and cowslips.  

While the majority of the plants that Chambers recommended were natives, there were obvious exceptions, such as his ‘polianthus’s’ and his ‘wall-flowers’. To be sure of a good form, the one must have been dibbled in through the turf, and the last, whether Cheiranthus cheiri or Matthiola incana, must have been added on an annual basis. Finally, with enamelling at its most lavish, we have two further possibilities, first plunging pots of exotics into the turf, as William Mason recommended at Nuneham (‘if your Lordship was to sink an orange tub here & there, or Myrtle, covering it with turf, it might do well in those places; I think I saw this done at Lady Dashwood’s, wch had a good effect’); second, the extreme form of Chamomile lawn and its variants (i.e. a grassless lawn), advocated by John Claudius Loudon for colour, texture and economy:  

In almost every case, where lawn is not fed by sheep, it should not be formed of mere grasses; which require continual mowing, and present one dull, vapid, surface of uniform green. They should be composed of primroses, violets, common and garden daisy, camomile, graphallium, doicum, hieracium pilosella and especially white clover. Any three of these species, or the whole of them judiciously mixed, would form a variegated carpet of gay flowers, from April to December, the effect of which, compared to mown lawn, would be as gaiety to gloom, or insipidity to expression – All the expence of mowing would be avoided, and all the smoothness necessary for lawn preserved, in connexion with such a variety of roughnesses as would give the whole a natural appearance. Lawns of this kind exist in nature, and have occupied the pastoral poet. The beauty they would add to artificial scenery is beyond description – the economy in yearly management by no means inconsiderable.  

Gardening of this kind, to ornament the grass, is a medieval tradition rather than an eighteenth-century invention, and of course depends neither on new imports nor on graduated planting.  

SEVENTH, AND LAST, THE PARTERRE  

Good Gardening concerns itself only (or chiefly) with the disposition of the foreground. This it ornaments in order to set off the distant Landscape to advantage. It ornaments it
with the most beautiful objects, such as Tufts of Roses &c & such shrubs & trees as will produce the quickest effect.¹⁰³

The parterre, designed to yield a ‘Prospect from your House’,¹⁰⁴ may be regarded as the most purely horticultural of these traditions, and though it may seem surprising, even Brown retained parterres (on the terraces at Chilham Castle, for example, and at Chatsworth,¹⁰⁵ and famously at Hampton Court where George III suggested that Brown should make changes but he ‘had the good sense to decline “out of respect to himself and his profession”’).¹⁰⁶ What changed was that the parterre was now reduced to a foreground, the focus of the view was to be more distant. This was Kent’s plan for Rousham, as the steward there understood it;¹⁰⁷ and this was Joseph Spence’s advice.¹⁰⁸

There is some evidence that it was felt appropriate for such foregrounds to be essentially floral and herbaceous, rather than evergreen. So the evergreens at Croome are almost always planted on earthworks and the earthworks (and hence the evergreens) almost always have a role in concealing views, while, where the two estate plans show beds but no plants survive, there are also no conspicuous earthworks. On the east side of the lake in the pleasure ground, for example, the absence of evergreens and of earthworks allows for the assumption that it was planted with flowering material, providing a view towards the house, akin to that from the Temple Green-house.¹⁰⁹ The island shrubberies outside the dining-room window at Berrington gesture at a further quality of this kind of planting. They were first mapped in 1887,¹¹⁰ and do not have a straightforward relationship with the windows or with the Claudean view at point blank, to the south across the water, but thicken up to the east, that is towards Long Wood, where from the windows of the house the rising ground is conspicuous. What their distribution suggests is a degree of deliberate, ungraded confusion, which is how William Mavor read the design at Blenheim: ‘Full in the front, the palace towers sublime …/ Low at it’s feet, the verdant carpet lies,/ Shrubs, trees, and flowers, in fair confusion rise.’¹¹¹ William Mason himself pursued this idea, when he suggested that ‘Tufts of flowering Shrubs’ might provide a good gardener’s foreground to replace Claude’s ‘heaps of Rubbish, trunks of feld Trees, scattered stones, Broken Columns, Nettles, Briars, & large Mallow leaves’ (Plate II).¹¹²

These seven examples of the horticultural and agricultural tradition provide a context for the eighteenth-century pleasure ground, which will be continued in two further homages to Mark Laird, which will look at the different forms of the eighteenth-century pleasure ground within which these traditions found expression.
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