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Foreword

The change in garden design from a composition of straight lines and formal spaces to a more indeterminate informal composition of seemingly natural countryside is an interesting one, for it has appeared, almost since its recognition in the middle of the 18th century, that landscape gardening is theoretically and stylistically opposed to the earlier system.

There is a gap of some fifty years between the maturity of the baroque system in Britain and the maturity of landscape gardening, and for various reasons this period is largely uncharted. Stephen Switzer (1682-1745) bridges the two methods of garden design, and is among the writers and designers of the early 18th century the most pivotal, for his training was with London and Wise, the great exponents of formal gardening in Britain, and in his late works of the 1730's and 1740's he made designs very closely approximating landscape gardens.

His theory of garden design appeared in 1715 in The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation and was expanded in 1718 as Ichnographia Rustica. Like his contemporaries Addison, Pope, and to a degree Shaftesbury, Switzer tried to reform garden design away from the mean-spiritedness of the "Dutch Taste" towards la grand manier, and far from despising the designs of France, these writers held them up as models.

There were factors which caused Switzer's conception of la grand manier to be very different from that of Andre LeNôtre. Wealth and
power were more evenly distributed in Britain so that designs of the scale of Vaux-le-Vicomte or Marly-le-Roi were impossible. There was too a growing personal involvement of the landowners with their estates and a desire for the improvement of them both for profit and pleasure.

Switzer's system took account of the peculiar conditions of the early 18th century and proposed a method of rural improvement which in its grand simplicity approached the character of the great French gardens, but because cheapness was one of his most cherished aims the precision of his designs was necessarily less than that of the preceding French or British gardens.

His method was to place the country house in a simplified formal setting, using banked and formed earth covered in turf, gravel walks, forest trees, and water as the elements. This relatively small area was separated from the outer plantations by some form of haha (terrace walk, dry ditch, or encircling "river"). There was, however, both visual and actual connection between the polished and rustic parts of his design, for Switzer considered the whole estate as a garden and he scattered the costly furnishings formerly concentrated near the house throughout the estate.

Switzer's outer plantations included fields, parks, ponds, meadows, fruit and kitchen gardens, and forests. Through these various elements he threaded walks and rides so that there was a correspondence of all the parts of his scheme. The necessary juxtaposition of polished and rough, or artificial and natural made Switzer's designs somewhat resemble 16th century Italian gardens, as his love of simplicity and grandeur
derived from 17th century French designs.

But Switzer is different from his predecessors and followers in that he appears to have been quite unconcerned with form. If there were a mature grove, a declivity, or a piece of ground ideal for some agricultural purpose, Switzer would have accommodated his design to them, whatever form might result. When the land was hilly and varied he recommended sinuous lines, and if the land were flat, straight lines.

It is difficult to judge the success of such designs for they were necessarily short lived, diffuse and practically impossible of illustration, but a few have survived in part, or can be recovered and from these it appears that Switzer practised as well as advocated in some measure his system of garden design. This system grew out of certain assumptions and requirements, but the forms he employed to accommodate these became, as conditions changed, valued in themselves, and what was originally calculated for an entire estate had begun by the late 1720's to be drawn into a new kind of pleasure garden, a garden with formal and associational characteristics of the countryside. His original scheme developed into the ferme ornée and became associated with lack of wealth and poetic imagination, and latterly Switzer practised, whether willingly or not is unclear, the developing new kind of pleasure gardening.

There is in Switzer's work an observable tendency to abstraction in the formal setting of the house; slopes in imitation of fortification
developed curves, at first symmetrically disposed and finally the polished parts of his schemes were freer in form and asymmetrical. So the baroque system of garden design, initiated in Italy and developed in France, grew logically in early 18th century Britain into landscape gardening, without theoretical or formal break.
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Stephen Switzer was a native of Hampshire\(^1\) and was brought up at Stratton near Winchester\(^2\). His baptism is recorded as 25 February 1682\(^3\) but it has not been possible to establish his date of birth. His family was English and apparently long settled in Hampshire;\(^4\) the circumstance of his birth and upbringing seems to have been, in the terms of the time, neither mean nor gentle,\(^5\) the family apparently having a farm at East Stratton copyhold from Lady Rachael Russell\(^6\). Switzer's mother died shortly after his baptism and his father did not remarry. There are no details for the first 15 years of his life and the circumstances of "the happiness I have had in an education none of the meanest for one of my profession"\(^7\) are unknown and tantalizing. He does not appear in the records of Winchester College,\(^8\) nor of either of the English universities\(^9\) and it would appear unlikely that he received instruction in the Russell household at Stratton Park\(^10\) nor, on present evidence,\(^11\) to any significant extent at home.

In late July 1697 Switzer's father made his will "being sick and weak in body" and left to him "the sum of twenty pounds for the settlement of him as an apprentice, and likewise a bed and bolster and pillow in ye room over ye hall..."\(^12\) The father was buried on 7 August 1697.\(^13\) Within a year it would appear that Switzer had become an apprentice at Brompton Park Nursery, London.\(^14\) How he came to Brompton Park is unknown;\(^15\) it would not appear that Switzer was originally intended to become a gardener.\(^16\)

If becoming a gardener was a disappointment of Switzer's expectations\(^17\) he could not have been more fortunate in his choice
of masters George London (d 1713) and Henry Wise (1653-1738) who were, in turn, Royal gardeners and also responsible for "most of the gardens and plantations of Great-Britain".18 Although their reputation has survived largely through Switzer's own efforts they were famous in their own time, being cited as the "heroick poets"19 of gardening in the Spectator and Wise ultimately retired to Warwickshire a rich man. Brompton Park was a large establishment, extending from Brompton to Kensington Gore. It was also a lucrative one, for besides the Crown contracts "the National was afterwards stock'd"20 from the nursery.

Switzer's first work with the... when he "tasted... the meanest labours of the Scythe, Spade, and Wheel-barrow"21 was likely in the Royal garden in St. James' Park, then under George London's direction.22 Kensington Gardens and Hampton Court were underway in the late 17th century as were Longleat, Wiltshire, Chatsworth, Derbyshire, and Dyrham, Gloucestershire, and Switzer likely laboured in these and other gardens. But two works had a profound effect on his subsequent thought and work: the gravel pit amphitheatre in Kensington Gardens, carried out by Henry Wise in 1704; and Wray Wood, Castle Howard from 1700 with George London.23 There is reason for believing that both these works were "prentice pieces by Switzer himself.

The site for Lord Carlisle's projected new house was selected just west of the large beech wood planted in the early 17th century. Two designs by London of 1699 show how
"he design'd a Star, which would have spoil'd the wood, but that his Lordship's superlative Genius prevented it, and to the great Advancement of the Design, has given it that Labyrinth diverting Model we now see it; and it is, at his time, a proverb at that Place, York against London, in allusion to the Design of a Londoner, and Mr. London the Designer."\textsuperscript{24}

Could Carlisle's "superlative genius" have been an officious, bold but well-meaning apprentice of 18?\textsuperscript{25} External evidence has not been found to prove or disprove this, but the circumstances of the design, its quality, its value as a model, and its employment in a theory of garden design is due entirely to Switzer, and though his attribution of the design to Carlisle may be taken as accurate, we now know that his attribution to Wise of a design in similar circumstances, and of similar quality, was only diplomatic.

The area north of Kensington Palace, known as Kensington Gravel Pits before it became Notting Hill Gate, was partly enclosed in 1704 as the "New Garden behind the Green-house", and the feature of this area was the amphitheatre,

"the Place where that beautiful Hollow now is, was a large irregular Gravel-pit, which, according to several Designs given in, was to have been fill'd, but that Mr. Wise prevailed, and has given it that surprizing Model it now appears in..."\textsuperscript{26}

According to Addison, "it must have been a fine Genius for Gardening, that would have thought of form'g such an unsightly Hollow into so beautiful an Area".\textsuperscript{27}

Switzer could not decently have laid claim to the design only three years later although, according to William Stukeley, "my old
friend Switzer contrived to make it in its present form. But if the amphitheatre required a "fine genius" the "incomparable wood" at Castle Howard surely merited "a superlative genius".

The Gravel-pit Amphitheatre was begun in September 1704 and completed by the following March, and in the spring of 1705 preliminary site work had begun at Blenheim under Henry Wise. Switzer apparently came straight from Kensington to Woodstock but he appears to have been an independent workman that summer being listed as "park quarries supervisor" in 1705 whereas his work in the "fruitful potager" the "ten-thousand hedge-yews, etc. that were planted under my direction...in 1706" the "buying a great many (Elms) in Oxfordshire for the Plantations..." and in the digging of the foundations for the Bridge and forming the River Glyme into canals he acted as Wise's "able deputy".

But all did not go smoothly. Switzer was ambitious and after his success at Castle Howard and Kensington and his responsibilities at Blenheim he expected advancement. But in the spring of 1708 there was a set back, "Mr. Wise has given the care of the gardens to another" presumably to Tilleman Bobart who had worked with Wise at Hampton Court and who, on Wise's recommendation, succeeded Boulter later that year as controller with Henry Joynes. Bobart was senior to Switzer and more experienced but why should Wise have "given the care of the gardens to another"? According to Vanbrugh, "My Lady Dutchesses servant Ben was with me this morning, to desire I wou'd put him into some employ at Blenheim, telling me that there was some changes towards upon Mr. Wise's turning out Steven. I told him I believ'd he
must be misinform'd, since I rec'd no letter relating to any such thing, which I should certainly have done, if there was occasion to displace or take in any new clerks..."

Perhaps Switzer's "officious boldness" had annoyed Wise, or perhaps by the time news reached Vanbrugh in London, by way of the household servants, the case seemed darker than it was. In any case Switzer's "turning out" was to put him to work "about the business of the bridge" known as "Mr. Wise's Digg" certainly a more interesting task, if less lucrative considering Boulter's death, than the care of the gardens by then "most part finish'd".

Vanbrugh's remark is interesting also for the light it throws on Switzer's relative position at Blenheim by his reference to him as a Clerk. Vanbrugh was surveyor, assisted by Hawksmore, and there were two clerks of the works, one apparently named by Wise, followed by the skilled workmen. Wise had no official position in this hierarchy, presumably because he was already employed by the Crown. As his assistant, Switzer would not have held an official position either, but it would appear that he was third in command (after Boulter and later Bobart) in the garden works; he would have had the opportunity of meeting Vanbrugh and Hawksmore, and at least overhearing their discussions. It would have been here, and perhaps also at Castle Howard, that Switzer may have developed his taste for grand simplicity characteristic of these "top Architects".

In the "Business of the Bridge" he would have been more intimately involved with the architects since Vanbrugh, Hawksmore and
Wren presented schemes for the park approach to the house. It is likely that Switzer too presented a design. In digging the foundations for the bridge and forming the irregular canals Switzer would necessarily have worked closely with Vanbrugh, probably more closely than with Wise. The occasion for his imbibing Vanbrugh's grand simplicity was present, and perhaps too his placing great value on ruins in 1715 may have had its start in Vanbrugh's vain attempt to preserve the old manor of Woodstock, very much part of the "Business of the Bridge".

Charles Bridgeman first appeared at Blenheim in 1709 and he may have replaced Switzer as Wise's assistant. Certainly the work Switzer did after 1708 tended towards architectural rather than purely gardening work, and whereas Bridgeman became something of a protégé of Wise's, working with him in Warwickshire after the works were stopped at Blenheim, and ultimately succeeding him as Royal gardener, Switzer, after 1710 appears to have had no connection with Wise at all.

The circumstances of Switzer's leaving Blenheim are unknown. It is assumed that he continued to work on the Bridge area until all work was stopped by the Duchess of Marlborough in October 1710. He did not return until with "that most ingenious promoter of all rural improvements, Mr. Broderick" he "ordered" some paddocks for the "present Earl of Godolphin" between 1724 and 1733, perhaps before Bridgeman returned to "finish" the gardens.

From Blenheim Switzer moved to Lincolnshire and was employed
by Robert Bertie (1660-1723) Marquess of Lindsey and from 1715 Duke of Ancaster at Grimsthorpe, and probably Eresby and Belleau. Belleau is a farm and its topography and Switzer's design associated with the house do not agree, though he may have been responsible for the canal which runs west of the house. Eresby, perhaps for Peregrine Bertie (1686-1742) 2nd Duke of Ancaster, has disappeared leaving only the remnants of an avenue running northwards to Spilsby, a gate-pier and the remains of a moat. Whether the open gently sloping south side was formed by Switzer is impossible to say.

Switzer's problem at Grimsthorpe, like Vanbrugh's, was to adapt old work to a new design. He remodelled the late 17th century garden and wood on the Blenheim model, but he also extended the "garden" to include the arable fields, hedge rows and other existing features and achieved what must have been the first complete essay in landscape design. Switzer introduced William Stukeley the antiquary to the Ancasters. Might he also have introduced Vanbrugh?

Mr. H.M. Colvin has discovered a plan for Grimsthorpe of 1715 which puts Vanbrugh there much earlier than was hitherto supposed and though Switzer appears to have left Lincolnshire by 1715 he may have recommended Vanbrugh.

In 1715 Switzer published The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation written presumably while he was with the Ancasters in Lincolnshire and dedicated to the Marquess of Lindsey. At about this time Switzer probably began working with Allen Bathurst (1683-1775) Lord Bathurst at Cirencester, Gloucestershire and Riskins,
Buckinghamshire. His work for Bathurst is not supported by external evidence and rests on the character of the gardens, Switzer's dedication of the *Practical Kitchen Gardener* to him in 1727 where Switzer writes of Bathurst as "the best of Masters, and best of Friends" and his publication in 1742 of a plan based on Riskins. Cirencester Park was laid out from about 1714 to 1742 and Riskins appears to have been begun at about the same time, and to have been substantially complete by 1727. These two "gardens" illustrate the extremes of scale of Switzer's rural and extensive gardening introduced at Grimsthorpe and in theoretical form in *The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation*. Cirencester was a planned estate of some 5000 acres whereas Riskins was an ornamented farm of less than 100 acres.

Switzer had moved to Newbury, Berkshire by 1718 and had prepared a design for Caversham, near Reading, for William Cadogan (1675-1726) Earl Cadogan who had been Marlborough's Quartermaster-General and M.P. for Woodstock from 1714. Switzer's commission doubtless came by way of Blenheim, either by recommendation or through having met Cadogan there before 1710. But a hitch seems to have developed as the articles of agreement are not signed, though they have been stamped, and according to Colín Campbell "These gardens were form'd by Mr. Acres, where he has left lasting monuments of his capacity. Anno 1723." However, the plate showing the plan of Caversham matches the description of Switzer's proposals in the article of agreement and the not especially remarkable design is doubtless his.
In the same year the full three volume set of *Ichnographia Rustica* was published, the first volume of which was a reset edition of *The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation*. The second volume was dedicated to Thomas Coningsby (1656-1729) Earl of Coningsby but whether Switzer's work for him at Hampton Court, Herefordshire was complete by that date is uncertain but it is more likely that it was still continuing. His activities at Hampton Court were largely outwith the rectilinear late 17th century garden though he was to some degree responsible for the kitchen quarters of the garden, but his principal work was the new river (like natural rivers sometimes serpentine, sometimes straight, and sometimes irregular) dug in the park north of the house and garden. It runs roughly parallel to Hall Brook, which joins the River Lugg at the foot of the garden, but is on higher ground and thus provided a head of water for the fountains in the garden, and acted as a reservoir for the hitherto unwatered lands north of the park.

Thomas Herbert (1656-1733) Earl of Pembroke was the dedicatee of volume three of *Ichnographia Rustica* and though there is no further known evidence of a link between him and Switzer at this date, it would appear that Switzer was responsible for the simplification of the great early 17th century layout by Isaac De Caus (fl. 1644). At the same time the grotto was resited and the garden enclosure opened up to the south by diagonal avenues. The garden remained in this transitional state until the late 1730's when Switzer appears to have transformed them into a proto-landscape garden.
Two garden designs of this period in Yorkshire have been associated with Switzer on the basis of their style and his expertise in water-works. Ebberston Lodge was designed by Colen Campbell for William Thompson (d. 1744) in 1718\(^7\) and by 1725\(^7\) the canal garden had been made. This is illustrated in four contemporary paintings\(^8\) from which it appears that Ebberston Lodge is closely related to Breamore, Hampshire and Spy Park, Wiltshire, both designs by Switzer in the 1720's. And on this basis the gardens at Ebberston may be attributed to him. Unfortunately the case of nearby Duncombe Park is even less certain. The house was built for Thomas Brown Duncombe (d. c1725) after 1713 and the garden, a woodland overlooking the River Rye and bounded on two sides by a terrace walk, appears to have been in progress in 1718. Its composition and the device of the terrace walks were of a kind used by Switzer at Cirencester and may indeed be his work. However, Duncombe answers in some respects Switzer's caveat about terraces, that they should be related to the principal buildings.

"...this is a great fault, that is easily discernable in the slopes of a noble situation in the north part of England where the slopes run neither parallel to the line, nor are they parallel to the level of the plinth, or, indeed, any of the building, which makes them look twisted away, and not so agreeable as they would otherwise be."\(^77\)

This is particularly true of the, perhaps later, south terrace, and though his criticism may relate to quite another garden it diminishes the likelihood of his authorship of at least the south terrace. As to the rest of the garden Mr. Hussey's conclusion must be repeated, "It is tempting to assign the Duncombe garden to Switzer, but it can be
no more than a suggestion...).

In 1720 Henry Hoare (d. 1725) paid Switzer £15.15.0 for a garden design to be made at Stourton, Wiltshire where Colen Campbell's Stourhead was then building. Unhappily this design is lost, but it is likely that it formed the basis of the garden shown on a survey of 1722. This was an unexceptional layout of very limited extent. Of more interest is the significance of the connection between Switzer and Henry Hoare II (1705-1785) whose early work at Stourhead was considerable but as yet largely unknown. Switzer used Hoare's bank from 1724, and Henry Hoare subscribed to his Practical Husbandman and Planter in 1733; they thus knew each other but that Hoare extended the gardens in the late 20's and early 30's under Switzer's direction can at present be only a suggestion.

In 1724 Switzer was living and working at Spy Park, Wiltshire. His client there was Anne Bayntun Rolt (d. 1734) who had succeeded her brother in 1716 but she did not live at Spy until 1722 when her husband died and their son Thomas Rolt inherited Sacombe Park, Herefordshire. She married James Somerville of Drum, Lord Somerville in 1724 and in 1726 they moved to the newly completed Drum, Midlothian. Switzer's concern in the summer of 1724 was the waterworks about which he was "prodigious busie" but the work at Spy included also the making of large scale mock-fortifications and this had likely been started earlier. In his Practical Fruit Gardener first published in 1724 Switzer had included the design...
which was executed with "the cheapest materials" and by 1729 Spy had become "forlorn".

From the dedication of the Practical Fruit Gardener to Charles Boyle (1676-1731) Earl of Orrery it appears that Switzer had been employed by him some time before 1724 at Marston, Somerset and their association continued through the 1720's with Switzer using Orrery's library in the compilation of his Hydrostaticks. In 1733/34 Orrery's son and heir subscribed to Switzer's agricultural magazine and in 1739 Lord Orrery in a facetious letter said he was proposing the planting of thistles and crab trees at Marston. The garden at Marston was not so complex as to require attendance over 20 years but as Orrery, father and son, are claimed as friends as well as masters his long association with the family was perhaps personal as well as professional.

There are two personal details which also date from 1724. In his letter to Stukeley from Spy Park Switzer refers to his wife joining him in his good wishes. But Elizabeth Switzer's maiden name and the date and place of their marriage remains a mystery. On 2 January 1723/24 Switzer's account at Hoare's Bank begins. His use of it that year and in 1725 is slight but from 1727 it becomes more active and continues until his death in 1745 and presumably this quickening of the tempo of the account coincides with his setting up as a seedsman in Westminster Hall. In 1/25 he was living in Pewsey, Wiltshire, where his son Thomas was born and in 1726 two letters to Thomas Broadley of Hull were addressed from Pewsey.
and gave Switzer's town address as Sturep's Coffee House, St. Martins Court. By August of the following year he had settled in Kennington Lane, "late Mr. Price's" where he also had a garden. It would appear that he opened his seed shop "at the Flower-Pot, over against the Court of Common-Pleas in Westminster Hall" in that year for in 1728 he speaks of "the short time I have kept a seed-shop" and thanks his customers "for the favour they have done me in buying their seeds of me this year". But why should Switzer have moved to London and set up a shop? Since he left Blenheim he had been moving about England from one job to another and he very likely felt that at 45 he might not be fit enough to continue with this method of work. He had seemingly recently married and had had a son: so his need for security would have been the greater. Of all the services and trades which were then part of garden and landscape design, that of seedsman was the most lucrative and required the least specialist knowledge and close supervision and as such newcomers were discouraged: Switzer met with "ill will" because of this. By having his shop "in so publick a place" Switzer was in a position to increase his opportunities as a designer, and to some degree become a public figure, as witness his rather feverish publication of pamphlets (which he began as an aid to business) in the late 1720's and early 1730's and the correspondence that resulted from them. By 1731 he had enlarged his activities to include a nursery on Millbank and thus though in a much smaller way, duplicated the business of London and Wise.
Switzer's pamphlets *A Compendious Method for the Raising of the Italian Brocoli*, *A Dissertation on the True Cythisus of the Ancients* of 1731 and 1735 and his magazine *The Practical Husbandman and Planter* of 1733/34 are of value in that they provide biographical information and may help in locating new designs. They are largely outside the scope of this work, as is, strangely enough, his most splendid effort, *An Introduction to a General System of Hydrostaticks and Hydraulicks* which first appeared in 1729. These works show a side of Switzer's character beyond that of designer and theoretician - the enthusiastic enquirer into the nature of things, albeit allied to business.

But as a theoretician and designer he was not altogether idle in this period. The *Appendix to Ichnographia Rustica* was written about 1729 (as witness, "the foregoing volumes were publish'd some ten or twelve years ago" and "the curious drafts and accounts of the ancient villas... (published by an ingenious gentleman lately deceased)..." that is Robert Castell's *Villas of the Ancients Illustrated*, 1728) but was not published until 1742. In it Switzer included the plan of Riskins, Buckinghamshire, intended for the *Practical Kitchen Gardener*, where the "produce is rais'd promiscuously up and down in fields... these fields are suppos'd to be enclosed (as they are often found) with hedges and hedge-rows ready grown." In the *Appendix* this small scale rural and extensive gardening is said to have "been the practice of some of the best genius's of France, under the title *La Ferme Ornée*." This would appear to be the first usage of the term, a usage considerably earlier than that of William Shenstone (1717-1763) who so described his place The
Leasowes, Shropshire, laid out from about 1743. But apart from this brief restatement and illustration of some of the principals of rural and extensive gardening and a similar recapitulation and further definition in the Prooemial Essay of 1742 Switzer’s theoretical writing ceased in 1718.

The designs given or executed by Switzer in the late 1720’s included a small garden design for Thomas Broadley of Hull in 1726 (conducted by post); the water garden for William Lord Brooke (d. 1727) at Breamore, Hampshire, where Switzer had written part of his Hydrostaticks and where his research for it had been directed by Samuel Lindsey, Lord Brooke’s chaplain; Leeswood, Flintshire, for Sir George Wynne, Bt (1700-1756) from c. 1726; and perhaps work for the dedicatees of the Hydrostaticks, Algernon Seymour (1684-1750) Earl of Hertford at Marlborough, Wiltshire and William O’Brien (d. 1777) Earl of Inchquin at Cliveden, or Taplow, Buckinghamshire and may conceivably have provided the design for Dromoland, county Clare, Ireland, for Inchquin’s kinsman Sir Edward O’Brien, Bt (1705-1765). To these works may be added in time gardens of the subscribers to Switzer’s Practical Husbandman and Planter such as Culverthorpe, Lincolnshire for Sir Michael Newton where a column and circular temple were built in 1728 and an obelisk contemplated. But at present there is insufficient evidence to warrant more than passing reference.

Foreign travel was considered a necessary part of a garden designer’s training by mid-century and in 1715 Switzer thought
it very desirable "The misfortune that most of my profession are under in not having been abroad, is certainly great..." although plans and perspectives could in some measure, make up for this. Apparently Switzer had not then been abroad himself but he hoped to go "in some short time", and to draw the magnificent Ideas of those Nations into a Volume by itself."

This compilation had not been fulfilled by 1718 and Switzer apologises for his lack of sophistication in the more architectural parts of his designs, and "in this point, I must expect to fall very short of d'Argenville's Theorie but, "if Providence permits, I hope, on the Spot, in these Countries, to collect what may yet farther advance us". He never published such a collection, although he included a number of plates of the water works at Versailles and the Villa d'Este in his Hydrostaticks.

However, Switzer did go abroad at least once but for a very different purpose from improving his imagination and skill as a designer. He was in Holland some time before 1724, perhaps as early as c. 1718, but he made the trip to observe various methods of raising fruit and probably to deal directly with his Dutch supplier "about three miles from the Hague", perhaps Hans de Veil. Whether he travelled further afield is doubtful; he does speak of current French practice of pruning roots but his inclusion of a plan of a French fruit garden in the revised edition of the Practical Fruit Gardener was through the good offices of his "worthy ingenious friend Sir James Thornhill" and it is clear that his knowledge
of the great French water-works was from "the prints, as well as by the accounts travellers bring". 130

In his business as a seedsman Switzer thought it wise to institute "a certain and secure correspondence"140 with his European suppliers so that it would no longer be necessary "to take up with the Italian, Dutch and Danish Faith" and to this end he promised that in the summer of 1729 to "visit all, or most of those places, in the Neighbouring Nations of Europe, from whence the best Seeds are imported". 141 It is doubtful that this foreign travel affected Switzer's designs or his attitude to rural and extensive gardening; his attitudes do not seem to have changed after 1718, and his later designs do not betray any fruitful contact with Dutch work (which "Taste"142 he makes clear he despised) nor do they contain any specifically French or Italian characteristics, indeed the reverse is the case.

An aspect of Switzer's business as a seedsman and of his publication of pamphlets was his association, in a semi-public non professional way, with the "Improvers", not only the society so known, but gardeners, factors, "projectors", landowners who in some measure considered themselves savants, perhaps not quite of the standing of the members of the Royal Society but certainly sharing their pragmatic curiosity. Study of natural processes, experimentation, and improvement constituted an integral part of his "pleasures of a country life" and thus his theory of garden design. By the 1720's a number of landowners and others were prepared to subscribe
to at least that part of his theory. The earliest and most consistent exponents of improvement were in Scotland where for example Thomas Hamilton (1680-1735) Earl of Haddington systematically improved his estate of Tyningham, East Lothian from 1700. His plantation there had an ornamental as well as practical purpose. 143

In 1725 the Society for the Improvement of Knowledge in Agriculture, or Society of Improvers, was formed under the aegis of James Murray (1690-1764) Duke of Atholl. By 1744 there were some 300 members, largely improving landowners, though William Boutcher and Switzer represented garden designers. Switzer's membership presumably as a correspondent very likely dates from 1731 when he was approached by them, 144 either through Charles Cathcart (1686-1740) subsequently Lord Cathcart from whom Switzer had received a "further account of the best method of burning clay" 145 or Switzer's "Ingenious and worthy friend Sir John Dalrymple" 146. Of English improvers Switzer acknowledged in 1727 149 Lord Bathurst, Lord Cobham (whose work at Stowe was then under Charles Bridgeman's direction) 148 and Lord Bolingbroke who was then farming Dawley Park, Middlesex himself. In c 1729 Riskins, and Dawley Park were instanced as examples of "La Ferme Ornee" as was nearby Abbs Court 149, the farm of George Montagu (?1685-1739) Earl of Halifax, "a great improver of ground". 150 Halifax gave early encouragement to Switzer's magazine, the Practical Husbandman and Planter and was probably the "Nobleman who favour'd" 151. his enquiry into the cythisus medicago. 152

Part of Switzer's reason for publishing his first pamphlet was that his customers required directions for raising the seeds they bought
from him because

"their gardeners living far in the Country, knew not how to manage them; for which reason he was often oblig'd to work a great many directions in a day, which took up more time and trouble than all his other business..."¹⁵³

His important position in Westminster, the corresponding attendant on the "great many directions" he sent out, and the pamphlets themselves contributed to the loose formation about Switzer of what appears to have been a corresponding society which by 1733 was cohesive enough to be listed as "a private society of husbandmen and planters" with Switzer as "principal assistant".¹⁵⁴ Unfortunately there is very little known about the precise nature and composition of the society, nor for how long it existed. Meetings appear to have been held at Temple Bar where papers were presented by Switzer¹⁵⁵ and perhaps by others and the essays published in six monthly parts in 1733 and 1734 are likely the record of the proceedings of the society. These essays had "been collecting for some time"¹⁵⁶ (and included Switzer's dissertation on the true cythisus of the ancients prematurely published in 1731)¹⁵⁷ and were intended to form a "general system" of husbandry.

Switzer is the only named member of the society and it is conceivable that he invented it as a ruse to cover the publication of his fugitive pieces and so avoid "being thought guilty of the itch of writing".¹⁵⁸ He had been planning such a collection of essays for some years, and he had promised in 1728

"the shortest, but most useful, Compendium that has been as yet published on these subjects, which will be a compleat supplement to this and all other writings that I have published."¹⁵⁹
and in 1732 this was "very far advanc'd". Its reception in 1733 and 1734 does not seem to have been all that Switzer wished. He intended to publish the essays in twelve monthly parts, but as only six of these appeared, it is likely that they did not meet "with approbation" and that plans for further publication were dropped.

There are several possible explanations for this. Switzer acted as his own publisher and though a number of London and country booksellers took copies there may have been resentment on their part, and their endeavours to sell them thereby reduced. His title, too, was somewhat misleading: the essays did not form "one of the completest Systems of Agriculture that was ever yet published" nor would it have done if finished: although it included much of practical value, for example "some new experiments relating to Lucern and German Spurrie" in the April number, it contained as much that was non-practical and scholarly such as "a Dissertation on the Ancient and Modern Villas" in the June number. In short it was neither complete nor systematic but was rather a collection of essays on rural affairs.

Another probable contributory factor to the lack of approbation the Practical Husbandman and Planter met with was its tone. A characteristic of Switzer's writing is that it is good natured and polite, but these Essays are splenetic and sometimes even unpleasant, and part of this no doubt derives from the "low Ebb that Husbandry is now at", and "insolent and insufferable" workmen. But Switzer's health was probably the greater cause. In the summer of
1734 he was "very ill at Newcastle, and so sick that I could not cost up the bill, much less state it minutely". Switzer was then passed fifty and his many projects would have strained him. As early as 1728 he had apologized for the "Waste and Hurry" that might affect his seed shop "and other Business" and in 1731 he remarked on his "Want of Leisure". By 1733 Switzer was keeping his seed shop "open all this Summer" and in August he wrote from Westminster Hall to Henry Ellison apologising for the delay in answering his letter;

"I have this summ been as yet only my Midland Tour which has took up nine weeks getting not home til late on Saturday night last..."

He also was giving designs and laying out gardens, as well as writing (at the very least editing) and publishing the Practical Husbandman and Planter, in effect three full time jobs, so a margin for ill health did not exist.

But whether the spleen in Switzer's essays is accounted for by this or some other cause, its direction was largely against Jethro Tull (1674-1741). In 1731 Tull had published The New Horse Houghing Husbandry, or an Essay on the Principles of Tillage and Vegetation in which he presented his seed drill for the mechanical and regular plantation of grain, and his theory that repeated plowing of soil would render the use of manures unnecessary "because it would make more readily accessible the food of plants already present in the soil". This theory, the efficacy of Tull's drill, and a good deal relating more to Tull than his publication, was
attacked in the Practical Husbandman and Planter. Switzer does not appear as hostile to Tull's improvements in 1731 however; indeed he held high hopes for both the drill and horse-hoeing. In "Further Improvements of the Lucerne" appended to his Dissertation on the Ture Cythisus Switzer expected success with the lucerne husbandry

"if the Drill and Horsehough Ploughs succeed; the first of which will plant and cover the seed well, and the second will help to keep the weeds down" and went so far as to recommend Tull's new-invented Drill-Plough which 'tis supposed will be by and by more common". It is unlikely that anyone was earlier in commending Tull in print and Switzer reversal within two years is mysterious.

The reasons for Switzer to welcome Tull's improvements were both general and particular. An advance in husbandry, especially the improvement of poor lands with seed crops, would accord both with Switzer's professed desire for agricultural improvement and his theory of rural and extensive gardening, and it would tend to increase his trade as seedsman. Tull and Switzer had mutual friends and acquaintance among the improvers, and Tull's reluctance to publish was overcome by, among others, Colonel Cathcart and Lord Halifax respectively Switzer's collaborator and patron. Switzer and Tull may have been personally acquainted, either through Cathcart or Halifax in the late 1720's, or from an earlier time in Wiltshire.

Switzer's attack, and Tull's counter-attack do have the stamp of
personal malice, and as the 1731 edition of *Horse-houghing Husbandry* appeared anonymously, Switzer may have rushed into print with his commendation without realizing who the author was. But whether it was dissembled or not Switzer had serious second thoughts by 1733:

> "Amongst all the Essays which have for these many years been wrote on husbandry, there is none that raised the expectations of the curious to that great height before it came out, as that of the *Horse-hoeing Husbandry*, said to be wrote by Jethro Tull, Esq." 172

His objections were briefly these. Tull had not invented the seed drill and should not have claimed to have done so. Tull's theory of tillage was madness, and his, to Switzer, gratuitous attacks on Virgil's *Georgics* proved this. And finally if Tull's theory and drill were as efficacious as he claimed, why was his own *Prosperous Farm* such a poor and mismanaged affair. These objections were delivered with immoderate warmth, perhaps as has been suggested because of the testiness of bad health, personal antipathy, or a mixture of both. Tull's replies were of an equal quality and their tone did proceed from sickness which from 1735 seems to have confined him to his farm. 155

Switzer's pamphlets, public controversies, new editions and his affairs as a tradesman loom large in an account of his life because this is the kind of information available in his published work, and on the evidence, recoverable from other sources, of his work as a garden designer in the last fifteen years of life the pattern of the late 1720's and early 1730's would appear to be a true one, for there are less than ten works in this period that can be absolutely
or reasonably ascribed to him. However, it is clear that he spent considerable time outside London, presumably executing his designs. He did not use his account at Hoare's Bank in 1729 (and there is only one entry for 1728) and in 1731. For the summer of 1732 there is only one entry; a payment of £15.0.0 from Charles Pole. There are likewise gaps between July 1733 and November 1734, April and September 1735, April and December 1737, June 1741 and August 1742.

The suggestion that these gaps signify any absences from London is not borne out by other evidence. It is clear, however, that he was away from his seed shop for extended periods, long enough to begin large designs. Smaller gardens, those close to London, and additions to gardens already underway would perhaps have been dealt with on shorter trips. In 1733 and in 1734, for example, this was the pattern of practice he followed. His last withdrawal from his account that year was on June 13th (although there was a payment into it in July), and though he was at Westminster on August 20th he had been away from London nine weeks on his "Midland Tour", "other gardens near London" were to be visited "this and next week".181

In January 1734 Switzer was in his shop182 and by the autumn he had been at least to the north of England.183 In December of that year and the Spring of 1735 he was undertaking work at Audley End, Essex, by short trips from London.184

His midland tour of 1733 was one of several and therefore his
comments on George London's practice might well apply to himself.

"...it was common for him to ride 50 or 60 miles in a day, he made his Northern Circuit in five or six weeks, and his Western in as little time as for the South and East, they were but three or four days' work for him."

If this pattern of practice be true it is unlikely that the list of gardens by Switzer recovered from the period 1730-1745 is complete. His prominent position in Westminster, the quasi-public figure he cut on account of his books and pamphlets, and the growing acceptance of his not yet dated ideas would suggest a much larger practice as a garden designer. However, the designs by him or probably by him in this period show that his practice extended from Northumberland to Wiltshire and from Flintshire to Essex, and that there was stylistic advance.

The first of these is Bold Hall, Lancashire, apparently laid out for Peter Bold, M.P. for Wigan, in the summer of 1731. In his Dissertation on the True Cythisus Switzer published a letter from Bold about burning clay, but it began,

"I received all your letters, and am obliged to you for the pains you have taken in the affair I recommitted to your charge; and shall willingly accept of the person you have recommended to my service..."

Bold Hall had been finished by 1730 by Giacomo Leoni and it is likely that the garden there was the "nursery" mentioned by Bold, and that Switzer had recommended a gardener to him, as he did in 1727 to Thomas Broadley and in 1733 to Henry Ellison. Bold was demolished in 1901, and the early 18th century layout is entirely unknown.
In the summer of 1732 Switzer was at Exton Park, Rutland, presumably to lay out the grounds for Baptist Noel (1708-1751) Earl of Gainsborough. Gainsborough subscribed to Switzer's *Practical Husbandman and Planter*, and a working drawing in the Gough collection at Oxford for the lake/cascade scheme is addressed in what appears to be Switzer's hand.

Evidence for Switzer's connection with Northumberland, and with Henry Ellison of Gateshead Park particularly, is contained in a series of letters beginning in August 1733 and continuing to April 1735. These deal with consignments of seeds and the like and with payments of bills, but the first letter of the series was not the first letter in the correspondence, and the likely possibility of Switzer having provided the layout for Gateshead Park remains, particularly as he visited the gardens in 1734. Gibbs had remodeled the house in 1730, "and great care taken in laying out the gardens, the lawn, the flower-beds, and kitchen gardens". Unfortunately no trace of these remain today and the only surviving plan is for a rectangular kitchen garden. Ellison's uncle Colonel Henry Liddell was among Switzer's north-east subscribers and may have employed him at Ravensworth, County Durham, or at Belsington, Northumberland, where a glacis and other Switzeresque earthworks remain.

A signed but undated design made for Sir Rowland Winn (1706-1765) for the grounds at Nostell Priory, Yorkshire by Switzer survives at the house. The house was James Paine's first work and dates
from c 1733-35 and Switzer's design for the grounds appear to have been made at the same time. Switzer's design, like Paine's, was only partially carried out, the great parade, the formation of the lawn, and a small mount in the wilderness are all that survive and apparently little, if any more, was carried out.

Switzer's client at Audley End, Essex, was Henry Howard (1706-1745) Earl of Suffolk. The work undertaken for him, on present evidence extending only from December 1734 to April 1735 does not appear to have included more than the simple parterre and flanking woodlands.

Switzer probably supplied the design for Sir Thomas Robinson's grounds at Rokeby, Yorkshire, notwithstanding Robinson's early recognition of William Kent's efforts in garden design. Rokeby has elements (the circuit, the figure in the park, and the fortuitous river side "garden") characteristics of Switzer. Robinson's house was finished in 1731 and plantations were proceeding in 1734. The garden design therefore would appear to derive from the early 1730's. Switzer's connection, apart from the style of the design, were a subscription from Robinson to the Practical Husbandman and Planter in 1733 and a payment into Switzer's account in 1736.

In 1737 Switzer undertook two very different works. Sometime before September 1737, he had contracted with a Mr. Fergusson, on behalf of the Duke of Chandos, to build a "Barn and Waterwork". This would probably be at Shaw Hall, Berkshire where Walter Fergusson
Chandos had improved Shaw from 1729 and in the early 1730s appears to have preferred it to Cannons. The barn was probably a replacement for the one damaged in a storm in 1735, and the waterwork was likely part of a scheme undertaken in 1733 and perhaps completed by Switzer. In September he provided the design for the grounds at Beaumanor, Leicestershire, for William Heyick. The gardens proposed by Switzer were very compact, original and curiously aligned and these characteristics no doubt arose because of the awkward relation of house, built in 1725, the remains of a previous house, the stable block and church. Whether the design was executed is uncertain - the present house dates from 1843 and it has not proved possible to examine the site. Switzer was helped in the preparation of the plan by Thomas Switzer, junior, who "script ornavitque". This would be either Switzer's nephew (b 1705) or his son (b 1725), and to judge from the quality more likely the latter. Switzer's son had been enrolled at Westminster School in 1736 Charles Bridgeman and John Vanbrugh's Nicholas Hawksmoore's sons were there at the same time and if this early encouragement was in the hope that Thomas would become a designer too it failed. Thomas Switzer went on to St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1741 and was graduated Bachelor of Laws in 1753.

In the summer of 1739 Switzer sent off a design and list of plants to Sir George Wymne of Leeswood, Flintshire who had commissioned a layout for his neighbour Nehemiah Griffith at Rhual. Like his work for Thomas Broadley in the 1720s Switzer made his
design cold;

"Not having seen the place to which this Plan belongs and depending chiefly on a Survey (without particular Profile to it) I cannot be certain that I have hit off all the affair, to an exact nicety..." 212

And also like the Broadley design the plan for Rhual has not survived, but fortunately the garden now exists largely in its early 18th century form, and it largely matches Switzer's description. His work consisted of remodeling and extending an earlier layout, and the chief feature of the scheme was a woodland contrived to embrace a paddock and thus connect house, garden and estate.

From his postscript to Wynne it appears that Switzer was working "a little farther" than Leeswood, probably somewhere in Lancashire, but it is not known where or what this work might have been.

The last garden layout with which Switzer is known to have been connected is Wilton from 1738 to 1745 where it has already been suggested that he simplified the DeCaus layout for the 8th Earl of Pembroke. The work for Henry Herbert (1693-1750) 9th Earl of Pembroke in extending the garden and making it a kind of landscape garden, comparable in many respects with the work of Lancelot Brown later in the century, has been the subject of some speculation with Pembroke (by himself or under the influence of William Kent) being attributed with the design. 213 However, Switzer is the only garden designer to appear in Pembroke's Housebook, 214 admittedly only as a seedsman, and the style of the work also points to Switzer as designer. 215
The 1740s are perhaps the most interesting years in the development of garden design, in relation to Switzer they certainly are, for his theory of rural and extensive gardening and the abstraction of formal elements in his style together form what might be called on the evidence of Wilton proto-landscape gardening. The time of transition was very brief, however, and it is unfortunate that no other examples are known from this period. It is impossible on present evidence to say whether Switzer would have developed purely in style towards the negligent naturalism apparent in some of Kent's work or towards the more precise and abstract naturalism of Brown. However, it can be shown that an unbroken, stylistically and theoretically logical, and unrevolutionary development from the baroque designs of London and Wise to the beginnings of landscape gardening is to be seen in Switzer's work.

In the last years of his life Switzer continued his trade as a seedsman, and his prosperity between 1739 and his death increased, his turnover rising from about £400 by degrees to some £1,200 in 1743 to level off at about £500 in 1745. Switzer made his will on 9 March 1745 and in April and May made four withdrawals from his bank, finally on 28 May balancing it. Switzer died on 8 June 1745, "well known for his treatises on agriculture and husbandry". He was buried in St. Margaret's, Westminster on the 13th and was succeeded by his son, Elizabeth Switzer apparently having died before him.

Although it has proved possible, by a bare recital of the facts
of Switzer's life and the judgements attendant upon them, to correct
and somewhat extend Sir Ernest Clarke's account in the Dictionary
of National Biography, the materials for a biography are not
present and he largely remains a shadowy figure, but as to his
qualities and achievement as a theoretician and gardener the case
is rather more fortunate and after a brief account of the
development of garden design before his time, an assessment of this
forms the following chapters.
The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation in 1715 and its expansion as Ichnographia Rustica three years later constitutes the first theoretical work on garden and landscape design. John James' translation of d'Argenville's Theorie et Practique du Jardinage had appeared in 1712 but the difference between it and Switzer's work is fundamental. Briefly d'Argenville presented a series of ideal solutions in plan form and then described by what methods an unusual or awkward site might be most effectively brought into line. Switzer on the other hand presented an "ideal" so ordinary, some might say natural, as to be independent of form, particular site or circumstances.

Garden design as conceived by d'Argenville began in the 16th century as extensions to great architectural works such as Bramante's Cortile del Belvidere, Raphael's Villa Madama or Giulio's Palazzo del Tè. By mid century great gardens were being formed, sufficiently complex and extensive to generate forms and compositions peculiar to themselves, but the theory which informed these works was a part of architectural theory and derived from Alberti or Filarete and continued the medieaval desire for manifest orderliness. However, it was the example of Villa d'Este, or Villa Aldobrandini, not the theory behind them that influenced subsequent work.

The Villa d'Este at Tivoli (from c 1550) despite the interest of its incidents is basically still an ancient or medieaval conception; it is a rectangle bounded by walls, but a very large
rectangle made up of similar elements added together. Because of
its size the centre line has become axial, though it is still one,
more or less, among equals. At the Villa Lante, Bagnaia, c 1580
and the Villa Aldobrandini, Frascati, 1598, the axial quality
hinted at in earlier gardens was the ruling principle of design.
The Villa Lante still has a walled garden, but it is the culminat-
ing incident in the composition. The garden starts at a cascade
house in the woodland above the villa and proceeds along the axis
to progressively more complex and architectural forms and spaces.
The Aldobrandini garden begins at a grotesque cascade (illustrated
in Switzer’s Hydrostaticks and of a type seen at Belton and Exton
in the 1730’s) and proceeds similarly to the highly formal terraces
by the villa. In both these gardens the effect of the design is
dependent on the proximity of artificial and natural elements and
their contrast. 2 This quality d id not become part of a theory of
garden design until the early 18th century.

Contemporary French work, such as Verneuil, 1558 or Charleval
(begun c 1580) were more like the Villa d’Este though the arrange-
ment of rectangular spaces was more coherent and complex. French
designers also held the view that gardens were an extension of
architecture, and largely no doubt because of the more ample land
forms of metropolitan parts of France they developed a garden design
based on regular spaces and "solids", directly linked to building
design, to a very high degree, e.g. St. Germain en Laye (temp
Henry IV) or a half century later LeNostre’s Vaux-le-Vicomte
(c 1650-60).
A similar desire to elaborate the grounds and house at the same time and according to the same theory is evident from Robert Smythson's Wollaton Hall in Nottingham (1580-88). The great cubic house was to be at the centre, and above, the surrounding environment, also laid out as a square and further sub-divided into eight equal squares of gardens and courts. There is no evidence that this design was proceeded with but a later design by John Smythson shows the idea carried further. There is no indication how this orchard was related compositionally to the house but its form derives from it. The area is a 2:1 rectangle, the corners of which break forward into pavilions as does Wollaton. The centre is laid out as a square with diagonal walks; there is a smaller square set within this at 45 degrees and finally a yet smaller square in which a double mount is designed on the same plan as the house. The orchard (the plan of planting is not indicated) would have occupied the spaces between the generating and enclosing lines.

As in much else there was a passion for number and device in late 16th and early 17th century British garden design as can be seen in other drawings of the Smythsons. These are related in form and doubtless in method of design to fanciful house plans and decorative designs. But it was very rare for the grounds to be so extensive as to allow large scale composition of elements. Gardens were still basically rectangular enclosures and although there might be several of these, their diversification extended only to pattern or perhaps changes of level.
The most extensive garden in the early 17th century in Britain was Wilton laid out in the 1630's by Isaac de Caus. The composition within a large flat rectangle is symmetrical about a broad walk. In the first division are parterres de broderie (in strap-work pattern), in the second low wilderesses and in the third parterres d'anglais. The sides were walled and the shorter ends enclosed by the house and the terrace walk and grotto building. Wilton demonstrates garden design by the addition of similar elements, though there is a sense of breadth and coherence which would have been unusual. Beyond the pattern of the parterre and woods there was little evidence of concern for device. However, the waterworks were complicated and intricate and would have gone some way to detract from the simplicity of the layout.

By the mid 17th century there was in Britain an acceptable vocabulary for garden design and, borrowed from architecture, a grammar, and on the whole gardens were laid out until the beginning of the 18th century within this framework. But within this 'theory' it was possible to proceed in two very different directions, either towards simplicity and grandeur or towards elaboration and attention to detail, and these tendencies, without ever becoming absolute distinctions, were appreciated in the late 17th and early 18th centuries as typical of French or Dutch designs.

The Dutch style was initially the stronger. There was, of course, political alliance with Holland against France, and a Dutch King on the British throne whose encouragement of gardening
naturally reflected Dutch attitudes and practice. But there was a deeper and more fundamental cause in that gardens of the Dutch style did not require design in Switzerland's sense: it was not necessary to look forward and plan. Their quality, and appeal, derived rather from their finishing — flowers, topiary, fountains, etc. And with this emphasis on detail it would have been positively undesirable to have had the various parts of a layout visually connected and blending into each other. Rather a series of discreet parts was required in which compositions of elements was important only where one enclosure led to another. The typical 17th century method of design by addition was ideally suited to gardening of this sort, and it also, of course, permitted extension without revision of the whole layout. The gardens recorded by Celia Fiennes were largely of this type, or, perhaps more important, she recorded their furniture not their design.

The other tendency of 17th century theory was developed and worked out in France, largely by Andre LeNôtre under the encouragement of Louis XIV. The layouts were basically the same as Villa d'Este, Charleval or Wilton and derived from the rectangular enclosure. The great difference was size. This had two effects: the enclosing walls disappeared or became visually meaningless and the necessity for variety within the rectangular system became critical. At Vaux-le-Vicomte the garden is enclosed by large plantations of forest trees, and variety is gained by the predominate parterre en broderie being flanked by secondary, and not quite symmetrical parterres of simpler design. The second stage, effectively under-
another 'garden', is linked axially and visually to the first and the whole composition is finished by an architectural theatre on rising ground. Divisions are emphasized by large pieces of placid water. Water is also used as integral parts of the parterres and in the northwest section becomes the primary material of the parterre. Though axial Vaux-le-Vicomte is finite whereas at Versailles the garden is visually extended along its axis by the great canal. Their structure is similar, however. Both have secondary gardens facing the minor fronts and plantations of forest trees framing the principal two stage garden. However, at Versailles the second stage is more important and the enclosing woodlands are themselves part of the garden. The whole of the Petit Parc is a rectangular (4:3) garden but its enormous size is visually reduced by the use of woodland gardens to enclose and direct the view from the parterres.

Although LeNostre greatly increased the size of gardens, and solved the problems arising from that, he did not alter the composition or the 'theory' of garden design. But by enlarging the scope of garden design he necessarily simplified it, for although the furnishings at Versailles were costly and finely made they were secondary to the structure of the garden which was manifest by land (sloped or terraced), forest trees, sheets of water, and sky. Visual and geometrical correspondence of the parts of gardens was a characteristic of French designers from duCerceau, senior, but LeNostre seems to have been the first to use diagonal vistas to this purpose. From the end of the second stage parterre diagonals cut
through the Petit Parc (to the south west to its edge; to the south east only through one division) linking the centre of the wooded division and the intersections of principal walks. At the end of the Petit Parc they fan out into the hunting parks beyond, and in front of the palace is the famous goose-foot.

Insofar as there was a theory of garden design in late 17th century Britain it was that gardens should take their form from architecture, and manifest the same concern for orderliness, but of more interest to designers and their clients was the catalogue of forms and compositions based on practice, and the fashionable way of assembling these. Until James' translation these were transmitted largely in a visual form through drawings and prints.

Besides recourse to collections of plates and drawings the ideal garden design was modified by foreign designers. Isaac deCaus was only first generation English and had received his training presumably from his kinsman Solomon de Caus, born in Dieppe. From the middle of the century three members of the Mollet family were working in England, notably at St. James' Park. Their father, Claude, had trained LeNostre father and son at the Tuileries and Claude and his father had laid out Anet in 1582 under the direction of DuPefat, just returned from Italy. Thus a direct link between the parliamentary and royal gardens of England and the great works of the previous hundred years was established. Unfortunately their achievement at St. James made such a connection meaningless; making allowance for the confined and awkward
site there was very little at St. James to recall Villa d'Este, Anet or the Tuilleries. In 1662 Charles II is said to have invited LeNostre to England and, at least, a design for the Queen's House gardens at Greenwich resulted. This does not seem to have been completely carried out but there are remains of earth terraces in Greenwich park which probably derive from this design.

Kensington Palace was laid out for William and Mary and they gave a Dutch stamp to Hampton Court.

"The Great Garden, that Garden next to the River, called now the Privy Garden, and Wilderness, and Kitchen-Gardens, were made with great dispatch; the only fault was, the Pleasure-Gardens being stuffed too thick with Box, a fashion brought over out of Holland by the Dutch Gardeners, who used it to a fault, especially in England."

Whether this is merely part of Switzer's anti-Dutch campaign or not is unclear, but it is evidence that the design of Hampton Court cannot surely be attributed to one man. The layout does suggest that a number of not altogether sympathetic designers were involved, among them Wren, Wise, the "Dutch gardeners" and Marot. It also illustrates Switzer's conception of the "Dutch Taste" as opposed to "La Grand Manier". The Great Garden, Privy Garden and Wilderness have no correspondence with each other though they meet at the principal front of the palace, and the avenue in Bushey Park does not lead to the Palace but is blocked by the wilderness.

The notions about garden design in late 17th century Britain
were somewhat complex and various but the garden designers George London, Henry Wise, Christopher Wren, William Talman, Alexander Edward, Sir William Bruce and the Earl of Mar, perhaps because they were designers instead of horticulturists, florists or botanists, obviously favoured the grand manner or "Gusto Grande". The most productive and influential of these designers were London and Wise and according to Switzer they should have set down a theory of garden design.  

"had their Leisure been equal to their Experience, the World might from them have reasonably expected the completest System of Gardening that any Age or Country has produced. To them we owe many of those valuable Precepts in Gardening now in use..."

As they did not write on garden design some of these valuable precepts may be found in their layouts; Longleat, Wiltshire where each partner "abode everyone his Month, and in the Intervals attended their own Business", Melbourne Hall, Derbyshire, and Wanstead, Essex.

Longleat was begun in the 1680's and its layout certainly determined before the end of the 17th century but the gardens (along with the regular house) merited inclusion in Colen Campbell's Vitruvius Britannicus. The garden was a walled rectangle (proportion 8:5) and beyond this a slightly larger grove on rising ground. There were two principal lines, the axis and perpendicular to this a discontinuous canal. The canal was unusually close to the house and bisected the large parterre. The parterre was surrounded by a broad terrace walk planted with conical yews. The
rest of the garden area was subdivided, regularly but not always symmetrically and the axial line was extended into the grove and there terminated by a hexagonal mount on which stood an ornamental building. The scheme is typical and although there are features soon to be criticised as little and mean - the "greens" (i.e. figured evergreen shrubs) and the "sett wilderness" (i.e. set out and therefore to a degree regular) the general impression is of extensiveness and amplitude. Not only does the axis lead into the wood, but the canal is formed into three rectangular ponds, joined by cascades, in the park and although the enclosure is walled the park side is formed into a terrace walk (separated from the park by iron palisade) and the outside of the walls are used for growing fruit. There are clairvoyées at the ends of subsidiary cross walks. Another feature which mitigates the standard layout is the crossing of canal and axial line in the typical garden "centre" which has the effect of keeping path and vista distinct (an axiom of landscape garden theory after mid century) and this variation further enhanced by placing the second series of parterres so that these were approached from the terrace walk surrounding the principal parterre by walks parallel to the main axis. The first division is visually asymmetrical because of the wall separating kitchen garden from parterre; the first division at Vaux-le-Vicomte is similarly asymmetrical.

Melbourne Hall, though rather smaller and based on an existing mid 17th century layout, illustrates the same tendency towards simplification, in this case by Wise. Melbourne consisted of three
descending sections joined by an axial line the parterre (or flower garden) next to the terrace, then the kitchen garden, and finally an orchard. Work had been going on in the late 17th century within this framework. A garden house was built in the cross-axis of the flower garden, and this had been stuffed with flowers in the typically "Dutch" way, 2000 crocuses, 1000 tulips etc., supplied from Brompton Park. The owner seems to have changed the direction of his taste about 1700 and has asked Wise for a design "to suit with Versailles". He could not have hoped to match Versailles in extent and as his garden was already regularly formed his desire must have been for simplification and a measure of grandeur. Wise achieved this without great difficulty by removing the walls around the flower garden and resiting the kitchen garden. He was thus left with a rectangular area (proportion 7:4) which he subdivided into two series of parterres. The principal parterre was figured, but quite simply, whereas the second pair were plain grass decorated with lead statues. There are still "greens" lining the walks and slope but the relative emptiness is remarkable. At the bottom of the parterres a large basin replaced the orchard. This was of complex shape - a rectangle enlarged by a double apse at the east end. The focus of the basin and the axis was a small wrought iron building. The lower section of the garden was surrounded by a belt of woodland which was hedged to the interior. A large area south of the basin and grass parterres took the place of the typical grove, irregularly placed here because of the situation of the ground. This was laid out about two principal
hedged lines with cabinets of various shape. The southern section contained plots of arable land instead of woodland and there was a serpentine subsidiary walk near the basin, but whether these features, typical of Switzer, were part of the 1700 design is not altogether certain.

Wanstead, Essex was laid out by London from 1706 and was according to Switzer in some respects a better design than Blenheim and though some of the design may perhaps have been due to Switzer it shows London's maturity. A great avenue lead eastwards from Waltham Forest through a park criss-crossed by regular lines of trees generated from rounds. Just before the house there were two large basins. The garden (on the east side) was again, a rectangular space (proportion roughly 2:1) and had a broad canal as its long axis. This was terminated in an octagonal basin and beyond this was a large circular parade. To either side of the canal were parterres, again in two divisions: low figured parterres next to the house, and wildernesses of different design in the second division. To the south of the principal garden was a nursery ground, kitchen garden and rectangular ponds and to the north there was a wilderness, practically another pleasure garden. This was somewhat larger than the principal garden but was also a rectangle of the same proportion. This curious juxtaposition of what seems like two independent gardens is made more mysterious by the double terrace walk with a row of conical greens down the centre as if to mark the boundary. The second garden was arranged about an axis
which runs parallel to that of the main garden. At the west end
was a semi circular walk which became side walks down the south and
north sides. There was a large circular cabinet at the east end
and opposite it at the west end was a cabinet of similar size but
more complex shape. There were smaller cabinets and walks within
the surrounding woodlands. This was one of the few parts of
Wanstead to survive the remaking of the gardens after the building
of Campbell's new house.

In these gardens of London and Wise it is plain that they
accepted the grandeur and expansiveness characteristic of French
garden design from the late 16th century. Despite their walls,
which in any case seldom impinged, they are outward looking
designs, and although their designs contain "Clipped Plants, Flowers,
and other trifling Decorations..." their best works show the
ideal

"that every thing appears tall, stately, and bold, and
contrary to that narrow and mean-spiritedness with
which designs generally abound".

It was this characteristic that Switzer was to take from them and
by which they were known in the early 18th century.
At the beginning of Switzer's career the designers and some clients had accepted the baroque conception of the standard theory of garden design. Over the next fifteen years it was to become accepted by a larger proportion of literate society, largely through the efforts of the essayists, the publication of d'Argenville's *Theorie* in English translation and finally Switzer's *Nobleman*, *Gentleman*, and *Gardener's Recreation*.

The literary pre-history of landscape gardening has been treated fairly extensively already in modern times. These writers have accepted the late 18th century conception that landscape gardening had its theoretical basis in a distaste for formality and have based their work on Horace Walpole's text,

"At that moment appeared Kent, painter enough to taste the charms of landscape, bold and opinionative enough to dare and to dictate, and born with a genius to strike out a great system from the twilight of imperfect essays."

There is another view, however, and another reading of the "imperfect essays", which goes some way towards clarifying the hitherto mysterious contradictions of early 18th century writers on garden design.

It is the purpose of this chapter to suggest the other view. It will be instructive, though out of chronological sequence to consider Alexander Pope's *Guardian* essay as it is the least complex and most directly relevant to garden design. Pope in his imagination, has taken a friend to see his place in the country a little worried that its rusticity would displease "a man of his Polite
Taste, particularly in Architecture and Gardening but was pleasantly surprised to learn that this quality was esteemed and was "wanting in the most celebrated seats...of the Nation". This was to be regretted for

"There is certainly something in the amiable Simplicity of unadorned Nature, that spreads over the Mind a more noble sort of Tranquility, and a loftier Sensation of Pleasure, than can be raised from the nicer Scenes of Art." This passage can be taken to signify Pope's distaste for formality, his distaste for the "...Baroque attitude of forcing nature into shapes of human conception". But is this what he intended to convey?

He goes on to argue that "this was the Taste of the Ancients in their gardens as we may discover from the Descriptions are extant of them". He does not adduce the sacred groves or academies which may have had some semblance to landscape gardens, but rather he inserts Homer's description of the garden of Alcinous.

"Four acres was th' allotted space of ground, Fenced with a green enclosure all around ... Here order'd Vines in equal ranks appear ... Beds of various herbs, for ever green, The beauteous order terminate the scene".

Which to him had that "amiable simplicity of unadorned nature" and contained "the justest Rules and Provisions which can go towards composing the best Gardens". What Alcinous' garden lacked, what was common in the "most celebrated seats of the nation" were the "nicer scenes of art" by which Pope did not mean straight lines,
enclosure, or fountains, but rather the disinclination to allow plants to simply be fruitful or provide shade.

"How contrary to this Simplicity is the modern Practice of Gardening; we seem to make it our Study to recede from Nature, not only in the various Tonsure of Greens into the most regular and form Shapes, but even in monstrous Attempts beyond the reach of Art itself: We run into Sculpture, and are yet better pleased to have our Trees in the most awkward Figures of Men and Animals, than in the most regular of their own."11

Though clipped greens may have been the most ridiculous excess of the late 17th and early 18th century gardens his censure was more general,

"People of the common Level of Understanding are principally delighted with the little Niceties and Fantastical Operations of Art, and constantly think the finest which is least Natural."12

Far from censuring the heroic designs of London and Wise or LeNostre, Pope's attack here is directed at the "Dutch Taste" for intricacy and elaboration and "trivial ornaments".13

Pope's aim in the Guardian essay was limited to a fairly precise range of excesses and having discovered the ridiculous elements of contemporary gardens the paper was ended with an ironic recital of the greens, in various stages, to be had for furnishing "Gardens adjacent to this great City...in order to distinguish those place(s) from the meer barbarous Countries of gross Nature".14

Of more complexity and substance were the writings of Shaftesbury and Addison. Shaftesbury's influence and effect was not discernable until the 20's but he was read throughout the century
both in Britain and abroad; Addison's effect was immediate as well as lasting. Whether Switzer read Shaftesbury is unclear; he did not quote from his works. Shaftesbury did not write about garden design and seems to have been little interested in the production of the "Virtuoso Tribe" though he referred often to the rules of art in trying to make his points clear. According to Shaftesbury there were three degrees of beauty, based on the act of design:

- the beauty of God which includes all beauties;
- the beauty of things made by God, nature and human beings;
- and the beauty of things made by man (which include his own actions).

"Thus Architecture, Musick, and all which is of human invention resolves itself into this last order." In this context Shaftesbury allows Philocles his well known hymn to nature

"I shall no longer resist the Passion growing in me for Things of a natural Kind; where neither Art, nor the Conceit or Caprice of Man has spoil'd their Genuine Order, by breaking in upon that primitive State. Even the rude Rocks, the mossy Caverns, the irregular unwrought Grottos, and broken Falls of water, with all the horrid graces of the Wilderness itself, as representing Nature more, will be the more engaging, and appear with a Magnificence beyond the formal Mockery of Princely Gardens..."

Theocles, having got Philocles thus far pushes him on.

"No wonder, reply'd he, if we are at a loss, when we pursue the Shadow for the Substance...whatever in Nature is beautiful or charming, is only the faint Shadow of that First Beauty...how can the rational mind rest here, or be satisf'y'd with the absurd Enjoyment which reaches the sense alone?"

Thus, at length, the whole conception is unfolded. In Shaftesbury's scheme of things princely gardens are necessarily inferior to nature
as having been made by an inferior "beautifyer". Their form and composition are beside the point. There is not a hint that any of the inferior sorts of beauty should be despised. Shaftesbury's concern after all was not aesthetic (though his ideas formed the basis of a later aesthetic system) but understanding so that he could become "in truth The Architect of his own Life and Fortune: by laying within himself the lasting and sure foundations of Order, Peace and Concord".20

If Shaftesbury did not have as an intention the reformation of a particular art is there anything in the Characteristics which would have led an intelligent reader to modify his appreciation of garden design, as Switzer did from Pope's Essay on Criticism? Obviously not directly, for all his enthusiastic imagery, but Shaftesbury did provide a rational framework for the extension of garden design beyond the elaborate and fantastical operations of art. Designers of all kinds had for long considered that they were following nature and this was particularly so in the early 18th century but they did not always share a precise conception of what nature was. According to Shaftesbury it was a divine work of art, and the designing of gardens, like the practise of other arts, though inferior, was an activity of the same kind. If nature is conceived as a work of art, then it can be accepted as it stands and inspiration can be drawn even from its apparently less agreeable aspects. But the rational mind, least of all the mind of the designer, could not be "satisfy'd with the absurd enjoyment which
reaches the sense alone" so the garden designer must bring out the best in nature, strive after the substance beyond the shadow. To invert Professor Willey's phrase "It is not only the grandeur, wildness and terror of nature which proclaim it divine origin, but also its order and symmetry". These two linked ideas separate the theorists and designers of Switzer's generation from those of the later 18th and early 19th centuries.

The Spectator papers of Joseph Addison (1672-1719) on the "Pleasure of the Imagination" fall somewhere between Pope's reforming essay and Shaftesbury's philosophical soliloquies and dialogues. Addison's own interests in garden design seem to have been general but his occasional remarks, and his imagery are instructive in establishing his somewhat advanced taste in the period immediately preceding Switzer's first book. And unlike Shaftesbury and Pope in this regard Addison had an immediate and a long term effect on thought about garden design, as much else, not only on Switzer, who quoted from these papers extensively, but on the literate part of society generally.

There are remarks about garden design scattered throughout these essays but the latter half of no. 414 and the second thoughts of no. 477 deal specifically with this subject. The second half of the penultimate paragraph of no. 414 is often quoted but the first half is equally instructive.
"we have observed, that there is generally in Nature something more Grand and August, than what we meet with in the Curiosities of Art. When, therefore, we see this imitated in any measure, it gives us a nobler and more exalted kind of Pleasure than what we receive from the nicer and more accurate Productions of Art. On this Account our English Gardens are not so entertaining to the Fancy as those in France and Italy, where we see a large Extent of Ground covered over with an agreeable mixture of Garden and Forest, which represent everywhere an artificial Rudeness, much more charming than that Neatness and Elegancy which we meet with in those of our own Country..."  

In other words Versailles or Villa d'Este are preferrable to Hampton Court not because they were less formal but because they were not "mean-spirited". The mixture of garden and forest should in Addison's opinion be practised in England but, "It might, indeed, be of ill Consequence to the Publick, as well as unprofitable to private Persons, to alienate so much Ground from Pasturage, and the Plow..."  

To get around this difficulty Addison suggested that a whole estate be formed into "a kind of garden by frequent plantations". A "Man might make a pretty Landskip of his own possessions".  

In the last paragraph of no. 414 he quotes Sir William Temple's passage about Chinese garden design and touches for the first time on the layout of gardens rather than their character. The Chinese "laugh at the Plantations of our Europeans, which are laid out by the Rule and Line; because, they say, any one may place Trees in equal Rows and uniform Figures".  

Addison may be recommending departure from formality in this quotation but it is more likely that he, like Temple, is speaking (by
way of the Chinese) against "commonly or easily observed" formality such as plantations in quincunx which manifests its orderliness at first view instead of the "particular Beauty of a Plantation that... strikes the Imagination at first Sight, without discovering what it is that has so agreeable an Effect". In any case he does not pursue this argument. "Our British Gardeners, on the contrary, instead of humouring Nature, love to deviate from it as much as possible." This deviation is, specifically, topiary work where "we see the Marks of the Scissors upon every Plant and Bush". The reason for this was that the "great modellers of gardens" had evergreens and Moveable Plants in stock so that it was "very natural for them to tear up all the Beautiful Plantations of Fruit Trees, and contrive a Plan that may most turn to their own Profit".

Two of these great modellers of gardens doubtless objected to this aspersion on their professional conduct, and if for no other reason than that the Spectator and London and Wise shared the same publisher (and one of their works was often advertised in the Spectator) Addison published in no.477 what seems intended as an apology. Although the sting of the last sentence of no.414 is removed by the specific compliment to London and Wise, and the proposal that there might be winter-gardens composed entirely of evergreens Addison did not depart from his more general strictures. Rather he classified garden design by comparison to the various styles of verse, "Makers of Parterres and Flower Gardens are Epigrammists and Sonneteers". Next, in order of complexity and
sublimity were the romance writers, "Contrivers of Bowers and Grottos, Treillages and Cascades...". Addison had described a romantic garden in no. 37 in his essay about the reading habits of women, specifically Leonora. The original of Leonora was supposed to be Miss Margaret Sheppard, later Mrs. Percy, daughter of Sir Fleetwood Sheppard who led a most mournful life, being always thwarted as happiness seemed near; in other words a typical romantic character. If there is any truth in this it reinforces the impression of Addison's text that the garden was "a feat of warm fancy".

"As her Reading has lain very much among Romances, it has given her a very particular Turn of thinking, and discovers itself even in her House, her Garden, her Furniture. Sir Roger has entertained me an Hour together with a Description of her Country-Seat, which is Situated in a kind of Wilderness, about an Hundred Miles distant from London and looks like a little Enchanted Palace. The Rocks about her are shaped into Artificial Grottoes covered with Wood-Bines and Jessamines. The Woods are cut into shady Walks, twisted into Bowers, and filled with Cages of Turtles. The Springs are made to run among Pebbles, and by that means taught to Murmur very agreeably. They are likewise collected into a Beautiful Lake, that is Inhabited by a couple of Swans, and empties itself by a little Rivulet which runs through a Green Meadow, and is known in the Family by the name of The Purling Stream..."

How far this description was intended as a recommendation to imitate is clear from its context but it is equally clear that the scene appealed to Addison and doubtless also to many readers. Gardens, or parts of gardens of this kind had already been made though their character was reckoned to be more serious and sublime than enchanted.
"Wise and London are our heriock poets" whereas "my compositions in gardening are altogether after the Pindarick Manner".

This was said to be

"several Acres about my House...a Confusion of Kitchen and Parterre, Orchard and Flower-Garden, which lie so mixt and interwoven with one another, that if a Foreigner who had seen nothing of our Country should be convey'd into my Garden at his first landing, he would look upon it as a natural Wilderness, and one of the uncultivated Parts of our Country." 45

Addison goes on to describe his early 18th century version of the garden of Alcinous with the emphasis always on the natural and common as preferable to the artificial and curious. There were flowers planted promiscuously in quarters, which is to say regular divisions, grouped only as to season of bloom. These might have been found "under a common Hedge, in a Field, or in a Meadow". This was preferrable to "the tender Plants of Foreign Countries kept alive by artificial Heats, or withering in an Air and Soil that are not adapted to them". 47

Elsewhere Addison had elaborated the distinction he drew between Pendarick and Heroick. 43 These were genius of two classes, the first untutored such as Pindar, the second, formed by rules, such as Virgil or Milton. He was careful to point out that this was not invidious, "not as I think them inferior to the first, but only for distinctions sake as they are of a different kind". This classification of genius was described with garden imagery,

"In the first it is like a rich Soil in a happy Climate, that produces a whole Wilderness of noble Plants rising in a thousand beautiful Landskips without any certain Order or Regularity. On the other it is the same
"...Soil under the same happy Climate, that has been laid out in Walks and Parterres, and cut into Shape and Beauty by the Skill of the Gardener." 49

Despite his protestation as to their equal merit it is clear which form Addison preferred. But the heroic would have been closer to Addison's conception of nature as being more "august and magnificent".

"If we consider the Works of Nature and Art, as they are qualified to entertain the Imagination, we shall find the last very defective, in Comparison of the former...There is something more bold and masterly in the rough careless Strokes of Nature, than in the nice Touches and Embellishments of Art. The Beauties of the most stately Garden or Palace lie in a narrow Compass, the Imagination immediately runs them over, and requires something else to gratifie her, but, in the wide Fields of Nature, the Sight wanders up and down without Confinement, and is fed with an infinite variety of Images...But tho' there are several of these wild Scenes, that are more delightful than any artificial Shows; yet we find the Works of Nature still more pleasant, the more they resemble those of Art." 50

And similarly works of art please more as they more closely resemble nature. Addison did not consider that nature was perfect and his recommendation to poets in no. 418 could apply equally to garden designers.

"But because the Mind of Man requires something more perfect in Matter, than what it finds there, and can never meet with any Sight in Nature which sufficiently answers its highest Ideas of Pleasantness, or, in other Words, because the Imagination can fancy to it self Things more Great, Strange, or Beautiful, than the Eye ever saw, and is still sensible of some Defect in what it has seen; on this account it is the part of a Poet to humour the Imagination in its own Notions, by mending and perfecting Nature where he describes a Reality, and by adding greater Beauties than are put together in Nature, where he describes a Fiction." 53

And the way towards perfecting both art and nature did not lie in "the nice Touches and Embellishments" or "the Neatness and Elegancy"
of "our English gardens" but rather with the "agreeable mixture of Garden and Forest" and "artificial Rudeness" of those of France and Italy. Like architecture garden design should strive for "Greatness of Manner" instead of that which is "poor and trifling".

If this reading of the "theory" of garden design in the early 18th century as evidenced by Pope, Shaftesbury and Addison be correct then it will no longer seem "incongruous" that Addison was one of the subscribers to John James' (c 1672-1746) translation of A.J. Dezallier d'Argenville's *Theorie et Practique du Jardinage*. D'Argenville (1680-1765) had studied architecture with LeBlond, who in turn had worked with LeNostre and had laid out the Peterhof gardens in St. Petersburg. He had therefore a link with the authors of the greatest gardens of the time and with

"The great love I always had for Agriculture and Gardening, the Abode I made at Paris and Versailles whose Neighbouring Parts contain so many Wonders of the Nature; the Satisfaction I found in surveying all those Beauties, and the Pains I have taken in planting several fine Gardens..."

he was particularly well suited to write the theory of garden design in the grand manner. The need for such a work is evidenced by its number of editions: four in Paris, three in The Hague, and three in London; 1712, 1728 and 1743 and as Mr. Hadfield has pointed out the section on design in Philip Miller's *Gardener's Dictionary* is taken from James' translation.

D'Argenville's *Theorie* had appeared in 1709 and James likely conceived the idea of translating it into English almost immediately
for the "unexpected delay this book has met with, has justly given
offence".

As has been mentioned before d'Argenville's Theorie was a presentation of an ideal based on Versailles and other works of Andre
LeNostre. Necessarily it would have nothing theoretically new in it, but as an antidote to the prevailing "Dutch Taste" in Britain its logical exposition of the distribution and parts of an ideal French garden was of great value. It begins with the choice of situation and proceeds systematically through the elements of a standard design to the "ornaments of use in the decoration and embellishment of gardens". The second half deals with practice and, obviously, provides methods for best realizing a garden in the grand manner.

The advertisement makes clear that d'Argenville is writing of something never before attempted, that is, the best ways of laying out pleasure gardens,

"I have read a great many Latin, Italian, French and Spanish Authors on the Subject of Gardening; the Reading of whom, tho' good in itself, has, however, been of no great Service to me in this case."65

because they had written of

"the pruning of Fruit-Trees; of the Culture of Kitchen-Gardens; of Botanicks, and the Nature of Simples; of Flower-Gardens, Orange-Trees, &c. Others of Tillage, and Manuring of Ground; of the Duty of a good Householder, Farmer, and Husbandman, of the Vineyard and Vintage; of Fishing and Hunting, of Cookery, and making all Sorts of Sweetmeats; in all which may be seen the Difference between this Work and theirs."66
If he had added English writers to those he named he would not have been very far wrong.

"These Men conceit, that because they can prune a Fruit-Tree, and make a Kitchen-Bed, they are perfectly skill'd too in what relates to Pleasure-Gardens, whose Disposition and Culture are very different." 67

Having established that he is writing for "Persons of greater and more elevated Minds" 68 d'Argenville began with the choice of situation, which in most particulars, can be summed up as advice to avoid extremes, not too high, not too low, not too much water, nor too little, etc. But since his ideal garden was a rectangular platform a site was best which sloped imperceptively or lay "on the plain, or flat" 69 insofar as this was commensurate with a prospect.

"This, indeed, is not absolutely necessary...but is yet one of the most agreeable...For my own part, I esteem nothing more diverting and agreeable in a Garden, than a fine View, and the Prospect of a noble Country. The Pleasure of seeing, from the End of a Walk, or off a Terrace, for four or five Leagues round, a vast Number of Villages, Woods, Rivers, Hills and Meadows, with a thousand other Varieties that make a beautiful Landskip, exceeds all that I can possibly say of it; a Sight of these Things being the only Means to form a just Idea of their Beauty." 70

The opening paragraphs of the chapter on general distribution demonstrate that d'Argenville, and presumably his translator and British readers, thought that gardens of this sort gained in value the more they reflected "the natural Advantages and Defects of the Place; to make use of the one, and to reduce the other." 71 Variety was equally important for "Gardens that afford the greatest variety, are the most valuable and magnificent." 72 The conception of these
qualities and how they were best to be arrived at in garden design had significantly changed by the middle of the century but the terms used to describe them had not.

The first plate shows the ideal flat site laid out as a rectangular (proportion 5:3) platform garden and demonstrates, in general, d'Argenville's ideal. The house is placed towards the north end with the long axis of the garden passing through its centre. To east and west of the house and kitchen and fruit gardens, base-courts and small secondary pleasure gardens. A broad walk separates the house from the parterre en broderie (depending on the site the parterre might be extended to form several stages, as at Vaux-le-Vicomte, and if so the parterre en broderie was to be followed by a parterre de compartiment and finally a parterre à l'Anglaise that is, plain grass: always in a descending order of complexity). Lateral composition of the parterres would follow the same order, in this case parterres de compartiment flank the parterres en broderie. The parterre was best finished by a semicircular space enclosing a circular basin and beyond this were the groves. A goose foot connected the end of the parterre with these outlying parts. Again, depending on the site, the groves could be extended, but like the parterres they should be more complex near the house becoming simpler the further away they were. In plate one there are two divisions of groves separated by a transverse canal. There were to be double cross walks between and through the centres of the major divisions, terminated either by a wall (or
perhaps a seat or arbour) or by a "Claire-Voie, or an Ah, Ah, with
a dry ditch at the foot of it" depending upon whether the view
was agreeable or otherwise. The central walk would be terminated
similarly, though it would have been reckoned a great fault if
this line had to be stopped by a wall. In plate one the central
walk is terminated by a "low Terrace-Wall, from whence you have a
view of the country round about", with a moat beyond. "A termin-
ation of this kind is certainly the most magnificent that can be". The
sides of the garden were enclosed by a wall but on the inside
was "a thin Gut of Wood, as well to hide it, as to make the Garden
appear bigger".

There were three other plates illustrating the general types
of situation to be met with. Plate two shows how to best dispose
a sloping site and plate three illustrates a site sloping from side
to side. Plate four showed two small gardens, one sloped, the
other flat. For the second edition James added other designs
because he had received complaints that most sites were of irregular
shape. These designs used the same elements and tried always to
disguise the irregularity of the site. But of more interest with
regard to British gardens of the early 13th century was d'Argenville's
general advice,

"in the business of Designs, you should studiously avoid
the Manner that is mean and pitiful, and always aim at
that which is great and noble, not making little Cabinets
and Mazes, Basons like Bowl-dishes, and Alleys so narrow
that two Persons can scarce go abreast in them. 'Twere
infinitely better to have but two or three Things somewhat
large, than a dozen small ones, which are no more than
very Trifles."
The search after grandeur in garden design, and its corollary the predisposition to look outwards and at least metaphorically include natural landscape is perhaps the most important factor in the context of Switzer's early years and the development of his thought on design. There are also a number of other factors which appear in his system in 1715. Though many of these are implicit in the early 18th century essays they are rarely stated. They were, however, necessary to complete Switzer's theory and although these factors overlap they may be considered under these heads: a growing fashion for retirement and agricultural improvement, a tendency for the nature and limits of garden design to expand, the role of the purse, irregularity and the interest in exotic gardens (China, ancient Greece and Rome), and changes in the conception of nature.

Bred

The ideal of a rural life and its associated rural pleasures in the 17th and early 18th centuries has been very extensively treated by Professor Rostvig. In the later half of the 17th century, the desirability of rural retirement is associated with the court party who, perhaps in reaction to the turmoil of Cromwell's revolution, preferred the Epicurean ideal that "Solitude, Contemplation, or a Country-life have more pleasure in them than publick Employment". Their emphasis was on "indolence of body and tranquility of mind". But by the early 18th century this emphasis had changed largely through the influence of Addison and other reformers of the country party. Rural retirement was then seen as more positive,
and in a very real sense had become, far from an escape from social
and moral duties, "publick Employment" of general benefit. Indol-
ence and tranquility were no longer the aims, rather moral and
intellectual and agricultural improvement. Instead of being in
a pleasant escape rural retirement had become a "prime moral duty". This new seriousness attracted noncomformist and middle class people
to the ideal of rural retirement, and the tories, too, had accepted
this significantly changed conception. By the second decade of
the 18th century, however, they might have voted, both tories and
whigs had become improvers, both of themselves and their estates.
As the century progressed the inclination to settle in the country
and to improve some part of it became increasingly fashionable
until in the early 19th century the term villa and the attitudes
associated with it gained its modern meaning.

The early 18th century attitude to retirement and improvement
is reflected in Addison's Spectator no. 583. Of rural amusements,

"I know of none more delightful in its self, and benef-
cial to the Publick, than that of PLANTING".

"There is indeed something truly magnificent in this kind
of Amusement. It gives a nobler Air to severl Parts of
Nature, it fills the Earth with a Variety of beautiful
Scenes, and has something in it like Creation..."

"But I do not only recommend this Art to Men of Estates
as a pleasing Amusement, but as it is a kind of Virtuous
Employment, and may therefore be inculcated by moral
Motives; particularly from the Love which we ought to
have for our Country, and the Regard which we ought to
bear to our Posterity..."33

Addison mentioned, as John Evelyn had done in his Sylva, that trees
were necessary for the navy and that therefore to plant them was a patriotic act, but there were much more basic reasons for retirement and improvement than keeping the navy afloat. To those whose wealth had been recently acquired it was a means of social advancement, to the religious or philosophical it had "something in it like creation" and to the educated it but was doing as the Romans had done in antiquity. But from whatever of the numerous sources the impetus came, rural retirement and improvement was an ideal shared by almost every body throughout the century.

And with the general acceptance of the value of retirement and improvement there necessarily came a change in the limits of garden design. The distinction between what was planted within the walls of a garden and what was planted in a park or field became less precise as the owners of estates became personally involved in improvement. This was not so as long as planting was the business of the steward or gardener. Lord Haddington reluctantly gave up "those turbulent pleasures" in favour of the more lasting pleasures of planting, and from his own account it does not appear that he distinguished between his improvements to his pleasure gardens and his improvements to his estate more generally.

Connected with the blurring of distinction between garden and outer plantations in the mind of the retired planter was cost. A choice between extra expenditure on fine plants or decorations in gardens of the "Dutch Taste" and the same money spent on woodlands
would be difficult to predict in the owner-planter of the early 18th century. D'Argenville's *Theorie* would have inclined him towards a finer and more elaborate pleasure garden.

"...such a garden, as I propose...shall do a Private Man more Credit, than the finest Fruit and Kitchen-Gardens in the World, which in truth, seem to argue, that their Master has more regard to his Profit, than to any other Consideration." 89

whereas a "regard to his profit" would urge the plantation of woodlands as a sound investment which besides bringing pleasure to himself would benefit the country. British planters do not ever seem to have considered pursuit of profit and bringing credit to themselves as contradictory, as, to judge from d'Argenville, their French counterparts did, but increasingly in the 18th century these motives to plant became indistinguishable. It was one of Switzer's inducements to rural and extensive gardening that for the same amount of money a planter could improve a much larger area, and in such a way as to ensure return on investment, but he was wary as he no doubt knew the trap Addison had fallen into, not to alienate his fellow professionals from his system. He assured them,

"that tho' there is a Frugality propos'd in the Making and Planting Gardens, yet the Gardener and Nursery-man will find their Account as much in the Extent, as they did before in the elaborate Exactness and Expensive way of Making Gardens." 37

Irregularity is one of the most striking features of garden design in the first half of the 18th century and it has been seen as an alternative to formality and a prelude to the naturalism of Lancelot Brown. 83 Indeed Frank Clark referred to the gardens of
this period collectively as "the irregular garden, which with the impetus of its own logic was to develop into the Landscape Park".

It appeared in several ways. There was the positive irregularity composed of straight lines or parts of regular figures which is characteristic of Charles Bridgeman's designs (e.g., the home park enclosure at Stowe, the terraces at Claremont, or the arrangement of avenues and plantations at Ambresbury) but which also appears in Switzer's work (e.g., the canal system at Blenheim or Hampton Court, Herefordshire); an accidental irregularity such as the south walk of Wray Wood, Castle Howard, and finally serpentine lines, either artfully or negligently composed. Irregularity of composition was one of the central parts of Switzer's system:

"...if a little Regularity is allow'd near the main Building, and as soon as the Designer has stroke out by Art, some of the roughest and boldest of his Strokes, he ought to pursue Nature afterwards, and by as many Twinings and Windings as his Villa will allow, will endeavour to diversify his Views... while the whole should correspond together by the mazie Error of its natural Avenues and Meanders." 90

But with Switzer irregularity was not more important than other parts of his theory, and to pick on irregular composition as an indication if distance from formality and proximity to naturalism is rather misleading, if for no other reason than that irregularity was not confined to advanced British practice in the early 18th century but occurred in contemporary and earlier, French designs.

Irregularity of plantation and layout is also associated with the "wild wilderness" of the 17th century. Francis Bacon had
recommended this as part of his princely garden.

"For the heath, which was the third part of our Plot, I wish it to be framed, as much as may be, to a Natural Wildness. Trees I would have none in it, but some Thickets... and some Wild Vine... and the Ground set with Violets, Strawberries and Primroses... And these to be in the Heath, here and there, not in any Order" 91

Bacon did not specifically mention layout (unless "framed... to a natural wildness" can be taken in this context) but confines his remarks to the plant materials, both wild and cultivated, and it is likely that the irregularity he sought was of plantations only, the various plants mixed together as if they so grown naturally. But even that was to be kept within predetermined bounds.

"part of which Heaps (of the nature of mole-hills) to be with Standards, of little Bushes prickt upon their top, and part without... But these standards to be kept with Cutting, that they grow not out of course." 92

The low middle section of deCaus' Wilton was probably designed on this model. There were two square thickets, to either side of the central walk, of low plants. The walks within formed a regular figure but the River Nadder also flowed through this section and added a more naturalistic touch.

A "sett wilderness" which also showed some attempt at a kind of irregularity of layout was part of the pre-Dridgeman gardens of Stowe, Buckinghamshire, laid out for Sir Richard Grenville in the late 17th century, probably before 1690.93 This was in an area west of the principal pleasure garden and kitchen garden which was modified in 1718-19 to include the Temple of Bacchus and a terrace walk overlooking
the Home Park. There were problems of situation at Stowe (for example the road running south of the house, and aslant to it, to the church, and that the area east of the house was not part of the garden) which were not finally solved until the 1730's. In the late 17th century there were a number of ingenious attempts to belie the irregularity of the site, none of which were successful, and these same problems largely account for Bridgeman's irregular gardens of the early 18th century. The wilderness lay to the north-east of the old slant road, which formed its long straight side. It was bounded on the north by an arc of a circle. It had a mount giving a prospect to the south west, a broad central walk and two simple star walks. The quarters thus formed were connected by serpentine walks. The straight walks are planted with trees and though the quarters are not shown planted they were most probably laid out with low plants of the kind recommended by Bacon.

A wilderness of similar kind, entirely of low plantation, but with much more complex winding walks, was part of Sir William Temple's garden at Moor Park, Surrey, and a drawing of it, dated about 1700, is given in English Gardens and Landscapes.

However irregular or even naturalistic, these 'set wilderesses' became they were unlikely to please the writers of 1710 to 1715 for they were small, or their effect was small, intricate, elaborate and lacked grandeur and were thus examples of the "Dutch taste".
Sir Henry Wooton's remarks on gardening and architecture are a much more promising source for Switzer's irregularity.

"I must note a certaine contrarietie between building and gardening. For as Fabriques should bee regular, so Gardens should be irregular, or at least cast into a very wilde Regularitie. To exemplifie my conceit, I have seene a Garden (for the manner perchance incomparable) into which the first Accessse was a high walke like a Tarrace, from whence might bee taken a general view of the whole Plott below; but rather in a delightfull confusion, then with any plaine distinction of the pieces. From this the Beholder descending many steps, was afterwards conveyed againe, by severall mountings and ralings, to various entertainments of his sent, and sight; which I shall not neede to describe (for that were poetical) let me onely note this, that every one of the diversities, was as if hee had been Magically transported into a new Garden." 

The first sentence was very agreeable to Switzer's theory, and was doubtless taken as support: "this worthy Person appears to be one of the first that had any thoughts of that Rule, Proportion and Design which has since took place in Gardening". But as Wotton's account goes on the suspicion grows that he is writing of luxurious and wild growth of plants whose effect is irregular rather than an irregular layout of the "pieces" of the "Plott". This is further strengthened by his next paragraph where he writes of Sir Henry Fanshaw's conceit at Ware Park "surely without parallel among foreign Nations" of arranging his flowers so that they formed a pattern based on their colour, size and season. But this was "like a piece not of Nature, but of Arte".

As ambassador to Venice Wotten can be supposed to have known gardens of Italy, perhaps among them Aldobrandini and Lante, but his remarks do not lead to the conclusion that he fully understood
their qualities. But whether this is the case or not his sentence about regularity of buildings and irregularity of gardens could be taken at its face value, and connected with Italian garden design.

A grander sort of irregularity in garden design had been practised by LeNôtre in about 1695 at Marly in the Dosquets de Louveciennes. The great walks were laid out as straight lines connecting various rounds and cabinets. The quarters of woodland thus formed were cut into paths and small clearings of fairly advanced sinuosity (the paths look more natural than contrived and the serpentine lines of the edges are not necessarily parallel). On the other side of the garden there was a large clearing of naturalistic shape which contained five clumps irregularly disposed. This was reached by a serpentine side, and in the park south of the pavilion was another serpentine side as well as sides irregularly laid out in Mr. Miles Hadfield's sense.

When the Grand Trianon was built at the west end of the great cross canal at Versailles it had, next to the Petit Jardin du Roi, the Bosquet des Sources. This was a relatively small area between the gallery and salon wing and one of the great diagonal rides from the end of the Petit Parc. Originally it was laid out as a wilderness of the Bacon type with meandering walks between two straight canals. Towards the end of the 17th century it was remade as the Jardin des Sources in a much looser and naturalistic manner. There were rougher serpentine walks connecting pools, while though of regular geometry were so complex that in this context they would
have appeared as naturalistic. The plantation, if any, between the walks and pools is not indicated, and it may have been conceived as a grassed area in the manner of Kent's Venus's Vale at Rousham. There is no particular evidence that these essays in irregularity and naturalism by LeNostre were known in Britain, but it is not unlikely that they were known, particularly Marly. A rather different kind of irregularity used by LeNostre in the design of the labyrinth at Versailles was known, and Switzer included it in his plans of labyrinths, because it was

"allow'd by all to be the noblest of its kind in the world and which I here place, to give my Country-men a Taste of the French in Labyrinths, and because this Draught may not by other Means fall into the Hands of many of my Profession".

Although it was looser and planted with forest trees the Versailles labyrinth was not of a different kind from the 17th century "sett wilderness".

The irregularity of the layouts of the Jardin des Pins of Fountainbleau of the early 17th century, LeNostre's early Chantilly or Sant-Cloud would also have been known. There was in the early 18th century an extraordinary kind of irregularity based on 17th century French designs but which also had a fractured rectilinearity sometimes seen in British gardens of the same date. Montmorency in France, begun by LeNostre and completed by Carte'and and the design of 1732 for Thorndon, Essex by Brugginon should be compared with Dromoland, County Clare, Ireland or Bridgeman's Stowe.
Another source for the irregularity used by Switzer and other designers in early 18th century Britain was the supposed layouts of exotic gardens of China and ancient Greece and Rome. Chinese gardens were known to the early 18th century through Sir William Temple's essay "Upon the Gardens of Epicurus" written in 1685. Temple (1628-1699) according to Switzer "hit upon a noble taste of Gardening, and was the Author of one of the politest Essays...that has yet appeared". "Upon the Gardens of Epicurus" concerns itself mainly with an historical account of gardening and plant material but it also establishes Temple's theory of garden design and his Epicurean philosophy of retirement. His passage on the gardens of the Chinese comes as something of a surprise although the essay is long and its subject matter somewhat varied. Having presented a case in cultural and climatic terms for gardens of the "Dutch Taste" and at some length described a small, inward looking English garden of the mid 17th century Temple goes off on an essayist's tangent,

"What I have said, of the best forms of gardens, is meant only of such as are in some sort regular, for these may be other forms wholly irregular, that may, for aught I know, have more beauty than any of the others..."

In the context of his Epicurean philosophy of fatigue, disappointment and doubt this tangent is not surprising. He had begun the essay,

"The same faculty of reason, which gives mankind the great advantage and prerogative over the rest of the creation, seems to make the greatest default of human nature, and subjects it to more troubles, miseries, or at least disquiets of life, than any of his fellow creatures..."
and then gone on to present his own alternative to a busy public
life, the quiet cultivation of his own garden, about which he had
strong systematic ideas. But having set these out at length and
demonstrated his own pleasure in Anglo-Dutch gardening he acknowledged
the potential futility of his scheme in that a large part of the
civilized world, "the Chinese\footnote{97}; would very likely consider it
ridiculous.

Although this may be the reason for its inclusion, Temple's
paragraph on Chinese garden design introduced a complex idea.

"...their greatest reach of imagination is employed in
contriving figures, where the beauty shall be great,
and strike the eye, but without any order or, disposi-
tion of parts, that shall be commonly or easily
observed..."\footnote{114}

Addison had used this quotation in his essay on garden design and
it has been pointed out that this could apply equally well to the
large geometries of French designs where the order cannot be
"commonly or easily observed". This quality also applied to
some English gardens. At Melbourne Hall, Derbyshire, it is not
the regularity of the basin that necessarily strikes a visitor but
because of its size and the complex geometry the edges appear in
some cases serpentine. It is only when one looks again that it
becomes apparent that this complex geometry forms itself into a
regular figure. And at Kensington Gardens the Round Pond is
neither circular in fact, nor does it appear as such. For all an
observer at ground level can tell it is of indeterminate shape.
In the context of Temple's essay it is not possible to say that this is the meaning he attached to the passage, but in the context of Addison's paper the question is less easily settled.

Temple's meaning becomes clear when he illustrates the quality of "Sharawadgi":

"And whoever observes the work upon the best Indian gowns, or the painting upon their best skreens or purcellans, will find their beauty is all of this kind (that is) without order,.\textsuperscript{15}

which is to say asymmetrical and pictorial, though it is far from clear whether the porcellain, screens and textiles instanced by Temple were picturesque or of the conventional perspective of China which is not "picturesque". But it is clear that asymmetrical composition and irregularity could be considered in the early 18th century as civilized, though exotic, qualities of gardens. The interesting point is: could Switzer (or Addison or anyone interested in such matters around the turn of the century) conceive a new system of garden design based on tea-cups and textiles and would such a new system approximate Chinese gardens or later landscape gardens? In both cases the answer is more than likely no. But with other equally important factors Temple's conception of Chinese gardens would take its part in a theory of garden design and could be used in support for a scheme that might have been considered new and untried.\textsuperscript{116}

The gardens of ancient Greece and Rome played a similar role in Switzer's theory, but even less was known about them. The
textual evidence was debatable and the visual evidence then non-existent. And yet, Pope made the garden of Alcinous the preferable alternative to the "Dutch Taste" and Addison had it in mind when he imagined his Pindarick garden. And according to Switzer Epicurus introduced to Athens gardens which had "the delights of fields and country mansions within the city itself, or rather suburbs of the city"\textsuperscript{117}, that is, what Switzer later called the \textit{ferme ornée}.

Ancient Greek and Roman gardens were largely poetic and imagined to the early 18th century writers, and their vague descriptions, and the heroic virtues of their makers, were used at will to further a particular conception of garden design. But not with any intention to deceive; the gardens of Adonis and the Hesperides "were however Subjects for the loftiest Strains in Poetry, a Theme from which they have drawn the beautiful Ideas they had of the pleasures of Gard'ning"\textsuperscript{118}. If ancient gardens could give rise to poetry and had been the residence of great philosophers they must have been equally noble themselves. It was sufficient for Switzer to "confirm the Values those ancient Heathans had for Gard'ning"\textsuperscript{119} to demonstrate the grandeur of their designs.

"The Silence of those Historians can't determine against this, since we may observe the Historians of these Times are altogether as omissive in this, as they were then; and indeed it is hard to collect out of any of our English Records anything of Moment concerning Gard'ning."\textsuperscript{120}

Strangely Switzer does not seem to have known of Pliny the
Younger's letters describing his Laurentine and Tuscan villas and quoted only the elder Pliny's *Natural History*. Whether Switzer knew Pliny's *Epistles* before 1715, or Felibien is doubtful, yet the Tuscan villa was similar to Switzer's ideal garden in its mixture of artistic and natural beauties. Although the artificial beauties were mainly topiary work for which Switzer had a distaste, there was also in the hippodrome a sort of "natural architecture", that is, trees disposed so as to grow to resemble walls with turrets, and the like, which Switzer recommended and acknowledged as being ancient practice but not specifically from Pliny. It would appear that Switzer derived his theory without knowledge of these Epistles and that his conception of ancient garden design derived from his "recourse to parallel cases".

Perhaps remembering Pope's advice "Be not the first by whom the new are try'd nor yet the last to lay the old aside" Switzer sought to reassure his readers.

"It may probably be supposed...that I am setting up new Schemes in Gardening...but on the contrary, I can affirm, that 'tis much the same as has been us'd already in some parts of this Kingdom, tho' I hope to make considerable Improvements, and for Antiquity, 'tis above 2500 Years, since it appears to be of the same kind as the gardens of Epicurus...This may likewise be supposed was and is the manner of Gardening amongst the Chinese..."

The final factor which impinged on Switzer's theory and on the garden design of the whole century, was the changing conception of nature. Everybody "followed nature" but it is obvious they could not have
meant the same thing, so it will be useful to try to determine what Switzer and his contemporaries in the early 18th century understood by their invocation of nature.

As has already been suggested Shaftesbury and Addison considered nature "as the essence or Platonic Idea of a kind, imperfectly realized in an empirical reality" and as such it was part of the artist's duty to "improve" nature so as to recapture some semblance of the first beauty. On the evidence of the art, particularly garden design, of the early 18th century this "improvement" carried with it a measure both of regularity and irregularity.

Switzer, like everyone else, invoked nature,

"First follow Nature, and your Judgement frame
By her just Standard, which is still the same
Unerring Nature still divinely bright,
One clear, unchang'd and universal Light;
Life, Force and Beauty must to all impart
At once the Source, and End, and Test of Art,
That Art is best which most resembles her,
And still presides, yet never does appear."

This quotation from Pope now appears conventional, an almost meaningless incantation, but not to Switzer writing in 1715. It formed part of the support he thought he needed for his "imperfect Essay on Design", and like his many other references to nature sprang from a deep and complex regard for the creation. But which "nature" did Switzer intend that his art should resemble?

Several circumstances of Switzer's life and personality make his conception of nature different from that of the "Gentlemen des
Although it seems hardly necessary to make the point, Switzer was a gardener, and was brought up in the country. He thus, necessarily, had a much more intimate appreciation of the processes of nature in vegetation and a heightened sensibility of seasonal changes. And since a large part of his life was spent in cultivation he had a just idea of the amount of assistance that it was necessary to give to these natural processes. Switzer was also deeply religious and looked upon the creation as a manifestation of the "Secrets of Nature, and the external Laws of the Supreme Being, by whose peculiar Care they are governed". And finally he was curious and believed that after "the unhappy Lapse of our first Parents" only diligent study could clarify the "unbounded Laws of God Almighty". These factors combined in Switzer's imagination so that his rural and extensive gardening "next to the Duties of Religion" was the surest path to the "Prospect of Felicities more durable than anything in these sublunary Regions". Switzer saw all of his work; his system of gardening, his practice of it, and his essays on natural history and phenomena, as a study of nature and as part of religion. In this context his assertion "That those who have no love nor taste for this Subject, may certainly conclude themselves of base, ungenerous Thoughts; I had almost said, they may suspect and dread themselves in danger in other respects that very nearly concern them" is perfectly logical.

The marvels of the creation are attested in scripture and were familiar to Switzer, but his appreciation of nature as the
manifestations of God's work was the subject "the never to be too much commended". William Derham's (1657-1735) Boyle lectures of 1711 and 1712. These lectures, or sermons, were published in 1713 as *Physico-Theology: or, a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God from his Works of Creation* and they accorded with, if they did not influence, Switzer's conception of nature. Derham organised the earth and living creatures in various categories e.g. (winds, gravity, senses of animals, tribes of animals, vegetables, etc.) and attempted to explain all their characteristics as tending to show God's wisdom. A large part of Derham's task was the refutation of Thomas Burnet's (1653-1715) *Theory of the Earth*. Burnet had maintained that the earth in its present form was evidence of divine wrath and ruin, that mountains and vallies were in the previous, ideal state, of nature non-existent and that the earth was smooth, that oceans and other bodies of water had been of regular disposition and form, and that the stars also had previously exhibited the regularity of God's initial creation. According to Burnet imitation of nature should be of this ideal and that man should try to atone for his original fall from grace by reproducing, as far as possible, original form and composition. There was in Burnet's work more than a basis for a theory of garden design, and the form of contemporary work is in some measure in accordance with his ideas but there is little evidence of a direct connection between *Theory of the Earth* and late 17th century ideas in gardening.  

Derham asserted that the opposite was true, that nature as it
presently existed far from demonstrating ruin manifested the benevolence of creation. According to Derham mountains were not "a blunder of chance, a work without design" but were "noble, useful, yea, a necessary part of our globe",

"And in the first place, as to the Business of Ornament, Beauty, and Pleasure, I may appeal to all Mens Senses, whether the grateful Variety of Hills and Dales, be not more pleasing than the largest continued Plains."141

He then lists six reasons why mountains are beneficial (besides beauty "which is the least valuable consideration"142 among them that hills are health habitations, block strong winds and give rise to rivers and springs. Derham's argument was that "all things were bright and beautiful" and "all contrived and made in the best manner, placed in the fittest places".143

Therefore natural philosophy was to be encouraged

"Many of our useful Labours, and some of our best modern Books shall be condemned with only this Note of Reproach, that they are all about trivial Matters,144 when in truth they are ingenious and noble Discoveries of the Works of GOD."145

Thus Switzer's numerous and seemingly irrelevant, essays in natural philosophy can be seen as an integral part of his conception of nature and God, his physico-theology.

There is some evidence, despite his apparent love of the creation as it existed, that Switzer also considered it improvable, and that there was a certain latitude allowed in his "well-govern'd pursuit of nature".146 When writing of woods he says
"the best and most general Rules that (in Words) I can possibly lay down, are to endeavour to follow and improve the Advantages of Nature, and not to strain her beyond her due Bounds"147

"Advantages" would be mature woodland or open and varied prospect whereas "defects" would be "wood misplaced" that is "when it is too near the Bye in any place, when it crowds so close up to it, as to admit of no open Lawn or Breathing, if it may be so term'd...It is likewise misplac'd when it hinders the pleasant Prospect of any noble View, such as the Sea, or distant blue Hills, or when near ones, and cloathed with Wood or fine Turf"148

But Switzer is rather reticent on the point of defects of nature and it is clear that he would have done all in his power to accommodate a garden to its situation, obviate a misplaced wood, and only as a last resort would he cut down existing trees. He does use the phrase "defect of nature" usually to describe poor soil149 but occasionally to signify an inconvenient characteristic of landscape.150 Nature's due bounds in this context, were exceeded if "such Doughs as are apt to grow in the Way"151 were allowed to remain to materially interfere with the pleasure of the garden.

To Switzer the laying out of gardens and estates was "a Kind of new Creation"152 and besides the natural materials at hand (i.e. the fortuitous collection of hills, water, plantations and the like) it ought to epitomize nature in general. According to his physico-theology nature was the design of God and though Switzer was not able to fully understand its secrets he accepted that there was an "imperceptible regularity" in the universe. Indeed many works of
nature were obviously regular, notably animals, and plants (e.g. a tree from a nursery is apt to be deformed but "we may expect that nature (in the operation) will force out those collateral or side branches in a more regular and splendid manner"). It will be remembered that this was the quality advised in Chinese gardens; they had no "order or disposition of parts, that shall be commonly or easily observed". This conception of nature is reflected in Switzer's designs and explains why the "roughest and boldest of his strokes" are regular. In the largest of these designs this regularity would be imperceptible.

The smaller regular parts of his scheme, the adjuncts of building, are geometrical for a different reason, though still part of his conception of nature (having been deduced from natural philosophy).

"A Regular Parterre, or Lawn... when smooth and even, and of a proper Proportion, strikes the Eye with a certain Reverence and Grandeur scarcely expressible. For, in this case, the Pleasure (as we are informed both from Experience and judicious Writings) springs from a double Principle, from the Agreeableness of the Objects to the Eye, and from their Similitude to other Objects.

Similarly terraces, or courtyards are regular. Kitchen gardens and bowling greens would be regular perhaps for this reason, and also because of their relatively precise function.

It is clear that Switzer, and his contemporaries, found nature more inspiring than art but he did not conceive of them as antithetical. He wanted to mix them, or bring them so close together.
that the distinction disappeared.

"If the Products of Nature rise in Value, according as they more or less resemble those of Art, we may be sure that Artificial Works receive a greater Advantage from their Resemblance of such as are Natural; because here the Similitude is not only pleasant, but the Pattern more Perfect" 159

Professor Rostvig has pointed out the danger in ascribing later conceptions of nature to the early 18th century, 160 and a number of writers have, unhappily, done just this and have consequently been disappointed to discover that Switzer's work is different from that of Lancelot Brown or Richard Payne Knight. There is another difficulty which, though it proceeds from the same source, Walpole, is even more apt to mislead. That is that the early 18th century writers conceived a distaste for French garden design and lent their efforts to destroying any traces of it in England. There was not the sense of purpose, of grandeur or sufficient money to create gardens of the size and complexity of Vaux-le-Vicomte in late 17th century Britain, and far from despising the style it was the ideal to which Switzer and his contemporaries looked. The object of ridicule was the anglo-dutch taste in gardening, which had developed throughout the 17th century. Sir William Temple had written of the reasonableness of this style as compared to the gardens of Italy.

"in the warmer regions, fruits and flowers of the best sorts are so common...that they grow in the fields...
On the other side, the great pleasures of those climates are coolness of air, and whatever looks cool even to the eyes...This makes the gardens of those countries to be chiefly valued by largeness of extent (which gives greater play and openness of air) by shades of trees, by frequency
...of living streams, or fountains, by perspectives, by statues, and by pillars and obelisks of stone scattered up and down, which all conspire to make any place look fresh and cool. On the contrary, the more northern climate, as they suffer little by heat, make little provision against it, and are careless of shade and seldom curious in fountains. Good statues are in the reach of few men, and common ones are generally and justly despised or neglected. But no sorts of good fruits or flowers, being natives of the climates, or usual among us...and the best fruits not ripening without the advantage of walls or palisadoes...our gardens are made of smaller compass, seldom exceeding four, six or eight acres, enclosed with walls, and laid out, in a manner, wholly for advantage of fruits, flowers, and the product of kitchen-gardens...

In the next quarter century every particular of this description had been called into question and reversed.

This revolution was encouraged by a changing conception of the value and reason for rural retirement. Allied to this was a growing desire to plant and improve, both for profit, pleasure, and more distant motives of public benefit. The distinction between garden and field thus became less clear but the tendency was for the outer plantations to rise in value at the expense of the garden. Of a large grove some distance from the house and garden, "cut out into Walks" Switzer thought

"the World will allow it to be much more naturally beautiful and noble, than the most elaborate fine Garden, and, as for the keeping, 10l. per Annu.in a Boy and Horse, a long Pole to cast about the Worn Casts and the Peers Buttons, with a Paddle to cut and root up any staring Weeds or Thistles, and a Bill fix'd in a Pole, to cut off such Boughs as are apt to grow in the Way will be sufficient, this 10 l. will do as much as 100 l. in the Keeping of a very fine Garden, besides the Beauty and Nobleness there is in seeing of the Deer feed in the open Lawns, and running backward and forward through our whole Design"
These outer plantations were often laid out on a regular plan, but when they enclosed fields, blotted a disagreeable prospect, or served as shelter they often had an irregular plan having been planted from a basis other than ornament. 163

Irregularity had been used in gardens as wildernesses in the 17th century, and also latterly in France, but when it became allied with the desire for grandeur and extent the effect much more closely resembled "unadorned nature".

The gardens of the ancients and the Chinese were introduced first in an academic way by Temple, and later as an encouragement to strive for qualities of grandeur within the peculiar circumstances of England by Addison and Switzer. Precise knowledge, especially of ancient gardens was limited, but by reference to "parallel cases" they too were brought in to justify the arguments.

"the ancients and politest Heathens form'd the greatest Conceptions, and the most elevated Notions they had of Heaven and a Future State, from the incomparable Beauties of the Garden,...their Elizum being no other than the happy and regular Distribution, and cheerful Aspect of pleasant Gardens, Meadows, and Fields, and had its original and Etymological Derivation from the several Roots out of the Oriental Languages, implying the exalted Notions of Joy, Happiness, and Pleasure, and the other unbounded Felicities of Nature, in her greatest Glory, and the sublimest Height those adumbrated Minds could at that time possibly amount to" 164

There were two lines of influence on Switzer's theory. The long term development of baroque garden design which through London and Wise he was heir to, and the complex and therefore disconnected thoughts arising out of changing conditions and attitudes. Baroque
garden design had developed over 150 years, mainly in Italy and France whereas the second strain was largely English and of much more recent date; Shaftesbury's Characteristics, Pope's Essay on Criticism, James' Theory and Practice of Gardening, Derham's Physico-Theology, the Spectator, the Guardian and finally Switzer's Nobleman, Gentleman & Gardener's Recreation appeared within five years. Early 18th century garden design, what Switzer called Rural and Extensive Gardening grew logically out of baroque garden design as a result of new circumstances, not in opposition to it.
Chapter Four: Switzer's Theory

Parts of Switzer's theory have already been adduced in an attempt to get his work in its historical context. This has necessarily resulted in a distortion, for Switzer, whether disen- genuously or not, professed himself to be the reverse of revolution- ary and in his own unfolding of his theory formality, symmetry, grandeur and all the forms associated with what is thought of as baroque garden design, play a role. And to assess his own understanding of garden design, or to hazard guesses at the way this understanding might have been received in his lifetime it will be desirable to describe his thought giving due proportion to these elements.

As will be seen in subsequent chapters Ichnographia Rustica was written after, or at least, at the same time as Switzer was putting into practice some of its newer and more interesting points. Precisely when it was written is in doubt; certainly after 1712. The first volume appeared in 1715, probably in the Spring, as The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation. The complete three volume set, with prints, was published in 1718 as Ichnographia Rustica. The further two volumes had been promised in 1715 but how much of the full work Switzer had then completed is unclear; "...I have collated some Materials, but their Publication will entirely depend on the Success this meets with in the World." All three volumes bear the marks of intermittent composition. Ichnographia Rustica even appears collated rather than conceived and written over
a relatively short space of time. And this characteristic is apparent throughout the work. There is no discernable change of style or pace between the completed work and its trial first volume. However, the sections to which a tentative date can be attached suggest that the whole work was largely complete in 1715 and then at his own, or more likely his bookseller's caution, caused the delay. The illustrations which appear in volume two and three were apparently made by 1715. The History includes the death of Queen Anne in 1714; a large section of volume two is related to Switzer's work in Lincolnshire and one part is dated to autumn 1714. Volume three also refers to no experience that can confidently be dated later than 1715.

Although Ichnographia Rustica appears to have been written intermittently its structure is cohesive. The scholarly and rhapsodic preface and history is followed by a general treatment of the natural elements, and the elements of gardens - forest trees, water, grass and gravel, and statuary. Volume two deals with the elements of the garden proper - courtyards, terraces, parterres - which is prefaced by a large section on the numerical and instrumental instruction necessary to carry out these more architectural elements. Volume three is devoted to the outer parts of the estate and includes essay on design and on rural and extensive gardening as well as directions for improving arable land. Switzer thus methodically conducted his reader from the natural (in the sense of natural philosophy) historical and generic to his inner garden and its layout, and finally to the "Embellishment of countries in general" or the
landscape.

The structure Switzer gave *Ichnographia Rustica* is important as a reflection of its content and as a plan for all his work.

"All this appears to be couch'd under Three General Heads, I mean, The Nature and Process of Vegetation: The best method of furnishing a seat with Wood, Water, etc. and... the method of Designing and Distributing to the best Advantage any Country Seat, both in respect to Profit and Pleasure." 12

His drawing on natural, historical and general elements resulted in his inner garden but this was only a stop, a restatement in quasi-architectural terms which lead directly to, and formed the reference of, his treatment of the landscape. D'Argenville, and the 17th century writers concerned themselves only with the specific garden and its form did not result from stated or implicit philosophical concerns. Batty Langley's *New Principles of Gardening* of 1728 indebted as it was to *Ichnographia Rustica* followed the more traditional structure of discussion of surveying and specific methods of raising particular plants, giving relatively little space to "the situation and disposition of gardens in general".

All of Switzer's subsequent work conformed to the pattern established in *Ichnographia Rustica*. The *Practical Fruit Gardener* of 1724 and the *Practical Kitchen Gardener* of 1727 formed for Switzer one work, the *Practical Gardener* 13 and derived from the last sections of volume two of *Ichnographia Rustica*. His agricultural pamphlets of the late 1720's and early 1730's derive similarly from volume three "Management and Improvements of Arable Land" with a
very large element drawn from the concerns first met with in 1715, the natural and philosophical basis of vegetation. The great Hydrostaticks of 1729 grew from his short essay on Springs and Water-works in 1715, with again, a large measure of scholarship and philosophy deriving from the same volume. In his work as a garden designer, insofar as it has been possible to recover it, Switzer also worked out the implications of his theory, and though he departed from it somewhat he did not materially change it.

That there was sufficient success shown by The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation to warrant complete publication is a little surprising considering its cast and contents. For there is in volume one very little of practical value: it is in no way prescriptive as its predecessors have been, and the theory there presented was couched in general terms so that it might not be "obvious to all that perhaps may read this book, at first sight". One of these was the Reverend John Laurence,

"I can meet with few that understanding, or like Mr. Switzer's Way of Writing. He has promised to treat upon your Subjects, but except he exceeds the Specimen he hath given us, his Books will hardly be lik'd; at least they will rather please the Poets, than the natural Philosophers." 15

If due allowance be made for the jealousy of writers of garden manuals, or in this case publishers, the charge that Switzer's work would appeal to the poets is not altogether unjust. The first volume of Ichnographia Rustica is both abstruse and rhapsodic and its positive qualities are allusive. He does not precisely describe an ideal garden, nor does he adduce concrete forms (this is a characteristic
too of the complete work) but rather by indirect reference to nature, history, philosophy, poetry and architecture Switzer presents something not unlike a poetic vision. What precisely his ideas on garden design resulted in obviously puzzled the publishers of the Lady's Recreation, and has puzzled others since.16

But given a rather elevated style, one volume of a projected three, and the lack of illustrations does The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation necessarily result in a confused idea of the kind of garden Switzer wanted? Switzer formed his imagination as a poet, that is, from all experience17 and the result was

"summ'd up in this Rustick Verse,
Utile qui dulce miscens, ingentia Rura,
Simplex Munditiis ornat, punctum hic tuit omne."18

Different ages and different expectations result in such a verse meaning, particularly in relation to gardens, a fairly wide range of things. Fortunately Switzer realised "that no body has yet enlarg'd on this Matter, but everyone makes what Judgement he pleases and thereby leaves' Design in Confusion..."19 and makes his own understanding clear. By utile dulci he meant "a judicious mixture and incorproation of the pleasures of the country with the profits"20 and more precisely that the profitable areas lay in the "outward" parts and included parks, woods, arable lands, "obscure enclosures &c."21 whereas the areas of pleasure were the "Interior Parts of my Designs".22 The clear implications for his contemporaries, and fully confirmed by subsequent advances, was that gardens as conceived by Charles Evelyn, Laurence, or Temple, and even those of d'Argenville,
had practically ceased to exist for Switzer. To make such a scheme practicable a radical simplification of the furnishings of gardens was necessary, and to Switzer (as to Pope and Addison) desirable. He so interpreted Horace's *ingentia rura* as being "oppos'd to those crimping, diminutive, and wretched Performances we every-where meet with, so bad, and withal so expensive...". To Switzer this quality would be found "in large prolated Gardens and Plantations, adorn'd with magnificent Statues and Water-works..." where the adjacent landscape was,

"laid open to View...not be bounded with high Walls, Woods misplac'd, and several Obstructions that are seen in too many Places, by which the Eye is as it were imprisoned, and the Feet fetter'd in the midst of the extensive Charms of Nature..."

*Simplex munditiis* signified to Switzer not only "a noble elegance and decency" but was also "a well govern'd pursuit of nature", whose effect was to reinforce his preference for grandeur and openness.

Switzer's meaning could not fail to be clear to his contemporaries on close examination whether they preferred the intricacies of the "Dutch Taste" or like himself, Addison and Pope, preferred a more simplified scheme. Whichever style was aimed at the basic structure (or ideal design) of gardens was well understood and from Switzer's remarks it would have been clear that this structure must necessarily change. He does not suggest in the *Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation* how his scheme is to be worked out in detail, though in the subsequent volumes this lack is made up for
somewhat. There are two possible explanations for this vagueness, and they are likely connected. Switzer, though not yet a tradesman, lived by giving designs and must have realized that to illustrate too fully might well cost him employment.

"...the only Objection that I find rais'd against Writing and Printing Schemes and Books of Gard'ning, is the base Use and absurd Imitation, that many Gard'ners make of them...these dull Imitators, like Quacks and Plagiaries, stealing something out of one Book and something out of another, make such a Medley, that a judicious Person cann't but be sorry to see it." 26

Connected to this is the practical impossibility of adequately conveying the impression, or complex series of impressions, of gardens of the size and type he was advocating. When the plates were published he warned against taking them too literally and obviously saw them himself as the most schematic and abstracted designs. 27 Unlike d'Argenville's method Switzer's could not have been illustrated by ideal designs, and its quality necessarily derived from the peculiarities of the individual situation.

"...for as situation and soils do very much differ, 'tis hard for any person to prescribe rules that may be suitable to every particular one..." 28

The plates in the 1718 edition were loosely based on gardens on which Switzer had worked, somewhat idealized to make them more general and their value as illustrations greater, but these were not meant to be taken as patterns.

Switzer does prescribe in the Nobleman, Gentleman & Gardener's Recreation but even then it is more the counsel of good sense than
the giving of infallible rules. His advice on the pitfalls of laying out gardens presupposes acceptance if not of his own scheme at least of "La Grand Manier". "Too great haste" the engaging of inexperienced or, to Switzer, dishonest designers, or master gardeners who "had no advantage of improving himself" necessarily resulted in an ill composed collection of parts "scarce every reducible (without a total Revolution) into any tolerable Figure".

This would not appear a particularly great problem to those to whom gardening meant the "Dutch Taste" but a large part of Switzer's aim in his first volume was to convince improvers of the meanness of that approach.

To "Gentlemen of a more lenitive and ingenious nature" who were prepared to accept the "officious Boldness of a well-meaning Man" Switzer had specific recommendations as to the best method of making a garden. First a design should be commissioned, perhaps several alternatives however small the initial intention, for "even in the least and meanest Design there is some Judgement, Thought, Frugality, and Contrivance". The design should then be reviewed by the improver "and some honest and experienc'd Workman" with due skepticism to the beauty of the "Draughts" for

"I will be bold to affirm, that regular fine Schemes have spoiled as many Gardens, as any other Fault... Thus we do often see many a noble Oak, or sometimes whole Lines of these and other umbragious Trees, fell'd, to humour the regular and delusive Schemes of some Paper Engineers, and such a Medley of Clipt Plants, Embroidery, introduced in their room, that 'tis hard to think of it, whether with Pity or Disdain".
Switzer recommended that great care also be taken in choosing a servant "I may call him a fellow-companion in this delightful employ" who should be "sober, ingenious, and good natur'd" and well paid: "his stipend ought to be equal to that of the best servant" else me might have recourse to "indirect means to maintain his private affairs".  

His third point was that a certain sum be set aside for the weekly payment of workmen. To proceed in any other way may now appear foolish but it does not seem that this was universally followed in the early 18th century; Blenheim, which Switzer knew well is a documented example.

"Labourers Unpaid, are of course the most Impertinent, Troublesome Persons that may be, and by their Clamour, Noise and Thievery, occasion a very large Alloy in and Discount from the Pleasures of a Country Life." Switzer considered from £100 "in small Undertakings" to £800 "in the greatest of all" sufficient annual expenditure.

"The last, and which is the Result, or rather the Substance of the former Advices, is, That Gentlemen Consider well before they Begin, and Proceed Leisurely; that the Motives that induce them to these Undertakings be Solid and Virtuous, and not the sudden start of an impetuous Fancy, which too often sinks and vanishes immediately, and leaves a Mark of Infamy and Disgrace on the Undertaker, rather than a Credit and Repute. 'Tis to this, in great degree, is owing the many Unfinish'd and Confus'd Designs to be seen in many Places of these Kingdoms.

According to Switzer an improver thus convinced of the efficacy of his theory, so far presented in general terms, equipped with a good design, an able, good natured gardener, sufficient wealth and the
right motives could not fail to find

"...Health, Peace and Plenty, and the happy Prospect of Felicities more durable than any thing in these sublunary Regions, and to which this is (next to the Duties of Religion) the surest path" 45

Most of Switzer's remarks about garden design occur in the preface to The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation but these are expanded somewhat in other parts of the volume. And a fuller and more precise understanding of what he intended can be got from some incidental remarks in his history. Switzer was the first historian of gardening, and initiated a series of 18th and early 19th century histories which include Walpole, J.C. Loudon and George Johnson. 46 These are useful in their relation of contemporary history or of contemporary attitudes: their treatment of earlier history has not the same sureness. Switzer particularly drew his knowledge of history largely from supposed allusion to gardens in ancient writers or the Bible. His knowledge of 16th and 17th century Italian garden design is very thin;

"The Gardens of Cardinal Ferrara at Tivoli have some time since exercised the Pens of our most curious Travellers... as well as those of Belvedere belonging to the Pontiff, are next: Besides some others, which, for Brevity, I shall pass over..." 47

"And altho' Gard'ning might in some measure, like the Phoenix, arise again out of the ashes of Italy, yet the Completion of it seem'd for France, and the other Northerly European Kingdoms of Great-Britain, which at present much out-doe Italy itself, whose Gardens I shall pass over, having as yet seen nothing in comparison to the Nations just before named." 48

His knowledge of other periods is hardly fuller but in considering
his thought as a designer his ignorance and selection, his confident assertion based on his own reaction to texts makes his History a useful source. His preference for Italian instead of French garden design which had already been discussed, must, on the evidence of his own remarks have derived from travellers' accounts, notably Addison's Remarks on Various Parts of Italy (touched on gardens only briefly) and his own imagination.

Similarly his appreciation of ancient garden design is largely imaginary. To Switzer Epicurus "was the first that brought into Athens the custom of having under the title of Hortus, a garden, the delights of fields and country mansions within the city itself, or rather suburbs of the city..." 43

Elysium too accorded with what Switzer recommended

"being no other than the happy and regular Distribution, and cheerful Aspect of pleasant Gardens, Meadows and Fields was..."

"of like Import doubtless was Paradise, which properly signifies Gardens of Pleasure, the Residence of Angel-ick and Happy Souls, unsullied with Guilt..." 49

But his conception of paradise was less spiritual or historical than Miltonic whose description Switzer included among his "Rural Landskips" 50

"...from that Saphire Font the crisped Brooks Rowling on Orient Pearl, and Sands of Gold. With mazy Error under pendant Shades, Ran Nectar, visiting each Plant, and fed Flow'rs worthy of Paradise, which no nice Art In Beds and curious Knots, but Nature's Boon, Pour'd forth profuse on Hill, and Dale, and Plain..." 51
Of late 17th century French gardens his knowledge was more complete, and yet there are very curious gaps. Having mentioned Versailles, Marly, Fountainbleau and St. Cloud "Works so stupendously great (as is very apparent by all the Draughts we have from thence, as well as the Reports of almost everybody)..." Switzer goes on to say "Who it was that particularly Design'd and Laid out the Gardens, &c belonging to that August Monarch, is not known to me, but I suppose it to be his Architects and Chief Builders, who, both There as well as Here, are extremely well skill'd in those Affairs." Could it be that he had not heard of LeNostre? In 1729 LeNostre appears in the Hydrostaticks but Switzer is at pains to point out that this was the engraver's mistake and that it should have read LePaultre. Switzer's seeming ignorance of the identity of Louis' designer seems even more extraordinary when he goes on to give a very full account of Jean de la Quintinie, director-general of Louis' fruit and kitchen gardens.

Switzer's interest in natural philosophy is shown by his reference to de la Quintinie and other botanical and agricultural writers - from Virgil and Columella to John Rose and Dr. Plunknet - who, with poets, and classical greats, largely made up his sources.

His account of late 17th and early 18th century England is made up of the work of the Brompton Park Nursery and London and Wise, work with which he was often intimately connected, certainly at Blenheim and Kensington, very probably at Castle Howard, and perhaps at Wanstead and Chatsworth. He appears to have had three aims in
this section: to sing the praises of Brompton Park, particularly George London; to court new clients (or perhaps mark the favour of a commission) as in the section on Cannons and to promote his rural and extensive gardening.

"...I shall conclude this History with that truly Ingenious Lover of Architecture and Gardening, the Right Honourable the Earl of Carlisle, in his Wood at Castle-howard, the highest pitch that Natural and Polite Gardening can possibly ever arise to. 'Tis there that Nature is truly imitated, if not excell'd and from which the Ingenious may draw the best of their Schemes in Natural and Rural Gardening. 'Tis there that she is by a kind of fortuitous Conduct pursued through all her most intricate Mazes, and taught even to exceed her own self in the Natura-Linear, and much more Natural and Promiscuous Disposition of all her Beauties." 56

Switzer's History suitably culminates in this rhapsodic praise (very likely of his own work) for it is written as an apology for his own ideas and shows a progression towards them. Whether he consciously suppressed unsatisfactory events is impossible to say; it is perhaps more probable that his theory of rural and extensive gardening and his limited knowledge of history developed together, and reinforced each other.

The essays on the classical elements and the process of nature in vegetation 57 are "Precepts of the Cultivating part of Gardening" and have little in them directly relating to the "noble and correct Judgement and Taste of Things" 53 which Switzer associated with design. They, and other similar parts of his work, indeed the most substantial part, do illustrate his view of nature and attest to his deep interest in its processes, and this in turn informs his judge-
ment and "taste of things". In these works Switzer is not being practical in the sense that the manual writers were. None of his writings, even when their avowed intention is to simply and briefly instruct, can be taken as a gardener's, improver's or engineer's vade mecum. There is always the tendency to scholarship or to digression. His intention appears to be to discourse on natural processes in an inquiring way more for the pleasure of understanding than for any precepts that might result. And in a limited sense Laurence's gibe was just. His practical works did meet with some success, especially his Fruit Gardener, but Ichnographia Rustica, and particularly the first volume, only occasionally deals with practical matters.

In one of these, Directions for Raising of Forest Trees, there are besides plain instruction, many classical quotations, epitomies of John Evelyn's rhetoric and other "Flights of a Poetick Fancy". In the Addenda to the Directions Switzer returns specifically to design and enlarges on his ingentia rura theme,

"...when I mention Gardening, 'tis not that which has been commonly us'd and understood by that Name, I mean, Flowering Parterre's, Box-Work, Clipt Plants, ., but Wood, Water, and such-like Natural and Rural, yet Noble and Magnificent Decorations of the Country Villa." One of the methods of achieving this "natural magnificence" was to sow a coppice of some twenty to thirty acres.

"These kind of Woods, as they are more Natural and Rural than the Set Wilderness and Groves, so much us'd of late amongst us, yet they are a great deal less expensive."

That these woods would not be such for many years did not trouble
Switzer, quite the contrary, he professed to take as much as delight in young woods as in mature ones.  

But whatever method was used Switzer was convinced that when

"these kinds of Rural Gardens shall be laid open to the extensive Avenues all round, in an open and unaffected manner, (not Wall'd round or Immured, as has been the Practice) when those large Sums of Money that have been buried within the narrow Limits of a high Wall...shall be lightly spread over great extensive Parks and Forests ...'Tis then we may hope to excel the so-much-boasted Gardens of France, and make that great Nation give way to the superior Beauties of our Gardens, as their late Prince has to the invincible Force of the British Arms."  

The second of Switzer's essays on the elements of garden design of Springs and Water-works, is largely given over to his preoccupation with the origin of springs but in the latter part he gives an indication of how water-works - reservoirs, canals and fountains - were to be incorporated in his rural and extensive gardening. Reservoirs "if they are out of whole Ground...are commonly circular" but if there "some Hollow or Valley in the Hill" then it could be dammed and so much the better. As to the shape of canals, whether straight, irregular, serpentine, or naturalistic Switzer is silent, though in practice in the period 1703-1718 he experimented with all shapes. Nor does he give any indication as to the design of fountains except that,

"I am not altogether against Fountains.adorn'd with Masonry, and other superficial Embellishments, but cann't advise them in any but the most elegant Quarters and Recesses of what we esteem the finest Parts of the Gardens."  

In the exterior parts of the garden,
"Twould be rather honest to advise a Grassy, strong Turf round the Edge of the Fountain, Canal, and Pond, as being very natural, and of little Expense. Water is not the less, but rather the more beautiful by it." 68

Statuary was esteemed by Switzer largely for its associational value as "the most publick and durable Memoirs of Virtue, Honour and Valour" 69 from the contemplation of which "tis possible for any Thoughtful Person to extract many useful Things for the Conduct of his Life." 70 They would give visual point and character to a space, but there were two difficulties that Switzer, and other designers and improvers, met with. There was no native "Encouragement of Statuary". He recommended that an academy be set up

"for its Improvement, and for a Nursery for young ingenious Men; which when they have least to Draw and Carve well, might be distributed amongst the Nobility and Gentry, who most of them stand in great need of these noble Decorations of Statues about their Country-Seats." 71

Switzer goes on in some detail about the government of the school, the benefit to both student and patron, and, characteristically, the lack of expense; carvers would cost no more "than...other common Servants, Wages excepted". 72 The other problem was associational solecism and the poor sculpture to be had in England, "Leaden lame Copies, abounding with...Incongruities" 73 Switzer lists the qualities and precedence of the classical gods from the greatest,

"Jupiter and Mars should possess the largest Open Centres and Lawns of a grand Design, elevated upon Pedestal Columnial, and other Architectonical Works, according to the Model of the best Designer..." 74
to the least,
"Then Vulcan with the Cyclops in a Centre of less note, and all the rest of the Dieties dispers'd in their particular Places and Order. Flora, Ceres and Pomona, to their several Charges; and the Faunes and Sylvans, to the more remote and Rural Centres and Parts of the Woodwork." 75

But Switzer's plea for better garden statuary and an academy was not acted upon, nor perhaps even taken seriously in 1715. However, his last advice in this section was received much more sympathetically and taken up for more than a hundred years: he

"recommended the Erection of all Lodges, Granges, and other Buildings that Gentlemen are obliged to build, for Convenience, in the Form of some Antiquated Place, which will be more beautiful than the most curious Architecture: There seems to be a much more inexpressible Entertainment to a Virtuous and Thoughtful Mind, in Desolate Prospects, cool murmuring Streams, and Grots, and in several other Cheap and Natural Embellishments, than in what many of our modern Designers have recommended..." 76

Next to his structural changes to the standard garden design this advice is perhaps Switzer's most important contribution to landscape gardening both for associational and pictorial qualities. Langley illustrated mock ruins in 1728 but his suggestion that they be used for "the termination of Walks, Avenues, &c." 77 is more static than Switzer's idea, and more prescriptive. It is not until after mid century with Lord Kames' Elements of Criticism 78 of 1762 that theoretical discussion of the effects of ruins in gardens and landscape approaches Switzer's remarks. 79

Switzer's final element of garden design is grass and gravel about which he is brief, "...however, I could not, without injustice...pass them over, they being those natural Ornaments of our Country-Seats."
To the present purpose, however, he offers yet another example of frugality and rusticity when he points out the needless expense incurred in getting fine turf from a great distance when, "...in truth, the coarset Turf...by a little good keeping will come fine, and be in some degree better than the fine Turf itself". In his conclusion to *The Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation* Switzer restates his general principle and adds a little detail, 

"...it is necessary that Gardens ought to appear as large as possible, if they were a hundred Acres or more, still the nobler..." 

and as a garden of this size would be objected to because of its expense and the alienation of good land, he repeats that it is a mixture of arable, wood and garden that he proposes, 

"...in the Heart of all Quarters and Divisions of Wood I have been speaking of, there shall be a large Lawn or open Square, or other Polygonar or Natural Plot, which may be turn'd into Kitchen-Gardens, Fruit-Gardens, Orchards, &c., all of them of considerable Use." 

As to the expense of keeping these extended gardens; that only consisted of, 

"Rowling and Levelling the Mould Hills, and a little more Exactitude near the Bounds of the inner Parts...the Cattle shall be the Mowers, and for Rowling, a Boy and Horse will do a great deal, and 'tis not incredible to affirm, that 100 acres will not cost above 50l. per annum the keeping, since there is no occasion of keeping those Outer Plantations very fine..." 

The expedient he proposed to connect the outer and inner gardens was simply to continue the line in the same form and material, either espalier hedge or standard, reducing the precision of keeping gradually, and by introducing no intermediate termination such as "fine Iron
Gates, a kind of Artifice not good, and a very great Expense in the Bargain". 85 How the inner parts are to be fenced he does not say until the 2nd volume in 1713, but it is likely the sunk fence, or more probably an enclosing terrace walk was in mind, since the former had been introduced by James, and he had seen the latter at Blenheim and Castle Howard and had employed it at Grimsthorpe. But whichever device he had in mind the effect of "these Designs (is) to go, as it were ad infinitum without changing the Scene". 86 If this method were accepted, and distant objects were brought into the garden by "some Arm of the Garden to view them, or, if possible, corresponding or projecting over them" 87 then "as great a Grace" would be added "to our Country-Seats as the most elaborate Gardens of the French." 88
Chapter Five: The Elements of Rural and Extensive Gardening

Half of volume two of *Ichnographia Rustica* is devoted to numerical and instrumental instructions for gardeners and

"is, I have the vanity to say, very instructive and entertaining. I knew a Gentleman of Shropshire, who, before he purchased these Volumes, understood little or nothing of Surveying and Measuring, afterwards commence as good a Surveyor, as many who had made it their whole Employ."¹

However, this part is of limited use in assessing Switzer's theory of design. The tail-pieces to the plates illustrating geometrical and other problems are not without their interest. A number of these, such as plate 3 to 6, 10 to 16 and 19 are free and rather crude renderings of plates of Versailles, but even in these, notably plate 3 where there is a cross-section of Switzer's version of the haha, or plate 11 where perhaps the earliest published design for a naturalistic pond is placed uncomfortably by a formal pool and fountain, there is some reflection of his ideas about rural and extensive gardening. Plate 2, 7 to 9, 17, and 20 to 22 are frankly picturesque being composed, asymmetrically of rivers, ruined buildings and trees and appear to be derived from Italian models, except plates 8 and 9 which are Dutch and German in character. The surveying examples in this section are based on work done for the Duke of Ancaster; Belleau and Grimsthorpe, Lincolnshire.

The second half deals with the "several Parts and Proportions" of the inner parts of his rural and extensive gardens.
"Mr. James's translation, indeed, goes before; and besides, he has the most magnificent Garden of all France to view, and he has certainly chose the very Marrow and Beauty of all those excellent Designs, so that, in this Point, I must expect to fall very far short of him..."

However, he proceeds, and begins with court-yards "those little Divisions that be contiguous to a Gentleman's House, and other his Offices of Convenience". They should be of the proportion 2:3 to 2:1, be well drained, and

"to have a Terrace-Walk round, or by the Side of, a Court; for by it the House is still elevated the higher to any Person that comes in upon the grand Level...either on Foot or Horse-back, besides the Cleaness, Decency, and Convenience there is for Servants..."

The lower part of the court was to be laid out for coaches without fountain or lawn, but with a textured paved figure in the centre for parking. Outside the gates he recommends that there always be a large Parade. Switzer is opposed to walls around courtyards, except as they are absolutely necessary and recommends rather the use of hedges as

"an impenetrable Fence, would break all the Winds better than Walls, and would always appear in a Forest Manner, and conduct the Eye as well as a Wall."

Likewise iron grilles are deprecated as

"at best...a Kind of Net-Work, I had almost said, contriv'd on Purpose to catch those Persons in, who are so unwise as to run to that great and unnecessary expense"

With terrace-walks Switzer's interest seemed more engaged. These were of four kinds, the
...great Terrace that lies next the House. The 2d, Side, or Middle Terrace, that is commonly rais'd or cut out above the Level of the Parterre, Lawn. The 3d, Those that encompass a Garden, and The 4th, many that lye under one another, as being cut out of a large high Hill..."  

To Switzer the great terrace, the side terraces and the parterre were of primary importance, fulfilling the same role as the courtyard, that is, to give elevation to the building and to provide a framework of neutral ground between the house and garden or landscape. He is somewhat stern about their meaness; one hundred feet long by forty feet wide was not too great.

"The Reason why I make it thus large, is because I have often (I may say always) thought that the Terrace-Walks under Buildings, in almost all the Designs I have seen in England, are too narrow, so narrow, that one can't, without a great deal of inconvenience and Pain, view the Building as one walks along."  

The side terraces performed a similar linking role between the architectonic great terrace and the more rustic parts of the garden, and framed the most regular element in Switzer's garden scheme, the parterre or lawn. And though it was to be made of earth and turfed it "ought to be, near upon a flat or deal Level, since it is to answer the Length of the grand Terrace, the Level and Plinth of the House, &c." and where possible correspond "with some Pavilion" or "some little Jettee of Building". Its width should be between twenty and forty feet, and its height between 2'6" and 3'6". As to the angle of slope Switzer preferred it shallow, "three Foot horizontal to one Foot perpendicular" but if there was little room 2'6" horizontal to 1'0" perpendicular would serve. But there
were

"some that are indiscreet enough to make one foot and an
half, nay, some not above one Foot, horizontal to the same
Perpendicular, it must be a very great Fault; for if the
Slope be deep, there is no standing to mow upon it, neither
if the Ground is tolerably good, will the Grass prosper
well...for rolling, there is not Room for supposing any such
Thing, which is what makes our Slopes the finest of any
Ordering or dressing we can bestow upon them, next to mowing..."

Switzer advises that in these, half architectural, half rustic parts
of the garden that "the Gardener and Builder ought to go Hand in Hand,
and to consult together..." not only so that there is agreement as
to levels and to the correspondence of garden element and building
element, but also that excavated earth from foundations and cellars
be used to advantage, and quickly, making storage heaps unnecessary,
but

"People are generally in such a Hurry and Amaze, and Garden-
ers take so little Notice of this one Particular, that I
have often seen those coarse heavy materials tumbled back-
ward and forward; and I dare aver, in a Design now carrying
on near 500l, has been thrown away in this one Article of
tumbling their Earth backward and forward, when it might
have been dispos'd in its proper Place at once..."23

The last part of the garden "court-yard" is of course the parterre
itself which Switzer very clearly preferred to be of plain turf
rather than figured.24 It should be an oblong, for according to
Sir William Temple's observation

"by the Rules of perspective...a long Square sinks almost
to a Square; so, consequently, an exact Square appears
much less than it (is) when in a Plan...and that the Eye
is covetous of Extent, and looking forward..."25

So a parterre should not be "less than the Length, and is very seldom
more than three times; and two times and an half is a very good Proportion". The breadth was related to the garden front of the house and if this were particularly wide the garden designer necessarily had to follow it, but,

"Parterres are, generally speaking, too large, by which Means the Expense of Gardening is not a little rais'd, and that which is the most valuable of any Part of a Garden, I mean Wood, and, consequently, Shade, is very much diminish'd". However grudgingly Switzer would allow a width of up to 300 feet, and consequently a length of between 750 and 900 feet for the largest buildings. His lower limit is, "140 or 150 Foot, by which Means the Length...will be 350 Foot, or something more, which is certainly a very handsome Proportion". The end of the parterre opposite the garden front was to be extended as an avenue or walk. In the plate illustrating the disposition of terraces where the parterre is five hundred feet long, the gentle slope of the parterre away from the house was to be maintained for another one hundred to four hundred feet when

"one may take the liberty to swerve from it, but it should be rather a rolling Level, than a straight stiff one, than which nothing looks more cramping and ridiculous..." If the ground at the end of the parterre fell away sharply, the

"Level ought to swim, as it were, over Hill and Dale, or if it be a strait Line, it ought to fall at once, by a Slope, with such Divisions to answer it as the Nature of the Place requires." Similar procedures would be taken with the extension of the courtyard the "Parade" forming a schematically symmetrical arrangement about
the principal axis, the place for "a little regularity". Secondary axes would be treated with a diminished version of this scheme.

But however simplified and natural (in the sense of being "constructed" of live vegetation, turf) these quasi-architectural parts of Switzer's scheme were, they were only refinements for early 18th century British practice of the idea perfected by LeNostre and given currency in James' translation of d'Argenville. And in these parts there is nothing that particularly calls for attention in the development of landscape planning. But these regular parts were for Switzer only the beginning, a kind of tidying up the immediate environs of the house and offices, whereas the stuff of his rural and extensive gardening was in the exterior parts.

It is at the boundary of the two parts of his scheme that Switzer advises the use of his third kind of terrace-walk, commonly known as a haha. The first use of the haha has been seen as a kind of technological innovation whose inventor should be honoured because he thereby made landscape gardening possible. Unfortunately the case is not so dramatic. The device is related to a moat, the two were so treated by Switzer, and the effect of the moat used as a non-visual boundary can be seen in LeNostre's lateral divisions at Vaux-le-Vicomte. The dry ditch haha was introduced to the British public in James' translation of d'Argenville's Théorie as a termination to an avenue or walk, but not as a method of bounding the garden. According to Switzer terrace-walks were first used to this purpose at Blenheim, and were introduced by
Vanbrugh. They were used to bound Wray Wood, Castle Howard, at probably the same date (1705-10) and Switzer had used them in this sense independently at Grimsthorpe and Cirencester. But the use of a haha, in d'Argenville's sense, was still sufficiently novel to warrant note in 1725.

Although Switzer would appear to be the first to realize the theoretical value of the haha, which lead to its use in landscape gardening, he neither claimed credit for its invention, nor seemingly, considered its invention as particularly important.

"...the Fencing of Gardens...has been of late done by a Terrace Walk in the Inside, and a Graff or Ditch in the outside (and) without Doubt, is the noblest Way of fenc-ing in a Garden (next to Water, which can't always be had ...which, when well understood, will, I doubt not, be much more put in Practice..."

Switzer's attitude to the haha is the most telling distinction between him and Brown and the other practitioners of landscape gardening.

"...upon these Terraces it is that one may look either forward or backward, and view with Pleasure the rude and distant Scenes of Nature, as well as the more elaborate Works of Art." 39

In this Switzer shows himself to have been as baroque as Vignola or della Porta for it is this same quality, the necessary visual juxtaposition of natural and artificial, that distinguishes the Villa Lante and the Villa Aldobrandini. But in the purely technical use of the haha there is nothing to distinguish Switzer in 1718 and Brown in the early 1750's, whose Crome Court, Worcestershire, has
a "Wray Wood" garden separated from the park by a haha which conforms exactly to Switzer's profile in the terrace-walk plate.

Switzer's haha is formed of itself, that is, there is no waste earth, nor is it necessary to import ground to build it. Earth excavated on the outside is used to raise the terrace walk on the inside, and a wall separates the two, giving the impression of a sunk fence. Unfortunately the Blenheim terrace walk apparently disappeared without its profile being recorded, but from Switzer's remarks it was this kind. The ditch,

"...ought to be about 15 Foot wide at Bottom, five Foot deep, and Slope 15 Foot horizontal...The Wall is seven Foot and a half high, from the Top to the Bottom of the Graff which is five Foot below the Plinth of the Terrace in the Inside; and two Foot and a half the Height of the Parapet-Wall which is about Seat-high within, and gives one the Liberty of all the Beauty that Nature affords without." 43

The width of the terrace could be 12 to 15 feet, but never more than 20 even in "the greatest Designs". 44

"But this Terrace ought not to be too high, two Foot nine inches, or three Foot is full high enough, and two Foot and an half will do; but this should likewise be detach'd from the End of all Walks, that the View may not be stopp'd into the Grounds adjacent; and this is also the Reason I would advise them not to be made too high." 45

But the "beautifullest of all fences" was the wet ditch, or encircling "Canal or Watercourse" 46 but the only surviving example of this, and the only one known, is Wrest Park, Bedfordshire 47 of the early 1730's which lies in a flat, dull countryside. Switzer illustrates its use in the Paston plate 48 which is related to
Grimsthorpe where he had employed a sort of haha and dry ditch.

Switzer had one final kind of terrace walk which in hill situations would take the place of his great terrace-parterre-side terrace scheme which was to be illustrated in the nine figures of plate 27, unfortunately missing from all copies examined and presumably never prepared, and therefore Switzer's words must be relied upon alone.

"Amongst all that can be said of the Beautifulness and Nobleness of Terrace-Walks, those that are cut out of a natural Hill very much exceed all others, plac'd upon which we view the adjacent Country with the utmost Delight, and the Spirits are by an unaccountable Delight rais'd to the highest Pitch that Nature and sublunary Prospects can possibly advance them." 49

Switzer's supposed unimproved hill had a slope of about 15 degrees (49 feet perpendicular to 180 feet horizontal) and was just shallow enough to allow the terraces to be supported by slopes. A steeper hill would, according to his calculation, require a mixture of supporting walls and slopes, or in a very steep hill, such as Powis Castle, Montgomeryshire (laid out c 1718-24) 50 walls alone. Although this last case, "truly looks very noble,...it is withal very expensive, and is not so rural as Slopes of Grass are". 51 He disposed his preferred slopes in this missing design in,

"Imitation of Fortification, in which there seems to be little Occasion to follow the exact Rules thereof, but to use it chiefly so, as that it may the most conduce to the Beauty and natural Form of the Hill". 52

In the light of subsequent developments the question of why the
natural form of the hill could not stand on its own comes to mind. The answer to such a question is difficult but it is very likely that it does not lie in the supposed inability of early 18th century writers to understand their own ideas. The answer is rather that to Switzer it was firmly accepted that the immediate environs of the house should harmonize formally with the building, and as has already been seen Switzer managed this harmony rather more subtly than his predecessors, and in relation to hills in this situation his work at Spy Park, Wiltshire of the early 1720's and his work at Nostell Priory, Yorkshire, of the 1730's shows a progression away from the design of plate 27 and towards a more abstract and surer formal harmony. And it must be remembered that Switzer's view of nature was somewhat more complex than that of later 18th century writers.

"At present let us observe, that a Hill thus regularly cut out, makes a kind of natural Perspective from the very Lines of the Plan: And, indeed, there is no Figure in all the Mathematicks, that suits the natural Beauty of an Hill so well, especially when it is a round one; but were it to be a Hill in Length, one would certainly, by cutting an Hollow in the Middle, make those Bastions at each Angle of an House, or any other Plan, at the Top of an Hill; for there seems to be something of a pleasing Air in the Breaking forward of those Angles, such, indeed, as few or no Geometrical Figures will allow of, because they splay off, according to the Rules of Fortification."53

He attempted in his rural and extensive gardening to represent his view of nature - that is a nature with some manifestly regular parts and about the rest he believed there was an "imperceptible Regularity". If the rules of geometry did not produce the effect he considered desirable then the rules, or something approaching them, of fortif-
ications could be made to serve.

When the hill had been formed and levelled it was to be turfed, or sown with hay, and it appears that the hill was to be wooded, but whether completely so or not is unclear. The similar slopes at Spy and Nostell were not wooded.

"I have made both the Steps and the Lines of high Trees, that stand upon the Tops of the Slopes, to splay off which I take to be absolutely necessary in Works of this Kind, which by the Diminution of the visual Rays are apt to contract the Vista too much." 54

Having thus treated of the structure of the interior or regular part of his scheme Switzer was left only with the particular design and furnishing of the parterre. He derived the word, unlike d'Argenville and the French Academy, from par and terra, "a level even Piece of Land" 55 and it did not exclusively imply, as was commonly accepted, a flower garden, but was a description independent of "any particular Decoration or Embellishment", 56 His purpose in this was to establish the general rather than the, to him unacceptable, particular idea of the parterre. And he goes on to enumerate the various kinds, parterres of water, parterres of embroidery and bowling-greens, the last, the kind of parterre Switzer advised, the French,

"own to have receiv'd from England...and is, above all, the beautifulest with us in England, on Account of the Goodness of our Turf, and that Decency and unaffected Simplicity which it affords to the Eye of the Beholder." 57

If it were not for custom and the fear of appearing singular Switzer would not have included designs of figured parterres but would have contented himself
"to have given only the Dimensions and Proportions of a
plain Parterre; but for this reason I have, in the Plates
at the End of this Chapter, given some Designs that have
already been us'd, and very much approv'd of in England,
and others, that, I may venture to say, are entirely new." He did, however, include two other designs for parterres with
rather better grace. The first,

"was a long Time since compos'd for a private Gentleman,
but neither that nor any other Design is yet there per-
form'd; for which Reason I have given it without any
Alteration." This is a design for a figured parterre and the contiguous wooded
quarters. The five divisions of the parterre have basically simple
forms but they are cut curved into seeming complexity. The scroll
pattern within the "rectangular" quarters is a highly irregular
composition of curves and becomes regular by virtue of being repeated
symmetrically about the principal and secondary axes. The semi-
circular end is figured with curves fanwise. The materials are

"Grass, Gravel, and Sand, or Cockle-shells interwoven
one with another, and is (unless it was to be entirely
plain) the neatest and cheapest Way of making Parterres;
besides, it is always green, and Winter and Summer it
maintains its natural Verdure, the Expense of keeping is
still less than when there are Borders and Edgings mix'd
derewith." It is furnished with vases on pedestals, conical greens (probably
cypress as the form is manifestly natural and not clipped), shrubs
in pots, and small unclipped trees. The size 360 feet by 130 feet,

"is rather the shortest, but is what we were oblig'd to,
thro' Fear of cutting away too much of the Wood that
fronts the End of the Sweep." The wooded quarters to the sides of the parterre have figured edges
somewhat simplified but similar to the parterre figures, whereas the end quarters are laid out as labyrinths,

"...something of the Nature of that of Versailles; yet by no Means like some others, that are made of single Hedges; for those seem to be calculated for an inferior Class of People. These are the most beautiful and most retir'd of all, and contrary to the Fashion very common amongst us of making their Wilderness open to all publick View..." 63

To increase a sense of privacy and to ensure solitude for the owner Snüter advised that gates be fixed at the entrances. At the ends of the walks,

"fix'd in the Espalier Hedge, are design'd Statutes, Urns, Paintings in Stone Colour, Grotesque and Antique Figures, Tables, &c. 64

The wooded quarters are different in layout and avoid "an Error too much run into by many Designers of Gardens, in making the two opposite Sides directly alike", 65 a problem also recognised by d'Argenville. 66

"This is, in Truth, the having only half a Garden, since wherever the Sides are equally the same, when one has seen and enjoy'd the one half, there is little Occasion to view the same over again; but this proceeds from the Delusiveness of a regular Draught on Paper." 67

Apparently this argument had advanced a stage further before 1718. "I can't agree with some, that would have, even in the Parterre, irregular and different sides..." 68 Bridgeman might have been the source of this view. His designs for Wolterton, Norfolk 69 show a long parterre-like space whose sides have identical curves, causing it to twist. But this feature is uncharacteristic of Bridgeman
and the dating of the Wolterton drawings is uncertain. But whatever the source it provoked Switzer to

"lay it down as an Axiom in Gardening, that whatever lies open to View, ought to be regular, while, nevertheless, whatever is within the Ambit of Wood, the more irregular the more entertaining and diverting it is".70

(In this regard the square basin in the wood quarter of plate 23 "was almost ready by Nature")71

Switzer's second parterre design72 is quite different being more properly as a cascade/canal system than his own "Parterre d'Eau, as the French term it".73 This plate too was based on an actual design and its departure from the standard parterre composition is likely explained by the peculiar situation. It was done

"some Years since, for a Gentleman that had a sloping Piece of Ground, that lay Side-ways of his House, which Slope is apt to spoil the direct View from any Building, and ought not to be admitted, especially in any main Front; for which Reason I thought it incumbent on me, to find out some Method to regulate this great Defect in Nature."74

It is not altogether clear from the plate what the nature of this "side-ways" slope was but it appears that the ground sloped from top to bottom and from left to right, the garden front of the house being on the left, outside the plate. Switzer resolved his problems by making the slope of the long axis into a series of basins and canal while the slope of the short axis was laid out as a series of terrace-walks, a broad central walk, the "parterre", and above and below three narrower terraces supported by slopes.
"The first Descent (as appears by the design) is into a Level compos'd of plain Grass, and Statues; and the next is all of Water; round which if there were plac'd maritime Ornaments, the Effect would answer the Expense: But the Design is entirely plain, and only a Grass Verge round the Water. The next Fall is a Basin, whereinto, upon occasion, may be thrown a great Deluge of Water by a Cascade, out of that great Basin that is above; with several Jet-d'Bau's, from a Reservoir at the Top of the Hill. The next Division is a Canal of 600 Foot long, which finishes the interior Part, of the Design."  

The flanking terraces, though one set lies above and the other below the parterre, are laid out in the same form ending in large circles by the canal. The centre terraces terminate in a circular basin with jet. The slopes are regularly planted with elms "under which, if the Owner desires, he may place Vasa's or Pyramid Yews; but I think it as well without".  

Switzer is most particular about shade, "I can't, indeed, but think it a great Fault in many of our Gardens, that there is so little Shade, especially on Terraces, which are always left very naked, and planted on each Side with nothing but clipp'd Plants; whereas good Shade, and a lofty cool View, seem much more desirable..."  

While the reason for adopting this fairly elaborate system of terraces was to remedy a defect of nature it was also a method making use of a natural asset, the view from the lower series, "over a beautiful Meadow, which Meadow, with the neighbouring Village, and the other pretty Landskips, might be view'd from the upper-most Terrace...the Hedge being low, and the natural Slope of the Hill falling away quite down to it; whilst the Wood that lies underneath, affords not a little Satisfaction, it being cut into large Walks that open at the Bottom to the aforesaid Meadow..."
Woods and groves, Switzer's last major element of garden design, used both in the interior and the exterior parts was "the greatest of all the nature Embellishments of our Country-Seats" when "judiciously contriv'd and cut out". He thought that as everyone agreed that variety was important that some method of achieving it could be agreed "But I know not how it comes to pass, People do differ, and that very much" and to reconcile these varying opinions as to how best to lay out a wood Switzer recommends two courses. Regularity, for those "that esteem nothing well in a Design, but long, large, wide, regular Ridings" is advised in flat, open parks, or forests "where the owner rides and hunts". But in gardens and woods "for walking in only" another approach should be taken.

"tho' a few of these Walks are absolutely necessary, in Respect to the Grandeur and general Beauty of a Situation, as the Middle and Side Walk, and a very few Diagonals, yet it is an unpardonable Fault, as we see it almost every where ...to have scarce any Thing in a whole Design, but carries open Walks." 

"when you find a Wood that has a great many Hills and Dales, and is almost all of it compos'd of Irregularities, 'tis there one should not strain either the Fancy or the Purse, but follow those little Shelvings and natural Turns and Meanders...whether the Wood it self be thick or thin, one ought always to take the advantage of it, and to make it most Agreeable to the Nature of it, having always a particular Regard to large old Oaks, Beech, and such like Trees..."

The contrary often resulted from the design of "some regular Scheme in the Closet" and even his own much respected master George Loudon was not free from this charge, having proposed that Wray Wood be felled and replanted in a regular form.

But however much Switzer revered standing timber he also realized
that a wood could be misplaced, as "when it crowds so close up... as to admit of no open Lawn or Breathing, if it may be so term'd..." or when it blocked some grand distant prospect or a pleasant nearer one.

"De a wood... never so beautiful, it would almost tempt the Owner to cut it down, except he has any other Prospects that exceed it." If a wood were on rising ground it should not be felled by any means since it is naturally better than anything it might block. On the south side of a building, the wood should be from 350 to 800 feet distant, unless "the Prospect be not extremely fine" and on the north side "the opener and larger your Lawn is, 'tis still the nobler" and if possible the wood should not begin for at least a quarter of a mile.

The designs Switzer presents in this section are all regular, but he does give a sort of word picture "an imperfect Sketch" very likely based on Wray Wood, of his more private groves.

"Neither will the natural Gardener be observ'd to have err'd, when he has fill'd all his little Eminences and Hollows with little Gardens, Statues, and other rural Decorations; for his Wood is entirely for walking in; it lyes high, and he is not observ'd to have cut down any noble Trees, when, in Truth, the Nature of his Wood would not allow it; neither has he shewn himself fond of any Mathematical Figure, but has made his Design submit to Nature, and not Nature to his Design. The Inside of his Wood is fill'd with Hares, Pheasants, the Statues of Rural and Sylvan deities all cut out in Wood, while he contrives likewise that living Hares and Pheasants shall abound; by which Means, besides the couchant Furniture in Imitation, he has really a great deal that is alive and in Motion, darting themselves across him where-ever he turns himself. He is often surpriz'd with little Gardens, with Caves, little natural
"Cascades and Grottos of water, with Pieces of Grotesque Painting, Seats, and Arbors of Honeysuckle and Jessamine, and, in short, with all the Varieties that Nature and Art can furnish him with." 90

But even in these regular designs there are features agreeable to the more irregular parts of Switzer's rural and extensive gardening, for example, the irregular part wooded "quarters" resulting from the intersection of the straight and regularly curving sides of Plate "28", figure 1. 91 And these geometrical designs were also to serve as models for the small gardens with which he recommended large irregular woods to be ornamented.

Figure 2, for Switzer "the noblest centre that is in any design I ever saw" is a long rectangle with contiguous circular divisions on the long and short axes, the whole enclosed by a triple rank of forest trees, of two heights,

"the Plattoons at each Corner, are, by a natural Elevation, mounted up into Turrets, while the Inter-spaces are kept low, and appear like Piazzas, to convey one from one Turret to another." 93

This was achieved by planting larger trees, perhaps thinned from an existing avenue, suitably pruned, and younger trees between. The design showed,

"how much may be borrow'd, both of Terms and actual Directions in the designing and laying out Gardens, from military and civil Architecture." 94

Switzer enlarged on the uses of architectural forms in garden
design at the end of the chapter, but unfortunately neither the plate nor all of the text made an appearance. It is possible to form some idea of the design from the abbreviated text. It was an essay in "designing and laying down some little Spots of Gardening, in the Manner that the Ichnography or Plan of a Building is; and by the means of Eugh and other tensile Greens, to imitate the Elevation thereof, in Columns, Pilasters, Niches, &c."

This was one method, and he could think of no better, of disposing of "the great Quantities of tonsile Plants we abound with" and which might otherwise find their way into parterres. On a raised platform Switzer proposed planting a gallery of yew leading to a central space which in turn lead off to "little Rooms or Cabinets of Retirement", the whole clipped in imitation of pilasters with niches to hold white stone figures.

How seriously Switzer viewed this bauble, however "entirely pretty and new" it was is unclear; that it would be the first to suffer from lack of money is plain. But "tho' they will be expensive in keeping, must be esteem'd the most surprising Decoration that any of our Gardens yet afford".

From military architecture, and from antiquity, Switzer deduced this quincunx, a method of planting so that not only the principle lines but also the diagonals ranged regularly. He recommended its use in flat parks and in orchards (which he also advised be provided with walks and fountains) both for its formal qualities.
and its efficient use of ground.

Plate 33, "The Plan of a Grove of Grass with Gravel Walks &c." is a large and complex regular composition of some skill, but its interest lies in the detail furnishing and its implications. The gravel walks were to be lined with hedges of Swedish Juniper "kept out to about two Foot high" and the unclipped standards were to be yew alternating with "little strip'd Standard-Hollies, about three Foot and an half in Stem". The crossings and cabinets were to contain jets, basins, and channels. The irregular quarters were, "if we would mix the Utile with the Dulce" to be

"stock'd with such Sorts of Kitchen-Stuff as are not offensive, as are Cabbages, ., for Pease, Beans, Artichokes ., being kept clean, will look as well as any Thing, and pay for their Keeping".

Besides being a regular grove and potager orné the design "will certainly make an agreeable Confusion, and an imperceptible Regularity".

Switzer concludes volume two with directions for raising hedges, and ordering and cultivating kitchen and fruit gardens, orchards and vineyards; and having thus covered the profitable and the regular parts of gardening he comes "to what has been all along by chiefest Aim, Natural and Rural Gardening".
Chapter Six: Rural and Natural Gardening

The sense of sight brings "the chief Satisfaction and Pleasure to the Mind"\(^1\) in viewing the "Works of the Creation".\(^2\) Of these, "a Country Seat distributed with Judgement, may well be accounted one of the greatest, in This every Person makes to himself a Kind of a new Creation, and when a Seat or Villa is decently and frugally distributed, what a Harmony does it create in a virtuous Mind..."\(^3\)

All the senses are engaged and receive "Innocent Gratification" and improvers are "insensibly" lead "to adore that divine Power that has made them thus susceptible of their own Happiness".\(^4\)

But some people were denied this method of achieving grace through their fear of its expense "and the Alienation of so much Land from other uses"\(^5\) so that any reduction of expense would be valuable.

"To accomplish which nothing (in my slender Opinion) can conduce more than this rural and extensive Way of Gardening I am here proposing, where a whole Estate will appear as one great Garden, and the Utile harmoniously wove with the Dulci; and, I believe, I am not singular in my opinion, if I affirm, that an even decent Walk carry'd thro' a Corn Field or Pasture, thro' little natural Thickets and Hedge Raws, is as pleasing, as the most finish'd Parterre that some Moderns have been so fond of. I am not by this for excluding every thing of that kind, but that an elaborate finish'd Garden should not determine our rural Pursuits, is what I suppose, very many will agree with me in."\(^6\)

But the saving of unnecessary expense was not Switzer's only reason for promoting rural and extensive gardening. It was also sympathetic to the "natural Frame and Temper of Mankind";
"for as the Imagination is continually taken up, and pleas'd with new Objects, and roves through the vast Fields of Nature uncontroul'd, nothing will fully satisfy it, but Immensity, and we often see it verify'd, even in some very large Gardens; that the Owner after they are made, cares as little for them, and would rather walk in his Corn Fields, something is therefore still wanting to compleat this happiness of a Country Seat, which may very easily be answer'd, to be decent Disposition and Distribution of all the Estate and Grounds that lye contiguous to the Mansion House, even if the Scope of Ground is so much for 3 or 4 Miles round." 7

Having demonstrated his scheme's efficacy in general Switzer devotes several chapters of volume three to design and the qualifications of good designers, and to the choice of situation and soils, before discussing the examples of natural and rural gardening.

In his essay on design Switzer complains that garden designers "have confin'd their Thoughts too narrowly into a sort of fine Sett Gardening" 3 which though something curious of its kind, was very expensive in making and keeping.

"Gentlemen of very good Genius's, and Dispositions seem (and that with a great deal of Reason) to esteem them as too stiff and formal" 9 and not capable of satisfying so much as nature. For confirmation "of what I am advancing" 10 Switzer quotes extensively from Addison's Essays on Imagination, and epitomizes his theory of garden design:

"...if a little Regularity is allow'd near the main Building, and assoon as the Designer has stroke out by Art, some of the roughest and boldest of his Strokes, he ought to pursue Nature afterwards and by as many Twinings and Windings as his Villa will allow, will endeavour to diversify his Views, always striving that they may be so inter-mixt, as not to be all discover'd at once; but that there should be as much as possible, something appearing new and diverting, while the whole should correspond together by the mazie Error of its natural Avenues and Meanders." 11
But to know how to do this, to make the best of "Hills, and Dales, of all Corn Fields, high Hills, Banks and Tuffs of Trees" and successfully court nature, a designer must needs be more than a "Skillful Planometrian". His imagination, as much as a poet's, should be enlarged. And continuing to quote and paraphrase Addison's argument "in a parallel case" Switzer urges the garden designer to "make himself Master of all Rural Scenes" and to "collect noble Thoughts" from both ancient and modern poets: from Homer "what is Great" from Virgil "what is Beautiful" and from Ovid "what is Strange".

Though Homer was of limited value in describing ancient gardens, "if we wander through the whole we find in other Parts of his Writings, something stupendously Great: Such are huge Forests mishapen Rocks and Precipices; these a Designer, if possible, ought always to draw into his View, and at the extent of his Design, nothing will be more entertaining, after the Fancy is as it were satiated with the interiour Meanders and other Rural Natural Embellishments." Virgil's description improved the fancy as much as his directions improved the judgement, and from the Metamorphoses the "Designer may collect Statues and Ornaments for the adorning his Villa, that carry the very Air of Enchantment with them." Modern English poets had drawn "the beautiful Scenery of Nature equal to, if not exceeding any thing, to be found in the Ancients; how sweet is that Description of Windsor Forest, and how Noble and Majestick that Inimitable Description of Paradise, by Mr. Milton".

Besides an improved imagination Switzer's designer needed at
least a

"general Idea of every thing, that is Noble and Stately
in the Productions of Art, whether it appear in painting
or Statuary in the great Works of Architecture, which
are in their present Glory, or in the Ruins of those which
flourished in former Ages." 21

In more practical terms the garden designer

"ought to be tolerable good Mathematician, Historian and
Architect; he ought to be a Person of an active, vigorous
Constitution, and very ready and quick at his Business." 22

This prescription, presumably based on Switzer's own skills and
characteristics, contains one omission generally held to be necessary
for garden designers and architects 23 as well as virtuosi of
independent means - foreign travel. "The Misfortune that most of
my Profession are under, in not having been Abroad, is certainly
very great." 24 Switzer himself had not been abroad by 1715 and
though he expresses the hope of going in several places in
Ichnographia Rustica he does not seem to have realized this ambition
until the mid 1720's, and then his travels extended only as far as
the Low Countries. However,

"that noble Taste with which the gardens of France and
other Countries abound, is in some measure discoverable
from those Plans and Perspectives that are brought over
from thence." 25

and this source appears to have been sufficient. Of the great
garden designers of the 18th century - London, Bridgeman, Switzer,
Kent, Brown and Repton - only London and Kent had been abroad.
According to Switzer design was not London's strongest point and
whether Kent learned more from his stay in Italy or from the writings
and practice in England after he returned is as yet unresolved.

Another omission is more telling - there is no mention of a necessity to be expert in, or even knowledgable about, horticulture. The relegation of plant material and its cultivation to a minor supporting role is characteristic of the 18th century. The reverse is true of the 17th century and more modern times where horticulture is the primary, and sometimes exclusive, business of garden design.

George London and the Brompton Park Nurseries built their reputation on their knowledge of plants, and in large measure an interest in horticulture formed J.C. Loudon's designs and writings. The designers between 1715 and 1815 worked within a severely limited range - trees, grass, and some flowering shrubs and the first to recommend this simplification was Switzer.

In his prescription Switzer was effectively calling for a new profession - neither architect nor gardener, but something of both with an imagination formed with as great care as a poet's, in short a landscape virtuoso. Of his contemporaries practising in 1713 only Bridgeman appears to approach this ideal, Laurence and Bradley do not. That there were others, at present unknown, is possible, but unlikely,

"How much of all these, Persons that give Designs know: and how well they are qualify'd for the Business they pretend to undertake: Dismal Experience shows in many Parts of this Kingdom." 28

In the choice of situation for a country seat Switzer offers
counsel of good sense rather than prescription,

"were all...to observe but the Tythe of what has been so

often prescrib'd, as Essential to a Country Seat; 'tis

hard to see, how 'tis possible they should any\n
Seats at

all".29

Fortunately "Providence has been wonderful kind to use of these

Islands"30 so that the problem was not so great as for continental

improvers. To Switzer a,

"happy Choice of Scituations, seems to be this, that it

be a meddling one...upon a gentle Plain declining towards

the South...it consists of a good Corn Land, red Soil, or

a black Pasture Land, and principally of a firm gravelly

Bottom."31

Any departure from this would require more or less skill to be

employed in overcoming defects, such as the awkward slope rectified

in Switzer's design of Plate 30 or the unsatisfactory soil of Blenheim

overcome by London and Wise's expertise.32 With common sense, and

luck (such as a situation "free from troublesome and contentious

Neighbours"33) a "judicious Man can make...his Habitation" the

"Emblematical Representation"34 of heaven.

How this might be done in the exterior parts is, after a review

of its efficacy and the method of treating the interior parts, shown

in three plates, and in Switzer's observations on them. The first

of these is based on his work at Grimsthorpe.35 The Paston plate

is, in everything but name, a ferme ornée being a small estate of

twenty-four acres which is supposed to be "furnish'd as they are very

often with Hedges, and Hedge-Rows, with some scattering large Oaks,
Elm, Beech, or Ash". These are to determine the layout of the exterior parts. The interior garden occupies no more than four acres (the two parts in this plate are expressed at different scales) and is bounded by a wet ditch and terraces in the form of a hexagonal fortification.

A rectangular parterre and circular basin are set within the fortification and the resulting irregular areas between them are planted with trees along their edges and the "little Fruit Gardens" so enclosed have single trees planted, informally, within them.

The middle walk is extended southward beyond the basin, and "to diversifie the going down it, I have plac'd Plattoons or Poletoons of Trees, and always suppose the coppice Wood on each side to be very high, or very low; so that a Gentleman, that walks down that Walk, may at those intervals have open glances into the little Corn Fields, that lie on each side." 39

The canal separating the interior and exterior parts is bounded on each side by terrace walks planted with trees. From the outside walk, as from the extended axial walk various straight, irregular, and curving walks meander through the outer plantations, a mixture of coppice wood, "Lawns, Enclosures of Grass, and Corn Fields". The wood was "not suffer'd to grow too thick", so that the "little Fruit Gardens" and other areas would be seen from the walks, and receive sunlight. The hedge-row/woodlands were to be "mix'd with Primroses, Violets, and such natural sweet, and pleasant Flowers; the walks that lead through afford as much Pleasure as (nay I venture to say more than) the most elaborate, fine garden".
The meandering wooded walks were terraced,

"not only to keep out the Cattle, that feed in the Laws, and Enclosures that lie between...but also from coming into, and cropping the Hedge-rows, and spoiling the Wood." 43

At the intersections of these walks

"shou'd be made a Fountain, or a little garden, of such a Figure as you will find in this or any other Book, or any Gardener can contrive." 44

The second example is rather larger 45 but is composed on the same principles. The design was "an entire Level Piece of Ground and a Rivulet running round the same". 46 Whether this rivulet was supposed to be existing or whether Switzer proposed digging it is unclear. Either is possible 47 but as it so conveniently encloses the inner garden the latter is more probable. His major lines are the middle walk, extended by a canal, several transverse walks, including the main terrace walk which runs from one side of the estate to the other, and various diagonal sides in the exterior part. The house is approached, precisely how is not clear, across an outer, irregular, but taken altogether symmetrically composed canal, and complexly formal lake. This is succeeded by two smaller basins fed by the enclosing canal and finally a long parade leading to the court. The house proper is quite small, with large office blocks flanking the court, and on the garden front "a long Gallery, or Lodgings at each end joyning to it". 43 It is not related to any known house. The parterre, like the parade rather long for its width, fronts the house proper, while the wings front the flanking wooded quarters which contain two large basins. The parterre is divided into three parts and is finished by a sweep. The long axis is extended southwards to the canal.

Apart from this "little Regularity" the estate is a mixture of
irregular and naturalistic forms based on the existing enclosures and advantages. The area enclosed by the rivulet both inside and outside the garden is wooded with variously shaped lawns and walks laid out within. The most remarkable of these, to the left of the extended long axis, is a close approximation of Switzer's description of the forms used in Wray Wood, Castle Howard. It is a sort of rustic labyrinth, whether hedged or not is doubtful, but instead of the walks being straight or irregular they are here as natural as laid out walks can be. They are more serpentine than anything else but unlike serpentine walks the sides are not "parallel" but wander in curves independent of each other. The walks lead, in a vaguely spiral form, to a circular centre.

Outside the wooded area to the right are a series of fish ponds, formal, simply rectangular, and one naturalistic. These are set within a wood planted quincunx. To the left are

"Padducks, the passing of the little Walks thro' them, makes them as pleasant as any Garden; and here 'tis we suppose, that all Trees, Bushes, &c., are kept a little trimm'd, I mean, as to the extraordinary Luxury of them."49

Opposed to the orderly plantations on the right, the trees here, except for those lining the straight walks, are informally arranged.

To either side of the canal are arable fields, pastures, and meadows of various size and shape. And in the upper right section of the plate is the mains and the kitchen garden,

"which one would always place at some Distance from the main House, and the Walks and Avenues being kept neat and well, the Owner will not I am perswaded think it too far to go to it."50

The edges of the estate are wooded, and near it is the circuit which from the extreme ends of the main terrace walk serpentine through all parts.
Switzer's third example is fully described but the plate to which it refers is not included in any of the examined copies, and the extra plate bound in various places in the 1742 edition, though presumably meant to supply this lack, does not agree with his description.

The missing design was an idealized one,

"attended with such infinite Varieties of Nature, and accom-panied with some of Art, that any one Person must rather wish and hope, than really expect, to find them in any one Place." 52

The house stood near the brow of a hill, overlooking a small valley which Switzer proposed to flood and turn into a lake,

"how this may sound to the Bars of the frugal, is not hard to determine, but that it is in it self the noblest of any thing in Nature, I presume no Body will deny." 53

The house was approached by diagonal ascent to a circular parade. On the garden front the terrace (100' x 700') planted with elms led to the left to a "Wood on a rising hill, the thought of which any Body that has seen my Lord Carlisle's Wood at Castle-howard, will easily discern is taken from thence" 54 and like his favourite wood "very much exceeds, all that can be imagin'd or thought of, in common Gardening". 55 On the brow of the hill of this Wood

"there is a little Walk, that leads quite round...which I call a Natural Walk, or Terrace, and which I do always lay down as a standing Rule, in all sloping Hills; under Wood is all suppos'd to be clear'd away, and only the Timber Trees left; for this gives an easy open View to the Walker, and he sees, with the utmost Pleasure, any distant Prospects, and particularly, that delightful Valley, with all its turnings, and windings, that lies under, which is always an adjunct to such rising Hills." 56

The long axis of the garden front is taken up by the parterre, in two divisions - a "plain Parterre" and a lawn, a middle walk of 1000 yards long, "and a canal at the end, of an indeterminate Length". 57 There were
fewer avenues than in the preceding example, because these were "the way of spoiling the varieties of any Scitation, since by that means, all the Beauty thereof is seen at once, and there's an End." 58 But along the middle line,

"there is something New and Noble, at every Center; as you pass the upper End of the first division, with a large Statue, or Obelisk on the Hill, on the Right a cross the Valley, while the other is bounded, shut with Wood." 59

At the bottom of the parterre were the middle, cross and diagonal walks which lead the eye "a cross the Valleys up the rising Hills on each side" to

"a large Statue, Danqueting house, obelisk, or what the designer pleases; And, if there be Plenty of Water, or Cascade rolling down, and facing the Person that looks thereon, at that great Distance." 60

There were to be woods flanking the centre walk and canal and

"if any Gentleman thinks, that the Quarters are too large and will admit of more (cabinets) there are some Designs in the foregoing Part of this Book, that will suit it; many may be collected out of Mr. James's Book; and still more may be contriv'd by our Skillful and Ingenious Draughtsmen or Planometrians". 61

So long as the principles and general design were accepted Switzer does not appear to care about the detail; the "main intent" was the outer parts where the fields, woods and natural beauties were joined to each other, and the interior parts, by curving walks.

"Of all the Lines that a Designer ought to use, in natural Gard'nig, the loose Serpentine Line seem to be the most entertaining; because thereby the Owner does not see all his business at once, but is insensibly led from one Place to another, and from a Lawn to a Hill, or a dale, which he is not apt to perceive, till he is just upon it... this Winding and twisting of the Lines, both upon the main Levels, and on the brows of the Hill, has an unspeakable effect on these Valleys, and rising Theatres of Wood on each side, involv'd, as they will appear with another" 62
These lines not only connected but enclosed the various fields and meadows, and would appear to play a larger part in this missing design than in the previous one. Of the value and character of his three examples Switzer is neither in doubt, nor over modest.

"There is certainly nothing, either in Nature, or Art, that excels such Designs and Improvements; and must be esteem'd at least a faint Essay, and Copy of the sublime Thoughts of ancient and modern Poets..." 63

In the 1742 edition Switzer included another large scale design, presumably to take the place of the missing plate, but it does not answer his description except in the most general way. A serpentine river and complex "bridge" is a feature of this design. 64 This is obviously based on the Glyme at Blenheim and probably represents Switzer's solution to that problem 65 and is likely a product of his early career. The outer garden is again a series of fields and woods connected and enclosed by straight, irregular and serpentine lines, and there is too a Wray Woot feature to the left of the house, but the main interest of the design lies rather in the transformation of the parterre. No longer is its width determined by the central block but rather by the whole house composition so that its width, according to Switzer's scale is some 500 feet, and it is somewhat short for this width being about 750 feet to the end of the sweep, in this case rectilinear. The only furnishing is a line of trees near the edge. It has become a lawn, and of a size approaching that which Switzer criticised Bridgeman for favouring though it still some distance from his 50 to 100 acres, where "the building or mansion-house in the middle
looks very small, and by no means proportionable". In this attitude Switzer was not confirmed by later practitioners such as Brown who made the lawn rather than the woodland the dominant feature of the grounds.

Switzer's observations on his own designs is followed by a full and approving description of Dyrham, Gloucestershire, probably by London though perhaps by William Talman who built the house. Dyrham, on account of the engraving by Kip is considered one of the most perfect examples of formal garden design in England and is instanced as the kind of place that quickly fell into disfavour. Why should Switzer choose this example to illustrate, at least by implication, his natural gardening? Dyrham's qualities lay in the intricacy and complexity of its parterres and waterworks, and it certainly possessed no general visual correspondence of parts - no gusto grande. Even so there are a number of reasons which might have induced Switzer to use it. From his practical point of view it was necessary to show that his ideas were neither singular nor altogether untried and to include a named example would in some measure do this. There would have been two problems: how many examples were there in 1713 and of these how many owners would not object to Switzer's naming them by way of support? Castle Howard, Blenheim, Kensington and Grinsthorpe he had described fully, though in some measure disguised or idealized. Heythrop, Oxfordshire, is mentioned in passing as having given use to all his thoughts on rural and extensive gardening but a fuller description
might have offended the Duke of Shrewsbury and a similar disinclination to offend may have further narrowed the possibilities. 69

Switzer had seen Dyrham "some years since"70 and his description might date from that time, or be an idealized recollection. Another likely explanation is that Switzer saw in Dyrham different qualities of the situation and the immediate effect. His description bears this out.

"To describe the Situation of the Seat in general is a task of difficulty, the best account I can give of it in a few words, is, that 'tis a beautiful irregularity, here a Dale, there a Mount, here a winding Valley, there a purling Stream, &c."71

Not all the garden at Dyrham was within the walls, not at least to Switzer. To the north of the house is a high, south facing hill, and

"Between this Hill, which gives the situation for the Cataract, and a Hill in the Park, you have a fine winding Valley of about half a Mile in Length, planted with Horse-Chesnuts."72

is cut into a number of channels "so that you are never out of the agreeable noise of a murmuring stream".73 These natural intricacies and the outer areas are not apparent in Kip's illustration, but even if this be granted, there are a number of characteristics at Dyrham which run counter to Switzer's ideas and his long and glowing description of it remains somewhat puzzling.

The rest of volume three is given over to practical advice on how to obtain good results in the outer parts under the general heading
"Of the Management, and Improvement of Arable Land". The additions to *Ichnographia Rustica* in the 1742 edition record Switzer's more mature ideas, or his second thoughts. These are mainly to do with the more practical side of the subject, the Appendix consists of further remarks on the classical elements dealt with in volume one.

Of second thoughts on design there is little, although he wrote,

"the foregoing Volumes were publish'd some ten or twelve years ago when...the whole Turn of Gardening saw in another Channel than now it does: that of the Rural and Extensive manner, being then in its infancy, was but little known and less practis'd..."  

There is a "Farther Account of Rural and Extensive Gardening" but it includes only material inadvertently left out of the *Practical Kitchen Gardener* in 1727. In the "Prooemial Essay" at the beginning of volume one Switzer is somewhat fuller on design, though this is by way of recapitulation. The only thing not mentioned in the earlier edition as such, though it was explicit in one of the designs was the "Anfilade or Circuit"

"which has been generally omitted by all that have wrote, and by many that have practised Rural and Extensive Gardening...This...ought to be six or seven Yards wide at least, and should be carried over the tops of the highest Hills that lie within the Compass of any Nobleman's or Gentleman's Design, though it does not extend to the utmost Extremity of it; and from those Eminences (whereon, if any where, Buildings or Clumps of Trees ought to be placed) it is that you are to view the whole Design..."

As for the rest of his theory Switzer let it stand unaugmented. He is still repentant about "a little Regularity" though in 1742 not
on such firm ground.

"A Regular Parterre, or Lawn stript of all those Decorations, of tonsur'd Plants with which the Gardeners have heretofore loaded them, when smooth and even, and of a proper Proportion, strikes the Eye with a certain Reverence and Grandeur scarcely expressible." 31

In summary Switzer's theory and the basis of his style throughout his life was a simplified baroque "frame" to the house composed in earth work in imitation of military architecture proceeding fairly quickly on the garden and court side to an informal arrangement, but even in more distant parts regular figures of plantation were recommended in the ground and situation were suitable. A Wray Wood element, detached somewhat from the composition, took the place of the old wilderness. The parterre was fenced by water or a haha and separated from the outer works by woodland. The exterior parts of his composition were much larger and included fields, forest, meadows and any visually pleasing natural feature. The whole was tied together by the circuit, and intermediate circuits. How much of this he achieved and how his style developed is the business of the following chapters.
The garden designs assessed in this part are those for which the evidence for Switzer's authorship is deemed satisfactory. This evidence includes his own published testimony: Blenheim; Hampton Court, Herefordshire; Spy Park, Wiltshire; and Breamore, Hampshire: the testimony of contemporaries: Grimsthorpe, Lincolnshire; Kensington Gardens; and Leeswood, Flintshire: documentary evidence: Caversham, Oxfordshire; Stourhead, Wiltshire; Rhual, Flintshire; a design for Thomas Bradby of Hull, Yorkshire; Audley End, Essex; Nostell Priory, Yorkshire; and Beaumanor, Leicestershire. Also included are garden designs for which the evidence is equivocal or incomplete: Castle Howard, Yorkshire; Eresby, Lincolnshire; Exton Park, Rutland; Gateshead Park, county Durham; Cirencester Park, Gloucestershire; Riskins, Buckinghamshire; Marston, Somerset; Wilton House, Wiltshire; Shaw Hall, Berkshire; and Rokeby Park, Yorkshire. And finally there is a garden attributed to Switzer on little more than its apparent style, Ebberston Lodge, Yorkshire.

A number of gardens previously attributed to Switzer are excluded and the reasons for their exclusion can be given briefly or at more length as the case requires. Interest in Switzer's ideas and practice as a garden designer did not begin until the early 19th century, and he was the first 18th century designer to be treated as an historical figure. In the latter half of the 18th century there was a remarkable lack of comment, which may be partly explained in that consciousness of garden design as an important art through a large or influential part of literate society is a characteristic of the age just after his death, and with this consciousness came the notion of the English
garden, later called Landscape Gardening, as a distinct, and superior kind of art, so that Horace Walpole (1717-1797) could write in 1770,

"Having thus cleared my way by ascertaining what have been the ideas on gardening in all ages as far as we have materials to judge by, it remains to show to what degree Mr. Kent invented the style..."

and with reference to literary hints thus dismiss its pre-history. In such a climate the examples of "false taste" in Switzer's work to be seen by the succeeding generation would have put him beneath consideration.

Switzer's character and reputation would also have played a role in the lack of notice accorded to him. He was not a "fashionable designer of gardens" and died "well known for his treatises on agriculture and husbandry". By 1750 "they are ignorant of his being the first promoter of the making gardens in the present rural taste a mixture of art and nature". The generation after Walpole took a less doctrinal view of the "ancient style"

"Part of the prevailing antipathy to the ancient style proceeds from a generally entertained idea, that the modern is an improvement on it, in the same way as a modern plough is an improvement on the clumsy implements of our ancestors, but the truth is, the two styles are as essentially and entirely different in principle, as painting and architecture, the one being imaginative, and the other an inventive art."

It also took an interest in Switzer. J.C. Loudon's History of Gardening forms a large part of his Encyclopedia of Gardening first published in 1822. He considered Switzer to be one of the last exponents of the "ancient style", and reprinted one of Switzer's parterre designs as an example.
Loudon did not attribute English gardens to Switzer\textsuperscript{10} but he did originate the attribution of a fairly extensive practice based on Edinburgh to Switzer.\textsuperscript{11} Loudon, who was educated in Edinburgh, and who practised there himself before moving south, would seem to be a reliable authority. However, research into this attribution has discovered no evidence of Switzer's work in Scotland, nor is the evidence of garden design in early 18th century Scotland consistent with Loudon's remarks. This evidence is included as an appendix. As with Scotland, so with Ireland: "Switzer and Laurence, as well as Batty Langley, occasionally visited that country".\textsuperscript{12} Ireland is outside the terms of reference of this enquiry and it is therefore not possible to refute Loudon's remark.\textsuperscript{13}

In his \textit{A History of English Gardening} of 1829 G.W. Johnson (1802-1866) praises Switzer,

"To me he appears to be the best author of his time, and if I was called upon to point out the classic authors of gardening, Switzer should be one of the first on whom I would lay my finger."\textsuperscript{14}

and analyses \textit{Ichnographia Rustica} at some length. He attributes to him employment as gardener by the Earl of Orrery in 1724, and at other times "in the same capacity servant to Lord Brooke, to Lord Bathurst and also to Lord W. Russell, who suffered in 1683,"\textsuperscript{15}

The attribution of work for Russell was doubtless a misreading of Switzer's account of his execution,\textsuperscript{16} and further led Johnson to assume that Switzer was "eighty years of age" in 1745.\textsuperscript{17} The Bathurst attribution arose out of Switzer's dedication to the
Practical Kitchen Gardener and the Brooke connection was probably based on Switzer's remarks in the preface to Hydrostaticks. According to Samuel Felton (fl. 1735-1830) Switzer was "eminent in his day, and added much to the beauty and magnificence of the gardens of many of our client nobility and gentry", but the only specific instance given is to Leeswood, Flintshire where a "specimen of his genius may be seen in the magnificent iron gateway now remaining".

Apart from Loudon there was no stylistic consideration of Switzer's work before the middle of the 20th century, and though the early 19th century accounts rescued him from total obscurity he was to remain a "shadowy figure" to the intervening period. Sir Ernest Clarke's account in the Dictionary of National Biography does not attempt attribution of designs and although Switzer's designs for Nostell Priory, Yorkshire had been published in 1915, nor do the writers of the 1920's, 30's and 40's, concerned as they were with largely literary evidence of garden design; Elizabeth Wheeler Manwaring's Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England of 1925, Christopher Hussey's The Picturesque of 1927, B. Sprague Allen's Tides in English Taste of 1937, and Nikolaus Pevsner's "The Genesis of the Picturesque" of 1944.

The first real attempt to extend the knowledge of Switzer's practice as a designer was undertaken by Laurence Whistler in his Imagination and Vanbrugh and His Fellow Artists of 1954. By document-
ary research, and by logically following the clues in Switzer's works Mr. Whistler added Castle Howard (Wray Wood), Eresby, Grimsthorpe, Eastbury water-works, Lumley Castle, Seaton Delaval, Floors Castle and Shotover to the Bathurst, Brooke, Orreley, Leeswood list.

Some of these must now be deleted as their inclusion rested on assumptions that now appear incorrect. The attribution of Lumley Castle, Seaton Delaval and Floors derives from London's evidence of Switzer's Scottish practice and the assumption that Charles Bridgeman and Switzer worked with Vanbrugh in the south and north respectively. London's evidence is very likely false and there is not sufficient evidence to determine the Vanbrugh connection: he and Switzer were at Grimsthorpe probably at different times, the Castle Howard connection is equivocal and Blenheim is in the south. As Mr. Whistler has pointed out Switzer certainly knew Lumley Castle but whether he knew from George London's there in 1701 or later is not so clear. Such illustrations as exist of the gardens at Lumley do not show very extensive grounds, nor is it possible to establish their style in any but the most general terms. The vague plantations of forest trees with their zig-zag walks cannot be associated peculiarly with Switzer. The Gilling Castle attribution is connected to the northern practice idea, and reinforced it, but it appears to derive from an error. In 1851 George W. Johnson had in his possession "probably the only specimens of his (Switzer's) hand-writing remaining and these are in bills for seeds sold to Lord Fairfax". It was assumed by Mr. Whistler that this referred to the Yorkshire Fairfax's, but
the only Lord Fairfax in 1732 was of Leeds Castle, Kent. 25 There is
little presently at Gilling to suggest that Switzer laid out the grounds,
nor are there papers to support such a view. Seeds at Gilling were
got from Telfords in York, and John Telford may also have been the
designer. 26

Telford has been suggested as the designer of the grounds at
Seaton Delaval, Northumberland. 27 William Etty (d. 1734) is also a
possibility. He laid out the grounds at Temple Jewsam, Yorkshire in
1710 and was Vanbrugh’s clerk of works at Seaton Delaval. 28

"Mr. Etty’s account of the fine prospect of the sea to the
east is very good, for the site there is open, or opener
I think than either to the south east or north east. All
is directly open to the east and north east, but to the
south east that rise in the corner of the east yards as the
way to the lodge, then Hartley a little more southerly
hinders the prospect of the point". 29

From what can be learned on the site and from ordnance survey it
appears that "Mr. Etty’s account" was acted upon. The gardens were
made on a square platform with round bastions at the southern corners. 30

How this was subdivided is not known. To the south east a narrow
wood ran to Seaton Sluice and on the west there was a sunken garden.
The wood blocked the spoiled prospect to the south-east while permit-
ting the eastern views to be seen from it, and the garden platform.

By Autumn 1723 only a little more than £100 had been spent on "plant-
ing expenses" and in 1724 Captain Delaval, who was to inherit from
his uncle before the house and grounds were finished, wrote that "all
the schemes I have about the house at present is to get covered for as
we go on the expense be far too great, and will make me very inconven-
An owner with such a lack of relish for building and
garden making is unlikely to have done more than decency required.

The suggestion that Switzer may have supplied the "engine in
the gardens at Eastbury, for Bridgeman, who designed the gardens, is
not likely to have equalled him in scientific skill" derives from
Switzer's claim to "the Carriage that plays the Engine at Blenheim
and other works of that kind done in several places in England". What Switzer owned doing was the Carriage, that is, canal or river,
but not the engine itself.

Of Shotover, Oxfordshire, probably made before Kent's ornament-
al buildings were added in the 1730's, Mr. Whistler wrote that "the
garden is of the kind that either Bridgeman or Switzer could form": there is unfortunately no external evidence to connect it with Switzer.
It was one of the most Italian gardens made in the period, being a
linear series of enclosures, water and buildings with the seemingly
more rustic ground visually contiguous at every point. The attrib-
ution of Grimsthorpe is confirmed by Stukeley's evidence and Castle
Howard and Eresby are included below.

In English Gardens and Landscapes Christopher Hussey suggested
the addition of waterworks at Claremont, Surrey and at Hampton Court,
Herefordshire, and Duncombe and Ebberston Lodge, Yorkshire. Clare-
mont would appear to have been the work of Bridgeman, whose design
was later slightly enlarged and made less precise by Kent. Switzer
did publish a revised design of the amphitheatre in 1729 and this
is likely the source of Mr. Hussey's attribution. Switzer pointed out that Bridgeman made the original but that the water in front of the amphitheatre was insufficient and cramping. Switzer's proposed solution was a canal. Kent solved this problem by making an irregular lake based on Bridgeman's basin. Duncombe and Ebberston have some stylistic affinity with Switzer. Ebberston compares with the Spy Park/Breamore plate published in the *Hydrostaticks*, but Duncombe "no more than a suggestion" by Mr. Hussey is even less certain and is excluded.

It has not been possible to use stylistic evidence to increase the number of works thought to be by Switzer: in the few cases where it has been employed, there is other evidence, admittedly slight, which is consistent with the attribution. This method has not been used more extensively because there is not a body of Switzer drawings with which to compare anonymous designs (for the technical reasons of size and the imprecision of the engraving his plates cannot supply this want) nor, on the basis of the following works does there appear to have been stylistic consistency, as is the case with Lancelot Brown.

The theoretical difference between Grimsthorpe of c 1715 and Wilton of 1738-1745, or between Spy Park of 1724 and Nostell Priory of c1734, is not great, but the stylistic difference is considerable. And except for the earth work terrace which is not dissimilar from Bridgeman's usage, Beaumanor is unlike any other of Switzer's works. It is hoped, of course, that examples of Switzer's practice will be increased, but of those few layouts still existing, or recorded, none can on present evidence by considered as his work.
Chapter Eight: London, Wise, Vanbrugh and Hawksmoor

It would appear that Lord Carlisle's "superlative Genius prevented" \(^1\) the spoiling of Wray Wood, Castle Howard and "Mr. Wise prevail'd" \(^2\) against the filling of the old gravel pit in Kensington Gardens by the same means: They accepted an alternative design by Switzer. But the exact form, and the contents, of Wray Wood is perhaps even more a subject of conjecture than its author. Switzer's accounts \(^3\) of it give its character but do not precisely describe it. A plan of the disposition of the wood earlier than 1778 has not survived. A very early plan shows the terrace walk surrounding it, but the three irregularly disposed circular "centres" connected by straight walks seem to have been rejected at an early date. \(^5\) Another plan showing an extension of the enclosed part of Wray Wood, also shows only its edge. \(^6\) That there are no plans of the wood contemporary with its design is in a sense not surprising. Once it had been accepted that to lay it out in a conventional form would spoil it there was relatively little need to show it in plans. \(^7\)

According to Switzer,

"'Tis here that Nature is truly imitated...she is by a kind of fortuitous Conduct pursued through all her most intricate Mazes, and taught even to exceed her self in the Natura-Linear, and much more Natural and Promiscuous Disposition of all her Beauties."

Lord Oxford's account was less glowing

"the close walks, when it is drier and warmer weather than it was at our passing through them, must be very pleasant and delightful"

The only furnishings mentioned by Lord Oxford were some water-
works, and whether Switzer was responsible for these and other features noticed in the early 1730's is not clear. It is one thing to have a splendid idea but the skill needed to execute it was probably beyond Switzer in 1700. But the disposition of the elements and the character of the wood are described by John Tracy Atkyns in 1732 perfectly matches Switzer's accounts and prescriptions in similar cases, and probably records his design, if not his execution.

There was a Statue of Diana on a grotesque pedestal, "surrounded with Spruce Firs". In another part

"the wood opens, and shews you a Piece of ground laid out in the Manner of a Parterre. Slopes one below another. Yews and other Trees planted round 'em in the Middle a large Bason" with a grotesque fountain.

In the same clearing were two summer houses recently finished.

"from hence you are carry'd, through a winding Walk which brings you to a Piece of Ground laid out in the form of an Amphitheatre. opposite to the Alcove here is a rude heap of Stone with several Hollows in it, from whence issue very lazy Streeams of Water which fall down 50 or 60 Steps and roll in a winding manner quite out of Sight." There was a statue of Apollo at the top of a steep ascent...cover'd with Trees of various Kinds, but not dispos'd in any Set Form, at the Foot of it, is an Octagonal Fountain"

with a Neptune at its centre throwing water "above 30 foot high" and nearby was

"a small Summer House...a grass Plot before the House, in
the shape of a Diamond, Gilt Cupids and Vases plac'd so to humour the laying out of the ground.\textsuperscript{13}

From the centre of the wood by a circular reservoir were two mounts, and from this point a broad rectangular glade was continued as the terrace in the north front of the house. The wood was separated from the park by a "Wall built in the Fortification way with several Bastions"\textsuperscript{16} a walk running parallel to it. And there were parts that "as Mr. Pope expresses it, Calls in the Country catches opening Glades in the most agreeable Manner that can be imagin'd."\textsuperscript{17}

The second phase at Castle Howard, the projected encircling serpentine river, and the mausoleum and bridge south and east of Wray Wood appears to owe nothing to Switzer, though he proposed a similar treatment at Nostell Priory. As a payment to Batty Langley in 1732 has been recently discovered\textsuperscript{18} he may have been responsible for the river scheme.\textsuperscript{19}

Wray Wood is an early example of appreciating existing beauties and basing a design upon them. Another example of "consulting the Genius of the Place" was in Kensington Gardens, but what was at Castle Howard a manifest blessing was at Kensington simply a hole. The area north of the palace and the newly built green house was drawn into the garden. It was divided into a rectangular quarters and wooded. According to several designs "given in"\textsuperscript{20} and a large irregular gravel-pit was to have been filled. But Switzer's design
was accepted and carried out during the winter of 1704/5. The north and south ends were terraced in five sloped steps, with the centres of parts of a circle and the ends splayed off at forty-five degrees. The junctions of the lines were marked by conical greens. The area at the bottom of the pit was laid out as a parterre with a square centre lined with conical greens marking further steps down. The two triangular ends were laid out in gravel and grass in a more floral pattern.

Wray Wood and the Gravel-pit Amphitheatre were successes. Switzer's problem at Blenheim was much more complex and he failed to achieve a satisfactory solution. Switzer's association with Blenheim begins in the summer of 1705. Queen Anne had decided to give Woodstock to Marlborough in the previous February and Parliament confirmed her decision in the early spring. Vanbrugh and Marlborough met at Woodstock and decided on the situation of the house. Vanbrugh proceeded without delay, clearing the Ground, diggin the Foundations, opening a Quarry in Woodstock-Park etc. The foundation stone was laid with due ceremony on June 13, 1705, and the gardens were begun at the same time under Henry Wise's direction who is also credited with clearing the site and digging the foundations. Switzer later recommended just such close collaboration between architect and garden designer, and to the same purpose. The lack of suitable stone for building was the first problem Vanbrugh encountered, and it is in connection with this problem that Switzer first appears, in August of 1705.
"To Stephen Switzer for his care and pains in looking after the Quarries in the Park In August 1705 being allowed by Mr. Vanbrugh. For six weeks attendance at 10s. per week - £3."

Henry Wise was not surveyor, nor comptroller, though he had apparently the gift of nomination to the latter post. He was an independent contractor and his payments had to be authorized, so that too much should not be made of his absence in this payment. But the direct payment to Switzer does indicate his independence, and the nature of the work here, and subsequent tasks, shows that he was considered a competent and skilled gardener.

Four or five quarries had been opened in the park by the middle of June. Only one provided freestone, little which was suitable for exterior work, and Vanbrugh began to draw on the quarries of neighbouring landowners, but whether Switzer was involved in this is not clear. Wise had been working on the site since April, and in midsummer he began planting. It is likely that after the failure of the park quarries Switzer assisted Wise in the gardens, he was certainly doing so the next year. The centre of the design was the great parterre and woodwork, a huge polygon nearly 2000 feet long. The woodwork was hexagonal and connected to the garden front of the house by the rectangular parterre. The whole was surrounded by a terrace walk with round bastions at the angles. Inside various walks and cabinets were disposed symmetrically about a central avenue. From the terrace walk the surrounding park was visible and was regularly planted with forest trees.
As soon as the park was cleared and levelled planting began with trees from Brompton park and others bought locally. Switzer was sent to Ditche to select elms and hollies, his bill coming to £332:13:5.28

The many straight and serpentine walks in the woodwork were edged with yew hedges and about ten thousand of these were planted under Switzer's direction in the autumn of 170629 and only 200 of these failed.

More interesting than his assisting Wise in the making and planting the gardens, or his assisting Vanbrugh in getting stone, is Switzer's involvement with the "Business of the Bridge".30 The chronology of this is complicated but it appears that Switzer worked on it, at least intermittently, from 1706 or earlier, to 1710. There were three distinct problems arising from the choice of the site for the house. The first was the method to be used to connect the two halves of the park, the second how to treat the river Glyme, much less significant than the depression its course caused to the surface of the park, and finally the execution of Vanbrugh's Bridge. Switzer was involved in two of these, and perhaps all three.

The problem of joining the two halves of the park appears to have been resolved by a competition, perhaps as at Kensington where several designs were "handed in". Vanbrugh mentioned "a Project of Mr Hawksmoor's...about marge the Hill for an easy access to
the House" in August of 1705. There was opposition to this design from the Duchess of Marlborough and Lord Godolphin and as Marlborough was away no decision was reached in 1705. In April 1706 several schemes were presented for Godolphin's decision, the Vanbrugh/Hawksmoor design, a design from Henry Wise, a design from Sir Christopher Wren, and perhaps others.

The Vanbrugh-Hawksmoor scheme was presumably the one that was carried out, that is, a large bridge connected to the opposite sides of the valley by causeways. Sir Christopher Wren's design survives as a description. His scheme was for two roadways forming semi-circles in plan to rise from the level of the causeway to the flat space in front of the house. This would also have caused a very great deal of earth to be moved, if, as seems likely, Wren intended a regular figure, a sort of amphitheatre. At least it would have saved the expense of the bridge, and its cheapness was his main argument in its favour. Its fault was that it solved only half the problem, although it fulfilled his brief simply and cheaply, for it did not connect the house with the park, but only the house and the water meadow. The same device would have been necessary on the north slope if this was to happen. And if such a scheme were used it would have cramped, if not swept away, the old manor of Woodstock which Vanbrugh wanted to keep.

The only design comparable with Wren's, given the added difficulty of connecting both sides of a valley, is a late one of Switzer's published in 1742. It is so like Blenheim that it could have been
a rival design. It shows a house connected to office courts by quadrant wings. A large parterre, absolutely without ornament is closed to south by a large wood, cut out in walks and lawns. On the north, west and south sides he shows a serpentine river, which follows the same course, generally, as the Glyme. Also to the northwest he shows a causeway, much shorter, but in the same position as that at Blenheim. The method proposed in this late design for crossing the river valley was by means of one large circle, instead of the two inherent in Wren’s scheme. The design is on the Blenheim scale and quite matches the grandeur of the house. Switzer’s double bridge would have been entirely of earth. The level of the roadway is the same as that of the two halves of the park, and it does not appear that it sloped down in the centre, but rather it continued the level round the great circle. To the outside the slopes would have been fairly steep, but to the inside they were much gentler and led to a large round basin. If this were ever intended as an alternative to the bridge its main fault would have been the same as Wren’s in Vanbrugh’s eyes: it would have swept away Woodstock Manor. It would also have been very expensive, though probably rather less than the £30,000 the bridge is reputed to have cost. It would have solved the problem of the water meadow by overwhelming it, though Switzer shows a good deal more water in his design than was at his disposal at Blenheim.

Of Wise’s scheme no description or drawing survives. He, Vanbrugh, and Hawksmoor were against Wren’s scheme but since they presented rival designs it is unlikely they were able to agree on
an alternative. In later years Wise rather disowned the bridge scheme (perhaps out of self preservation) even though it was "Mr Wise's Digg". When asked in 1716 to supply drawings of the Court and Causeway he replied that "those works being in John Vanbrugh's and Mr. Hawksmoore's design, I never had any perfect Draught of them", and, when pressed, 'am sorry your Grace should think that I would not give Your Grace as full an Acct of the Charge of finishing the Causeway as I Could, wch I am no more able to do, than to tell what it will Cost to finish the House, the whole depending entirely upon the breadth & depth of the Slopes...tis impossible for me to guess what it will amount to, having never had a plan of it, nor examined the Levels for Some Years".

A hint of what Wise may have had in mind can be seen on two drawings which have more relevance to the treatment of the river course and water meadows. In the earlier drawing there is a trace of what might have been intended as an amphitheatre on the north side of the river. This ran into the fortifications of Woodstock manor. In the later drawing a bridge is shown with a smaller, oval, amphitheatre on the south side. These drawings have been variously attributed - "perhaps by Wise, perhaps by Vanbrugh" and "Evidently by Wise". Could they have been by Switzer? Unfortunately there is no contemporary drawing of his to compare these with. There is little writing on the plans, numerals on the scale of the earlier plan, and "Blenheim" and "Map of ye Gardens" on the later. The "B" in Blenheim does not match the two "B's", both Deston, in the earliest specimen of his hand, but these notes may have been later endorsements. However, both drawings, and particularly the
later one, are designs for what Switzer later claimed to be his work. the "Carriage that plays the Engine at Blenheim and other Works of that Kind...have fallen to my Lot". With the choice to proceed with the Great Bridge, the second major problem arose, how to treat the river. As Switzer's carriage, or canal, was dug by July 1706 the likelihood that these designs represent his proposals increases.

The first drawing is early, before the bastioned parterre and woodwork had been adopted. The form of the garden is polygonal, an irregular hexagon, and its complex geometry is somewhat reminiscent of the garden in Cranborne Chase, Windsor, by London and Wise. The water meadows are indicated by a wash: three inter-penetrating canals are faintly ruled in. They meet at irregular angles where square and rhombic ponds are formed.

The second plan is also early, probably before the summer of 1707, when the office wings were becoming courts. It is a plan of the water-course, whereas the earlier plan was only secondarily concerned with this. The notion of inter-penetrating canals is here developed, and the ponds formed at their crossing are more adventurous. There is an irregular pond west of the house, which with its 'apse' end appears as a distorted rectangular basin. But from here northwards to the main set of canals there is a naturalistic stretch, gently serpentine, its opposite sides not parallel. One canal is shown under the bridge, which after another right angle turn joined the existing course of the river. The area
north east of the causeway is shown flooded, and is obviously a second thought, as is a wilful serpentine stretch from one of the square islands to the bridge.

The third major problem was the execution of Vanbrugh's Bridge and the associated causeways. Switzer had wanted to be put in charge of the by then largely completed gardens. He was disappointed in this and whether there was a breach between him and Wise or not, Switzer went to see Samuel Travers, M.P., Surveyor General of Blenheim, and told him that Wise had promised that he should be employed on the Bridge. Travers wrote to Boulter, "I think he may be very useful to us and hope you will employ him accordingly" and Switzer was put in charge of digging the foundations. This was begun in July 1703 and by the autumn of 1710 the main arch had been finished. The digging of the foundations also included work on the causeways linking the Bridge to either side of the valley. This work was not completed until 1723 under the direction of Col. John Armstrong who had at least referred to Wren's rejected scheme. Presumably Switzer continued "about the Business of the Bridge" until the autumn of 1710 when all work was stopped.

It appears that Switzer had become interested in the problem posed by the topography of the park and river and had probably suggested ways of overcoming the difficulties. During his period of work on the Bridge foundations he would necessarily have become involved in Vanbrugh's attempt to save the ruins of Woodstock manor.
What direct part he might have played is unknown but by 1715 he showed a marked sensitivity to the "unexpressible Entertainment to a Virtuous and Thoughtful Mind" conjured up by "Antiquated" places.  

Switzer's work at Blenheim was not as successful as his work at Castle Howard or Kensington, but the problems were greater and more complex. In his first independent work he drew on the experience of all three and made what was effectively a new kind of garden.
Switzer's client at Grimsthorpe, and at other Ancaster properties in Lincolnshire, was Robert Bertie (1660-1723) Marquess of Lindsey, created Duke of Ancaster in the summer of 1715, and his son Peregrine Bertie (1636-1742).

When the gardens were begun is uncertain. Ancaster's father had refronted the house in 1685, and his wife Elizabeth (daughter of the 4th Lord Wharton) had, at about the same time, planted extensively. "This Lady was reported to be a continual Attendant and Supervisor of her Works, without any regard to the rigid Inclemency of the Winter-season: and not only so, but also in the Measuring and Laying out the Distances of her Rows of Trees, she was actually employed with Rule, Line, &c." These gardens and plantations are illustrated by Knyff and Kip in a series of engravings of 1707, and as the new front was to give way to Vanbrugh's so Lady Lindsey's gardens were to be simplified and some of her woods, "cut out into Gardens, &c." The gardens at Grimsthorpe have been attributed to George London, and it is possible that Switzer first came to Grimsthorpe as London's assistant. However, a letter from Switzer to Stukeley of 1714 shows that Switzer was then with the Lindseys and that he was able to introduce his friend into a long and fruitful association with the family, and Stukeley himself confirms the authorship of the gardens at Grimsthorpe when he notes that Switzer first introduced "the present rural taste" there. Stukeley recorded the layout in a plan and three views in 1737, and these show that Grimsthorpe is the basis for Switzer's Manor of Paston plates. 
One of these shows the unimproved state, the other shows the manor "divided and planted into Rural Gardens". These two sources taken together give an idea of what Switzer intended, and with what implications, and what he was able to accomplish.

The layout at Grimsthorpe owed much to Switzer’s experience at Blenheim; it owed even more to his imagination, for, although many of the forms used here have precendents, the organization of the various elements, and the intention of this organisation is new. The composition, in the outer parts of the published design is also forward looking. Whether the gardens at Grimsthorpe were as sophisticated in this regard is problematical, but it is likely they were.

Grimsthorpe is in a generally flat country, but the house and gardens lie on a ridge which runs roughly north to south, and therefore there are extensive views to the east and west over the surrounding countryside. To the west of this ridge are the Home Parks, shown in Kip’s views as a deer park, but by Stukeley they are shown to be under cultivation. The view on this, the relatively hilly side, is bounded by Bishopshall Wood, apparently planted by Lady Lindsey. To the north the line of the ridge is greatly extended by the North Avenue, to the west of which is The Oaks, another 17th century plantation. This wood now comes very close to the house, and is shown so doing by Kip, but in Switzer’s time it was separated from the house by a lawn "a quarter of a Mile in Length" and at that distance was "one of the noblest and most pleasing Views in
The land to the east falls away to the coastal plain of Lincolnshire, and Stukeley's plan shows an orchard, and what appear to be fields on this side. The line of the ridge is extended to the south now by the Long Plantation, but whether this is of Switzer's planting is unknown.

The late 17th century parterre to the south of the house is retained in Switzer's gardens: it is made up of three sections, a grass plat the width of the main axial walk separates two wider parterres with figured surface, whether this is of shell-work or plain grass is unclear. The parterres are, however, fairly simple, furnished only with conical yews. A breast wall separates the parterre from the sloping ground to either side, where two other gardens with diagonal walks are shown. The quarters of these are not figured. The wood south of the parterre, and on axis, is shown in Kip's view of 1707 as rectangular, with a walk through its centre, again following the long axis. This walk is retained, but the wood is formed into a polygonal "fortress" with ten subsidiary walks running from the pointed bastions to the centre of the wood, where they meet in a large circle. The wood next the parterre is flat, and the entrance into it by the main walk is set off by a shallow apse; at each side of the parterre the side walks are extended into the wood, and these curve to meet at the broad walk at the far end of the wood. There are no serpentine lines shown by Stukeley; the quarters left by the intersecting walks hardly leave room for them. The planting here is promiscuous: evergreen, deciduous, flowering shrubs impenetrably thick; only the walks are clear. These are
separated from the woods by what seems to have been an earthen breast wall, and the same device is used to separate the outer walk from the surrounding countryside.

The broad walk is extended through the wood to form an avenue of platoons, which is terminated as a walk by an apsidal haha flanked by apsidal platoons; the line is extended to the south into the Long Plantation. On the west side of this avenue was a low plantation, probably of flowering shrubs, Switzer's coppice-work, and the western edge of this new wood is Grim's Walk, which is terminated in a small circular space known as Grim's Seat. This antiquity was probably unearthed by Stukeley, and while no mock-ruin is indicated, Grim's Seat and Walk very likely had the same effect on the Ancasters and Switzer and their friends, as Shenstone's Vases and verses had on the next generation. There is an irregular walk, though not serpentine from Grim's Seat to the termination of the Broad Walk.

The outworks, if such there were, at Grimsthorpe are only sketchily indicated on Stukeley's plan. To the east of the extended Broad Walk was what appears as an orchard, with rows of trees running perpendicular to the platoons of the avenue. North of this are two enclosures, the southern is shown in the view of the Duchess' Bastion to have been a pasture. No hedge-rows are indicated on this side, and those on the other side are shown at a distance in the view of the parterre, but they are not indicated on the plan. Although Grimsthorpe does not precisely match the Paston plate in the
disposition of the outer plantations it was clearly laid out on the same principles, an inner garden connected visually, and in some places actually to the surrounding countryside.

Two other Lincolnshire properties belonging to Ancaster have a connection with Switzer; Eresby and Belleau. Switzer’s letter to Stukeley of 1711 was sent from Eresby. No other connection is known, but it is likely that such work as was carried out there in the early 18th century would have been under his direction. The house has completely disappeared, a stable building and a solitary gate pier alone remaining. Of the observable garden works there is an avenue to the north of the site of the house running from thence to Spilsby; part of the moat; a pond of doubtful date to the south; but and to the southwest an overgrown wood with very curious unidentified earthworks.

Belleau too has completely disappeared. Although there are fragments of building there is no garden work remaining. This house and Switzer’s connection to it are known through a specimen measuring book which he included as part of his numerical instructions to gardeners in the second volume of *Ichnographia Rustica*,

"Sept. 14, 1714. The Mensuration of several Works done (or to be done) for the Right Honourable the R of ____, at Belleau in Com. Linc."

This heading could have been altogether fictitious, but since Switzer had only recently finished gardens for the family, and such a book dealing with rough leveling and other rudimentary garden works would
have been readily to hand this is unlikely.

There is a design associated with these specimens, two plain parterres lying under one another, flanked by four smaller parterres beyond two terrace walks. The lower parterre with its apse and abuts a wood which is cut out into walks, both straight and serpentine. The topography of Belleau would have made it impossible for this design to have been carried out there, and it would seem to be an idealized layout.

Switzer's connection with Allen Bathurst (1683-1775) Lord Bathurst is not so straightforward as his connection with the Ancasters, nor are the gardens at Riskins and Cirencester possible to date precisely.

It has been assumed that Cirencester, Gloucestershire was not begun before Bathurst's enoblement in 1712 and his subsequent fall from favour. He had inherited the eastern end from his father in 1704, and although he was M.P. for Cirencester from 1705, he lived for some time after 1706 at Battlesden Manor, Bedfordshire from which he took his title as baron. Kip's view of Oakley House (as Cirencester was then called) in 1712 shows an unimproved estate, and it was not until 1716 that Bathurst bought Oakley Wood and Sapperton to the west, thus making himself master of 5,000 acres of land, five miles from his house in Cirencester to the western end on the Severn. It is only in 1718 that the earliest surviving letters between him and Pope begin, and the first of these
show that he was already at work. The gardens can therefore be tentatively dated from Queen Anne's death in August 1714.

Bathurst's other property, Riskins, Buckinghamshire came to him in 1703, through his wife's inheritance. It may have been laid out before 1712 during Bathurst's parliamentary career but there is no evidence of this: a date between 1712 and 1720 is more probable. It was apparently complete by 1727. Its layout is conjectural; Switzer published a "regulated Epitomy", and the skeleton of the design survives.

Switzer's plan of Riskins was published in 1742, but it was 1727 when it was first described by him: a plan of it was to be annexed to the Practical Kitchen Gardener which had been dedicated to Bathurst, but for some reason the plan did not appear. His description in the Appendix is slightly fuller but the main difference is his first use of the term ferme ornée.

Switzer described his plan of Riskins as,

"but an imperfect Epitomy of the fine Design it is took from, there not being room in so small a Plate as an Octavo Edition will allow to make it larger: nor have I room to insert the whole Design."

This was about one fifth the size of the actual garden, but the most noticeable difference is the canal. Switzer shows this as straight, on axis with the house, whereas the brook at Riskins, is irregular. Bathurst claimed that it was the first deviation from straight canals, and it has been assumed that he meant that it was serpentine: if it
had been made in the '30's it would have been wilfully sinuous, but as it is, and presumably was, it can only be called irregular. The proposed water-course at Blenheim, the new rivers at Hampton Court, Herefordshire, and Bushy Park, Middlesex are contemporary and similarly irregular. There is a break of nearly 90 degrees in its middle, and the curves are so large as not be remarked. It is moreover effectively straight in its long run south the house. But apart from the relative size and the shape of the canal Switzer's plan appears to have been faithful to its subject: "a small Specimen of what may be done in a larger case". 23

There was a double axial arrangement with the house at the centre. The long axis is flanked by fields, lawns, and small gardens instead of the customary thick woodwork. The house, shown as a square in plan, is raised on a square earthen plinth. On the shorter axis to either front of the house are lawns, and to the south side, stretches the canal with wide grass walks flanking it. Connecting the house, lawns, and canal side are "arcades of limes or elms kept down so low that they may not shade the quarters". 26

This was to give "an immediate cover to the owner as soon as he is got out of the house". 25 Running parallel to these arcades was, "a little hedge-row of about six or seven yards wide, thro' the middle of which there will be a private path of five or six foot wide or more", 26 the same specification as for Paston. But instead of fragrant flowers he here has "nuts, philibuds, chesnuts, and other ordinary, but useful fruits" making "an agreeable pleasure in such a private retreat". 27
To either side of the canal are the fields and little gardens through which,

"there are half-standard fruit trees planted, which form, some circular, and other straight diagonal lines, with no other art or labour than the sowing the edges with parsley, time, or other sweet and fragrant herbs." 28

These fields are irregularly shaped, which if they aroused objection were "not so very necessary but they may be omitted", 29 or if the ground were "a sandy loam, or other light soil, these quarters may be laid out square, and so order'd that they may be plow'd". 30

There is a "cart, coach or chaise road round the whole plantation". 31 This is shown running parallel to a highway and separated from it by iron railings, and probably this represented a circuit but it is difficult to see where such an encircling side could have been laid out at Riskins.

Of Riskins Switzer says,

"...I cannot but think that a Farm of 2 or 300 Acres thus employed (be it even double the Quantity) where the Lawns and Fields are kept free from Ragweed and Thistles, and the Turf well rolled in the Spring, and all Mole-Hills and the Dunging of Cattle kept continually spread about: I cannot, I say, but think that it is really the truest and best Way of Gardening in the World, and such as the politest and best Genius of all Antiquity delighted in." 32

Lord Bathurst sold the garden/farm in 1739 to Lord and Lady Hertford. 33

Cirencester is very different from Riskins, not in its general form, but in its extent. It is "the largest and most impressive example surviving of 'extensive or forest gardening'", and very
likely was always among the most extensive at about 5,000 acres. Cirencester would have been to Switzer the perfect garden, and Bathurst the perfect improver. Bathurst was apparently not a rich man, and when political favours were barred to him he retired to his country estate and lavished all his care on its improvement. Not only did he exemplify the Roman virtues, he was prepared to garden, in what Switzer considered, the Roman way, and extensively. By 1716 he was master of an estate five miles long, and all together. How large Oakley Wood was when he purchased it is not known, nor is the amount of wood already growing there. In any case Bathurst planted much, "as far as liberty of Planting" would allow him. Switzer might have taken Bathurst as his model when in 1715 he recommended,

"an Employ so diverting that it ought to terminate but with Life itself and to be plac'd amongst the greatest Diversions of it; all others are subject to Disappointments, but in this, not a Day, Hour, or Minute in the whole Year but what courts our Admiration or requires our Care."

Half of this vast estate when completed was woodland, and half a mixture of garden, parks, woods, and fields: Oakley Wood and Sapperton to the west, and Cirencester Park and Home Park to the east. The only plans of Cirencester that have survived, or have come to light, are those in Thomas Ruddler's New History of Gloucestershire of 1779 and these two are the source of our knowledge about the form and distribution of the gardens and plantations.

Cirencester House stands at the east end of the estate and at the west end of the town (separated by a gateway and a court-yard of
yew hedge). This replaces the wings and forecourt of the old Oakley House. The horse-shoe court of yews is as tall as the house, and has a proportional diameter. There is no precedent for this "concious conceit" in Switzer's published designs, but it solves a problem rarely met with. This is the only garden work on this side of the house. To the west of the house in that part which may be considered the garden is a plain grass parterre, a double square at the end of which is a circular area embraced by two curved banks of earthwork. Beyond this circle an avenue of platoons runs about a mile to Queen Anne's Column, which is enclosed in a large circle of platoons. To either side of the parterre are diagonal walks whose extended lines meet at the garden entrance to the house. There were two of these to the south, much of both of them is now gone and replaced by a wide lawn. The southern most diagonal runs a short way and is stopped by the ice-house/mount. A terrace walk runs along this side the garden and overlooks the Cirencester-Stroud Road. Between this terrace walk and the second diagonal walk was a relatively small garden whose main feature was the mount. Much of this survives.

It is to the other side of the parterre, the north side, that the gardens really began. It was only in the late 18th century, after Bathurst's death, that the Great Avenue which bisects the estate was continued into the town, and is shown by Rudder as stopping abreast of Queen Anne's Column. In this eastern section was a very long and relatively narrow terrace garden of close wood-work. Parts of this also remain, and from those its former character can
be judged. Rather more than a mile in length the Terrace Garden connects the Parterre with Seven Rides. Its form is irregular and it contains numerous straight and serpentine walks. Its edges are raised terrace walks and its end at Seven Rides looked down the Great Avenue. There were at least two ornamental buildings here, the Venetian Building and the Hexagon. Pope's Seat is beyond the Terrace Garden in Seven Rides. The Hexagon is nearer the house, and from it ran three walks, in goose-foot fashion, to the south, south-east, and south-west. That to the south-east led towards the parterre and the house through the Terrace Garden; its end nearest the house is curved so that a direct view was not possible. The walk of platoons to the south west, or rather the line terminated at Harley's Temple on the southern edge of Home Park, and the South walk ran across the end of the garden to the Horse Temple, which was also at the end of the Stroud Road Terrace, thus Cirencester Park was enclosed and effectively made garden. The outside of the south walk, towards Home Park, was banked and raised in simple fortification-work. At the south-west corner of Cirencester Park, by the Horse Temple, is the Lake: the lack of water is the only fault of Cirencester and this late addition in some measure makes up for it.38 The rest of Cirencester Park was apparently made up of lawns.

These parts may be considered as making up the interior gardens: the triangular Cirencester Park with the house, the Horse Temple and the Hexagon at its vertices, and the long Terrace Garden running along the north side of Cirencester and Home Parks. The rest, and
by far the largest part, is, in Switzer's sense the outer plant-
ations. The full extent of Bathurst's estate is not known, but
it is likely that that part not given over to garden or plantation
was under cultivation. Since the area beyond the North Terrace and
south of the Cirencester-Bisley Road is not shown on Rudder's plan
as part of the garden, it is possible that there were fields here.
If such an assumption is correct the Terrace Garden could not have
had more varied views. From the South Terrace there would have
been views of lawns and avenues in Cirencester Park, rougher and
grander views over Home Park, and as the Terrace approached Seven
Rides distant views of Oakley Wood. From the North Terrace would
have been views of fields. Thus Bathurst and his friends could
"walk four or five Miles...without going over one Walk twice" and
it could be done in "Night Gown, and Slippers" and have a view
of the main parts of his great estate.

Seven Rides is the first of three stars, or rond-points, along
the Great Avenue, and can be considered as the beginning of Oakley
Wood. Pope's Seat, Ivy Lodge, the Round Tower and the Square Tower
ornament Seven Rides: Pope's Seat is classical but the others are
mock medieval. The area between Seven Rides and Oakley Wood is a
mixture of wood and pasture, and parts of this may have been under
cultivation in the 18th century as they are now, but to judge from
Rudder's plan it seems to have been treated as a landscape park in
the latter part of the century. It is bisected by Hermitage Bottom,
through which ran a road in 1779, and through which an estate road
still runs. This is the only sharp change in land form, the rest of
the estate being mostly flat, or at most made up of gentle hills and valleys. The date of this section is unknown. Switzer recommended this kind of plantation as early as 1713 and designed a park with scattered trees in c. 1734 but it may be as late as Mr. Hussey suggests that this was the last part of the estate to be planned, and it may have been done after Switzer's death.

Oakley Wood is now a thick forest of about 2,000 acres intersected by numerous, mostly straight, rides. To the north and south are two other woods which roughly double the area. How large it was when Bathurst found it is not clear, but it is certain that he considerably enlarged it. The area is generally flat, (or its character is, the surface undulates somewhat) and along the Great Avenue is a "rolling level". In its vastness with its many rides and tall timber it has a noble but somewhat sombre character: it is no place to be on foot. In the centre of the wood is the Wood House, or King Alfred's Hall. This gloomy mock-ruin, cleverly sited off any vista, and thickly planted round with standard yews is the very picture of melancholy and answers Switzer's suggestion of 1715. Pope loved the spot, and may have laid it out: Swift did not like it.

From Alfred's Hall one of the few serpentine rides leads back to the Great Avenue at the Horse Guards, two sentry-box like buildings. Juxtaposition of these two association producing buildings and gardens would have appealed to a man of taste throughout most of the 18th and part of the 19th centuries.
Beyond Oakley Wood to the west is the clearing of Sapperton Park which is crossed by the Great Avenue and a secondary avenue making the last star. From thence the main line is further extended until the land falls sharply away to the Severn.

Articles of agreement were drawn up between Switzer and William Cadogan (1675-1726) Earl of Cadogan in 1718 and the description of the work to be executed matches the plan published by Colen Campbell in 1725. But according to Campbell "the gardens were form'd by Mr Acres...Anno 1723" and there was no mention of Switzer's responsibility for the design. If Campbell is credited it is apparent that between 1718 and 1723 the contract was taken away from Switzer and given to Acres, and as the articles of agreement are stamped but unsigned a difficulty may have arisen directly. However, there is no evidence for such a disagreement at the outset. Switzer did have grave difficulties with an unnamed client. There was

"a base unjust Aspersion cast upon me by a great Man, some few Years ago deceased, as if I did not perform my Work, but embezzled several hundred Pounds of his Money besides; the Falsity of which is visible, and speaks for itself...and that the said great Man has since paid all that Money."

Cadogan is the only known "Great Man" who recently died (Switzer's "some few Years ago" and similar usages are imprecise) and he is also the only client known to have entrusted several hundred pounds to Switzer. However, the evidence is coincidental and Switzer's remarks might apply to an as yet unknown client. For whatever reason it appears that Acres carried out Switzer's design.
The design of Caversham was one that could be executed by an independent contractor with no difficulty; both the site and the design were simple and straightforward. The site, north and east of Reading, was on the edge of the Thames valley. To the north and the ground is flat and between Caversham on the Thames and Reading is a long, but gentle declivity. The house was placed on the edge of the slope and a rather wide and shallow garden laid out to the south in three broad terraces. Set within these and at a right angle to them was the parterre, a long rectangle with a semi-circular end. The differences of level caused by this juxtaposition were resolved by slopes. To either side of the parterre, in the second division were two long canals, set parallel to the house, and terminated by twin pavilions. In the longest division the parterre sweep overlooked two low woodwork quarters and these were flanked by a pheasantry and kitchen garden. The upper level, separated from the parterre by a glacis, was laid out as a terrace walk (1200 feet long) but it ran from the house eastwards only, the other side being blocked by a pavilion at the south-west corner of the house. To either side of the terrace were wooded quarters laid out in various figures. The line was extended eastwards by a clairvoyée. Thus within a strictly rectangular system, the wide, and rather bland landscape, was broken into one principal framed view with secondary views from the tree lined canals. Within the system there is considerable subtlety in breaking down the symmetry. The main axis and the secondary axis are balanced; the strength of the canals in the latter and the southern prospect of the Thames valley in the other. And by extending the terrace east-
wards and flanking it with close wooded quarters another "garden" is made to coincide with the parterre at the garden door.

Switzer's work for Thomas Coningsby (1656-1729) Earl Coningsby at Hampton Court, Herefordshire was altogether different. A large platform garden had been made by George London in the late 17th century and by 1705 a large fountain had been installed in a semi-octagonal basin. And though the site was in a bend of the river Lugg, and Humber Brook had been canalized on the east side, there seemed to be a lack of water. So Switzer constructed a reservoir roughly half a mile north of Hampton Court, on axis; and fed this with a carriage running roughly parallel to Humber Brook, but instead of falling in cascades it follows a level 300 feet above sea level, or 75 feet above the level of the gardens and the river Lugg. Besides the benefit of extra water to play the fountains in the gardens there was an economic reason for constructing the water carriage. It emptied

"itself on some high Lands or Eminences that lie above that ancient Seat, waters all the Land thereabouts, and causes an uncommon early Verdure, and Profit to the Possessor" 49

The carriage had also,

"laid a Foundation for the Watering of Two or Three hundred Acres of Land, that is, and may be very well improved from five or six Shillings, to twenty or thirty Shillings an acre at least" 50

and though "this useful, but expensive Work" could be

"reckoned amongst some of the greatest Undertakings that were ever attempted in this or any other Country by a
This reasoning has the ring of the "projector" about it and the improving fever of the years before the crash of South Sea stocks may have influenced Coningsby, but though Switzer said it had only "laid a Foundation" it is difficult to see that anything but the park and gardens could have benefited from the carriage as the bulk of arable land lay north and east of it, and above it.

Humber Brook had included a decoy in the park north of Hampton Court, and this side of the house appears to have been in some measure conceived as part of the garden. Switzer's new river would therefore have had more than practical value. But nevertheless it did not have the close visual connection to the house that the Glyme had at Blenheim. Also unlike Blenheim where any shape could technically be made in the water meadows, at Hampton Court the carriage

"was conducted by many Windings and Turnings through high and almost impenetrable Rocks, some of at least ten or Fifteen Yards perpendicular, and over other Variety of Earth, Clay, etc." and its form would therefore have been somewhat restricted. It also had to follow the contours of the land if it was to be effectively horizontal. But given these conditions Switzer still had a measure of latitude about the form of the carriage: he could have made it irregular like the new river in Bushey Park, or he could have made it serpentine like the water at Well Hall, Lincolnshire made in the early 1730's. He chose neither of these solutions, and though the
carriage has elements of both (there are near 90 degree turns and straight sections while the curves at the eastern end are languid and snake-like and ought to be compared with the course of Humber Brook below) it is remarkably unselfconscious. While in no sense naturalistic, (the constant width of five yards would alone preclude such a description) it is nonetheless natural. If it were not for its early date and its manifest artificiality it would in no way be a remarkable course for water to follow.

At Hampton Court the work was "begun and finished in eight or ten Months" but it is not known in what year. The Cadogan contract called for Switzer's attendance of Caversham for most of 1718, but a date of c 1718 would appear reasonable.

The third volume of Ichnographia Rustica was dedicated to Thomas Herbert (1656-1733) 8th Earl of Pembroke and it is possible that this too was a dedication to an employer. The simplification of the great 17th century gardens at Wilton appears to date from this period and Switzer would seem the likely designer.

Isaac deCaus' garden is the best illustrated of the 17th century, and the finest. Its chief furnishings were water works, pieces of architecture and fine plants. The garden was a long rectangle with a broad central walk leading to the famous Grotto. The north and south sides were walled, and the west (the grotto) side was formed into a ballustraded terrace. The River Nadder flowed through the garden but was perhaps the most minor water work, practically no use
was made of it in the design. The Jones range of the house occupied half the eastern side of the garden, and designs survive for repeating this range north of a centrally placed frontispiece, thus making a balanced composition of house and garden.\textsuperscript{56}

By the second decade of the 18th century the qualities of Wilton, the delicate and elaborate water works and the fine plants, its "nice" conceits, were becoming objects of ridicule, and were held to appeal only to the vulgar. Wilton was also a closed composition, the axis being decidedly resolved by the grotto building and this quality too was out of favour in the 18th century, when compositions were to be balanced by distant "determinate Prospects"\textsuperscript{57} and when looser and more extensive layouts were preferred. It is these characteristically 17th century features which were initially removed, but it was twenty years before this transitional and rather negative design was replaced by a more positive one.

The grotto building was removed and replaced by a clairvoyée and the axis was extended to a wooded ridge in the park where Marcus Aurelius on horseback was placed against the sky.\textsuperscript{58} The wood and gardens were joined by lines of forest trees. The water works were removed and their place was taken by a large basin decorated by a baroque sculpture group. The \textit{parterres en broderie} were replaced by grass with conical greens as decoration and a few pieces of sculpture. The garden walls remained. The entrance side of the house (the south side) is not illustrated by deCaus, but the long canal, River Wily, on this axis has been dated to 1683.\textsuperscript{59} However
the diagonal vista to Salisbury cathedral church is likely to have been among the works of c 1718. Between the forecourt and the garden was the bowling green with a building from the garden re-erected here, opposite the Corinthian column.

To what extent the wood west of the garden was used as a garden is unclear, Stukeley marks Sir Philip Sidney's walk which runs roughly north-south along the house side of the wood (now the line of an estate road). The wood was sufficiently mature to admit of a treatment similar to Wray Wood, and certainly in the later scheme this was done, but none of the visitors to Wilton mention this part of the scheme, and it was a way out of the gardens used by Lord Oxford's party. There was an enclosed cascade in this section, but precisely where is unclear. It was in full view of Marcus Aurelius, and on the east side, perhaps in one of the newly cut diagonal walks, or perhaps in a cabinet in the wood. It was sufficiently important a feature that Stukeley made at least two drawings of it.

The layout itself was also considered important. A painting was made of it probably by Leonard Knyff (d. 1721) in c 1720, and this was the basis for a double plate in Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* of 1725. The qualities of the Jones range might account for this, except that the house is not shown to particular advance, and the garden is. Despite, or perhaps because of its very transitional qualities, the garden was esteemed in the second and third decades of the 18th century.
The simplification of the gardens was complete when William Stukeley recorded them in 1721 but when it was begun is less clear, but these drawings, Knyff's painting and Campbell's publication would suggest that the work was of recent date, probably between 1715 and 1720.

The canal garden at Ebberston Lodge, Yorkshire is similar to Switzer's plate, published in 1729, based on Breamore, Hampshire and Spy Park, Wiltshire. There is no known connection between him and Ebberston or with its owner William Thompson (d. 1744). Christopher Hussey suggested that Switzer may have designed the grounds at Ebberston because of his presumed practice in the north of England and his manifest expertise in water works. Evidence for Switzer's practice in the north of England occurs in the 1730's only: between 1715 and 1725 he appears to have practised in the south and west. But there are qualities in the gardens at Ebberston that point to a designer of the first rank, and on present knowledge, this would be Switzer or Bridgeman. Of the two Switzer is more probable.

Whoever the author of the grounds was a good measure of the credit for their success must be shared with the architect, Colen Campbell for the setting of the house is crucial. The site in the north slope of the Vale of Pickering and the prospect though extensive is not vast. On the north side of the Vale are many long narrow valleys perpendicular to the slope and at the mouth of one of these Campbell sited the Lodge.
The garden was made behind this so that the house, garden, landscape relationship seen at Caversham is reversed. The house at Ebberston is treated as an ornament between the garden and landscape. From the house two very different prospects were provided: to the south the Vale of Pickering and to the north the enclosed and regularized valley.

The axis of the valley was formed into a canal and three cascades. The slopes were thickly wooded, and between them and the canal were two broad walks, regularly planted with clipped evergreens. The centre of the scheme was a small circular island with an obelisk at its centre, and the canal, walk and slope curved around it. At the upper end the valley turns westward out of sight of the house, and today this has a relatively wild character: the 18th century treatment of this part is unclear, but a progression from unimproved ground through the regularized valley to the house would be expected.

The canal emptied itself by a cascade under the principal room of the Lodge into drains and the water was conducted underground around the house to reappear as two short canals on the south side, and finally to a stream, on axis, flanked by a pair of fountains. The scheme was complete by 1725 when Campbell published the design for the Lodge.

Sir Richard Hoare founded Hoare's Bank and at the time of his death in 1718 his son Henry Hoare I (1677-1724) purchased Stourton, Wiltshire from his elder brother's trustees. In 1720 he built
Stourhead to designs by Colen Campbell. He commissioned Switzer to prepare a design for the gardens but he carried them out himself. 67 This design has not survived. According to Colt Hoare,

"a greater degree of formality prevailed in the disposition of the ground immediately around the house...the immediate precinct of the mansion was surrounded with walls, and decorated with fountains...its formality was somewhat diminished by the second possessor and my worthy predecessor, Henry Hoare, Esq." 68

A map of Stourton of 1722 69 shows a forecourt to the east and two rectangular enclosures south of the house. The forecourt has an apse end, perhaps a clairvoyée, and an oval parade, both to be expected of 1720, but otherwise no details can be discerned. Switzer was paid for a design but as he did not act as contractor, it is possible that his design was not proceeded with. The main interest of the lost design would be its relation to the subsequent making of the lake and the landscape garden laid out around it. The lake area, in 1722 a series of 7 ponds, is sufficiently far from the house to have been excluded by Henry Hoare I from his plans for the gardens: the extent of the gardens shown on the Stourton map would suggest that he intended the house only for occasional, or future use, for they are the smallest he could decently have had. Its picturesqueness aside, the main qualities of the lake garden are its seclusion, that it looks inward and takes no part in the surrounding landscape. It has the character of a secret garden, all the more unexpected because of the wide, grand landscape of the Downs as seen from the house. A similar secretiveness was obtained at Castle Howard in Wray Wood, but that is more like a
sacred grove than a sheltered piece of paradise. Ebberston Lodge has something of the feeling of Stourhead, as does the contemporary, likely amateur, Hall Barn, Buckinghamshire, and this character is a common feature of early 18th century gardens - the juxtaposition of secret and grandly open spaces. In that sense the plantation of the area of the ponds could have been in Switzer's mind, though the forms used would likely have been very different from those finally employed. The connection between house and garden today is particularly unhappy but a map of 1785 shows the original approach. The rather short parterre shown on the 1722 map is trebled in length. At its end a terrace walk, at forty-five degrees, begins, and runs along the edge of the plan above the lake. It stops at the Obelisk, west of the house on axis. Entry to the lake garden would have been from this terrace. An irregular small park was enclosed by the extended parterre and wooded terrace walk.

Sir Richard's widow, sister of William Benson, lived at Stourhead until her death in 1741. Henry Hoare appears to have interested himself in the house but to what extent is not clear. He subscribed to the Practical Husbandman and Planter, perhaps significantly, from Stourton in 1733/34. Switzer used the family bank from 1724. It is tempting to suggest on this evidence that he might have designed an extension to the scheme of 1720, lengthening the parterre, and making the terrace walk, and conceivably suggesting the inclusion of the lake area. This period of the gardens formation is practically blank, and his efforts from the early 1740's are, without professional assistance, difficult to explain. That
Switzer was the designer of Stourhead, or Henry Hoare's professional ghost, can be at present only a very tentative suggestion.
Chapter 10: Work 1720-1730

Spy Park, Wiltshire occupies the southern part of Bowden Hill and is about 300 feet above the countryside to the south west. The old house stood on the edge of the hill, "too near the Precipice" and has been built by Mrs. Rolfe's grandfather Sir Edward Bayntun.

"...the humourous old Knight has built a long single house of 2 low stories in ye precipice of an incomparable prospect, and landing in a bowling green in ye park."  

The gardens lay between the house and the bottom of the hill. The designs were published by Switzer, a folding octavo plan of the gardens in 1724. Of the area north east of the house, the entrance side, nothing is known, although a large basin west of the present house is not apparently part of the 19th century garden. Nor is anything known of the large park of other outworks.

But though the design is fragmentary it is nonetheless an interesting one. Switzer said that it was "entirely new in its Kind" and this would seem to be so, for it is axial parallel to the main front and not as was common, perpendicular to it. There are two reasons for this solution. Switzer conducted his water as horizontal as he could so that a canal and basin were possible. If his main line had gone in the other direction, that is perpendicular to the south west front of the house, his only effect would have been a cascade. In the event he was able to have a cascade and much else besides. The second reason for this change from normal procedure was that the house was fifty feet and more above the garden, and close to it; therefore there was no necessity to open the view through the garden on axis which was the original
impetus for avenues. From the house and terrace a very extensive landscape presented itself: the garden would have played little part in the view from the house. But if the view from the house were "the finest of any in the Western Parts" why repeat the similar but diminished view fifty feet below? By changing direction Switzer was able to have the grandeur of the landscape and the very different grandeur of an open garden composed on a great line. The connection of the two schemes was the major problem, which he solved by making a great basin of $2\frac{3}{4}$ acres. This lay directly under the house, and gave the landscape a lake in foreground. The two schemes were further connected by a column of water according to Switzer's scale, 110 feet high. The hill between the house and basin was formed into a mock fortification, a glacis on 'axis with a rounded centre section, and two plane slopes leading to bastions at the ends of the terrace. This feature

"occasion'd the raising a good Part of it a-new, and at a great Expence, particularly the Bastions...But the Beauty of those great Slopes with so large and useful a Basin of Water, as is below, will, 'tis hoped, compensate the Expence."  

The walks connecting the upper and lower gardens were quite separate from the visual connection. These led through wooded areas from the ends of the terrace to the kitchen garden on the east and the wood on the west. The basin then was reached from these parts, either obliquely or along the axis of the lower garden.

According to Evelyn the old house had "not a window on ye prospect side". Switzer solved this problem by building a grotto in
the centre of the south west front on axis with the column of water, and joining the grotto to the basin was a cascade about 15 feet wide. Its fall was 50 feet in 85 and it ran down the centre of the rounded section of the glacis. The grotto does not appear to have been built by 1724 for Switzer refers to it as "design'd" or to "the place for a Grotto". Unlike some later grottos the one for Spy Park was architectural, more a grotesque porch than a grotto in the normally accepted sense. Switzer apparently was very sensitive to the sun and liked shade and in this south western exposure the heat and brightness would have made a grotto a pleasant retreat, but even so his placement of it at the top of the slope instead of at the bottom seems unusual. The cascade and grotto at Chatsworth is misleadingly similar, and it may have had an influence, but whereas it is built into a more gently sloping hill with the house below it the grotto at Spy is the topmost feature of the garden and is attached to the house.

The lower garden was divided into three parts; the kitchen garden, basin and woodwork in three descending levels. The canal running through the kitchen garden separates it into two groups of four beds or quarters. Each quarter has a square basin in its centre and each basin has a small column of water. The kitchen garden is not walled. Fruit is grown on a retaining wall north of the garden set into the hill under which is another terrace walk which overlooks the canal and kitchen quarters. At the west end of the kitchen garden a narrow cascade leads from the canal into a small basin of complex shape and then into the Great Basin. The basin is
surrounded on three sides by woodlands with "Cabinets in Quarters for Greens and Flowering Shrubs" and lawns connected together by serpentine, straight and irregular walks. The basin is symmetrical about its north-east/south-west axis but the shapes of its edges are very complex. The canal flows "through" one side rather than the centre, and except from the grotto and terrace its shape would doubtless appear indeterminate, and the walks along its edges would appear serpentine. On the west side another small ante-basin empties into "A Circular Cascade or Fall of Water" with leads into the menagerie, which had not been made in 1724, but it is related to the plate of the cascade at Breame, Hampshire, published in 1729 which was said to be like one "I have sometimes since made at Spy Park".

Switzer had plenty of water at his command, and reservoirs would have been made in the high parkland to work the many columns of water. But the area was sandy and he had some difficulty in contriving satisfactory ponds and carriages which would necessarily have been lined with clay, or chalk. How extensive the carriages and reservoirs were is unknown, but they would likely have been similar to those at Hampton Court, Herefordshire.

None of the water works or gardens survive today. They were made originally out of the cheapest materials and any traces that may have survived into the 19th century were probably swept away by the new owners when a new house was built.
A property near Spy Park with which Switzer apparently had a long connection was Marston, the English seat of Charles Boyle (1676-1731) 4th Earl of Orrery and first Lord Marston.

The only known representation of the garden is a plate published in 1739. From the style of the gardens shown it would appear that the garden was designed between 1715 and 1720, and Switzer's calling Orrery "good friend and good master" by 1724 indicates an early date.

It is not a large garden and in some ways is rather old fashioned. The pleasure garden lay northwest of the house on rising ground, and at the end was bounded by the highway to Frome. To the south east of the house the churchyard and farm were rather close and the kitchen garden lay to the other side of the forecourt. The pleasure garden and forecourt were walled. The composition of the pleasure garden is one of four rectangles, but instead of bisecting the walled enclosure with his main line Switzer divided the square space into nine so that the main and secondary lines subdivide the garden asymmetrically. The largest area, the four "squares" in the north east corner is shown as a lawn surrounded by a breast wall, and strangely, apparently no way in, or out. The narrower area west of the main walk is likewise walled but is planted as an orchard. A small square garden at its centre is reached by serpentine and irregular walks. A similar enclosure occupies the south east square. The two remaining squares give a symmetrical foreground to the house; this area further is subdivided in a more
conventional way. A parterre the width of the house is flanked again by orchards. The cross walk and main walk are reached by a complex earthwork. The walls of the lawn and orchard gardens are lined by small standard trees while the interior of the perimeter walls are used for growing fruit. The whole is plain, almost severe and is relieved only by the earthwork. Part of this is obscured by the house in the print, but six levels are visible. The topmost levels are properly in the main walk and their apse shape is shared by similar curves to the breast walls of the lawn and orchard garden. The next level is a terrace walk running the width of the garden and communicating to all parts. From this a wider earthwork of two levels leads towards the parterre. At each end are ramps which curve outwards. Immediately below this is the final earthwork, basically the same as that above it, but wider and larger and with ramps curving inwards.

A more interesting earthwork is in the "forecourt". The gateway is about fifteen feet below the house, and the drive forms a perfect figure eight around two circular basins. The ground is continued level in an extended semi-circle around the top. The descending drive and the level are connected by banks curving about three axes.

A curious feature of Marston is the kitchen garden. Unlike the rest of the gardens it is not walled. It is an area roughly half the size of the pleasure garden and is divided into many square beds. Standard fruit trees are negligently scattered over the
garden. What appear to be walls for fruit are concentrated in the centre: four regularly spaced parallel walls and two open ended cross walls.

This arrangement for a fruit or kitchen garden is apparently unique. In the 1731 and subsequent editions of the Fruit Gardener Switzer includes a design where the walls, insofar as they do not enclose the garden, are disposed in a similar way. In this latter case they were to be heated so that fruit could be forced: Switzer recommended such a step only where it was absolutely necessary for "those who live northerly, and on cold moist spewy Lands" and where coals are plentiful and cheap, e.g. Northumberland and Durham, and by 1731 he had executed a garden of this sort for "a Gentleman of Honour and Worth in the North". But Marston would not have required such a system, and the value of this disposition of the walls lies in there being many various and concentrated exposures for vegetables required at different seasons, a condition already well provided for by the many walls in the pleasure garden.

From Parr's print these "walls" appear to be at least two feet, a thickness at once insufficient to hold a heating mechanism and too great for ordinary walls. The 'walls' are probably frames on which hardy fruit trees are trained, perhaps apples, but their disposition is nonetheless curious.

Plate 28, figure 1 of Ichnographia Rustica volume two (referred to in the text as plate 32) was in 1718
"lately compos'd for a Gentleman, and since it is not yet executed, I here place it at the Front of my Designs of Wood-Work". 17

It was designed for the north side of the house, and considering Switzer's remarks on woods in the situation and form presumably flat. 18 This "little Park" is fairly thickly-wooded and is cut out in a complex figure symmetrical about both axes. A rectangular basin with three columns of water lies in the main axial side with four further, octagonal, basins and columns of water aligned diagonally to it. The most striking characteristic of the design is its extreme formality. But this is misleading

"We have purposely designed to clear away all the brushy Under-wood, in order to make the Grove the more open; besides the Deer would break it in Pieces, and make it appear so ill, that one ought by all Means to take this Care, in order to prevent that Blemish, and it can't be deny'd but that an open Grove is as beautiful as a close one." 19

The sides are avenues in a sense but the trees are not planted regularly, nor clipped, except "such Boughs as are apt to grow in the Way". 20 The most interesting feature of the design are the shapes of the lawns between the sides. These too were to be "purposely clear" 21 of undergrowth. They are of various naturalistic shapes and their edges are often obscured by setting trees forward from the "line". In a few cases trees stand singly and quite detached from the edges, but there are no clumps. At Grims-thorpe and Riskins this formation had already been used, but to a different purpose.

There is no clue to the identity of the client for whom it was
designed nor to whether it was ever carried out.

Plate 1 of the *Practical Fruit Gardener* was designed for "a Person of Quality in the West Countrey". It illustrates a point often overlooked in assessing early 18th century garden designs, that is, a client of pronounced and somewhat conservative opinions.

"The turn of this Nobleman's Taste is a good Fruit-Garden having neither Room nor inclination to Wilderness or other works" though by 1731 he seems to have been wavering somewhat, so to the humble fruit garden Switzer added the "beauties that are found in Wildernesses or Parterres". The design is of a rectangle 750 feet long and proportionally rather narrow. The main body of the garden is on two levels, and each of these was divided into two beds for fruit and kitchen stuff. The centres were planted with herbs or made into basins. A broad walk ran crosswise at the centre of the garden on an intermediate level. At the top of the garden was a mount and behind it an apsidal projection, and at the bottom was a large octagonal basin flanked by close woodwork through which are serpentine walks. The whole is walled, and the entrance is from a large circular parade. As its unknown owner probably intended there is nothing especially remarkable about the design.

The second plate of the *Practical Fruit Gardener* was made especially to illustrate Switzer's notion of making fruit gardens rhombic instead of rectangular, but it was "a Figure that with some Amendment I made some years ago for a noble Lord". Whatever
advantage the fruit may have derived this disposition of fruit
gardens would have had a remarkable effect on the perspectives in
the pleasure gardens. By turning the angles of the walls of the
flanking fruit gardens some 20 degrees out of true Switzer created
a great funnel. Near the house the two gardens are 100 feet apart,
but at their far ends, only 550 feet away, they are 475 feet apart.
The space between is made into a large basin with a great column of
water in an apse end against the wood. Except for the peculiar
geometry this is a most ordinary composition, and whether a baroque
distortion was in part his object is not clear. From the great
avenue extending on axis from the end of the basin it would appear
that it was. Here the sides of the avenue diverge in a more
conventional way but this is misleading: these lines, like the walls
of the fruit gardens and the sides of the basin are generated from
a point in the centre of the garden front. It is doubtful that
from any viewpoint in the vicinity of the house that the basin would
have appeared rectangular, that anywhere there would have been a
perceptible regularity.

There is strictly speaking, no parterre, here replaced by the
parade which has characteristics of both parterre and terrace walk.
This was either paved, or had a gravel surface. The wood had two
functions. It guarded

"the wall'd Garden against the Impetuosity of the Winds.
&c. for it is and has been all along my Method when I
could, to enclose these Fruit Gardens within the larger
Quarters of Wood, &c Whereby the Garden lies more commod-
iously to come to and adds to the Extent and Beauty of
your Garden at once, and if well dispos’d, is one of the greatest ornaments of a Design.\textsuperscript{26}

It is doubtful that Switzer considered these fruit gardens among the greatest ornaments of the design for he felt obliged to acknowledge that "the figure is not itself the most beautiful."\textsuperscript{27}

"...A man may with almost as much certainty paint a face as give a perfect design for a place he never saw."\textsuperscript{28} Yet this is precisely what Switzer was prepared to attempt on at least two occasions. Thomas Broadley (1703-1734) had written to Switzer in late summer of 1726 presumably asking that Switzer send him a design for his grounds. He cannot have been very specific in this although he had given Switzer an account of his view of the Humber, and indicated that plainness and simplicity of design was what he wanted.

Whatever misgivings Switzer may have had about this procedure he wrote on 10th September 1726 asking for an exact survey and suggesting his friend Mr. Pelham for the job, and within a month he had received it, and had prepared a design. Switzer was unhappy that the house was in the corner of the site, being bordered by the street and a lane, which he presumed could be diverted, and on that basis prepared his design, with the warning "if you are soe unfortunate as not to have room for a whole one you must submit to have a little more than half a garden."\textsuperscript{29}

This attitude to the site seems rather cavalier, and he is very far from "consulting the genius of the place". We tend to consider
roads, buildings and certainly towns as influencing the character of a site as much as its orientation or the form of the ground. But these impediments do not seem to have been appreciated as in any way binding in the early 18th century. Lord Carlisle removed Kenderskelfe Castle and village, and though the old street may account for the form and direction of the southern terrace of Wray Wood all were swept away. Lord Mar suggested a similar expedient - of moving the road from Twickenham to London northwards to accommodate his projected gardens and Switzer again proposed, unsuccessfully, that the Wragby-Foulby road be diverted away from Nostell. Roads and lanes were seemingly regarded as no more than rights of way to be diverted at will by the courts by a "Writ of Quod Damnum which won't cost about 20 l". In the event the lane by Broadley's house could not be diverted because "it's so deep it would cost me above 150£ filling upp".

Switzer's design has not survived but we can draw some notion of it from his description. Broadley's ground apparently measured 60 yards by 347 yards, certainly an awkward proportion: with Switzer's proposed removal of the lane the width would probably be increased to 100 yards, so that the garden would cover roughly six acres. Most of this would be occupied by the "outer quarters" of "wood or coppice worke, made without any art". It is not altogether clear whether these quarters were to be made in various figures, like clumps, or were to enclose cabinets or lawns of various shape; very probably the latter. Switzer was not concerned about this in detail and promised to send larger scale designs for them as
Broadley proceeded.

The garden was to be composed, presumably symmetrically, about a middle line or "vista". There was a "little sweep parterre" or as Broadley put it "an oval of limes" and five divisions for fruit trees except the middle one for "Evergreens and flowering Shrubs with Cabinets". But Switzer was worried less about the disposition of these elements in detail than the possibility that the house might not be in the "Middle not only of your Gardens but the Enclosures contiguous thereto" or that one of the lawns would have to be given up "since tis on this Depends the Beauty, Privacy and Conveniency of your Seat".

But this was not to be. Broadley's last letter is politic. He accepts Switzer's estimate of cost, but suggests that in any case he might not proceed for three years. He would probably proceed if he could make it "worth ye while", and asks Switzer to try again; "I would have itt to looke as much like nature as possible" but not to send another tinted drawing, for which he would have to pay however suitable the design, but rather a black and white sketch in a letter. It is not known how Switzer responded to this, or whether a design was carried out.

It is interesting that Broadley should have written to Switzer. Broadley was only 23 at the time, and though from his letter he does not seem rustic, nor does he seem to have been abroad or to have been fashionable. Yet he is very specific about the character his garden
should have, "as much like nature as possible", an advanced notion for a man of his position in 1726. He may have accepted such ideas and picked on Switzer to carry them out from reading *Ichnographia Rustica* (we do not know where Broadley's original letter was addressed, perhaps to Switzer's publishers) or Switzer may have been recommended to him. The most probable source for such an introduction would have been George Crowle, M.P. for Hull from 1724 to 1747, who, with his gardener John More, subscribed to Switzer's *Practical Husbandman* and Planter or the Mr. Lillison of Penniby who also subscribed.

However this may be the letters do show that advanced ideas in garden design were not exclusive to talented noblemen and wits, and that Switzer was regarded as most suitable choice as designer.

The designs in *The Practical Kitchen Gardener* of 1727 approach Broadley's in size but they are apparently in no other way related. The first of these is conventional: a rectangle twice as long as its width is divided into six square quarters symmetrically arranged to either side of a middle walk. The garden is on three levels separated from each other by slopes "for strawberries, early peas &c.". The six square quarters are to be hedged with espalier fruit trees, both for the quality of fruit and to keep the garden more private.
and screen

"the quarters planted...with cabbages, pease, beans and other vegetables, in themselves not the least agreeable, as to prospect nor smell."45

The centre of each quarter held a standard fruit tree and small bed. The diagonals were included to increase the number of beds

"but if any gardener please, he may omit those, and let them be all squares, or he may divide them into straight beds of four foot wide"46

To either side of the entrance are square lodges for the gardeners, and the lodges at the corners were designed for tools or "for pavilions for the owner, as those of Sunbury in Hertfordshire are".47 At the bottom of the garden was a canal running at right angles to the centre line, and beyond this a wide clairvoyée opened the garden to the south. Switzer used ramps, or "glacis's in the room of steps ...both for their safety as well as cheapness before steps"48 and the walks could be grass, gravel, coal-ash "or whatever is most convenient".

Within the conventional rectangular system Switzer has contrived the plan to greatest effect. The lodges emphasize the entrance and the corners. The quarters are enclosed, their entrances and walks line up regularly, and their square form is elaborated. The walks are wide (side walks 10 feet, middle walk 15 feet) and the ramps join the various levels easily. The canal and clairvoyée provide spaciousness and a point of interest. And the whole is surrounded by fruit bearing walls, over topped by clipped trees.
The second kitchen garden design, the melonry, is Switzer's most architectural exercise being more an extension of the offices than a garden. The general shape is a rectangle (140 feet by 100 feet) with a complex apsidal end. Within this envelope are a complex of walled gardens, buildings and ancillary spaces. The first space is the "common yard", a square area lined by trees. On the southern side the gardener's house is set back between two convex curving walls, which conceal the gardener's private gardens. Behind the gardener's house is another square area, with the corners made into convex curves: this is "a Reed Hedge Garden for raising Frames Flowers &c.". And beyond this "The main Melon Ground" a square space divided into long narrow beds. The south side of this contains a circular basin and jet. To either side of the two square gardens are secondary gardens and spaces of various shapes for "hovels for tools pots etc." and reserve gardens for annuals, flowers, asparagus etc. The whole area is surrounded again by trees "either of yew, which is very thick as well as durable, or of elm, which may justly be accounted the hospitable and friendly plant that grows.".

It is possible that this series of gardens records, or is largely based upon a part of a country house that Switzer knew. In no other plate or design does he more than show the outline of buildings whereas here he is very specific, as to the internal arrangement of the gardener's house. It may conceivably refer to his own house and garden in Kennington Lane, Vauxhall, but it does not correspond to any known place.
The last design is more unusual and interesting. This is an octagonal kitchen-pleasure garden of about 350 feet diameter. The octagon was chosen partly to give as many fruit trees "an equal and proportionate share of the sun" as possible but probably more for the handsomeness of the form.

"The hint I first met with, that gave rise to all that I have thought on this subject, was taken out of a garden of this kind in the north, where going from the best front of the house towards the precipice of a steel hill, you are presented with a fine garden of this form. I must confess I was not a little surpriz'd with the elegance and beauty that this figure first struck me with, tho' upon perusal I found it was not in the center of the building, and wanted many of those conveniences that the nature of the place would have afforded." 52

In Switzer's design the octagon has a 50 foot circular basin with jet at its centre and from this broad walks lead to a centre of each side, forming eight irregular shaped quarters, as in his other designs hedged by espalier fruit trees. The garden is walled but unusually it is planted on both sides. The garden is enclosed by a moat and broad grass terrace.

The lines diagonal to the main axis of the garden have at their juncture with the walls four pavilions of triumphal arch form. 54

These were intended for the storage of "fruit, and for banqueting, as they serve below, on one side for room for stairs to run up in, and on the other for gardener's utensils." 55

The lines are extended through these and across the terrace to four "Bastions, after the latest manner" 55 which look over the moat into
"little pieces of wood, and wild walks, and the meanders and trees that will there be found, are all not only ornamental but also a guard to the walls and fruit."  

The axis of the garden runs from a circular parade 120 feet in diameter, from which two curving ramps descend to the enclosing terrace. This side of the octagonal garden is not walled, but of "iron work, all open." On the opposite side of the octagon the axis is extended by a canal.

It is not known which garden in "the north" inspired Switzer to this design. The situation would answer Sir John Clerk's Mavisbank, Midlothian, but the garden there is circular, or very near it, and it is doubtful that Switzer ever saw it, besides which it is more likely that Switzer means the northern counties of England rather than Scotland. Ramps of this kind were made at Holme Lacy, Herefordshire.

Part of Switzer's Hydrostaticks of 1729 was written at Breamore in Hampshire, "one of the Seats belonging to the Lords of Brooke". And plate 60 of that book shows a design for a canal-garden of a kind that Switzer had made at Spy Park. "The design here produc'd, was made (though not finished) for a young Nobleman of Hampshire, some little Time ago deceas'd." This young nobleman would appear to have been William Greville (c 1694-1727) 7th Baron Brooke step brother of Anne Baynton Rolt (Lady Someville) through whom Switzer could have come to his notice. Dreamore had come to the Grevilles by marriage in the late 17th century and had then been let until at
When Lord Brooke began improvements at Breamore is not known, perhaps about the time of his marriage in 1716. There were terraced gardens of the 17th century part of which survives today, but there is no surviving evidence of a large layout of the 1720's of which Switzer's series of cascades would be a fragment.

Switzer's design was for a gentle slope, within a thick wood. At the head of the cascade series is a goose foot. At the centre of this is a grotto, or more properly a grotesque niche, with a statue of Neptune, from whose feet the water springs, flowing through a short rough cascade to the first and largest basin, basically rectangular with slightly curved ends. This basin is aligned across the axis of the cascades, and this secondary line is continued to either side by avenues; the intersection of the two lines is marked by a column of water.

A low mark is set in this basin opposite Neptune and from this the water spills into the first, of seven small basins. The first two are basically square, then a larger square with apsed sides, followed by two round basins and finally another square empties into a basin of complex shape. The cascades between the basins are roughened to make the water froth and three of them have great mounds of grotesque rockwork in their centres. There are many columns of water, increasing in frequency towards the bottom. The sides of the basins are turf slopes.

The character Switzer hoped to achieve obviously derives from the grotesque water works of the Villa d'Este (of which there are a
number of plates in *Hydrostaticks*) where the naturalistic parts are rough, big, and mis-shapen and give maximum and uneasy contrast to the formal and architectural parts. But there is a curious pastoral quality about the Breamore design that looks forward to the landscape gardens of Lancelot Brown.

To either side of the cascades are broad smooth grass verges, the whole enclosed by hedged woodland. Planted on the verges are single trees, not regularly, nor yet consciously irregularly, but with an apparent carelessness. They seem to grow in their places naturally, not to have been placed there naturalistically, yet from their size it is obvious that they were to be new planted. There is a probable explanation for this. The plate is neither plan nor picture but a mixture of both and it is probable that these trees were "placed" on this drawing and not on a pre-existing plan, as the rest of the scheme would have been. Plate 28 of *Ichnographia Rustica* and Plate 3 of *The Practical Kitchen Gardener* show trees placed on plan in a way approaching this, but in both those cases the trees were more in the background whereas at Breamore they are very much part of the central design. If this hypothesis be accepted then Switzer was practising something like picturesque composition before 1729. And certainly by c1734 there is evidence of trees and clumps placed in such a way as to have at least a picturesque effect. 64

The gardens at Leeswood, Flintshire for Sir George Wynne Bt (1700-1756) were attributed to Switzer by the Honourable Daines Barrington (1722-1800) in 1782. Besides this attribution there
are other connections between Switzer and Wynne: a payment in Switzer's account at Hoare's bank from Wynne of £53.5.0 on 19 March 1732/3, a number of subscriptions to the *Practical Husbandman and Planter* connected with the Wynne household, and a letter to Wynne about improvements at nearby Rhual, Flintshire.

Although Barrington's essay has many of the characteristics of late 18th century histories of gardening he was well placed with respect to observations about Leeswood, being justice for Merioneth, Caernarvon and Anglesey counties in 1757 and later a justice at Chester, and although his attribution is not contemporary he had opportunity to meet those who would have known Leeswood from the late 1720's.

Wynne's payment to Switzer, coming just before publication of the first number of the *Practical Husbandman and Planter*, could conceivably be taken as subscriptions for it but the very great differences in the amounts (2s per set for subscribers, £53:5:0 from Wynne) make this a very unlikely explanation and since in the late 1730's Wynne was employing Switzer as both designer and seedsman so his earlier payment would more likely be for some of the works at Leeswood.

Wynne's fortune came unexpectedly and not without trouble. A rich lead source was discovered in 1715 at Halken, a part of his mother's fortune which had been left in trust for him. Wynne's father tried to exploit this find, was stopped first by Wynne's father-in-law and guardian of the Halken property, and in 1723 by Wynne him-
The father was put in jail for debt and as he would not agree to his son's conditions he remained there some time and published in 1734 *Some of the Sufferings of John Wynne, Esq.* from which it appears that Wynne had by then spent some £40,000 on Leeswood house, built on debatable ground.69

Like the Duke of Chandos Wynne's expenditure and reputation for grandeur proceeded more from malice than judgement. Certainly Leeswood house is modest, and the gardens were neither particularly extensive nor costly. But two remarkable and costly furnishings have survived from them, the great White Gates and Screen and the more modest Black Gates. These have been dated 1726-770 and as they would have been part of the garden design would necessarily follow it.

No plans or views of the gardens are known to have survived, though much of the layout does. It appears that the gardens have always lain west and north of Leeswood House and consisted of only three elements, the parade, Leeswood, and the park. Leeswood house faces west and on this front is the broad rectangular parade, terminated by the White Gates and Screens, roughly the width of the house. To the south a thick plantation separates the parade from a public road and to the north is Leeswood71 which contains a mount, a circular cabinet, and pond. The mount lies towards the south and its spiral walk is planted with standard yews. At the top are four stone seats with high backs and a large circular table.72 The circular cabinet, now called the American garden lies to the north
and east of the mount. It too is bounded by standard yews and has
a sundial at its centre. There are remains of grass terraces and
slopes and a straight walk ran from this garden across the wood to
the park where it ends in a semi-circular ramp. The small pond
lies at the south west side of Leeswood and connects the three.
elements of the design. The park is north of Leeswood and the
entrance road runs across it from the more functional Black Gates
on the Mold road. East of Leeswood is the kitchen garden with
contemporary stove and gardener's house. The common courtyard
stables are on the east side of Leeswood house but the present
entrance is through the park and along the western and southern
edges of the wood to the house. This is very likely an early 19th
century change. Originally the entrance would have run north of
Leeswood and along the east side of the kitchen garden. The wood,
park and parade are not separated from each other by a terrace
walk, though there is one between the west front of the house and
the parade.
Chapter Eleven: Work 1730-1745

Exton Park, Rutland, dates from the early 1730's. Switzer was there in the summer of 1732 and two views of the layout were published in 1739. An undated drawing for the lake in the park is addressed to Lord Gainsborough in what appears to be Switzer's hand shows the design as illustrated in 1739. A slightly later scheme for the lake, rather more picturesque was apparently complete by 1744 and is probably also by Switzer. The design was not consistent, and there was little correspondence of parts. This may have been caused by the client's requirements, but a large measure is owing to the qualities of the site. The ground was generally flat, and according to Rocque and Badele's plates largely unwooded. The house was completely surrounded by the village. Thus it was impossible, short of removing the village, to have an outward looking scheme, and because of the landscape such a procedure would have been relatively unrewarding. However, the area of the garden proper was not small and though it is surrounded by walls these do not impinge greatly. The garden lay south and west of the house and the enclosing wall was visually diminished by the making of terrace walks on the inside. This terrace walk, irregular because of the boundary was sloped in various complex figures deriving from fortification into two large lawns immediately south of the house, and to a close woodwork in the south western corner of the garden. The lawns, separated by slopes were very large and had no determinate form (though the edges were, on the whole, straight) and east of them a much shallower slope led to an irregularly rectangular pond and beyond it a small deer park.
The great park was quite disconnected and lay east and north of the village. This was largely open with a thin scattering of single trees and a series of large plantations near the north end. These were cut out into straight sides. The park was obviously intended for hunting and this function was antithetical to the idealized representation of nature that Switzer proposed slightly later at Nostell. The subsequent design of a grotesque cascade with Gothic features would have provided visual interest to the scheme but it could not have overcome the lack of comprehension necessitated by the site of the garden and the function of the park.

Switzer's connection with north east England in the early 1730's is based almost solely on the letters between him and Henry Ellison and Ellison's steward Thomas Sisson. These cover a period of two years, the first on 20 August 1733 and the last on 2 April 1735. Henry Ellison married Hannah Cotesworth in 1723 and through her inherited Park House, Gateshead, Durham. In 1730 his uncle Colonel George Liddell had got James Gibbs to design the alterations to Park House. The house had been altered in 1718 soon after William Cotesworth had acquired it and at this time and until 1725 the gardens were under the direction of Allan Brown. Presumably these were altered by Switzer in the early 1730's. Unfortunately they have vanished quite without trace.

Certainly the first of the surviving letters was not the first Switzer had written. He already knew Ellison's gardener Wooley
(dismissed in 1733) and was trying to find him another. He also knew Hugh Boag, Sir Henry Liddell's surveyor at Eslington, and had sold seeds to Mr. Harry Liddell the year before. He did similar business with a W. Gibson, Sir Henry Liddell, Colonel George Liddell and a Mr. Pickering. Added to this are the large number of subscribers to the Practical Husbandman and Planter in Northumberland, Durham and north Yorkshire. It would seem therefore that Switzer had extensive connections with this part of England. Unfortunately this must remain largely speculative as no designs of his are known nor with a few exceptions, are there materials indicating the form of gardens in this period. There are only two known gardens contemporaneous with Switzer's established connections with north-east England and one of these is practically non-existent. Sir Henry Liddell's principal house was Ravensworth Castle, county Durham. He was rebuilding this in 1724 but nothing is known of the gardens. A little survives of his other place Eslington, Northumberland which had been rebuilt by 1730. The house and garden are on low ground, and perhaps to give it elevation a large basin was made from the stream flowing close to the south side. There was no room for garden works next to the house here: the present gardens are south-east and may reflect the early 18th century pattern. The principal gardens appear to have been on the south side of the basin, and consisted of a broad terrace walk, bounded on the south and east by woodland and formed into a large curved slope facing the house. No other identifiable garden works remain, but the slope, basin and general composition are probably by Switzer.
Of the many northern families who were establishing themselves in the early 18th century one of the few with which Switzer had no known connection were the Blacketts of Wallington, Northumberland. Yet there is circumstantial evidence that Switzer may have prepared one of the two surviving designs for Wallington. Sir Walter Calverley Blackett inherited Wallington from his uncle in 1728. In 1737 there was an estimate of £2,155:9:2 "for the terrace on the south front, Mr. Joyce's plan". The gardens were conceived between those dates, very likely within the period of Switzer's connection with the area - 1732 to 35. That there should be two plans is not so unusual as might be thought. Switzer had recommended such a procedure and there are two known designs for the contemporary Nostell Priory, Yorkshire.

Neither plan is signed or dated, but one, presumably "Mr. Joyce's plan" was carried out (as two ponds shown on this plan still exist) and is different from the point of view of design from the conceivably earlier scheme. The schemes are similarly composed - a parade or lawn south of the house, a woodland garden to the west, and a smaller woodland and kitchen garden to the east. The later scheme is somewhat more extensive but is less elaborate having little slope-work and no terrace walks. The ponds are irregular, one specifically "to be made to humour the ground". There is a serpentine river north and west of the house, whereas the river at the bottom of the parade is left unimproved. South of the house are two relatively simple terraces and glacis within a rectangular frame. The parade or lawn splays out from this point and has a large circular area inscribed
in the turf at its centre. The line of the terrace is continued quite through the wood and at the western end the vista is formed into a cabinet, but within the cabinet are two naturalistic plantations of exotics obscuring the elaborate shape. Kent used this feature at Carlton House c 1734, but it was used most extensively in the late 1740's and 50's by designers such as Richardson. In both schemes the woodland is rendered as a fairly regular stipple, but the avenue trees on the Joyce scheme are much smaller and tighter than on the other, and it seems more hard-edged and carefully drawn. There is no known designer of the name Joyce, but if Joyce were a misreading for Joynes then the designer might conceivably be Henry Joynes (c 1684-1754) "a surveyor" mainly employed in Crown works.

The Joyce scheme is thought to be later because of its slightly more advanced feature, the Carlton House plantation, its quality of severe hard-edged irregularity, and its pond specifically labelled "to humour the ground" which conceivably presupposes an earlier scheme in which this was not the case. And at Wallington this would appear to have been the case.

In the earlier scheme the large basin is oval, with a jet at its centre and to the north is a complex series of mock military slopes, terraces and glacis faintly reminiscent of the Claremont amphitheatre. North east of this basin, running roughly in line with the boundary terrace walk, is a serpentine river somewhat less wistful than the one in the Joyce plan. This terminates in an
octagonal basin next to the parade, which has more the character of an avenue. The terraces and slopes on the south front of the house are wide and end in curves in the flanking woodlands. The river at the foot of the parade is improved, being formed into an irregular lake and more serpentine course. The woodland is bounded by a terrace walk with bastions at corners. None of these match known work of Switzer, being more angular and irregular than any of his. Bastions of this shape appear in a design for Newburgh Priory, Yorkshire in the 1730's which may be by Bridgeman. Except for this feature and the way the flanking woodlands cramp the parade the design might be by Switzer. Bridgeman, Thomas Wright or Telford are also possibilities, but none of these are known to have had the contemporary extensive practice in this area that Switzer had.

Switzer was at Audley End, Essex, intermittently in the winter of 1734 and 1735, and may have visited the house before or after that time but to judge from the survey and design preserved in the Gough drawings it would not have required many visits. The extent of the garden works appear to have been the making of a plain rectangular parterre flanked by two woods which were cut out into straight walks. This side of the house was very close to the village and the parterre, with semi-circular end, is nearly square. On the entrance side a courtyard was approached by a large parade (the edges of which were not wooded) which was crossed by a canal. The canal then flowed passed the kitchen and fruit garden in a sparsely wooded area. On the park side was another plain parterre, flanked by woodland and a walled garden and beyond it was a large
irregularly shaped lawn with two circular basins disposed symmetrically above the long axis. Beyond the lawn was a large park with sparsely scattered trees.

Sir Rowland Winn, Bt (1706-1765) ordered two garden designs for Nostell Priory, Yorkshire, one from Switzer and the other from a local man, John Perfect of Pontefract. The Perfects held a similar position to the Telfords of York, supplying plants, seeds and presumably designs throughout the 18th century and like John Telford Perfect subscribed to Switzer's *Practical Husbandman and Planter*. Perfect's design is dated 1731 and shows a house of the same composition and proportion as James Paine's executed design. If this represents Paine's design he must have been at Nostell some two to four years earlier than has hitherto been supposed. Winn decided to rebuild the older house after his marriage in 1729 to Susannah Henshaw. Switzer's plan is undated and though it shows a house of the same composition as Paine's the proportion of the central block is nearer square and may represent an earlier design. If this be so Switzer's scheme may date from 1729 or 1730, but the sophistication of the design would suggest a later date, c1734.

Apparently Switzer's design was not proceeded with though there is now a low mound in the wood north east of the house which corresponds to the top of Switzer's "Amphitheatre and Mount". Switzer's design would have been expensive but probably more to the point its effect required the removal of the bridge and the building
of a new bridge and road to the south, "to place ye house in ye middle of ye park". There may well have been difficulties of expense and inclination which forbade this procedure. The bridge was not rebuilt until 1760 and not then in Switzer's position.

Perfect's design was a much more modest affair and may conceivably have been ordered because of deficiencies in Switzer's scheme. His oval lawn within a great rectangular parade may have been carried out as well as his wilderness south west of the house by the lake. The wilderness would probably have been swept away in the 19th century when the woodlands were planted. The relationship between house and lake in Perfect's design would not have pleased, certainly not for long; he proposed planting a line of trees along a straight section of the lakeside north of the house, and his wilderness would have blocked the western and southwestern views.

Structurally Switzer's design is conventional, following the accepted scheme of axial and diagonal elements placed in geometrical relationship to the house and offices on the east from the long rectangular parade; on the south the court and "great lawn" framed by regular plantations of platoons; on the north there is an axial view of "a designed belvidere" and diagonal vistas; and similarly the west front has diagonal views to the centre of a wood and the new bridge and an axial view of the "Hermitage and cascade out of the old quarry". But this conventional structure is used only as a cue, the elements and views composed within it are irregular,
naturalistic, and even picturesque, and except for the formal east and south entrance fronts the structure of the garden would only be observable at the centre of the facades.

The "parterre" has become merely a wider section of a grass terrace and with the symmetrically curved slope serves only as a base for the west garden front. North of the parterre the terrace and slope becomes serpentine as they lead down to the dam. On the right is a lawn, of indeterminate shape and beyond it the wilderness. The terrace joins the enclosing terrace walk which crosses the dam to the much larger wilderness on the west side of the lake, Foulby Wood "designed to be planted with Beech etc. for game". Foulby wood was formed into a simple star with three major arms giving views into the park, the garden front of the house, and a small subsidiary park, and four minor arms leading to cabinets, circular and serpentine walks lead to the Hermitage which faces north over a regular basin. At the east end of the basin a flaring cascade empties into the lake directly in front of garden facade.

The wilderness contains a complex series of slopes and terraces which culminate with the mount on which Switzer showed a circular building, presumably a round temple of the type Vanbrugh had built at Stowe. Behind the mount is a greenhouse facing south over a widening parterre to the parade. Serpentine walks lead to a basin and a rectangular cabinet. The "Ah! Ah! Terrace" leads from the parade northwards in a straight line and then breaks into an arc of a circle until it crosses the dam as a straight line. It runs
along the north edge of Foulby Wood as a serpentine. West of Foulby Wood is an irregular "cornfield for benefit of game" and to the south, bordering the lake, is a small park with rough but basically serpentine edges and clumps and single trees planted promiscuously in its centre.

The main park is treated in a similarly picturesque way. In "full view from the Ah! Ah! Terrass" are a serpentine river and pond, clumps and single trees, and the formal "grand lawn". This is a great "rectangle" formed by square clumps and lines of trees which are curved as apres to the east and west side. At the north end of the lawn the Belvidere is framed by an S shaped double line of trees and to either side of the Belvidere are further cornfields for hares. The north section of the park is more closely wooded. South of the parade Wragby wood is shown "cut out into walks" presumably for the villagers.

The lake at Nostell is mediaeval and Switzer altered only the corner by the old house, which became the parterre and slope, the area by his cascade, and the shore by the new bridge. The effect of these alterations was to give the lake a more natural, that is free flowing outline. As Hermits were supposed to have lived in caves around Nostell lake in the middle ages a centrepiece of the gardens becomes the Hermitage and Cascade. Switzer had managed in this design to include all the characteristics of 18th century garden and landscape design and it is a very great pity it was not carried out.
Geographically connected with Switzer’s activities in North East England is Rokeby Park, Yorkshire on the border with County Durham. Sir Thomas Robinson, Bt (1701-1777) had built the house there for himself and it was "entirely fitted up"[38] in 1731 but he was not able to live there,

"...in none of my future schemes do I propose to myself so much pleasure as in retiring to Rookby Park. How soon that may be, we have not yet determined but sooner or later in life 'tis what we shall certainly do"[39] although he did go to Rokeby from time to time. Partly to mend his exhausted fortune Robinson went to Barbados as Governor in 1741. In his letter to Carlisle Robinson mentions the gardens and plantations going on in various parts of the county, including the news that Kent’s notion of laying out gardens was to work without rule or line[40] but he rarely mentions his own works.

"I have received the honour of your Lordship’s, and since one from my servant at Rockby, who acquaints me with your generous present of beech and Spanish chestnuts lately sent from Castle Howard, for which I return my sincere acknowledgments, and flatter myself I shall see your Lordship there next summer...and have your approbation as to the place and manner of planting them, as well as the other wood of all sorts which I shall intermix amongst them this winter"[41]

Besides Robinson’s subscription to the Practical Husbandman and Planter, 1733-34, there was a payment from him recorded in Switzer’s bank account ("By bill on Sr. Thos. Robinson") of £20 on 7 April 1736. The payment is unspecified but may be, as with Sir George Wynne, one of a number of payments.

Robinson might well be considered able to contrive his own garden
design, particularly since he had built his own house, or barring that to have consulted William Kent. But Robinson had great admiration for Castle Howard, particularly Wray Wood and asked Carlisle in 1736 if he could have a landscape painter draw "-

"some pictures of Rea Wood, &c., for I think no seat I ever saw has so much scope for genius to exert in this way, and where the original is a favourite and gives great pleasure, surely it must be very agreeable to possess a good copy".\(^42\)

This being so Switzer would be an obvious choice. The gardens as executed show little which is characteristic of Kent and quite a lot which is not, whereas the great lawn in an architectural setting of trees, the use of natural features, and the use of ruins, are to be expected of Switzer.

Robinson's garden was relatively small and simple, the only expensive elements are the buildings and the plantations of trees. The whole site is encircled with a close plantation of forest trees and within this is a side, neither serpentine nor irregular but meandering and seemingly careless. The entrance to Rokeby was by the Greta Bridge into a wood. Straight ahead an avenue was sited on Northam House, an old peel tower, but the drive did not proceed along this avenue. Rather the entrance was by way of the circuit, either parallel to the Carlisle road, then northwards to the house, or along the side of the River Greta to the kitchen garden and from there westwards across the park. The house was at the north end of the great lawn which was composed of three rectangles of diminishing size framed by double rows of trees and terminated by an apse, which was to hold an obelisk. The axial line was carried beyond this
point, across the Carlisle road to another, unspecified, building which stood in a circular space formed by curious wedge shaped plantations. To the west of the lawn was a small park and to the east a much larger one planted with clumps and scattered single trees.

The east west axial line of the house was centred on Northam Tower and between the two, along the west side of the river, was the "garden". This was reached by a short walk between rows of trees forming the north side of the lawn. At the end of this the deep river valley was reached by ramped terrace walks. The "garden" consisted only of a bowling green, with its house by Robinson and the walk to the kitchen garden.

The contrast between this secluded, wild area and the grand architectural setting for the house was very effective. The lawn was not laid out according to design and there is no trace of the Bowling Green house, but the garden remains, replanted in the 19th century with the help of Sir Walter Scott, and indicates just how far Robinson and Switzer consulted the genius of the place and how with minimum effort they created a garden of maximum effect.

It has been possible to fill out Switzer's activities in the northern counties of England because of the Ellison letters. In the first of these he apologised to Henry Ellison for not answering his letter more promptly.
"I have this summer been as yet only my Midland Tour which has took me up nine weeks getting not home till late on Saturday night last".

What gardens Switzer visited on this tour and to what purpose it is not possible precisely to say. Presumably there were also Northern, Eastern, Western and Northern-western tours conducted after the fashion of George London. But of all this activity in the Midlands only one design can be absolutely given to Switzer. This is Beaumanor, Leicestershire for William Herrick in 1737, for which the signed plan exists.

Unlike the precise coloured drawing for Nostell the design for Beaumanor has the same hurried quality as Switzer's handwriting, indeed, he even allowed his 12 year old son to letter and ornament the drawing, with considerably facility but less foresight. The design too has little similarity with Nostell apart from the slopes and the figure in the park, in this case an avenue.

The site of Beaumanor is low and generally flat, though to the west there is a relatively notable ridge, the "forest hills" of the plan, and a more gentle bow in the ground between the house and church. The site too was relatively small, roughly 40 acres as compared with 600 acres at Nostell or about 100 acres at Rokeby. These qualities obviously played a part in the design but they cannot fully explain for it is one of the most curious designs of the period.

Structurally it is a circle penetrated by a rectangle set within a largely undifferentiated landscape. The house was built in 1726 and, to judge from Switzer's plan, was square, and probably two
storied. This stands at the centre of the circular part. Two "axial" lines run from the east and south front but neither of these are quite perpendicular to the facades. The line to the east is the road from Loughborough and this is formed into an oval immediately it comes within the garden area. South of the parade are the stable block and kitchen garden, accounting for half of the rectangular section. The other half is a "lawn or parterre" bisected by the south "axial" line. The lawn becomes a segment of the circle west of the house, while on the north side there are three wedge shaped wilderness quarters. Water is provided by a serpentine aqueduct running from the western ridge to the parterre/lawn where it is formed into a large basin, then to the kitchen garden as a canal and finally east of the stables, around the north side of the gardens and north west as an aqueduct. The garden is enclosed on the west and south sides by a raised terrace walk planted with conical, or standard yews.

The avenue is terminated by the medieval church, and the ground outside the garden is made up of paddocks to either side of the avenue, "an open lawn towards the forest hills" on the west side and "fine meadow lawns towards the woods" on the north side.

There was no functional reason to separate the external lawns from the parterre by the terrace walk as the parterre was specifically meant "for sheep or deer to feed on" and the wilderness quarters are protected by iron railings. His curious geometry might be explained if we assume that the kitchen garden had to be
south of the stables (this is functionally sensible) and further that it either had to follow the line of the existing west front of the stable block or was thought desirable to make of these one continuous wall. A strong diverging line relative to the south front of the house, was thereby established. Unfortunately such a line misses being terminated by the church by a small margin, so Switzer continued the line by the avenue and stepped in westward in three stages. Having got thus far he established the centre line of the avenue between the mid point of the church tower and the mid point of the south front of the house and he duplicated the line generated by the stable and kitchen garden as the west side of the avenue.

But a problem would have arisen here if the line were extended to the house. It would have been much too close and although it could have turned westwards, thus forming two parterres it seems clear from Switzer's design that he wanted rather to have the house set within one parterre or lawn. The difficulty could be resolved by using an equally strong geometry to both stop the line and give it a satisfactory finish - hence the expedient of the circle.

Switzer's enclosing terrace walk is not a haha in the accepted sense because it was not intended to exclude the beasts and yet bring in the view. It was rather a resolution of a geometrical problem caused by the "genius of the place" and merely de-limited two types of lawn. The deer or sheep could, and likely would have, crossed it at will.
Immediately west and south of the house was a terraced walk supported by slopes and glaces (curved on the south, straight on the west) which further resolved the shapes of the house and lawn. The wedge shaped wilderness quarters on the north side were divided according to type of plant, (low flowering shrubs to the north west, forest trees to the north east). These were cut out into cabinets which lead directly or indirectly to the "Old Moat". The "Old Kitchen House" joined to the newer house at one corner was the focus of the cabinets.

The kitchen garden was of conventional design although the west and south walls were planted on the outside. The rectangular quarters were separated by a middle walk and on the shorter axis by the canal. At the east side the canal flowed under a concave slope at the top of which was "an alcove seat facing the water". The parterre/lawn was planted only with six "large trees with seats round 'em" and these were placed, as far as possible, so as to be symmetrical about the canal/basin line, the south "axial" line, and the west axial line. In the paddocks are two circular clumps, symmetrically placed to either side of the avenue, and a few single trees to the west.

The nature of Switzer's work for James Brydges (1674-1744), Duke of Chandos in 1737 is unclear. He had "contracted with Mr. Ferguson for the Barn and Water work" probably at Shaw Hall, Berkshire. Chandos had an insecure hold on Shaw from 1726 until 1738 when his son Lord Carnarvon took it. It would appear
that he preferred Shaw to Cannons and considered it a retreat. From his taking up residence in 1730 Chandos made various improvements but a new garden was not among them. However in 1733 Chandos had two canals, a semi circular basin and a cascade made at Shaw but he employed John Hore of Newbury for this work. Whether the waterwork Switzer had made was an extension to this scheme, or a new project is unknown. The barn was probably to replace the one severely damaged in a storm in 1735. Why Switzer should have been commissioned to build or repair a barn is a mystery. It might be that Chandos' letter, addressed to "Mr. Switzer" may have been written to Switzer's brother Thomas, a carpenter in Abbots Worthy, Hampshire. This possibility is strengthened somewhat by the reference to Mr. Pescod who "acted for Chandos in Hampshire" to whom Chandos had sent £50 to be paid to Switzer on production of an account. But whereas Thomas Switzer was more likely to have built the barn, Stephen Switzer is a much more likely candidate for the water-work.

Switzer was employed by Sir George Wynne again in 1739 to make a plan for the gardens at Rhual, Flintshire. This was for Nehemiah Griffith, who had already subscribed to Switzer's Practical Husbandman and Planter presumably also through the good offices of Wynne. Like Thomas Broadley's garden at Hull, Rhual was done by post and by this time Switzer seems to have overcome any misgivings. Although he was not certain he had "hit off all the affair, to an exact Nicety...it is such that Davy, or any other Gardiner that understands Drawing may form an idea of what I mean, and how he is to make ye
Part, at least, of Switzer’s plan seems to have been carried out. The court and slightly wider forecourt walls are very likely late 17th century and the two levels originally were marked probably by a low wall and steps and the outside of the court closed by iron screens and gates. The yew hedged parterre south of the courts may likewise date from an earlier period. Instead of a terrace separating court from forecourt there is now a grass slope with three glacis or ramps. This, and the curving haha separating fore-court and drive from fields is the limit of Switzer’s work on this side.

The wood and paddock, west and north of the house, presumably derive from Switzer’s design. The ground immediately west of the house slopes fairly sharply upwards, and was asymmetrical to the house. This was

"the chief Difficulty that I can see in it...for which Reason I have design’d a Hollow in the Front that with the Earth coming out that Deficiency may be made up."

If this was elaborately terraced and sloped it has since been obscured though Mr. Hussey suggested that this might originally have been terraced. What Switzer more likely designed was a simple "handsome green Slope up the Hill". At the top of the slope is a sunk bowling green parallel to the house and beyond this is the wood. There are no traces in the wood of paths or cabinets. On the south side the wood is separated from a road by walls, though this occasionally becomes a terrace walk because of the differing
levels of the wood and the road, but on the north side there is a
curving terrace walk overlooking a long paddock. The terrace walk
stops at a gate on the west side of the paddock but the line is
continued eastwards by a narrow wood on the ridge between the paddock
and the river valley. This plantation is continued to the north
side of the kitchen garden. Although the wood and the walk are much
overgrown it is clear that it was originally part of the garden.

The Alleluia Monument, a short obelisk on a base, put up by
Nehemiah Griffith to commemorate the battle in 420 when the Britons
defeated the invading Picts and Saxons is southeast of the gardens
and does not appear to have been part of the design. It is the kind
of feature that one would expect to find in the wood, and it may
have been subsequently removed.

The simplification of the deCous gardens at Wilton at c1720
for Thomas Herbert, 8th Earl of Pembroke and Switzer's probable
connection with them have already been discussed. Far more
interesting was the complete transformation of the gardens between
the succession of Henry Herbert (1693-1750) 9th Earl of Pembroke
in 1733 and 1746 when a plan of the new proto-landscape garden was
published by John Rocque. 59

There are a number of connections between Switzer and the
Pembrokees and Wilton; dedication of volume two of Ichnographia Rustica
to Thomas 8th Earl (and presumably with Henry 9th Earl's knowledge
and consent the dedication remained in the edition of 1742);
subscription to Practical Husbandman and Planter by the Dowager Countess and mutual friendship with William Stukeley. Finally there are the regular payments to Switzer, in his capacity as seedsmen, from 1738 to 1745. On the basis of these connections and qualities of the gardens as complete in 1746 it is probable that Switzer continued the work begun for the 8th Earl and completely remodeled the gardens at Wilton.

A case has been put that Lord Pembroke was his own designer and once the notion has been accepted that it was possible to combine the duties of a landlord and aristocrat with practise of architecture and garden design such an attribution is practically impossible to disprove, for there is bound to be a large measure of control over designs by the client. The most important control is the decision to proceed: how far, what character, and what cost. If a designer can work within these limitations the personal preference of his client becomes relatively unimportant.

An attribution of the gardens at Wilton to Lord Pembroke derives from his reputation as an amateur architect, and more subtly from the presupposition that advances in architecture and garden design, particularly in the 1730's, are a question of fashion and that fashion is a prerogative of leisure. It will be clear by now that the second of these causes does not universally apply, and there is some doubt about the role Lord Pembroke played in designing the buildings with which he is known to be connected. Similar doubt exists about his role in the design of the gardens at Wilton. That Kent laid out
the gardens at Wilton has also been suggested. He did provide designs for chairs, and a barge at Wilton but an examination of the plan of Wilton of 1746 is sufficient to exclude him. The bases of his style were that he "worked without rule or line" and that he designed, not in plan, but in upright like a painter. There are important elements at Wilton which required rule and line to execute, notably the terrace, and though some parts may have had a picturesque effect this does not necessarily point to Kent. William Chambers thought there was a stiff regularity about the gardens when he improved them in 1757. Kent's influence, is a more complex problem but there are other explanations to account for the form of the gardens.

It is not clear when the new gardens at Wilton were begun. Pevsner suggests 1732 to 1738. This seems rather early. They were being laid out when Lord Oxford visited Wilton in October 1737 though the Palladian Bridge was then finished and Defoe's account in 1737 reads as though the work was only recently undertaken. A date before 1735 is hardly likely on stylistic grounds. George Vertue remarked that the east bridge was completed by 1740 but he did not mention the gardens otherwise.

In the 1720 work the old garden had been extended into the park to the south, terminating the line on Marcus Aurelius. There existed then the canal to the east, an axis with the entrance front, but this was also the site of the road from Salisbury to Wilton and therefore effectively outside the garden. Lord Oxford reported
that "there is a noble row of limes, there did a road go by, but this Lord has turned it and made it fine with turf and it looks extremely well", but Rocque's plan shows the road still there. However, another axial line was established between the entrance front and the distant prospect of Salisbury Cathedral and this was to be the primary direction of the new garden. But like Nostell Priory the axial composition is more real than apparent.

The walls were removed from the deCaus garden and the two halves became lawns: enough of the formerly planted trees were retained (in the centre line cedars, and to the sides deciduous forest trees) to echo the old pattern. The river was widened, and the sculpture group which was formerly in the large round basin was moved to the centre of the river, and still on the old axis. What appears to be a new mount was made just west of the centreline near the end of the old garden. The palladian, or as it was called in 1746, the great bridge was built in line with the old east wall of the garden. The garden front of the house was given its originally intended breadth by the planting of a nursery for cedars. This rectangle was raised on slopes and extended to the western side of the old garden.

South of the old garden the triple star of avenues, centred on Marcus Aurelius, were, except for the last section, removed. From Marcus Aurelius northwards down the slope the area formed by the avenues was roughly sloped making a funnel shaped emphasis instead of the former axial one. Sir Philip Sydney's walk was
extended north westward and across the old axis where it was sloped and terraced, and formed into a base for the primary slope to the equestrian statue. The woodlands to either side of the statue were cut into naturalistic non-specific sides and cabinets.

Having taken down the walls the large, generally flat area to the south east lacked interest or direction, save the prospect of the cathedral. This was resolved by damming the river at the eastern edge of the park and on this dam was built Lord Oxford's bridge of communication.

"He has taken all the best of the columns, pilasters, and carvings that did belong to the old grotto, and put them to this new building, which will be very pretty and have a very good effect. From this bridge of communication there will be about the middle a summerhouse which will look directly upon the beautiful steeple of Salisbury." This not only stopped an awkward termination to the river but gave a point of view in the middle distance. By damming the river at this point a large shallow 'lake' was created, wooded on the south side, and, by this means the view was further directed to Salisbury and the problem of the large featureless park in this quarter overcome.

The area of park left to the south was laid out as meadows separated by rows of trees and by a new tributary of the river Nadder made to flow roughly south and east along the line of the old garden walls. The area west of the former gardens was seemingly unchanged.
With this structure established there was little garden work, apart from the buildings, to do. In the area north of the river a new mount, probably an ice house, was made. Bits of deCaus' buildings made the east and west fronts and four curved slopes led to the "roof" diagonally. Through the centre was a serpentine stream, rising seemingly from nowhere at the corner of the forecourt and emptying into a new canal. Shallow slopes ran along the river side and at the edge of the old kitchen garden and "enclosed" the mount area. Another stream was made along the east side of the park. It turned west at the dammed river and became serpentine through the meadow disappearing finally to join the new tributary underground at the south-east corner of the old gardens.

The terrace at the end of Sir Philip Sydney's walk is formed of the familiar elements, bastions, glacis and slopes and it is not only askew the primary axial line from the house but is also asymmetrical. The two round bastions and the ends do not match in form, the east one being made in a curl shape, presumably to save the tree it embraces. However, from the house side it would appear the same as the corresponding bastion. And the two central glacis are similarly differentiated, the one to the west having a raked side, the ramp down. The terrace was supported in a double ramp from the park.

The wood to the west was closely planted and mature and was cut to form glades, clumps and rides, though it would have appeared solid from the garden. The area immediately surrounding Marcus Aurelius
was considerably thinned leaving clumps and few single trees. This had the effect of opening the view of the statue which in Stukeley's view of the 1720 work seems constrained, but it would not have lost its terminal power, being placed on the skyline, and being framed by the terrace and funnel shaped slope.

Besides rides and glades the western wood contains two quarries, one improved and the other still worked. The southeastern quarry, reached from the west end of the terrace, looked northeastwards over the meadows and the new "lake". This was formed into an amphitheatre of three concentric slopes and the orchestra was planted with groups of what appear to be Lombard poplars. From the top of the amphitheatre the series of walks and glades began, leading to the statue or to a cabinet open to the south and overlooking a rectangular field which contained a maypole. There were three sloped terraces where the field and cabinet met. This was presumably a "box" from which the Wilton family observed country dances and the like.

The eastern wood was practically felled leaving only a few clumps and a small wood near the statue. This was apparently done to lighten the lower meadows to the north and further concentrate the southern view on Marcus Aurelius and the remaining wood.
Switzer's theory was published in 1715 and 1718 and his practise as a garden designer extended from 1700 to 1745. He is therefore the earliest exponent and one of the early practitioners of what was later known as modern, English or Landscape gardening, but can he "justly be called the father of modern gardening"? Probably so, but for this claim to have any meaning it is necessary to look briefly at the development of garden design in the early 18th century and determine how it was like, or different from Switzer's.

The system of garden design presented in John James' translation of d'Argenville's Theory and Practise of Gardening continued its influence throughout Switzer's life and on the basis of its circulation would have reached a wider audience. It ran to three editions as against Ichnographia Rustica's two, and further became the basis of the section on design in Philip Miller's Gardener and Florist's Dictionary being simplified only in 1737 when a plain parterre was preferred, and in 1743 when the parterre is dropped altogether.

Although Switzer's ideas informed Batty Langley's New Principles of Gardening of 1728 Langley included James' translation with Switzer's books as "the very best...among all the celebrated Books that have been wrote on the laying out Gardens". Although Switzer's system was fundamentally different he too esteemed d'Argenville, insofar as it encouraged grandeur and simplicity. But Switzer's despised "Dutch Taste" still had life and some exponents. In 1720 Richard Bradley presented a "New Invention for the more speedy Designing of Garden-Plots; whereby we may produce more Variety of Figures in an Hour's Time, than are to be found in all the Books of Gardening now extant".
But whether this folding mirror contributed to the design of many gardens after 1720 is doubtful.

The other major garden designer in the early 18th century was Charles Bridgeman and according to Horace Walpole compared to London and Wise,

"Bridgeman, the next fashionable designer of gardens, was far more chaste... He enlarged his plans, disdained to make every division tally to its opposite, and though he still adhered much to straight walks with high clipped hedges, they were only his great lines, the rest he diversified by wilderness, with loose groves of oak." 5

Bridgeman first appears as a draughtsman at Blenheim in 1709 and later became Royal Gardener in succession to Henry Wise. His early life, his precise duties at Blenheim, and his training are at present unknown. He and Switzer doubtless knew each other but there is no evidence of friendship or collaboration. Switzer referred to Bridgeman as "a late eminent designer" 9 in 1742 and criticised his style as "aiming at an incomprehensible Vastness and attempting at Things beyond the reach of Nature". 10 In 1729 he had criticised Bridgeman's amphitheatre at Claremont for being too big for its setting. 11 Switzer provided seeds for Bridgeman's extension of Boughton, Northamptonshire in 1732, and their sons were school fellows at Westminster. There is no other known connection between them.

What theory, if any, informed Bridgeman's work is unknown, he is silent on the subject. It is conceivable that he developed a different style from Switzer, but based on Switzer's ideas: at
Richmond from 1727, he

"dared to introduce cultivated fields, and even morsels of forest appearance...but this was not till other innovators had broke loose too from rigid symmetry" 12

Whether Stowe, developed by Bridgeman from c 1719, 13 may likewise be said to have been influenced by Ichnographia Rustica is debatable; the irregularities of the grounds there derive perhaps more from the intractible nature of the relation of house, boundaries and then existing attempts to regularize the scheme. 14

Stowe is certainly Bridgeman's first essay in irregularity and his greatest work, Eastbury, attributed to him in 1725, but presumably contemporary with the house, that is, from 1718 is altogether different and shows his skill as a designer to greater advantage that Stowe. It was a great regular platform scheme in which the house occupies one of many similarly composed areas. It was more centralised than d'Argenville's ideal schemes, with two axes meeting at a large rectangular basin: the house beyond a pair of gradatio groves on one side, and close woodwork quarters on the other, terminating in an amphitheatre which projects into one of the parks. On the secondary, that is non-entrance, axis two enriched parterres separate the basin from flanking earthworks; on one side a large circular mount is set at the end of a lawn with a park beyond, on the other twin octagonal mounts flank a smaller lawn whose long axis is continued into a park by circular platoon plantations. The surrounding parks are geometrical and are enclosed by belts or square plantations of forest trees. A more formal design it would be hard
to conceive, but while its grandeur distinguishes it from the "Dutch
taste" it is neither a provincial exercise in the manner of LeNostre. Eastbury was rather a sophisticated and skilful essay in architectonic composition and though it likely had greater appeal as a plan than as a garden it shows Bridgeman as a mature designer opposed as much as Switzer to "those crimping, diminutive and wretched perform-
ances" of the "Dutch taste", and Eastbury was characteristic of the 18th century in the secondary position of the house, an ornament among many. Its architectural quality, large, simple masses, articulated and distinct, is characteristic of Bridgeman's irregular works too, and distinguishes his style. Another characteristic of Bridgeman (and not of Switzer) is the sharp angularity of his irregular schemes; such as the Home Park enclosure, or the lake at Stowe, and the terrace walks at Claremont done in the 1720's, and even at Amesbury, Wiltshire of 1730-38.

At the "singularly romantic" Claremont, done before 1725, Bridgeman took advantage of the situation but even there he contrived the ridge of the woodland, effectively the garden, as an architectural sequence of building, woodland and earthwork. A serpentine path led from a rectangular amphitheatre behind the villa to Vanbrugh's Belvedere. A straight walk lead from this along the ridge to a rectangular lawn, and in the centre it was flanked by two closely opposed glacis, beyond which were four symmetrically disposed bastions: rectangular platforms from which to enjoy the view. A similar area laid out by Switzer would have lacked this clarity of form and composition.
Richmond, slightly later than Claremont, is in many ways Bridgeman's most interesting design, and is the least characteristic. It was a ferme ornée, not quite in Switzer's sense: the fields are square and instead of there being garden scattered or threaded through the farm some of the fields have been planted and cut out in walks, amphitheatres and the like. These connected wooded enclosures run from Richmond Palace north east to an enclosing walk and thence to the Queen's house by the river, from which there was an alternative route back by the terrace walk along the Thames. The fields lay largely south of the wooded sections, but the whole could have been appreciated by a circuit of the enclosing walk south to Richmond Green, where a smaller ornamental wood was set and thence along the main avenue back to the Palace.

Bridgeman's last design was Ambresbury, Wiltshire, in 1738 which has the clarity of Eastbury and Claremont, though its composition is irregular. He was faced with regularly planted areas of woodland south and east of the house. Bridgeman retained the avenue and the outline of the main plantation, but he thinned its interior. An irregular field east of the house enclosed by quadruple ranks of trees was formed into a regular lawn by felling and new plantation. The old gardens were swept away and replaced by an embanked plinth, and a new kitchen garden made west of the house. The serpentine canals were retained; Bridgeman formed a circular basin in one of them on axis north of the house and planted their banks with a single row of trees. The meadow west of the kitchen garden became an irregular enclosure reminiscent of his Home Park.
at Stowe. Beyond this, and not shown on Flitcroft's survey, Bridgeman planted the rising hill, and made a large, single amphitheatre at its foot. Above this a broad terrace follows the curve of the hill. On axis with the amphitheatre a regular enclosure of three receding sections leads to a round. With the exception of the informal plantation beyond the basin on the north front of the house, and perhaps the marsh between the meadow and wooded hill, there is nothing at Ambresbury that Bridgeman had not done elsewhere. But apart from the amphitheatre and hill he has used the minimum means to transform the grounds, saving trees and leaving undisturbed other existing features, and the design may reflect the constraints of his clients.

Bridgeman was an excellent draughtsman and his designs betray a delight in planometric representation of reality and though he was too good a designer to have been one of the "closet paper engineers" it appears that this was a weakness which could have led him to the "incomprehensible vastness" Switzer complained of.

No particular debt to Ichnographia Rustica is discernible in Bridgeman's designs. It would appear that he and Switzer developed separately from Brompton Park, with Bridgeman working out a designer's solution to various difficult sites, but not being particularly concerned with theories or with extending the scope of the pleasure garden. A collaboration between Bridgeman and William Kent at Rousham did result in an enlarged pleasure garden which both brought in external features, and in some measure was internally modified
by them so that it became, in effect, a landscape garden.

The original impetus of rural and extensive gardening, the blending of pleasure garden and estate began to be modified in the 1720's notably in Langley's *New Principles of Gardening* and in the 1730's by Switzer's own practise. Thus an enlarged pleasure garden with features of the garden/estate scheme developed parallel to the theoretically purer rural and extensive gardening.

The *ferme ornée* was a term introduced by Switzer to describe the small-scale version of his rural and extensive gardening, specifically Riskins, Buckinghamshire. Grimsthorpe was perhaps also designed "upon the Plan of the Ferme Ornée": the plate based on it in *Ichnographia Rustica* certainly was.²³ By about 1727 Dawley Park, Middlesex, and by 1729 Abbs Court, Middlesex, for Lords Bolingbroke and Halifax were underway. Philip Southcote made Woburn Farm, Surrey from 1735, as did Sir John Clerk of Pennicuik at about the same time, and in 1743 William Shenstone began The Leasowes. What Abbs Court and Dawley Park were like is unknown. Woburn Farm is known from Thomas Wheatley's description of it. The farm was one hundred and fifty acres of which one fifth was "adorned to the highest degree".²⁴ Two thirds of the remainder was parterre and the rest arable. But, true to Switzer's prescription,

"The decorations are...communicated to every part; for they are disposed along the sides of a walk, which, with its appendages, forms a broad belt round the grazing grounds; and its continued, though on a more contracted scale, through the arable."²⁵
Thus the extended garden, as a "walk", threaded through the useful parts of the scheme and contained an octagon building and a ruin, and for part of the way "a thick and lofty hedge-row, which is enriched with woodbine, jessamine, and every odoriferous plant", (Switzer had suggested "Primroses, Violets, and such natural sweet, and pleasant flowers"). Southcote does appear to have been fonder of flowers than Switzer would have recommended or Wheatley approved but otherwise the description perfectly answers Switzer's scheme of 1718. Whether Switzer laid out Woburn Farm is doubtful but it is very probable that he was its "designer" having given perfectly clear instructions, to which Southcote's farm answers to a considerable degree. It is conceivable that Southcote was completely unaware of Ichnographia Rustica and re-invented the ferme ornée himself, but the evidence, such as it is, is consistent with a contrary view.

Sir John Clerk's "rather rustic, than cultivated" Pennicuik, Midlothian, was laid over a number of years by himself. It lacked the continuous thread of garden/walk, and rather had the ornamental parts scattered throughout the grounds. The natural advantages of that part of Midlothian, the river Esk and abruptly rising hills with exposed rock, probably determined the discontinuous scheme. Clerk possessed a copy of Ichnographia Rustica.

William Shenstone's (1714-1763) "perfectly Arcadian farm" was The Leasowes, near Hales Owen, Shropshire. Shenstone began laying out The Leasowes when he took up residence in 1743 and he continued
to embellish it throughout his life. The small estate was "never distinguished for any particular beauties" until Shenstone took it over: he had the

"ingenuity both to discover and improve them, which he has done so effectually, that is now considered as amongst the principal of these delightful scenes which persons of taste, in the present age, are desirous to see".

The Leasowes was more a state of mind than an actual performance, "The Genius Loci when its first master departed" and its quality depended on the agreement that it was "a perfect picture of his mind".

The form of The Leasowes was varied and contained several small valleys and hills, but it was principally a farm consisting of a number of regularly and irregularly enclosed fields. Through the whole ran "a walk as unadorned as common field paths" from which neighbouring villages and house, hills, plantation and the steeple of Hales Owen church could be seen. These, in contrast, with various improvements of Shenstone's, small cascades and "lakes", an octagon seat, and a ruin, produced various effects. The Leasowes was a sentimental garden of the kind favoured by Lord Kames where the various emotions of gloom, gaiety, or grandeur were added to those of beauty. Shenstone achieved this largely by his inscribed seats

"chiefly intended as hints to spectators, lest in passing cursorily through the farm, they might suffer any of that immense variety the place furnishes to escape their notice", which by verse set the appropriate mood. The ruin would have con-
jured up sober reflection whereas the Venus in the flowering shrubbery would have brought forth ideas of gaiety.

For all its inscriptions and visual pointers the Leasowes was a private garden, and its appreciation required the attendance and commentary of Shenstone himself and when he was absent the Leasowes reverted to an ordinary farm. That Shenstone was his own designer there can be little doubt but his claim to have derived the term ferme ornée was likely disingenuous; the term had appeared in print in 1742, and had been used by Switzer as early as 1729. Whether Shenstone re-invented the ferme ornée or not, it had been proposed as early as 1715, as had the notion of association of ideas.

The peculiar qualities of Shenstone's "landskip, or picturesque" garden, and Dodesley's equally poetic description of it, with its many visitors may have hastened the decline of the ferme ornée and hence Switzer's rural and extensive gardening. The designs after mid century exclude the useful parts of the estate and Wheatley distinguished clearly between the two.

"Though a farm and a garden agree in many particulars connected with extent, yet in style they are the two extremes. Both indeed are subjects of cultivation, but cultivation in the one is husbandry, and in the other decoration; the former is appropriated to profit, the latter to pleasure."

To Switzer advances in husbandry and advances in ornamental plantation were parts of the same thing and his system was developed to take advantage of these advances. But the forms originally
derived to suit his rural and extensive gardening had visual and associational appeal quite outside their original function. And what was conceived as a method of providing a perfect setting for a peaceful rural life finally developed into the sophisticated and artfully natural pleasure garden characteristic of the century.

The cleavage began in the late 1720's with Batty Langley's *New Principles of Gardening*, and in his work of the 1730's Switzer appears to have accepted this basically modified version of his theory. Langley's book was largely a reworking of *Ichnographia Rustica* and began by castigating the same faults that Pope, Addison and Switzer had observed some years before. "that, regular, stiff, and stuff up manner...first taken from the Dutch" 42 He echoes Switzer in castigating the felling of trees to produce a "very great Exactness" 43 in plantation, the crowding of parterres with plants and objects so that "the whole appears a confusion" 44 and the leaving of important parts of the garden "naked of Shade". 45 In the spirit of *Ichnographia Rustica* but apparently a particular dislike of Langley's was the making of grass slopes "poor and trifling" 46 instead of having "one grand slope". 47 There is no distaste of French garden design: Langley quotes extensively from Rene Rapin's *Of Gardens* in his "General Directions" for laying out grounds 48 and apparently saw them as an antidote to the Dutch style. For Langley "after nature's own manner" meant "designs that are truly grand and noble". 49

But there are essential differences between Langley and Switzer.
Although he adopts the forms and notions, Langley does not recommend rural and extensive gardening: he is rather concerned with the pleasure garden, and what is appropriate and desirable at the scale of an agricultural estate has a quite different effect when employed within a much smaller area. It could become in Professor Pevsner's words "wiggly, puny and playful", the reverse of Langley's stated intentions. And to judge from his plates (which are folding quarto size and represents a relatively small area: they may be taken as truer representations of his ideas than the large scale designs in *Ichnographia Rustica*) this is the tendency. This tendency is reinforced by his version of Switzer's "a little regularity", "... when we depart from this regular Scene, then all the remaining Parts should consist of regular Irregularities". Instead of accidental irregularities being drawn into a scheme and made a feature Langley would have them created *de novo*, hence "Hills and Dales...be made by Art, where Nature has not perform'd that Work before". This is apparently what Alexander Pope meant by consulting the "genius of the place". According to Joseph Spence, Pope had said,

"In laying out a garden, the first thing to be considered is the genius of the place: thus at Riskins, for example, Lord Bathurst should have raised, two or three mounts, because his situation is all a plain, and nothing can please without variety."

Similarly the objects with which Switzer proposed to diversify a rural and extensive garden are with Langley brought into the pleasure garden purely for the visual (and perhaps associational) value in creating variety, as for example "Inclosures of Corn, open Plains, or Small Meadows".
Langley's use of ruins is subtly but significantly different from Switzer's. Instead of recommending

"The Erection of all Lodges, Granges, and other Buildings that Gentlemen are obliged to build, for Conveniency, in the Form of some Antiquated Place", 55

Langley rather preferred the visual shadow to associational "substance" and included designs,

"of the Ruins of Buildings, after the old Roman manner, to terminate such Walks that End in disagreeable Objects; which Ruins may either be painted upon Canvas, or actually built in that Manner with Brick, and cover'd with Plaistering in Imitation of Stone. And since we are to build no more thereof than as much of the Shell, as is next to our View, I therefore recommend their Building before their Painting, not only as the most durable, but least expens-ive"56

In other words there is with Langley a significant change, a tendency to imitate idealized nature rather than to follow empirical nature.

Langley's desire for variety goes beyond Switzer in the choice of plant material used to make up an element: thus, a,

"Plantation should not only be adorned with entire Walks and Hedges of Trees of all Sorts, as well as Fruit as others; but intermix'd together in many parts, as if Nature had placed them there with her own Hand"57

These would include "Oak, Beach, Elm, Lime, Maple, Sycamore, Horbeam ...

...and the weeping or mourning Willow that was brought from Babylon".58

This is a trait too of Kent and later designers and reached its peak in the 19th century when individual plants, "specimens", were valued in themselves, and informed a kind of garden design.
Also in 1728 a very different publication, Robert Castell's *The Villas of the Ancients Illustrated* supported Switzer's bland and unsubstantiated assertion that the gardens of ancient Greece and Rome were agreeable to his system. This enquiry into "the situation and disposing of the Roman Villas" was supported by Lord Burlington and was to have been a preliminary to his projected work on Vitruvius. His sources were the occasional remarks and descriptions of the ancient authors. Castell drew mainly on Pliny the younger's description of his villas of Laurentium and Tuscum, a source apparently unknown to Switzer, with the works of Varro, Palladius, and Columella used for clarification.

According to Castell there were three distinct styles of garden design in ancient Rome. The earliest Roman gardens

"seem to have been no more than select, well water'd Spots of Ground, irregularly producing all Sorts of Plants and Trees...Their whole Art consisting in little more than in making those Parts next their Villas as it were accidentally produce the choicest Trees...the Face of the ground suffering little or no Alteration".

This "First Manner" was succeeded by the "laying out the Ground and Plantations of Gardens by the Rule and Line, and to trim them up by an Art that was visible in every Part of the Design". And based on the accounts of Chinese gardening Castell suggested that there was a third manner,

"whose Beauty consisted in a close Imitation of Nature; where, tho' the Parts are disposed with the greatest Art, the Irregularity is still preserved".
Pliny's Tuscan villa used all three styles, and by his large plan Castell demonstrated his understanding of each, "The main Body of his Garden was disposed after the Second of these" corresponding to Switzer's "a little Regularity", and including the avenues, forecourt, "parterre" and the like. From the regular parts "one as it were accidentally fell upon those Pieces of a rougher Taste". The park or Vivarium, to either side of the hippodrome were in Castell's third manner, whereas the two rectangular cabinets at the far end of the hippodrome were examples of the first being the pratium where "Nature appears in her plainest and most simple Dress" or an "Imitation of the natural Face of some Country". A reader later in the 18th century would doubtless have thought the manners reversed, but to Castell, like Switzer, where "Hills, Rocks, Cascades, Rivulets, Woods, Buildings &c. were possibly thrown into such an agreeable Disorder, as to have pleased the Bye from several views, like so many beautiful Landskips; and at the same Time have afforded at least all the Pleasures that could be enjoy'd in the most regular Gardens." was to be preferred to unimproved nature or strict regularity.

Pliny's omission of the useful parts of the villas was reckoned by Castell a blemish, and he resorted to remarks by Columella, Varro and Palladius (Switzer's only sources) to make his enquiry complete. Although Castell included a codicile on the relation of villa, ornamental plantation and arable it could not basically affect his version of ancient practice. Therefore Villas of the Ancients Illustrated would have strengthened the tendency evident in Langley to confine garden design, whatever its forms and extent to purely
Even Switzer was prepared to practise a "Farm-Like way of Gardening", that is a pleasure garden with visual characteristics of a farm or park, as well as the more functional rural and extensive gardening. The less functional approach was characteristic of William Kent whose beginning in garden design may have been connected to Castell's vision of Pliny's villas.

However, Castell seems to have had an effect on William Kent (who was Lord Burlington's protégé, began to lay out gardens in 1734 "without level or line" and who built a Praeneste, named after one of Pliny's villas, at Rousham) and it is with Kent that the distinction between rural and extensive gardening and what became landscape gardening begins to become evident.

Kent was nearly fifty when he took up garden design. He had been sent to Italy in 1709 to study painting, and returning to England with Lord Burlington in 1719, was promoted for the next ten years as painter and decorator. His architectural work began in the early 1730's. It is possible that Burlington also encouraged Kent to become a garden designer, and it would appear that he grafted the ideas recently put forward by Langley and Castell to his own talents.

Neither Kent's forms, nor, as far as they can be ascertained, his intentions were new or peculiar to himself. It was his method...
of composing gardens that was apparently unique: he sketched the various elements in perspective and thus can be credited as the first picturesque designer. However, in his first essays in planning with pictures he does not appear to have realized its potential. His proposed clump plantations for Euston, Suffolk are no more like landscape pictures than Switzer’s rendering of the Spy Park/Breamore cascade and as late as c 1740 his composition is basically symmetrical. Even when he employed two point perspective, a system which favours asymmetry, as in his drawing for Venus’s Vale, Rousham, Oxfordshire, the layout is still effectively symmetrical.

A direct influence by Ichnographia Rustica on Kent is not apparent although there are some hints that Switzer may have had a personal influence on him. Lord Orrery was Burlington’s cousin, so there might have been a connection through the family, Burlington’s gardener in Yorkshire, Thomas Knowlton, had a high opinion of Switzer’s work. Thomas Coke (1697-1759) Lord Lovell (created Earl of Leicester in 1744) Kent’s client at Holkham subscribed to Switzer’s magazine in 1733/4, and the structure, at least, of the grounds at Holkham might conceivably be due to Switzer. Another subscriber was Sir Michael Newton whose grounds at Culverthorpe, Lincolnshire also might have been laid out by Switzer: Lord Lovell and Sir Michael Newton consulted each other about their building and planting operations. Although these hints are suggestive, on present evidence they can be no more.
Rousham, Oxfordshire "the most engaging of all Kent's works" was laid out 1726-1739 and appears to have been a collaboration with Bridgeman. Kent was engaged on architectural work at Rousham from 1738 to 1741 and it may therefore have been after Bridgeman's death that he "softened the lines" of Bridgeman's scheme. The garden was laid out on the south and west banks of the River Cherwell; the meadow, fields and rising ground on the north and east sides of the river providing prospect. Rousham retains Bridgeman's articulacy of parts with the principle elements, house and parterre, Praeneste, and Venus' Vale having their long axes generated from a common point in the meadow. The informing idea behind the design appears to have been a tight circuit walk connecting the principle elements of the garden and external prospects. As suggested by Mr. Hussey the circuit began at the foot of the parterre, from which the river, meadow, fields and Kent's "eyecatcher" were visible over a concave slope. A straight walk ran between closed grove on the river side and an open grove, through which the paddock beyond a sunk fence was visible, to a terrace. The terrace was supported on the north side by Praenepte, and there were open views to the river prospect and the paddock. A straight terrace walk overlooking the paddock led to the edge of the garden where an oval basin was set within loose groves. A broad serpentine grass walk ran along the western edge of the garden to the lead figure, but the "course" would have turned to Townsend's building, facing north over a concave slope to a round clump behind which the river ran. This group at the extreme edge of the composition was
obviously a quotation of the house/parterre group at the other end. From the round clump the course would have turned back on itself to face the lead figure beyond which the Praeneste was visible at the end of a straight walk. From here a walk through a loose grove on the river bank, a serpentine walk through a close woodland, the straight walk or another serpentine to the cold bath, ended at the foot of Venus' vale, with an oblique view of Praeneste. The Vale, a composition of two ascending rectangular basins set within a softened rectangle and circle, were apparently conceived as a tableau vivant. The Praeneste was set irregularly next to the vale and it commanded linear views along the river, and beyond it to the meadow and fields. From Praeneste a short walk along the river led to the slope below the parterre, passing an amphitheatre. East of the parterre group, between the river and kitchen garden, was another loose grove.

The prospect beyond the river was an integral part of Kent's scheme but, it was composed in a rather different way; except for the placement of rock ruined mill and beyond it the eyecatcher, it was not composed. The road in the middle distance with its enclosing wall was left as were hedgerows and fields. The meadow as not planted. A bridge from the grove east of the parterre led into the meadow and in Kent's sketch a group of gentry was faintly drawn in after the cattle, boatman and rustics. This part of the scheme may have for practical reasons lain outside Kent's brief, but for whatever reason he used the prospect as a tableau vivant of a different kind: a rustic English scene contrasting to the more
highly organised sections in the garden evocative of classical antiquity.

However, the credit for the placement of elements is apportioned between Bridgeman and Kent, the resulting design laid out under Kent's direction, despite its parterre and straight walks, is undoubtedly a landscape garden with elements of the ferme ornée and comparable to the mature style practised after mid-century. It is evident too that it was laid out by using pictures and is therefore picturesque. The critical question, however, is: are landscape gardens and gardens laid out on picturesque principles necessarily the same? Do the undeniable qualities of Rousham depend on Kent's method of composition, or could the same qualities be obtained by other means? And was a stylistic, if not theoretical, influence from Switzer possible?

Nostell Priory dates from Kent's first attempts at garden design and it is in many ways comparable to Rousham: the intentions of the designer are evident, there is the same close juxtaposition of house/parterre, water, garden, park and prospect, its elements are composed of both straight and curved lines and as at Rousham the site at Nostell determined a non-axial arrangement north and west of the house. An important existing feature, the lake at Nostell, the river at Rousham, lay close to the house and necessarily impinged on the design. Although there was an earlier alternative design for Nostell there was apparently no collaboration so its earlier date may somewhat compensate for the equivocal early work in deter-
mining the cast of Rousham. It is different mainly in that there is neither evidence nor hint that it was a picturesque composition.

Nostell was somewhat larger than Rousham and it therefore did not have to rely on Kent's tight circuit but circuits or at least a meandering course was necessary to exhibit the plantations. Nostell should therefore be amenable to the same analysis Mr. Hussey applied to Rousham. In Switzer's design the parterre, also plain but of complex geometry, lay west of the house. It was separated from the lake by a convex slope. The prospect included the curved sides of the lake, a classical bridge, an irregularly laid out park, a large close woodwork, a "grand lawn" in the larger park, and the south lawn and "common court". Directly opposite the parterre was a cascade descending from an old quarry. An imagined circuit starting from the parterre would cross the lake by boat to a walk just north of the cascade and lead to the regular basin formed out of the quarry. From the hermitage on the south side of the basin a serpentine walk led westwards and then northwards through the close woodwork showing the small park (whose edges were curved and consisted of trees and shrubs, the interior being planted with round clumps and "naturally" disposed single trees) to a series of maze-like straight and curved walks leading to small formal basins. These emerged at the octagonal basin in the centre of the close woodwork for which there was a diagonal vista of the lake and north front of the house, a view north-east to the great park, and south west to the small park and beyond it the curved end of the lake and half the classical bridge. From the central basin a straight walk led
north west to a subsidiary formal basin from which a curved and then serpentine walk turned northwards to the terrace which was the northern edge of the garden. A "cornfield for benefit of game" surrounded by a serpentine walk in a wooded belt lay at the extreme west end of the terrace. The terrace consisted of four sections: serpentine north the close-woodwork, straight as it ran across the dam, then an arc of a circle and finally another shorter straight section. Proceeding eastwards along the terrace there was the park to the north, in the foreground a serpentine river ending in a naturalistic park with clumps and scattered single trees; in the middle distance the great formal figure of forest trees and beyond that a belvedere. To the south was the close wood with a sharper diagonal vista of the north front of the house, and on the dam of the lake, slopes, parterre and house. The views from the terrace as it crossed the principal north-south axis were complex; to the south there was of course a full frontal view of the house, but this was modified by the foreground. The continuation of the convex slope below the parterre ran slantways across the axial view and further rose towards the house so that the eye was rather directed along the "axis" of the lake, south-southwest, terminated by an oblique view of the cascade with the lake disappearing beyond. To the north the geometry of the figure would have been fully apparent and beyond that the south front of the belvedere. At the beginning of the curved section of the terrace the scattered trees in the park became denser, opened to reveal a diagonal vista and then closed again as the terrace turned south to the parade.
The circuit here would have led into another close wood or along the terrace where it could have turned to show the greenhouse in its formal setting. Behind this a serpentine path led first to a formal basin and then meandered to the top of a complex sloped amphitheatre, from which the great park, serpentine river, lake, and wood were visible. A grass sward ran in front of the amphitheatre to the north front or to the upper lakeside walk leading to the parterre.

The design for Nostell was more ample than Rousham but it makes use of the same forms, and exhibits the same complex series of tableaux vivants. The great formal elements at Nostell are not softened as they were at Rousham, but their very size in some measure mitigated the geometric shape. On the garden sides at Nostell Switzer departed from his "little regularity near the house" in favour of an informal foreground and middle distance, and "an imperceptible Regularity" in the background and in the axial and diagonal vistas.

Whatever the relative importance of geometrical elements at Nostell and Rousham, Kent using the techniques, not of Brown, but of the commentators of the later eighteenth century and Switzer using techniques of the earlier part of the century, developed a kind of garden design which was effectively the same.

Kent contributed picturesque planning to garden design and by 1739 this quality had been assigned to Pliny's description of his villas, where
"Art and nature, in the Conveniences and Beauties, blended with the just Approbation of his Designs to the Spot on which they were erected: His Scenes are Picteresque Images of a delightful, pleasant, and fertile Soil"  

He also contributed a negligent or shaggy character to what had before, even with Switzer, been rather precise. This doubtlessly arose because of his method of composition, and partly because his age and expectations predisposed him to ignore the professional skills theretofore required of garden designers.

James Dallaway (1763-1834) in his "Supplementary Anecdotes of Gardening in England" distinguished between the "reformed taste" and modern gardening, and J.C. Loudon simply contrasted "The Ancient, Roman, Geometric, Regular, or Architectural Style; and the modern, English, Irregular, Natural or Landscape style".

In the second half of the eighteenth and the first quarter of the nineteenth century landscape or modern gardening was practised, mostly in England but to a lesser extent in Scotland, France, Italy, Germany and other European countries. It was, however, no more a uniform style than the garden design of the early 13th century had been. But whether the test of a modern garden was "that a landscape painter would choose it for a composition" or that it produced "not only an emotion of beauty...but also some other particular emotion, grandeur, for example, gaiety, or any other...The most perfect idea of a garden is...the adjustment of the several parts, in such a manner as to inspire all the different emotions that can be raised by gardening"
whether like Switzer the environs of the house ought to have "a little regularity", or admit the park, and cattle, to the drawing room windows: or whether it was preferred shaggy natural, smooth natural or something in between it was practised within a generally agreed system of forms and notions introduced and nearly perfected by 1740. If any practitioner, or professor, as they came to be called, can stand for the whole period, it must be Lancelot Brown (1716-1783), who, by about 1750, had achieved an unequivocal landscape garden.

Brown's first independent work and one of the few entirely new designs was Croome Court, Worcestershire. The large, low plain with a slight rise to the east did not appear a favourable situation, indeed it was reckoned "as hopeless a spot as any in the island": most of the ground was marshy and there were no remarkable features to the landscape. In the 1740's George William Coventry (1722-1809), who succeeded as Earl of Coventry in 1750, had begun to reclaim part of the estate, and Brown was called in after Sanderson Miller had seen the possibilities of the site and suggested draining the park. This was affected by digging in the lowest part of the site a great drain which was contrived as a somewhat serpentine river, and became the unifying element in the garden. The shape of the drain appears to have resulted more from its necessary position, course and function, than from will; therefore it appears inevitable. A new house was built in the centre of the site, near the bottom of the most significant slope which rose eastwards from the drain. The stables, offices and kitchen garden
lay east of the house, disguised by a plantation which was continued eastwards, thus forming with the wooded boundaries three distinct parts; a park north and south of the house, and the area west of the drain. The ground south and east of the house was laid out as a "garden" (corresponding to the close woodwork at Castle Howard or Nostell Priory). A circular ornamental building acted as its focus, being fully visible from the river and south park and standing on the highest ground. It was the culmination of a wooded walk east and south from the house. This wooded garden was enclosed by a terrace walk.

The entrance to the grounds and house was along the northern edge of the woodland separating the two eastern parks, and the woodland on this side merged with boundary plantation, in which, north east of the house, Brown placed a mock Gothic church. The junction of the two eastern parks next to the river was marked by a bridge and a riverside plantation. The parks were planted with clumps and single trees, and the boundary plantations formed, so far as can be determined, was like that in the little southwest park at Nostell or the similarly small park northeast of the parterre at Rousham. The original farm ground west of the river is unknown: from the glimpse of it in Wilson's picture it is presumed to have had a similar character to the eastern parks - that is, pasture land diversified by scattered plantation.

In later life Brown was criticised for the formality of his elements and the predictability of his improvements, so that his
style is better known in caricature (belt, clumps, "shaven" lawn, water, house). Brown may have been justly criticised for not departing significantly from the design of Croome Court, but the design itself remains historically logical and sensitive, though it contains no new elements or composition. The parterre, effectively abolished at Nostell and Aylesbury, is at Croome, as at Wilton, replaced by lawn differentiated from park, though here the beasts are allowed to come to the house itself. The artificial river is used in the same way as the lake at Nostell, the rivers at Rousham and Wilton, or the artificial river at Risksins. The plantations, as has already been observed, are likewise traceable to designs of the 1730's. The boundary plantation, or belt, derives from Switzer and Woburn Farm his use of it, however, is opposed to its spirit at Woburn and to Switzer's instruction. The wooded garden, of course, had its origin in form and intent at Castle Howard at the beginning of the century.

According to Walpole, Brown had "set up on a few ideas of Kent and Mr. Southcote" and insofar as his schemes were informal the connection between him and Kent may have been so, but there is a significant difference between Brown and Kent. Brown did not compose his designs as pictures. In 1782 Hannah More reported,

"He illustrates everything he says about gardening by some literary or grammatical allusion. He told me he compared his art to literary composition. "Now there!" said he, pointing his finger, "I make a comma, and there, pointing another spot "where a more decided turn is proper, I make a colon; at another part, where an interruption is desirable to break the view, a parenthesis; now a full stop, and then I begin another subject."
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and earlier he had written that for a design to be right it would

"be exactly fit for the owner, the Poet and the Painter. To produce these effects there wants a good plan, good execution, a perfect knowledge of the country and the objects in it...and infinite delicacy in the planting &c ...Place-making, and a good English Garden, depend entirely upon Principle and have very little to do with Fashion; for it is a word that in my opinion disgraces Science wherever it is found"104

Brown prepared plans for improvement not pictures, and though he realized the painter should be pleased, he appears to have relied on principle and "science", and that his head rather than his eye informed his designs. Thus it is not so surprising that there was considerable similarity in his schemes, or that he judged a site on its capabilities for improvement to his pre-conceived ideal.

In his non visual approach Brown is more akin to Switzer than to Kent. Except for Switzer's practice in Northumberland in the period just before Brown came south to work in 1739 there is no particular reason to connect them, as there is between Kent and Brown and Stowe. And Brown's principles overlook one of the central tenets of rural and extensive gardening, that the whole estate should be brought into the design. Brown alienated arable to give room for his idealised scheme, and excluded the rest by boundary plantation. Instead of humouring, or following nature, Brown idealised it and swept everything aside that did not contribute to his ideal, just as London had been prepared to do at Wray Wood.
But, however removed theoretically Brown is from Ichnographia Rustica his notions, forms and composition derive from it, and his style derives from Switzer's work perhaps more than from Kent's.

To concentrate on the historical and stylistic development of garden design in the work of Switzer, Kent and Brown, while it shows a satisfying and logical development is as misleading as to forget that James' translation of d'Argenville continued a potent force nearly to mid century. Lack of knowledge of the more minor figures determines such a course somewhat, but from what little is presently known of garden design around the middle of the 18th century it would appear that the transition from late Switzer to Brown was being worked out at various rates and with various emphasis by other designers. A number of advanced designs are presently too little known to even admit of speculation: Stourhead is known only from sources after mid century though it was made from 1742; and only Hagley's effects are similarly unknown. Perhaps these, as has often been suggested, are the amateur efforts of their owners and friends.

According to J.C. Loudon "Wright seems to have been in some repute at the time of Kent's death", presumably Thomas Wright (1711-1786) primarily an astronomer, but after his introduction to London in 1733 he gained a number of landed friends and admirers who he obliged with "designs for their houses, gardens, garden buildings, fans, screens, and so forth" but as he provided designs only and did not contract to carry out work "he had little employment".
His designs might include work at Wreath Park in the late 1730's where he was intimate, at least architectural work for the Duchess of Kent at Windsor from 1743; buildings and perhaps gardens at Horton, Northamptonshire, 1740's; Shugborough, Staffordshire between 1745 and 1750, and Oatlands, Surrey from 1747. In the early 19th century Wright was said to have been the "director of public taste" between Kent and Brown. The quality of his garden designs appear to have relied on the addition of a number of discreet elements, with buildings pre-eminent. At Shugborough the lawn to either side of his serpentine river was crowded with an orangery, two ruins and a Chinese pavilion. His proposed remodelling of St. James Park in 1766 (associated with a new palace) relied on the regularising of the park thus making a large and geometrically complex "parterre". This was to have been furnished with a symmetrical basin and surrounded by complex plantations, informal in themselves but taken altogether making a formal pattern. The Greek Park was to have had a broad avenue formed of alternating round and square clumps.

A contemporary designer whose work had somewhat less singular characteristics was Francis Richardson (fl. 1733-1745). In 1733 Richardson was gardener at Hurstbourne Priors, Hampshire, in the late 1740's he made designs for a lakeside "fortification" at Thoresby, Nottinghamshire and in 1754 for Lowther Hall, Westmorland; there is an undated design for Worksop Manor, Nottinghamshire. Richardson's designs are for remodelling or extending existing grounds but at Lowther this was complex enough to stand as a new scheme. An
anonymous survey of 1732 shows the late 17th century house, severely
damaged by fire in the 1720's, still standing, with gardens to the
west and a woodland to the east. In Richardson's survey of
1754 the main block of the house and the eastern flanker have
disappeared and trees are shown growing on the site: a new house
is shown in his design, sited north of the old one nearer the outer
flankers.

Richardson's design has some affinities with Wright: the use
of clumps and fragments of regular plantation to define at a very
large scale a non-specific formal shape, as in the forecourt for
Lowther. This fragmented, basically linear, scattering of forms
on a dominant ground whose effect was meant to be both formal (in
plan) and informal (in comprehension) is perhaps characteristic
of secondary work of the period 1740 to 1760 and is a logical
extension of Switzer's "imperceptible Regularity". It has some
of the characteristics of contemporary decorative art and may too,
for convenience, be called rococo. It was not, however, an
extension employed by Switzer himself.

The proposed garden was traditional - a parterre flanked by
close woodwork and the whole enclosed by a terrace walk - but even
here there is a sort of rococo style introduced. The sides of the
parterre, or since its length is so extended, the glade, are neither
straight nor do they break forward and recede in imitation of "nature".
Rather the recessions, which face diagonally inwards, are formed of
precise whip lash curves, symmetrically composed. The eastern
division of the garden was to have the existing loose grove to the
north, and to the south a smoothly informal lake separated from the
glade by the closely wooded recessions. The west side, including
the old kitchen gardens, was closely wooded with three large inform-
ally planted "centres" (reminiscent of Castell's Vivaria at Tusculum)
connected by broad, smooth serpentine walks. There was an attempt
to regularise the platform into a non-platonic form.

Of other designers of the period little is known beyond their
names, "Mr. Eyre, an imitator of Bridgeman" may have been at work;
Barnes "mentioned in terms of respect by G. Mason" is unknown;
"Mr. Greening" had a house at Claremont in 1733 where he may
have been working with Kent. Charles and Edward Greening took over
Bridgeman's contract for keeping the gardens at Richmond at his
death, though which of these prepared a scheme for Kirtlington,
Oxfordshire, by 1752 is unknown. This included a scheme "for
cutting a wood to the south-east of the house into a number of groves,
several of them containing classical temples". Of John Lowe
and John Swinhoe who also succeeded to part of Bridgeman's royal
practice, Swinhoe was connected with Switzer in business in some way,
probably as supplier of plants. Lowe is unknown. Batty Langley
lived until 1751 but very little is at present known of his practise
as a garden designer.

Of the designers known to have been active in this period those
whose work can be in some measure assessed (Langley, Wright and
Richardson) had characteristics unlikely to be confused with Switzer, Kent or Brown. There does appear to have been a secondary style, or rococo undercurrent, separate and distinct from the progression from late Switzer to early Brown.

Large scale garden design began in Italy in the mid 16th century as a branch of architecture, and from its beginnings the contrast of improved and unimproved nature was essential to its appreciation. Mock ruins, semi-naturalism, irregularity and caricature can be observed in the earliest Italian examples. By the late 16th century gardens of this scale were made in France and England but their architectural character and impetus predominated; there was little apparent interest in the contrast of rude natural and sophisticated man made. This tendency developed in both countries until the middle of the 17th century when in France Andre LeNostre developed his grand expansive architectonic style, whereas England reverted to an easier method of design by addition in which the structure was subordinated to the horticultural and hydrostatic furnishing. London and Wise towards the end of the 17th century tended towards a more comprehensive structure in their schemes, in which the furnishings continued important, in imitation of the developed French grand manier in which by the end of the century there is observable a measure of irregularity and even composition in imitation of nature; the sunk fence had been introduced also.

Switzer joined London and Wise in 1698 and just after 1700 he was responsible for two examples of a new and non-doctrinal approach
to garden design: the appreciation and celebration of existing features. But Wray Wood and the Kensington amphitheatre were unusual. Most of the first decade was spent in mastering the craft of garden making at Blenheim, where from 1706 he was also faced with the problem of a fault in the site, the course of the river Glyme. He never came to satisfactory terms with it and was not able to make of it a beauty, but he did learn, probably from Vanbrugh, that old buildings as well as mature trees and natural inconsistencies of situation were worthy of appreciation and incorporation into garden designs.

Between 1710 and 1715 Switzer worked out his system of garden design: his version of the grand manier put the house in a simplified, practically unfurnished, architectonic setting, which was connected both visually and actually to the outer plantations. These were to be laid out as a mixture of forest, park and arable land whose forms were to derive from existing enclosures, or woodland and take advantage of prospects or any inconsistency of situation. The house, garden, outer plantation complex was to be made to correspond together by a series of walks which ran straight or serpentine as circumstances suggested. Garden ornaments were to be incorporated into the design as association producing objects.

He received support, and doubtless some influence, from the essayists who in the same period held the "Dutch taste" up to ridicule. However, his system derived more from the style of London and Wise modified to include existing features of beauty or value,
and from his desire to see the money being spent on fine horticulture and furnishings used instead to make extensive useful plantations, than from contemporary literary sources. He did conceive that his system was agreeable to ancient and Chinese practise. His design for Grimsthorpe, based on Blenheim in the shape of the garden and the use of an enclosing terrace walk, was the first laid out in this way, followed by Cirencester and Riskins.

Between 1715 and 1730 Switzer practised as a gardener and designer based first in the West of England and later in London. The designs of this period, though largely fragmentary, do not appear to have included rural and extensive gardens. They are advanced, in their outward looking simplicity and use of irregular or natural forms, but are usually conventional exercises in garden, rather than integrated estate, design. In 1724 Switzer started a period of publication of books on practical gardening, hydrostaticks and agricultural improvement, and in c 1726 he set up a seed shop in Westminster.

The designs of the period 1730 to 1745 tend to show a stylistic advance in the diminishing importance of geometrical features and even an apparent theoretical shift from estate planning to an enlarged pleasure garden in some measure representing the qualities of the landscape. In his last design though parks have replaced the arable land, the fusion of garden and external plantation is complete.
Thus Switzer's writings and stylistic development show an unbroken and logical progression from his conception of continental baroque garden design to landscape garden design.
Appendix 1, Switzer's Family

Thomas Switzer (d. 1697) (alias Sweetser, Sweetsur, Switsur) m. 1, 1652, Margaret Freemantel

2, 1676, Mary Hapgood (d. 1682)

Thomas Switzer (1678-1742) m. 1701, Sarah Purchell

Stephen Switzer (1682-1745) m(?) Elizabeth ——?

Thomas, b. 1705
Stephan, b. 1707
John, b. 1709
Mary, b. 1712
Sarah, b. 1715
George, b. 1718/19
Jane, b. 1721

Thomas, b. 1726
Appendix 2. The Surname Switzer

"Sweetser, Sweetsur. A native of Switzerland was formerly called a Switzer" 1

"SWEETSER, SWEITZER, SWEETZER, SWEETSIR, SWITZER... is no doubt foreign, but was early settled in England, and has acquired an English appearance." 2

"SWEETSER, German - Schweitzer; Flemish - Switser; (a Swiss)" 3

"Sweetser, Sweetsir, Sweetser, Sweetser: (Eng. plus A. - Fr. - Lat.) Sweet Sir 4... Switzer (Swiss) a Swiss (early Modern English Switzer - Ger. Schweizer; Schweiz, the German name for Switzerland is from the canton and town of Schwyz, a name probably of Romanic (Romanch) origin.)" 5

"Sweetser, Sweetsur, Sweetser, Switsur, Switzer... 'Sweet Sire'" 6

The disagreement as to the common derivation of the variant forms of Switzer may be somewhat resolved in the particular case of the Winchester Switzers. Thomas, senior and junior, and of course Stephen Switzer used the form Switzer, but when recorded by others various spellings were used, and these variations may have derived from the late and 13th century pronunciation. Thomas Switzer, senior was married first a Sweetsir, and secondly a Sweetsur; he died a Switsur. Thomas, junior, and Stephen Switzer were born Sweetsur, and this form was used with reference to Thomas Switzer’s family until 1721. 7 There is an example of variation deriving purely from faulty spelling; Switzur. Stephen Switzer was referred to by Scottish acquaintances as Sweetzer 8 and Switeser. 9 These examples appear to indicate that there was no difference in pronunciation between forms, and, whatever their origin, that the variants
are related.

There are examples of variations deriving from what seems to be faulty spelling,¹⁰ and there is one documented example of a German family using the form Switzer before their arrival in England from the Rhineland Palatinate.¹¹ The English form may therefore be of continental origin. Although it cannot be geneologically proved it would rather appear that the Winchester Switzers both from the variations in the records of the family and the similar variations recorded over three centuries in Byrd's Marriage Index¹² are related to the medieval English form Swetesire,¹³ a "nickname of disposition".¹⁴
Appendix 3. Documents relating to Switzer family property in Hampshire


Deed of bargain & sale, 13 Jan? 1713 (HRO 4M62/191 & 4M62/210)

"All that Mesuage or Tenement and Barne with the appertences situate...in a Certaine meadow called Chamports Bast Stratton...And also all that West End of the said Meadow...And above all those four Acres and Eight Weade roodes of arable land...in the Comon Feilds of East Stratton."

Parcels of land in east, west and middle fields plus right of way from Stratton streets across east side of Chamports meadow.

1730 A Copy of a Survey of His grace the Duke of Bedford's Estates at East and West Stratton, Micheldever...taken by Thomas Brown in 1730 since which time many alterations have been made. m.d., Bedford Estate Office, London.

p.23 East Stratton Copy hold, Thomas Switzer, "A House Work house Garden" 0...1...25"

p.29 Abbots Worthy Copyhold, Thomas Switzer, "House Two Barnes Stable Carthouse Orchard and Garden" 1...1...37"
Lower house, Work house, and Orchard "0...2...12"
plus arable Land, in all 55...1...23.

1740 Will of Thomas Switzer, junior, Carpenter of Abbots Worthy (HRO 4M62/219, copy)

"my Freehold Estate" in Stratton plus leave to sell and give wife dower's thirds to Stephen and John.

"my Leasehold house lately built in the Parish of Kings Worthy and Garden Plott thereunto belonging granted by his Grace the Duke of Bedford for the term of fourscore and Nineteen Years" to daughter Jane Switzer; plus legacies,
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Sarah, £100
Jane, £30
Mary Vokes, £30
Thomas, £20 "to be raised out of my Stock lying in his Yard or out of such goods as shall be most Proper for his business"
Wife, beds, plate, etc.; residue of household goods to Sarah and Jane.
grandchildren, one guinea each.

1746 Deed (HRO, 4M62/220)

Stephen Switzer, E. Stratton, Carpenter and his wife Mary, and John Switzer of Iching Abbott Carpenter and his wife Mary, to Thomas Woodman, Gent. of Basingstoke, Deed for "Mesuage Two Barnes One Garden one Orchard Ten Acres of Sand Four Acres of Meadow & Common of Pasture... now in possession of James Gould

1747 Indenture of Hine, Woodman and Switzer (HRO 4M62/195)

1752 30 April, Mr. John and Mr. Stephen Switzer to Mr. Richard Waterman, Lease for a year (HRO 4M62/?)

1 May, same to same, Release of a Messuage and Lands in East Stratton. (HRO 4M62/222)

25 July, Stephen Switzer to James Hutter, Mortgage for £40 at £410½0 per cent. (HRO 4M62/197)

1753 Stephen Switzer to Walter Swann, Mortgage of £50 of Premises in East Stratton (HRO 4M62/199)

1755 Swann Switzer to Kember, assignment of mortgage for £55 of premises in East Stratton (HRO 4M62/200)

1757 Bedford Estates Office, "Cash Book, 1731"

"23 May 1757 By Thomas Switzur paid him for the Purchase of a Copyhold at Abbots Worthy held by him for his own Life and right of widowhood to his wife. £200:-:-:-:.

1759 March 12, James Huller to Stephen Switzer, Deed of surrender of Mortgage (HRO 4M62/198)
Appendix 3.

May 3, John Switzer of Worthing Abbotts carpenter to Stephen Switzer of East Stratton carpenter, release and discharge of right to a messuage, Lands and Premises in East Stratton. (HRO 4M62/196)

1761 Bedford Estate Office, Hampshire Ledger from Mich. 1761, p.17 Stephen Switzer (now John Switzer) A House Yard Copyh. for lives said Stephen 54, Jno his Brother 52, Jno son 21 0.1.8
For a Quit Rent for his Freehold Cott ½ Land part of his Freeh. For the Tyth of 3a or 6p -.-.½ (payments to 1767) 0.7.6
p.68
Stephen Switzer (now Mary Smith) A Cott. ½ Gard. Copyhold for life of Mary Smith late 36 (Colleev 46) to 6/m rent 0.0.6
(payments 1762-1769)

1765 Will of Stephen Switzer, nd, proved 1765 (HRO 4M62/201)

"my freehold messuage Barn Backside garden and free Land in E. Stratton now in my possession & ______ subject to the payment & discharge of £50 due to Thomas Kember of Tadley"

plus legacies

Anne, all wearing apparel of mother
Stephen, 10/6 "to be paid within 6 months if it is lawfully demanded"

Trustees for James and Thomas Switzer, William Hyfield of West Stratton Yeoman and William Handbrook of East Stratton Wheelwright.
Appendix 4. Wills

1. Thomas Switzer, Senior (d. 1697) (20 July 1697, Hampshire Public Record Office, Winchester)

In the name of god Amen I Thomas Switzer of East Stratton in the County of South'ton Being sick and Weak in Body But of good perfect mind and Memory thanks be to god do make and ordain this my Last will and Testament in form and manner following First I commend my soul into the hands of almighty god my maker hoping in and through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ his deare Son and my allone Saviour to obtain Everlasting Life And my body I Commit to the Earth to be decently Buried according to the discretion of my Executor Hereafter named And as touching such worldly Estate where-with god hath been pleased to endow me I Dispose thereof as followeth:

Imprimis I will that my debts and funeral Expences be discharged Item I give to my son Stephen the sum of twenty pounds for the Settlement of him as an Apprentice, and Likewise a bed and bolster and pillow in ye room over ye hall. Item All the Rest of my goods & Chattles moneys and ye rest I give and bequeath unto my son Thomas whom I do hereby make and ordaine full and sole Executor of this my last will and Testament. And I do hereby Constitute and appoint Richard Speering Mecis of ye City of Winchester and Nicholas Wickham of the parish of micheldever to be Trustees and overseers of this my last will and Testament: hereby revoking all other wills heretofore made in witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand seal this 20th day of July Año Doí 1697.

Thomas Switzer...
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IN THE NAME OF GOD AMEN I Stephen Switzer of the parish of Saint Margaret Westminster in the county of Middlesex Seedsman and Gardiner being well in Health and of sound and perfect mind and memory Gods most holy name be praised considering the uncertainty of this Life do hereby make and ordain this My last Will and Testament in the manner and form following (that is to say)ffirst and principally I recommend my Soul to God that gave it and my Body I commit to the Earth from whence it came to be buryed in such decent manner as my Executors herein after mentioned shall think and touching such Wordly Estate as hath pleased god to bless me with I give and devise the same in manner following that is to say ffirst I give and bequeath unto my Cousin Jane Switzer Spinster all my household Goods Brass Pewter Copper Beds Bedding and ffurniture and household Stuff standing and being in the upper Room of the Apartment wherein I now live Also I give and bequeath unto my said Cousin Jane Switzer one Moiety or half part of my Stock in my said Trade which I carry on in my Shop or other place in Westminster Hall And also one Moiety or one half part of my said Trade and also one Moiety or one half of the Lease of the said Shop and place thereto adjoining which I shall be possess-ed at the time of my death for and during the Remainder of the time I shall then have therein also all the rest residue and remainder of my Estate whatsoever both Real and Personal wheresoever the same shall be situate lying and being or of whatsoever nature kind or quality I give devise and bequeath unto my dear and loving Son Thomas Switzer to have and to hold the same unto him my said Son Thomas Switzer his heirs Executors Administrators and assigns forever and I do hereby recommend it to my said Cousin Jane Switzer and my said Son Thomas Switzer to carry on the said Trade together so long as they shall think fit and I do make and constitute Barewell Smith Esquire deputy Auditor of the Exchequer and Spicer Gentleman of the Clerks of that Office and Thomas Willson gentleman of Round Court in the Strand Executors of this my last Will and Testament hereby revoking and making null and void all former and other Wills and Testaments by me at any time heretofore made and do declare this to be my last Will and Testament In Witness whereof I subscribe my name March 9th 1744/5 Stephen Switzer Signed Sealed and delivered and declared to be the last Will of the Testator in the presence of Witness Thomas Datemon Charles Blundell.

THIS WILL was proved at London before the worshipfull Robert Chapman Doctor of Laws and Surrogate of the right worshipfull John Betterworth also Docter of Laws and Master Keeper or Commisary of the prerogative Court of Canterbury lawfully constituted the fifteenth day of June in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and forty five by the Oath of Thomas Willson one of the Executors in the said Will named To whom Administration was granted of all and singular
the goods Chattels and Credits of the said deceased being first sworn only to administer power reserved of making the life grant to Percivell Smith Esquire and Spicer the other Executors named in the said Will when they or either of them shall apply for the same. Ex'd.
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34. Stephen Switzer to Thomas Sisson, 2 April 1735. Gateshead Public Library, Ellison MSS, Bundle C/25.


36. Stephen Switzer to Sir George Wynne, Bt., 1 July 1739. Flintshire County Record Office, Harwarden, Heaton MSS.
Appendix 5.

b. Transcripts (Letters 9-11, 16-18, 23, 27 and 28 are here abbreviated)

Testimonial.

To William Boulter Esqr at Woodstock in Oxfordshire.

Sir

Stephen Switzer was with me this morning & told me Mr. Wise has give the Care of the Gardens to another, but told him he should be employ'd about the Business of the Bridge &c. I believe him a very Ingenious Man in his Profession, & never heard but that he has bin honest and industrious. If you have the same good Opinion of him, I think he may be very useful to us, I hope you will employ him accordingly...

Travers

London 11th March 1707

1.

To Doctor Stukely att Boston

Sir

I promise my self the happiness of seeing you here next week and that you will bring The Arms of the Willoughby family, you were soe kind to show me as it will be very satisfactory to his Lordship, to whom I have opentd your Design of waiting on him - so nothing shall be wanting in me to testify the Respect due to you; his Lordship desires that you may see the Antiquities of his family in Spilsby Church, and has a Bock att Grimsthorpe he designs to show you, when he has the next opportunity, if you are att home tis probable I am give you the trouble of my Company an hour or two to morrow or next day but I think to morrow. being assured I shall hear a good Oration at Boston. til then I am Sr Your humble Servant.

S. Switzer
For
Dr Wm Stukely
at his Lodging near Powis
House Ormond Street
London

Spy Park, July 16th
1724

My Dear Friend

It was with great concern that I heard of your Being in this Country and not Coming to see me, Because I was prepared to give you, though not the most plentiful yet the Wellcomest Reception I could.

My Request now to you is that you would be so kind as to give me in a Letter a short sketch of the principal Dykes in those Levels of Cambridge and Lincolnshire you are Best acquainted with I don't mean any Plan, but an Act of the falls, that I may in Case of any Urgency know what fall water will in its utmost necessity Require. because I know not Country is so much straitned in their passages and falls for water as Lincolnshire is. This Acc I hope will not be long or very much Trouble to you, since it will be only naming some few of the principal Dykes, their Length fall &c. which I suppose is already adjusted & made Publick, if not that you would be so kind as to send me and know (?).

The Principal fall of the new River will also be I hope with the same ease Enquir'd into and any short Observations of your own will be of the greatest Obligation and you may Command me as much.

If a piece of venison at this Distance will be serviceable let me know what part is best likt and I will send it. My Wife Joynes with me in all acknowledgments of your last &c. I am yours -

S. Switzer

PS
My chief aim is to know how much fall in a Mile is Requisite at the least to Convey Water by.

We are prodigious Busie here on Acc of water wor'/s, and should have been glad of your assistance and advice. Pray Be soe kind as to Direct for me at Spy Parke near Chippenham Wiltshire.
3.

Thomas. Broadley Esqr
att Hull
Yorkshire

Pewsey Sep 18th 1726

Sir

The Favour of yours Rec'd I have in answer to it to desire that the Plann of your Ground be taken by some professt Surveyor and the angles and Profile be true drawn to a Scale, by Profile I mean the Descent, for it must be a very curious Gradual one indeed that can be adjusted without it.

The House I generally am at when in Town is Sturep's Coffee house in S. Martins Court, But if you please to direct as you did the last it will Come safe to Sir your humble Servant

Stephen Switzer

If you were near Enough my friend Mr. Pelham He would ffrank freely to me.

4.

Thos Broadley Esqr
att Ferriby
nr Hull, Yorkshire

Pewsey Oct the 23 1726

Sir

I Rec'd the favour of your 2d Letter with the Measures and Dimensions of your Ground, and cant Enough lament your Misfortune in having your House plac'd soe near the Street, and a narrow Lane that almost spoils your Gardens and Every thing about you, the first I mean the Street I suppose is unalterable, but the last I mean the Narrow Lane may I suppose be alter'd by a Writ of Quod Damnare (?) which wont cost above 20 l. and I hope you live by soe good Neighbours, that you may not only turn it farther off from your House but your Gardens and Inclosures alsoe. And on that Supposition I have made you a Plann which is however alterable at Pleasure and if you are soe Unfortunate as not to have Room for a whole one You must submit to have a little more than half a Garden. I should have been glad to have had a Plann of your House that I might have known of which End the offices and which the Best Rooms lye that the Coach House and other necessary Buildings might have laid contiguous thereto, Because on that Depends the Privacy and Convenience of all the Rest of your House Gardens &c, but till I know whether you can turn the Road, I shall be at some loss whether the Design I have sent you be fully fitted, Because on that Side alsoe must lye the Kitchen Garden.
I have made the little Sweep Parterre and Every Thing very Plain as you were pleas'd to intimate I should, without any Borders for flowers Greens &c. with which Gardens are generally Stufft because I think a neat decent Plainess is much Better than any Interlacings of Embroidery or Box Worke.

All the Quarters next the middle walk are designd for fruit Trees as you was pleas'd to mention except the Middle Division which is to be of Evergreens and flowering Shrubs with Cabinetts as mark'd. L. A. A. A. A.

The outer Quarters are of Wood or Coppice Wood, made without any Art but just as if they were cut out of hedge Rows, as to the Figures of which they may be made either of this or any other Figure and as I have kept a Rough Copy of all the Divisions or Quarters I can send you any new Design on larger Scales for either of them as you shall goe on always keeping the main design in View, and sorry shall I be if you cant turn the Road so that your House may not be in the Middle not only of your Gardens but the Enclosures Contiguous thereto and goe up one of the two new Lawns B or C since tis on this Depends the Beauty Privacy and Conveniency of your Seat.

You was Sir pleas'd to desire that I should send you an acct of what kind of Trees you are to plant and of the Expense attending such a Worke both which will be Difficult for me to doe till I have heard farther from you as to what I have before wrote; Besides I suppose you will goe Regularly and Leisurely on, and then by Letter I may have more Time and Leisure to give you an Answer to each Particular. I can only say at present that I believe every Acre of Ground you make may Cost about 50£ or 60£ planting and all or it may be you may doe it for 40£ but cheaper I dare say you can't, see that to all those Things it will be best that I answer you Piece by Piece as you goe on, beginning with your Kitchen Garden or Parterre &c first. I have had no acc. whether there by Gravell or Water to be had or noe and whether there by already any Wood Growing only as orchard which I take to be old or of soo little use that it will be best to take it quite away, as for Water except it be for use it is noe great matter since there is nothing of that kind that you can doe compareable to that fine acc. you are Sir pleas'd to give of the Number.

The Main Point I would now mention is the getting an Intelligible proper Person to Execute the Worke and one who can be with your Self correspond with me about the same Since tis Impossible for me at this Distance to settle every Point that might occur in a Design of this Kind, and a man may with almost as much certainty Paint a face as give a Perfect Design for a Place he never saw.
4.

I have here with me a very good Gardiner that has liv'd sometimes in one of the County adjoining to the Humber that would be glad to come that way, and I can say of him, that I think him a good workman and as far as I know an honest man, and he and I can talk together pretty well at this great distance.

The plan I shall send up to London this week to be left at Mr. LeGrands Perukemaker in Chancery Lane where upon paying for the trouble and expense I have been at you may have it, and enjoy any other commands that shall be laid on Sir your most obed. Servt

Stephen Switzer.

5.

Hull 26th Novem: 1726

Sir

Some time since I rec'd your letter but itt was Tuesday last by my friends mistake before I rec'd ye plan which I would like extremly well would my Ground admitt of itt. in ye first place itt's impracticable to turne ye lane if itt was itts so deep itt would cost me above 150£ filling upp neither is ye Ground on ye other side of itt mine observe you have made 5 divisions I imagin your design is to have each liveled & steps to goe downe from one to another if so I dont thinke ye highest will admitt of itt being ye soil att ye top is so shallow as I told you in my last so for ye highest 30 yards thinke an oval of Limes round ye Summer house will doe (provided my Ground will not answer ye Charge & expense of any thing else) I must submit to have nothing but a Vista of ye same downe to ye bothome but I would very willingly lay out 150£ or 200£ if I could make itt worth ye while in which I desire you would be so kind as to give me your further advise for your information there in ye Estate I have lately bought my House is but little 4 small romes on a floor ye best next to Townes street I desing itt only for a hunting seat ye Ground I design to plant is 347 yards long from me Summer house to ye street 60 yards broad from ye narrow Lane by ye House I would have itt to looke as much like nature as possible if you can hit of any design as you may thinke will fit ye Ground I desire you will send itt me enclosed in a letter itt will doe in Lite in black & white only to see ye nature of ye thing theeres a Gentleman lives in my House that had itt leashed when I bought itt & now wants 3 Years of expireing I beleive I can buy out his time when I resolve to begin I shall desire you to recomend a Gardiner to me those quarters for fruit trees may be let alone I can plant as many in my kitchin gardin as will serve & those out quarters I suppose you designed to hedge with Espelier with homebeane or Elme I have Gravill hard by but I thinke grass walks preferable as to ye situation I refer you to my last letter.
Sir,

Sir Thomas laid his commands upon me, to give you an Account of the Water-works by him design'd, which comes from a Spring a Mile from his Hall, with a natural Descent all the Way, at least above 60 Feet high, falling naturally into several useful Offices following, viz.

1st, It serves a very fine Marble, but unusual Beaufet to wash his Glasses, and which will hold above nine Bottles, at least half Way in Water to cool his Liquor.

2dly, The rest serves to turn the Spitt in his Kitchen, by which, instead of a Jack (and much more useful, and less trouble-some) he roasts all his Meat.

3rdly, Another large Cock in his Kitchen, which serves all common Uses in the same.

4thly, A Cock that turns in a Tubb, to keep the Wort cool in the same, to condense the Spirits from a Bolt-head still.

5thly, The next is the Brewhouse, where it serves 4 Coppers, the first plac'd 20 Feet high, to keep Water hot all Day from brewing, mashing, and scalding the Vessels, and which falls into the mashing Tubb, and from out of the mashing Tubb into the under Deck, from thence into another Copper to boil the Wort, and from thence into a large Cooler, naturally by Descents, without either pumping or leading.

6thly, And lastly, (at present) in his lower Kitchen it roasts his meat (as in the upper Kitchen), churns his butter, dresses the Flower for his bread, washes his cloaths, grinds his Malt. And now give me Leave to add a 7th, upon the Anvil not yet bought to Perfection, which will be necessary and very useful, being lately married to a fine young Lady, and which he is now contriving, will be to rock the Cradle.
To Mr. Bradley.

Kennington Lane, Aug. 8, 1727.

Sir,

Yesterday I received the five first Numbers of your MISCELLANY Papers, which were to me, who am so great an Admirer of what is thus produced for the Publick Good, a most valuable Present.

The Hints you have given me in your first Paper of the Situation and Discovery of Springs were more particularly acceptable to me, in that it was exactly agreeable to what I have long observed on this Head; and it were to be wished, that your ingenious Correspondent (who, If I can judge of his Name by the initial Letters, is one of the most curious Genius's of this Age) had been more extensive and particular on this Head. But, in the mean time, pray be so good as to indulge an old Acquaintance (and one whom you have heretofore approved of) in the communicating some Thoughts on so useful a Branch of Knowledge as this is, and which includes a Desire of making more publick one of the most useful Improvements of this Age: I mean the Conducting of Water by the new-invented, or, at least, the so much new-improved Pipes made of Potters Clay, an Account whereof you have in the Evening Post of August 1, Inst.

The Original and Rise of Springs, like all other Things whose Causes lie concealed, has long entertained the busy and curious World with Reasonings equally learned and elaborate; nor are the Methods of discovering and bringing them Home to the Places where they are to be used, Subjects less useful and entertaining. To the Stellaria Aquatica, and the Saxifraga Aurea, which your ingenious Correspondent mentions, give me Leave to add Coronarius, and others of good note, have formerly mentioned: the Twig-Wit, Fleabane, Pond-grass and Bullrush, as also the Water-Plantane, Calamint, Coltsfoot and Chamomile, with a large Tribe of Mosses, &c. as Plants that denote Springs of Water; but whether these Plants are certain Tokens, a little Practice may determine.

Your Observations relating to the Discovery of Springs on the North Side and tops of Hills, rather than in Bottoms, or Southern Expositions, are very just, as may be seen in many shady, dark, and unbragious Places, where the Ground is composed of a rocky Gravel or Sand, or of a coarse Gravel and Clay mixed. I could produce the Opinions of many celebrated Authors concerning the Nature of Springs, but shall not detain you, Sir, any longer: But come to what I more particularly aim at in this Epistle; I mean the Conducting of Water from the Places where it is found to the Reservoir.
Vitruvius, lib. xxxix viii. cap. 6, tells us, That the ancient Romans made use of Pipes baked in a Potter's Furnace; they were two Inches thick, and joined together with a Kind of Mortar mixed with Oil; and when they had a Joint to make, they used a red Free-Stone, which they pierced through to receive the tow Ends of the Pipes, which strengthened and secured them in the Nature of a Bandage. And these Kinds of Pipes are often (as I have been informed from Travellers) dug up amongst the Rubbish, and now found in the Ruins of the old Water-works about Rome, and other Places in Italy, &c.

The same Kind of Pipes, or Pipes, much like them, have been also found in some of the old Water-works about London, and in Hyde-Park (though they were not so thick and substantial, as those described in Vitruvius) yet from the several Circumstances that attended them, were supposed to be the Work of that great People, when they were inhabitants of this Island. These were not bandaged with Stone but had the Joints guarded by a Collar made of Sheet Lead; all which has contributed to a new Invention, at least an Improvement of what was heretofore done: viz. Earthen Pipes of a more convenient Dimension, and the Earth so close and well-worked, that they are of great Use in all Water-works, and serve in most Cases, where Lead or Wood is used to do. They are used in the insides of Walls of Houses, and are affixed likewise to the Outsides of such Walls, from the lower to the uppermost Floor, and receive and discharge the Water from the Roof and Gutters of such Houses, as effectually as any Pipes made in Lead or Wood, and are to be sold for one sixth part of the Value of Lead, and the half of what Wood costs: as I shall more particularly set down in a large Essay I have now in Hand on the Subject.

There has been an Objection raised against these Pipes (though upon the strictest Enquiry I can make) without any Foundation of Truth; that when they are laid into the Ground, a Weed will grow in the Joyns where the Cement is, which with its Fibres will soon choke up, and consequently stop the Water in the Pipe: but this (if any such thing there be) may be easily remedied, by ramming some harsh intractable Clay round those Joints; nor, are they so apt to crack, or break there, as it imagined they will, if the Cement be well made. Nor is the Objection against them, as to their being hurt and damaged by the Frost of any Account at all since 'tis plain they may be laid deep enough to secure them against any such Misfortune. Neither can there be any Objection made against their Strength, since the Experiments made with them on the 24, 25, and 26 of July last at the York Buildings Water-Works, before the Reverend Dr. Desaguliers, when they were fairly tried with all the Compressure of Aire and Water that the Engine could lay upon them without making the least Fracture, either in the Pipes, or the Cement that join'd the Pipes together.
7.

I have nothing more to add, but that a very ingenious Friend and Neighbour of mine, who was one of the first Inventors of this Kind of Pipes, Mr. Aaron Mitchell Potter at Vaux-Hall, by Virtue of an Agreement lately made between him and Mr. Edwards the Patentee, makes and sells the said Pipes of several Dimensions. He has likewise arrived at an extraordinary Perfection in making Vases and Flower-Pots from two to four Foot high, of a Free-stone Colour; the Architecture, or Fashion of them is so genteel and just, that they may be used as Ornaments to any House, or Garden; appearing as well as those made in Stone, or Lead and sold at much more reasonable Prices.

Specimens of the said Pipes and Pots may be seen at Mr. Mitchell's aforesaid, or at my House, late Mr. Price's, in Kennington-Lane.

I am, Sir, your humble Servant,

Stephen Switzer

8.

Lanesborough,
July 13. 1728.

Sir,

Having read the second Edition of raising Brocoli, Celeriac, &c. and the Description of that good Plant which you suppose to be the Italian-Celery, (though very different from it) I presume to send you this Account of it. The Celeriac is a low dwarf Plant, in Leaf somewhat like the common Celery, but much smaller, and the Root almost bulbous, or rather knobbed, and about the Size of a large Apple, or small Turnep; and therein greatly differs from either the Italian or common Celery. Besides, it is not so apt to pipe (as we term it) as those other Sorts beforementioned do, which being a peculiar Property of this Kind, makes it so very valuable to every one that has it.

It may be sown at any time in March or April, on a hot Bed, and from thence planted directly in Trenches (which for the Reasons by and by to be given, should not be very deep) by drawing out the largest first, and so on to a second and third Size one after another; and then you may earth them up, as you do common Celery, about a Month before you want it.

I hope, Sir, you will excuse the Freedom I take in giving you my Opinion, having always had a Respect for your Endeavours in Husbandry
8.

and Gardening, ever since you commenc'd an Author. Your Intro-
duction and Manner of handling those beloved Subjects, (the Sale
of which I have endeavoured to promote) being in great Esteem with
me; being (as I think) the most useful of any that have been wrote
on these useful Subjects.

If on any Subject, you shall hereafter revise or write farther upon,
any Communication of mine, will be useful or servicable to you, I
shall be very ready to do it. I heartily wish you Success in what-
ever you undertake, as it tends to the publick Good; And am

Your's, &c.
Thomas Knowlton.

9.

R. r Mr. Switzer
Seed-man, in
Westminster-Hall

Sir

You having desired to know the Method that my Master (James Ogle-
 thorpe, M.P.) took to make Milium Indicum, or Indian Wheat, useful
in this Climate, the following is an Account of what he hath done
towards the bringing of it to the present Perfection it is in with
him...

I am
SIR,
Your Humble Servant,
Francis Moore.

10.

Pomfret, July 24.
1730.

Mr. Switzer,

I Received yours of the 12th Instant; and as soon as ever I could
draw it up, have sent you the best Account I can of the Methods used
by our Liquorice Planters, in the Raising, Curing and Vending their
Ware; as also an Account of the Charges which are naturally contingent
thereto, as well as of the Profits which they make by it. I send
10.

it only in a rough Manner, so pray give it what model you think most suitable to your Purpose... (the account)... I wish you good Success in all your Undertakings,

And am, Your, &c.

J.(ohn) P.(erfect)

11.

Warminster
Nov. 30. 1730.

Sir,

Before I had seen your Treatise which directs the Methods of raising Italian Brocoli, Cardoon, &c. and in the second Chapter treats of La Lucerne, and other Seeds for the Improvement of the Land, I had sown a small Quantity of the Lucerne, which I had from a Neighbour, who had sown some of it before but without Success. But mine has succeeded so well, that I am determined to sow more, and to encourage the Propagation of it; farther than that, I have recommended it to my Friends, several of whom intend to make Trial of it...

I hope to see you some time in the Spring, when I shall have an opportunity of communicating to you what other Observations I have made on this useful Grass.

Yours, &c.

Henry Wancey

12.

Lanesborough,
Dec. 18. 1730

My good Friend,

I received both your Letters, and should have answered them much sooner but that I had not seen or heard of Mr Cowell's Book, but from your self; I have since got it, but shall say nothing as to the general turn of the book, being unwilling to pass Reflections on
12.

any thing which has the least Tendency to Improvements, tho' I can by no means think that the Cythisus and Bastard Sena are the same Plants; I have consulted many Authors about it, but cannot form any Judgement from them of that about which you wrote to me, so wait the appearance of your Dissertation.

Your Method of burning of Clay Hills, I shall this next summer pursue with Vigour, having finish'd a great deal of other business which has hitherto obstructed it; and this I am encouraged to, by the success of a Friend of mine, who from your Directions has burnt about 300 Acres of Land, (chiefly Ant-Hills) which has greatly improv'd his Estate, and we of this Country are much beholden to you for so useful an Improvement.

As your Endeavours seem calculated entirely for the publick Good, without any mixture of trifling indifferent things, you may always depend on my good Wishes for your success, and of any assistance that lies in the power of

Sir, Yours &c.

13.

Winton, Dec. 28. 1730.

Sir,

According to your Request, I took a Tour to Langston, and other Places where I heard they had been trying to burn Clay; some whereof had succeeded very well in the Operation, and others not so well; The Person at the Place abovenamed is both Bailiff and Gardener, who says he can burn it very well, and that it is certainly a very great Improvement on cold Lands; but that the Expense of burning it is such, that he thought few would pursue it, especially in that country where Fewel was so scarce. I wish I could have sent you a more satisfactory Account; however, as the Dearness of Fewel is not the same in all places, it may not frustrate the Scheme you have so earnestly recommended in other countries, tho' I am afraid it will in this.

I am your Dutiful Kinsman,
T. Switzer.
Mr. Switzer,

I Received yours, wherein you desire an Account how my Lucerne has stood this Winter, and prospers now. In answer to which, I assure you, that it has stood the Winter very well, and comes on now very finely; and although the Frost was very severe, the 11th and 12th Instant, I do not see it is more hurt than other grass would have been at the same Height. It is now near eight Inches high, and looks very well, which is more than can be said of any other grass or Fodder whatsoever.

I am,

Your Humble Servant

Henry Wansey.

Mr Switzer,

I received all your Letters, and am obliged to you for the pains you have taken in the affair I recommitted to your charge; and shall willingly accept of the person you have recommended to my service; I can say nothing of the effect which burnt Clay has had in this County, when laid on the Ground, that Improvement being of so late a date that it can't be yet discovered; but the burning it goes on very successfully, a Gentleman of my Acquaintance having burnt a large quantity, for less than 8d. a Load, which is much cheaper than your computation was, he mixes Slick (which I take to be the dust of Coal, which is very plenty in the West and North Ridings of Yorkshire) amongst his Clay, and says he can burn what Quantity he pleases, provided the Weather be fair that his servants can attend the Heap.

I hope to be in Town soon, and may perhaps give you a farther Account; in the mean time I am

Your assured Friend, &c.

P. Bold.
16. Buxton-Hall
Jan. 30, 1732.

Sir,

It being my Unhappiness not to be acquainted with your Name, till just before your Departure from hence, I have often regretted the Loss I sustained, in not consulting you about the ordering of a hot Bed, which Nature has been so kind as to afford me Materials for; viz. from the waste Water which runs from our warm Bath...

Tho' this, Sir, may be of no great Advantage to the Publick, as being a particular and peculiar Experiment of my own, yet I am in Hopes you will be so kind, as to animadvert a little upon it, and to favour me with your Opinion how I may improve these loose Hints, and the Favour shall be always most gratefully acknowledged by, Sir,

Yours, &c.

Alex. Taylor.

17. B(asingbourne Hall) Essex, July 12, 1732.

Mr. Switzer,

In Answer to yours concerning the Planting or Setting of Corn with proper Instruments, and for introducing a kind of Vineyard Culture into our Fields, I acquaint you that I have made diligent Search amongst ancient Authors, but can't find any thing which seems to point that way, altho' it must be acknowledged to be a very pleasant, useful, advantageous Method, in all well cultivated Soils...(There follows observations on various 16th and 17th century British experiments of drilling)...I have read what Warlidge, and the Author of the Horse-Houghin-Husbandry have wrote on this Subject, which, with my own Observations, shall be the Subject of some other Letter.

I am your assured Friend and Servant

J.K.

(John Kendal, Esq. F.R.S. Basingbourne-Hall, Essex, subscribed to the Practical Husbandman and Planter.)
18.

To Mr. Switzer in
Westminster-Hall

Lonersburgh (sic)
Lanesborough, March 7, 1733.

My good Friend,

I lately receiv'd a Letter from our Acquaintance Br ..., from Chatsworth; which gives an Account of an Oak fell'd in Haddon Park, within two Miles of that Place, call'd the Lady's Oak, which was sold to Henry Green, cooper, at Wittington in that County, for sixty six Guineas...Your inserting of this may in all probability be very acceptable to your Readers, amongst which is,

Sir, yours, &c.

J.K.

19.

Walsingham, March 10, 1733

SIR,

I receiv'd yours with the Seeds and Books; and should be glad if Barlie would yield the Price you set it at, in your Computation; for then you might Expect a Flota of it soon. At present the Price of that and other Grain is so very low, that Farmers can scarce make their Rents; but 'tis to be hop'd that Times will mend.

One Thing I thought proper to acquaint you with, and that is, of the great Success we have had in this Year in this Country, by the sowing of Rape in those Places where the Spring Crops fail'd, by the great Droughts which have happened this Summer. And this sowing of Rape may effectually be done sometime about Midsummer, the Uses of which for Sheep in the Winter, I suppose you are well acquainted with.

Sir, yours, &c.

L Warner.
Chipping-Norton,  
June 3, 1733.

SIR,

Pursuant to your Request when last here, I have enquired after the Carthamus, or Scarlet Flower, which Dr. Plott in his History of this County writes was in his Time raised at North-Ashton, by the then Colonel Vernon, but can't hear any Thing about it, so fear that it is a Plant which is quite lost (in these Parts especially) that History having been wrote near fifty or sixty Years ago, if not more.

However, it is to be hoped, that this Misfortune will not deter you from enquiring and giving the best Account you can of it; which will highly oblige your Correspondents, and amongst them none more than

Yours, &c.

J. Mackerness.

21.

Brompton-Lane, April 16, 1733

Mr. Switzer,

In the enclosed I have sent you an Extract of the Plants that grow natural in North-America, some of which, particularly the Red or Scarlet-Oak, are what we have now great Quantities in our Plantations, near the Old Spring-Gardens at Knightsbridge, and as the Introduction of all these hardy Plants into England, may be of great Use to Planters, so it is to be hoped you will pursue your Intentions of getting as many of them over every Year as you can, (because some of them growing on swampy ground, and others on that which is very barren) such an Introduction may be of great Use in many Parts of Britain, where there are great Quantities of such Sort of Land, now lying waste; and for the planting of which there are at present but very few Kinds of Trees; for the doing of which, all ingenious Men, and Lovers of Improvements will be thankful to you, and amongst the rest, no body more than, SIR,

Your Humble Servant,

Joseph Allerton.

P.S. The great Uses to which these American Trees are put, both in Ship, and other Building, as well in the Cure of several Misfortunes incident to Mankind, will, 'tis hoped, much encourage the farther Propagation of them, especially when they appear to be so hardy, and grow so fast, as we find they will.
22.

To Mr. S. Switzer,
Seedsman in Westminster-Hall.

Brompton-Lane,
June 6, 1733.

SIR,

According to your Desire, I here send you a Translation of what Deserres, in his Theatre d'Agriculture, has wrote concerning the Esparcet, or Spurrie. In the doing of which, I have kept as near the Original as possible, and am

Your Humble Servant,
William Oram.

23.

To Mr. Switzer, -
Nursery-Man in Westminster-Hall.

Ash, (near Basingstoke) June 11, 1733.

SIR,

In answer to yours of the 30th of last Month, and in Compliance with the Request made in it, I shall give you a short Account (but such a one as may entirely be depended upon) of the Use we make of Malt-Dust upon Land. 'Tis a very common Manure in our Neighbourhood... I heartily wish you Success in your Undertaking, and am,

SIR.

Your humble servant.

(Rev.) R. Russell.
24.

For
Henry Ellison Esq'r att
Gateshead
near
Durham

Westm. Hall Aug. 20th. 1733

Sir

I have this summer been as yet only my Midland Tour which has took me up Nine Weeks getting not home till late on Saturday Night last or you had been answered sooner to the Letter you did me the Favour to write the 6th of July last past.

As for Wooley there is noe great wonder why you part with him, for though somewhat Industrious & knowing in his Business is undoubtably ill natur'd and false Enough & wont Stick at any Thing to fill his pockets as it is said By those that Come from Newcastle.

It is a Time of the Year when few good Servants are out of Place, and therefore it will be the more difficult for me to Oblige you Sir in what you Command But I will doe the utmost I can, Being makeing a short tour round other Gardens near London this & next week & will assoon as Ever I can fix upon one proper for your Purpose send one Down.

I have sent down a monthly Design of Husbandry & planting to Master Hugh Boag, which I hope you'll please to Favour with your Subscription & am Sir yo' most Obed humble Serv

Stephen Switzer

I sold Beech mast to Mr Harry Li (ddg11?) last year for 3 shill a peck & (MS torn) Cos' Lettuce for 12d p' ounce (MS torn) were the Prizes all over Town

(on back of letter)

PS I saw a person the Minute I closed this that gives me hopes of a good Gardiner in a few Days.

(and)

all over Town the year before, Beach mast was 3 Guinea's a Bushell & this I feel will be 4 or 5 Guinea's

( endorsement, in Thomas Sisson's hand)
20th Aug. 1733.
Mr S: Switzer.
To Mr. Switzer,
Seedsman and
Gardner in Westminster-Hall.

SIR.

Having always had your Commands in Mind, ever since you left this Country, am sorry that I should be longer before I wrote to you than you expected: But the Reason has proceeded from a mistaken Imagination of mine, that you might not be return'd as yet from your Northern Journey, and so not at Home, or at Leisure to regard my Writing.

I have measured and cast up the Dimensions of the large Oak, standing in Sir Nathaniel Curson's Park, the Dimensions and Content of which are as follows.

The Height of it is 57 Foot, and the Circumference of it at Bottom is 18 Foot, about the Middle it girths 14 Foot, and at Top 11 Foot 6 Inches; and so uniform, that it may (without any Error) be well accounted as the lower Frustum of a Cone; and, according to the most exact Calculation, contains 866 Feet (or 17 Load 16 Feet) of solid, good Timber, as it stands unhew'd.

As for the Lopwood or Boughs, these are (as you must well remember) but few of them; this Tree having long stood (amongst other Trees of that Kind) at the Foot of a thick Grove of Oaks, which are as great an Ornament to that fine Park, as any (as far as I know) that are to be seen in England.

I am, &c.

Yours.

Francis Webb.
To Henry Ellison Esq.
att
Gateshead Parke
Near
Durham

Westm. Hall Jan. 16th 1733/4

Sir

On Monday last I received the favour of yours of the 11th Instant and yesterday Grass seeds &c. were sent on board Sr Henry Liddells Shipp the Geroge who sails this Day, and underneath I send you according to Custom the Bill of Parcels the payment of which I desire you'll Honour at your Leisure. They are in two Casks. Yours is that Mark. H. & M. Gibsons in that mark. W G. The Quantities and Prices of which are as follows.

Jan. 15th to Henry Ellison Esq. P. Stephen Switzer 1733/4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88 lb of Clover at 3½d/½lb: 8s: 9d/5Qu.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ lb Spanish onions--2s: ½ Strasbourgh D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 14: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz Leek. 8½/ 3 oz Parsnips. 3½/ 1½ lb Early Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td>£7: 0: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ lb Hackney Turnep. 14½/ 1 lb London Radish.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb Spinage 10d/ 4 oz Beet 12½/ 4 oz Curd. Endive. 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ oz Golden Parsley 3½/ 2 oz Yellow Savoy 16d/</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ oz R. Cabbage 6d/</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz Battersea Cabbage 18d/ 1 oz Borecaule 8½/ 1 oz Broccoli 10d/</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ oz Sweet marjoram 8d/ 1 oz Dill 4½/ 1 oz Indian C</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 oz of Annual Sunflowers 6d/ 2 Qu. Mannfat (?) Pease</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Qu. of White Dwarf Kidneys 16d/ 2 Qu. Barberry D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ Oz of Carrot Seed. 8½/ 1 Cask 5½/ 2 Baggs</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage below Bridge. 2½/</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3: 6: 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Mr. Gibson

176 lb of Clover. 2½: 11½/ 4½/10 Bushells of Raygrass

1 Cask 4½/ a Sack 16d/ | | £3: 14: 03 |

£7: 0: 0
Sir
The Carriage below Bridge may be divided as you please --- But it is what we always charge wherefor(?)

Sir
The Gentleman you was pleas'd to Mention has not been with me as yet, whenever he does come, you may depend on my Doing you Justice, and Because the man shant say that I doe y' By him, which I would not have done By me shall show him Sr. His Liddells Bill of Beech Mast Cos: Lettuce, that the Colonell(?) paid me last Year.

When I found that Wooley had prevail'd Sir on you to goe to Strand in the Green I guess'd at the Reason, and that by a Private Understanding between the Nurseryman and him (which he knew I would never Submit to) You was in a fair of Being well cheated But it was not proper for me as I thought(?) at that Time to intermeddle in it.

I take Wooley to be as great a Rogue as any in England that Way, he has had the assurance to call and Write often to me for a Plan. But I never answer'd him. I suppose the Bill the Gentleman brings contains the hedge Plants, fruit Trees shrubs &c. that Planted the new Garden I Remember they were all pretty Small tho: I dare say the Price will be large Enough. There was a Gardener in Bishoprick yr wanted to come in with me on the same foot as Wooly has undoubtably done with your nurseryman. But I did not only refuse him, But (as was Just) told his Master of him this the Collonell knows to be true.

This concludes with ye Sincere wishes of a happy new Year From, Sir your most Obed. Serv.

Stephen Switzer

27.

To Mr. S. Switzer Seedsman in Westminster-Hall.


SIR,

I Received yours of the 21st Instant; and in Answer to it (with the Assistance of a gentleman, whose Situation gives him, with several Memorandums very useful on this Occasion) have sent you the following Account of the Manner of discovering, digging, drying, and Uses of, Peat and Peat-Ashes...(a long account follows)...
27.

Thus (my good Friend) have I ventured to give you the best Account I can, at present, of the great Uses of Peat-Ashes, when used in Husbandry: And if this be of any Service to your Purpose, you are welcome to communicate them for the Publick Good, which seems to me to be the full Intent of all your Papers; which if they take well in the World, (as I hope they will) you may expect some other experimental Hints on this Subject, as Opportunity shall offer. At present I can only add, that Peat may undoubtedly be found, in other Places, under the like Circumstances, as our Meadows are; tho' at present they are chiefly to be had in the Meadews from Woolverhampton to this Place, and so on to Hungerford, all in Berkshire. Which is all that I think proper to add at present; being (whenever you command me farther)

Yours, &c.
J. B.

28.

Jan. 31. 1733-4

Mr. Switzer,

In Answer to that Part of your request (when we were last together) which related to the Parallel between the ancient and modern Husbandry, I send you the following Abstract...(there follows a long account of Roman agriculture to prove that Jethro Tull's view of Virgilian husbandry was wrong)...I am much of that Opinion (which is recited in the Introduction to No.1) believing that modern Husbandmen have nothing to glory in, but in their being born after the Ancients, whose Precepts they have long had before them.

But so much has been said on this Head already, that I need add no more than that I am, Sir,

Your Humble Servant

J. B.
Gateshead Parke Sep't 22nd 1734.

Sr

When you were here you hurried me so about the payment of your note that the business I then had upon my hands would not allow me time to examine it, and presumeing it to be right I paid it without examination, but when I came to look into it before I entered it in my books, I find these undermentioned mistakes, which, as they are to your disadvantage, I thought it proper you should be acquainted with, & receive what in your note you have wrong'd yourself of viz.

The first article you charge 26 lb/4 clover at 3l:4s:0d. but it comes at that price to 3lb:6s:od.

So short charged ------------------------------- £1:2:0.

The 2nd article is 15 bush. of rye grass at 2/9 £1:3:9 but it comes to £2:1:3. So short charged ------------------- 1:7:6

In the adding up the first parcel which comes to 5:15:3 you make it 5:16:3 so over added ------0:1:0 12 0

So that you will want this £1:8:6. This note should have been made into 4 notes viz. the clover & ray grass seeds for Mr Ellison w. the charges thereon should be charged in one note to him & Mr. Cane.

The garden seeds & charges thereon in another note to Mr Ellison only.

The ray grass & clover seeds & what was ordered with them which you charge to a gentleman of Mr. Ellison's acquaintance should be charged in another note to Mr Pickering.

For the reason of ye aforesaid mistakes I've not charged the 8:9:4 I paid till I hear from you. If you find what I've said to be right &c. will please to make up the 4 notes as before mentioned & send me them with rec. under each of them I will pay the 1:8:6 to any person you'll order, & deliver him your other note with the rec. upon it which I took at Gateshead. I am

Sr your very humble serv't.

Tho. Sisson

To Mr. Stephen Switzer 2:2:1
Seedsman in 1:6:6
Westminster hall 3:16:6
London 2:13:1

9:17:6
Audley End in Essex Decr 20th 1734

Mr. Sisson

Sir

I Rec'd yours and Being going to London on Thursday will take Care to Answer all the orders, I have Rec'd of Mr. Ellison By Your demands (?) in a Manner wherein I hope to meet with his Approbation. 

I beg Sir the Receipt of Yours of the 22nd of Sept. also, But could not understand how or in what Manner it was that I was in the Wrong, for if you Remember I had been very ill at Newcastle, and so sick that I could not Cost up the Bill, much less State it Minutely. But as soon as I get home will take another View of it, & send you down a Particular Answer.

If you Remember there was a Gent'n at whose House we call'd that spoke to me about Elm for wheels for your Coal Carriages; now Being in a Country where there are some of that Kinds of Elm, which if I am right are those which have Cut'd Knotty heads (caus'd By often Lopping) or Carbuncled Bodys &c.

My request is that the Gentleman would Send me his Scantlings (?) which are how much Diameter they might be in the In the Rough, both for fore & Hind Wheels and if we must cut them out how thick.

To this also may be added the Price which may be afforded at any Seaport Town where Coals come. Either in Norfolk or Essex.

Direct all this to me under the Cover of the Rt. Honorble The Earle of Suffolk at Audley End near Saffron Walden in Essex where I shall be down again next week, and perhaps I may get a good Deal.

I beg my most Obed't Service to Mr. Ellison & I am Sir your very Obedient Humble Serv.

Stephen Switzer

PS The Acc't about the Willows shall be sent you from London—as soon as I get there.
Mr. Sisson

My L. Suffolk transmitted me the favour of your last to Audley End last night. But I shall take noe more Notice of that till I return thither again. But Answer your other relating to the Fruit Trees, Seeds &c, which were put on Board the Three Brothers Peter Pen master for Newcastle at Dassies Wharf yesterday and are to sail this Morning.

The Catalogue of Fruit for Newcastle (?) MS torn) one I take for Gateshead and the other for Hynburn is as follows.

In Matt H. E. no 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fruit Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admirable peach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Katherine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange abricot</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronan Nectarines</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In another Parcell but Bound up in the same Matt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fruit Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Warden pears</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uvedales S. Germain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadillacs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Burgonots</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Musk Pears</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinsons Warden</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colman</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellpear</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burce de Roys</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hambden Burganot</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have made a small alteration to your list which I hope be approved of.

In Matt T.S.G. (______)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fruit Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lingeman peach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Do</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Newington</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Newington</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. Roman Nectarines</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Do</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange abricots</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Do</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telham Do</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those in Matt T.S.G. (______)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fruit Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange abricot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Do</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange peaches</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Newington Do</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Nectarines</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscovy (?) Do</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Peaches</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nectarines</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apples on Paradise Stocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fruit Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Coster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden surprise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Russet</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Pernain</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kston pippin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Philbert</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmish onion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frasborough</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Leek</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney Turneppe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich Radish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Leek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsnip</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Turneppe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackney Turneppe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short top Radish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich Radish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battersea Cabbage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savoy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battersea Cadet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Marjoram</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curled &amp; divide</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savoy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Cresser</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Cresser</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Cresser</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devease Celerie</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devease Celerie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia Cabbage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curled &amp; divide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witch ondine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asparagus seed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witch ondine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asparagus seed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Cos Lettuce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Marigold</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cadytroot</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Teeser</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauliflower</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauliflower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia Cabbage</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Cos Do</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Cos Lettuce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Marigold</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cadytroot</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Teeser</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snaster</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snaster</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snaster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asparagus seed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Kidney Beans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Kidney Beans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The White Dwarf</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apricocks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peach Trees</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbandrie Seed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tares</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tares</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tares</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£2. 01. 11.
(endorsed by Sisson)

Hen Ellison Esq

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seeds</th>
<th>Trees</th>
<th>Tares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2: 1: 11</td>
<td>0: 15: 9</td>
<td>1: : :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: 17: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: 17: 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Mr Talens

£ s. d.

To the Gardners in one Parcel:

8 peaches and Nectrons.—at 18d each -------0. 12. 0
4 apricocks----------at 12d each -------0. 04. 0
3 oz Short topt Radish---at 18d e--------0. 04. 0
one Matt for this and the next parcel 1 at----------0. 00. 9

£1: 01: 3

Short topt Radish

? ? ?

not come
1735 Ap 23rd*

In another Parcel — For Martin Patterson?

12 peaches and Nectrons at 18d each -------0. 18. 0.
2 apricocks at 12d each ---------------0. 2. 0.
6 apples on Paradise Stock at 18d each ( ? ? )
one matt ----------- at -----------------0. 0. 9.

£1: 9: 9

D to D — For 12 Yards of Linsey Woolsey aproning for Martin Patterson at 18d P yard 0. 18. 0

£1. 18. 0.

I have chargéd the Gardner to full height But shall allow him as Gardner Totall £3. 7. 9.

when the money is paid

Here follows a Scheme for _____ ? _____ ?
31.

The first sort is the Red Red (sic?) Willow or Ozies(?); which is very Long Strong and tough. The Spanish Brown is also very tough (?) ______ (?) or Reddish Ozies. The White Coloured (?) is in great Esteem for fine Worke.

Quantity to an Acre

They are to be planted later End of Jan'y and begin of Feb'y. 8000 setts plants an acre at about 28 Inches asunder

Produce

If they thrive well you may cut 6 or 7 ___? Boll (?) an acre the 3rd year they are not to be cut the 1st or 2nd. Every Boll ought to be 40 Inches Girth about a foot high above the Bottom. When headed they must be cut about 2 or 2 foot above the ground.

S'n Yours S. Switzer

The Setts which are about 2 or 3 foot high are sold from 8d to 1s a Hund. as they are in Size the Larger than are the stronger & Greater is the produce

I shall take it Exceedingly kind if you would put the affair of the last years Bill, which I shall send you in the manner you desire in yours of the 23d of Sep. next Post in a Frank from L's Suffolk's and am once Sir your oblig. &c. S. S.

(endorse by Sisson)
24 Dec'r 1734 / Mr Switzer Acct of Trees /& Seed.

32.

Mr Sisson /

Audley End Dec'r 30th 1734

I have sent you the last Years Acc't with Receipts to Each of the four notes which I suppose are all agreeable to your Method.

The Sums are £ s d

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 17: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What you have paid of this you know, and the Remainder shall if you please be charg. at the Head of this Years Acc't or as you think most proper.
32.

I am looking out after Elm proper for Wheels, But the scantlings are so large that I fear I shall have a hard matter to get many of them if any of Beach there is in this Country there is some pretty large Hornbeam You dont say if there be a flaw in one side or Circumference of the Wheel whether or no it may Split provided the main part of the Wheel carry its full Diameter, to be sure the less there is the better. But some of it I have seen direct hither as usual till the 12th or 13th of next month when I shall go to London again. I am Sir your Humble sert in haste

S. Switzer

33.

For
Mr. Thos Sisson at
Gateshead Parke House near
Durham

Westm. Hall Feb'y 17th 1734/5

Sir/

I had this Day the Favour of yours of the 14th Instant, and in answer to it Believe you'll find upon a 2d Enquiry that you have not so much Reason to Blame here, as you at first imagin.; for as for the Nursery Trees, we have had some leisure to open the and you are pair: that they grew here, and upon a 2d perusal of our January Acc. find y the six on paradise stocks were put up in the same Bundle that the 2 apricocks;

12 peaches and nectrons and the 12 yards of Linsky Cloth was that not mark: and that you are extremely misinform'd that there was no matt to it is certain because it was that very matt which was mark: T S G that was the matt. and it could never have been mark: If it had not been there as for the seeds our Hall being rather a Hive than anything else where so many Hund. of people are always swarm- ing, noe wonder that a mistake or two may happen, where it does sometimes to in a Private Shopp as from Noise; the Brocaulie (tho' mention'd in the Letter) was not in the List, and so escapt our Notice, and as for the Trapgopogan or Sassifer, we had gone at that Time, tho. now we have, But we are most of all surpriz'd at the 3 lbs of sheet topt Radish & 6 Qu'ts of Watten Hotsparn Pease, which my people are positive they put up.
33.

There is in Matt but Golden Bill peas instead of Two but that small oversight would have been corrected in the Bill as to the Tares they were only 4 (?) Bushells and half a peck. But in this you have left off abruptly & tis difficult to know (as By the Enclos.) how much you Rec. & you must consider that our London measure is much shorter than yours in the Country.

In Relation to the Apples on Paradise stocks tis proper to observe that Oliver has not the true French sort from London or if he has, he never intends to pay for them, Since no nurseryman about London ever sold them to his Dest Customers under 12 a piece for 3 or 4 Dozen together besides Borderridge &c nor do Gentlemen ever give less less (sic) than 10d. So that Oliver must be Dutch Paradise stocks which are not worth more than coldings (?); I should abated the Gard'ners 3d; If for a Gentleman. The Brocaulie & Sassifer shall be sent on Thursday if not too morrow which will I hope put that to Rights. I am Sir yours S. Switzer.

(Sisson's endorsement)
17 Feb. 1734/5
Mr. Switzer about his Mistakes in the Trees Seeds &c.

34.

Westm Hall Ap11 2d1735

Mr. Sisson

Enclos'd is the Acc. of the Things sent down this Year you having I hope rec. those sent in Covers a good While agoe.

I have let the 6 apples on Paradise stock stand as they were as also the 3 lbs of sheet topt Radish hoping that they were found after the writing of your last, for the nurseryman stands stoutly in it that they were sent. If not pray scratch it out.

I have also charg'd the Gardening Acc. full but will abate _five_ shillings on his Acc.

As to the Wheels I have endeavoured all that I can, but cant find by all the Enquiries I can make that they will come so cheap as being a part (?) by people who Deal in the Elm Trade that in these Parts they will come to 7s 6 a Wheel, But hope to give you a better Acc. this Sum. of it, when I come into a Part of the East adjoining to the sea where I beleive Elm is cheaper.
34.

At your proper Leigure, I begg you'll be so good as to peruse and Correct the Enclos. Acc. & what ever you do on that Head shall be gratefully acknowledged by Sir your humble Ser.

Stephen Switzer

35.

Lon° 29 Sept° 1737.

Mr. Switzur

Sir

The Duke of Chandos orders me to acquaint You, that he receed a Lre from You dat° 6 August, complaining of your not being paid for the Barn and Waterwork You contracted with Mr. D Fergusson for the building; upon which his Grace spoke to his Steward, who told him he had wrote to You to send up an acc. of what was due to You, & to let you know my Lord had remitted to Mr. Pescod (? ) 50£, which he would send directions to be paid to You, as soon as You sent up the Account, and that he sees (?) thereby what it was you had done, & how much you had receed in part of it. But Mr. Fergusson tells his Grace he has never receed any answer from you to this. My Lord would have You send up this Account as soon as maybe, which will be the only way of coming to an adjustment of w. is depending between Mr. Fergusson & You, & to bring You into Your mony.

I am
Your &c.
J.L.

36.

Westminster hall July 1 / 1739

Hon. S. r

Not having seen the Place to which this Plann belongs, and depending chiefly on a Survey (without particular Profile to it,) I cannot be certain that I have hit off all the affair, to an exact Nicety, but it is such as that Davy, or any other Gardiner that understands Drawing may form an Idea of what I mean, and how he is to make y. Garden.
The chief Difficulty that I can see in it, is the making a handsome green Slope up the Hill in the Front of the House which I find falls off greatly towards the Right hand where the Kitchen Garden is for which Reason I have design'd a Hollow in the Front that with the Earth coming out that Deficiency may be made up.

The Woodwork on the Right hand the Oval Court as one comes up to the House, being a little to (sic) narrow to admit of a private SideWalk. I would have the Walk carry'd quite up to the prick'd Line, and then the Stable Yard will be bigg enough.

As for Yr Honrs Bill I submitt it to what you please and should be glad on Account of Yr Honrs Very ill Ususage if I could make you a Present of it, but that I can't doe on Acc of my Family, but a little prompt Payment shall satisfy me.

The Gentleman for whom this is, will not I hope grudge 3 or 4 Prices (?) this (?) last will doe if I serve the Trees, which I hope I shall.

Underwritten is a general Catalogue of Trees proper to compleat the Kitchen Garden as I have draw'd it. A General List of Fruit Trees to Plant the Gardens of Nehemiah Griffith Esq. Rhual Flintshire according to my Plann drawn by Order of Sr Geo Wyne.

```
20 Peach Trees   )
10 Stand. Cherrys ) For the South East Aspect.
10 Vrale (? ) Vines )
2 Figs
20 Morello (? ) Cherrys) For the North West Aspect.
20 Dutch Currans )
6 Very tall stand Pear Trees For the North East Aspect
5 Dwarf Abricots
11 Dwarf Plums ) For the North West and by West Aspects.
10 Stand Cherrys )
11 Dwarf Duke Cherrys ) for the N.W. and by West Aspect.
10 Stand. Plumbs
4 Dwarf Abricots )
5 Dwarf Plums ) At the Back of the Offices and Barn &c.
6 Stand. Peares )
3 Stand. Abricots )
```

A list of Stand Fruit Trees in ye open Quarters of ye Garden in the Inside
In the Inside of ye Garden

2 Mulberrys
2 Flanders Cherrys
2 Green Gage Plums
2 Brussels Abricots
1 Derganotte Pears

32 Espalier Pears for the middle and Cross Walks.
52 Espalier Fruit in the Inside of ye Garden
32 Espalier Vines for the
2 Brussels Abricots

On the Outside the Garden

S.B. Border

2 Stand. Cherrys
2 Apples D.
2 Pears D.

10 Dwarf Plumbs for ye NE Do.
14 Dwarf Apricots for the N.W.
&c by N. D. .................
27 Apples on Paradise Stocks.
for ye Border next the Philbeard Hedge
50 Philbeards for the Said Hedge
20 Hedge Hollys or Yews for the Entrance at C .................

The Reason why I have been so particular in this Matter is because my himble Opinion is that this Garden should if Mr. Griffith Pleases be done the first thing, that is, and that the old Court Walls may be proper for the Purpose.

Your Honrs. most obedient Serv.

Stephen Switzer

PS
I am going a little farther But if Yr. Honrs. Pleases will wait on you as I come back or at Some other Time.
Appendix 6. **Articles of Agreement between The Earl of Cadogan and Stephen Switzer, 21 April 1718.** (Berkshire Record Office, Reading: several large stains affect text; the plan and list of specialist workmen referred to are absent, and their whereabouts is unknown.)

**ARTICLES of Agreement intended to have made & agreed on this One & twentieth day of April in the fourth year of the Reign of our Sovereign & Lord George by the Grace of God of Great Britain France & Ireland King Defender of the faith &c Anno DÆ 317

FIRST the said Stephen Switzer (for & in consideration of the sume of Four hundred twenty one pounds thirteen shillings & three pence to be paid at such times & in such manner hereinafter is expressed) for himself his Executors & Admrs doth hereby covenant promise & agree to & with the said Earl his Heirs & Assignes that he the said Stephen Switzer shall & will in the most workmanlike manner reduce to its proper Levells the parterre & Terrasse walks on each side thereof at Caversham park in the County of Oxon according to the plan hereunto annexed (Except on good reasons it shall be thought proper by both parties to alter or amend the same) In which works the Borders designed for Greens & Flowers shall be well & duly prepared for the reception of what therein is to be planted And to be at least four foot of assize wide & two feet deep AND all such parts as are to be Grass shall be laid there - under full four inches thick of Mold on the Gravel or Clay on which the Turf lies And also the Gravel walks shall be at least ten inches thick the whole shall be exactly & truly performed by the twentieth day of November next ensuing the date hereof PROVIDED always & these presents are out his Condition Nevertheless that the said Earl his Heirs & Assignes do & shall in this as well as all the following Articles find & provide his & their own good & sufficient Mules or Horses to the full number of twelve (including those designed for wattering) To perform all Carting or moving of Earth Gravel Turf or Clay that is above fifteen yards distance Or that the said Stephen Switzer in case of any deficiency herein shall & may & hereby has full power and authority to hire & employ such other mules or horses as shall amount to that number AND is to be paid the same by the said Earl his Agents or Assignes (as shall be appointed for the payment of the several sumes of money to be expended in these Works) Upon the production of two Vouchers One whereof if the said Earl pleases to be appointed by him to be Examined on Oath if required of the validity of the same PROVIDED that the said Earl his Heirs & Assignes do find & provide at his & their own proper Costs & Charges All such flowers edgings greens statues vases & all other Ornaments not contained in the Compass of this as well as in the following articles.
ALSO the said Stephen Switzer for & in consideration of the further sume of Two hundred sixty six pounds (?) large stain & in such manner as hereinafter is also expressed shall & will Digg two Canals to be on each side the parterre & fruit garden full sixty foot wide Seven hundred long & six foot deep from the Drim which Drim is to ordered & raised one or two foot (?) in Counter walks of Eight foot wide & Terrass walks of twenty wide on each by which means the said Terrasses will be one or two foot above the natural ground & sometimes one or two foot under it without Break (?) large stain a Skimming dish and clayed with Clay ? brought? at least four & twenty inches thick of the Bottom there being no Occasion on the other side

ALSO the said Stephen Switzer for and in consideration of the sume of One hundred seventy five pounds seven shillings & in such manner as hereinafter is also expressed shall and will in good & workmanlike manner from those Terrass walks that are formed (?) or plants as the said Earl shall please to provide for the same PROVIDED also and these presents are on this (?) Heirs & Assignes do & shall find pales & paleing for the same AND that the said work and workmen about it & to apply himself in their behalf to ? Agents as shall be impowered to pay the severel sumes of Money (?) this Work Monthly with two vouchers as aforesaid if required of the validity of their Amounts The same sumes not to exceed Eight hundred thirty six pounds Seven shillings & Eleven pence mentioned in the postscript.

ALSO the said Stephen Switzer for & in consideration of the further Sume of One hundred pounds to be paid at such times & in such manner as hereinafter is also expressed shall & will in workmanlike manner distribute the several quarters & divisions of the fruit Garden according to the plan hereunto annexed (One of the Divisions being to be cancelled to maintain the Beauty of the Lawn) into the Best & most natural manner that such an uneven piece of Ground will admit and raising the same with Dung & Mold to about One foot or two foot Deep AND also shall & will level smooth & turf round all such Basons & ponds as shall be ordered for the watering the said garden or otherwise the whole to be made ready for planting by the month of September next ensuing

ALSO the said Stephen Switzer for & in consideration of the further sume of five pounds to be paid at such times & in such manner as hereinafter is also expressed shall & will immediately levell or cause to be levell'd the new planted walk that points Westward towards Caversham by abating the rising Ground & filling up these with the low Ground And that the said Stephen Switzer shall & will readily
give directions for new setting the foundation wall & pallisade
work at the Entrance into the park by the new sweep The said Earl
hereby empowering him to give directions accordingly.

ALSO the said Stephen Switzer for & in consideration of the further
sum of Eighty five pounds & fifteen shillings to be paid at such
times & in such manner as is hereinafter also expressed shall & will
in good & workmanlike manner levell plant turf & Gravel the Division
on the East of the parterre and the upper end thereof designed for
Woodwork as is more particularly expressed in the Plan hereunto
annexed (Except the same can be anyways improved) In which work
the said Stephen Switzer is to find or procure plants And plant the
Hedge Elms or Hornbeam seven or eight foot high with small plants
between As also that the forest Trees & flowering shrubs to be
planted therein shall be of the best kind. The forest Trees
ten foot high at least & the flowering Shrubs strong well rooted
plants and the Turf & Gravel shall be well & workmanlike performed
& according to the several thicknesses before mentioned & expressed
in the first Article relating to the parterre

ALSO that the said Stephen Switzer for & in consideration of the
further sum of One hundred eighteen pounds & five shillings to be paid at such
times & in such manner as is hereinafter also expressed shall & will in well and workmanlike manner with clay well wrought
and truly levell & sloop round & between the fish ponds in the
fishery as is more particularly expressed in the plan hereunto
annexed The ponds to contain full six foot deep in the Middle And
to be shaped & clayed as is before set forth in the Article relating
to the two Canals.

ALSO that the said Stephen Switzer for and in consideration of the
further sum of one hundred ten pounds two shillings & eight pence
to be paid at such times and in such manner as is hereinafter also
expressed shall & will in well & workmanlike manner & according to
the Dimensions more particularly expressed in the annexed plan form
(?, stain) & make into two Amphitheatres in Grass sloops & water the
Ground next to adjoining the two Cascades on the end of the two
Canals before mentioned _______? arranging? top with the middle
or Crossline of the parterre before named And it being chiefly turf
& water the same is to be done & performed in like nature as is
before specified in the Articles relating to the Canals & fishery

ALSO that the said Stephen Switzer for & in consideration of the
further sume of One hundred nine pounds & ten shillings to be paid
at such times & in such manner as is hereinafter also expressed
shall & will in well and workmanlike manner layout & distribute
the addiconal fruit & kitchen Garden Divisions on the south side of
the Grove next Reading And to plant the full number of five hundred
fruit trees of the best kinds of peach Apricock plum pear cherry vine
& Apple for the Training the said Trees up through the said walls should not be Built nor the Espaliers erected this Year in Order to plant their beds? & all when the said wall or Espaliers is ready the ground to be well trenched dug & manured in a method proper for its producing such Legumes or other kitchen vegetables & fruits as shall be proper to Crop it next year And for the exception of the fruit Trees above mentioned AND the said Stephen Switzer doth hereby for himself his Executors & Adminters Covenant promise & agree to & with the said Earl his Heirs & assignes That the several Works before mentioned shall be entirely finished & completed on or before the thirtyeth day of November next ensuing in the best & most workmanlike manner And that there shall in Order thereto be employed not less than One hundred & seventy men in the carrying on the said work from the day of the date hereof (allowance being made for the first & second week to prepare that Number) to the six & twentyeth day of July next ensuing being fourteen weeks if all the rough Levells be not done before that time And also that from the fifteenth day of November before mentioned being Eleven weeks shall & will employ not more than Eight or less than Seventy men Unless the said Works be entirely finished as before But on Condition that if the whole number of one hundred & sixty men in the whole week it shall not be deemed or taken to be a Breach of this Article though there may on any particular Occasion or Day be not quite that number As also if the other number of Seventy Men or upwards after harvest time amount to four hundred & twenty in a whole week it shall not be deemed a Breach of this Article as aforesaid.

ALSO the said Earl for himself his Heirs & Assignes doth hereby Covenant promise & agree to & with the said Stephen Switzer his Executors & Administrators that he the said Earl his Heirs Agents or Assignes shall & will well & truly pay or cause to be paid unto the said Stephen Switzer his Executors Administrators or Assignes the full sum of One thousand three hundred ninety two pounds four shillings & nine pence of lawful money of Great Britain being multiples(?) of the several sums above expressed in manner & form following (that is to say) two hundred seventy two pounds part thereof on the day of the date hereof Two hundred seventy two pounds more thereof on or before the Nineteenth day of May next ensuing Two hundred seventy two pounds more thereof on or before the sixteenth day of June next ensuing One hundred thirty six pounds more thereof on or before the thirtyeth day of the same month of June In like manner after Harvest time one hundred fifty two pounds more therefore on or before the fifteenth day of September next ensuing One hundred fifty two pounds more thereof on or before (?) ensuing One hundred thirty six pounds four shillings & nine pence being the rest residue & remainder thereof on/or before if the said works are finished (?) next ensuing
ALSO that the said Earl his Agents or Assignes shall & will well & sufficiently find & provide all carts (?) stain twelve Mules or Horses the said Earl shall allow towards the Carting before mentioned & all water carts vessels & things as shall be required for watering of trees And that in Case any deficiency thereof the said Stephen Switzer should find & provide any Mules or Horses Cart (?) stain That then the said Earl his Agents or Assignes shall & will monthly & every month well & truly pay or cause to be paid unto the said Stephen Switzer his assignes All such sume & sumes of Money due to Carpenters & other Workmen as shall be employed in & about the pales or paleing aforesaid (? stain) preservation or improvement of what is doing or to be done in & about the works at Caversham shall & will be paid him or his Assignes Monthly & every month as aforesaid upon the production of two Vouchers on Oath if required as aforesaid (provided the whole exceed not the Eight hundred thirty six pounds Seven shillings & Eleven pence mentioned in the postscript)

ALSO the said Earl his Agents or Assignes shall & will find & provide all flowers Edgings Greens Statues Vases & all other Ornaments as shall be used or employed in & about the said works (And not mentioned In the Covenants Articles & Agreements in these (here on the part, ? stain) & be shall of the said Stephen Switzer to be done & performed) as the same shall be wanted AND that it shall & may be lawful (?) stain said Stephen Switzer & his Assignes in case of any Obstruction by the said Earl's Agents or Assignes during the said Earl's Absence of payment or any of the several Sums of Money to the Stephen Switzer of his Assignes or any part of any of them on the several Days & Times above mentioned & limited To cease the said works IN WITNESS whereof the said parties have hereunto Interchangeably sett their Hands & seals the day and year first above written

Sealed & Delivered In the presence of us Whereas it is agreed between the parties aforesaid That the several Artificers Bills amounting to the sume of Eight hundred thirty six pounds seven shillings & eleven pence shall be put into the said Switzer's Account for his careful Management & reduction of the same to more moderate prizes He is hereby impowered by the said Earl that in Conjunction (with Mr Laws?) he shall have power to apply himself to whosoever the said Earl shall appoint for the payment of the several sums of Money appropriated by the said Earl for the Garden Works before mentioned by way of impress or subsistence money for the several Artificers mentioned in that paper The Copy whereof is hereunto annexed And the full sume of Money when the whole is finished And this postscript shall be a further Explanation of the Inclusive parts of these Articles Contained in the first & third of the said Earls It being supposed for Certainty that what may be saved out of the Eight hundred thirty six pounds Seven shillings & eleven pence will more than pay for any unforeseen contingencies that may happen in the said Works

1. Stephen Switzer, 1724-1745. (Hoare's Bank, Fleet Street, London: MS Ledgers 26, folio 398; 32 folio 2; 33 folio 305; 36 folio 385; 40 folio 25; 43 folio 85; 44 folio 141; and 45 folio 219.

2. Elizabeth Switzer, 1732 (Hoare's Bank, Fleet Street, London: MS Ledger 33 folio 381.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2</td>
<td>To himself in p £</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Mr Willis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13</td>
<td>To notes 12 Jany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 23</td>
<td>To clear Mr Willis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22</td>
<td>To p note 26 March</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25</td>
<td>To note 25 May</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(165)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>To note 29 Ap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 10 each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 26</td>
<td>By note</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By notes 15 &amp; 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19</td>
<td>By notes 10 &amp; 10 185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10</td>
<td>By note</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 29</td>
<td>By notes 10 &amp; 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13</td>
<td>By Note</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 30</td>
<td>To note 29 Aug</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 29</td>
<td>To note 13 Jany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 26</td>
<td>By note</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap 1 11</td>
<td>By note</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ledger 32 folio 2. (with Henry Archer Esqr, Mr Chris. Fryer & Mr Wm Richards)

Mr. Stephen Switzer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 22</td>
<td>By notes 20, 20 &amp; 10</td>
<td>1 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>By note</td>
<td>1 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By note</td>
<td>1 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap 22</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>1 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap 25</td>
<td>By note 10 &amp; 10</td>
<td>1 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>By Jn Goodricke's bill *</td>
<td>1 14:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24</td>
<td>By bill on Lord Lonsdale</td>
<td>1 14:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>By bill on Duke of Bedford</td>
<td>1 7:0:9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr 33 folio 120

Cr 201..17..0

Pr 120-----

Ball 81..17..0)
Ledger 33 folio 305.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Mr. Stephen Switzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep 6 To note 20 May</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep 7 To cash note sent to Mr Switzer</td>
<td>10--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 27 To himself</td>
<td></td>
<td>50--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 1 To charges of noting Thos Sharp's note</td>
<td>0 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 13 To Thos. Brayfield</td>
<td>7 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 10 To W Watson</td>
<td>15--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 15 To himself</td>
<td>21--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 17 To W Watson</td>
<td>26 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 27 To W Westad's bill</td>
<td>3--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 28 To himself</td>
<td>21--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 12 To Jn Carey</td>
<td>10--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1733 Ap 6 To Sam Airis</td>
<td>30--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1733 Ap 1 By money due &amp; Crd from Lr 32 folio 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1733 July 13 By bill on Charles Pole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1733 Sep 25 By John Neville's note</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 14 By bill on Crisp &amp; Wyld</td>
<td>18 02 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 2 By bill on Rogers &amp; Beardsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>12----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 13 By bill on Matthews(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 15--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 16 By himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 23 By bill on Thos Powis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 28 By himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 15--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 19 By bill on Geo Wynne</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 05--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 17 By himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 31 By bill on R Barny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 15--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ap 6 By himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ledger 33 folio 305, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr £sd</th>
<th>Cr £sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>6 6---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>To Do</td>
<td>6 6---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>To Do</td>
<td>281 17 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>497 18 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1734

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr £sd</th>
<th>Cr £sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1 10---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jany 22</td>
<td>To Wm Collins</td>
<td>1 25---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>To Wm Quish(?)</td>
<td>1 15---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>To Wm Wood</td>
<td>1 30---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>To Cha Ackers</td>
<td>1 8---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feby 5</td>
<td>To Wm Watson</td>
<td>1 5---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1735

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr £sd</th>
<th>Cr £sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>To Jn Swinhoe</td>
<td>1 30---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1 60---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Thos Heath</td>
<td>1 7---</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novr 10</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1 55---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 29</td>
<td>To Thos Hawkworth</td>
<td>1 10---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novr 10</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1 55---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>To Do</td>
<td>1 55---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ledger 33 folio 305, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>To Thos Bateman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decr</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jany</td>
<td>To D''</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb'ry</td>
<td>To Hans de Veill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>To Thos Hawksworth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>To D''</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>To D''</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20</td>
<td>To Sam'l Smith</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 516 5

Jany 28 | By bill on R Wilson | 1 | 49 4 |
Feb'ry 14 | By himself | 1 | 25  |
March 6 | By bill on Sam Cross | 1 | 11 11 |
1736 27 | By Ditto | 1 | 20  |
April 7 | By bill on Thos Robinson | 1 | 20  |

Ledger 36 folio 385.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Switzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>To money pd &amp; bro'd L' 33 folio 305 By</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17th</td>
<td>To Thos Bateman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19</td>
<td>To Hans D'Veill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By money rec'd & bro'd from L' 33 folio 305 By 516 5

July 31 | By bill on Edw'd Sparke | 11 | 10 |
Ledger 36 folio 385 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 9</td>
<td>To Jas Marchbank</td>
<td>1 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2</td>
<td>To Carry Erackenbury</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2</td>
<td>To Wm Hazard</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jany 8</td>
<td>To Wm Quit?</td>
<td>1 1 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Hans De Veil</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Wm Wood</td>
<td>1 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 28</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1 5 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1737

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>To D. to ball ce ye acc t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>392 17 11</td>
<td>979 5 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I do allow ye acc t to be true & just & have rec t from Mess. Hoare & Arnold all ye Notes & rec t for money paid in ye same & also Three Hundred & Niney two pounds 17 8 to ball ye acc t.
Witness my hand 6 th April 1737
Witness present Stephen Switzer
Wm Turner

1737

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 19 th</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>1 16 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(?, Lsd 3e Ded d)
### Ledger 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (Cr)</th>
<th>Amount (£sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1 5 5</td>
<td>1 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>To D⁰</td>
<td>1 12 12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>To Jn⁰ Swinhoe</td>
<td>1 29 5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1 6 6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>To Jn⁰ Swinhoe</td>
<td>1 29 5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>To D⁰</td>
<td>1 5 5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1738

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (Cr)</th>
<th>Amount (£sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>By bill on Wm Boothby</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>1 16 4</td>
<td>16 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>1 21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 202.9.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (Cr)</th>
<th>Amount (£sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>By Jos: Nicholson's hand of Jn⁰ Ray</td>
<td>1 12 5</td>
<td>12 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>By bill on Samebridge &amp; Co</td>
<td>1 16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>By Jn⁰ Bellinger's note</td>
<td>1 10 10</td>
<td>10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>To Wm Wood</td>
<td>1 23 3</td>
<td>23 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1 25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>To Thos Bateman</td>
<td>1 5 5</td>
<td>5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1739

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (Cr)</th>
<th>Amount (£sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ap</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>1 33 01</td>
<td>33 01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ledger 36 folio 335 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
<th>pr Contra</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By bill on Bettsowrth &amp; Co</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>To D°</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>To D°</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>By bill on Barisell &amp; Son</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>389 4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17</td>
<td>To Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>13 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to balce ye acco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>389</td>
<td>4 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ledger 40 folio 25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
<th>pr Contra</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Mr. Ste. Switzer</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By Tos: Nicholson hand of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cha Carlisle</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novr  10</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5 05</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decr  13</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jany  14</td>
<td>To Jn° Swinhoe</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feby 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ledger 40 folio 25 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dr £sd</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td></td>
<td>pr contra</td>
<td>Cr £sd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1740

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Ap</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 |To Jno Swinhoe |18 |   |   |
May 15|To Tho Woodward|5 |5 |   |
|16|To Tho Grace |10 |   |   |
June 3|To Jno Watts |6 |18 |   |

275-1-

July 3|To himself |10|10|   |
22|To D |5 |5 |   |

Aug 5|To Henry Flutter|5 |   |   |
21|To Jno Applebee |5 |   |   |
28|To Ro: Monroe |10 |   |   |
Sep 6|To Henry Flutter |12 |   |   |
13|To Jos: Jesser |10|10|   |
15|To himself |5 |5 |   |

Aug 18|By bill of Jno Nesbitt |40 |   |   |
5|By Wm Grey hand of Jno Ray |15|52|   |
18|By himself |200|   |   |

Sep 18|By bill on Wm Hodges |1 |4|04|   |
22|By bill on Jno Still |1 |12|12|   |

Oct 4|By Sir Cor. Firebrace's bill |9 |17|   |
10|By himself |1 |23|02|   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
<th>pr Contra</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 14</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>To Henry Flutter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 29</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>To Jos: Banister</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 31</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>712:11:0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>To Thos Bateman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>To Jno Swinhoe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>To Mr Wood</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 16</td>
<td>To Bearer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 24</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 11</td>
<td>To Thos Switzer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 5</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 1743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 14</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 3</td>
<td>By Mr Goodwin pon^c(?) of Ed. Lechaere Esqr</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 6</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ledger 40 folio 25 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr £sd</th>
<th>pr Contra</th>
<th>Cr £sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 7</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>12 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By 920 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 22</td>
<td>By bill on Jos Channing</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex 964 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£ 43 folio 85.

Ledger 43 folio 85, (with Mr. Wm Dobbs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr £sd</th>
<th>pr Contra</th>
<th>Cr £sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 26</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>8 16 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By 920 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 13</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jany 13</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>To Jno Totter</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Chas Mimier</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feby 8</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>To Ald Nutting</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>To Mr Walford</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>To Mr Fluttor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 4</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>1 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>By bill on Mess Knight</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jany 26</td>
<td>By bill on Eds Clark Parish</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feby 4</td>
<td>By bill on Jno Money</td>
<td>1 12 18 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>By bill on Wm Wood</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ledger 43 folio 85. (with Mr. Wm Dobbs) cont.

Dr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>Pr Contra</th>
<th>Cr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>By bill on Dan^1 Webb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1134-19-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>To Bearer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To Mr Flutter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1031-2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>To Fra^s Hunt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>To Edw^d Munday</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To Nath^1 Allen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To Ale^m Nutting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>To Thos Bateman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug^27</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To Ale^m Nutting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reced up S Switzer (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep^1</td>
<td>To Mr. Flutter</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To Eliza Switzer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Thos Bateman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>To Mr Flutter</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 6</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2</td>
<td>To Mr Flutter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To himself to ball ye acco</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1241 7 6

I do allow this acco^t to be true & just & have reced from Mr Ben^t Hoare & Co. Seven Shillings to ball ye acco Witness my hand of 2^nd Nov 1743— Stephen Switzer

Witness

Wm Turner £5 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 9&quot;</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>To Mr Flutter</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec¹ 1</td>
<td>To D⁰</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>48 13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feby 10</td>
<td>To Thos Wilson</td>
<td>22 10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>To Tim: Burson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16</td>
<td>To Thos Wilson</td>
<td>7 9 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(1744)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>By D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**256..12..6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>To Jn⁰ Gardiner</td>
<td>10 12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>To Jn⁰ Swinhoe</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>To Fra⁰ Hunt</td>
<td>5 16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>To Wm Butterfield</td>
<td>5 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230..13..6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>To Cha⁰ Mineirs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>To Thos⁰ Switzer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 4</td>
<td>By bill on Thos .Pan</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lr 43/**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>£sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 9 th</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>By bill on Jos: Channing &amp; Co</td>
<td>8 13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec² 8</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>By bill on Finch &amp; Co</td>
<td>7 10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>10 10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feby 6</td>
<td>By D⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>By bill on Ar: Beardsley</td>
<td>7 9 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ledger 44 folio 141. cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr. £sd</th>
<th>Pr Contra</th>
<th>Cr £sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 6</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 9</td>
<td>To Edw Roybauld</td>
<td>7 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 21</td>
<td>To Cha Münier</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 8</td>
<td>To Chas Nutting</td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 27</td>
<td>To Bearer</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1</td>
<td>To Ja Fox</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 27</td>
<td>To Wm Quelch</td>
<td>13 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>To Wm Hazard</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 24</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>13 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 12</td>
<td>To Wm Hazard</td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 29</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>To Wm Gibbs</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 5</td>
<td>To Chas Blundell</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 8</td>
<td>To Jn Edenborough</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>To Wm Hazard</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>To Fra Alzin</td>
<td>6 2 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 18</td>
<td>To Wm Hazard</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 19</td>
<td>To Fra Phillips</td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 19</td>
<td>To Tho Wilson</td>
<td>5 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 21</td>
<td>To Jn Edinburgh</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 22</td>
<td>To Tho Nash</td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr. £sd</th>
<th>Pr Contra</th>
<th>Cr £sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 30</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 14</td>
<td>By bill on Finch &amp; Co</td>
<td>11 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 27</td>
<td>By bill on Sam Smith</td>
<td>20 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>By himself</td>
<td>12 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>11 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>18 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 19</td>
<td>By D</td>
<td>20 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex 403 13 3 By 430 15 1

Lr 45 folio 219
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Mr Ste: Switzer</td>
<td>Dr £sd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Pr Contra</td>
<td>Cr £sd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec' 24th</td>
<td>To Edm' Burton</td>
<td>5 14 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan' 4</td>
<td>To Jos Bannister</td>
<td>4 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Tho' Bateman</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To 'm Walstead</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Wm Quelsh</td>
<td>25 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To T. Switzer</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Sam' Gray</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Mr Ribould</td>
<td>8 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb' 1</td>
<td>To Tho' Rutting</td>
<td>6 4 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To D'</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Jn' Stagg</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Edu' Lay</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>To Fra' Phillips</td>
<td>8 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>To Wm Dodc</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 13</td>
<td>To Tho' Wilson</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>To D</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28</td>
<td>To himself</td>
<td>7 16 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ledger 45 folio 219.

By mony rece'd & bro't from L 44 folio 141

Ex 403 18 3

Jany 2 By bill on Mr. Thorne 33 3 6

15 By himself 12 12 -

26 By D 28 - -

Feb' 9 By D 3 - -

19 By bill on Røt Cliff 7 - -

22 By himself 2 0 - -

March 15 By D 545...6

March 9 10 10 -

545...6
Ledger 33 folio 331. (with Sir Rich. Palgrave Bart.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>Sep 7th</th>
<th>Pr Contra</th>
<th>Cr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep 20</td>
<td>To note 7 Sep 1733</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap 1733</td>
<td>By bill on James Baird</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap 1733</td>
<td>By bill on Geo. Barnes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>By bill on Geo. Barnes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>To mony recd of Baird</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>To D of Barnes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>To D of D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>To D 26 Ap</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8. Garden Design in Scotland, 1682-1745

A connection between Switzer and the gardens of Scotland, particularly those in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh rests largely on remarks of J.C. Loudon. Further support for the suspicion comes from Laurence Whistler and certain circumstances of Switzer's life.

Loudon (1783-1843) was born in Lanarkshire but educated in Edinburgh from about 1790. At fourteen he was apprenticed to a nursery man and landscape gardener. He was apparently a precocious child with an early interest in gardening and botany, and was certainly a man of enormous application and considerable intellect. Typical of these qualities is his Encyclopedia of Gardening written by 1822 which thoroughly covers and minutely classifies the subject. A large part of the Encyclopedia is devoted to a history.

"An universal history of gardening throughout the world has never been attempted till this Encyclopedia appeared, and the author flatters himself that with the assistance of Mr. Forsyth, he has, in this edition, rendered it, not only a very complete, but a very entertaining and instructive, portion of the work."  

How complete and instructive it is in the particular cases of Scotland and Switzer is the concern of this appendix.

It will be useful to quote Loudon's article in full.

"1217. English Artists were employed in Scotland during this century. Switzer, Lawrence, and Langley mention, in their works, that they were frequently sent for into Scotland to give plans of improvement. Switzer appears to have resided a considerable time in Edinburgh, as he there published, in 1717, a tract on draining, and other useful and agricultural improvements. The Earls of Stair and of Haddington (who wrote on trees), both great planters, about
this time, probably consulted them; as would, perhaps, Fletcher of Saltoun, the proprietors of Dundas Castle, Barnton, Saughton Hall, Gogar, and particularly Craigie Hall, a residence laid out with much art and taste, and next in rank in these respects to Hatton. New Liston, Dalkeith House, Hopetoun House, and various other places near Edinburgh, are also in Switzer's style..."

Laurence Whistler, accepting Loudon's account, suggests that because of this connection with Scotland that Switzer "inherited part of George London's northern circuit and developed a practice

"of his own in the North of England, becoming for Vanbrugh what Bridgeman was becoming in the south...It may be that he was concerned with Seaton Delaval...and with Floors, the great Scottish house near Kelso, attributed with some likelihood to Vanbrugh..."

Besides these there are a number of verifiable, or likely, connections between Switzer and Scotland. The first of these, was in 1724 when his client at Spy Park, Wiltshire, married Lord Somerville. The Drum, or Somerville House, Midlothian was commissioned from William Adam almost immediately, and it would have been quite natural for them to have asked Switzer to lay out the grounds.

Also in 1724 the Honourable Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland, or the Society of Improvers was founded. Of the 300 or so members "Mr. Stephen Sweitzer of London, Gardener" is the only Englishman. How early Switzer was associated with this society is unclear, perhaps not before 1731.
"...I must take the liberty of owning the honour and favour of a letter sent me by order of the Honourable Society for Improvement in Agriculture, establish'd at Edinburgh with some commands in my own way, which I shall gladly execute."

Switzer does not say what these commands were, but they very likely sprang rather from his recent publication on Lucerne, Brocoli, Cythisus, Burning of clay etc. or his Practical Fruit and Kitchen Gardener than from his reputation as a designer or from his Ichnographia Rustica. Apparently, from the moment he set up as a seedsman in Westminster Hall in about 1727 Switzer and his shop became a centre for receiving and disseminating ideas about improvement. His visitors were as likely to be Scots as otherwise.

One of these visitors was Colonel Charles Cathcart (1686-1740), Baron Cathcart from 1732. He had fought with Marlborough, later became a courtier of George II, both as Prince of Wales and as King. In 1720 he bought Craighall, Ayrshire, which he planted and improved. He was subject to melancholia, and was often on the edge of, or in, debt. He had various projects, and an experimental mind. He was a member of the Society of Improvers and in 1733 was President.

In the editions of the Compendious Method of 1728 Switzer had published accounts of burning clay for use as fertilizer. Cathcart came to see him on March 8 1729 at Westminster Hall and signified "...in a very obliging manner, his readiness of communicating what he had observ'd in this useful method of burning clay." Two days later Switzer called on Cathcart who explained his method to
him, and they worked on the manuscript together on the 14th. However, it does not appear that Switzer knew Cathcart's improvements in Ayrshire first hand, at least not by 1731.

"Some gentlemen lately come from North Britain, assure me that great improvements have been made there, especially on the lands of that worthy gentleman mentioned in the Compendious Method."

Switzer knew at least one other member of the Society of Improvers, and speaks of him as "my ingenious and worthy friend Sir John Dalrymple" of Cousland, "one of the principal clerks of session". Through Dalrymple Switzer learned of the observations of Alexander Heron of Bargaly in Dumfries on the Cythisus medicago which he duly published.

Some ten years later Switzer was visited in London by John Cockburn of Ormistoun, East Lothian. "...I called at Suiteser's Shop in Westminster Hall, having got a List of Seeds from him as I passed some days before" Although he was an improver Cockburn was not a member of the Society of Improvers, but had set up a society in imitation in East Lothian.

Finally there is evidence of Switzer being known in Scotland through his books. Sir John Clerk of Pennicuik was supplied in 1727 with Ichnographia Rustica by Allán Ramsay of Edinburgh and "Switzer's Gardening" appears with Bradley, Cook and others in the inventory of Wills House, Roxburghshire in 1727. There are also several Scottish subscribers to his Practical Husbandman and
Planter of 1733 and 1734. So in the latter half of Switzer's life there are these snippets of support for Loudon's assertion, but what of Loudon's specific points - that Switzer often worked in Scotland, that he published a book in Edinburgh in 1717, and that many gardens near that city are in his style?

In the advertisement to his New Principles of Gardening of 1728 Batty Langley wrote that he "may be readily commanded at all times to any part of Great Britain, or Ireland"21 to survey or lay out grounds.

Switzer never published anything remotely like this. Nor did he ever say that he was often called into Scotland to lay out grounds. His references to Scotland are few and brief.

"...an ingenious Person of my Acquaintance, that was born near it, assures me that there is a round Hill in the shire of Aberdeen in Scotland, call'd Pennychy or Bend-up-High, about the height of a Scotch mile" 22

"...And Sir Robert Sibbald, who wrote an Account of Scotland, ...tells us, that there was also a perpetual fountain on the very high Top of the Mountain Lominius, in the Island of Hoia of the Orcades" 23

He specifically differentiates between England, "these kingdoms", 24 "North Britain"25 "South Britain"26 and "Great Britain". 27 Further, he claims credit for introducing a "farm-like way of gardening, before it was used by anybody in any place, in Great Britain", 28 but of waterworks only that same "works of that kind done in several places in England have fallen to my Lot". 29
There is little confusion in Switzer's usage of "the North", but it seems always to refer to the North of England so that his supposed dislike of Scottish gardeners, his "Northern lads" refers rather to gardeners from the north of England.

It must be concluded that Loudon is mistaken in this assertion, unless Switzer made these comments in the book he is said to have published in Edinburgh in 1717. But no trace of such a book has been found. Loudon might have mis-attributed Lord Belhaven’s Advice to the Farmers in East Lothian how to Labour and Improve their Ground (c 1707) or Brigadier Mackintosh of Boslun’s Essay on Ways and Means for Inclosing, Fallowing Planting &c. in Scotland, 1729, both published anonymously, but it is reasonably certain that Switzer did not publish a book or pamphlet in Edinburgh in 1717, or at any other time. Following on this assertion in Loudon’s account is the corollary that Switzer resided a considerable time in Edinburgh, but again, there is no support for this, and such knowledge as we presently have of the period 1715 to 1720 puts him in the south and west of England.

Even if it be accepted that Loudon is wrong in his first two points - the third, that a number of gardens near Edinburgh were in Switzer’s style, requires rather more discussion, and to settle this last point it is necessary to give a short account of garden design in Scotland during Switzer’s life.

John Reid (fl. 1683) wrote the first book published in Scotland
on gardening, The Scots Gard'ner. It is, not unusually, a hand book of gardening prepared for the climate of Scotland. But the layout of gardens was also important to Reid - about a third of the book being given over to "contrivance and design". Reid shows himself a 17th century theorist in this section; he develops an ideal layout. Ingenuity would consist of elaborating the various parts or in adapting the ideal solution to an awkward situation.

"In a confined situation of ground, I add what I can but diminish nothing. I take a survey of the work and when I find several regular and irregular things done on one side of the house, and nothing correspondent on the other, I mark the very same on the opposite side, and this I continue to do, till two irregularities produce one uniformity."

Everything should be done to make a design "both orderly and cheap" and Reid's remarks reinforce this ideal. He suggests various regular ways of making plantations, including quinquinx and various geometrical clumps. The design he uses to illustrate these points shows a square house within a square series of gardens, courts, etc., bisected by 2 axes and also by two diagonal lines, and these lines are continued outwards to bisect the sides of a regular octagon. Reid would have this complex regular geometry consistently applied, from the ordering of flowers in the parterre to the furthest plantations.

No other design by Reid is known. He worked for Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh (1636-1691) who had property at Rosehaugh, Ross-shire, Newtyle, Forfar-shire, Shank and Haughhead, Midlothian, and Abbot Melrose's House, Strachin's Close, Edinburgh. It is
perhaps likely that Reid designed some or all of these places, but nothing is known of their form.

It is unlikely that any improver could have shared Reid's passion for orderly and complex planning - it would have required a remarkable single-mindedness. Of those late 17th century Scottish gardens now known, none more than approximate in some parts this desire for axiality. Culross, Fife, has gardens which are symmetrical and orderly within themselves, but there is no correspondence of parts. There was an attempt to link the various parts of Saltoun Hall, at least visually, where the centres of each walled enclosure are mutually visible by means of clairvoyée. But nowhere is there evidence of Reid's influence although the 18th century Scottish use of geometric clump plantation, either singly or in avenues, and square or rectangular fields may be ultimately traced to Reid. However, his book does demonstrate an awareness of garden and landscape design that is unusual in late 17th century Britain, appearing as it did at about the same time George London and his partners were forming the Brompton Park Nurseries.

Sir William Bruce of Kinross (? 1630-1710) was an amateur architect, and at Balcaskie, Fife (c 1665 onwards), Kinross House, Kinross (1685 onwards) and Hopetoun (c 1700-10) he laid out gardens: at Hopetoun and perhaps at Kinross with Alexander Edward (1651-1708). Bruce may also have been responsible for Hatton, Midlothian (c 1685) for Charles Maitland, Earl of Lauderdale, brother of Bruce's political crony and viceroy John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale.
Details of Bruce's early life are wanting but his first essay in architecture and garden design at Dalcaskie came just after his return from France in 1663. A better introduction to garden and landscape design could not then be had than the recently completed Vaux-le-Vicomte of Andre LeNostre, and all Bruce's designs have something of the breadth and confidence of contemporary French work.

Dalcaskie is his least ambitious effort: he regularized an older house and made the gardens in descending terraces overlooking the Firth of Forth. But even here a curiosity of Bruce's work appears: the principal line of the garden is sited on the Bass Rock across the Forth. At Kinross, Leven Castle is made use of in this way and at Hopetoun, Berwick Law and more immediately a secondary avenue is terminated by Blackness Castle. Reid preferred an infinite prospect and where this could not be had suggested a clump of first to give a sense of depth. Natural objects or ruins at the end of walks and avenues are not used in England until the 18th century though they appeared in Italy from about 1550. By the beginning of the 18th century such terminations were not unusual in Scotland but they first appear in gardens associated with Bruce.

Reid's concern for the integration of house and grounds is first worked out at Kinross. Its situation is a broad flat peninsular running from the town of Kinross into Loch Leven: hills rise abruptly on the far sides of the Loch in the background. Bruce organised the grounds as an axial composition of rectangles: avenue, courts, mansion house, garden etc., a not unusual late 17th century method.
But Bruce's design is thorough, varied, monumental and not monotonous, and the picturesque ruin of Leven Castle can always be seen, on axis through the house or from the gardens. Further he framed the grounds with thick regular plantations of forest trees so that there is no conflict between his formal and orderly landscape and the natural landscape outside which is visible in the hills above the tree belts and by the "curious vistas" cut through them.

Whether the layout of Hopetoun House as it now exists is the work of Bruce and Edward or is a remodelling of the 1720's is not altogether clear but the situation, the general disposition of elements, and in large measure the character, is due to them. Bruce built the house on a broad shelf of land west of South Queensferry and overhanging the Forth. To the south the ground rises fairly steeply. The axis was laid out east–west so that the Forth and the lands beyond are an integral part of the scheme, but like Kinross Hopetoun is framed by woods and the distinction between internal and external landscape is maintained.

It was decided to remodel Hopetoun in 1721 but the first section was not completed until 1725. It is likely that the grounds described by Macky in 1723 are those laid out by Bruce and Edward. The courtyard of the old house was "adorned with Statues and Vases"; but since the building the two wings, the court is to be extended to the breadth of them and proportionally larger.

"The Parterre fronting the Salloon, is longer than that at Cannons, and like it, hath a large Basin of Water at
Bottom: It's also adorn'd with a Multitude of Statues on Pedestals, as at Cannons; but the Views here are prodigiously more extensive.  

West of the house the table of land runs north west forming a sort of peninsula above the Forth. This was laid out as a wilderness with a terrace walk running around the edge. From this Macky had "the finest View I ever saw anywhere; far beyond Frescati, near Rome, or St. Michael del Bosco, near Bologna, for Variety" including towns, countryside, distant mountains and castles, and the Forth, "like a pond".

Nearby Hatton House, Midlothian is known mainly through a print by Slezer and mis-named as Argyle House when it was published in 1713. Hatton is a more modest affair, the house is square and partly classical (as Thirlestane and Holyrood are). The walled gardens were to the south on two wide terraces, possibly by Bruce, but Loudon ascribed it to London and Wise.

Alexander Edward (1651-1708) was the son of a minister and after his education at St. Andrews he became the minister of Kemback Church, Fife. His interests included besides theology, cartography, literature, science, history, heraldry, drawing, painting, and architecture and garden design, which he seems to have taken up as a profession after 1689 when he was deposed as a non-juror.

His work at Brechin Castle, Angus from 1696 included not only the gardens but a new west front. The forecourt at Brechin was
flanked by offices and beyond this he planted a goose-foot. It is not known what his other garden works at Brechin were or what form they took, but Panmure House, Fife for the same owners may be his as may be, with Bruce, CRAIGEHALL. 

In the early 18th century Edward was sent on a tour to England, France and the Low Countries "for taking draughts of the most curious and remarkable houses". He also bought, among other things, seeds for the Earls of Hopetoun and Mar.

Of Edward's work as a garden designer only the design for Hamilton Palace survives. It is a remarkably advanced design for 1708, no longer a garden design but one for a large section of landscape. Edward's composition is still formal but there is no trace of the concern expressed by Reid of integrating house and grounds, at least not in a geometrical way. There is an axis of some two miles long and to either side of this line various enclosures and plantations are grouped asymmetrically. The house alone is on the axis. Even the specifically garden part of the scheme lies to the side of the house and embraces a large paddock or park. Edward's design for Hamilton is practically a landscape garden with its large loose structure, interpenetration of artificial and natural elements, and clump plantation. Only serpentine lines are lacking.

The introduction to the 1761 edition of Treatise on the Manner of Raising Forest Trees by Thomas Hamilton, 6th Earl of Haddington (1680-1735) includes the story of the early eighteenth century
plantations at Tynningham, East Lothian. The scope, and methods of
design used by Lord Haddington and his friends were probably more
typical in this period than the grander efforts at Kinross or
Hopetoun.

When Haddington came to Tynningham about 1700 there were only
some fourteen acres planted with trees. It had been generally
held that nothing would grow in such an open marine situation. His
grandfather planted a garden after the civil wars, but little more.

"My father...began to plant, to drain, and enclose his
grounds to very good purpose...but his father-in-law
dying, he went to take possession of the estate in
sight of my mother, who was heiress, and settled at
Leslie where he planted a great deal."

Most of these plantations at Tynningham were ruined by tenants,
and it was not Haddington's idea to replant, but his wife's, Helen
Hope, sister of Lord Hopetoun. She was

"a great lover of planting (and) did what she could to
engage me to it; but in vain. At last, she asked leave
to go about it, which she did, and I was much pleased
with some little things that were both well laid out and
executed."

And Haddington began planting himself, and first made a small
wilderness near the bowling green, "I laid it out in a centre with
fourteen walks from it, the most of them having tolerable good
terminations."

After this Lady Haddington suggested that they enclose the
muir of Tynningham and plant its 360 acres. Haddington was cautious
and believed it would be a waste of time, but his wife proceeded by herself in 1707.

"After she had begun to plant it, I thought it would be a pity not to have a centre in it, and walks from it, with the best terminations we could find."

Haddington "traversed the ground" and found a suitable centre; his wife liked his choice, "but walking about, lighted on a spot of ground she thought more proper for a centre."  

As they were to be visited by Lord Hopetoun (1681-1742) Lord Marchmont (1641-1724) and Sir John Bruce they decided to leave the choice to their visitors.

"When they came, we all went to the field. The spot your grandmother had pitched on was the first we came to; here she stopped and said what she could in praise of her choice. I begged to go to mine, but my Lord Marchmont said, it would be best to set up the instruments there, and to take the views and walks, when that was done, he would go forward, and do the like at mine; and when both were laid down upon paper, it might be judged which was best. In the meantime, Sir John Bruce had straggled from us, and sent to tell, he had lighted upon a finer spot of ground for a centre, than either of the two we were contending for. My Lord Marchmont sent him the same answer he had given me; and when he had ended what he had to do at mine, he went and did so at the place where Sir John was at."

When the three centres, walks and terminations were drawn out it was decided to use them all, and planting proceeded on that plan. The only change in execution were the addition of serpentine walks and "some figures" designed by Charles Lord Dinning (1697-1732) in 1703.
Haddington continued to plant after this, enclosing fields and making shelter belts, and importing Dorset farmers to improve the local husbandry, but he left ornamental planting to his wife and son.63

According to Haddington the great planters of late 17th century Scotland were his father, Archibald Hope, Lord Rankeillor (1639-1706), Sir William Bruce, and John Hay (1626-1697) 1st Marquess of Tweedale. But it was,

"the late Earl of Mar that first introduced the wilderness way of planting amongst us, and very much improved the taste of our Gentlemen, who very soon followed his example."64

John Erskine, 11th Earl of Mar (1675-1732) is remembered for his unsuccessful backing of the Pretender in 1715, but he was also an amateur architect and garden designer of considerable skill as his three surviving volumes of designs attest.65 The bulk of these designs were made after his exile, many for continental houses and gardens,66 a number of designs for remodeling British houses,67 new houses for King James VIII at Kensington,68 Dun House69 for David Erskine, Lord Dun (1670-1758) and two groups of designs for himself—Alloa House, Clackmananshire and the site subsequently used for Marble Hill House, Twickenham, Middlesex. It is in these two groups that designs made before 1715 are found.

The earliest of all the designs is an engraved plan of the town gardens and parks of Alloa, dated 1710.70 This plan shows an enormous layout, according to Macky forty-two acres of garden and
one hundred and fifty acres of woodland of great sophistication and complexity. The house, and just west of it the town of Alloa, lies on flat ground on the north side of the Forth with a steeply sloping hill to the north of it. The gardens lie between the house and the Forth. The axis through the south front of the house, typically determined the principal line of the garden, and similarly the axes of the other fronts, and the associated diagonals became principal lines in the parks. Secondary, but determining lines resulted from the various prospects which Mar used as terminations. From the centre line of the garden were

"Thirty two different Vistoes, each ending on some remarkable Seat or Mountain, at some Miles Distance; one of them shews you Sterling Castle, at four miles Distance; another the Palace of Elphinston, on the other Side of the River; a Third the Castle of Clacmaning; and so the rest."

Having thus determined his principal and secondary lines Mar extended them backwards from his axial avenue until a varied series of irregular elements conforming to a general symmetrical pattern was achieved. These elements contained woods, cabinets, grass etc. Within this structure the various parts of the garden would have seemed greatly varied although they were not particularly remarkable in themselves. A curious feature is a naturalistic inlet of the Forth which runs around to sides of the garden and ends in a circular basin very near the house. There was apparently no attempt to regularise this though it would have been feasible, and the suspicion that Mar must have intended it to take this form is strong.

From the east front of the house are three principal avenues the
most northerly of which runs through the centre of the wood. Cross this avenue at right angles is the centre line of the wood which runs from the Forth due northwards to a lodge on the ridge of the hill. This lodge, Comely Bank, had a terrace on its south front from which all the gardens and parks could be seen. A slightly later general plan shows Mar's intention to double the area of the parks centred on a new villa at Comely Bank. The additional sections to the north were to be laid out as avenues and the resulting irregular sections were to be parks. A large round basin was to be built in the wood below Comely Bank. The central line of the wood and parks to the north of Comely Bank were to interest two very large circular woods. If a date of about 1720 be correct for this design it would obviously never have been carried out.

After Mar's exile Alloa was maintained by the Government. Macky, visiting Alloa before 1723 said,

"it will be an additional Honour to the Duke of Argyle, that when he was with his Army at Sterling, and the Lord of this house at the head of the Army against him, he gave strict Orders for the Preservation of this Place". When Edward Harley, Lord Oxford, visited it in 1725 he remarked on the unfinished house,

"there is a great deal of additional building to the old house begun just as his Lordship engaged in the unhappy enterprise which obliged his flight from it, and continues now in the same condition wherein he left it"

So Alloa remained an example and an inducement to Scottish improvers throughout our period.
Mar may have planned to have a villa near London as early as 1711, but the actual design is in the form of a flap, dated April 1719, on the survey. There is a detailed plan of the central section of the garden of the same date. The villa itself is a square block with flankers, and convex colonnade to the great court. It is very similar in plan to the villa for Comely Bank, Alloa. Unusually there are two sunken gardens to either side of the main block, one for orange trees, the other for flowers. The villa and gardens are set near the river, and the London road is moved to the north permitting a small park. To the north, east and west of the villa is close woodwork with straight walks cut out. A desire for spaciousness is evident in Mar's proposed continuation of his main lines across the river by Ham House, north of the London road, into Sir James Ash's grounds to the east, and a link with Secretary Johnstone to the west. In choosing to align his terrace with "the centre line of Mr. Johnston's walk of his parter next the river" Mar gets a line not quite parallel to his proposed south front, which he duly repeats on the east side.

The parterre is the width of an extended garden front made up of building and garden works. The flanking stables and office blocks are given classical porches on this side, and the round chapel and saloon, in the arms of the colonnades to the north, are echoed in two circular mounts. The composition is completed by two more sunken gardens. The parterre is divided into two quarters of "grass with some embroidery" flanked by two smaller grass quarters. And
next to the river, and open to meadows on the east and west sides, are two basins.

Mar was an amateur but his skill as a garden designer was of an order to invite comparison with Henry Wise or George London or even Andre LeNostre. Perhaps because he was an amateur his style could develop its curious eccentricities untried by awkward clients. His reliance on vistas and view lines as a method of composition, and the resulting uneasiness of his formal elements is peculiar to himself, though the Haddington's designed this way, and there is a hint that Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun might have developed this method had the opportunity existed. What is wanting in Mar's schemes is a complex inter-penetration of formal spaces, and the breadth and simplicity of other British or of French designers. Yet, even if his eccentricity be accepted it must be allowed that he designed in a European context. His understanding of typical forms and elements is complete: his avenues, goose feet, basins, parterre quarters, etc. are competent. Mar owed little to English practise as such, and was, so far as we can presently judge, independent of it.

William Boutcher, senior (d? 1738) had a nursery garden at Comely Garden, Abbey Hill, Edinburgh from at least 1719. The earliest references to him as a garden designer occur in 1721, when he surveyed and prepared a new design for Airth, Stirlingshire.

Earlier in the same year Boutcher was consulted by Colonel
Charles Cathcart, about the design for Auchencroff

"I was with Boucher early at Auchencroff he laid out all the design of Mount Holmstoun, Scharres mount and mough Allexandre, we were very muddy but the work was done."

Boutcher is not mentioned in the Diaries before though in November 1720 Cathcart spoke of "my designs at Auchencroff" and Boutcher may have been acting as Cathcart's surveyor. There is also some doubt as to Boutcher's role when he is next mentioned by Catchcart in 1728. What precisely Cathcart's, or Boutcher's, design was is not known.

Mavisbank, Midlothian was built from 1723 by Sir John Clerk of Pennicuik (1676-1755) and William Adam (1669-1743). Both Clerk and Adam designed gardens but in the case of Mavisbank it would appear that William Boutcher provided designs, at least a design for the parterre. Boutcher may be the author of an unsigned and undated 18th century drawing of the forecourt at Mavisbank. This shows two grass plots divided by a central gravel walk; the western plot has *embroderie* indicated in pencil. On the reverse are a variant plan of the parterre, various alternative plans for the gate side, and a sketch of the gate. In a standard layout the court is on the north side of a house and the parterre is on the other side. At Mavisbank, the restricted site, and Clerk's and Adam's placement of the house makes this arrangement impossible. It was very probably realized that the parterre and court could not conveniently occupy the same place, and the parterre was therefore left out. Its place
could in some measure have been taken by the steep mount close to the west front. This feature was once a Roman fortlet, and turning it into a mount would have appealed to Clerk's antiquarian interests. The only other known garden works at Mavisbank were a near circular kitchen garden on the south side and a very restricted goose foot on the east side.

The case brought by Mrs. Boutcher in 1733 yields interesting material on Boutcher's relations with clients. Boutcher had made a plan of Grange, Peeblesshire, for Hon. Major Thomas Cochrane of Grange, and supplied trees in 1728. Cochrane had only paid five guineas of the £14.8.4 bill by 1734. Whether the 1728 plan had proved unsatisfactory or was no more than a survey is not clear, but in 1733 Boutcher made a design for Cochrane, which certainly proved unsatisfactory. Cochrane was convinced Boutcher would therefore make changes but apparently he was disinclined to do this and Cochrane was obliged to chase him.

"Mr. Boutcher
I sent my servant this morning to your house but he missing you, I am obliged to write this to let you know that Balgonie is to be at my house tomorrow morning so I expect you and your instrument without fail to be with me by ten in the morning.

Thos. Cochrane."\(^{89}\)

This order met with no response

"Mr. Boutcher,
I shall begin my letter praying that God may damn you for ever. Balgonie and I have been here since Wednesday and have been expecting you every day. I have sent my servant to carry your instrument and chain and I expect you will be here by nine tomorrow morning if you do I shall use my interest to suspend the first part of my letter.

Thos. Cochrane"\(^ {90}\)
According to Cochrane's deposition of 1740 Boutcher had refused to alter his plan, and therefore had made it useless and hence worthless. Mrs. Boutcher maintained that the plan had been made and that it must be paid for. Cochrane admitted this but held that,

"Boutcher was no more than the hand or instrument to draw out the plan, but not the head to contrive it that the defender (Cochrane) had the choice of his plan and Boutcher was found to follow his directions and not his own fancy. That nevertheless Boutcher refused to make out the plan according to his employers directions but drew one quite contrary to his directions and which did not answer either his grounds or designs...and as Boutcher did not perform what he had undertaken nothing was due for this useless plan made out to please his own fancy".

The court ruled that Cochrane must pay.

The offending plan is in Register House, as is a simpler undated alternative. The design is axial and the forms regular but compared with earlier 18th century work it is simple (e.g. the parterre has become the "great green") and the design relies on grass, banks, water and blocks of trees for its effect. There is also a tendency to asymmetry; the drive runs parallel to the main line so that the two forecourts are approached from the side; the canal system has non-formally composed elements; and the front forecourt, whose slopes could have been designed by Switzer or Bridgeman, is entered eccentrically. But when compared with the contemporary Carlton House or even Nostell it seems slightly old fashioned. However, the client was difficult, his imprecations are scrawled on the plan and the alternative is even more conservative, although it has considerable dignity. In the place of the kitchen garden Boutcher proposed a
large square wood centred on a secondary front. The centre is a large octagonal basin set within a circular opening. Walks run parallel to the edges of the square through the remaining woods punctuated by cabinets of varied design.

On account of Dutccher's "obstinancy the defender was obliged to employ Mr. Mr. Adams, another artist, who made out a plan which the defender carry'd into execution". 94

Adam, like Druce, Edward, and Mar, was an architect primarily, but there is some evidence that he designed other gardens; Hopetoun 1725, Armistoon 1726, Blair Adam, Fife, and Hamilton Palace 1732.

Adam made a plan of the grounds of Hopetoun in 1725: 95 it is signed "Gull Adam Arch Delint" not designavit, and might therefore be considered a survey of existing work. A similar case occurs at Armiston, Midlothian in 1726 96 where Adam's "General plan of Armiston House Parks and Gardens", "may be styled a surveyor's plan". 97 There are also surveys by Adam of the grounds at Leslie, Fife, Craigston Castle, Banffshire 98 and Basilly. 99 But it is known that Adam designed gardens, as at Grange, Hamilton Palace and presumably his own estate Blair Adam, Fife. In the absence of supporting evidence to sort out these two distinct activities, we can gain some idea of the attitude he took to garden design, from Cochrane's account and Adam's remarks to James Nasmyth in 1742 that
"as for laying out the grounds, he says it's impracticable for him to mention a sum till he is on the spot and sees what is to be done. If it's only to lay out ground for a garden or anything about the courts that will be easily done and not add much to the charge. But if his operations are to be more extensive he says he must take one additional horse and servant along to carry his instruments he is to work by"

It would appear, then, that Adam was prepared, at least as far as the grounds were concerned, to be the "hand or instrument to draw out the plan but not the head to contrive it".

But however doubtful the authorship of the designs may be, the designs exist and in some measure were carried out. At Hopetoun the new work would include the forecourt, probably the waterworks west of the parterre and perhaps the serpentine walks in the wilderness, though as these appeared at Tyningham in 1703 so these walks more probably date from the Bruce/Edward layout.

The forecourt is very large, and is wider than the complete east front, main block and flankers. It has become something more important than a court and were it not for its geometrical shape it could be taken for a lawn of the kind associated with mature landscape gardens. It is unclear from Adam's survey whether a haha is intended to define this court, (what appears to be a palisade is shown enclosing the curved end), but it is likely that this was a second thought because the belt of trees defining the eastern edge of the court were not planted. The haha, or more properly terrace-walk, further opens the court making it, from the house or the drive, indistinguishable from "the plan field" and sparsely
wooded park flanking the Great Avenue.

The entrance to the great avenue is one of the most skilful parts of the design at Hopetoun. Although it might conceivably date from the early 18th century it shows Adam's house to such an advantage that the suspicion that it dates from 1725 is strong. Approaching from South Queensferry the drive turns northwards through 45 degrees and rises gently to the plateau of the house and gardens. The first visible elements are the statues on the skyline of the house, and then the full width of the house and dependencies are seen briefly in three-quarter view before the drive enters the Great Avenue.102

Immediately west of the parterre Adam's plan a complex series of basins, cascades and architecturally banked earth. On axis is a squared basin roughly the size of the Bruce/Edward one in the parterre. Short canals connect this to two smaller basins which in turn are connected to, on the south side, a canal and basin, and on the north side to a shallow cascade and octagonal basin. From the axial basin three slopes of varied shape lead to an obelisk and final basin. Beyond this is a round defined by a tree belt and the western avenue. These, and the reservoir south of the gardens, are likely a proposal contemporary with Adam's plan. It is unlikely that these features were ever made as they would appear on Roy's Military Survey of Scotland, though a much larger reservoir was built by 1755.
According to Roy the western avenue was extended to Mannerstoun by regularly disposed platoons or clumps. And to the south of the gardens he shows a large wood cut into serpentine sides with a just formal "centre".

The garden at Ar Mastery is stylistically different being a bastioned square rather than a series of connected rectangles and lines. It recalls plates from John James' *Theory and Practice of Gardening*, 1712 (e.g. plates 1 and 4) and is related to another Scottish garden, Newliston. Dr. A.A. Tait has assembled evidence of a circumstantial case that Adam designed the grounds at Arniston and a far less convincing case, at least as far as the grounds are concerned, that Sir John Clerk's "Country Seat" supplied the theoretical framework. In the absence of supporting documentation and the equivocal nature of Adam's plan it is not possible to positively ascribe Ar Mastery to him, but he would appear the most likely candidate.

The house was placed in the middle of the north side of the square of the garden and a parterre, rather wider than the south front, connects the house to the garden's centre a round basin and jet. The two halves of the square are laid out in two stars with some of the resulting quarters close wooded while others are, presumably, shrubberies. Serpentine walks run through the outer quarters. Tree lined walks enclose the square and meet at small rounds at the corners. Again, it is not clear whether there was a terrace walk in this position, such would appear indicated, but
in the survey of 1753, no such feature is shown.

The principal walk parallel to the south front was extended westward to a wilderness outside, but contiguous to, the square. This had a star with an oval centre and serpentine walks through the wooded quarters. South of the gardens, and separated from them by a declivity through which a tributary of the River Esk runs, was a cascade emptying into a basin. It was lined with trees but was otherwise outside the system of the gardens, and its hour's play would doubtless have been watched from the end of the garden, or one of the first floor rooms.

Two great avenues are shown extending northwards and eastwards and both have rounds of the same design as Mar's projected extension to Alloa. According to the later survey neither of these rounds was planted, though the eastern avenue was. The northern avenue was to have Arthur's Seat as its termination.

Adam's work for the Duke of Hamilton and Brandon (1702-1743) was extensive and lasted from 1727 to 1742 "a good part of each year". It included a design for a new front to Hamilton Palace, Lanarkshire, and the great Kennels (known today by its subsequent name Chatelherault) and garden works.

The Kennels were built directly south of the house in Edward's avenue and terminated the view. They were formally related to the house and meant to, in a sense, mirror it. The garden works included
a Canal, also referred to as "ye great Piece of Water"\textsuperscript{108} and there were plans by Adam "of the gardens of Hamilton in different shapes".\textsuperscript{109}

To the south of the Kennels the land sloped steeply to the River Avon, which here bisected Edward's avenue. These slopes are partly wooded on the plan of 1708 but whether more plantations were added in the early 1730's is unclear. Picturesque travellers later in the century seized on this area as the capital beauty of Hamilton. There was also a bowling green and associated with it a temple, apparently between the Kennels and the house in the avenue.

Like Hopetoun the previous composition and structure of Hamilton is unchanged, but here the additions made by Adam fundamentally altered the character of the layout. Instead of a great avenue proceeding to seeming infinity, there is a long, relatively narrow (even so it was some 300 feet wide) space stopped at each end by similar buildings and the area between furnished as a garden.

Charles Bridgeman was involved indirectly in the Chatelherault project. Lord Selkirk, the Duke of Hamilton's uncle, had asked Bridgeman to recommend a gardener for Hamilton "and he has promised to lett me know if there be any whom he could recommend to you".\textsuperscript{110} When Selkirk showed Bridgeman the design he was rather sharp and said "he was really surprised to see it and did not think there was any body in that part of the world could draw so well".\textsuperscript{111}

Adam's commercial interests and his offices allowed him to buy
his own estate, beginning in 1731 with Blair Crumbeth, Fife, to which he added throughout the remainder of his life and renamed Blair Adam. The estate plan of c 1750 in Register House presumably records Adam's own design and plantations. There are no gardens as such but the house, estate and projected town are composed as an architectural setting. A field of avenue proportions connects the square of the village to the front of the house. The shelter belts enclosing this field diverge slightly before being curved inwards to a shorter avenue which leads to a "forecourt" of Hopetoun proportion. From the court eight subsidiary avenues run through woodland or form avenues of entrance. The forecourt itself is defined by a belt of trees, curving at both ends, and diverging slightly from the house. To the rear, or garden side, an apse the width of the house is cut into a broad rectangular wood; otherwise no planting is shown on this side. By using his shelter belts and woodlands to achieve architectural forms Adam created an effective and cheap grand setting for his house.

Sir John Clerk of Pennicuik (1676-1755) was a central figure in Scottish architecture and taste in the second quarter of the 18th century and his contribution is well known. He built Mavisbank with William Adam, and made an architectural tour to England with him: he knew Lords Pembroke, Burlington and Hertford and sometimes acted as agent for the Duke of Queensberry. He planted from about 1700, first at Pennicuik House, Midlothian, to a plan prepared by William Adair in the 1690's, then at Cammo, near Edinburgh,
Mavisbank, and finally at Pennicuik again after he succeeded in 1722.

Mavisbank has been mentioned in connection with Boutcher, and unfortunately very little is known of Camo, though the work there may have included a cascade. The real interest of Clerk's efforts at garden design lie at Pennicuik in the 1730's and 40's. Clerk knew some of the more advanced garden designs of England, notably Studley Royal, Yorkshire which he had seen in 1727 and Corby Castle, near Carlisle, fully described to him by the owner in 1733. He had met Lord Burlington and had seen Chiswick, and in 1728 Clerk had bought a copy of Ichnographia Rustica. And despite certain strangely old fashioned remarks Clerk's manuscript poem "The Country Seat" anticipates some of the achievements of the Ferme Ornée of the 1730's and 40's.

"Let us here and there be seen some little Hills
Fit Pasture for your harmless bleating Flocks
Let all the Fields in view be chequered round
With floury meadows Groves and plenteous Springs
Or Rivulets descending from the higher Grounds"

Clerk's poem was essentially a private exercise and contained very little that was not generally accepted, being an amalgam of "The Choice" and classical and renaissance precepts with a decidedly architectural bias.

But to know Clerk's thoughts on design, his love of retirement (tempered by his official duties as Baron of the Exchequer) his interest in architecture and classical antiquity, and later British
antiquity, and his (relative to the Hopes) narrow fortune, allows an understanding of his remarkable achievement at Pennicuik.

He improved Pennicuik house and grounds by stages, and his conception seems to have grown likewise in easy and not necessarily connected, stages. After Navisbank Clerk seems particularly insensitive to architectural composition in his grounds, and were it not for his loose composition, the effect would have been decidedly late 17th century. Most of his forms were typical - avenues with suitable terminations, parterres, walled gardens etc., but his seemingly careless disposition of them in the varied landscape of Midlothian made what was very close to a landscape garden.

In an undated letter to Herman Boerheave (1668-1738) Clerk said of his gardens at Penicuik that they were "rather rustic than cultivated, according to modern elegance, and pleasant rather than sumptuous". The reason for this character may have been partly economic.

"I have always thought that my salary as a Baron of the Exchequer was publick money and a gratification I owed to my Country, and therefore I laid out the whole of it and some more of my private patrimony for the Improvement of my country".

But this does not fully explain his motives, any more than relative poverty accounts for Shenstone's The Leasowes, Shropshire of the 1740's.

One of the most interesting, and most forward looking, elements of Pennicuik is the Cave of Hurley scheme completed in 1742. This
is some distance south of Pennicuik House and was not connected to it in any architectural way. The River Esk flows along the southern edge of the broad valley below Pennicuik House. Immediately south of the river the land rises sharply to ridge on the southern side of which was a sort of amphitheatre or bowl of land. In about 1740 or 41 Clerk here made the Hurley Pond and stocked it from Corby. The entrance to the pond was necessarily indirect and presumably the impetus for the cave was for more direct access. The cave was entered from the valley across the Esk at a particularly turbulent spot. It ran from this point, slightly upwards, through the hill to Hurley Pond. It is clear that here, and presumably elsewhere at Pennicuik, Clerk was relying on association and contrast of ideas and sensations to give his garden structure and not on architectural composition. This method was later organized into a theory of garden design by Clerk's younger contemporary and colleague Henry Home, Lord Kames (1696-1782).  

What the Hurley scheme meant to Clerk can be seen in his description of it,

"Nor can I omit another fish-pond, or lesser lake, noteworthy for its position and solitude, which a poet only could describe. It is surrounded by hills and steep rocks, and no one can get access to it but by the mouth of a frightful cave. To those who enter, therefore, first occurs the memory of the cave of the Cumaen Sibyl, for the ruinous aperture, blocked up with stones and briars, strikes the eye. Then there comes upon the wayfarers a shudder, as they stand in doubt whether they are among the living or the dead. As, indeed, certain discords set off and give finish to musical cadences in such a way as to render the subsequent harmony more grateful to the ear, so does the form of this mournful cave, with its long and shady path followed by the light and prospect, make the exit more delightful. For suddenly the
"darkness disappears, and as it were at the creation of a new world." 127

In order to "civilize the prospect" to the south from Hurley Pond, Clerk built two small houses and planted a garden around each. In 1747 he planted young oaks nearby at "Clermont" Hill and in 1749 he finished a summer house at Hurley in order to

"entice my friends and others about my house to walk for their diversion, and in this I myself have found great advantage. The natural beauty of the place, and the solitude which one finds here, are a great help to studies and meditation." 128

And later, following Seneca's advice for a remedy to age, Clerk walked every day; "My constant walk is to my pond of Hurley and grotto, where I take great delight." 129

But what of the other gardens attributed to the English garden designers or specifically to Switzer - Dundas Castle, Barnton, Saughton Hall, Gogar, Craigie-Hall, New Liston, Dalkeith, and Floors, or the gardens of his known clients or subscribers.

According to Roy's Military Survey any improvements and plantations at Dundas Castle near Hopetoun were carried out after 1755. There was an avenue running south from the castle, a parterre, and north of this looking towards the Forth what might be a large semi-circular slope or glacis but on present meagre evidence London would seem mistaken in his dating. Likewise Gogar House, Midlothian which from an estate plan of 1839 130 seems to have had an 18th century garden consisting of parterre and square wood within a
rectangular framework. Gogar Durn which runs near the house might have been part of a more extensive layout, as would have been the piers and wrought iron gates from the west lodge of Caroline Park, Midlothian, moved to Gogar presumably after the death of the Duke of Argyll and Greenwich in 1743. Saughton Hall and gardens stood in a bend of the Water of Leith and included a parterre and walled garden overlooking the haugh to the south which was bounded by the river. The last of this group of villas to the west of Edinburgh is Barnton owned from 1693 by Lord John Hamilton, Earl of Ruglen and later by John Campbell (1696-1732) Lord Glenorchy, who succeeded as Earl of Breadalbane in 1752. A quadruple avenue lead from the Edinburgh-Queensferry Road to the house diverging as it did so. To the west of the house was a large parterre surrounded by a wood. A smaller parterre to the east and a roughly rectangular lawn to the north complete the garden work. The rest of the small estate was divided into rectangular fields by shelter belts. According to Macky there were "very many pretty little seats" in this area and it is unfortunate that they have disappeared, apparently without trace.

Craigiehall, the seat of the Marquess of Annandale, is in this area but it has survived, though no contemporary designs or surveys are known to exist.

"It's Kinross House in Miniature, and would be a fine Seat, if it was not so near to Hopton; as Maythrop in Oxfordshire, if it were not so near Blenheim. There is a vast deal of regular planting round it, with very good Gardens."
The house, and very likely the gardens, were by Bruce for William Johnstone, 1st Marquiss of Annandale. Of these gardens only the north avenue survives. His daughter married the Earl of Hopetoun in 1699, and his son James (1688-1730) spent much time abroad and became an artistic advisor to John Hope, 2nd Earl of Hopetoun (1704-81) and left him his large collection of pictures. Annandale’s taste was modern Italian, and this extended to garden design. Whether Annandale intended extending the gardens at Craigiehall or remodeling them after a new fashion during the ten years he held it is uncertain, but he seems to have been fully engaged in advising the Hopes about Hopetoun, collecting pictures and tending his health.

At his death the titles and pictures went to John Hope but Craigiehall was left to the second son of the 1st Lord Hopetoun, Charles (1709-1791) who took the surname Weir. In 1744 Hope Weir added the lands east of the River Almond to Craigie Hall.

"A considerable part of this barony, especially along the river, is low meadow ground... (but) Near Craigiehall, the channel of the river becomes rocky and contracted, with high and well wooded banks... Here the Almond forms a cascade of about six feet in perpendicular height".

If adding this rustic and picturesque scene was Hope Weir’s object in acquiring the opposite bank, he apparently did not begin operations until after he had returned from a trip to Italy. He built a bridge in 1757 "executed in the rustic stile, and the spring of the arch concealed by the wood... this bridge has the appearance of a natural rock perforated".
The slopes were laid out in walks, and on the east side a deer park was overlooked by a broad terrace walk and the Belvidere, a three storey oval building furnished with Hope Weir's Italian antiques. There were also British antiquities at Chapelknow, a sixteenth century dovecot, a bath house, and an island containing a lead Venus di Medici.

John Dalrymple, 2nd Earl of Stair (1673-1747) may have begun the gardens of Newliston, West Lothian, as early as 1723 but they were in progress in 1728 when Lord Peterborough told the Queen that Stair was using "his dragoons and his cavalry to build a house and make gardens".145

A plan at Newliston, dated 1759, probably records work begun in the 1720's.146 This shows an irregular square garden completely encircled by a terrace walk. The centre of the scheme is a half oval basin and a lawn of the same shape completing the figure. South of this is a bowling green (taking the place of the parterre) and the house. In front of the house is a lawn given shape by the horseshoe terrace walk which encloses it. A canal runs east to west through the half oval basin and south of this, but not parallel, is the broad walk "being a view to Craigie Hall". Various slant lines, some sited on the north front of the house, further subdivide the enclosure. The resulting quarters are planted with trees and shrubs and are cut into various walks and cabinets. The largest area is an irregular park just north of the central basin but within the garden. If it be accepted that this feature dates from the 1720's147
then it is contemporary with Bridgeman's irregularly shaped Home Park similarly enclosed, at Stowe.

No author is known for this design. Besides Switzer, Adam has been suggested and in general disposition Newliston is not dissimilar to Armiston. The treatment of the canal and basin is similar to Doutcher's Airth 1721 and Newlands 1733, and indeed to the one recorded by Adam at Craigston, also 1733. And for general composition - house, parterre, canal with central basin, woods, all enclosed by a walk, it is very like plate 1 in John James' Theory and Practice of Gardening. Stair was Ambassador at Paris from 1715 to 1720, and before that he had been in Williams' or Marlborough's campaigns since leaving the University, so it might be expected that his ideas of gardens should have been formed abroad.

But whether Stair or his designer took a plate from James as a parti the design departs from it significantly. Composition by lines is used here again, but within a rather geometric framework there is a general carelessness about the relation of the various parts - the house stands in a formal, but vague series of lawns, the two main east-west lines slightly, but obviously, out of parallel, a wood on the east side of the "parterre" is balanced by a lawn on the other, and the ends of the diagonal lines are curiously indeterminate.

The formality of Newliston may derive as much from circumstances (that it is a secondary house, the holding is not extensive, and the
land is generally flat) as from French practice. Certainly at Castle Kennedy, Wigtownshire, the irregular features of Newliston are carried a great deal further. According to Stair's anonymous 18th century biographer, after his retirement from court and government he exclusively "applied himself to Agriculture, which he understood to such a Degree, that he might be called the Virgil of the Age".

He was one of the leading improvers, to which society "The Earl of Stair has shown noble Examples, both in Lothian and Galloway. His Lordship, besides his Improvements by Lucern and St. Foin, uncommon Guests in our Climate and Soil, his Turnip, Cabbage and Carrot Husbandry by the Plough... has set up a Manufacture of fine Linen, made of Flax raised on his Farm, and dressed at his Mill... He has shewn that the Galloway Hills, in his Management, can raise better Cattle than ever the Lothians of Fife commonly do."

Stair's interest in improvement, of course included his pleasure gardens, in which he took "vast delight". His gardens at Castle Kennedy were made on a isthmus between the White and Black Lochs. The lands to the north, east and south were in cultivation, and to the west were deer parks and two further, smaller lochs, Loch Nagrelie and Soulseat Loch. The boundary and shape of the garden was determined by the choice of situation but there was no attempt to render the area more agreeable to a preconceived form. Rather the curves of the isthmus seem to have been humoured and made, within their own terms, more regular. Castle Kennedy was no landscape garden; in the lower section of the isthmus a rectangular area was made with the Castle at its centre. This contained the parterre, fore court, and lawns and divided the gardens into two wooded parts.
Unfortunately no contemporary design or survey survives but the plans of the works done in the 1840's show various parts of the gardens in detail. J.C. Loudon was at Castle Kennedy in 1842 and may have provided the new planting schemes. There is some evidence of pastiche 18th century design notably in the pinetum laid de novo on what was apparently a lawn where a terrace was "to be cut into turf steps" and a new shrubbery planted in/ of the wooded quarters north of the castle containing a mid 19th century flower garden. But the general design and earth works appear to belong to the 2nd quarter of the 18th century.

Entrance to the gardens and castle was from the south, across a canal connecting the two lochs, into a terraced goose foot and from here there was an irregular approach through a wooded quarter to the castle. West of the Castle was a plain parterre and short avenue to the White Loch while to the east a formal lawn led to the narrowest part of the isthmus and a large circular basin. From the basin various terrace walks ran to all parts of the garden. To the north-east a broad terrace, edged with slopes, glacis and non-objective terraces, overlooked both Lochs and to the west another lawn or park (the site of the 19th century). Northwards beyond this terrace a series of walks led to the Culcaldie Plantation and overlooked the Inch Parks. On the Black Loch side were two amphitheatres, the southern irregular and the northern more naturalistic.

South of the central basin and at the end of the eastern lawn was a Claremont like amphitheatre overlooking the Black Loch, and south
of this a terrace walk along the Black Loch and canal to the entrance. A similar walk ran westwards from the basin along the edge of the White Loch. The various wooded quarters contained cabinets and secondary walks.

Castle Kennedy is very probably unique, though it has some of the qualities of Studley Royal, Yorkshire - irregular composition of water, turf banks and woods, it is both more extensive and more contained. It may be that the irregular elements of Newliston are owing to Stair and are grafted onto a design of perhaps Boucher or Adam whereas at Castle Kennedy he used his own imagination entirely and to the 200 workmen¹⁵⁹ to create the gardens. The mock fortification would be expected of an early 18th century general in such circumstances as would the fantastic shapes based ultimately on field fortification. But whoever the author was Castle Kennedy is one of the most interesting designs of the period.

Dalkeith Palace, Midlothian, is the last of the gardens said by Loudon to be in Switzer’s style. James Smith had begun remodeling the old house at Dalkeith in 1701 for Anna Scot (1651-1732) Duchess of Buccleuch. The grounds of Dalkeith were surveyed in 1718¹⁶⁰ and show the house at the north end of an avenue (with seven rows of trees per side) overlooking the North Esk River. The park is east of this bounded by the North Esk and South Esk rivers. A large square kitchen garden was just east of the avenue and between this and the house, presumably contemporary with the old house, was a smaller walled garden.¹⁶¹ According to Macky in 1723
"...round the Palace a terrace, which on the North, where the Front of the Palace is 120 Foot wide, over-looks a Precipice to the River, as at Windsor. On the East side there is a natural Amphitheatre; in the Bottom of which are to be Water-works, and a flower garden, and round the Sides green Slopes, and Evergreens."*162

These works do not appear on a survey, perhaps by William Adam 163 when he built a gardener's cottage with a doric alcove and a bridge over the South Esk in the park.164 This survey does show "The Wilderness" in the area occupied by the kitchen garden in 1718. This is a star radiating from a circular centre, with a secondary concentric walk and a secondary centre to the south. The avenue has become a great ramp with the slopes reaching nearly to the fore-court. Hacky had mentioned that this was "to be" and it was apparently the greatest undertaking at Dalkeith.

"For a long time they have been cutting a Vista just before ye house, which when completely finished, at best ye View will be only on corn-grounds rising at some distance."165

The amphitheatre and water works are not mentioned, only that "Water and Wood may be seen from ye sides of ye house"166 and from Lady Oxford's remark in 1745 that there were "no gardens but for use"167 it would appear that this scheme was not carried out.

Floors, Roxburghshire was said by Loudon to be "a miserable house, in one of the finest situations in Scotland".168 The house has been attributed to Vanbrugh.169 William Adam was at Floors in 1723 and 1724170 when the garden also seems to have been laid out, probably as Vanbrugh's contractor.171 He prepared a
plate, presumably his own design, of the house, for *Vitruvius Scoticus* which would probably answer Loudon's description but from the plan, the house that appears on the 1736 survey could also be Vanbrugh's. The gardens recall Switzer in their structure; a spine of woodland roughly following the course of the Tweed connects the terrace walk of the south front of the house to all parts of the home farm and is cut into walks and cabinets (the termination of walks by antique buildings or ruins is used but this is a Scottish habit quite independent of Switzer). The forms do not recall Switzer however. The wood north of the house has zig-zag walks never known to have been used by him. He is more likely to have used different walks and openings in the spine wood and not to have adhered to the field structure to this extent, and would not have put the wood on the north side of the house. And the absolutely plain "parterre" bounded by what appear to be hedges would be uncharacteristic.

The Drum, Midlothian, also by William Adam, would appear the likeliest candidate as evidence of Switzer's work in Scotland. It was built for Lord and Lady Somerville who remained at Spy Park, Wiltshire, while the new house was building. That they should have chosen Switzer who was then finishing his works at Spy would not be surprizing. Yet there is no evidence that they did so. A late survey, of c 1800, shows very little in the way of garden works, only an avenue, and a star plantation of axis behind the house, nor is Roy's *Survey of Scotland* helpful in this case. The grounds were not extensive enough to be intelligible at so small a scale.
A final source of connection between Scotland and Switzer are the Scottish subscribers to his *Practical Husbandman and Planter* of 1733 and 1734. These were Brodie, Lords Crawford, Carmichael and Glenorchy, and Thomas Fletcher.

Of these only Lord Glenorchy is thought to have laid out a garden during Switzer's lifetime, and that was at Sugnall, Staffordshire. The principal house of the earldom was Taymouth, Perthshire, where gardens had been made before 1720, in a semi-circular bend in the River Tay just east of Loch Tay. On the south side were a long series of grass parterres on axis and a kitchen garden, on the west a figured square parterre, on the east a double court, and in the north four small parks separated by avenues and along the riverside a semi-circular avenue. The north-south axis was defined by a triple avenue. On the diagonals were avenues of platoons. Lord Breadalbane consulted his brother about Scottish manufacturers but apparently not about further improvements at Taymouth nor does Lord Glenorchy appear to have done any works at Darnton in the 1740's.

It would appear that Loudon's account of garden design in Scotland in the early 18th century is incorrect in every particular. This is especially strange since he grew up and was trained in gardening in Edinburgh at the end of the century. And yet he mentioned none of the professional or amateur designers nor some of the great designs such as Alloa or Castle Kennedy. There are perhaps reasons for this apparent failure. He had in mind what he called "the ancient
style" and having thus disposed of all that was not modern he did not look too closely at it. This unfortunate attitude is observable in writers from about 1750 onwards. He apparently assumed a cultural backwardness in Scotland so that any remarkable piece of garden design would, necessarily, be the work of an Englishman or a Frenchman.

But whatever the value of Loudon's evidence in this case, or the reasons which might account for it there is no direct evidence that Switzer laid out gardens in Scotland and quite a lot of circumstantial evidence to suggest that he did not.

The question of any influence Switzer may have exerted on garden design in Scotland is necessarily a more speculative and less surely verifiable one. Until the Union of Parliaments in 1707 the development of garden design in England and Scotland was more or less independent, using similar forms and compositions but also reflecting local characteristics and drawing inspiration from more developed systems of garden design without reference to each other. After 1707 this distinction would become progressively more confused until, as with Boutcher's Graing design of 1733 or Clerk's Hurley Cave scheme of 1742, elements and attitudes are effectively the same. Such influence as Switzer may have exerted could have been transmitted in two ways; primarily, through his books, especially Ichnographia Rustica, and secondly through personal contacts, either with Switzer himself or gardens laid out by him or with gardens made by others, or notions transmitted by others which he can be shown to have
initiated.

Lord Haddington said that he had "read all the books I could lay my hands on that are in English on the subject of planting (and they are not a few in number)" but the only ones he specifically mentions are Evelyn's and Cook's. He does not mention Reid but he would have been included in the

"Many have written since, but the most part have only been transcribes from these two, even to setting down their errors, and have added many more of their own."

It is likely that Haddington's view was not peculiar to himself. But his is writing of practical guides to planting which touch on design only tangentially if at all. The first book to deal with garden design in a systematic way in English was John James' Theory and Practice of Gardening of 1712. This was dedicated to James Johnston, sometime Scottish Secretary, and the subscribers from Scotland were numerous, including Lord Haddington. Its circulation among those who could lay out gardens would have been extensive, both in England and Scotland.

There is not the same evidence for the circulation of Ichnographia Rustica. It is known that it was in two libraries of a quite different kind in the late 1720's, the small Borders estate of a retired London mercer and in what was in large part hub of Scottish architecture and garden design, the library of Sir John Clerk. This is a painfully small sample but as Ichnographia Rustica ran to two full editions as against three for Theory and Practice it is not unreasonable
to assume, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that the extent of their circulation in Scotland was also of this ratio. Of the Scottish garden designers Bruce, Edward, Mar and Haddington were too early to have met Switzer when he was a mature designer. Blenheim and Castle Howard were going on, both too late for Edward's visit to England in 1701; the aging Bruce is not known to have travelled to England in this period and Mar's designs for Alloa and the villa at Twickenham do not seem to owe anything to these gardens.

Unfortunately we do not know whether Dutcher came south, though his slopes and basins at Airth and the Grange are very like those of Switzer or Bridgeman. In 1727 Lord Stair invited William Adam, "to go with him to London where he had never been that he might have an opportunity of being introduced to many people of genius and taste and of seeing various buildings both public and private". Adam joined Sir John Clerk of Pennicuik at Stamford. They were not admitted to Burghley though both would doubtless have noticed the great avenue, curving into a semi-circle at the north front. They went to Wimpole, Cambridgeshire where the Bridgeman gardens were dismissed for there being, "no water or water-works here only some fish ponds". It is not clear whether Adam and Clerk parted company in London but as the invitation to Sir Gregory Page's Wrinklemarsh in Greenwich was from Adam's H.P. perhaps they went together. If so, both would have seen the gardens at Wanstead the next day. "...The gardens are very well kept and very large, many
ponds and canals but no jets or cascades".  

Clerk obviously had no conception of the difficulty of having any water at all at Wanstead. He went without Adam to Wilton, whose gardens he did not remark upon but there is grudging praise for Switzer's Caversham, Oxfordshire. The gardens were

"well enough laid out in some parts and the canals are pretty but the ornaments very bad. Amongst other things of this kind his Lordship at vast expense brought several large marble statues from Holland. There are several Goddesses but of such a clumsy make as one may see they were made in a country where women are valued by the pound of arse."

Burlington's garden at Chiswick fared little better

"The gardens are very well disposed, but the planting approaches too near the house... The ends of every walk are adorned with some piece or other of architecture as a temple, Summer-house, pillar or obelisk. All these things stand advantageously as possible considering the ground, but the whole situation of this villa is low and without any prospect."

On his way back to Edinburgh, presumably without Adam, Clerk called on Switzer's friend Dr. Stukeley at Grantham. Castle Howard he condemned, "it must displease any body of taste", but not Wray Wood

"The finest thing here is the wood which is cut into a great variety of walks and coolnesses; the trees in this wood, being mostly beeches, are very large. I never saw any so fine in my life."

Clerk's remarks on gardens in 1727 show a quite different attitude from that of the 1730's and 1740's. The difference between fascin-
ation with jets and cascades and architectural terminations to walks and the loosely structured and associational Pennicuik is considerable. His copy of *Ichnographia Rustica* may account, in part, for this difference: his method of design, its cost relative to his estate, his love of retirement and simplicity, his lack of concern for formal composition, and his use of associations of ideas in laying out Hurley Cave and Pond are all in Switzer. It is true that he loved retirement, the Roman virtues, architecture and antiquities and had an open and enquiring mind before the late 1720's, but it would seem that it was a combination of these qualities and Switzer's theory that made Pennicuik.

Considering their joint interest in agricultural improvement, the beneficial effects of growing St. Foin and lucerne to the soil, and field fortification forms in garden design Lord Stair ought at least to have been influenced by Switzer at Castle Kennedy, had he not actually employed him to design it. Unfortunately there is no known evidence for such a supposition. Opportunities for a meeting between c 1726 and 1733 would have been many, and after 1728 there would have been reason outwith the client-designer relationship, but until more is known of Stair's character and taste and his specific works, Castle Kennedy must be considered a prodigy, conceived without professional assistance.

Similarly a connection might in time be established between Switzer and the gardens of his fellow improvers, notably James Murray (1690-1764) 2nd Duke of Atholl who laid out extensive and irregular
gardens at Blair Atholl, Perthshire in the early 1730's, or Archibald Campbell (1682-1761) Earl of Islay who laid out The Whim, Peebleshire from 1730. And there are gardens which have some characteristics of Switzer's work laid out, as yet anonymously, for landowners who were not members of the Society of Improvers, such as Eglinton, Ayrshire for Alexander Montgomerie (1660-1729) 9th Earl of Eglinton, but on present evidence even Switzer's influence in Scotland was apparently limited.

But if Switzer could influence the development of garden design in Scotland, so might developments there have an influence on him, notably clump plantation, known in Scotland from the 1630's, but in England only in latter part of the first decade of the following century or serpentine walks, used at Tyningham in 1708, or arable land and garden combined as in William Adair's design for Pennicuik in the 1690's. There is no evidence that Switzer knew of these developments, though his nameless Aberdonian acquaintance might have told him so before 1715. After his theory had been established the influence would more likely have been the other way. Bridgeman, whose friend and patron's son visited Perthshire several times might have been told of developments in Scottish garden design but to judge from his remarks to Lord Selkirk quoted above he too was ignorant of them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes: List of abbreviated references.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cythisus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stephen Switzer), <em>The Practical Husbandman and Planter</em>, 2 volumes, 1733-1734.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Darrington</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colvin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green, Blenheim</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green, Gardener</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Green, <em>Gardener to Queen Anne</em>, 1956.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMC Carlisle VI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hussey, Gardens</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Langley</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loudon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. FG (1731), p. 204.

2. IR, I, p. 66.

3. I am grateful to the Rev. C. H. Gibson, East Stratton, Winchester for providing me with extracts from the parish registers.

4. See Appendix 2, Note on the name Switzer.

5. See Appendix 3, Switzer family property.

6. It has not been possible to establish the holdings of Thomas Switzer, Senior, Stephen Switzer's father, as the Southampton estates papers are incomplete for the 17th century. At Lady Rachael Russell's death in 1730 they passed to the Dukes of Bedford and from a survey of that year it appears that Thomas Switzer, Junior, Switzer's elder brother, then held a copyhold farm at East Stratton of some 50 acres. Except for a small bequest to Stephen Switzer, Thomas Junior inherited all their father's property. It is assumed that the house and farm at East Stratton were part of this legacy (see Appendix 3, and Appendix 4, Will of Thomas Switzer, senior).

7. IR, I, p. x.

8. I am grateful to Mr. Peter Gwynn, Archivist, Winchester College for this information. The only member of the family to attend Winchester appears to have been Henry Switzer, a chorister from 1838 to 1842.


10. Lord William and Lady Rachael Russell's son Wriothesley (1680-1711) was heir to the Bedford titles and estates. It would not have been altogether unlikely for him and Switzer to have been childhood companions or even to have shared John Thornton's puritan instruction. But Wriothesley Russell appears to have received his education mainly at Woburn and Bloomsbury (G. S. Thomson Life in a Noble Household, 1937, p. 387 et seq.). Switzer's remarks on the execution of Lord William Russell and "the loss I have sustained in so great a friend" (IR, I, p. 66) further diminishes such a possibility.

11. No books are mentioned in the father's will.


14. Switzer's own evidence for the date of his becoming a gardener is contradictory. In 1727 he wrote that he had been "24 or 25 years a practitioner in gardening" KG, p.7, that is 1702 or 1703, but in Cythisus, p.16 it was "this 30 years past" or 1701. He worked under George London at St. James' Park before 1702 (KG, p.279; IR, pp 80-81). He was drawing wages in 1705 (Green, Blenheim, Appendix XV, 321). If this be so his seven years apprenticeship would have begun in, at latest, 1698. As he laid out the gravel pit amphitheatre (see below (Kensington Gardens) in 1704 (IR, I, p.83) his apprenticeship could conceivably have been as early as 1697. The years 1697/8 - 1704/5, except for the St. James' work, are not otherwise accounted for.

15. There are two possibilities, the suggestive but unproved connection between Thomas Wise (c 1613-1635) and Stephen Switzer (fl. 1664), masons (who were partners in Greenwich in 1664, Colvin, pp 687-688 quoting D. Knoop and G.P. Jones The London Mason in the Seventeenth Century, 1935, pp 35-36, 39 & 49) and Henry Wise (1653-1733) and our Stephen Switzer. Some circumstances make this something less than farfetched. Stephen and Thomas are favourite names in Switzer's own family through at least three generations, and the liklihood that Switzer's father and the masons were brothers thereby increases. The circumstances of Henry Wise's birth in 1653 is unclear (Green, Gardener, p.5). Henry Wise's grandfather, Richard Wise (1586-1698) is named, but his father (ibid., x, Appendix 1, p.207) is unknown. So it is conceivable that Henry Wise and Stephen Switzer were introduced to Brompton Park by near relations. The other possibility is that he came to Brompton Park through the good offices of Lady Rachael Russell and her father-in-law the Duke of Bedford whose own gardener John Field (d 1687) was one of the original partners.

16. He would have probably been apprenticed at an earlier age in that case.


18. IR, I, p.79.


20. IR, I, p.78.

21. IR, I, p.x.

22. KG, p.279.
23. Opinion varies somewhat as to the dating of Wray Wood. Christopher Hussey Gardens, p.125 leans towards a date more or less contemporary with Switzer's account in 1718 (IR, II, p.198 et seq. and IR, III, p.100 et seq.) but it appears also in 1715 (IR, I, pp 38 & 87). Such a date is surely much too late. The unique characteristics of the design for Wray Wood was that it was not designed, but was accepted as an ornament in its own right. This necessarily suggests a date contemporary with the original layout of the gardens as a whole, c 1699-1700. The furnishing of the wood with fountains, grots, cabinets etc., probably continued for some years. It was "finished" in 1732: See below, Castle Howard.


26. IR, I, p.83; noted by Addison as the "Passage of the heroic poets of gardening to commend", Spectator 477, IV, pp 188-192.

27. ibid.


29. IR, I, p.xxxviii.

30. IR, II, p.198.

31. IR, I, p.83.


33. ibid., p.321.

34. KG, p.156.

35. FG, p.62.

36. IR, I, p.220.

37. Hydr., p.120 & 10.


39. Travers to Boulter, British Museum, Add MS 19608 - see Appendix 5, testimonial.

40. Green, Gardener, p.113.
41. ibid., p.113 & Green Blenheim, p.319. Mr. Green suggested that Switzer hoped to succeed Boutler and that this was the purpose of his visit to Travers in London, but as Travers wrote to Bouler about the visit Wise's decision to replace Switzer must have been taken before Bouler's death.


43. Travers to Bouler, loc. cit.

44. Green Gardener, p.114.

45. IR, I, p.34.

46. That by "Steven" Vanbrugh meant Stephen Switzer is more than likely. According to David Green Blenheim, pp 319-321, no other person of that name was employed at Blenheim.

47. Green Gardener, p.113.

48. IR, II, p.144.

49. See below, Blenheim.

50. IR, I, p.317.

51. See Vanbrugh, Complete Works, vol. IV, pp 29-30 "Reasons Offer'd for Preserving some Part of the Old Manor" 11 June 1709: the possibility that Vanbrugh's interest in the manor may have come from Switzer or that they arrived at an appreciation of ruins jointly ought not to be ruled out altogether.

52. As draughtsman of a large plan of Blenheim, Green Blenheim, p.68.


54. Green Blenheim, p.117: the bridge earthwork, and the canals were not completed until the 1720's, under the direction of Col. John Armstrong, Hussey Gardens, p.24 n.2.

55. FG, (1731) p.183.

56. Green Blenheim, p.321 gives Bridgeman's return as the 1730's.


59. IR, II, p.52 et seq. Specimen Measuring Book "Sept. 14, 1714 The measurement of several works done...for the Right Honourable the B____ of _______ at Belleau in Com. Linc."

60. See below, Grinsthorpe.

61. See Appendix 5, letter 1.


63. 1723 is the date given by Whistler Imagination, pl.131.

64. KG, dedication "A2" and verso.

65. See below, Cirencester.

66. But Christopher Hussey, Gardens, p.79 suggests that it was improved during the period 1705 to 1712 quoting W.H. Ward and H.S. Black History of Iver, 1933; see below, Riskins.

67. When Switzer's plan based upon/was to have appeared, see KG, pp 421-424. It finally appeared in 1742 in the Appendix to Ichnographia Rustica, IR, III (1742), Appendix pp 3-11 and plate 39.

68. Switzer's terme La Ferme Ornéé, ibid.

69. Berkshire Record Office, Reading, Articles of Agreement between the Earl of Cadogan and Stephen Switzer, 21 April 1718; see Appendix 6.


71. ibid., pp 96-97.

72. National Record of Archives 1178: De Ros MSS. Lord Molesworth wrote to Lord Coningsby in 1719 about a proposed visit of Switzer about the gardens at Breckdenstown near Dublin, mentioning also complications involving Lord Cadogan. I am grateful to Dr. Peter Willis and Mr. T. Hudson for this reference.

73. KG, p.241, Kidney beans "I some years ago procur'd from Holland, and are now to be had in many places, particularly at a place to which I first sent them, I mean the Lord Coningsby's at Hampton Court in Herefordshire."
74. **Hydro**, pp 10, 102 & 103.

75. See below, Wilton I and Wilton II.

76. **Vit. Brit.**, 3, pp 7 & 47.

77. *ibid.*, pp 140-146.

78. At South Dalton, near Beverley, Yorkshire. They are reproduced in Hussey Gardens, plates 60, 62, 63 & 64.


81. Henry Hoare I, Personal Account Book. There are various non-consecutive entries on unnumbered pages. I am very grateful to Mr. R.W. Winder, archivist at Hoare's Bank, 37 Fleet Street, London for kindly pointing out this reference.


83. *ibid.*, pp 21-23.

84. See below, Stourhead, and for Mr. Woodbridge's account of this period see *ibid.*, pp 22-37.


87. There is a design attributable to Charles Bridgeman for Sacombe. Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Gough Drawings, a4 folio 64.

88. John Fleming, Robert Adam, 1962, p.49: the Drum was built by William Adam who may also have been responsible for the gardens.

89. Switzer to Stukeley, loc. cit.

90. "contriv'd for a Lady of extraordinary merit in Wiltshire on the Road to the Bath", FG, p.508: he identifies the garden as "Spy Park, the ancient Seat of the Baynton's" on page 315.

91. **Hydro**, p.412.
92. ibid., p.80: there is no trace of Switzer's work today.

93. FG, 1724 et al "I have now done my self the honour I long propos'd..." Dedication "1".

94. Hydro, p.31.


96. FG, dedication "2" and verso.

97. The marriage is not recorded in the indexes of the Society of Genealogists, Harrington Gardens, London, S.W. I am grateful to Mr. Richard Jeffree for his advice and assistance in going through the Society's collection. I am grateful too to the vicars and curates of St. Anne's, Bowden Hill, Wiltshire; St. Mary's, Hope-under-Dinmore, Herefordshire; St. Michael's, Malton, Yorkshire; St. James', Spilsby, Lincolnshire; St. Nicholas', Newbury, Berkshire; and St. Mary and St. Nicholas, Wilton, Wiltshire, for checking the records in their charge.

98. See Appendix 7 for a transcription of his account.


100. See Appendix 5, Letters 3 & 4.


102. Method, p.2. And yet there is apparently no record of Switzer's residency (or of his predecessor Mr. Price) in Kennington in the extant uncatalogued records of the Duchy of Cornwall Office, agent for the landlord. The house of Aaron Mitchel, Switzer's neighbour (mentioned in 1727, see Appendix 5, Letter 7, and in Method, (4th edition, 1729) pp 57-60) is listed in a Rental List for 1732 on the north side of Lambeth Dutts. The house next door was empty.

103. Cythisus, p.53.

104. Method, p.17.

105. ibid., "Preface to the first and second editions" p.9: the publishing history of Compendious Method is complex but briefly there appears to have been three editions in 1720, perhaps one in 1727, 2 editions in 1729 and one each in 1731 and 1735. See Bibliography.
106. He first alluded to his health in 1723, Method, p. 8.

107. Charles Bridgeman, even with his Royal appointment, partly because of his commissioning Rigaud to make a record of Stowe, left his family in "dire financial straits" at his death in 1738; Peter Willis "Jacques Rigaud's Drawings of Stowe in the Metropolitan Museum of Art" in Eighteenth Century Studies, Berkeley, 1972, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 93, n. 19.


110. ibid., p. 9.

111. ibid., Preface, p. 5.

112. Cythisus, p. 53.

113. At London's death in 1713 Wise let Drompton Park Nurseries to Joseph Carpenter and William Smith (Green, Gardener, p. 139). They both died in the late 1720's, in Wise's debt (ibid., p. 156) having failed to run the nursery successfully. It ceased to be an artistic force with London's death.

114. IR, III (1742) Appendix, p. 2.

115. ibid., p. 8.

116. d. 1729, Colvin, p. 129.

117. KG, p. 421.

118. IR, III (1742) Appendix, p. 9.

119. Ferme Ornée is not listed in the Oxford English Dictionary nor strangely in E. Littré, Dictionnaire de la Langue Française, Paris, 1878.


121. See below, and Appendix 5, Letters 3, 4 & 5.


123. ibid., p. 30.

125. The anonymous design for Dromoland was published as plate 47 in Irish Architectural Drawings, catalogue of an exhibition in Dublin, Belfast and London, 1965. The design of the irregular lake suggests Bridgeman, while the title "Ichnographia of Dromolan" echoes Switzer's Ichnographia Rustica. Irish garden design, excluded from this thesis, is being studied by Desmond Fitzgerald, Knight of Glyn and Edward Malins.


128. IR, I, p.10.

129. The procuring of stocks for Drompton Park was done by Joseph Carpenter in 1712 (FG, 1731, p.88) and though Switzer may have been sent on a similar mission his own remarks make this doubtful.

130. IR, I, p.11.

131. IR, II, p.136.

132. FG, p.385.

133. KG, pp 240-241, Switzer had "procured" kidney beans from Holland for Hampton Court, Herefordshire.

134. FG, pp 35 & 56

135. ibid., p.36.

136. See Appendix 7, entries for 11 February 1735/6 and 19 July 1736.

137. FG, pp 69-70.


139. Hydro, p.7.

140. Method, p.55.

141. ibid., pp 55-56.

142. IR, I (1742) Proemial essay, p.8, and IR, III (1742) Appendix, p.2.

143. See Appendix 8, Garden Design in Scotland.
144. *Cythisus*, p. 20


147. *KG*, p. 422.

148. George Clarke who is working on the history of Stowe has yet found no evidence of Cobham's work as an improver, apart from the making of the great pleasure gardens. I am grateful to Mr. Clarke for this information.

149. Dawley Park is shown in John Rocque *Topographical Map of Middlesex*, 1754, and Abbs Court appears in his *Topographical Map of Surrey*, 1768. They fell somewhat short of Raskins in their layout.


151. *Cythisus*, title page.


161. There are two full copies of the *Practical Husbandman and Planter* known in Britain (National Library of Scotland, and Royal Agricultural Society of England) and both these contain only six parts. It is conceivable that the other parts were also published but have since disappeared.

165. ibid., p. 4.
166. Switzer to Sisson, 20 December, 1734, Gateshead Public Library, Ellison MSS, bundle C/25; Appendix 5, Letter 30.
168. Cythisus, p. 22.
172. Cythisus was probably written in 1730 (witness p. 15) whereas the "Farther Improvements..." appear to have been written after the appearance of Tull's Horse-Hoewing Husbandry.
173. Cythisus, p. 41.
174. ibid., pp. 41-42.
176. Tull's farm, Prosperous, was on the Berkshire-Wiltshire border.
178. Tull referred to it as a "Specimen", e.g. ibid., p. 421.

184. Appendix 5, Letters 30-32, & 34.

185. IR, I, p. 31.

186. Cythisus, pp 46-47.


188. There were extensive layouts of this period at nearby Lyme Hall, Cheshire and Clandon Park, Surrey, both by Leoni. A survey of Lyme, undated but c 1760?, shows the remains of earth works and an extensive garden of the kind Switzer might have designed. I am grateful to Mr. C.R. St.Q. Wall, Attingham Park, Shropshire, of the National Trust for calling my attention to this plan. The layout at Clandon is reported to have been extensive and not unlike Switzer's work but I have not examined it and have not been able to secure a photograph of it. There is no evidence known which would connect Switzer with either of these gardens.


191. Appendix 5, Letters 24, 26 & 29-34.


193. Gateshead Public Library, Ellison MSS, bundle C/25 "Draught of Kitchen Garden".


195. See below, Nostell Priory.

196. The present grounds, particularly the area across the lake date from the early 19th century.

197. His mother was Henrietta Howard, confidante and reputed mistress of George I. The gardens of her house, Marble Hill, at Twickenham were laid out by Charles Bridgeman, Peter Willis "The Work of Charles Bridgeman", Amateur Historian, vol. VI, m. 3 (1964), pp 91-96, from a reprint, p. 4.

198. See Appendix 5, Letters 30-32 & 34.
199. Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Gough Drawings, a4 folio 60 and a4 folio 67.


203. ibid., p.365 et seq.

204. ibid., p.378.

205. ibid., p.379.

206. Leicester County Record Office, Leicester, Herrick MSS, "A Plan for the new designed gardens and plantations... at Beau-Monar..." 6 September 1737.

207. Colvin, p.660.

208. ibid., p.434.

209. Until recently Beaumanor was used by the Army, and the grounds consequently closed.


211. Switzer to Sir George Wynne, Flintshire County Record Office, Harwarden, Heaton MSS; Appendix 5, Letter 35.

212. ibid.


215. See below, Wilton II.


217. Information kindly supplied by Miss Higginson, Vestry Clerk of St. Margaret's, Westminster.

1. Margaretta Jean Darnall has recently pointed out that Pietro Crescenzi's *On Rural Accomodation* of 1305 first introduced ideas that "were followed with slight variations by garden designers throughout the Renaissance", *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, October 1972, vol. XXXI, no.3, p.226.


6. e.g. survey of Ham House, Surrey (? 1609) I/7, ibid., p.70; Somerset House (? 1609) I/13, ibid., p.75; Worcester House, Surrey (? 1609) I/17, ibid., p.78; or Slingsby Castle? II/2(1), ibid., p.84.

7. II/10, ibid., p.108.

8. II/35, ibid., p.121.

9. Although III/25(3) ibid., p.173, of the Smythson Collection shows a banqueting house in front of a rectangular basin set in a park crossed by diagonal walks or sides, this is catalogued as by John Smythson (d. 1634) but is more likely late 17th or early 18th century.

10. This is an 18th century view "This Lord has destroyed the old ridiculous water works and whims that were then when made much in vogue", Lord Oxford in 1733, HMC, *Portland*, VL, p.177.

11. IR, I, p.75-76.

13. Green, Gardener, pp 37-38, quoting State Papers (Domestic) for payments and passports etc. to Andre Gabriel and Charles Mollet 1658-1666. Andrew and Gabriel were succeeded by John Rose in 1666. For the connection generally between France and England in the latter half of the 17th century see ibid., chapters 1-6.


17. The Broderie was designed by Daniel Marot; Green, Gardener, p.49, n.1.

18. IR, I, p.76.

19. London, Wise, Talman and Wren as well as Marot and the "Dutch Gardeners" appear to have been involved. See Wren Society, vol.IV, 1927, p.64 et seq.


22. See Wren Society, vol.VIII, 1931, pl.2 and pl.3.

23. See Green, Gardener, pl.8 for Talman's Hampton Court villa project (c. 1699) and Whistler, Imagination, pp 31-33 and pl.21 for the Talman/London scheme for Castle Howard (1699).

24. For Edward, Bruce and Mar, see Appendix 8, Garden Design in Scotland.

25. "...The Ancients knowing Architecture was chiefly design'd to please the Eye, only took care to avoid such Disproportions as were gross enough to be observ'd by the Sight, without minding whether or no they approach'd to a Mathematical Exactness." This was "an Effect of Art, and what the Italians call the gusto grande" rather than negligence. Joseph Addison, Remarks on Several Parts of Italy, 1753, p.205. John Macky credited the Duke of Queensbury and Louis XIV with the gusto grande, A Journey Through Scotland, 1732, p.17.
26. For Wise see Green, Gardener. There is no study on London though he seems to have been responsible for more of their work. Wise's effective retirement the year after London died suggests that London was the leading designer.

27. IR, I, p.8.

28. IR, I, p.78, Longleat was begun by the old partnership of London, Lucre, Field and Cook but after c1690 was carried on by London and Wise.


30. London visited Melbourne in 1701 but it was Wise who had supplied the designs in 1700. Melbourne is fully described in Hussey, Gardens, pp 37-64.

31. Ibid., p.59.

32. The design is shown in a survey of Melbourne of 1722, ibid., p1.45.

33. IR, I, p.84.

33a. Switzer does not seem to have held a high opinion of Wise as a designer. He says later (IR, I (1742) proemial essay, p.10) that Blenheim was meant by Pope's remarks on Timon's Villa.

34. There is no direct evidence for this supposition, but by 1706 Switzer had already taken a share of the design done by the London and Wise partnership.

35. London's last design was Cannons, Middlesex (IR, I, p.84) for the Duke of Chandos. Its form is largely unknown but from John Rocque Topographical Map of Middlesex, 1745, NB sheet, it is clear that it was much more modest than Wanstead or Blenheim.

36. Not unlike LeNostre's addition to the Tuilleries.

37. There is also a house of comparable size to Wanstead facing south over the principal garden. This is late 17th or early 18th century, having a tall ground floor, a shorter first floor, projecting cornice and finally attic storey. Could this be a false start on a new Wanstead house? It has no architectural relationship to the gardens as would be expected if new house and gardens were proceeding apace. It is not mentioned in Howard Stutchbury Architecture of Colin Campbell, 1967, or Colvin, and there are no remains in that part of the garden today.
38. Chatsworth it is true is piecemeal and disorganised in a way more typical of the "Dutch taste" but this reflects more on the indecisiveness of the owner than the intention of the designers. Dyrham, Gloucestershire for William and Mary's Secretary of State William Blaithwaite is irregular too but was reckoned to be so in a creative way, IR, III, p.113 et seq.

39. IR, I, p.18.

40. ibid.

2. Walpole, p. 81.

3. e.g. Pevsner "Genesis", p. 83 "This attitude conceals a curious contradiction" et seq; B. Sprague Allen, *Tides*, vol. II, p. 127 on Switzer's "mental confession" in admiring Pope's *Windsor Forest* "an epitome of artificiality which would only stupefy a love of nature if it did not actually foster a dislike for it"; or in Hussey, *Picturesque*, p. 130 that Batty Langley's designs do not bear much resemblance to paintings or nature "the copying of which he advocated".


5. ibid., p. 336.

6. ibid., According to Shaftesbury only a "Polite Taste" could appreciate the "Shades the Rustick or the Dissonances... which the Vulgar understand not". *Moralists*, in *Characteristic*, vol. II, p. 402, Farnborough, 1968.

7. ibid.


10. ibid., p. 337.

11. ibid., p. 338: Pope neglects to mention that clipping trees and shrubs into artificial shapes is an ancient, albeit Roman, practice specifically recommended in Pliny's description of his Tuscan villa.

12. ibid., pp 338-339.


15. Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713) 
An Inquiry concerning Virtue (1699); A Letter Concerning 
Enthusiasm (1708); The Moralists, Sensus Communis, An Essay 
upon the Freedom of Wit and Humour (1709); Soliloquy (1710); 
Published collectively in Characteristics of Men, Manners, 
Opinions and Times (1711); 1714 edition reprinted Farnborough 
1963. He had a weak constitution but was member of the 
Commons, 1695-1693, and the Lords, from 1699. He 
withdrew to Holland in 1703 after being dismissed his office. He 
died at Naples where he had lived from 1711. His son 
(1710-1771) subscribed to Switzer's Practical Husbandsman 
and Planter.

16. Advice to an Author Characteristics, I, p.333.


18. ibid., pp 393-394. Shaftesbury realized how closely this 
resembled the thoughts of lovers in a romance. For 
Addison's romantic garden imagery see below.

19. ibid., p.395.

20. ibid., p.427.


23. Not part of the Pleasures of Imagination essays, but based 
upon them. "...Having lately read your essay on the 
Pleasures of the Imagination, I was so taken with your 
Thoughts upon some of our English Gardens..." etc.

24. These essays are a revision of a single long essay, in which 
these two paragraphs on garden design do not appear; III, 
p.535 n1 and p.551 n1.


26. Mr. Bond specifically excludes this "Addison here contrasts 
the formal gardens of England owing something to the Dutch 
influence...with the private gardens of France and Italy - 
not, of course, the great gardens of LeNostre at Versailles 
..." III, p.551 n2. However, there is no evidence in 
Addison's text for this statement, nor is further evidence 
adduced.

27. "At Frescata I had the satisfaction of seeing the first 
Sketch of Versailles in the Walks and Water-works..." 
Joseph Addison Remarks On Several Parts of Italy, ed. 1753, 
p.216. The manuscript of the Pleasures of Imagination
contained this extra sentence in no.417. "Milton wd never have bin Able to have built his Pandemonium or to have Laid out his Paradise had not he seen yᵉ Palaces & Gardens of Italy..." no.417, III, p.564 n1.


29. ibid., p.552: this is the kernal of Switzer's theory.

30. ibid., This is the only instance where Addison can be said to write of making landscapes. He usually intends a pleasing prospect filled with various objects and forms, either real (e.g. description of the Roman campania in Remarks on Several Parts of Italy, 1753, pp 213-215), painted (e.g. *Spectator* 33, I, p.355) or described (e.g. *Spectator* 417, III, p.564). But Addison's conception of Landskip does not exclude gardens, e.g. no.94, I, pp 401-402, where he suggests "...a beautiful and spacious Landskip divided into delightful gardens, green meadows, fruitful Fields..."

31. ibid., III, p.552.

32. Sir William Temple, Works, Edinburgh 1754, vol.II, p.217. It should be remembered that, even at Versailles, the formality of the plantations is rather more understood than actually observed, and according to LeNostre's drawings the woods were laid out promiscuously as often as in quin-cunx. See de Ganay, Andre LeNostre, 1962, plates XIX, XXVIII, XXXVII, or LII.


34. ibid.

35. ibid.

36. ibid., p.553.

37. ibid.


39. This paper is not definitely attributed to Addison. "The letter which makes up this number may have been sent in by a correspondent, but in style and subject matter it is like Addison's best work", vol.IV, p.188, n1.

40. ibid., p.139.


42. *Spectator*, 37, I, pp 158-159.
At this point Addison came perilously close to slipping into the error of valuing conceits. This passage is in the MS but was later deleted.

"I believe most readers are pleas'd with the Eastern King's device, y make his Garden ye Map of his Empire; where ye Great Roads were represented by ye spacious walks and allies, ye woods and forests by little thickets and tufts of Bushes. A crooked rill discover'd ye windings of a mighty River, & a Summer-house or Turret ye Situation of a huge City or Metropolis. This natural draught of his Dominions was doubtless pleasanter ye a more accurate one of another Kind made by ye Strokes of a pen or pencil, because ye materials of ye Map had more of nature in 'em, and were likesy 'things, they represented."

Walpole criticised the Emperor of China for similarly following nature so closely as to attempt to reproduce it; Walpole, pp 78-79.

52. e.g. "... a man in a Dungeon is capable of entertaining himself with Scenes and Landscapes more beautiful than any that can be found in the whole Compass in Nature." no.411, III, p.537; or novelty can make "...even the Imperfections of Nature please us" no.412, III, p.541.


60. James, p.2

61. Hadfield, *Gardening in Britain*, p.158. Switzer's *Ichnographia Rustica* came to only two full editions, 1718 and 1742, although a new edition was apparently contemplated in 1723.

62. ibid.

63. His work as an architect included the octagon for Secretary Johnston's house at Twickenham, Winklemarch, Kent and Warbrooks, Hampshire for himself. His work as a garden designer is largely unknown but he probably laid out the grounds at Wrinklemarch and at his own country house, Hurstbourne Priors, Hampshire, may also be his.

64. James, *Theory*, The Dedication.

65. ibid.

66. ibid., p.2.

67. ibid., p.3.

68. ibid., p.4.

69. ibid., p.9.

70. ibid., p.13.

71. ibid., p.15.

72. ibid., Variety was to be achieved in d'Argenville's system by having different cabinets in the groves to either side of the central walk, by enclosing a circular basin in an octagonal space, etc.

73. One of the noblest and most magnificent designs that can be, ibid. p.23.

74. Parterres d'eau as at Versailles were "quite out of use", ibid. p.33.

75. ibid., p.28.

76. ibid., p.25.
77. ibid., p. 29.
78. ibid., pp 20-21.
83. Spectator, no. 583, IV, p. 592 et seq.
84. ibid., p. 595.
85. See Appendix 8, Garden Design in Scotland, for Lord Haddington's work.
86. James, p. 4.
87. IR, I, p. xli.
88. Whistler, Imagination, pl. 18 and pl. 35 notes.
89. H. F. Clark, The English Landscape Garden, 1948, p. 10.
90. IR, III, pp 5-6.
92. ibid.
94. This information very kindly provided by Mr. George Clarke.
95. Hussey, Gardens, pl. 3.
97. IR, I, p.49.

98. ibid., p.110: Switzer who had "not lately seen that book" (IR, I, pp 43-49) mis-remembered that it was "a garden of my Lord Veralum's...one of the best he had seen either at home or abroad".

99. ibid.: Wotton seems to have shared the interest in conceits and devices characteristic of early 17th century garden design. "Signor Fabritio" (Wotton) came to Ware Park in summer 1613 when the gardens were nearly complete "and as he is ignorant in nothing, so he takes upon him to propound many new devices and would fain be a director where there is no need of his help", ibid., p.137 quoting a letter of John Chamberlain's.

100. DeGanay, Andre LeNostre, 1962, pl. XCIII; noticed in Malin's English Landscaping and Literature, 1966, p.11.

101. See Miles Hadfield, Gardening in Britain, 1960, p.111 and fig.5 for Thomas Kirke's "irregular figure, actually surveyed and disposed into walks".

102. DeGanay, Andre LeNostre, 1962, pl. LXIX.

103. ibid., pl.LXXII.

104. IR, II, p.220 and fig.4 of plate 34 (facing p.219).

105. See Alfred Marie, Jardins Francais créés a la Renaissance, Paris, 1955, pl. 44 and 45.

106. DeGanay, Andre LeNostre, 1962, pl. CVII - CXII.

107. ibid., pl. CII & CIII.

108. ibid., pl. CXLIII.


111. IR, I, p.60.

112. Temple, op. cit., p.216.

113. ibid., p.182.

114. ibid., p.217.

115. ibid., p.217.
In "A note on Sharawaggi" (in Nikolaus Pevsner Studies in Art, Architecture and Design, 1963, vol. I, pp 103-107) Professor Pevsner and Dr. Lang have considered the meaning and derivation of Sharawaggi as well as the accuracy of Temple's conception of Chinese gardens and how he came to know of them. They considered European visitors to China and Chinese visitors to Europe, especially England, as a possible source for his knowledge, as well as illustrated accounts of China. A source they did not consider may be equally likely. In the paragraph following his account of Chinese gardens Temple mentions a garden made by the Dutch governor of the Cape colony. Might not then a governor or other member of the Dutch East India company have been the source for his knowledge, either directly or by second hand in the Netherlands? Temple's public life was almost entirely taken up with Dutch affairs and it is improbable that members of the Dutch East India company would know mainland China.

117. IR, I, p.12.
118. ibid., p.7.
119. ibid., p.20.
120. ibid., pp 20-21.
122. Les Plans et les descriptions le deux des plus belles maisons de compagnie de Pline le Consol, Paris, 1703.
123. cf William Falconer "Taste of Gardening among the Ancients" in Twenty Essays on Literary and Philosophical Subjects, Dublin, 1791, pp 156-159.
124. IR, II, pp 206-203 and p1.23.
125. Switzer recommended the Duke of Wharton's attempts at this at Winchendon, Oxfordshire (ibid., p.22). The Earl of Burlington used "natural architecture" of this kind at Chiswick; cf "Plan de Jardin et vues des Maison de Chiswick", 1736, view of the Orangery.
126. IR, I, p.xvi.
127. **Essay on Criticism** (1711), lines 335-336.

128. IR, I, p.xxxvii-xxxviii.

129. Arthur O. Lovejoy "Nature as Aesthetic Norm" Modern Language Notes, vol. 47, November 1927, p. 445. In so classifying Shaftesbury's conception of nature one goes against Lovejoy's own classification, his sense (ibid., p. 446) of "nature as antithetical to man and his works; the part of the empirical reality that has not been transformed (or corrupted) by human art" citing as evidence Moralist, III, Art. 2. Indeed in Philocles' rhapsodic outburst "I shall no longer resist..." already quoted this would seem to be so, that that was only part of the argument, and only part Philocles' conversion. Three paragraphs later Shaftesbury has Theocles say "for if we may trust to what our reasoning was taught us, whatever in nature is beautiful or charming, is only the faint shadow of that first beauty. (Characteristics, vol. II, p. 395). Mark Akenside, The Pleasures of Imagination, 1742, does seem to have held the antithetical view.

130. IR, I, pp xx-xxi quoting lines 68-73 of Pope's Essay on Criticism. The last two lines are not in Pope and are presumably Switzer's own contribution. He took similar liberties when quoting lines 243 et seq. when he changed "wit" to "gard'ns", ibid., p.xxi.

131. ibid., p.xliii.

132. ibid., p.190.

133. ibid., p.4.

134. ibid., p.205.

135. ibid., p.xxxiii. This side of Switzer's thought has been met with some ridicule; D. Sprague Allen, Tides in English Taste, New York, 1953, vol. II, p.126.

136. IR, I, p.97.

137. e.g. Psalm 40, verse 5 (IR, I, p.190.) Leviticus 26 verse 4 (IR, I, p.132.)

138. IR, III (1742), Appendix, p.42.

139. First published 1681, discussed in Allen, Tides, I, pp 159-162.
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142. ibid., p. 72.
143. ibid., p. 444.
146. IR, I, p. xix.
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151. IR, II, p. 205.
152. IR, III, p. iii quoting Addison, *Spectator* 583.
155. Switzer so describes one of his groves for riding; IR, II, p. 211.
156. *Spectator*, no. 414.
157. IR, III (1742), prooemial essay, p. 9, see also IR, II, p. 187.
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162. IR, II, p. 205.
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3. The Dedication is to Robert Bertie, Earl of Lindsey, who was created Duke of Ancaster on 26 July 1715.

4. ibid., p.xv.
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39. ibid.
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41. ibid., p.164.
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43. ibid.
44. ibid.
45. ibid., p.165.
46. ibid.
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55. ibid., p.183.
56. ibid.
57. ibid., p.184.
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94. ibid., p.208.
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97. ibid., p.222.
98. ibid., p.224.
99. ibid., p.222.
100. ibid., p.224.
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104. ibid., p.211.
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1. IR, III, p.i.
2. ibid., p.iii.
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32. ibid., pp 35-36.

33. ibid., p.43.
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42. ibid., p.83.
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53. ibid., pp 100-101.
54. ibid., p.101.
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8. IR, II, plate facing p.183.
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10. He repeated Daines Barrington's attribution of Leeswood, Flintshire.

11. ibid., p.81.
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10. Method, 4th edition, 1729, pp 45-65: Switzer refers to Cathcart anonymously as a "worthy and honourable gentleman of North Britain" (p.45), but in a letter from Duke of Chandos to Cathcart, 1 June 1729, "...being told that the account published in Mr. Switzer's late book of gardening, of the method of burning clay, was communicated to him by you". Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marion, Stowe MSS, Duke of Chandos' Letter Books.


13. "Je m'accompai la matinee a regler mes papiers, a lire les lettres qui concernaient la navigation De Devan et a concerter avec Switzer la relation de la maniere le bruler la terre, au levee de Roye qui me se parfait pas bien des Henarhoids", ibid.


15. ibid., p.37.


19. I am very grateful to W.W. Spink for this information.
22. IR, I, p.296.
25. ibid., p.43.
26. FG, p.159.
27. IR, I, p.39.
28. IR, III (1742), Appendix, p.10.
29. Hydro, p.10.
30. ibid., p.12; KG, p.150; Method, p.9.
31. IR, I, p.xxiv and KG, p.x.
32. C.V. Wedgewood, Wentworth, A Revaluation, 1961, p.63 records this usage.
34. ibid., Preface.
35. ibid., pp 17-24.
36. ibid., Title Page.
40. "and through the great avenue fronting the Palace, your view terminates on North Berwick, Berwick Law, near the Dass, at thirty miles distance, appearing like a sugar-loaf." (John Macky) Journey Through Scotland, 1723, p.205.
42. *e.g.* Langley, *etc.* XIX, XX & XXI.
43. *e.g.* Villa d'Este.
44. Dinning Wood, Tyningham, East Lothian and Alloa House, Stirlingshire; see below.
47. (John Macky), *Journey Through Scotland*, 1723, p.205.
49. A.A. Tait "William Adam and Sir John Clerk; Arniston and the Country Seat" *Durlington Magazine*, March 1969, p.133, n.46 refers to an account at Hopetoun referring to the wilderness in 1704, but whether here, or elsewhere, is unknown.
52. Loudon, p.343.
53. See below.
54. Quoted by John Dunbar and David Walker, "Brechin Castle", *Country Life*, August 12, 1971, from which also the above biography is drawn.
55. Chatelherault, the Kennels, were designed by William Adam c.1730 and also placed on axis; see below.
56. (Earl of Haddington) *Treatise on the Manner of Raising Forest Trees*, Edinburgh, 1761, p.2. Leslie, by Bruce, is described in Macky, p.169, and there are 18th century surveys of the grounds in the Scottish Record Office, H.M. Register House, Edinburgh: RHP 9739 (1731, William Adam), RHP 8740 (n.d.), and RHP 19 (1775).
57. *ibid.*, p.3.
58. *ibid.*
60. ibid., p.3.
61. Sir John Hope Bruce (1634? -1766) son of Sir William Bruce
62. ibid.
63. ibid., pp 10-11.
64. ibid., p.3.
66. e.g. House for the Bishop of Namur Spa, August 1731, GD24/V29 folios 26-27.
67. e.g. Wilton, GD24/V28, folios 50-53 (Feb. 1724); and Drumlanrig, GD24/V23 folios 64-66 and GD24/V29 folios 26-27.
68. GD24/V23, folios 1-9 (Clichy 1721).
69. GD24/V29, folios 1-10: John Fleming, Robert Adam and his Circle, 1962, pp 35-36, 330 and p.13, erroneously attributes this design to William Adam.
70. GD124/V30 folio 2, "The Plan of Alloa The Seat of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Mar, etc. in the Shire of Clackmanan in Scotland, 20 miles from Edinburgh and 4 from Stirling Engraven by L. Sturt 1710 after a Drawing of Bertone w' was copied from ye Original Survey'd and Drawn upon the place."
71. (John Macky), Tour Through Scotland, 1723, p.181.
72. ibid., p.181.
73. GD24/V30, folio 1, 71720. A villa has replaced the lodge at Comely Bank. There are a number of schemes for a garden house, GD24/V23, folio 37 ct. seq., from 1719, including waterworks by French designers, Valet, GD24/V30, folios 16-21, and Dubusson, GD24/V30, folios 23-26.
74. (John Macky), Journey Through Scotland, 1723, p.131.
75. HMC Portland, VI, p.121. Harley also recorded that the gravel for the walks had come from Kensington as ballast, and unloaded at the bottom of the gardens at Alloa (p.120).
76. GD24/V28 folio 67, "Scatch of the grounds at Twintinhame from the Earle of Staffords to Richmond ferry etc. also the grounds of Ham. October 1711" showing the garden plans of Ham, Secretary Johnston's (James Johnston, 1655-1737, Secretary of State in Scotland 1692-1696) and unimproved ground between Johnstone's house and Sir James Ash's at Richmond Ferry. This ground was subsequently used for Marble Hill House. There are faint lines and notations related to later drawings for a villa and gardens. They may or may not be contemporary with the survey.
77. GD27/V23 folio 63.

78. ibid.


80. After his exile, of course, he lived and reworked his designs in a number of continental towns, but there is little observable growth or evidence of influence.

81. His wife Elizabeth Park, raised a summons for payment against David Carmichael of Dalmedie and Major Thomas Cochrane of Grange and is described as "wife of deceased William Boucher, gardener". S.R.O., G.S. U.P. 1 Currie Dal. P/1/28 Parv v Cochrane. I am grateful to Dr. Ian Adams for details of this.
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