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Gardening with Shakespeare

Nicola J Watson, Open University

Brief bio

Prof. Nicola Watson currently works at the Open University, having previously held posts at Oxford, Harvard, and Northwestern. Her publications include *England’s Elizabeth* (with Michael Dobson, OUP, 2002), *The Literary Tourist* (Palgrave, 2006), *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-century Culture* (2009) and numerous articles and essays. She specialises in the afterlives of texts and authors, including Shakespeare; her new study, *The Author’s Effects: Literary Objects, Places, and Pilgrimage*, explores such afterlives as manifested within writer’s house museums.

In the grounds of Northwestern University, situated in Evanston north of Chicago, there is a smallish formal garden, bounded by high hedges, and furnished with stone seats, a sundial, and a wall-fountain. It is usually deserted; the odd elderly lady, or sometimes a student, might pass through, although to judge by the green-blue shininess of the nose on the bronze bas-relief portrait of Shakespeare that presides over the fountain by the stone seats, it must be regularly visited. As a faculty member twenty years ago, I used to take my grading there without giving very much thought to the oddity of this garden, anomalous to the local garden aesthetic and clearly made in the teeth of Chicago’s magnificently inhospitable winter and summer climate. On further investigation years later, rather than being merely a picturesque oddity on the side of the
campus away from Lake Michigan and the athletics facilities, this garden turned out to be famous in its own right as a ‘Shakespeare garden,’ made to commemorate the tercentenary of Shakespeare’s death in 1916. In what follows I explore and explain the existence of the Northwestern garden by placing it within the long history of imagining Shakespeare in cultivated space. That habit begins within English landscape-gardening, moves to smaller-scale English gardens, public and private, and is then propagated across the globe, most notably into North American soil in the early years of the twentieth century. What were the roots of this idea, what forced it into flower, and how come it was transplanted across the world?

**Roots**

There had been a history of celebrating Shakespeare within the English landscape long before the genre of the Shakespeare garden proper emerged. Shakespeare’s own garden at New Place, complete with the famous mulberry tree said to have been planted by his own hand, was already a tourist attraction by the 1740s when it was shown to the young and admiring David Garrick (who made a point of sitting under the tree), and, famously, the house and garden had become enough of a tourist draw by the 1750s to inconvenience the then-owner the Rev. Francis Gastrell to the extent that he demolished the house and cut down the tree.\(^1\) David Garrick’s Jubilee of 1769 expanded the sense of Shakespeare within the landscape to include the whole of Stratford-upon-Avon, generalising the Shakespearean out from the Birthplace and the grave to the banks of the Avon, ornamented for the occasion with a handsome
temporary pavilion in the shape of a classically-styled rotunda. In this, he was invoking the aesthetic of contemporary landscape gardening. In fact, Shakespeare had already made a guest appearance in the English landscape garden from the first half of the eighteenth century onwards, featuring as a cameo-bust in the Temple of British Worthies at Stowe designed by William Kent in 1734. David Garrick himself had already, in 1756, erected a Temple to Shakespeare as an ornamental garden folly in the grounds of his villa at Hampton. Not only had Shakespeare there grown in scale to the life-size statue he commissioned from Roubiliac (based on the Chandos portrait), but the Temple boasted Garrick’s increasingly extensive collection of Shakespeare relics, including a chair designed for Garrick by William Hogarth and made of mulberry wood from Shakespeare’s celebrated tree. The Temple focussed a landscape setting for Garrick’s various self-dramatisations as Shakespearean celebrity (here he entertained the Twickenham set including Horace Walpole, Samuel Johnson, William Hogarth, and Mrs Delaney, reportedly making them write verses of homage to Shakespeare and lay them at the foot of the statue), family man (it was lavishly illuminated for a fête champêtre to celebrate 25 years of marriage), and local patron (he would sit in the ‘Shakespeare’s chair’ on May Day to dispense largesse to locals). Others would be inspired in their turn to ornament their garden landscapes with Shakespearean follies; a hundred years later, Charles Letts, owner of Southview House on the south coast of the Isle of Wight, installed a Shakespeare fountain and a prominent temple-like rotunda to celebrate the tercentenary of Shakespeare’s birth in 1864.

Enabled in part by Garrick’s Shakespeareanization of Stratford, much travel-writing about visiting Stratford, such as Samuel Ireland’s *Picturesque Views on the Upper, or Warwickshire, Avon* (1795),
expended considerable effort imagining the bard inspired by his native Avon. The idea of Shakespeare as part of a classicised landscape gave way patchily to a national Shakespeare part classical, part historical, and part topobiographical. Ireland’s frontispiece, for instance, shows a Tudor-costumed Shakespeare reclining with a classical lyre on the banks of the Avon against a backdrop of Holy Trinity Church. He is depicted in the throes of inspiration attended by appropriate Muses and a swan, and captioned with a line from Charles Churchill: ‘Here NATURE list’ning stood, whilst Shakespear play’d/And wonder’d at the Work herself had made!’⁵ The high Victorian version of this had become more prosaically realist and educational: C. Roach Smith was entirely conventional in recommending a visit to Stratford because ‘Those who have read Shakespeare…may yet learn much of him in the fields, in the meadows, and, indeed, in the general kingdom of nature’, given that Shakespeare was both a countryman and in all probability a gardener.⁶ The romantic sense of the presence of Shakespeare within the landscape, the idea that native genius could be accessed or evoked by touching native soil and anything that grew out of it, gave rise to the tourist habit of collecting leaves and flowers from Shakespearean sites, a sort of economy version of the early lucrative trade in things made from Shakespeare’s mulberry, and subsequently from ‘Shakespeare’s crab-apple’ at Bidford (under which the bard was supposed to have lain dead drunk), which was said to have been destroyed by ‘American curio-hunters’.⁷ So important was this idea of an organic continuity between land and poet mediated by flora, that it gave rise to the replanting both of the mulberry (in 1862) and the crab-apple (some time towards the very end of the nineteenth century).⁸ Later visitors were mostly forced to content themselves with plucking leaves or flowers from the locality of Shakespeare’s grave or birthplace for pressing into albums. Julia Thomas notes one letter sent back to
America on 6 September, 1858 which ‘still shows the stitching where [the
sender] attached an ivy leaf from the wall of the church.’ Similarly, the
Folgers sent back seeds from New Place to a friend in America. It was a
fashion that would persist through to the 1920s; a college English teacher
from North Dakota, Emma Shay, collected for her friends’ albums no
fewer than forty daisies from Holy Trinity churchyard, forty leaves from
the garden at New Place, forty specimens of flowers from the banks of
‘Shakespeare’s river’, grass, pansies, and rosemary from the environs of
Anne Hathaway’s cottage, and clover leaves from Mary Arden’s house.

This practice points to a sense that a love for Shakespeare could be
appropriately described through plants and flowers. By the tercentenary
of 1916, there had already been some half a century of interest in
depicting and identifying ‘Shakespeare’s flowers’. Early books on the
subject were expensively produced to lie about on drawing-room tables to
beguile an idle moment; they matched attractive and expensively
produced chromolithographs depicting flowers with suitable quotations
from the plays lettered in gold, and were designed as the basis for a little
lightweight cultured conversation amongst women as much interested in
art and botany as in Shakespeare per se. Perhaps, indeed, that is a little
over-condescending; it might be truer to say that this was part of how
women individually and collectively appropriated Shakespeare to the
domestic, amateur sphere. These books included the expensive
lithographs of Jane Giraud’s *The Flowers of Shakespeare* (1846) and Paul
Jerrard’s *Flowers from Stratford-on-Avon* (1852) which last dressed its
equally ‘costly and novel’ illustrations of flowers ‘still growing on the
very spots where they may have first inspired the boy Shakespeare’ with
graceful sentiment: ‘the specimen was drawn from a most luxuriant spray
in a hedgerow that Shakespeare may often have passed in his visits to
Anne Hathaway.12 Or there was Shakespeare’s Bouquet: the Flowers and Plants of Shakespeare (1872), Bessie Mayou’s Natural History of Shakespeare, being selections of Flowers, Fruits and Animals (1877), or Leo Grindon’s illustrated volume The Shakespeare Flora (1883), which sought to combine natural history with a compilation of poetic ‘beauties’. The genre was still going strong in the 1900s with Leonard Holmesworthe’s Shakespeare’s Garden; with reference to over a hundred plants (1906), and would reach a height of feminized whimsy in Walter Crane’s Flowers from Shakespeare’s Garden: A Posy from the Plays (1906), which depicted a succession of ‘flowers in human garb, or…human beings garbed as flowers’ glossed by quotation from the plays.13 These volumes brought Shakespeare into domestic space – capitalising on an extant feminocentric culture of album-making and flower-gardening.

Besides books to beguile wet days in the drawing room, there were scholarly monographs by horticultural enthusiasts caught up in the late Victorian revival of interest in flower-gardening, and especially in the ‘old English garden’. This was a counter-response to urbanisation and industrialisation as much as to the boom in exotic plant collection from imperial territories indulged in by the Rothschilds amongst others. The first such book, it seems, was associated with the tercentenary, Sidney Beisly’s Shakspeare’s Garden, or the Plants and Flowers named in his Works Described and Defined (1864). Most prominent amongst these books was Henry N. Ellacombe’s effort at a comprehensive survey and identification of all the plants mentioned by Shakespeare, The Plant-lore and Garden-craft of Shakespeare (1878). Originally published as a series of articles in the periodical The Garden during 1877, this book is composed equally of literary notes, botanical identifications, practical
advice on how to grow the flowers mentioned, and descriptions of Elizabethan garden practice and design drawn from the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Republished in 1884 and again in 1896, Ellacombe’s book would become a classic. Along with the book subsequently derived from it by the American Esther Singleton, tellingly entitled *The Shakespeare Garden* (1922; republished 1932), it laid the practical groundwork for actually making a Shakespeare garden. Helpfully, it also hints at the late Victorian ideological groundwork for such gardens. Ellacombe celebrates, for example, ‘one especial pleasure’ in writing the book, which derives ‘from the thoroughly English character of Shakespeare’s descriptions’ of ‘thoroughly English plants’. The sheer length of the list of ‘Shakespeare’s flowers’ is cited as proof that the love of flowers is no new thing in England, still less a foreign fashion, but that it is innate in us, a real instinct, that showed itself as strongly in our forefathers as in ourselves; and when we find that such men as Shakespeare… were almost proud to show their knowledge of plants and love of flowers, we can say that such love and knowledge is thoroughly manly and English.

Here ‘Shakespeare’s flowers’ are hoicked out of the drawing-room and into the realm of the ‘thoroughly manly and English’; knowing them will be a way, too, of asserting genetic continuity of national identity with ‘our forefathers’. By the 1890s and early 1900s, therefore, it was possible within England to conceive of actually making a ‘Shakespeare garden’, whether in feminine, private and sentimental mode or as something patriotic, public and manly.
**Flowers**

A ‘Shakespeare garden’ had certain fixed formal characteristics. First and foremost, ideologically, such gardens celebrated ‘Englishness’. This sort of Englishness had nothing to do with the English style of landscape gardening invoked by Garrick and imitated in ‘English gardens’ across northern Europe in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century (there are examples still extant in Berlin and Munich, for instance). As in Garrick’s Hampton grounds, that sort of Englishness connoted a self-consciously natural landscaping with meandering pathways, naturalistic tree-planting, contrived views, and eye-catching follies. It had rather more to do with the nativism, nationalism and localism evidenced by the 1864 planting of the Shakespeare oak (ceremonially transferred from Windsor in honour of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*) on Primrose Hill in London, watered in with Avon water, to celebrate the Tercentenary.\(^{16}\) This may be glossed by the inclusion of a paper entitled ‘Wild Flowers of Shakespeare’ in the official Tercentenary programme, and by the design of the Shakespeare Tercentenary medal which encircled the poet’s head with ‘a wreath of wild flowers’, lovingly detailed and partially referenced to the plays.\(^{17}\) The now conventional idea that Shakespeare derived ‘his lofty inspirations in the meadows among the wild flowers by the side of the ‘soft-flowing Avon’ developed into the deliberate cultivation of Shakespeare’s flora; \(^{18}\) it seems from one casual mention by Robert Hunter in his description of the Tercentenary celebrations that the garden of the Birthplace may have been planted up with ‘Shakespeare’s flowers’.\(^{19}\) By the late nineteenth century, however, the Shakespeare garden had become consciously historicist, typically designed in reference to current notions of the Elizabethan as the quintessential moment of merrie England. Elizabethan Englishness was
realised principally through nativist planting, which aspired to include only plants and trees mentioned in Shakespeare’s *Works*. These plants were implicitly or explicitly captioned with the relevant Shakespearean quotations. How they were organised within a ground-plan was much more variable, ranging from Victorian-style border planting of specimens, through scholarly reconstruction of the Elizabethan knot garden, to more impressionistic and generalised formal gardens composed of formal beds intersected with paths and enclosed by walls or hedges. Frequently, but not invariably, some sort of representation of the Bard himself would preside over the whole. A sundial proved an all-but essential component of this sort of garden, connoting as it did escape from urban modernity ruled by railway and factory induced clock-time.

Probably the earliest version of a ‘Shakespeare garden’ in this sense was made by the Countess of Warwick, the celebrated beauty and heiress ‘Daisy’ Greville, in the gardens of her home at Easton Lodge in Essex. Here she designed the planting of a 4-acre ‘plaisaunce’ around Stone Hall, an old ‘cottage’ within the estate. By 1898, the Countess had installed a collection of Victorian-style themed gardens including a garden constructed as a living sundial, a rockery, a fernery, The Garden of Friendship, The Border of Sentiment, The Rosarie, The Scripture Garden, and the Shakespeare Border. Her expensively produced and illustrated book about this project, revealingly entitled *An Old English Garden* (1898), begins by explaining the rationale for constructing the ‘plaisaunce’ as an antidote to the febrile thinness of contemporary urban socialite life. Referencing the garden of Lady Corisande in Benjamin D’Israeli’s novel *Lothair* (1870) as her inspiration (‘in the pleasure ground are the remains of an ancient garden of the ancient house that had long been pulled down’), the gardens were designed as a retreat into the
medieval and Elizabethan past of the estate, which had been the honeymoon destination of Edward and Elizabeth Woodville, and a hunting resort of the Virgin Queen. The garden in *Lothair* is specifically described as a feminine idyll referencing a kinder past and gives a strong sense of what the romance and appeal of the Shakespeare garden was supposed to be:

When the modern pleasure grounds were planned and created,…the father of the present duke would not allow this ancient garden to be entirely destroyed, and you came upon its quaint appearance in the dissimilar world in which it was placed, as you might in some festival of romantic costume upon a person habited in the courtly dress of the last century….The duke had given this garden to Lady Corisande, in order that she might practise her theory, that flower-gardens should be sweet and luxuriant, not hard and scentless imitations of works of art.20

Stone Hall, ivy-draped and elaborately leaded on the outside, Jacobethan within, provided the central folly in which charming lunch picnics of ‘high revelry’ were provided. The building also included the Countess’ ‘Garden Librairie’ with a substantial collection of old garden books including Gerard’s Herbal and the many photographic illustrations dwell lovingly upon ‘Elizabethan’ details such as the window-seat. The building is of a piece with the language of the essay which offers a tour in the style of high Edwardian whimsy derived at distance from Charles Lamb, heavily laced with echoes of Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Keats, Ruskin; building and language are also of a piece with the associative and affective gardens captioned with labels providing quotation from poets, philosophers, and Scripture. Foremost amongst these gardens she places
her ‘Shakespeare Border’ which she describes as ‘the greatest interest of my garden’:

It represents the work of many a winter’s evening spent in hunting for quotations, and in reducing them, when found, to these label limits – delightful pottery butterflies ‘twixt green and brown, on each wing of which is the text, with the reference to the play from which it comes.  

The Countess had no thought of recreating the ground-plan of Tudor gardening; the border is laid out so that ‘all the trees stand back in rows, while in front of them are grouped the flowers and herbs that the immortal bard loved so well’. Her plant list reveals how ambitious the border was, aiming at comprehensiveness of wild and garden plants.  

In 1906, the garden was famous enough to encourage Walter Crane to dedicate his *Flowers from Shakespeare’s Garden* ‘to the Countess of Warwick, whose delightful Old English Garden at Easton Lodge suggested this book of fancies’. His frontispiece depicts her kneeling at the foot of a bust of Shakespeare and presenting it with flowers.

Daisy Greville’s ‘plaisaunce’ clearly shows Victorian sentimental planting shading into the Edwardian fantasy of an unalienated Elizabethan idyll that would eventually produce the Arts and Crafts houses and gardens of the Cotswolds – such as that at Rodmarton. Thirty years or so later, the Shakespeare garden had become something of a cliché. In 1931, E.F. Benson, brother of the Stratford upon Avon actor-manager Sir Frank, satirised ‘Perdita’s garden’ as made by the inimitable Lucia, posturing heroine of his series of comic novels. Lucia ornaments her stockbroker mock-Tudor house in Surrey with a garden to match: cut
down to suit a middle-class budget and space, a Shakespeare garden now consists of

a charming little square plot in front of the timbered facade of The Hurst, surrounded by yew hedges and intersected with paths of crazy pavement, carefully covered in stone crop, which led to the Elizabethan sundial from Wardour Street in the center [sic]. It was gay in spring with those flowers (and no others) on which Perdita doted.24

Benson’s sly digs at his heroine’s suburban pretension focus on the craftedness of the garden’s olde Englisheness – the carefulness with which the crazy paving is made to seem artlessly overgrown, the clever urbanite purchase of the bargain antique sundial (discovered in a London street famed since Charles Lamb’s time for bookstalls, curiosity shops, bric-a-brac, and perhaps most pertinently theatrical props) relocated to authenticate a spurious Elizabethan manor, and the pseudo-scholarliness and nativism of the planting, which excludes all English imperialist plant collection since the time of Elizabeth. Behind the fiction of ‘Perdita’s garden’ may well have lain the garden belonging to the woman who had immediately inspired E.F.Benson’s satire, the best-selling novelist Marie Corelli, another social climber. Corelli’s garden at Mason Croft in Stratford-upon-Avon was (and is) embellished with an eighteenth-century garden building which Corelli persisted in claiming as Tudor and which she accordingly refurbished with diamond leaded panes in the windows and ‘Jacobean’ wood panelled interior on her purchase of the property in 1899.25 A more sophisticated and scholarly version of Shakespearean gardening of the 1930s is provided by Eleanour Sinclair Rohde’s ‘Suggestions for the making of a Shakespeare Garden’ in her
Shakespeare’s Wild Flowers, Fairy Lore, Gardens, Herbs, Gatherers of Simples and Bee Lore (1935). Rohde dismisses merely planting of the flowers and herbs Shakespeare mentions as ‘incredibly dull!’ and recommends instead making ‘a small garden characteristic of Elizabethan times’ on the formal plan of a Tudor winter knot garden. She supplies a detailed plan (featuring ‘A Fairy Entrance’ embowered with musk-roses), succession planting, footnotes all relevant quotations, supplies botanical names, suggests an arbour, and strongly recommends the inclusion of a sundial, providing a list of suitable Shakespearean mottoes for one.26


Benson might laugh at ‘Perdita’s garden’, but this enterprise was of a piece with the contemporary Shakespearianization of Stratford through its gardens. F. G. Savage’s series of articles published in the Stratford upon Avon Herald between 1909 and 1916 captures the mood. He harps on the need to make a fully Elizabethan space at the Birthplace:

If there is one garden more than another that should be set apart for the cultivation of the exact plants as mentioned by the poet, surely it should be this. At present there are several he could not have known, while others he well knew are entirely missing….may I venture to suggest the planting of old-fashioned flowers such as those the poet would be likely to have known in place of the modern varieties….27

Modernity is to be rolled back in favour of authenticity; tellingly, he adds ‘I think even colour might be sacrificed for correctness’, sounding a new,
anti-Victorian note. Sidney Lee seems indeed to have planted the garden at the birthplace with Elizabethan flowers before the war law 14. And in the early 1900s the gardens of the Shakespeare properties were indeed being Shakespearianized. Together they made a series of localist arguments for Shakespeare’s nativism, attempting to restore or realize the imaginary biographicised spaces conjured up by the aptly named J. Harvey Bloom in his book *Shakespeare’s Garden* (1903) – ‘such was the garden in which the poet may have spent some at least of his summer hours half-buried in his arbours of woodbine and sweetbriar’. The style of planting would be at once modern and yet ‘Shakespearean’ in its naturalness and abundance. Like Ellacombe, who abominated bedding-out, Bloom, a latterday Perdita, promoted ‘the cultivation of flowers in Nature’s methods, their native elegance unrestrained and unfettered by man’:

> The leading idea is to copy Nature as near as may be and discard the tiring, gaudy colouring and set lines of bedding plants, the straight rectangular walks and plots, and to have everywhere constant change of shape and colour, an orderly wilderness of bloom against a background of ever-changing green.

In practice, the gardens ranged from the 1870s so-called ‘cottage-garden’ style planting still substantially in place at Anne Hathaway’s Cottage put in place by Miss Wilmott, through to the antiquarianism of Ernest Law’s ‘curious-knotted’ garden and the deliberate ‘wildness’ of the ‘Wild Bank’ both laid out at New Place in 1920 (Figures 2 & 3: ‘Knot-garden at New Place’, ‘The Wild Bank’). Between them, they described the spectrum of the Shakespearean cultivated landscape as envisioned within Edwardian and post-Edwardian culture. They encompassed the charming, feminized, and native domesticity of Anne Hathaway’s
Cottage, the nativism of the Birthplace, the historicist sense of the Elizabethan at New Place, and (also at New Place) a version of Shakespeare as a ‘countryman’ which expressed a feeling of Shakespeare as so bound to his native soil that he might best be described in terms of wild rather than garden flowers, in Titania’s flowers rather than Perdita’s. What all these constructions have in common, though, is a sense that the truly Shakespearian garden preserved an English past. The Englishness that Law achieved in his redevelopment of New Place was composed of the past of the site, textual evidence for Shakespeare’s knowledge of and love of gardening, plants from the gardens of royal palaces & historic houses associated with the Bard’s life and works, genetic homage (roses sent by the royal family were planted by ‘the direct lineal descendant of Sir Thomas Lucy’ (Law, 24), and Elizabethan groundplans. More recent versions of Shakespeare gardens around the properties, from the orchard filled with sculptures at Anne Hathaway’s cottage (1988) and latterly the enchanted wood hung with quotations, or the sculptures in the Great Garden at New Place (2003-4), extend and inflect these models – they continue to argue that Shakespeare’s works grew out of English ground and are appropriately thought of on and in relation to that ground.32

In 1916, however, the gardens of Stratford were more than places to dream of Shakespeare’s life and works; they were places of escape into Shakespeare’s England from the anxieties of war. Marie Corelli’s ‘invitation to the summer festival at Stratford-on-Avon from July 29 to August 26, 1916’, for instance, was entitled ‘With Shakespeare in His Garden’ and expressed the hope that Shakespearean Stratford might offer imaginative refuge: “In the midst of war and war’s alarms, how many there are who would gladly escape, if only for a brief interval, from the hard strain of constant worry and suspense, and take something of a
holiday, if they knew of any ideal spot where peace and beauty conjoined
could give the weary heart and brain a spell of sorely needed rest. A
sense of Shakespearean England as a metaphorical walled garden also
suffuses the pageant conceived and performed in the garden at Wadham
College, Oxford in September 1916. Bernice de Bergerac’s In
Shakespeare’s Garden was composed of a great number of garden scenes
extracted from the plays, including one or two that only happen offstage,
bound together by a series of ballets and masques featuring a cast that
included the Spirit of Nature, eighty-one flower fairies, seven bees, three
butterflies, one moth, Puck, and Shakespeare himself, the whole rendered
bearable by teas provided by the local Boy Scouts in the interval. Like
Corelli, Bergerac describes ‘Shakespeare’s garden’ as a consolatory place
of escape at once real, theatrical, and imaginary:

If you would wander an hour or so
In the garden that Shakespeare knew
Where the night-wind waved the nodding rose,
    And the purple pansies grew,
You have not to find some elfin sprite
    To speed you on your way,
For that magic garden of Long Ago
    Is open to all today….

And you shall forget for a little while
The Banners of War unfurl’d,
As you gaze at the kindly and gentle Shapes
    That people the Poet’s world;
And it may seem that the Dawn is nigh,
    And the darkness fled away,
As you walk in the garden that Shakespeare made,
That is open to all today.\textsuperscript{34}

Like the de Bergerac pageant, the Shakespeare garden made beyond Stratford was instigated by the desire to celebrate the Shakespeare tercentenary of 1916. Birmingham, for example, set about producing its own Shakespeare garden at Lightwoods Park in 1915, conceived equally as a matter of civic pride and of mass education. ‘Birmingham citizens will thus be able to see at a glance, and study on the spot, another phase of our Warwickshire poet’s glorious work, and I trust it will be a shrine at which many of his admirers will obtain still more knowledge in ideal surroundings’, wrote the chairman of the City of Birmingham Parks Committee.\textsuperscript{35} On a smaller scale, the Tercentenary Committee suggested that schoolchildren might make up their own Shakespeare gardens ‘containing plants and flowers mentioned in his works’ as ‘permanent memorials’.\textsuperscript{36} More generally, the fashion for playing Shakespeare outdoors, especially in gardens, from 1884 onwards discussed by Michael Dobson might be related to this need to celebrate and commemorate deep England.\textsuperscript{37} But although the idea of the Shakespeare garden was strong in the Britain of 1916, the exigencies of wartime meant that it was rarely realised until after the war. It was only in 1919, in keeping with Corelli’s rhapsodic version of the town, that New Place was improved by the addition of several gardens including ‘the wild bank’ and ‘the knot garden’ to match the planting already in place at the Birthplace.\textsuperscript{38} By that time, such gardens were functioning as a poignant memorial to a lost England -- it expressed nostalgia for pre-war England enfolded within an already established structural nostalgia for Elizabethan England. W. Foxton’s preface to the 1934 reprint of his book \textit{Shakespeare Garden and Wayside Flowers}, originally published in 1914, tellingly identifies
them as such when he remarks that ‘In England a Shakespeare garden is now a familiar memorial’. And, perhaps because Stratford proper was already (in Corelli’s words) ‘Shakespeare’s garden’, and because otherwise Shakespeare’s garden was all but lost, it was not primarily in Britain that the tercentenary Shakespeare garden took root, but across the Atlantic in the United States.
Transplantation

If in England, gardens invoking Shakespeare might stake claims to professional or social territory (like Garrick or Corelli), or might re-create an older lost England (as in Stratford), or might more simply celebrate civic and national pride (as in Birmingham), in the United States the making of Shakespeare gardens whether private or public was generally motivated by a desire to claim the Bard as a true American and Americans as the true heirs to a Shakespearean England. The effort to make Shakespeare adequately American had already had a long history: the American poet and sage William Cullen Bryant, dedicating the statue to Shakespeare in Central Park on the occasion of Shakespeare’s Birthday April 23rd 1870, remarked that ‘Shakespeare, though he cannot be called an American poet, as he was not born here and never saw our continent, is yet a poet of the Americans’ arguing for continuity on the basis of shared language and shared bloodlines. The idea of asserting another sort of organic continuity had already taken hold before the outbreak of war: in Los Angeles a replica Birthplace was built in 1901 which included a garden filled with Shakespeare’s flowers; and Wilhelm Miller had promoted the Shakespeare garden as one of ‘Sixty Suggestions for New Gardens’ in an article of the same name published in 1912 in The Garden Magazine. But it received new impetus from the spectacle of an England in the throes of world war. Making a garden in honour of the tercentenary was a shortish step from collecting seeds in Stratford and sending them back home, and not that far removed from the American habit of installing memorials in Stratford itself, from the American fountain in the marketplace to the two American windows in the church.
Monica Smialkowska notes that, preparing for the Tercentenary in 1915 ‘the Drama League of America put forward suggestions for the appropriate kinds of celebratory activities’. These suggestions included ‘plays, masques, festivals, pageants, music, dancing, chorus, lectures, sermons, art and craft exhibitions, club programs, library exhibits, study courses, story telling, tableaux, planting of trees, and developing of Shakespeare gardens.’ In America, although the Shakespeare garden was not conceived of as a refuge from war, it was still inflected by a sense that English culture was under strong threat and was in need of urgent conservation. What that intervention might be was exemplified by a one-act play devised for an amateur company of Junior Leaguers, written, performed and published just after the war had ended, in 1919. *The Shakespeare Garden Club* by Mabel Moran enjoyed a long success thereafter across the States, being performed by women’s clubs, Shakespearian societies, and garden clubs in a variety of venues, including outdoors in gardens. The scene is set in Anne Hathaway’s Cottage in Shottery, where Anne Hathaway and her colleagues – busily American-sounding versions of Mistress Page, Mistress Ford, Perdita, Desdemona, Cordelia, Katherine, Jessica, Rosalind, Portia, Juliet, Titania, Ophelia, Rosaline, and Cleopatra – have convened for a club meeting, Lady Macbeth in the chair. The business in hand is to decide on action to conserve the banks of the Avon following a previous meeting at which Shakespeare had requested the ladies to tidy up and replant the riverside area, currently disfigured by ‘defunct felines’. Their discussions consider at length the flowers they might plant, each lady contributing quotations from her own play, and the meeting is wrapped up by Lady Macbeth with this closing statement:
Ladies, let me prophesy, that when our members have died, and
worms have eaten them and Master Shakespeare himself hath
become but ancient history – clubs in times to come will remember
fair Avon’s shores made lovely by your sweet sugge

What this play proposed imaginatively -- the conservation by American
amateurs of the English landscape for posterity, in the name of
Shakespeare, others were already literalising on American soil. There
seem to have been, for instance, many temporary evocations of
Shakespeare country associated with tercentenary pageants. Orie Latham
Hatcher’s handbook, Shakespeare Plays and Pageants, not only suggests
how a pageant-master might Elizabethanise the landscape with a fair
(‘any available stream may serve as the Avon and furnish pleasure boats
for the people’) and how to build a replica Birthplace, but how to
embellish a replica of Anne Hathaway’s Cottage with a suitable garden:
‘with proper forethought there might even be some of the old English
garden flowers popular in Shakespeare’s time, growing outside the door’.
A helpful list of such plants is provided in an appendix. Hatcher notes
that ‘the ideal for every pageant is that it shall represent a community’
and that the rationale for the evocation of the ground of Stratford within
such a pageant is educational – ‘knowing Shakespeare and his plays
better is the natural motive behind such a festival, and the advantage of
suggesting the environment in which he and his work developed is too
obvious to need argument.’ Putting these two statements together, a
Shakespeare tercentenary pageant thus naturalised Shakespeare within
American communities and on American soil.
On a much larger scale, between 1913 and 1916, five important permanent ‘Shakespeare gardens’ were dedicated or celebrated: in Central Park, New York City; in Cleveland, Ohio; at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois; at Vassar College in New York State, and at Wellesley College in Massachusetts. What Mark Tebeau says of Cleveland’s 1916 garden -- that it ‘referenced broader attitudes about the ascendancy of Anglo-Saxon racial identity, an outpouring of sympathy for Britain’s entry into World War 1, and the resurgence of centenary celebration as vehicles for asserting collective identity’ -- holds true for all five 1916 gardens. But their strategies for evoking ‘Shakespeare’ were rather different. Was ‘Shakespeare,’ for example, primarily to be described as a real biographical subject who was best referenced by reiterating his own gestures of rootedness and ownership? That seems to have been the impulse behind the dedication in 1913 of a pre-existing garden of botanical specimens in Central Park to Shakespeare, through the inclusion of a graft taken allegedly from the original mulberry tree supposedly planted by Shakespeare in 1602. Central Park, of course, already had a statue of Shakespeare, erected in 1864, which, according to William Cullen Bryant, who gave the oration, would have already been sufficient to attract to the spot quantities of fairies by moonlight. Or was Shakespeare more appropriately transplanted in the shape of the flora mentioned in his works and native to his Warwickshire? – Central Park hedged its bets here by taking delivery of a Stratford oak sent by the Mayor of Stratford upon Avon. This strategy of botanic quotation was also adopted by Vassar College. Their garden opened on April 24 1916 with a ceremony of the planting of pansies and flower seeds from Shakespeare’s gardens in Stratford-on-Avon. Laid out on the site of the old botanical gardens by the combined efforts of the Shakespeare and
Botany classes, it was meant to be a scholarly and comprehensive library of Elizabethan plants.\(^{52}\)

Or there again, was it more that a Shakespeare garden was designed to evoke a more generalised Elizabethan Englishness understood as American prehistory? Cleveland, for instance, was ‘Elizabethan in mood and pattern. At the entrance are gateposts of English design and the garden boundaries are defined with hedges.’\(^{53}\) The garden was designed as a riot of colour and scent, converging on a bust of Shakespeare. Cleveland, in fact, was especially imaginative and energetic, for this garden boasted a multiplicity of Shakespearean authentications – biographical (a mulberry tree from a cutting made at New Place), botanic (it was planted with hawthorn, daffodils, violets, fleurs-de-lis, daisies, pansies, and columbine—‘the flowers given immortality in the poetry of Shakespeare’), critical (the mulberry cutting was sent by the Shakespearean critic Sir Sidney Lee), bardic (the garden is adorned with oaks planted by Yeats and by the great great granddaughter of Shelley), theatrical (more trees were planted by Phyllis Neilson Terry, niece of Ellen Terry), and literary-topographic (a circular bed of roses – supposedly Shakespeare's ‘favourite flower’ -- plus some ivy, was sent by the Mayor of Verona, from the monastery garden associated with the alleged tomb of Juliet, and saplings from Birnam Wood seem to have been sent to Cleveland as well). Other features included the Byzantine sundial presented by the distinguished actor, Robert Mantell, and jars planted with ivy and flowers by Sarah Bernhardt, Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree, and Rabindranath Tagore--the ‘Shakespeare of India’. Cleveland in this respect was unusual in admitting a touch of global Shakespeare into this form of commemoration – a faint whisper here of Israel Gollancz’s cosmopolitan *Book of Homage* (1916). Equal verve was demonstrated by
the Shakespeare Garden inaugural exercises which took place on April 14th, 1916, on the upper boulevard near the garden entrance. Speeches of civic welcome were succeeded by selections from Mendelssohn’s *Midsummer Night’s Dream*, and the Normal School Glee Club performed ‘Hark, Hark, the Lark’ and ‘Who Is Sylvia?’ A group of high school pupils in Elizabethan costume escorted the guests to the garden entrance and stood guard during the planting of the dedicatory elms. According to *The Cleveland Times*, ‘Miss Marlowe climaxed the proceedings by her readings of Perdita's flower scene from "Winter's Tale," the 54th Sonnet of Shakespeare, and verses from the Star Spangled Banner. Her leading of all present in the singing of the National Anthem brought the impressive event to a close.’ 54 In contrast, a Shakespeare garden, even one made in 1916, might remain remarkably feminocentric and sentimental. According to the *Wellesley College News* for 18th May 1916, the dedication ceremony of the Shakespeare garden at Wellesley College was characterised by the extensive and sentimental presentation of Shakespeare’s flowers between various women faculty and students, together with ceremonial plantings enlivened with singing and the recitation of suitable quotations.55

And so, finally, to return to the Shakespeare garden in Evanston. (Figure 4: View of Shakespeare garden, Northwestern University, Evanston Illinois: photographer Clara Calvo) Designed in 1915 by the Danish-American landscape architect and conservationist Jens Jensen (1860-1951), it must have been cutting-edge for its time, for it was inspired by Bacon’s ‘Essay on Gardens’ and claimed to take the form of an Elizabethan knot-garden.56 It therefore predated Law’s redevelopment of the garden at New Place, also inspired by Bacon. The planting, carried out by the Evanston Garden Club, was more of a Shakespearean
quotation-quiz than an exercise in botanic comprehensiveness: ‘The flowers, shrubs, trees and herbs in the garden are mentioned in Shakespeare’s plays and are varieties best suited to the garden’s location and Midwestern climate.’ According to the current website, ‘the more than 50 plants that can be planted’ include ‘rosemary, lavender, thyme, hyssop, rue, lemon balm, columbine, old roses, oxeye daisy, anemone, daffodil, pansy, poppy, nasturtium and marigolds. Parsley, holly, ivy, mint and peonies are also allowed.’ (This explains the otherwise inexplicable nasturtiums I noticed in the early 1990s, although it does not precisely justify them.) The Elizabethan-style stone bench and the fountain, featuring a bronze relief of Shakespeare’s head and suitable quotations from *As You Like It, A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *The Winter’s Tale*, were relatively late additions, eventually dedicated in 1930. (Figure 5: Shakespeare bas-relief and quotations, Shakespeare garden, Northwestern University, Evanston Illinois: photographer Clara Calvo) In taking refuge in the only garden in Evanston, I discovered to my amusement, I had unconsciously chosen to be transported home to England.

These American gardens are divergent in their expressions of Shakespeare and Shakespearean authenticity, and divergent too in their modes – ranging from the grandly public and patriotic through to the markedly feminine and sentimental. All, however, claim authenticity by twinning transplantation and quotation. This was a habit of mind that extended beyond these particular gardens. As Katherine West Scheil has noted, in 1937 the Avon Bard Club laid out a Shakespeare garden in New Rochelle, NY which included (as ever) ‘a sun dial inscribed with a quotation from *The Merchant of Venice*’ and ‘a luxuriant bed of English ivy, grown from cuttings brought directly from Stratford-upon-Avon.’
The dedication ceremony for the replica Globe Theatre in Dallas Texas in 1936 was also thought to require such gestures; Graham Holderness quotes a telegram requesting English aid: ‘Please send earth Shakespeare’s garden water River Avon…’ to sprinkle on the stage.\(^{59}\) (Ivor Brown and George Fearon note that selling Avon water to Americans had been characteristic of the twenties.)\(^{60}\) To what extent these gestures were acts of cultural self-fertilisation and to what extent compassionate conservation of the real thing, old England, is not entirely clear, but it finds a satirical commentary in Angela Carter’s fantasia *Wise Children* (1991), which tells of the Chance twins and their efforts to import Stratford earth (packed in a ceramic head of Shakespeare) onto the Hollywood film-set of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. In this fiction, Stratford does not travel well; the soil has been used by a filmstar’s pet Persian cat in default of a litter-tray on the long rail journey across the continent. The Chance sisters replace the soil from the most authentic available, dug out of a facsimile Shakespearean knot-garden at an Olde English motel called the Forest of Arden, comprised of multiple replicas of Anne Hathaway’s Cottage set in grounds garnished with ‘Warwickshire apple-trees, imported oaks, you name it.’\(^{61}\) But though it is sprinkled onto the set by Melchior Hazard, proponent of global Shakespeare, this soil, perhaps because it is ersatz, fails to save the *Dream* from being a turkey. Nonetheless, Carter’s comedy picks up on a continuing impulse within American culture. A hundred years on from the making of these tercentenary gardens there are still extant some twenty-seven Shakespeare gardens across the States, of which 16 are located in public parks or function as botanical gardens, 11 are attached to universities or colleges, and 4 are associated with Shakespeare Festivals.\(^{62}\) (For the sake of academic respectability, I am not counting the garden attached to the Disneyland replica of Anne Hathaway’s
Cottage in which ‘you are sure to meet Pooh Bear’ as a Shakespeare garden.\textsuperscript{63}

The longevity of the Shakespeare garden in America suggests how successfully it has solved the problem of the relation between the native soil of genius and the trans-global portability of genius’s printed works. It naturalises through transplantation, by botanic quotation. It brings Shakespeare home to somewhere he never knew. Nowhere is this power more clearly suggested than in the Shakespeare garden in Wessington Springs, North Dakota. This garden was made by the Mrs Shay who diligently collected leaves and flowers on her tour of Stratford for her friends in 1926. On her return, she not only conscientiously made up the albums she had promised her friends, but created a Shakespeare garden complete with quotations, setting at its centre a replica of Anne Hathaway’s Cottage to which she and her husband in due course retired.
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Redesigned and re-planted in the 1920s and 1970s, it retained the ambition of including only plants appearing in the Works. In the remodelling of the 1980s, this ambition was diluted, the plant-list expanding to include plants which were grown in England in the seventeenth century, not just those mentioned by Shakespeare. ‘The original purpose of the garden was not forgotten, however: the renovation included two special beds created for the display of medicinal and culinary herbs, identified with tags bearing quotations from Shakespeare.’
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Originally private gardens include Huntington Library, CA (established 1959); Wessington Springs, South Dakota (1932); Vienna, Austria (2005); Herzogspark, Regensburg, Germany (n.d.);

Public/civic/botanic gardens include Bethel Public Library, CT; Shakespeare’s garden, Brookfield, CT; Brooklyn Botanical Gardens, Brooklyn NY; Cleveland, OH; Johannesburg Botanic Garden, South Africa; Central Park, NY; ; Golden Gate Park
(1928), San Francisco, CA; the Elizabethan herb garden, Mellon Park, Pittsburgh PA; Cedarbrook Park, Plainfield NJ;

**University gardens** include Misericordia University; Northwestern, Evanston, IL; Illinois State University, IL; Kilgore College’ St Norbert College; Purdue University; University College of Fraser Valley, BC; University of Massachusetts; University of South Dakota; Vassar College; University of Tennessee at Chattanooga; Folger Library (1989);

**Festival gardens** include International Festival Garden, Portland, Oregon (1945); Alabama Shakespeare Festival (Blount Cultural Park); Colorado Shakespeare Festival; Illinois Shakespeare Festival.

To this may be added the College of St Elizabeth; the Texas Festival gardens; the garden at the Mayflower Inn, Washington CT; Cedar Rapids, Iowa; the botanical gardens in Wichita, Kansas, which contain a formal Shakespeare garden; Hiram College; and one in San Jose, CA. There is also a ‘Jardin Shakespeare’ in the Bois de Boulogne, Paris. There are almost certainly more. In the years after the tercentenary proper, seven further gardens were made in North America (Brooklyn in 1925, Wessington Springs in 1927, Plainfield, New Jersey, 1927; Golden Gate Park, California in 1928; St Elizabeth 1931, and Portland, Oregon, 1945) and there remains a surprisingly strong interest in making such gardens from scratch nowadays in conjunction with festivals or as a way of upping the status of universities (recent examples, for instance, include the Texas Shakespeare Festival Garden, the Stratford festival gardens, the Alabama festival gardens, the Shakespeare garden at the University of South Dakota (1988), the garden at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, (2000), Washington College (2007), the Shakespeare garden at Misericordia University, Dallas, Pennsylvania (2010).
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