

Published as Brook, I. 2008 'Wildness in the English Garden Tradition: a reassessment of the picturesque from environmental philosophy' in *Ethics and the Environment* 13:1, pp. 105-119.

## Penultimate draft

### **WILDNESS IN THE ENGLISH GARDEN TRADITION:**

#### **A REASSESSMENT OF THE PICTURESQUE FROM ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY**

### **Abstract**

The picturesque is usually interpreted as an admiration of 'picture-like', and thus inauthentic, nature. In contrast, this paper sets out an interpretation that is more in accord with the contemporary love of wildness. I briefly cover some garden history in order to contextualize the discussion and proceed by reassessing the picturesque through the eighteenth century works of Price and Watelet. I identify six themes in their work (variety, intricacy, engagement, time, chance, and transition) and show that, far from forcing a 'picture-like' stereotype on nature, the picturesque guided the way for a new appreciation of wildness – one that resonates with contemporary environmental philosophy.

### **Introduction**

There is undoubtedly a current interest in and love of wild nature expressed in the form of protecting pristine wilderness or traditional rural landscapes.

The rise of the appreciation for wild landscapes in the wild was well charted by Nicholson and we are often struck by the, now almost unthinkable, worldview that saw mountains and dark forests as frightful wastelands that were best ignored and hidden from view or used as evidence of the fall or the flood (God throwing up these abominations in response to human sin)<sup>1</sup>.

We often look directly to the concept of the sublime characterised by the dramatic impact of mountains for the source of this sea change in attitudes to nature but I would like to focus on the, often overlooked because misunderstood, picturesque in garden design. The picturesque is often characterised both as informally rustic and as following the rules of composition in landscape paintings.

The suggestion that we track the love of wild nature through garden styles and traditions seems immediately problematic as what could be more unnatural than a garden? It has exactly the mix of natural entities, i.e. plants, and their constraint or artificial arrangement that is the mark of the unnatural. A piece of architecture is an artefact with no direct pretensions to be nature. A naturalistic style of gardening by contrast seems the very essence of the inauthentic, it cannot help but fail to inspire a love of real wild nature. I am not suggesting this task will be easy, just that there are aspects and undercurrents here that are worth bringing out.

### **A brief historical sketch**

The garden as we know it probably developed from walled areas to protect delicate crops from the burning heat and winds of the desert. They took on the dual task of providing food and a pleasant area where one could rest under the shade of date palms. The earliest record of a garden layout comes from an Egyptian tomb from around 2000 BCE<sup>2</sup>. It depicts a walled area with a central rectangular fish pond with flowering lotus, surrounded by fig trees and edged with flower beds. All is symmetrical and there are tall shade trees. This basic pattern crosses many cultures and many centuries. The Persians created elaborate gardens along these lines and the garden as a *hortus conclusus* - an enclosed space - continues for centuries.

What is being excluded varies across the types of nature to be excluded. The Egyptian enclosed garden creates a formalised and ordered simulacrum of something rare from nature - the oasis - what is excluded is the desert heat and wind. In the English context the garden was a clearing in the vegetation; a sun trap where overshadowing vegetation is controlled. A crucial motif of the garden is the exclusion of raw nature.

This exclusion of nature is furthered by the ordering of what is inside the wall. Running through centuries of garden design is the straight axis and the symmetrical arrangement of planting areas and plants themselves. To us it appears that order and a horizontal axis reigns supreme, but these early gardens were also about order and a vertical axis that connected the labour of humans to their God, it is this vertical axis relationship that was important to them not our relationship to the world outside of the garden wall<sup>3</sup>. In the early botanical gardens we see an attempt to recreate the Garden of Eden, which would, of course, have been an ordered world<sup>4</sup>.

### **Breaking down the wall**

For a brief tour of the important shifts in this garden story I will focus on the various garden technologies that begin to break down the wall. These technologies take away from the garden its role of excluding nature and point to a deep shift in cultural responses to nature. An early, post-medieval, development was called a mount, this small constructed hillock would allow those enjoying the garden to view the world beyond its enclosure. Often they were *mounted* by a spiral walk and the summit graced with a summer house arranged for the best views. For example, at Hampton Court this was a view of the Thames. At the same time as the development of the mount walls were being pierced with window type openings to allow for views beyond the garden. Possibly the most innovative pierced wall, because the gap reached to the ground, was a *saut de loup* (wolf's jump). In French formal gardens this was a means of ending a broad walk with a gap in the wall, the grills of early versions of this form of opening were able to be dispensed with by introducing a ditch and embankment to prevent animals passing into the garden. In a text by A.J. Dezallier d'Argenville of 1709 this is called an Ah Ah!<sup>5</sup> This is, of course, the precursor to the revolutionary innovation that changed the English landscape on an immense scale, the ha-ha. Instead of a gap in the wall the ha-ha, by extending the ditch horizontally, dispenses with the wall entirely. Nature is now so redeemed that it can be enjoyed, not as something glimpsed from the safety of the garden, but as the backdrop to the garden. In fact the visual illusion of the ha-ha is that the two: garden and nature have become a seamless whole. The illusion, however, only

works because at the same time as the wall is dissolving the garden within it has been changing.

These contemporaneous changes could be seen as a way of bringing nature into the garden. Before the break with formal garden styles and the move to the more informal there was already trend for setting aside part of a garden for small areas of woodland or informal planting. These were called wildernesses, which of course sounds hopelessly naïve today, and indeed they were often planted with trees in straight rows or with the informality contained within hedges and traversed by straight paths. But there was something going on there, some stirring of some kind of precursor to feelings we currently have for nature. An early reference to this practice is in Francis Bacon's essay *On Gardening* published in 1625 where he advised having a heath or wilderness of six acres within the garden.<sup>6</sup> This was a managed area, but managed to look like a flowery heath.

The ha-ha, as we saw earlier, was a way of blending the garden with the land around and this was spoken of as the garden blending seamlessly with nature. One of the earliest proponents of the style of gardening that the ha-ha facilitates was Stephen Switzer. In his *Iconografia Rustica* (1718) Switzer suggests that opening out the garden allows for enjoying "the extensive charms of nature"<sup>7</sup>. The garden around the house is further simplified and 'naturalised' by getting rid of formal structures and introducing serpentine paths.

I should point out that these are, in some senses small steps; there is both a disjunction between what Switzer said and what his patrons allowed and, along with other writings such as Shaftsbury's, we need to be careful about imposing a contemporary understanding of what they meant by 'nature'. In the early 18<sup>th</sup> century this could just as well be taken as meaning the beauty of geometrical forms. What we need to do is proceed in small steps rather than grand causal claims, but now at least the steps can now take an irregular and not a straight path.

Moreover, another way of looking at the ha-ha is not as an opening of the garden to nature but as taking the gardening mentality of shaping land to specific, art determined, aesthetic ends and applying it to nature. In that guise the English

landscape garden becomes not a newfound appreciation of nature but a new opportunity for even greater domination.

From this observation a familiar story is emerging, we can see that what this is leading to is the idea of landscapes as scenic; as Italian art inspired tableaux and the prominence of English estates shaped to the aesthetic of the landscape paintings of Claude Lorrain and Poussin. This is a well trodden path and one that leads directly to contemporary critiques, such as Allen Carlson's "Landscape Scenery Model" of incorrect aesthetic appreciation of nature. Here the prime suspect in distorting our relationship to nature is the picturesque, which he describes as "a mode of appreciation by which the natural world is divided into scenes, each aiming at an ideal dictated by art, especially, landscape painting"<sup>8</sup>. However, what I will now do is look in detail at the idea of the picturesque and see if there isn't something, or indeed a number of things, going on there that could redeem this maligned aesthetic notion.

### **The Picturesque**

What I aim to do is to give expression to some of the now less heard early spokespersons for the picturesque and see if what they have to say about the appreciation of local natural settings as they occur, rather than as artificially shaped to an artistic ideal, seems to chime with contemporary voices in environmental philosophy.

First we need to look in some detail at the commonplace but in fact rather strange definition of the picturesque as being "like a picture". The construction of the word and the way it was used, both in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and since, certainly suggests that interpretation, but it is strange nonetheless. I want to argue that this definition is either meaningless or tautological. A landscape is not and indeed cannot be like just *any* picture, pictures come in many styles and with many subjects so the definition, 'like a picture', is obviously useless as it means almost nothing. We could extract from it a more focused meaning that goes something like, 'a scene or landscape that has the qualities sought by particular landscape painters such that it appears a fitting subject for a landscape painting of that style'. But what does style mean here? If it

means picturesque we have a tautology not an explanation. The problematic circularity of the 'like a picture' definition is identified by Uvedale Price in 1794<sup>9</sup> and discussed very clearly in his objection to Gilpin's definition. He endorses Gilpin's observations but points out that a definition has to be able to divide some things from others and as many things, here he quotes Gilpin, "please from some quality of being illustrated in painting"<sup>10</sup>, such a definition does nothing to explain what specifically is the quality of the picturesque. Gilpin's travels are to particular types of places and show an appreciation of particular types of things and not others and so it is necessary to examine those types so that a descriptive definition can emerge such as we have for the beautiful and the sublime. Here Price is clearing the way for sharpening up the definition but he doesn't merely make the obvious point that all paintings or subjects of painting are not picturesque so 'being a fitting subject for a painting' doesn't make something picturesque. He has much to say about the role of art in developing our appreciation of landscape. However, he also begins to unravel the idea that our appreciation of landscape is wholly driven by our appreciation of landscape painting. Whilst the weight of historical scholarship on the picturesque is against such a claim<sup>11</sup> I think it is worth contemplating an alternative. Perhaps we have been so blinded by the cultural interpretation of our taste being driven by art that we forget that at some point someone had to think that there was something about nature that was worth painting. In chapter three of *On The Picturesque* Price presents an alternative origin of the term:

The Italian pittoresco is, I imagine, of earlier date than either the English or the French word, the latter of which, pittoresco, is clearly taken from it, having no analogy to its own tongue. Pittoresco is derived, not like picturesque, from the thing painted, but from the painter; and this difference is not wholly immaterial. The English word refers to the performance, and the objects most suited to it: the Italian and French words have a reference to the turn of mind common to painters; who, from the constant habit of examining all the peculiar effects and combinations, as well as the general appearance of nature, are struck with numberless circumstances, even where they are incapable of being represented, to which an unpractised eye pays little or no attention. The English word naturally draws the reader's mind towards pictures; and from that partial and confined view of the subject, what is in truth only an illustration of picturesqueness, becomes the foundation of it<sup>12</sup>.

Of course nature is then packaged, commodified and sold as an ideal that can then become a scene which nature either lives up to or not. Of course the inspiration for painters such as Claude and Poussin was nature as allegorical setting, not nature itself. The early English landscape gardens of Kent and Bridgeman and later those of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown were allegorical landscapes; they move out into 'nature' as poetic setting as can be seen by the classical temples that they placed as focal points to the scene<sup>13</sup>.

There is certainly evidence in the writings and actions of landscape designers and landowners of the time of exactly this kind of idealized picture making; where ancient trees are felled and even villages moved to create exactly the right vistas at just the right points to be viewed and enjoyed by the trained eye. Trained that is in reading the landscape as allegory. In one sense this is the picturesque in full swing and it has a great deal to do with the emulation of particular styles of painting and a great deal to do with control. But it is not, I contend, the whole picture. To find some redemptive element in the picturesque as a way in to nature I again return to the writings of Uvedale Price.

Although we often see the picturesque aligned with the break with formality (and of course it does reject the formal) it is better seen as a rejection of a particular type of contrived informality best exemplified by the landscapes of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown and his imitators. Price and Richard Payne Knight, though they differ on some quite fundamental aspects<sup>14</sup>, both abhor the style and prevalence of the Brownian landscape. Their criticisms on this are in accord and attack Brown for being formulaic, boring, and *unnatural*. Price equates Brown and his imitators to quack physicians with a single cure for all ills.

...in both arts the quacks are alike – they have no principles, but only a few nostrums, which they apply indiscriminately to all situations, and all constitutions. Clumps and Belts, pills and drops, are distributed with equal skill ...The best improver or physician is he who leaves most to nature – who watches and takes advantage of those indications which she points out when left to exert her own powers; but which, when once destroyed or suppressed by an empiric of either kind, present themselves no more<sup>15</sup>.

The popularity of Brown's style for a brief but wealthy period in English history meant that many large estates were taking on the same appearance which, though it purported to connect to nature in its serpentine paths and 'naturalistic' clumps, bore no relationship to its geographical location. Thus not only was each estate rendered bland and boring as an individual landscape, but they were all bland and boring in the same way. Copying pictures is not the way to a picturesque landscape, but what is? At the heart of the picturesque is a love of wild nature in a small compass and it is this impulse that, I think, might have contributed to our current sensibilities and certainly has still more to say.

### **The appreciation of wildness as evidenced in six picturesque themes.**

How exactly does this idea of an appreciation of wild nature come through in writings on the picturesque proper? I would like to identify and explore six themes all of which, I maintain, are linked to our current affection for, enjoyment of, and impulse to protect, nature.

The first, drawn directly from Uvedale Price, is the idea of **variety** as pleasing<sup>16</sup>. It is a characteristic of nature, in the eyes of this Herefordshire landowner, that it is varied and that variety is something to treasure not to obliterate through inappropriate, style driven, management of the land. Pleasing variety as shown in the changing variety of plants and shapes and forms encountered whilst walking an 'unimproved' country lane is not the only type of variety. The idea of variety as a good in itself of course finds contemporary resonance with ideas of biodiversity. But, lest we mistake Price for wanting the equivalent of a botanical garden or zoo remember that in his anti-Brownian polemic we saw that he admires the natural variety that makes one place different from another. Nature in Herefordshire is not like nature in Lancashire and the garden style that tries to emulate the same form everywhere (particularly one imported from another country entirely) is destroying what Pope, in 1731, had called the *genius loci*<sup>17</sup> and what we have now come to call local distinctiveness<sup>18</sup>. I am not claiming that Price, if alive today, would have been taking part in the anti globalisation movement just that his attack on Brown has resonance with the anti-Macdonaldisation idea. For Price it was each place itself that was source of rich aesthetic experience. For example, the way a path turned or

the way sheep, just through use of a sheltered spot, hollowed out spaces in the banks of a track and revealed the gnarled tree roots. To enjoy and cherish such things was the appreciation of place rather than the hankering for another place. This feeling for *genius loci* and rejection of formulated landscape ideals perhaps has much to say to us today about cherishing nearby nature rather than only hankering for wilderness on a grand 'untouched' scale.

The next, connected, theme is that of **intricacy**. Again it is Price who brings this out explicitly. The term suggests a density of detail but Price adds a specific meaning when he describes intricacy as "that disposition of objects, which, by a partial concealment, excites and enriches curiosity"<sup>19</sup>. Variety and intricacy work together, but for Price intricacy is what stimulates our curiosity and imagination. On a country lane it is this that makes the gnarled tree roots fascinating and drives us on to see what is around the next bend, hidden from view. I might be stretching the point here, but this notion of intricacy does seem to point also to an enjoyment of and a desire to know the specifics of nature: to enjoy *this* particular clump of primroses, to want to find out more about *this* particular woodland. We need to remember that the period of the picturesque is also that of Enlightenment empiricism. The rejection of a poetic/emblematic landscape, the new enjoyment and appreciation of a landscape for itself, and our being intrigued by it and wanting to understand its intricacies all fits well with that wider cultural shift. Currently we can see a similar understanding of nature emerging in something like understanding local ecology, not necessarily from a reductive scientific understanding, but something more akin to an informed amateur naturalism or the resurgence in interest in Goethean observation and understanding nature through his idea of a delicate empiricism<sup>20</sup>.

My third theme, **engagement**, is developed more fully in the writings of a French essayist Claude-Henri Watelet. In his 1774 *Essay on Gardens* he discusses the problem of likening the work of laying out a garden to that of an architect. He makes the point that with a building we enjoy taking it in at a glance, admiring its organisation of, particularly, vertical space. But that mentality applied to the garden has given us the formal structures of straight paths and symmetrical patterns which do not entice the viewer to even venture out into the garden itself, as Watelet says:

... while an immense parterre or endless allées may astonish, this pleasure lasts but a few moments. One questions the purpose of walking across such great expanses when a single glance has already explored them. ... But even if one were to undertake this tedious task, this walk that nothing encourages him to hasten or slow down, he would no doubt be like a man who moved his legs without going anywhere<sup>21</sup>.

For Watelet the garden must be planned out in the place itself, utilizing its natural irregularities and pleasing views, not indoors at a draughtsman's table and not to point to this or that fable or myth but to be itself. The land then becomes something to explore. And note that for Watelet that exploration is driven by the land itself, *it* speeds us or slows us according to what is happening in the land. And what are the fruits of this kind of engagement? For Watelet they are psychological, such as peace for the soul, respite from the tiring concerns of society. His accounts of gardens in the essay are given as *perambulations*, they record not just the scenes but the movement through landscapes and the thoughts and feelings such engagements bring out. For example:

The last rays of the sun sometimes find me considering in silence the tender concerns of the swallow for its young, or the cunning tricks of the kite attempting to capture its prey. The moon is already up, and I am still sitting. This is an added pleasure. The whispering water, the sound of the leaves in the breeze, the beauty of the sky, all immerse me in a sweet reverie. The whole of nature speaks to my soul as I wander listening...<sup>22</sup>.

I don't feel I need say much to bring out the contemporary feel of this: the engagement calls to mind Arnold Berleant's work on the role of engagement in environmental aesthetics<sup>23</sup>; the multi sensory account chimes with aspects of eco-phenomenology<sup>24</sup>; and the soul healing notion of nature contemplation hints at what is later developed in ecopsychology<sup>25</sup>.

My fourth theme is **time**. This is obviously connected to movement; if the form of nature appreciation becomes the walk, rather than the picture or isolated scene, it has to take place over time. The shaping of the landscape by the passage of people or animals over time crops up in Price as he eulogizes over the twisting path "shaped by the mere tread of passengers and animals, as unconstrained as the footsteps that formed it"<sup>26</sup>. We are properly carried through the wilder landscape not on the

planned paths of the 'improver' (a term used for landscape designers such as Brown), whether they be straight or serpentine, but by the paths that emerge through long term interaction and engagement.

The most obvious aspect of time in the picturesque is the enjoyment of the action of nature over time on the works of humans. The classical temple that had meant one thing, once weathered and decayed, now tells a new story, part of which is evident in the ruin itself and requires no prior learning. Here nature as entropic of human order brings about unplanned changes that render what was once simple and smooth - the epitome of the beautiful - into the epitome of the picturesque. Price gives a wonderful time-paced account of this process.

Observe the process by which Time, the great author of such changes, converts a beautiful object into a picturesque one: First, by means of weather stains, partial incrustations, mosses, &c. it at the same time takes off from the uniformity of the surface, and of the colour; that is, gives a degree of roughness, and variety of tint. Next, the various accidents of weather loosen the stones themselves; they tumble in irregular masses upon what the perhaps smooth turf or pavement, or nicely-trimmed walks and shrubberies-now mixed and overgrown with wild plants and creepers, that crawl over, and shoot among the fallen ruins. Sedums, wall-flowers, and other vegetables that bear drought, find nourishment in the decayed cement from which the stones have been detached; birds convey their foods into the chinks, and yew, elder, and other berried plants project from the sides; while the ivy mantles over other parts, and crowns the top. The even, regular lines of the doors and windows are broken, and through their ivy-fringed openings is displayed, in a more broken and picturesque manner...<sup>27</sup>.

His account in this passage also ushers in my fifth theme, that of **chance**. What is admired in the variety, intricacy, and developments through the passage of time is that the changes are wrought by chance. Yes we can create the appearance of a decaying ruin, and of course this was done once it became a popular aesthetic. However, the value that Price and other writers were finding was not in decaying ruins *per se* but in them as emblematic of nature at work; nature indifferent to human likes and dislikes and just doing its own thing. In the English context of a moist temperate climate this was verdant growth wherever, however, it happened to find a place. Although Price and others talked of creating this effect it was very much by letting it happen or rather not stopping it happen such that the 'effect' was

what would be there if we were mere participants in rather than conquerors of the land for which we had responsibilities. This opening oneself to chance encounters or developments - going with the flow - and enjoying the surprise of what the other has to offer is seen today as psychologically healthy. And of course the idea of letting nature *be* became the clarion call of the contemporary environmental movement.

My sixth theme, **transition**, brings us up to date with recent work in environmental philosophy, even here we can find useful ideas and precursors in the picturesque. The Brownian design was much criticised by Price, Knight and later garden designers because it took the green sward – the smooth expanse of grass – right up to the house, having dispensed with the fripperies of intricate parterres and flowering plants. Price does not advise that the roughness and unplanned nature of the picturesque should rule everywhere despite some early criticisms that suggest he did<sup>28</sup>, Price felt that certain comforts of the home necessitated some order, such as smooth driveways and decorative embellishments close to the house in the garden proper<sup>29</sup>. Hence, rather than writing the informal garden over the wider landscape he makes a nice distinction between the human environment close to the house as the garden and that which is beyond the garden to be enjoyed for its picturesque qualities. The picturesque can then be seen as a transition between the human realm and the very wild realm of nature further afield as Sublime. Indeed Edmund Burke, writing in 1757 saw it functioning in exactly this way<sup>30</sup>. Here the picturesque can be seen as a mixing and juxtaposing of the Sublime and the Beautiful, such that the smoothness of the beautiful is ruffled with a rustic patina of nature / human relations and the quasi threatening disorder of the sublime (untouched wild nature) is toned down to a charming irregularity. Gilpin also brings the two together by describing the picturesque as, “Beauty lying in the lap of horror”<sup>31</sup>.

What the picturesque allows is the transition to be made from one realm to the other without seeing wilderness or wild places as somehow there for us to tone down and shape to our sensibilities, but to experience as they are. Also we can still value the particular qualities that an ordered garden can bring where human design has the upper hand. The transition zone is where both humans and nature have a hand, but neither is tyrant; deer roam, sheep are grazed, trees might be coppiced

but this is a more direct working with what nature affords and an enjoyment of its bounty. The idea of the landscape of utility can also be found in Watelet. He develops the idea of the embellished farm where the function of the mill, arable fields and dairy are not contrived but useful and yet nothing is developed to such a scale that they do not delight the person passing through them with their appositeness to the land and their variety. Here the picturesque is the landscape that can arise with the human working in and with nature as a participant and this strikes a chord not just with a Leopoldian style land ethic<sup>32</sup> but also with recent concerns about the wilderness discourse of early environmentalism leaving no place for a healthy and nature respecting, but nevertheless human, mode of life<sup>33</sup>. The picturesque can help us make aesthetic sense of those mixed communities such as the urban park or sensitively farmed land, as well as bridging the gap between our love of order and love of extreme wildness.

## **Conclusion**

I have sought to show that the picturesque, interpreted in this way, has many resonances with understandings of human nature relationships in contemporary environmental philosophy. There is much to poke fun at with its later interpretations and particularly, what I would call, its decayed form with its fake ruins and rustic hovels. Indeed there were even satirical novels produced at the time<sup>34</sup>. However, my aim was simply to say let's take a closer look before consigning it to the history books of bad design ideas or corrupting influences on our understanding of the natural world. There was something going on there, which I maintain has aided and abetted other cultural ideas to help us see the natural world as both pleasing to us and as a kind of agency with which we can and indeed must engage.

The implication of this reinterpretation is that environmental philosophers can look to an aesthetic notion other than the sublime to explain and further inspire our love of wild nature. Moreover, if we think of the sublime as inspiring the love of and drive to protect wilderness landscapes then the picturesque serves a similar role for the more local landscapes. In this way sensitively farmed country and city refuges, such as parkland and even the carefully but not over tended back yard or garden,

can be seen not as poor cousins of wilderness but aesthetic places that inspire a love of nature in their own right. The six themes I have drawn out of the picturesque can be used to explore our relationship to nearby nature and I suspect they can do much to honour and help direct our feeling for local nature and endorse our care for nature in a small compass. The aspiration to preserve wilderness is not thereby undermined; rather, wilderness takes its place as one type of nature that requires care and respect, but not the only type.

### **Acknowledgements**

An earlier version of this paper was given at the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) Annual Conference 2005. Support for attendance at the conference was provided by The British Academy. Also thanks are due to the anonymous reviewer for their helpful comments.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nicolson, M. H. [1959] 1963, *Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory*, New York: W. W. Norton and Co. Inc., 196-8.

<sup>2</sup> Hobhouse P. 1992, *Plants in Garden History*, London: Pavilion Books, 11.

<sup>3</sup> Aben, R. and deWit, S. 1999, *The Enclosed Garden*, Uitgeverij: 010 Publishers.

<sup>4</sup> Heyd, Thomas, 1996, 'Thinking Through Botanic Gardens' *Environmental Values* 15:2, 197-212.

<sup>5</sup> Dezallier d'Argenville, A.J. [1709] *La Theorie et la Pratique du Jardinage* quoted in Fearnly-Whittingstall, Jane, 2002, *The Garden: An English love affair*, London: Weidenfeld Nicolson, 123.

<sup>6</sup> Bacon, Francis, [1625] 'On Gardening' quoted in Dutton, Ralph, 1950, *The English Garden* 2nd ed. London: Batsford, 49.

<sup>7</sup> Switzer, Stephen. [1718] *Iconographia Rustica* quoted in Quest-Ritson, Charles, 2001, *The English Garden: A social history*, London: Penguin, 112.

<sup>8</sup> Carlson, Allen, 2000, *Aesthetics and the Environment*, London: Routledge, 45.

<sup>9</sup> Price, Uvedale. [1794] 1842, *On the Picturesque*, Edinburgh: Caldwell, Lloyd and Co.

<sup>10</sup> Gilpin, William. [1792] 1794, *Three Essays*, London: R. Blamire., Quoted in Price, *Ibid*, 78.

<sup>11</sup> See: Dixon-Hunt, John 1992, *Gardens and the Picturesque*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, and Townsend, Dabney, 1997, 'The Picturesque' *The Journal of Art Criticism* 55:4, , 365-376.

<sup>12</sup> Price, Uvedale, *Op.Cit.* 80.

<sup>13</sup> Dixon-Hunt, John, *Op.Cit.* 50-75.

<sup>14</sup> Ross, Stephanie, 1998, *What Gardens Mean*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 121-154.

- 
- <sup>15</sup> Price, Uvedale, *Op.Cit.* 187.
- <sup>16</sup> Price, Uvedale, *Op.Cit.* 69.
- <sup>17</sup> Pope, Alexander [1731] 'Epistle to Lord Burlington' quoted in Hobhouse, Penelope, 2002, *The Story of Gardening* London: Dorling Kindersley Ltd, 207.
- <sup>18</sup> Clifford, Sue. and King, Angela. eds, 1993, *Local Distinctiveness: Place, particularity and identity*, London: Common Ground.
- <sup>19</sup> Price, Uvedale, *Op.Cit.* 69.
- <sup>20</sup> Goethe, J.W. von 'Maxims and Reflections' in *Scientific Studies* Miller Douglas, (ed. and trans.) 1988, New York: Suhrkamp Publishers, 307.
- <sup>21</sup> Watelet, Claude-Henri [1774] 2003, *Essay on Gardens: A chapter in the French Picturesque*, Danon, S. (ed. and trans.) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 51.
- <sup>22</sup> Watelet, Claude-Henri, *Ibid*, 59.
- <sup>23</sup> Berleant, Arnold, 1992, *The Aesthetics of Environment*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- <sup>24</sup> See: Brook, Isis, 2005, 'Can Merleau-Ponty's Notion of 'Flesh' Inform or even Transform Environmental Thinking?', *Environmental Values* 14:3, 353-362, and Brown, Charles, and Toadvine, Ted, eds, 2003, *Eco-phenomenology: back to the earth itself*, New York: SUNY Press.
- <sup>25</sup> Winter, Deborah, and Koger, Sue, 2003, *The Psychology of Environmental Problems*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- <sup>26</sup> Price, Uvedale, *Op.Cit.* 71.
- <sup>27</sup> Price, Uvedale, *Op.Cit.* 82.
- <sup>28</sup> Repton. H. [1794] 'Letter to Uvedale Price, Esq.' in: Price, Uvedale, *Op.Cit.* 411-416.
- <sup>29</sup> Price, Uvedale, *Op.Cit.* 297.
- <sup>30</sup> Burke Edmund [1757] 1998, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and the Beautiful*, London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- <sup>31</sup> Gilpin, W. [1786] *Northern Tour to the Lakes, etc. Made in 1772*, quoted in Hussey, C. [1927] 1983 *The Picturesque*, London: Frank Cass and Co. 22.
- <sup>32</sup> Leopold, Aldo [1949] 1989, *A Sand County Almanac: And sketches here and there*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>33</sup> Cronon, William 1995 'The Trouble With Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature' in Cronon, W. (ed.) *Uncommon Ground*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company Ltd, 69-90.
- <sup>34</sup> Combe, William [1812] 1878, *Tour of Doctor Syntax in Search of the Picturesque*, London: Routledge and Son.