

“Nature’s Journeyman”: Cultivating Political Desires In New York City’s Shakespeare Gardens

Transplanting Shakespeare’s Gardens

At the end of her essay “The Spirit of the Elizabethan Garden,” Elizabeth Woodhouse boldly proclaims, “There is not one existing garden that is alive to the language of the Elizabethan age” (1999, 27). In a similar vein, Roy Strong concludes his landmark study *The Renaissance Garden* by noting that “No other visual manifestation of the Renaissance in England has suffered such total obliteration as the garden” (1999, 223). Assuming Woodhouse’s and Strong’s claims are correct, how do we reckon with the dozens of self-proclaimed “Shakespeare Gardens” blooming throughout the United States, a country particularly obsessed with such gardens? What are these gardens doing when they punctuate their flora with plaques bearing Shakespeare’s language? This essay will consider the role of Shakespeare’s art in today’s gardens, as well as the role of early modern gardens and landscapes in Shakespeare’s art. It works from the premise that gardens and landscape should never be understood as purely or even primarily aesthetic or ornamental; in fact, such emphases on aesthetics have, during Shakespeare’s time and our own, masked and mystified the cultural and political work performed by these ecological dramaturgies.



Figure 1: The Brooklyn Botanic Garden’s Shakespeare Garden

New York City is home to two Shakespeare gardens, one in Manhattan’s Central Park and another in the Brooklyn Botanic Garden (see figure 1 above and figure 2 next page). In 1897, the State of New York set aside 39 acres of land for the

Brooklyn Botanic Garden, which opened in 1911 and now comprises 52 acres; in 1925, a gift from Standard Oil tycoon Henry Clay Folger allowed the garden to include a Shakespeare Garden (“A Brief History” 2017). The Garden itself, nestled between the Brooklyn Museum and the Central Brooklyn Library, sits adjacent to the 585 acres of pastoral landscape which make up Prospect Park. The Park and Parkway were designed by Fredrick Law Olmstead and Calvert Vaux, who are perhaps more famous for designing Manhattan’s Central Park, where we find another Shakespeare Garden.



Figure 2: The apricot tree in the Brooklyn Shakespeare Garden, glossed with the Gardener’s instructions from Richard II: “Go, bind thou up yon dangling apriocks Go thou, and like an executioner, / Cut off the heads of too fast growing sprays, / That look too lofty in our commonwealth: / All must be even in our government” (3.4.29, 33-6).

Situated not far from the Delacorte Theater, the summer home of the Public Theater’s free *Shakespeare in the Park* performances, this second Shakespeare Garden, less than nine miles from the one in Brooklyn, was planted first, in 1913, and then officially named the “Shakespeare Garden” in 1916 to mark the tercentennial of Shakespeare’s death. One hundred years later, in 2016, the Central Park Conservancy, a non-profit public-private partnership which has maintained the park since 1998, celebrated the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare’s death. This essay is a fuller and more candid version of the essay presented as part of that celebration.

We might begin our inquiry into the rise of Shakespeare gardens by situating them in time and space. When we look back on the second decade of the twentieth century, the explosion of Shakespeare gardens seems, in many ways, overdetermined. In the best book on this subject, published just one month ago, *The Quest for Shakespeare’s Garden*, Roy Strong (2016) argues that in the last decades of the nineteenth century, a long-dormant interest in Elizabethan gardens arose in reaction to the High Victorian style. The period witnessed a flourishing of books exploring this long-forgotten and often

misremembered era of garden history. These historical studies were published alongside an impressive number of books that, by organizing and binding Shakespeare's references to flowers within the leaves of books, anticipated the cataloging spirit of real Shakespeare gardens. Strong lists Sidney Beisley's *Shakespeare's Garden, or the Plants and Flowers Named in his Works Described and Defined* (1864) as the first, followed by countless imitators, of which Walter Crane's *Flowers from Shakespeare's Garden* (1906) is the most well-known. These paper gardens were an off-shoot, Strong notes, of the larger literary trend known as the Victorian language of flowers, a phenomenon wherein a bouquet of flowers could be deciphered and translated into a secret message, that began when Louise Cortambert's *Le langage des fleurs* (1818) was translated into English in 1834. The Victorian desire to turn flowers into a secret language would be answered, in England and the US, by an equally fervent desire to turn Shakespeare's language into flowers. The first Shakespeare garden appears in Brockwell Park in Herne Hill, South London in 1892, and many followed on both sides of the Atlantic (Strong 2016, 64-5).

Central Park's garden begins with Dr. Edmond Bronk Southwick, a gardener, the Parks Department entomologist, and devoted reader of Shakespeare's plays, who, in cooperation with the Shakespeare Society and the Board of Education, planted the first bulbs of the garden ("Shakespeare Garden" 2017). The Shakespeare Garden in Central Park shares its official inauguration with a number of other Shakespeare gardens. During this year, the year of the tercentennial in 1916, Northwestern University and Vassar College also inaugurated Shakespeare gardens. Mick Hales observes that many of these gardens were established to illustrate the US' "empathy with England" in the middle of World War I (2006, 57). An article in the *New York Times* one year later reiterates this connection between the Garden, Anglo-US relations, and WWI:

Shakespeare's influence in developing among Americans appreciation of the ideals which caused her to take her stand beside Great Britain in the war against Germany was emphasized yesterday by speakers who assisted in the planting of an oak tree from Stratford-upon-Avon in the Shakespeare Garden in Central Park. The oak, gift off the Mayor of the bard's birthplace, was sent to New York City by Ambassador Page. Thousands of persons, including 150 girls from Public School 93, whose white dresses and red hair ribbons added the color of the occasion, witnessed the ceremony." ("Plant" 1917, E3)

What do we make of the politics of this transplanting of trees from nation to nation? If we think about the final and tragic catastrophe in *Macbeth*, we might remember Macbeth's shock when he's told that "the wood began to move" (Shakespeare 1951, 5.5.35). Within the drama of the play, the forest serves a few purposes: it is part of the magical and occult symbolism of the witches' prophesy, and it is an ostensibly fixed element of nature which, importantly, is linked to the stability and durability of Macbeth's political sovereignty. It's almost unthinkable that a forest might uproot itself and move elsewhere, or is it?

Jacobean audiences would be familiar, at this point, with such tropes implying the (im)possibility of “supplanting” a sovereign (like Richard II) or “transplanting” a sovereign (as happened when Scotland’s King James was transplanted into English soil). When the Duchess of Gloucester, in *Richard II*, bemoans the death of Thomas of Woodstock, she further links his arborescent name with the figure of a family tree, calling the sons of Edward III “seven fair branches springing from one root” (of solid “wood stock”) of which Thomas was “One flourishing branch of his most royal root...hacked down, and his summer leaves all faded / By Envy’s hand and Murder’s bloody axe” (Shakespeare 2002, 1.2.13,18-21). Horticulture provided a figure through which early moderns encoded and rationalized politics, but this relationship was reciprocal; politics also provided a lens through which to understand gardens and nature. Furthermore, this relationship was mediated, strengthened, and developed, as *Richard II* and *Macbeth* show, by another vehicle: theater.

Theatrical Gardens and Garden Theaters

Theater, gardening, landscape, and politics share an intimate and overlapping history. The leaves of books and the leaves of trees formed materials shared by early modern actors, sovereigns, courtiers, gardeners, and designers as they staged politics. John Dixon Hunt argues that “the equivalence of garden and theatre was palpable. Indeed, the relationship of theatre and garden in the late Italian Renaissance was particularly close and indelibly marked the English reaction to the latter” (1986, 59). Hunt highlights the slippage between gardens and theater by pointing out that, in English, the words “theatre” and “garden” were both used interchangeably to mean “compendia or collections,” citing John Parkinson’s *Theatricum Botanicum. The Theatre of Plants, or an Universall and Compleate Herball* (1640) and Henry Peaham’s *Minerva Britannia, a Garden of Heroicall Devises, furnished, and adorned with Emblems and Impresses* (1612) (1986, 67). Today, “Theatricum Botanicum” names an outdoor theater in Topanga Canyon, California founded by Will Greer, the botanist and actor who founded the theater for fellow actors who had been blacklisted by the House Un-American Activities committee during Hollywood’s Red Scare. The theater is also a Shakespeare Garden, with plaques marking flowers named in Shakespeare’s plays (“Our Story” 2017).

Many scholars have described how, as Jacobean gardens and theaters moved away from earlier Tudor styles, England witnessed “an increasing theatricalization of garden space” (Comito 1981, 618; Strong [1979] 1998). Elizabeth’s royal processions and James’ masques – particularly the work of Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones – wedded theater to gardens and landscape to drama. Theaters were built into gardens; gardens provided a crucial setting within staged drama; both theaters and gardens drew upon a shared repertoire of literary and mythological imagery and symbolism, particularly the natural themes of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (Woodhouse 1999, 22); and, in the seventeenth century, Euclidean geometry and linear perspective came to define the spectator’s

increasingly visual and durational experience of both the theatrical event and the garden promenade (Hunt 1986, 72; Strong [1979] 1998, 203; Cosgrove 1985).¹ The rich and fertile grounds that once connected the fields of theater and landscape architecture have since eroded, making them appear as separate fields which might, curiously and occasionally, overlap. We can now muse sincerely, if not innocently, on the significance of their coincidence in places like Shakespeare gardens. Let's turn, now, to examine the relations between theater and landscape architecture in the writings of Frederick Law Olmsted. New York City's Shakespeare Gardens are situated within the larger landscape of Olmsted and Vaux's Central Park, a design indebted to and derived from the naturalistic style of the "English landscape garden" tradition that dominated the European continent, beginning in 1720, before being transplanted to the United States. In a curious way, then, NYC's Shakespeare gardens cultivate a nostalgic desire for English soil within another, later style of English landscape architecture, one that nurtures and preserves – even while it threatens to sever and disavow – its English roots.

Olmsted wanted to keep science tethered to art. Seeking to recover a landscape architecture at once scientifically rigorous and enriched by investments in poetry and drama, Olmsted lamented what he saw as an historical shift toward scientific specialization, what he called "tunnel vision." In his essay "Landscape Gardening," Olmsted praises William Kent, the early eighteenth-century English landscape architect who, with Lancelot "Capability" Brown, transformed the ordered Tudor and Stuart landscapes into the picturesque English landscape garden; Olmsted worried that his contemporaries may have forgotten Kent's gardens' "impressive poetical qualities." He writes: "We may be sure, I think, that the profession of landscape gardening has not since been gaining as steadily in power to affect the imagination as it has gained in working material and in science. It is possible that it has lost something" (1876, 145).

It is difficult to reconcile Olmsted's view of Kent with our own contemporary view of the English landscape garden tradition. On the one hand, Roy Strong forcefully dedicates *The Renaissance Garden* to the "memory of all those gardens destroyed by Capability Brown and his successors." Strong argues that, as early as the middle of the seventeenth century, after England's Civil War, "Magic and science part company and the garden becomes instead a living instance of man's understanding of the processes of nature....Horticulture and the myriad phenomena of nature are studied for themselves and no longer for their occult meaning" (1979, 221). Olmsted, on the other hand, writing at a time when relatively little was yet known about Elizabethan and Stuart gardening styles, can look back to find aesthetic inspiration in the earlier styles of Kent and Brown (Scheper 1989).

¹ For a parallel study of the theatricalization of gardens in France, see Chandra Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions and the Garden of Versailles*. Cambridge UP, 1997.

In his “Address to the Prospect Park Scientific Association,” Olmsted claimed, “My own opinion is that the science of the engineer is never more worthily employed than . . . when it is carried into works not merely of art but of fine art” (1868, 195). He ends this speech by claiming “A park is a work of art, designed to produce certain effects upon the mind of men” (200) and by advising his colleagues that “We must study to secure a combination of elements which shall invite and stimulate the simplest, purest and most primeval action of the poetic element of human nature” (195-6). What changes between Shakespeare’s and Olmsted’s lifetimes, and between Olmsted and ours, is how we imagine the relationship between “poetry” and “nature,” and which “combination of elements” will produce the variously desired “effects”? For Olmsted, the key combination was the pastoral and the “picturesque,” an “unstable middle term” between the “smallness, smoothness, sweetness, and grace” of the *beautiful* and the “vastness, uniformity, magnificence, terror, and awe” of the *sublime* (Menard 2010, 519 n. 16).

The picturesque, like catharsis, describes specific formal qualities less than it describes the affective force of a spectacle in relation to the viewing subject. By 1878, Olmsted will describe the ideal effects of landscape architecture the way we often describe theater’s ability to move an audience through catharsis, though his description is couched in the sentiments, language, and philosophies of American Transcendentalism:

[F]rom the point of view of art or of the science of the imagination we may ask for something more in a landscape than breadth, depth, composition, and consistency. A traveler, suddenly turning his eyes upon a landscape that is new to him, and which cannot be directly associated with any former experience, may find himself touched as if by a deep sympathy, so that in an instant his eyes moisten (1878, 158).

Olmsted’s understanding of landscape architecture and the arts is nearly as far removed from ours as it is from Shakespeare’s, part of what makes the Shakespeare Garden in Central Park feel like a fascinatingly uneven palimpsest of aesthetic, horticultural, and political trends.

Horticultural Semiotics

No Shakespeare garden is complete without a plaque commemorating Juliet’s musings on horticulture and naming: “What’s in a name? that which we call a rose / By any other word would smell as sweet” (1980, 2.2.43-4). The question appears in the Central Park garden (though they prefer the first quarto’s “by any other *name*”), and in nearly every book written about Shakespeare and gardens. What strikes most about these gardens (and the books which parallel them) is how, through indexing and pairing, the gardens decontextualize twice over: once, by isolating individual references to plants within the plays, and the second time by isolating individual flowers from the broader garden as a whole. Juliet’s question perfectly illustrates the dangers of this double decontextualization. Her question, pulled from its dramatic context, suggests, to

postmodern audiences, the arbitrariness of the sign, or to the casual visitor, the idea that “names are not important” as long as “it is what it is.” Within its dramatic and historical context, however, the passage suggests the exact opposite; in Juliet’s world of feuding families, names and roses are incredibly important, mortally important even. A rose by any other name might mean treachery. Love, far from being an abstract or personal emotion or decision, was highly codified and regulated by familial alliances, the religious institutions of marriage, and the court (we still say “courtship” without, perhaps, recognizing the persistence of these semantic ghosts) all of which were rooted in property and land.

Today, it is easy for us to isolate and delimit the meanings of objects like roses, even if roses are perhaps the most semantically loaded flower in the American horticultural imaginary. For most visitors to the Shakespeare garden, a rose might suggest a limited range of associations: love, Valentine’s Day, perhaps apologies, but for early moderns, in addition to being used in cooking, medicine, and cosmetics, the rose carried a host of political resonances. Bennett explains how the Tudor rose symbolized a reconciliation of the feuding houses in the thirty-year War of the Roses:

The red rose of Lancaster (*Rosa gallica* var. *officinalis*) and the white rose of York (*R. x alba*) were united when Henry VII married Elizabeth of York and he created a new emblem – the Tudor rose. With its red outer and white inner pedals, it became a potent symbol of the dynasty...The Tudor rose remained the royal symbol throughout the reigns of Henry VIII, his son Edward and his daughters Mary and Elizabeth. (2016, 20)

Shakespeare dramatizes the history of this floral (and military) emblem, of course, in *Henry VI*. These meanings, and their connection to the feud between Montagues and Capulets, are lost when we universalize Shakespeare’s plays or remove them from their “feudal” and dramatic contexts.

The practice of isolating individual flowers – no doubt influenced by the Victorian language of flowers – also obscures the way in which each element within Tudor gardens spoke to its neighboring plants through a complex intertextual dramaturgy. In early Tudor gardens, heraldic beasts, atop brightly painted pinnacles, took center stage, supported by and integrated within an ensemble cast of painted wooden rails (green and white, the Tudor colors), sundials, mounts, fountains, and, perhaps most importantly, knot gardens. Roy Strong describes how, as early as 1530, fish ponds and moats, which were necessary for sustenance and defense, respectively, become “cast in a role beyond that of the purely utilitarian,” as practical features of grounds like Hampton Court metamorphosed and took on the aesthetics of the pleasure garden (1979, 28). But these aesthetic dimensions, we should acknowledge, are also practical and utilitarian means of meeting political ends. Heraldic beasts, of course, explicitly symbolize aristocratic power and privilege. These ends become more explicit and more complex in the age of the Elizabethan garden.

For centuries gardeners and scholars have conflated Tudor and Stuart gardens. Strong's study changes this narrative by illustrating a series of distinct garden styles existing between Henry VIII and James I. Most significant, perhaps, is a transformation inaugurated by Elizabeth's reign, when "the older heraldic vocabulary developed into the much richer language of allegory" (Strong 1979, 34). Whereas today horticultural signifiers have a rather limited, finite and loosely associated number of signifieds (we are still quite Victorian in this respect), for Elizabethans, the range of associations would have been broad and endless. Early moderns lived in a world of multiple and intricately overlapping systems of association: imitations and resemblances, conjunctions, allegories, analogies, and sympathies, all of which tightly worked within and wove together politics, theology, commerce, science, nature, and domestic life (Foucault 1970).² The human body itself was elemental, composed of and corresponding to the larger orders of the universe, its elements, and seasons. It's within this cosmology that we can better understand not only the rose but the allegorical and emblematic discourses of Elizabethan gardens in general.

These emblematic Elizabethan discourses were mediated by mazes, labyrinths, and knot gardens, but these mazes and knot gardens were not like what would come later; Elizabethans did not yet use box, which did not become popular until the early seventeenth century, and their mazes were not tall but rather like "foot mazes" in the medieval tradition, reaching only one or two feet high (Bennett 2016, 32); this low height allowed a garden visitor greater freedom of vision. Jennifer Munroe tells us that labyrinths date back to the pre-Reformation monastic gardens; they "were places of meditation and exercise, and they served as visual reminders of how humans imposed order on the natural world: the garden labyrinth represents human art ordering the disorderly landscape" (2005, 44). Much as we, today, labor to restore Elizabethan gardens while putting them to use in the present, Elizabethans, too, appropriated a medieval past in order to venerate the present and cultivate a national future. The Protestant Reformation and the dissolution of the monasteries in 1539 each mark crucial shifts in Tudor understandings of gardens and parks. In *The English Park: Royal, Private, and Public*, Susan Lasdun explains: "The years 1536-9 saw the biggest transference of land since the Conquest. One third of England was said to have changed hands. And between 1540 and the end of his reign, Henry VIII sold, gave away or exchanged two thirds of the monastic lands, distributing

² When Michel Foucault describes what he calls the "four forms of similitude" dominant in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century (*convenientia*, *aemulatio*, *analogy*, and *sympathies*) in "The Prose of the World" chapter of *The Order of Things*, his citations all show early moderns linking horticulture to zoology to the humanities. In his discussion of emulation, he cites O. Crollius, who writes "The stars are the matrix of all the plants and every star in the sky is only the spiritual prefiguration of the plant, such that it represents that plant, and just as each herb or plant is a terrestrial star looking up at the sky, so each star is a celestial plant in spiritual form" (1970, 20).

them among roughly one thousand people” (1992, 26). The period witnessed an increase in *landed* gentry for whom gardens were de rigueur.

Like the monastic gardens, which served as sites for spiritual contemplation, emblematic gardens, under Queen Elizabeth, become sites of Protestant, spiritual (and thus political) contemplation. Strong writes, “For the Protestant the summer house replaced the cloister in which one might seek solitude” (1979, 211). The late medieval *hortus conclusus*, or walled garden, drew upon scripture to equate the walled garden with the body of the Virgin Mary, with the sealed yet productive space serving to represent immaculate conception. After the Protestant Reformation, Queen Elizabeth appropriates, Protestantizes, and nationalizes this conceit, displacing the cult of the Virgin Mary with the cult of the Virgin Queen (49). Emblematic gardens built by Elizabeth’s courtiers also labored to celebrate their Queen and England’s power, wealth, and order; gardens referenced Elizabeth’s mythological aliases as Astraea, the Greek goddess of Virginité, Chastity, and Justice; one courtier constructed a garden in the shape of a crescent moon, signifying Cynthia or Diana, the chaste goddesses of the moon with which Elizabeth was associated (Strong 1999, 6).

King James’ ascension to the throne normalized relations with the continent and allowed English gardens to reconnect to gardening styles in France and Italy. The Stuart and Caroline Gardens, described by Strong as “Mannerist” and then “Eclectic,” incorporated hydraulic waterworks and were increasingly marked, especially after Inigo Jones’ return from Italy in 1614, by the wedding of perspective to duration in order to theatricalize nature in dramas that literally naturalized the divine right of kings (Strong 1979, 200). Because of Jones’ interdisciplinary expertise, which spanned from theatrical masques to landscape architecture, both gardens and theaters “deliberately developed into [machines] for controlling the visual experience” of garden visitors and theatrical spectators (203). Terry Comito describes how the two-dimensionality of the Elizabethan knot garden became folded into a “more plastic use of space” wherein new, three-dimensional gardens offered visitors a temporal, and thus more theatrical, experience (1981, 617).

The Horticultural Body Politic

From atop Mount Prospect Park, near the entrance to the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens, one gets a sense of the picturesque which emerged in landscape architecture during the age between Shakespeare and Olmsted, along with elements drawn from both times. One can look down toward Grand Army Plaza, also designed by Olmsted and Vaux, at the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Memorial Arch, a triumphal arch with grand Tuscan columns crowned by Frederick MacMonnies’ allegorical quadriga. One can see, within the symbolism of this political allegory, the persistence of Tudor heraldry. Before Olmsted and the US Civil War, Mount Prospect Heights served as a natural defense and vantage point – a strategic site/sight – in the Battle of Brooklyn in the American

Revolutionary War against the British. The British won and retained control of New York City. How appropriate, then, that at least one British citizen maintains a presence within his eponymous garden there. Denis Cosgrove alerts us to two etymological developments regarding the words “prospect” and “landscape” which might help us understand the connection between the Brooklyn’s Shakespeare Garden and this site/sight: by the middle of the seventeenth century, the word “prospect” had become synonymous with “landscape” because of the “*commanding* sight or view” such prospects offered: “landscape,” when it enters English from the German “*landschaft*,” meaning simply “area,” acquires the aesthetic and visual connotations which tie geography to art (1985, 55-6, emphasis in original).

The logic and aesthetics of Stuart and Caroline gardens were carefully laid out in a monumental and influential book written by the appropriately-named John Parkinson (“park in sun”), apothecary to James I and later the Royal Botanist of Charles I. In his book *Paradisi in Sole Paradisus Terrestris* (Park-in-Sun’s Terrestrial Paradise) (1629), “[Parkinson] was seeking to distinguish the ‘fit’ from the ‘unfit’, to rank and order plants into a hierarchy according to affinities. In presenting the reader with an ordered and ranked garden, he was also presenting them with a perception, whether real or not, of an ordered, ranked and stable society” (Francis 2008, 25). In *The Order of Things*, Foucault argues that knowledge in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was organized around a logic of similitude (resemblance, conjunction, analogy, allegory, sympathy); we see this in the Tudor and Stuart gardens. But the seventeenth century, what Foucault calls the “Classical Age,” marks a shift in epistemology and a movement toward distinction, identity, and dispersion. Foucault writes, “there has opened up a field of knowledge in which, because of an essential rupture in the Western world, what has become important is no longer resemblances but identities and differences” (1970, 50). We can see this tension and rupture between “affinity” and “rank and order” in Jill Francis’ description of Parkinson’s project. We can also see this rupture dramatized in Iago’s advice to Roderigo in *Othello*, advice excerpted and displayed in many a Shakespeare garden: “Our bodies are our gardens, to the which our wills are gardeners” (Shakespeare 2016, 1.3.321). Rarely does anyone cite the next part of Iago’s exhortation, which continues:

So that if we will plant nettles or sow lettuce, set hyssop and weed up thyme, supply it with one gender of herbs, or distract it with many, either to have it sterile with idleness, or manured with industry – why, the power and corrigible authority of this lies in our wills. If the balance of our lives had not one scale of reason to poise another of sensuality, the blood and baseness of our natures would conduct us to most preposterous conclusions. But we have reason to cool our raging motions, our carnal stings, our unbitted lusts; whereof I take this, that you call love, to be a sect or scion. (1.3.321-333)

Here we witness the horticultural human body figured as an ecosystem tended by the gardener, “reason”; against a “sensuality” and the “baseness of our

natures,” reason prunes the “scions” of “unbitted” emotions. The self-fashioning gardener makes distinctions and separations, in the body politic and the body natural, between the sterility of pastoral idleness and the fecundity of urban industry.

Gardening manuals of the time regularly linked the care and shape of gardens to larger political and social concerns. Francis observes that “It was as relevant to write, as Reynold Scot did, of ‘The Reformation of a Disordered Garden’, giving instruction on how ‘to repair a ruinous garden, which through ignorance was disorderly let, and through sloth suffered to overrun’, as it was to write in broader terms of the reformation of the social order” (2008, 23). We can witness this connection if we remember that Hamlet also worked as a gardener when he pruned the rottenness within the state of Denmark. In his first soliloquy, he tells the audience that the world is “an unweeded garden / That grows to seed, things rank and gross in nature / Possess it merely” (Shakespeare 2006, 1.2.135-7). But this connection between gardens and the health of the body politic is perhaps nowhere better represented than in the garden scene in *Richard II*. In this scene, the Head Gardener of Kings Langely Palace tells his apprentice that England, figured as a “sea-walled garden,” would be in better health had Richard not sheltered his courtly flatterers with his “broad-spreading leaves,” allowing these “noisome weeds” to grow and eat away at him (Shakespeare 2002, 3.4.43, 3.4.50, 3.4.38). These real-life courtiers were appropriately named “Bushy” and “Green.” “O, what pity is it,” the Gardner exclaims, “That [Richard] had not so trimmed and dressed his land/As we this garden!” (3.4.55-57)

Tensions and changes within the body politic – between vertical social mobility within rigid hierarchy and horizontal, democratic civic ideals – exist in both Olmsted’s and Shakespeare’s worlds. By the end of the sixteenth century, gardens, increasingly rooted in a logic of Divine Right, escaped the boundaries of the great estates of aristocrats. The emergent “middling sort” and new gentry, a class that would include Shakespeare, were increasingly adding gardens to their country cottages. The growth of the printing press produced a flowering of gardening literature in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and this included a substantial number of manuals for more modest gardens. Books of husbandry and herbals made horticultural expertise available to gardeners of various classes. Women, too, were very involved in creating Jacobethan gardens (Munroe 2005, 23). Jennifer Munroe notes that one of these new manuals was aimed at women of the middling class:

[William] Lawson’s *A Countrie Housewife’s Garden* [1617] [sought] a new audience of women gardening enthusiasts: rural country housewives who had new sources of expendable income and enough leisure time to plant knot gardens [...] Most late-sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century modern women, whether aristocratic or country housewives, received training in needlework and gardening as part of their education and engaged in these practices on a routine basis. (38-9)

Munroe and others describe the intimate connection between needlework and gardening, how actual garden plants and designs became patterns embroidered into fabric. Her study, which focuses on writer, needleworker, and gardener Lady Mary Wroth, highlights the ways in which gardening and needlework gave women power and agency, as each provided a space to improvise within forms established by and inherited from men (39).

Shakespeare's dramatic poetry and these early modern gardening manuals are not too distant from Olmsted's writings on landscape architecture, which, like these texts, always sought to connect the management and production of nature with larger civic issues. They differ, however, in their understandings of the proper shape and dynamic of the body politic. The Jacobethan aristocracy sought order and hierarchy as a relief from political chaos, civil strife, and an unruly nature, whereas for Olmsted and Vaux, experiencing crafted, picturesque landscape could provide sanctuary and prospective freedom from and within a highly constrained, regulated, and rigidly organized urban environment. Olmsted describes the park's aim: "to remove those who are affected by it to the greatest possible distance from the highly elaborate, sophisticated and artificial conditions of their ordinary civilized life" (1868, 195-6). Whereas Elizabethans needed order from their gardens, nineteenth-century Americans needed a break from such order. But the park offered more than just a break; its benefit was not simply an absence of harm. For Olmsted, the park experience is didactic, socially and politically. Because one of the defining features of the picturesque is that it allows park visitors to practice relating various parts to wholes, exercising the freedom of perspective vision within what appear to be the constraints imposed by nature, the park would train and prepare citizens by retooling how they see the world and their place in it (Menard 2010, 519-23).

Gardens, Heritage, and History

Today, organizations like English Heritage and the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust labor to preserve and restore England's Renaissance gardens. However,

Shakespeare's Gardens today [in Stratford] have elements of Tudor and Jacobean design and planting within them, but they are not recreations of sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century gardens [...]. Very few gardens are recreated totally in the period [...] but tend [instead] to illustrate a succession of periods and styles. (Bennett 2016, 14)

We might think that gardens resemble medieval palimpsests in their ability to register, assemble, and combine multiple histories. But to what extent might such combinations of periods and styles create false continuities or obscure historical differences?

Like these gardens, which are successions of different periods and styles, Shakespeare's stage might have also operated according to a principle of polychrony. A drawing by Henry Peacham, who saw *Titus Andronicus* performed, survives as the only image of a Shakespearean performance made by a

contemporary (Bate [1995] 2002, 38-43).³ The actors on the stage, curiously, wear costumes from three distinct time periods: ancient, medieval, and early modern. This suggests the ways in which Shakespeare's history plays worked to produce analogies between past and present. It also allowed his drama to speak to the present through dramatizations of the past. Perhaps the Peacham drawing will allow us to make sense of another moment in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, a moment we can find on one of the plaques in Central Park's Shakespeare Garden. It's the moment when Oberon remembers the location of Titania's bower:

I know a bank where the wild thyme blows,
Where oxlips and the nodding violet grows,
Quite overcanopied with luscious woodbine,
With sweet muskroses and with eglantine:
There sleeps Titania sometime of the night,
Lulled in these flowers with dances and delight;
(Shakespeare 1999, 2.1.249-254)

Richard Mabey (2010), in his book *Weeds: In Defense of Nature's Unloved Plants* makes an interesting observation about the bank described by Oberon, one which we might link to the Peacham Drawing. He writes:

But the location isn't literal. The botanical dramatis personae are from different seasons and different habitats. Even in Warwickshire's Forest of Arden you couldn't at one moment of the year assemble a bouquet of pansies together with the luscious but bewildering ingredients of Titania's bank, 'whereon the wild thyme grows' It is certainly a very odd list They grow in different habitats, and flower at different times of the year (2010, 110, 112, also qt. in Thomas and Faircloth 2014, n.p.)

So, this bank is technically impossible, yet it works on its audience because the Ovidian landscape of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* operates as a space of fantasy and dream. In fact, forests operate this way in many of Shakespeare's plays. The same might be said for our city's parks. It seems that what we seek from a garden or a park, and what we see in such landscapes, register anxieties born of the polychronic tension between nostalgia and social desire.

Connected to this desire to disconnect from the city and escape into such Green Worlds, as Northrop Frye called them, is an equally potent nostalgic desire to commune with the past. It's this desire that fuels the heritage industry obsessed with historical reconstruction, origin stories, authenticity, natural purity, and historical continuity. This desire is manifest in the legend of the mulberry tree Shakespeare planted at New Place. When, in 1759, Reverend Gastrell chopped down the tree on what was then his property,

³ While there is wide agreement, there is not total consensus about what we can infer from the Peacham Drawing.

an enterprising carpenter, Thomas Sharpe, made trinkets from the timber – snuff boxes, goblets and caskets – as mementos to be sold to visitors. Many more of these survive than could possibly be genuine....Whatever the truth, Shakespeare mulberries have sprung up in many gardens – claiming to be descended from the original” (Bennett 2016, 64).

Possession of such items promises to put us in proximity of the man himself, rooting us in the same history and soil in which his genius flowered. Shakespeare mentions the mulberry in *Coriolanus*; when the hero’s mother begs him to check his pride, she asks that he be “humble as the ripest mulberry / That will not hold the handling” (Shakespeare 2013, 3.2.80-1; Bennett 2016, 64). History, and historical gardens, work like the mulberry, falling apart at the very moment we reach out to touch them, never quite satisfying our appetites. Historical work requires patience, and mulberries, similarly, have long been associated with patience, an emotion which roots us firmly in the present while easing our relation to the future.

In his book *Cultural Shakespeare*, Graham Holderness makes a crucial distinction between “heritage” and “history.” He writes that a “characteristic strategy of ‘heritage’ [is] to affirm the contiguity of the present and the past. An old world can be ‘entered’ simply by stepping off the present on to a plane of imaginative reality continuous with the past” (2002, 89). Here, Holderness is describing enterprises like Civil War reenactments, the living museums of Colonial Williamsburg, or the “original practices” movement embraced by Shakespeare’s reconstructed Globe Theatre in London. Interestingly, Strong points out that in the first quarter of the twentieth century, the period during which NYC’s Shakespeare gardens were planted and the New Place garden was redesigned to ensure its historical authenticity, similar heritage projects and garden reconstructions were being constructed in France and Colonial Williamsburg (2016, 89). “Original Practice” or OP, describes a fantasy of historical reconstruction in which all-male casts follow early modern rehearsal processes, perform in historical accents and locations, and dress strictly in authentic period costumes. This is often, however, “heritage” performance. “Historical” performance, on the other hand, recognizes and values historical change and difference; moreover, historical performance *disorients*. According to Holderness, such an experience of ‘history’ invites “dislocation in normal habits of perception, the shock of coming up against historical difference” (2002, 85). How might theater or gardens perform such cultural work? How do we look back without nostalgia?

The study of Elizabethan gardens and dramas highlights such historical difference, as these objects fail to speak to us in a language we understand. Their design no longer suits their social function. Perhaps David Harvey’s work on the relationship of heritage to landscape (what some call “heritagescape”) might be of use here; Harvey, for whom “heritage” is a less pejorative term, argues that “rather than the *retrospective* memory of the palimpsest, therefore, the *immanence* of heritage process suggests a *prospective* memory, an on-going

relationship between past, present, and future [...which...] recast[s] material pasts as having action, as having a stake, as being co-present, co-creative, and co-constitutive (2013, 159, 155). Shakespeare's theater drew upon the past to produce a future-oriented civic vision. The radical possibilities of his public theater opened up new social spaces not unlike those inaugurated by the public parks Olmsted and Vaux brought to American cities.

Rethinking Labor, Primitive Accumulation, and the Pastoral

Olmsted and Shakespeare redefined and complicated assumptions about the relationship between art and nature, each fighting against those who would place their faith in nature while remaining suspicious of art. This, despite the fact that Shakespeare was dubbed the Poet of Nature and Olmsted was imagined as its architect. In what is undoubtedly my favorite of Olmsted's essays, "Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns," Olmsted wittily reminds us of his contemporaries' (mis-)understandings of nature:

[A leading citizen] of distinguished professional reputation seriously urged [...] that the ground [of what would be Central Park] should be rented as a sheep-walk. In going to and from their folds the flocks would be sure to form trails which would serve the public perfectly well as foot-paths; *nature would in time supply* whatever else was essential to form a quite picturesque and perfectly suitable strolling ground for such as would wish to resort to it (1870, 238 emphasis added).

This faith in nature's benevolent and harmonious relationship to human needs (the so-called Gaia hypothesis) is very different than the view of nature expressed in the Elizabethan garden, with its submission of nature to the will of the artisan. But the naturalism emphasized by later gardens might make one believe such a thing about nature. Indeed, Olmsted and Vaux' aesthetic encourages such a view.

Leo Marx, in his groundbreaking study of the pastoral, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*, writes that "At times the garden is used to represent the sufficiency of nature in its original state. Then it conveys an impulse-centered, anarchic, or primitivistic view of life. But elsewhere the garden stands for a state of cultivation, hence, a less exalted estimate of nature's beneficence" (1964, 42). He notes, "Each of these attitudes toward nature accords with a distinct idea of history" (55). We might note the Romanticism of the former and the early modern logic of the latter. However, the two are often mixed.

What we do not see, according to many scholars, is the strain of labor missing from the Elizabethan pastoral that flourished in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, nor do we see the laborers themselves (Montrose 1983, 427). An earlier pastoral tradition emphasized the sweat of the brow and the work of the plowman, which produced rural comforts – the labor in the sun which gave meaning to the rest in the shade. The pastoral of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, however, marked an historical shift; it was now an aristocratic

form written by upstarts and “new men” intent on writing their way into the country estates outside London. Kenneth Burke claimed that the pastoral did not depict class antagonisms as much as it provided “a stylistic transcending of conflict” contributing to the “mystification of class” (qt. in Montrose 1983, 417). Whereas the success of Olmsted’s naturalistic landscape design suggested the expendability of nature’s architects (they might be replaced by sheep), Shakespeare and his colleagues labored to naturalize and obscure changing conventions regarding the ownership of nature (wherein arable pasture was in fact replaced by sheep).

This leads us to the second historical shift which gave shape to the Renaissance pastoral and its attendant ideas about the country and the city: the decline of feudal relations and the emergence of agrarian and mercantile capitalism. The transition from feudalism to capitalism, and the instability of authority which it entailed, marks every play in Shakespeare’s canon, and scholars have long labored to see how these changes are registered in his drama. One of the biggest changes involved the enclosure and privatization of the commons, public land which sustained the landless classes (95% of those living in England). Montrose explains:

[P]astoralism was the focus of a moral, economic, and ecological controversy that had provoked pamphlets and petitions, riots and rebellions, throughout the sixteenth century...In order to capitalize on an expanding market for wool (and also for mutton) Tudor landowners enclosed common fields and engrossed small, scattered holdings. These and other measures taken to ‘rationalize’ pastoral farming often resulted in the abrogation or erosion of traditional tenant rights and in the disruption or even the destruction of village life in some rural areas. (1983, 425)

The enclosure of the commons marks one shameful origin of English landscape gardens. Coinciding with the explosion of popularity of the English landscape garden, four thousand Parliamentary Acts of Enclosure were enacted between the second quarter of the eighteenth century through the first quarter of the nineteenth. While the process of enclosure began in the thirteenth century, it “reached a first peak in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries” (Williams 1973, 96). In a nation in which sheep outnumbered people by as much as three-to-one, it is no wonder that the ploughman of earlier pastorals was increasingly replaced by the gentleman shepherd (Montrose 1983, 421). In fact, when Sir Philip Sidney’s composed his famed pastoral, *Aradia*, he did so “in a park which had been made by enclosing a whole village and evicting the tenants” (Williams 1973, 22).

Olmsted recognized aspects of this history. When he explained the origins of parks to the Prospect Park Scientific Association, he articulated this history in the starkest terms:

[Parks] were not public properties but when the state of society was yet essentially barbarous [parcels of land] were selected and taken possession of, prized, fought for and held solely by the rich and

powerful – and when society became better organized and less rude, these same pieces of ground still remained a peculiar possession of the more fortunate and arrogant, who had residencies in the midst of them. (1868, 190)

Elsewhere, Olmsted observes that the migration of people to towns “corresponds closely with the degree in which the habits of the people have been recently changed by the abolition of feudalism, slavery, and government by divine right” (1870, 207). In this moment, Olmsted seems to recognize that the values and politics of Shakespeare’s world – the world of the great Tudor and Stuart estates and gardens – were both the *origin of*, and the *great impediment to*, the possibility of public parks. Surely this tension must have been on Olmsted’s mind when he discovered the value of public parks in England while visiting the People’s Park at Birkenhead, or perhaps during his many trips to London to do research, perhaps at Regent’s Park, land emparked by Henry VIII after the dissolution of the monasteries which, while open to the public, is named for and owned by the tradition of sovereignty which appropriated it (Lasdun 1992, 29-30). But Olmsted’s comments on the migration to cities as a result of the abolition of feudalism are, of course, a bit more complicated. Marx described this process as “primitive accumulation” in Volume One of *Capital*, and Marxist scholars have continued to define “primitive” or “primary accumulation” as a violent separation of the people from the land (the means of production) and their exile into the wage slavery offered by cities (De Angelis 2001).

Marxist scholars debate whether Marx’ term “primitive accumulation” describes a distinct historical event, particular to Europe, or if the term can be used with any precision to describe subsequent and continuous instances of capital enforcing the separation of pre- or non-capitalist laborers from the means of production (De Angelis 2001). Even as Olmsted, in his writings, recognizes the violence of enclosure as the condition of possibility for his public park projects, in many ways he continues the violence of this disavowed legacy. In a study of Olmsted’s work in Yosemite, Kenneth Robert Olwig cites Olmsted’s racism toward Native Americans – his belief in the insensitivity of “savages” who are “lazy, ravenous, brutal, filthy, improvident, lying, treacherous, bloodthirsty scoundrel[s]” – and highlights his ambivalence around, and connection to, enclosure: “Like the British country gentlemen who created their parks by incorporating common lands and displacing local communities in the process, Olmsted sees no problem in evicting native inhabitants, or even pioneer homesteaders, from a park” (2002, 201-2, 199). Olmsted’s ambivalence, can be explained by W.J.T. Mitchell’s thesis on the connection between imperialism and landscape painting: “Like imperialism, landscape is an object of nostalgia in a postcolonial and postmodern era, reflecting a time when metropolitan cultures could imagine their destiny in an unbounded ‘prospect’ of endless appropriation and conquest” (2002, 20).

Sewing Democracy, Reaping Hierarchy

Shakespeare and Olmsted sought, in very new ways, to reimagine democracy's complicated relationship to hierarchy, about which both were deeply ambivalent. Scholars are equally ambivalent in their descriptions of Shakespeare's attitudes towards democracy and the lower classes. We know that he had a friend who participated in the leveling of the hedges during the Midland Revolt, but there are also suspicions that he benefited from enclosure; we also know that he hoarded grain in order to resell it when the shortage increased prices (Holland 2013, 65-7; O'Dair 2000, 89). The plays, of course, like the playwright, seem to play both sides, extolling the virtues of equality while capitulating to their aristocratic and monarchic patrons. He was, after all, one of the King's Men. Graham Holderness argues that in America, in particular, "Shakespeare has been...used to rationalize a chronic ambivalence towards both the practice of democracy and archaic forms of authority and the absolutist state" (2002, 123). Montrose has argued that the pastoral itself is a form wherein contradictions, between secular aristocracy and hierarchy are in conflict with democratic notions of equality, common origins, and a "shared fallennes" (1983, 432). During the Peasants Revolt of 1381, the radical priest John Ball popularized an enduring mantra which invoked the biblical garden in order to question aristocratic privilege. His question was, "When Adam delved and Eve span / Who was then the gentleman?" In this perhaps shortest of pastorals, we see very clearly the labor that would have to be repressed by the Renaissance pastoral. This tension is also evident in *Richard II*, in which the Gardener, while expressing pity that Richard has lost his crown, asks the Servant to "Cut off the heads of too fast-growing sprays / That look too lofty in our commonwealth. / All must be even in our government" (Shakespeare 2002, 3.4.34-6).

Nevertheless, Shakespeare's public theater went a long way towards creating a space for public democracy, and his plays transgressed such forms of authority quite regularly. Sir Philip Sidney, the aristocratic poet, sided with Puritans who castigated the new public theater for "mingling kings and clowns" (1595 [1999], 383) When servants, which is what Shakespeare and his fellow actors were, are licensed to wear the trappings of a king, violating the sumptuary laws of the time, which highly regulated the colors, fabrics, and types of clothing each class could wear, certainly this democratizing gesture poses some challenge to traditional authority. In this respect, theaters – like gardens in Olmsted's day – became laboratories for experiments in social change. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, Shakespeare's public theater was an innovation that put otherwise segregated populations into close contact. By the end of Shakespeare's life, in fact, London's theaters were already beginning to segregate by class. The political dream of the exiled leper colony, described by Foucault in *Discipline and Punish*, was already giving way to the political dream of the arrested plague, the latter of which is the disciplinary regime of separation and segmentation (1975, 197-8). Kings and clowns would mingle no more.

It comes as no surprise, then, that in nineteenth-century New York City, a city mired by poverty and riled by xenophobic responses to newly-arrived immigrant communities, Olmsted and Vaux faced similar criticism when they attempted to create a park that would encourage a mixing of classes and nations – what Olmsted called “congregated human life” (1870, 231). An 1857 editorial in the *New York Herald* makes this fear of inter-class congregation explicit:

It is all folly to expect in this country to have parks like those in the old aristocratic countries. When we open a public park Sam will air himself in it [...]. He will knock down any better dressed man who remotely remonstrates with him. He will talk and sing, and fill his share of the bench, and flirt with nursery-maids in his own coarse way. Now we ask what chance have William B. Astor or Edward Everett against this fellow-citizen of theirs? Can they and he enjoy the same place? Is it not obvious that he will turn them out, and that the great Central Park will be nothing but a great beer-garden for the lowest denizens of the city, of which we shall yet pray litanies to be delivered? (qt. in Olmsted 1870, 238-9)

Olmsted cites this fear, after the fact, to illustrate the baselessness of such attempts by the New York elite to halt his park project, and to argue that such spaces will transform the character and behavior of their visitors. Olmsted believed public parks would stoke what he called the “gregarious” and “neighborly” instincts in the city’s inhabitants (at least, we might clarify, the city’s “white” inhabitants). He argued that “No one who has closely observed the conduct of the people who visit the Park, can doubt that it exercises a distinct harmonizing and refining influence upon the most unfortunate and most lawless classes of the city – an influence favorable to courtesy, self-control, and temperance” (1870, 246). We should also pause, here, to recognize who, in fact, was dominated and pushed out of the Park; it was not William B. Astor.

These concerns return us to the present, a present enriched perhaps by Olmsted’s prescient and prospective vision of the city: “If the great city to arise here is to be laid out little by little, and chiefly to suit the views of land-owners, acting only individually, and thinking only of how what they do is to affect the value in the next week or the next year...the opportunities [will] amount to nothing” (1870, 229). The twentieth century was a great experiment in the expansion and support of public institutions across the US. But in the twenty-first century those institutions are shrinking in the face of a neoliberalism, austerity, and privatization. Recent analyses of the wealth gap show the US returning to nineteenth century levels of inequality. The public parks movement, it seems, has also been re-enclosed by NYC’s current aristocracy. On February 12, 1998, NYC Mayor Rudolph Giuliani formalized the City’s surrender of Central Park to the Central Park Conservancy, a public-private partnership which offered to “rescue” the Park (but not its unionized workers or parks in less wealthy parts of NYC) when the very financial maneuvers which made that class wealthy bankrupted the city; the Prospect Park Alliance did the same in

Brooklyn.⁴ The Shakespeare garden might, in this light, have something to teach us, something disorienting about our own past, something long obscured yet hidden in plain sight. Michael Powell, in the *New York Times*, describes the City's parks under public-private partnerships (PPPs).

New York's parks offer a feudal landscape of the privileged and underprivileged. There is the squire's fancy that is Brooklyn Bridge Park, the Von Furstenberg/Barry Dillared ornament that is the High Line, and of course the grand duchy that is the Central Park Conservancy. These largely private operations are not for plebes. (2013, n.p.)

When Powell asked Emily Lloyd, the President of the Prospect Park Alliance to explain, she replied, "In this country, we don't really fund public infrastructure and public spaces as we do in other countries" (n.p.). But we did. Curiously, Olmsted's Brooklynite contemporary, Walt Whitman, once imagined a real Jacobethan garden in Central Park toward the end of the nineteenth century. In his "Central Park Notes," Whitman records a conversation with a park policeman, "C.C." When asked about politics, Whitman reports that his friend perceived how "the inward caste-spirit of European 'aristocracy' pervaded rich America" as evidenced by the "hundreds of thousands" of carriages riding by day after day (1892, 582). Whitman continues:

And on a large proportion of these vehicles, on panels or horse-trappings, were conspicuously borne *heraldic family crests*. (Can this really be true?) In wish and willingness (and if that were so, what matter the reality?) titles of nobility, with a court and spheres fit for capitalists, the highly educated, and the carriage-riding classes – to fence them off from 'the common people' – were the heart's desire of the 'good society' of our great cities, aye, of North and South. (582; emphasis original)

Enclosure is continuous, and the recent defeat of the Great Sioux Nation at Standing Rock bears witness to this fact. Neoliberal privatization threatens to revive inequalities of the past, erasing the work of the public parks movement. If these trends cannot be resisted, the future promises to transform the whole of Central Park, and Prospect Park, too, into Shakespeare gardens more monstrously authentic than we can imagine, a reality which might finally disabuse us of our inherited pastoral fantasies of "Merrie Olde England."

Bibliography

- "A Brief History of BBG." 2017. *Brooklyn Botanic Garden*. Accessed August 27, 2017. <http://www.bbg.org/about/history>.
- Bate, Jonathan. 2002. "Introduction." *Titus Andronicus*, by William Shakespeare. 1995. London: Arden Shakespeare, 3rd series.

⁴ For a fuller account of this story, see Kim Moody's *From Welfare State to Real Estate: Regime Change in New York City, 1974 to the Present*. The New Press, 2007.

- Bennett, Jackie. 2016. *Shakespeare's Gardens*. London: Frances Lincoln, in association with the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust.
- Comito, Terry. 1981. "Review: *The Renaissance Garden in England*, by Roy Strong." *Renaissance Quarterly* 34 (4, Winter): 615-618.
- Cosgrove, Denis. 1985. "Prospect, Perspective, and the Evolution of the Landscape Idea." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 10 (1): 45-62.
- De Angelis, Massimo. 2001. "Marx and Primitive Accumulation: The Continuous Character of Capital's 'Enclosures'." *The Commoner* (2): 1-32.
- Foucault, Michel. 1975. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- . 1970. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Francis, Jill. 2008. "Order and Disorder in the Early Modern Garden (1558-c.1630)." *Garden History* 36 (1): 22-35. Accessed November 17, 2017. www.jstor.org/stable/25472392.
- Hales, Mick. 2006. *Shakespeare in the Garden: A Selection of Gardens and an Alphabet of Plants*. New York: Abrams.
- Harvey, David. 2013. "Emerging Landscapes of Heritage." In *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*. Edited by Peter Howard, Ian Thompson, Emma Waterton, and Mick Atha, 152-62. New York: Routledge.
- Holderness, Graham. 2002. *Cultural Shakespeare: Essays in the Shakespeare Myth*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Holland, Peter. 2013. "Introduction". *Coriolanus*, by William Shakespeare, London: Bloomsbury Arden.
- Hunt, John Dixon. 1986. *Garden and Grove: The Italian Renaissance Garden in the English Imagination, 1600-1750*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lasdun, Susan. 1992. *The English Park: Royal, Private, and Public*. New York: Vendome Press.
- Mabey, Richard. 2010. *Weeds: In Defense of Nature's Most Unloved Plants*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Marx, Leo. 1964. *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Menard, Andrew. 2010. "The Enlarged Freedom of Frederick Law Olmsted." *The New England Quarterly* 83 (3): 508-538.
- Mitchell, W.J.T. 2002. "Imperial Landscape." In *Landscape and Power*. Edited by W.J.T. Mitchell, 2nd ed., 5-34. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Montrose, Louis Adrian. 1983. "Of Gentlemen and Shepherds: The Politics of Elizabethan Pastoral Form." *ELH* 50 (3): 415-459 Accessed November 17, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2872864>.
- Munroe, Jennifer. 2005. "'In This Strange Labourinth, How Shall I Turne?': Needlework, Gardens, and Writing in Mary Wroth's 'Pamphilia to

- Amphilanthus'." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 24 (no. 1, Spring): 35-55. Accessed November 17, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20455210>.
- O'Dair, Sharon. 2000. *Class, Critics, and Shakespeare: Bottom Lines on the Culture Wars*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Olmsted, Frederick Law. 2010 (1868). "Address to the Prospect Park Scientific Association (1868)." In *Frederick Law Olmsted: Essential Texts*, edited by Robert Twombly. New York: W.W. Norton: 187-200.
- . 2010 (1870). "Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns." In *Frederick Law Olmsted: Essential Texts*, edited by Robert Twombly. New York: W.W. Norton: 201-252.
- . 2010 (1876). "On Landscape Gardening." In *Frederick Law Olmsted: Essential Texts*: edited by Robert Twombly. New York: W.W. Norton: 139-147.
- . 2010 (1878). "Landscape Gardening." In *Frederick Law Olmsted: Essential Texts*, edited by Robert Twombly. New York: W.W. Norton: 149-162.
- . 2010. *Frederick Law Olmsted: Essential Texts*, edited by Robert Twombly. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Olwig, Kenneth Robert. 2002. *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic: From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- "Our Story: Will Greer's Living Legacy." 2017. Will Greer's Theatricum Botanicum. Accessed August 27, 2017. <http://www.theatricum.com/history/>.
- "Plant Shakespeare Oak: Gift of Stratford's Mayor Now in Central Park," 1917. *New York Times*, ProQuest Historical Newspapers, May 13.
- Powell, Michael. 2013. "Reducing Some City Parks to the Status of Beggars," *New York Times*, May 27. Accessed November 17, 2017. www.nytimes.com/2013/05/28/nyregion/reducing-some-city-parks-to-the-status-of-beggars.html.
- Scheper, George L. 1989. "The Reformist Vision of Frederick Law Olmsted and the Poetics of Park Design." *The New England Quarterly* 62 (3): 369-402.
- Shakespeare, William. 2013. *Coriolanus*. Edited by Peter Holland. London: Bloomsbury Arden.
- . 2006. *Hamlet*. Edited by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor. London: Arden Shakespeare.
- . 1951. *Macbeth*. Edited by Kenneth Muir. London: Arden Shakespeare, 3rd series, 10th edition, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1997.
- . 1999. *Midsummer Night's Dream: Texts and Contexts*. Edited by Gail Kern Paster and Skiles Howard. London: Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- . 2016. *Othello*. Edited by E.A.J. Honigmann. Revised Edition. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 3rd series.
- . 2002. *Richard II*. Edited by Charles R. Forker. London: Arden Shakespeare, 3rd series.
- . 1980. *Romeo and Juliet*. Edited by Brian Gibbons. London: Arden Shakespeare, 3rd series, 2000.

- "Shakespeare Garden." 2017. *Central Park*. Accessed August 28, 2017. www.centralparknyc.org/things-to-see-and-do/attractions/shakespeare-garden.html.
- Sidney, Philip. 1595. "A Defense of Poetry." In *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*. Edited by Brian Vickers, 336-391. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Strong, Roy. 1979. *The Renaissance Garden in England*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1998.
- 1999. "The Renaissance Garden in England Reconsidered." *Garden History* 27 (1): 2-9. Accessed November 17, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1587170>.
- 2017. *The Quest for Shakespeare's Garden*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Thomas, Vivian and Nicki Faircloth. 2014. *Shakespeare's Plants and Gardens: A Dictionary*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Whitman, Walt. 1892. *Prose Works 1892, Volume II: Collect and Other Prose*. New York: New York University Press, 2007.
- Williams, Raymond. 1973. *The Country and the City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Woodhouse, Elizabeth. 1999. "The Spirit of the Elizabethan Garden." *Garden History* 27 (1): 10-31.

Images

Figure 1: The Brooklyn Botanic Garden's Shakespeare Garden

Figure 2: The apricot tree in the Brooklyn Shakespeare Garden, glossed with the Gardener's instructions from Richard II: "Go, bind thou up yon dangling apricocks Go thou, and like an executioner, / Cut off the heads of too fast growing sprays, / That look too lofty in our commonwealth: / All must be even in our government" (3.4.29, 33-6)

All photos by the author