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Fragments come in many guises. When the fragment takes the form of a ruin, a torn scroll, a crumbling parchment, a broken column, an inscription in pieces, or a corner of a fresco, it gestures towards a whole that is absent; its potency lies in a resistance to notions of unity or resolution. In other cases, the recombination of a number of individual fragments can produce a new entity, a different work that lays claim to its own completeness. However, a reconstructed statue has a different status from a building made from spolia. Both are new works, but while one gestures back towards a once-perfect original state, the other gestures forward to ever more reorganizations, none of them authoritative, all equivalently contingent. In order to preserve a sense of the fragmentary, a work must be able to hint that the bonds holding its fragments together could easily be dissolved, or that the order in which they have been assembled is by nature arbitrary, and thus open to reordering. It is only by retaining this sense of incompletion that the fragment and fragmentary can suggest multiple elaborations, interventions, reworkings, conclusions.

The fragment and the fragmentary are important components of eighteenth-century English landscape aesthetics. Whether one thinks of the vogue for ruins or Uvedale Price’s definition of the irregular, crumbling picturesque, a visual equivalence between imperfect, undefined forms and a ‘natural’ landscape aesthetic is easily imagined. Ever since Horace Walpole described William Kent as he who ‘leaped the fence, and saw that all nature was a garden’, a stylistic divide has existed between those picturesque or proto-picturesque landscapes that sought to imitate nature and natural forms, and their immediate precursors, which just as avidly tried to subdue nature to a predetermined geometric order. However, a correlation between the natural and the fragmentary is not limited to proponents of the picturesque. Rather, it is part of a larger epistemological tendency that spans the entire long eighteenth century, is integral to both scientific and artistic activity, and is as equally associated with geometrical gardens as with picturesque landscapes.

The conjunction of the natural and the fragmentary can be traced in writings associated with the founding of the Royal Society and with its Fellows’ efforts to define a methodology for the study of nature. One of the key components of this activity was the collection of observations related to particular phenomena, directed toward the composition of natural histories. Characterized by a resistance to system, a privileging of the aphoristic over the explanatory, the fragment over the whole, the natural histories produced by the Fellows of the Royal Society demonstrate the adoption of a particular methodology derived, in large part, from the writings of Francis Bacon.

Bacon’s preference for fragmentary textual forms is amply exemplified by his publications, which often take the form of the aphorism, the essay collection, the list. But his championing of the fragment is particularly evident in his directions for the creation of
natural histories in the *Novum Organum*’s ‘Catalogue of Particular Histories by Titles’, or *Parasceve*, and in the incomplete and fragmentary *Sylva Sylvarum: Or a Natural History in Ten Centuries*. Whereas the *Parasceve* is in effect a blueprint for the experimental study of nature – it contains a list of 130 topics for investigation ranging from natural histories of clouds to natural histories of gemstones, birds, surgery, vision, glass-making, the dairy, and forest cultivation – *Sylva Sylvarum*, with its apparently random collection of heterogeneous experiments, presents the first steps of that experimental program. These experiments, whether culled from the writings of other authors or tried by Bacon himself, were gathered together into ten ‘centuries’, or groups of one hundred. Bacon’s method of selecting, copying, and reorganizing textual excerpts is characteristic of commonplace book culture, as is his organization of all knowledge under particular heads or titles in the *Parasceve*. The title of *Sylva Sylvarum* – or collection of collections – self-consciously makes reference to a classical genre known for its heterogeneity while simultaneously suggesting a reworking of that genre. The connotations of the title, at once a literal forest or wood as well as raw materials for construction, are only heightened by Bacon’s play with words, emphasizing the sense of copiousness and drawing attention to the multiplication of instances and examples Bacon believed necessary to his method of inquiry. Although both of these influential texts thus demonstrate a reworking of established literary genres and practices in order to emphasize their heterogeneous and fragmentary nature, the significance of this tendency goes beyond the textual. Bacon argued that, at least initially, knowledge could be newly established on certain and firm foundations only when maintained as a set of piecemeal and fragmentary observations. ‘Aphorisms,’ Bacon wrote, ‘representing only portions and as it were fragments of knowledge, invite others to contribute and add something in their turn.’ Preferring ‘a knowledge broken’ to one resolved, Bacon placed the fragment at the heart of the new science and its investigation of nature.

This privileging of a fragmentary methodology was paralleled by a renewal of interest in fragmentary theories of matter. Such Royal Society Fellows as Robert Boyle, Walter Charleton, and John Evelyn were instrumental in revitalizing interest in Epicurean atomism, stripping the classical philosopher’s ideas of any hint of atheism, and publishing works that demonstrated the conformity of the mechanical hypothesis’s tenets with experimental results. According to the atomist philosophy, matter was made up of particles – or atoms – which, although various in form, were invisible, indivisible, and infinite in number. Objects were aggregates of atoms, but these atoms were in a state of constant motion, engaged in a continual process of agglomeration and decomposition as they collided and merged, or broke off from one another. The result was that objects were understood as being far from stable entities. The creation or destruction of any individual object was merely the changeable organization of basic elements; order itself was merely a temporary state, and further re-orderings were inevitable. Stability existed only on the most elemental level, and nature, from the atomist point of view, resembled nothing so much as a fluctuating collection of fragmentary forms. Variety, flux, motion, change, chance, an order that consisted of disorder – these were the characteristics of nature highlighted by the atomist philosophy.

The combination of Baconian methodology and the atomist hypothesis was achieved and shaped into a program for action by those scientists and virtuosi associated with the origins of the Royal Society. Fragmentation, in particular, was a central characteristic of
activities related to the compilation of natural histories, which involved the accumulation of a number of randomly ordered, isolated facts about individual phenomena. Central to these natural histories and their compilation were the list and the questionnaire.

Soon after its foundation in 1660, the Royal Society began to implement the vast work of collection and experimentation that formed the basis of the empirical method. Robert Boyle compiled a list of questions to be given to captains of vessels bound for little-known lands; Henry Oldenburg drew up a document detailing ‘General heads of Inquiries for all Countries’ to be used in gathering information about the air, water, earth, plants, animals, minerals, and famous inhabitants of particular locales; and Robert Hooke outlined a method to be followed in writing the histories of terrestrial bodies, whether animal, vegetable, or mineral. The questionnaire had become a key tool. And in 1664, the Royal Society established eight committees to divide its Fellows’ work of observation and experimentation into discrete areas, forming the mechanical; astronomical and optical; agricultural; anatomical; chemical; trade; and correspondence committees; as well as the catchall committee ‘For collecting all the phenomena of nature hitherto observed, and all experiments made and recorded’.

The agricultural or Georgical Committee had as its goal the composition of ‘as perfect a History of Agriculture and Gardening, as might be’. To this end, the members of the Georgical Committee outlined a four-step process with evident debts to commonplace book culture. First, they were to compile lists of ‘Georgical Authors’ whose books were to be epitomized into a list of subjects, or heads of inquiries. From this initial survey, they were to generate lists of questions. Questionnaires were then to be sent to ‘experienced Husbandmen’ in all parts of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and finally, their responses were to be shaped into a history of agriculture and gardening. The questions generated by the Georgical Committee take a characteristic form: a list, under a general subject, of particular instances. This form of question was designed to elicit a particular form of response: a list of questions would generate a list of answers. A query such as

There being many sorts of Wheat, as the White or Red Lammas, the bearded Kentish Wheat, the gray Wheat, the red or gray Pollard, the Ducks-bill Wheat, the red-eared-bearded Wheat, &c. And so of Oats, as the common Black, Blue, Naked, Bearded in North-wales: and the like of Barley, Pease, Beans, &c. The Enquiry is, which of these grow in your Country, and in what Soyl; and which of them thrive best there; and whether each of them require a peculiar Tillage; and how do they differ in goodness?

is nothing more than a list of varieties of crops, open to additions. The questions – and the answers they were intended to provoke – evidence a heaping or collection of individualized examples. They are representative of an approach to the acquisition of knowledge that is wary of system, preferring instead to leave observations in a bare and broken state, a vast collection of only loosely ordered particular instances. The result of this kind of investigative method was an image of nature as a compendium of individualized fragments; a nature whose order was arbitrary and relative; a nature whose order ultimately lay in its disorder.
Although the Georgical Committee’s efforts to generate a natural history of English agriculture were only marginally successful, a parallel venture by one of its members, John Evelyn, was destined for greater longevity. His Sylva, Or a Discourse of Forest-Trees, and the Propagation of Timber in his Majesties Dominion of 1664 was in fact a compendium of three separate treatises: Sylva, or ‘A Discourse on Forest-Trees’; Pomona, or ‘An Appendix concerning Fruit-Trees in relation to Cider’; and the Kalendarium Hortense, or ‘Gard’ners Almanac’. Sylva’s heterogeneous nature was only augmented over the course of its publication history, as Evelyn continued to add other short treatises: Terra, A Philosophical Discourse of Earth in 1679, and, in 1706, Acetaria, A Discourse of Sallets [salads]. Evelyn acknowledged that Sylva was part of a larger attempt to generate a comprehensive natural history of agriculture. In that spirit, instead of being presented as a finished treatise, Sylva was cast as a first step towards that goal, a set of building materials, a collection of pieces and ‘scattered parts’. In defending his ‘tumultuary Method’, Evelyn acknowledged his debts to a fragmentary and aphoristic style, asserting that ‘such rude and imperfect draughts’ were ‘far better in their [the Fellows of the Royal Society’s] esteem (and according to my Lord Bacon’s) than such as are adorn’d with more pomp, and ostentatious circumstances, for a pretence to Perfection.’

Sylva, Pomona, the Kalendarium Hortense and Acetaria are all lists in the guise of prose. In Sylva this is evident in everything from the table of contents – a list of trees – to the text itself, which is presented as a series of numbered paragraphs rather than as an integrated whole. The conclusion, composed as a set of aphorisms, exemplifies yet again Evelyn’s tendency to present Sylva as a collection of individual elements. Furthermore, multiple voices are a hallmark of the text. Sylva’s content – recalling commonplace book
convention – is gleaned in large part from other authors. *Pomona* incorporates six essays by various Royal Society Fellows, set off from one another typographically so as to reinforce the impression of a hybrid text. Rather than presenting *Sylva* as a finished whole, Evelyn drew attention to its fragmentary character, hoping that others would be inspired to contribute to the project by adding their own piecemeal observations, so that it would be a work ‘which our industrious Gardn’er may himself be continually improving from his own Observations and Experience’. Through its content and its form, the fragmentary *Sylva* promoted the creation of a wooded landscape that would mirror its own composition as a collection of discrete parts.

Evelyn’s exhortations to his countrymen to plant trees had widespread effect, and in the years immediately following *Sylva’s* initial publication, ornamental woods proliferated in the gardens of the nation’s gentry. Moses Cook, the Earl of Essex’s gardener, created one of the earliest of these at Cassiobury (fig. 1). Acres of deciduous and evergreen trees were planted – some in quincunx, some more randomly – and walks were cut through the resulting forest to form vistas for the eye and paths for the feet. Round clearings, paved with grass or enlivened with fountains, marked changes of direction and provided open enclaves within the woodland. Cook’s publication of *The Manner of Raising, Ordering, and Improving Forest and Fruit Trees* in 1679 – a treatise avowedly indebted to Evelyn’s *Sylva* – helped to disseminate techniques for planting, designing, and caring for ornamental groves, and soon other forest gardens began to spring up across the country.

The gardens at New Park, Surrey (fig. 2), begun c. 1692 by the Earl of Rochester, demonstrate a development of the woodland garden genre begun at Cassiobury. On
the slopes beyond the terraces and parterres, large tracts of woods were planted, interlaced with tree-lined avenues of varying widths. The forest element of the garden can be seen as having two distinct parts. In one, the axes of the house and parterres are extended through the woods, offering a visual experience of apparent infinity based on the repetition of elements – in this case trees – which succeed one another at regular intervals. The other area, on the slope to the left of the house, presents an equally additive system, but with more diversification. Combinations of avenues, their crossings, and clearings supply a complex and shifting sequence of experiences. Various dispositions of avenues offer differing collections of views – with a fork providing two; a goosefoot, three; a crossing, four; and the large rond-point, eight. Some avenues are diversified by clearings ornamented with statues, fountains, or a centrally placed tree. In contrast to the part of the garden that affords relatively uninterrupted views, here the views are oblique, or partially blocked. In the avenue dotted with clearings on the far left of the print, the path extends, but the axis of vision is broken, repeatedly, by centrally placed trees whose branches would merge with the surrounding foliage and obscure the view. Thus the experience of walking through this section of the garden would be one of a repetitive sequence of enclosure and expansion, while the placement of the single trees would confuse any sense of what might lie ahead.

Elements are inserted into the fabric of the wood with no clear connection to the composition of the whole. A rectangular bowling green is depicted to the left of another avenue, but disconnected from any direct visual axis. Round clearings with fountains are buried in the midst of the forest, not on any path, yet close enough to ensure that the plashing of a jet would be heard without it being immediately clear where it was coming from – an element to stumble upon by chance rather than an obvious goal. The surprise offered by these features presents a challenge to the more predictable repetition of the lower part of the garden. Here, an additive aesthetic experience is created through the multiplication and alteration of a few basic elements: the avenue, the clearing, the crossing, the central tree. Sequence and repetition engender multiplicity and variety.

In 1712, Dezallier D’Argenville’s treatise on gardens was published in English by John James as *The Theory and Practice of Gardening.* The translation and publication of this work testifies to a growing English interest in texts on gardening that broached issues of aesthetics, as well as cultivation. Woods, the ‘greatest Ornament’ of a garden, were the subject of one chapter and a sequence of ten plates. These images convey a sense of progressive multiplication: the first plate presents two designs for ornamental woods; the second, four; the third, six; the fourth, ten. Following these are plates with plans for substitute cabinets so that ‘in case the Designs of those already given should not suit the Places you have for them, or should not be liked so well; you may then make Choice of any of the twelve Figures that are in these two Plates.’

In the third plate (fig. 3), six different designs for woods are shown. These are all variations of a single type: a wood, of about four acres, cut by paths and dotted with clearings, centering around a water feature ornamented with a jet or statue. Each example has a clear center, and makes use of symmetry and repetition. The designs of the paths are all variations of a St Andrew’s cross, and the entry paths are invariably intersected by ring paths of varying shape – octagon, square, oval, diamond. A limited number of elements – trees, paths, clearings, benches, central
water features – are combined in six different ways to generate six different woods and, by implication, six different experiences.

The text, too, evidences an aesthetic delight in multiplication and repetition, pointing out that the fifth design has six entrances – four at the corners and two in the middle – and that it contains ‘two Goose-feet, eight Cross-Alleys, and two Recesses, or Sinkings, with Benches’.26 This additive aesthetic runs through many of the treatise’s descriptions. One wood is ‘pierced to such Advantage, that which way soever you turn yourself, you have three Walks at least that face you, and form a Goose-foot, and so at the eight Entrances: A little forwarder you find small Cross-ways with four Alleys; and in the great ones, [...] there are six Walks that meet in a Center, and compose Stars.’27 Its fountains, likewise, evoke pleasure through plurality: they ‘make a fine Sight, when in walking you discover three Spouts at least in every Alley, in some five, and at each End of the Middle-walk you see all the seven.’28 And it is not only multiplicity that pleases, but also the distinction of individual elements. Trees are planted so that they ‘stand single and detached’. A view of a water feature is enjoyable because its jets are ‘seen one after the other, as you walk’.29 Here, it is precisely the lack of connection between elements that contributes to the aesthetic pleasure of abundance and variety.

Verbal descriptions of built, rather than ideal, gardens share an appreciation of aesthetic effects produced by the addition, combination, and permutation of distinct elements. In Robert Plot’s The Natural History of Staffordshire of 1686 – a work that was to help to define the new genre of the natural history of a single English county30 – gardens appear as lists of materially defined elements, collections of parts. For example, the description of Staffordshire’s most elaborate garden, under construction by Sir

---

Richard Astley at Patshull Park, was dispersed by Plot into four separate sections. It was mentioned once for its fountains, again for its stone-work, in another place for its plantations and groves, and finally, within the category of ‘arts relating to the feathered kingdom’, for an ingenious invention designed to measure the length of a chicken.  

The building up of the estate’s description by breaking it down into its component parts continues within each section. Plot’s account of Patshull’s waterworks, for example, is a list of four features: a basin with a high jet; a pipe with a revolving spray, a cistern in an aviary, and a canal terminated by a grotto. Patshull’s trees are likewise described in quantitative terms, its walks commended for their length, breadth, and double rows of elm trees. Patshull is described by Plot as a list of elements, a collection of parts that includes the stone mansion, the gardens, the fountains, and the walks with their views, the iron gates ‘curiously painted and guilt’ leading into them, and mounts and ‘places of repose’ at their ends. For Plot, it is precisely the combined value of all of these singular elements that establishes Patshull as ‘the most accomplisht and delicious Mansion in the whole County’.  

Other visitors to Patshull likewise seemed to feel that a list was the most appropriate form of description. Celia Fiennes, who toured the gardens in 1698, provides an account that moves abruptly from a linearity paralleled by her arrival along a hedge-bordered road, to something of a narrative explosion once she reaches the gardens.  

She presents Patshull not as a unified whole, nor as a sequence of elements and views, but as a list of objects presented with neither order nor hierarchy; courtyards, iron gates and ‘pallisadoes’, dials, statues, fountains, statues, pots, gravel walks, grass-plots, an aviary, groves, ponds, a canal, summerhouses, hedges, flowers, and evergreen trees and shrubs including Silver, Scots, and ‘Noroway’ firs, cypress, yew, bay, laurel, and box crowd her sight. She counts two dials in Patshull’s court; six walks in the grove, which provide twelve lines of sight and twelve corresponding different views; and four summerhouses around the canal, which is in its turn ringed by 348 pipes and ornamented with two statues and four sea horses.  

If on the one hand Fiennes’s description of the garden takes the form of a list of parts, her attempt to document the kind of experience such a garden provided gestures toward a more complex mode of viewing. When standing in the middle of the court she notes that the profusion of iron gates gave passage to the eye in three different directions – towards the house, towards the flower gardens and park, and towards a fountain with a very high jet. When she reaches the middle of the forest grove, and comes to the point where the six walks meet, she notes that ‘you look twelve wayes which discovers as many several prospects either to the house or entrance or fountains or gardens or fields’.  

Her use here of an either/or construction – ‘either to the house or entrance or fountains or gardens or fields’ – suggests a visual experience characterized by interchangeability, rather than hierarchy, one where any one view is both equivalent to yet different from the next. Each element, each view, is an equal component of a complex, multilayered visual experience.  

Patshull’s profusion of elements, multiplication of scenes, and resistance to a single all-encompassing point of view presented a problem of representation in visual, as well as verbal terms. When Robert Plot commissioned Michael Burghers to engrave the numerous seats featured in The Natural History of Staffordshire, Patshull presented particular difficulties. Burghers was unable to represent the garden precisely because of the proliferation of its particulars – ‘the Designe of the Graver fell so very much short of the
real thing itself (the many trees, gates, and buildings hiding each other) that it had been an abatement or disparagement to its true worth to have given the Prospect of it. Plot's desire to include all of Patshull's elements, his understanding of the garden as a jostling, multifaceted collection of particulars, in which each element was equally important and equally deserving to be seen in full, necessitated a representation that could give multiplicity a visual form. Burghers, working within perspectival conventions, found that Patshull's profusion of vistas, walks, trees, gates, mounts, summerhouses, and fountains made it unrepresentable. It could not be comprehended from a single point of view.

In 1706, the year of Evelyn's death, a fourth edition of Sylvia appeared. If earlier editions of Evelyn's treatise had helped to create and disseminate an image and understanding of the landscape as a set of discrete objects or parts, an augmented section of this edition, entitled 'An Historical Account of the Sacredness, and Use of Standing Groves' gives voice and form to a woodland aesthetic. A plate showing the ornamental grove at Mosely in Yorkshire (fig. 4), dotted with clearings and cut with radiating paths,
serves as an illustration.\textsuperscript{36} Below it, a table enumerates the number of views the grove can boast of based on the number of crossings and the number of paths radiating from each. There are four crossings with two views, six with three, thirty-five with four, two with five, ten with six, four with eight, and one each of centers offering seven, nine, ten, and twelve views, for a combined total of 306 views. Utilizing the mathematical principle of permutation, the design of this grove and its accompanying table evidence the striking coincidence of a scientific method and an aesthetic vocabulary. This woodland garden is not represented as offering either a dense symbolism or a single meaning: rather, we see multiplication, proliferation, and permutation as aesthetic aims in themselves. The plan of the grove and the table are two equivalent representations, both documenting, with their unremitting horizontality, a particular kind of visual experience. In this image, we see fragmentation uniting epistemology and art.

The woodland aesthetic developed in England at the turn of the eighteenth century is not, I would argue, simply a translation of French fashions onto English soil. Nor do its geometrical, and often symmetrical, forms imply an aesthetic characterized by hierarchy and fixity. Rather, I believe that such garden designs manifest a tendency to visualize nature, and, more importantly, to visualize our perception of nature, as a fluctuating collection of multiple forms. A woodland garden, cut with paths, presents a number of discrete views and focused perspectives. It offers no set sequence of perambulation; rather, one view is more or less equivalent to any other view, and the order in which each is appreciated is irrelevant. Variety, multiplicity, an infinity of combinations and recombinations, are conveyed. Fountains or statues appear and disappear. Objects are seen from different points and contrasting perspectives. The principle of permutation offers more than a bare collection of particular instances; it places individual moments in networks of shifting relations, complex interdependencies, unresolved and fluctuating associations.

Bacon’s exhortations to retain an understanding of nature in fragmentary form, implemented in the Royal Society’s empirical investigations of the English landscape, are given a visual interpretation in these woodland gardens. Not only do the ornamented woods of this period embody an image of nature fragmented, they also simultaneously offer experiences of nature as sets of isolated moments, laced together by one’s motion through shifting scenes and crossing paths. In these gardens, a visitor is presented with a vision of the universe framed, to use Bacon’s words, ‘to the eye of the human understanding [...] like a labyrinth, presenting as it does so many ambiguities of way, such deceitful resemblances of objects and signs, natures so irregular in their lines, and so knotted and entangled.’ Nevertheless, the path to a complex and multifaceted knowledge is ‘still to be made by the uncertain light of the sense, sometimes shining out, sometimes clouded over, through the woods of experience and particulars.’\textsuperscript{37} In theory as in practice, in science as in aesthetics, nature fragmented was nature open to observation, to investigation, and, ultimately, to understanding.
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