



This is a repository copy of *Fruit cultivation in the Royal Gardens of Hampton Court Palace, 1530-1842*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/113400/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Woudstra, J. orcid.org/0000-0001-9625-2998 (2016) Fruit cultivation in the Royal Gardens of Hampton Court Palace, 1530-1842. *Garden History*, 44 (2). pp. 255-271. ISSN 0307-1243

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

FRUIT CULTIVATION IN THE ROYAL GARDENS OF HAMPTON COURT PALACE (1530-1842)

Jan Woudstra, Department of Landscape, University of Sheffield, Arts Tower,
Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TN Tel: 01142220609
Email: j.woudstra@sheffield.ac.uk

While Hampton Court Palace was occupied by the royal family, fruit cultivation formed an integral part of horticulture. This paper reveals that it was not only integral to the gardens but also had an important symbolic function. The collection of fruit at Hampton Court was a leading reference collection, new trends were set here, new varieties were cultivated and new techniques of cultivation were developed.

While it was generally recognized as such, it was compromised during a reorganisation of the functions of the gardens of the various royal palaces around London in 1842. Until then, fruit culture at Hampton Court was justly celebrated, and this case study investigates for the first time how over a three-hundred-year period societal change affected and shaped new fashions of consumption and cultivation. As such this paper alters our thinking about the role fruit had within society and how it was an indicator of social and political change.

When in 1528 King Henry VIII claimed Hampton Court as his own by ousting his Lord Chancellor, Cardinal Wolsey (1473-1530), controller of the national church as papal legate, he took over Wolsey's building project there. By this stage the complex consisted of a series of interconnected courtyards within a larger walled and moated space with, to the north, an open space that was the presumed orchard. All this was set within a park that was bounded to the south and east by the Thames and north and west by a brick wall bordering the Kingston Road. Henry VIII continued digging the

moat and building the so-called Great Wall to the south, which embraced the new Privy Garden and the pond yard. The existing orchard became the Privy Orchard, with the Great Orchard immediately to the north and Tiltyard to the north-east (Figures 1a and b).

FRUIT FOR COOKING

This Great Orchard was constructed at a time when the notion of eating raw fruit was changing. Although introduced by the Romans, apples and pears were favoured for cider and perry, while they were also popular for cooking, baking and drying. Only for medicinal purposes was fruit eaten raw,¹ but the suspicion for eating fresh fruit slowly dissipated from the early sixteenth century, with Henry VIII being one of the keenest proponents for the improvement of fruit.² From 1530 onwards there is evidence for the acquisition of apples and pears for the Great Orchard, and the king was clearly keen to include choice varieties.³ Trees included pears, damsons, medlars, cherries and apples, but there were also cucumbers, melons and large quantities of strawberries, grown presumably in the open ground between the young trees. Some fruit trees came from dissolved monasteries, such as Charterhouse.⁴ There was also a 'Little Garden' planted with sixty-seven apple trees bought from William Gardener in London for sixpence the piece.⁵ The acquisition of six hundred cherry trees at sixpence per hundred probably implies that close planting distances were maintained.⁶ The acquisition of tools, such as a grafting saw in March 1533 suggests that further propagation took place at Hampton Court.⁷

The Privy Orchard was ornamented with seven dials and timber King's beasts on posts that were painted and gilded in 1530. Such beasts were also included in the New or Privy Garden and included lions, greyhounds, hinds, dragons, bulls, antelopes, griffins, leopards and rams, some holding vanes with the king's arms.⁸ The

use of dials and beasts on posts in the Privy Orchard suggests that this - like the Privy Garden - was similarly divided in compartments. It is not known what Henry's Great Orchard at Hampton Court looked like, but it also appears to have contained forest trees of oaks and elms.⁹ It is likely that these were planted around the edge to serve as a shelter.

The orchard at Hampton Court clearly was not enough to supply the demands of the court and Henry VIII's keenness in improving availability of fruit is also evident from his support of Richard Harris, as the King's fruiterer. He commenced a large commercial orchard in Teynham, Kent, in 1533. This was planted with propagation material from the Low Countries and France, including apples, pears, plums and cherries, and became the model for similar orchards, ultimately leading to Kent being referred to as the Garden of England.¹⁰ Until this was the case the majority of dessert fruit had been imported from France and the Netherlands, with smaller quantities being produced in the market gardens around London.

By 1538 Henry employed a French priest Jean le Leu/ Loup, also referred to as John Wolf/ Woolf, as the king's gardener, responsible for finding new varieties and propagating them. He was sent abroad to do so, and it is often suggested that he introduced the apricot, but though still precious at this time it already featured in Shakespeare's plays so some were likely to have been present already.¹¹ The botanist William Turner, who in 1548 noted 'we have very fewe of these trees as yet', confirms its rarity though.¹²

From 1553-58, during the reign of Queen Mary, who was reported to be fond of fruit, fruit trees were also planted in other parts of the garden; John Bereman was noted as setting pear trees round the Henrican Mount at the south side of the Privy Garden.¹³ Queen Elizabeth (r.1558-1603), whose liking for candied fruit had

blackened her teeth, continued to maintain the gardens, but they did not see the innovation they had received during Henry VIII's reign.¹⁴ John Gerard's *Herball* (1597) is perhaps symptomatic of the era; it was based mainly on foreign sources and still referred to apples, pears, plums and cherries primarily for their medicinal properties, noting that 'Rosted Apples are alwaies better than the raw, the harm whereof is both mended by the fire, and may also be corrected by adding unto them seeds and spices' (Figure 2).¹⁵

As early as 1577 William Harrison (1534-93), then chaplain to Lord Cobham, stated in his *Description of England* that orchards in England 'were never furnished with so good fruit nor with such variety as at this present'. And the anonymously authored *The Fruiterers Secrets* (1604) revealed how individuals had taken propagation material from Harris's orchard as a result of which there was now a sufficient supply of fruit to the London market. The great innovator at the time however was Hugh Plat, who was knighted for his inventions by King James I in 1605. His horticultural innovations were detailed in his *Floraes Paradise* (1608) and included proposals for orchards of dwarf trees kept below a yard high, so that plants could be protected by straining course canvas across them during cold spells. Instead of privet hedges around the various quarters he proposed dwarf apples and plums on trellis work; quinces were best grown against a wall following Italian examples and he also revealed how ripening of fruit (cherries) might be delayed by stretching a tent across it and wetting this as had been performed by Sir Francis Carew at his house in Beddington during a visit of Queen Elizabeth.¹⁶

It is clear from the reference to growing quince against walls that this was quite uncommon. Indeed the soil below walls was generally considered too dry, and it was 'exceeding common in England' to plant walls with rosemary, which on the

continent was an essential ingredient for meat dishes, but in England primarily used as a medicine for various ailments, and for making crowns and garlands.¹⁷ Paul Hetzner, travelling in 1598, reported that at Hampton Court rosemary was ‘so planted and nailed to the walls as to cover them entirely’.¹⁸ This was changed in 1611 when William Hogan, keeper of His Majesties still-house (distillery) and garden at Hampton Court, was paid one hundred pounds ‘for planting the walls of the said garden with apricot trees, peach trees, plum trees, and vines of choice fruits’.¹⁹ This seems to indicate that by this stage the last vestiges of the Henrican Privy Orchard had been cleared with the area being used as a kitchen garden, with the walls reserved for fruit. A further ten apricot and four peach trees were added in 1614, possibly replacing plants that had failed.²⁰ This would certainly have ensured a richer palette of fruit at Hampton Court, and was particularly important as general supply remained restricted in choice and quality. Orazio Busoni, a chaplain to the Venetian ambassador in England (1617-19) reported that apples ‘were really very good and cheap’, available in various sorts and procurable all year round; pears however were ‘scarcely eatable’; and only one type of cherry was available, a ‘very bad morella’. Eating habits had changed also; though fruit was not eaten at the table: ‘between meals one sees men, women and children always munching through the streets, like so many goats, and yet more in places of public amusement’.²¹ This appears to provide evidence of raw fruit being enjoyed.

FRESH FRUIT FOR THE TABLE

In France there had been a continuing emphasis on fruit for the table, which had permeated through the classes and led to increasing demands for quality fresh fruit. This became part of the expectations when King Charles I married Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV of France and Maria de Medici, in 1625, and in her found a

queen greatly interested in gardening. She improved gardens at Oatlands, Somerset House and Greenwich, before embarking on Wimbledon, her grandest project, in 1639. While the layout of the garden was determined by the Frenchman André Mollet, John Tradescant was employed to collect plants, with over one thousand fruit trees being planted.²² There were one hundred and nineteen cherry trees ‘of great growth’ on the upper and lower garden, as well as one hundred and fifty ‘divers kinds of apples and pears’; fifty-three fruit trees of apricots, may cherries, duke cherries, pear, plums, ‘Bon Chretien’ pears, French pears ‘and many other sorts of most rare and choice fruits’ against the walls of the upper garden; and thirteen muscadine vines in and about the upper garden, as well as two ‘fair Fig-trees’ with the borders containing currants, as well as box, rosemary, perennials and herbs. Among the forest trees in the pheasant garden were ten fruit trees. Within the ‘vineyard’, divided in a star shape with a lime tree in the centre its twelve triangles were planted with five hundred and seven fruit trees ‘of divers kinds of fruits’ and some borders of currants and raspberries. Three of the outer walks were aligned on the inside with ‘latticed rails’ with one hundred and six ‘divers kinds of wall fruit’, while the fourth outer walk was planted with sixteen quince trees. In the ‘out borders’ there were thirty-eight pears and cherries. The walls of this vineyard garden were covered with two hundred and fifty-four ‘of divers special sorts and kinds of wall fruits’; apricots, pears, pear plums, may cherries, ‘Bon Chretiens’ ‘and divers other kind of fruits’. In the kitchen garden there were forty wall-fruit trees, thirty-eight standard cherry trees, and an arbutus tree in the middle.²³

The above shows the importance of fruit, which was present in varying forms in virtually every part of the garden. It was the same to a slightly lesser extent at the other royal gardens. Following the beheading of Charles I in 1649 during the

Commonwealth, most of the royal properties were sold off, or sometimes just the contents, with the gardens thrown open to the public. When Oliver Cromwell became Lord Protector in 1651, however, he decided to adopt Hampton Court as his main residence, which secured the property and the gardens continued to be maintained. The Puritan government in the meanwhile stimulated planting of fruit trees ‘for the relief of the poor, the benefit of the rich, and the delight of all’, as expressed by Samuel Hartlib.²⁴ Hartlib, a Pole, who had studied at Cambridge, remained in England and became Cromwell’s ‘Agent for the Advancement of Universal Learning’.²⁵

At the Restoration, when Charles II returned from exile in 1660, he set out to restore his various palaces. One of his main projects was at St James’s, where Mollet designed the new garden, which contained dwarf fruit and was also ornamental. He was succeeded there in 1665 by John Rose, the author of *The English Vinyard Vindicated* (1666). At this time both St James’s and Hampton Court were supervised by Hugh May, who appears to have been responsible for a new canal and avenue at Hampton Court. There was also a new vineyard, located next to the mount, possibly by Rose, as were dwarf fruit trees, for which he was said to have been inspired by those at Versailles.²⁶ The Henrican Great Orchard was then referred to as the Old Orchard, and appears to have continued to exist till the arrival of William III and Mary as monarchs in 1688/89, replacing the ousted James II. William, who suffered from asthma, considered that the ‘air of Hampton Court agreed so well with him’ that he adopted it as his main residence. This meant the development of various schemes for the palace that was enlarged, with further plans for the gardens. Before grander plans were developed by William Bentinck Earl of Portland (1649-1709) and his deputy George London, an immediate makeover was implemented, proposed by

artisans in the trail of the Glorious Revolution. Daniel Marot designed a semi-circular parterre de broderie for the new Fountain Garden, and appears also to have been responsible for designs for the Privy Garden, and a wilderness on the area of the Old Orchard. The latter consisted of the construction of a star-shape pattern of walks intersected by an 8-shape, with the walks aligned by hornbeam hedges. It is possible that some of the old fruit trees were retained within the planting of the quarters. The existing kitchen garden was now too small and a new kitchen garden was conceived at the location of the Henrican Tilt Yard, while the former kitchen garden was now particularly dedicated to the cultivation of melons and became a general nursery (Figure 3).

The new kitchen garden respected the Tudor walls, which were left intact, but additional walls created smaller enclosures making a favourable microclimate for vegetables and fruit, as well as providing space for wall fruit. Thus six similar sized compartments were created that contained both wall fruit and dwarf trees in the inner borders around the compartments. George London did this work in his capacity as a royal gardener, who also partnered with Henry Wise in their nursery at Brompton Park. As leading gardeners of the period they were responsible for a number of publications that include detail on the cultivation of fruit. In *The Retir'd Gard'ner* (1706) they described how in borders the French plant pear trees twelve feet apart, with an apple in between. They criticise this as being too small, and considered such spacings more appropriate for espaliers. Taking the example of the Royal Garden at St James's Park, planted in the 1660s and reaching its perfection in the early eighteenth century, they recommended that 'Planting of Dwarf-trees, whether Pears or Apples, (except Apples on Paradise Stocks) at Fifteen Foot asunder: between which

may be planted One Gooseberry and Two Currants, or One Currant and Two Gooseberries' (Figure 4).²⁷

The spacing of wall fruit depended on the height of the wall, the exposure and the nature of the soil.²⁸ For example:

Wall – Trees must be distanc'd by the goodness of the Earth, and height of the Wall. If the Walls are 12 foot high, let one Tree shoot up to garnish the top, between two to garnish the bottom, planting them within 5 or 6 foot of each other. But for Walls of 6 or 7 foot high, the Trees may be Planted at about 9 foot distance.²⁹

After planting, the 'Principal Branch of them be nail'd to the Wall' to aid establishment. In order to fill up the wall 'then head your Trees, cutting them within six or nine Inches of the budding or grafting Place, more or less, according as the Tree is furnish'd with Buds'. During establishment no other plants should be grown 'within five or six Foot of the Root of the Tree'.³⁰

A considerable collection of tender wall trees was planted at Hampton Court including eight varieties of cherries, thirteen or fourteen apricots, fifty-three peaches and nectarines, thirty-three plums, six figs, twenty-two vines and twenty-five pears.³¹ Bending or pallisading 'the Branches to form the Figure of the Tree as you please' was traditionally done by 'tacking them with shreds of Sheep Skin, or Shammy, or Lists of Cloath, less than half a Finger's Breadth, and a Finger long'. While this method gave good results, it was labour intensive ('tedious') and had to be repeated again after two years or so. Although alternative methods were sometimes considered with laths or palisades London and Wise suggested that this was seldom or never used in England, recognizing however that:

it may be very proper for old Brick Walls, where the Joynts are at such a distance, that the Trees cannot well be nail'd to them, or likewise for Stone Walls, where the Stones are so thick that they cannot be nail'd to any advantage for the good of the Tree. But more especially for Mud Walls that are made of Earth an Hay, such as are us'd in some parts of the West of England, and other parts where Bricks are not plenty; because the Trees cannot so well be nail'd to such Walls, without something of a Lattice or Pallisade in this manner.³²

There is substantial evidence of nailing trees against the walls at Hampton Court, with nails surviving from various periods, and leather straps, which were double the half a finger breath suggested (Figure 5).

By the early eighteenth century fruit cultivation at Hampton Court had gained a considerable reputation. John Vanbrugh wrote in 1716: 'The Kitchen Garden now the trees are in full vigour and full of fruit, is really an astonishing sight.'³³ Stephen Switzer in *The Practical Fruit Gardener* (1731) used various examples in his book; thus we learn that there was a 'Vert Longue' pear that ripened in October, a 'St Germain the Pre-eminence' wall pear that ripened in November, and a 'Bugi' or 'Easter Burgamot' wall pear that ripened in December. We know there were blue and white Frotaniac vines in the melon garden. Reed hedges were used in the kitchen garden to ripen peaches; these were constructed with laths and reeds and provided extra shelter.³⁴

Fruit culture had spread through the county of Kent since the days of Richard Harris's New Garden at Teynham, which was referred to as 'the Mother of all other orchards',³⁵ and it had continued to do so into Surrey, and along the Thames, particularly Fulham and Chiswick, while the area between Esher and Hampton Court

became renowned for its cherries.³⁶ By the early eighteenth century there was the belief of the superiority of English fruit over that from the countries from which it had traditionally been imported: ‘now it is known, that Liquorice, Saffron, Cherries, Apples, Pears, Hops and Cabbages of England, are the best in the world’.³⁷ This encouraged a keen interest of amateurs and professional gardeners in fruit cultivation, and in turn the development of new varieties. One project that highlighted the popular appeal of fruit and the reference status of the collection of Hampton Court was initiated by the botanical artist George Brookshaw, who published a magnificent folio volume including ninety plates of fruit mostly deriving from Hampton Court (Figures 6a, b and c).³⁸

Thus far any serious research had been hindered by issues relating to incorrect or false naming of fruit varieties and the Horticultural Society, for the improvement and practice in horticulture, founded in 1804, set out to address this. In 1815 their first research programme intended to resolve synonymy in fruit varieties, in which they were recorded in a portrait once their provenance had been resolved. While in 1818 the society had no garden itself, they were reliant on members providing the fruits that were painted by William Hooker. This project was overseen by a committee that included William Padley, head gardener at Hampton Court from 1804-28.³⁹ While various varieties were contributed by ‘gentlemen and amateur growers’ and ‘nurserymen’, the majority came from Padley, who contributed eleven varieties as opposed to any others, who contributed three maximum. This confirms the significant status of the collection at Hampton Court.⁴⁰

To the society this project highlighted the need for a garden, which was established in 1818 in Kensington, moving to Chiswick in 1822. Here, much of the research was carried out aided by an excellent soil for fruit cultivation, and a

competent gardener in Robert Thompson, who was employed in 1826, in charge of the fruit department. The new project involved illustrations produced by Mrs Theodore Withers, who was employed by John Lindley, secretary of the Society, and Thompson to produce illustrations for the *Pomological Magazine*, an independently published periodical that appeared between 1827 and 1830, with some one hundred and fifty-two plates. Some of the best cultivars were later republished under the title *Pomona Britannica*.⁴¹

Fruit cultivation of all kinds had gained a considerable reputation at Hampton Court; there was the 'Black Hamburg' vine that had been acquired from Valentine's and was planted in the former stove in 1769 while Lancelot 'Capability' Brown was head gardener. It grew to be one of the largest in the country and in some years produced twenty-two hundred pounds of grapes.⁴² The king was said to have had 'new grapes on his table every week in the year, except the last week in March and the first two weeks in April' (Figure 7).⁴³ The ability to produce fruit out of season was due to a series of forcing houses, where forcing of 'peaches, nectarines, cherries, vines, figs, cucumbers, and strawberries' was 'carried on with much spirit'. A German visitor considered these houses to be both 'remarkable' and in a 'very good state'.⁴⁴ For example, they were able to provide a regular supply of cherries from the middle of March, till it ripened on the open walls. Padley suggested that this could only be done with four forcing houses, or two houses with 'a large stock of plants in pots'. Strawberries and 'other articles' were forced in the same house as the cherries. The outdoor walls were improved also with the aim of increasing productivity, with Hampton Court being one of the first places to adopt these specially moulded bricks invented by Caleb Hitch of Ware, and build some walls designed by the architect George Godwin. The large glazed bricks were laid on edge and had cavities, making

the walls more economical, with provision to incorporate copper wires to tie the trees onto, so as to obviate the need for nails (Figures 8a and b).⁴⁵

DEMISE OF THE FRUIT COLLECTION AT HAMPTON COURT.

After Padley's death in 1828 the management for Hampton Court, as that for other royal gardens at Kew, Kensington, Buckingham Palace, Cumberland Lodge, the Royal Lodge, Virginia Water, came to W. T. Aiton, but in 1830 after complaints this monopoly was broken down, with Aiton delegated in charge of Kew only and Hampton Court given to Tyrrel/ Augustus Turrell.⁴⁶ By this stage John Loudon had questioned royal extravagance in a country oppressed by debt, and envisioned the royal gardens as 'gardens and pleasure grounds for the people'. Kitchen and forcing gardens at Windsor, Hampton Court and Kensington had been well run, but their expense was being questioned when 'supplies for the kitchen, the dessert, and for decorating the drawing-room, could be got both cheaper and better from Covent Garden Market and the Bedford conservatories'.⁴⁷

In 1838 this led to Lindley being employed to lead an inquiry 'into the management, superintendence and expenditure of several Royal Gardens', employing Joseph Paxton to assist him. In their survey of the walled kitchen garden they observed the 'nearly new' cross walls that had been 'covered with roping fitted with wires to train Trees on'. The Tudor outer walls were considered to be 'much out of repair'. In total there was more than thirteen hundred yards of wall. There were mainly young trees, in good health, but those on the west side were in bad health as a consequence of large elms on the other side of the wall. There were a few old trees of peaches and pears on the east side. The new walls were covered with peach trees on the south side and morello trees on the north. To the north wall, either side of the gate were forty-seven yards with five fig trees and thirty-five yards with six vines, recently

planted. Lindley considered that 'It does not appear to us possible that with the exception of peaches and Nectarines there can be any considerable quantity of wall fruit supplied by the Garden for some years to come'. This would have been a considerable indictment as to the ability of the gardeners.

There was a twenty-eight-feet-long greenhouse with orange and lime trees planted in the ground, with some trees displaying signs of frost damage. There was a range of two forcing houses heated with flues, totalling seventy yards, in excellent repair that contained figs, peaches, nectarines and cherries. They were not being forced and though figs had cropped well they 'were not wanted much in the palace'. A range of one-hundred-and-fifty-feet long pits contained 'Pine Plants out of health'. When interviewed, Turrell acknowledged being the 'sole Gardener', with responsibility for two foremen, fifteen labourers and one carter. The interview seems to set out to show a lack of purpose for garden produce, and incentive to produce sufficient quantities of quality fruit and vegetables. Similar surveys and interviews were held at the other royal gardens, leading in 1842 to the abandonment of the royal kitchen gardens and the creation of one new kitchen garden at Frogmore near Windsor, where the logistics of supply of fresh fruit and vegetables to Queen Victoria's main residence were diminished.⁴⁸ In the event, the melon ground and kitchen gardens at Hampton Court were leased to Thomas Jackson, a fruiterer from Kingston, who continued to grow and expand fruit cultivation for commercial purposes and for a while at least built a successful business (Figure 9).

CONCLUSIONS

The above confirms the leading role of the royal gardens at Hampton Court in the cultivation and development of fruit in England. There was the cultivation of always the latest varieties, development of new varieties, new ways of using fruit, and always

the largest and best specimens. The most surprising finding in reviewing this is how quickly the demise occurred, from an internationally leading role as a reference collection to being regarded as inconsequential and better replaced by what could be produced in a new garden, with little regard for inherent practical and theoretical knowledge. The economic reasons used to argue the case for reorganization feel incredibly contemporary, which suggests that today's value system has not advanced much.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper was based on a lecture at a conference on historic orchards, held in Brixen, Italy, in October 2015.

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1a and b The gardens and orchards at Hampton Court Palace have been progressively extended; shown here is the phase of the 1520s contrasted with that of the 1550s; Travers Morgan, 'Royal Parks Historical Survey: Hampton Court and Bushy Park', vol.1 (unpublished report, 1982), Figs. 1 and 2

Fig. 2 John Gerard's Herball of 1597 is symptomatic for the era in that apples, pears, plums and cherries were primarily considered for medicinal purposes; John Gerard, *The Herball or Generall Historie of Plantes*, ed. Thomas Johnson (London, 1633), p. 1497

Fig. 3 William Talman's survey, c.1695 includes a wilderness designed by Daniel Marot, the melon ground and a new kitchen garden divided in six separately walled quarters on the site of the tiltyard; RIBA drawings collection, SB64/16

Fig. 4 In the late seventeenth century the outer borders in the newly created kitchen garden were planted with dwarf fruit interplanted with soft fruit. Here shown in a re-

creation of one of the quarters of the kitchen garden in June 2015. Photo: author (June 2014)

Fig. 5 Traditionally twigs were nailed ‘with shreds of Sheep Skin, or Shammy, or Lists of Cloath, less than half a Finger’s Breadth, and a Finger long’. This practice continued for centuries and this photograph shows clear evidence of this practice on one of the Tudor walls at Hampton Court; Photo: author (May 2010)

Fig. 6 a, b and c George Brookshaw’s *Pomona Britannica* of 1812, which contained folio-sized plates of fruit had relied mainly on produce grown at Hampton Court for its illustrations; George Brookshaw, *Pomona Britannica ...* (London, 1812), title page, Plate lx, Plate x

Fig. 7 A single Black Hamburgh grape planted in 1769 still occupies a greenhouse in the Pond yard at Hampton Court. Photo: author (October 2015)

Fig. 8a and b Detail of an early nineteenth-century kitchen garden wall at Hampton Court invented by Caleb Hitch of Ware, Hertfordshire, which was more economical with material. Photo: author (October 2015)

Fig. 9 After centuries of decline, in recent years the interest in wall fruit has been revived at Hampton Court, with historic varieties being replanted, here shown on a seventeenth-century kitchen garden wall. They are now attached to trelliswork, which traditionally was rarely used in England, but now enables the conservation of the historic fabric. Photo: author (October 2015)

¹ Joan Morgan and Alison Richards, *The New Book of Apples* (London: Ebury Press, 1993).

² John Harvey, *Early Nurserymen* (London: Phillimore, 1974), pp. 27-28, 31.

³ Alicia Amherst, *A History of Gardening in England* (London, 1896), p. 91

-
- ⁴ Mollie Sands, *The Gardens of Hampton Court* (London: Evans Brothers, 1950), pp. 57-58.
- ⁵ Amherst, *A History of Gardening*, p. 92.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 101.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 105n.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 93.
- ⁹ Sands, *The Gardens of Hampton Court*, p. 48.
- ¹⁰ Ronald Webber, *The Early Horticulturists* (Newton Abbot: David and Charles, 1968), pp. 29-42; Blanche Henrey, *British Botanical and Horticultural Literature before 1800* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 157.
- ¹¹ Harvey, *Early Nurserymen*, p. 28.
- ¹² William Turner, *The Names of Plantes* (London, 1548), p. 52.
- ¹³ Sands, *The Gardens of Hampton Court*, p. 69.
- ¹⁴ Horace, Earl of Orford, *Paul Hentzner's Travels in England* (London, 1797), p. vi.
- ¹⁵ John Gerard, *The Herball or Generall Historie of Plantes* (London: Thomas Johnson, 1633 edn), p. 1460.
- ¹⁶ Hugh Plat, *Floraes Paradise* (1608), pp. 40, 60, 161, 174.
- ¹⁷ Gerard, *The Herball*, pp. 1293-94.
- ¹⁸ Earl of Orford, *Paul Hentzner's Travels*, p. 58; Amherst, *A History of Gardening*, p. 111; John Parkinson, *Paradisi in sole* (London, 1629), p. 425.
- ¹⁹ Amherst, *A History of Gardening*, p. 153; F. Devon, *Issue Rolls of the Exchequer, James I* (London: HMSO, 1836).
- ²⁰ The account of George Hopton, Underkeeper of His Majesty's gardens at Hampton Court, transcribed in Sands, *The Gardens of Hampton Court*, p. 90 from NA: E. 351/3379. Declared Accounts, Pipe.

-
- ²¹ Webber, *The Early Horticulturists*, pp. 41-42.
- ²² Roy Strong, *the Renaissance Garden in England* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979), p. 191; Tradescant's appointment is disputed by others.
- ²³ Amherst, *A History of Gardening*, pp. 315-27.
- ²⁴ Samuel Hartlib, *A Designe for Plenty, By an Universall Planting of Fruit-Trees* (London, 1652), p. 4.
- ²⁵ Charles Webster (ed.), *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- ²⁶ David Brewster, *The Edinburgh Encyclopaedia*, vol. 11 (Edinburgh, 1832), p. 676.
- ²⁷ George London and Henry Wise, *The Retir'd Gard'ner*, I (London, 1706), p. 47.
- ²⁸ George London and Henry Wise, *The Complete Gard'ner* (London, 1701), p. xii.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. xi.
- ³¹ The Wise Papers, containing the archive material deriving from the legacy of Henry Wise, contain an unfinished survey of wall fruit at Brompton Park, Kensington, Hampton Court, Windsor and Blenheim in 1708, with no information given on Brompton Park and Kensington Palace. It appears that Hampton Court was the first list to be completed, as fruit varieties are listed in the order they were numbered in the gardens. Trees are listed in the order of cherries (8 varieties), apricots (13 or 14 varieties), peaches and nectarines (53 varieties), plums (33 varieties), figs (6 varieties), vines (22 varieties), and pears (25 varieties). See, also, Fred J. Chittenden, 'Henry Wise and Royal Gardens in Queen Anne's Time', *Journal of the Royal Horticultural Society* (October 1939), pp. 475-78.
- ³² London and Wise, *The Complete Gard'ner*, pp. 170-72.

³³ Bonamy Dobree and Geoffrey Webb, *The Complete Works of Sir John Vanbrugh*, IV (London: Nonesuch Press, 1928), p. 70.

³⁴ Stephen Switzer, *The Practical Fruit Gardener* (London, 1731), pp. 125, 130, 134, 165, 299.

³⁵ Anon., *The Fruiterers Secrets* (1604), 'The Epistle to the Reader', p. ii.

³⁶ *The Flower, Fruit and Kitchen Garden by Practical Gardeners and Florists* (London: E. Lloyd, 1853), p. 179.

³⁷ Richard Weston (ed.), Samuel Hartlib, *A Treatise concerning the Husbandry and Natural History of England* (London, 1742), p. 13.

³⁸ George Brookshaw, *Pomona Britannica, or A Collection of the Most Esteemed Fruits at Present Cultivated in this Country; Together with the blossoms and leaves as are necessary to distinguish the various sorts from each other, selected principally from the Royal Gardens at Hampton Court and the most celebrated gardens round London* (London, 1812). This has recently been republished by Taschen, with incomplete title and without the original descriptions; Henrey, *British Botanical and Horticultural Literature*, p. 597.

³⁹ It was published in a volume entitled *Pomona Londinensis: containing colored engravings of the most esteemed fruits cultivated in British Gardens, with a descriptive account of each variety* (London, 1818). For further information on Padley, see Robert Hogg, *The Fruit Manual: A Guide to the Fruits and Fruit Trees of Great Britain* (London: Journal of Horticulture, 1884), p. 167. Hogg based this on an account of Padley's friend, John Rogers, in *The Fruit Cultivator* (London, 1834), pp. 83-84.

⁴⁰ Brent Elliott, 'English fruit illustration in the early nineteenth century. Part 2: Hooker, Withers and the Horticultural Society', in *Occasional Papers from the RHS Lindley Library*, vol. 7 (2012), pp. 38, 42.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 47; Brent Elliott, *The Royal Horticultural Society: A history 1804-2004* (London: Phillimore, 2004), p. 253.

⁴² John Claudius Loudon, *An Encyclopaedia of Gardening* (London, 1822), p. 1227; ‘Calls in Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Berkshire, Surrey, Sussex, and Middlesex’, *The Gardener’s Magazine*, 5 (1829), pp. 557-604 (p. 570); H. Cummings, ‘Some account of a large vine at Sellwood Park, the seat of Michie Forbes, Esq., Sunning Hill, Berkshire’, *The Gardener’s Magazine*, 6 (1830), p. 439-40; Anon., ‘Horticultural Society and Garden’, *The Gardener’s Magazine*, 7 (1831), p. 509-10.

⁴³ John Claudius Loudon, ‘*Magasin d’Horticulture ... par R. Courtois ... 1832-3*’, *The Gardener’s Magazine*, 10 (1835), pp. 78-85 (p. 84).

⁴⁴ Jacob Rinz, ‘Remarks on various gardens about London, and in other parts of England, visited in April and May, 1829’, *Gardener’s Magazine*, 5 (1829), pp. 379-84 (p. 381).

⁴⁵ John Claudius Loudon, ‘A summary view of progress of gardening’, *Gardener’s Magazine*, NS4 (1838), pp. 545-73 (p. 567); Charles M’Intosh, *The Book of the Garden* (London: Blackwood, 1853), vol.1, pp. 84-85. The wall of ‘Patent Rebated Brickwork’ which was referred to as ‘uniform and bold’ required very little mortar and was thought to be twenty to forty percent cheaper than an ordinary garden wall. The headers and stretchers of this wall were rebated together and formed ‘two external faces of brickwork enclosing a hollow space, or a series of hollow spaces’. The headers had two dowel holes through them and the undersides were profiled, or ‘hollowed out’, so that these holes were properly aligned. Iron rods or oak stakes might then be inserted to string the bricks together, and the interstices filled with concrete. In order to prevent the walls being damaged by nailing in order to train trees, a short strip of zinc with a small hole was positioned, edgewise, every two

courses of brickwork at set intervals through which wires would be passed, so that trees might be tied to it. Thus the management of the trees was more efficient and no longer required them to be nailed to the wall; George Godwin, 'Hints on construction; addressed to architectural students', *The Architectural Magazine* 5 (1838), pp. 577-81 (pp. 579-81).

⁴⁶ John Claudius Loudon, 'The Royal gardens', *Gardener's Magazine*, 6 (1830), p. 731.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 489-90.

⁴⁸ National Archives (Kew) NA/T90/189 Royal Commission on the Courts of Justice and other similar Commissions: Records. Public Offices, Committee on Fees (Treasury Minute, 3 November 1836), Royal Gardens, Committee of Inquiry. Minute and letter book (1838).