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Garden and Forest’s Journey to Cyberspace

LeeEllen Friedland

In March 1888, the first issue of a new periodical, Garden and Forest: A Journal of Horticulture, Landscape Art, and Forestry, was received by the Library of Congress for copyright deposit. Every week thereafter, until the journal ceased publication in December 1897, subsequent issues of Garden and Forest were added to the Library’s collection.

Since the time of its original publication, Garden and Forest has provided readers at the Library of Congress—and other libraries—a distinctive and invaluable resource. Its pages contain a vast array of materials, from articles on entomology and pomology to advice on ornamental plant gardening to position statements on forest conservation policy to summaries of retail flower market prices. Every issue is generously illustrated with detailed line drawings, photographs, and landscape plans. The advertisements on the front and back cover leaves of each issue serve as a guide to commercial products and services of the time, including flower pots, seeds and bulbs, tools, glass for greenhouses and graperies, horticultural architects, nurseries, and gardeners. There are also advertisements for periodicals on agriculture and literature, and even a Pocket Kodak camera appropriate for amateur photographers who might wish to capture “snow-scapes” of “leafless trees and ice-bound streams.”

How did Garden and Forest journey from the shelves of the Library of Congress, where it rested safely for a century, to cyberspace, where, in December 1999, it became the first complete serial publication digitized by the Library and released on the Internet? Three intertwining paths formed this journey and represented a confluence of issues—digital technology, historical content value, and preservation needs—central to the Library’s mission.

The Library of Congress began to explore the use of digital technology to create reproductions of historical collection materials in 1990. The goal of the early pilot program, called “American Memory,” was to “get the champagne out of the bottle” in order to share the Library’s treasures with broader audiences. Most of the collection materials chosen to be digitized were nominated by Library curators, but some project ideas arose through other channels. One such instance was in response to a generous gift from Laurance S. and Mary French Rockefeller to fund digital collections about subjects of longstanding interest to them: President Calvin

Entrance to the Arnold Arboretum
Coolidge and his times and the history of the conservation movement in the United States. As work got underway on the digital collection to be called “The Evolution of the Conservation Movement, 1850-1920,” Library staff were confronted with an embarrassment of riches. The Library of Congress has outstanding collections in the history of science, especially covering eighteenth- and nineteenth-century America, and in the areas of gardening, horticulture, forestry, and landscape art. Among these riches, *Garden and Forest* stood out in several ways. In addition to primary information on scientific topics, it provided a wonderful snapshot of the cultural history of the early conservation movement in the United States. A striking number of important individuals active in the burgeoning conservation movement published in *Garden and Forest*, and their writing spanned the broad range of interests that impelled them, including landscape design and preservation, national and urban park development, scientific forestry, forest conservation, horticulture, and botany. *Garden and Forest* also published the work of a significant number of woman authors, an unusual occurrence in publications of the time.

Although interest in *Garden and Forest* was high, technical impediments initially prohibited its inclusion in the American Memory digital collection. Over the next several years, some of those impediments lessened, but the journal’s overall size—almost 9,000 pages—and the relative expense to digitize it in its entirety remained concerns. The frequent requests for *Garden and Forest* by researchers coming to the Library of Congress throughout this period, however, reinforced its importance as a resource.

During the time *Garden and Forest* was being considered for digitizing, Library staff noticed that its paper showed signs of deterioration, including embrittlement. At that time, the Library’s Preservation Directorate began to develop its digital reformatting program to provide another option for creating surrogates of original materials that might be damaged if used by readers. *Garden and Forest* was chosen as the first project for this new approach, and since standard procedure in preservation reformatting—with older technologies such as microfilm as well as new digital technologies—is to capture the complete work, there was no question that every volume of the serial would be digitized in its entirety. The Preservation digitizing approach also led to two fruitful collaborations for the Library: one with the University of Michigan, to deliver *Garden and Forest* on the Internet through a collaborative gateway that provides access to many nineteenth-century periodicals; and one with the Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, to develop specialized access aids to the content, including background essays and a detailed subject index.

Since *Garden and Forest* was released online in December 1999, it has had a new and greatly expanded life among millions of pages of other electronic journals that provide full text access over the Internet. This has enabled tens of thousands of new researchers throughout the world, who might never have discovered *Garden and Forest* on a library shelf, to have a first-hand glimpse of a critical period in the history of the conservation movement in the United States and the development of related scientific fields.

Endnotes

1 The American Memory digital collections can be viewed at the Library of Congress web site: http://memory.loc.gov/


4 See: http://lcweb.loc.gov/preserv/prd/gardfor/digitizegf.html

5 See: http://lcweb.loc.gov/preserv/prd/gardfor/gfhome.html

LeeEllen Friedland is a Senior Specialist with the National Digital Library Program at the Library of Congress.
The avenue of Cypress trees . . . forms the most conspicuous feature of the garden of the Villa Giusti, in the city of Verona. The villa itself, a Renaissance building, is not of great architectural importance, nor are the gardens very extensive, covering, perhaps, an acre and a half of ground. But they are beautifully laid out in the true Italian style, and there is nothing in all Italy finer in its way than this Cypress avenue. The trees are probably some four hundred years old, and most of them are in fine condition . . . [Garden and Forest 2 (1889) 458]
Garden and Forest and “Landscape Art”

Ethan Carr

Laura Wood Roper notes in her 1973 biography of Frederick Law Olmsted that the 1890s were years of “staggering reverses” for the profession of landscape architecture. Pioneers such as Frederick Law Olmsted and H. W. S. Cleveland retired from practice, while the untimely deaths of Henry S. Codman and Charles Eliot diminished the next generation. But it was also during this period that a body of theory and technical expertise was developed and became the basis for training landscape architects. What had been a practice, in other words, matured into a profession. And much of this transition is documented in the pages of Garden and Forest.

Garden and Forest, published from 1888 through 1897, benefited from an extraordinary group of editors and contributors who saw it as their best forum for shaping the profession of landscape architecture. Correspondents included (besides Olmsted, Cleveland, Eliot, and Codman) Beatrix Jones (later Farrand), Samuel B. Parsons, Charles H. Lowrie, Frank A. Waugh, O. C. Simonds, Warren H. Manning, Harold A. Caparn, Wilhelm Miller, J. C. Olmsted—all leading practitioners of the day. Eliot and Codman described European landscapes seen during the travels that had been part of their apprenticeship. Others discussed specific aspects of technique and practice, for example, “The Treatment of Slopes and Banks” (J. C. Olmsted), “Park Construction” (Cleveland), and “The Garden in Relation to the House” (Farrand). The editors Charles Sprague Sargent and William A. Stiles published descriptions of showcase projects including the Boston Metropolitan Parks, the World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago, and Biltmore, as well as plans of smaller but typical residences and gardens. In an era before a professional organization or academic instruction existed in the field of landscape architecture, Garden and Forest took on aspects of both.

The magazine did all this, of course, while also promoting scientific forestry, botany, horticulture, city planning, and scenic preservation; indeed, numerous professions trace their early development in part to the influence of Garden and Forest. But landscape architecture, which aspired to combine planning and design on many scales, enjoyed a special status in the magazine and influenced its editorial structure. Landscape architecture was not limited to the “planting of flower-beds and of ornamental shrubs,” the Garden and Forest editors asserted in 1897, but was a “broad and catholic art . . . as useful in the preservation of the Yosemite Valley or the scenery of Niagara as it is in planning a pastoral park or the grounds about a country house.” Descriptions like these summarized not only the ambitions of landscape architects, but also the editorial goals of Garden and Forest. It was the emphasis on landscape architecture, Stiles felt, that distinguished Garden and Forest from “any other garden paper.” Stiles and Sargent published articles on horticulture and “country place” design alongside calls for the “Preservation of Natural Scenery” from suburban Boston to the Sierra Nevada. In the editorial tradition of Loudon and Downing, readers were urged to expand the aesthetic sensibilities developed in their own gardens and to become advocates for better management of the larger landscape, especially of public parks and forests.

If the practice of landscape architecture offered conceptual unity to Garden and Forest, the magazine in turn helped define the emerging theory of the profession. This was largely due to the contributions of the art historian and critic Mariana Gnswold (Mrs. Schuyler) Van Rensselaer, who contributed a total of almost 50 articles beginning with a seven-part series on “Landscape Gardening” in 1888. Already an established art critic, Van Rensselaer became intrigued with landscape architecture through her friendship with the elder Olmsted. In her Garden and Forest articles, she set out to define landscape architecture as “landscape art,” which, after architecture, sculpture, and painting, constituted the “fourth art” of design. To Olmsted’s great satisfaction, she helped establish the professional status of landscape archi-
A VIEW IN CENTRAL PARK.

The view on this page is taken from a point in the Ramble in the Central Park of this city, looking southward, and including a portion of the Terrace. Of course, it is much more than a picture of the Terrace, but it clearly shows how much this bit of architecture adds to the composition. The distant horizon line of trees has an attractiveness of its own. Nearer by are the upper Terrace lines contrasting with the masses of foliage above them. Below these are the open arches with deeper shadows, then the lower lines of the Terrace, the lake shore and the passage of water separating more distinctly the extreme distance from the middle distance. All these, with the lines of the shrubbery about the little lawn, mark the successive planes of the composition and help to bring out the gradations of light and shadow. In the Park the observer would enjoy in addition the ever varying tints of the sky which would also be reflected in the water, while he could look up to and into the leafy framework in the foreground forever without exhausting its interest. The illustration is a good example of what can be accomplished by framing in a distant object with foliage, so as to make a complete and consistent picture, and there is no reason why such planting as it shows should be confined to public parks. Many a lawn could be made the foreground of a picture quite as attractive, and it could be graded and planted so as to emphasize the interest and increase the pictorial effect of some important object, natural or artificial, and trees could be disposed about it so as to concentrate the attention which would otherwise be distracted by surrounding objects.

[Garden and Forest 1 (1888): 30]
tects by defining their practice as a fine art, unlike the craft or trade of gardening.8

Continuing this essentially Reptonian discourse, Van Rensselaer distinguished landscape art from the other fine arts by observing that it “uses the same materials as nature herself.”9 The landscape gardener (her preferred term) “takes from nature not only his models but his materials and his methods.” This “partnership with Nature” might seem to limit the artist’s opportunity for self expression, a necessary quality of true art. But like the painter or the sculptor, the landscape gardener observes nature and “re-unites her scattered excellences” in artistic compositions that express the wholeness and unity that nature possesses but rarely reveals in a single place or view. Nature always provides “vitality, light, atmosphere,” she concluded, and especially “what no other artist ever gets—perfection in details.” But “composition . . . is the chief thing in art . . . and the landscape gardener’s compositions are and must be his own.”10

Van Rensselaer’s contributions in Garden and Forest made her a foremost landscape theorist of her day, and her ideas would be taught to generations of American landscape architects.11 If many of her discussions of nature and art would not seem out of place in the late eighteenth century, to a remarkable degree they also anticipated some of today’s debates in the fields of landscape design and planning. Van Rensselaer deplored the naive tendency to assume that rural scenery was “natural,” for example, when it was usually the (often unintended) product of generations of cultivation and management. Nature and art were rarely mutually exclusive in the landscape. Sargent and Stiles adopted this theme and criticized the excessive veneration of what was assumed to be natural or “wild” because it had led to the neglect of “that part of the landscape which is necessarily not wild—the landscape of our daily lives—the humanized scenery of the earth.” In words that resonate today, they regretted the tendency of people to travel “in search of the picturesque while what might be the picturesqueness of their own neighborhood is unperceived or destroyed.”12

Throughout the pages of Garden and Forest, simplistic distinctions between what is “nature” and what is “art” were condemned, as were dogmatic preferences for either the “natural” or the “formal” styles in garden design.13 “Landscape art” encompassed both spheres, which is why it offered a unique means for improving a broad range of public and private environments, from vacation villas to city plans and from municipal parks to national reservations. Landscape art was necessary in all these designs because without it they could never achieve the unity inherent in great artistic compositions. The “true artist” planned landscapes—from gardens to entire cities—by first analyzing and recognizing the “characteristic and salient aspects of the place,” in order to “work in harmony with them instead of coming into conflict with nature.”14

Garden and Forest was dedicated to advancing landscape design as a compositional “art,” inspired by the greater composition and unity of “nature” and intended to integrate human society into the larger, natural environment. Landscape architecture was seen as the profession that would supply the necessary artists. But landscape art was not for art’s sake alone. In an editorial reflecting the sentiments of the elder Olmsted (as was often the case), Sargent and Stiles state that “true art is not the servant of some temporary fashion, but something that is to endure, and must, therefore, have a permanent basis in the necessities and aspirations of human life.”15

Among contemporary landscape projects, therefore, none received more attention in the pages of Garden and Forest than the Metropolitan Park Commission’s system of suburban parks around Boston. Charles Eliot, who first proposed the system in an 1890 letter to Garden and Forest, was praised as an example of the “true artist” needed to successfully direct such a project.16 But the deaths of both Eliot and Stiles in 1897, followed soon by the demise of Garden and Forest, marked the end of one era and the beginning of another. Within three years, landscape architects had established their own professional organization, the American Society of Landscape Architects (1899), and instituted the first academic program in the field, at Harvard University (1900). The profession flourished, bolstered by a growing market for “country place” residential design. Whether Garden and Forest’s ideals of “landscape art” survived as well in the new century, however, is an open question.
THE FIELD OF LANDSCAPE-ART.

We are constantly asked whether the profession of landscape-gardening offers a promising field for young men who are looking for some calling in life which will be useful and remunerative. We have always felt obliged to reply that there is comparatively small demand for the counsel of landscape-gardeners in this country. The prevalent idea is that his work is chiefly ornamental and that his province is to do about the same thing for the surroundings of a house that the decorative artist does for its interior when he selects the furniture, rugs and hangings and decided upon color-schemes and the like. That is, after an architect has built a house, it is considered proper to call in a landscape-gardener to plant some ornamental trees and shrubs about it and lay out paths and flower-beds in order to beautify the grounds. In fact, the beauty of the scene, which includes both the house and the grounds, should grow up from the general design and framework of the house and grounds as a place where all the varied necessities of the family in the way of health and happiness and home life are the first things considered.

All this means that a landscape-gardener ought to be much more than a mere decorative planter. The successful designing of public parks or of private grounds for daily occupation means first of all the study of human wants—the necessities of men and women and children of various circumstances and conditions. A good artist must be primarily a man of sound judgment and he should have a cultivated mind, wide sympathies and catholic tastes. Reading and travel and scholarship can do for the designer in landscape all that they can accomplish for the architect. A man may be able to mass a shrubbery effectively or arrange a border of herbaceous plants with skill and yet not have a particle of that profounder art which was seen in the grouping of the great buildings at the Columbian Exposition, and the planning of that Court of Honor which was the crowning artistic success of Mr. Olmsted's life. This view of the case contemplates an ideal that is rarely attained, and it is because the work of real artists in this line is rarely seen and still more rarely appreciated that the very existence of such an art is practically ignored or denied.

[Editorial. Garden and Forest 10 [1897]: 161]
THE SQUARES OF PARIS.

ONE of the best features of the park system of Paris is the number of small squares scattered about in the different quarters of the city. The parks themselves, especially the larger ones, are at such great distances from the crowded centres of population, that the working classes, except on Sundays and holidays, seldom have a chance to visit them, so that these squares admirably serve the purpose of keeping the children out of the streets, and of allowing the poorer people, in the few hours of leisure they have during the week, to get a breath of fresh air and a glimpse of green.

A stranger, on first entering one of them, marvels as he sees how neatly they are kept while so thickly crowded with visitors, reading, working or playing. In plan they are usually quite simple, as the accompanying diagram will show. A broad gravel walk, ten or twelve feet wide, following near but separated from the boundary by occasional shrubbery plantations, encloses a quiet piece of lawn sufficiently open to get a glimpse through to the opposite end, but planted on the sides with trees, shrubs and foliage plants.

Plan of a Paris Square.

There are few attempts at fancy gardening, but much care has been taken to select hardy shrubs and plants with the view of avoiding bare and empty beds during the winter. The condition of the turf is everywhere excellent, for water is freely used, and suitable small playgrounds are provided for the children, which serve the purpose of keeping them off the grass. These playgrounds, which are an admirable feature, are generally formed by simply widening the walks in the corners and planting enough trees there to afford ample shade. There are always one or two flower beds, which are kept bright and attractive during the spring and summer by a constant succession of showy flowering and foliage plants. Permanent seats are provided, but not in sufficient numbers to accommodate every one, but for a very small sum a chair for the whole morning or afternoon can be hired and you can move it about at will.

The only serious fault in all these squares is the stiff and formal appearance of the shrubberies. Almost without exception these plantations are in the form of regular figures—circles, ovals or ellipses—and they are always planted on slight mounds. These two facts detract very much from any effect of naturalness, and it seems a great pity that, when it is so easy to give a varying outline to the groups, it has not been done. It would also be an improvement to plant the borders of these beds with plants or shrubs of low, half trailing habit, and thus, in a measure, hide the sharp, stiff outline between the turf and the dug ground of the bed... in Paris there are no less than seventy breathing places, not counting the boulevards and other tree-planted streets. They are usually most attractive spots and teach a lesson which might very well be copied in many of the crowded cities of our country.

Paris. 

Henry S. Codman

[Garden and Forest 1 (1888): 267]
Plan of the Columbian Exposition in Chicago, April 1892, by F. L. Olmsted & Co.
THE PLAN OF THE COLUMBIAN FAIR GROUNDS.

MORE than twenty years ago a design was prepared by Messrs. Olmsted, Vaux & Co. for laying out three tracts of land which were known together as South Park, Chicago. One of these tracts is now Jackson Park, the site of the Columbian Exposition. Among the striking features of this plot of land, as pointed out in the report accompanying the plan alluded to, was its long frontage on the lake, which, in the opinion of the designers, added an element of such grandeur and sublimity that it compensated for the absence of picturesque elevations of surface, while at the same time it provided means of transportation by water from the city, whose business centre was some seven miles away . . . Visitors who come by rail would pass through the arches of this stately structure [the Administration Building, the loftiest and most strictly monumental building on the grounds] into the quadrangle, where their first impressions of the Exhibition will be received. A glance at the map will explain to some extent this arrangement and the magnitude of the scale upon which the whole idea is worked out will be understood when it is remembered that the basin contains nearly nine acres of water.

This plan of ushering visitors into the grounds through a porch of such dignity and into a court surrounded by architectural splendors, instead of letting them in through some side-entrance, so to speak, seems to us one of the finest inspirations of the design. No group of buildings approaching these in magnitude or of equal ambition in design, and related to each other so intimately, has ever been constructed in the entire history of architecture, and while the designers of the separate buildings have been allowed certain liberties as to details of expression they have worked together in perfect sympathy to secure a single consistent and harmonious effect . . .

[Editorial. Garden and Forest 5(1892): 289]

In the throng who witnessed on Monday the Columbian Exposition few probably realized that the harmony of the scene and the perfection and convenience of the whole scheme of arrangement were due to the genius of one man, Frederick Law Olmsted. Many others have brought to this great enterprise their gifts of labor, devotion, artistic training and the enthusiasm born of a great opportunity, but the spark of genius which has produced a single and consistent work of art, changing the sandy and uninviting waste of Jackson Park into a marvel of stately beauty, sprung from his brain. Of this the world may still be ignorant, but his associates realize and proclaim it; and the architects, sculptors and painters who have been inspired to their sincerest efforts feel that their work serves a nobler purpose, because the labor of each contributed to the harmonious development and expression of his comprehensive idea . . .

The foremost artist which the New World has yet produced, Mr. Olmsted, has been singularly fortunate in impressing himself during his own life upon his time and people, and in living to see with his own eyes the development and perfection of his greatest conceptions. The memory of his name and personality may be dimmed in the passage of years, for it is the fate of architects to be lost in their work, but millions of people now unborn will find rest and refreshment in the contemplation of smiling landscapes which he has made, and will enjoy the shade of trees which he has planted. No American has been more useful in his time or has made a more valuable and lasting contribution to civilization in this country.

[Editorial. Garden and Forest 6 (1893): 192]
THE GARDENS AT MONTE CARLO.

Many are the sins that have been committed in the laying out and building of American towns, but the greatest of all, perhaps, has been the neglect or defacement of their water-fronts. Whether the adjacent water is ocean or great river, lake or little stream, we seldom see its shores turned to the best advantage, and often they present a more deplorable aspect than any other part of the town. In New York tumbledown, malodorous, muddy wharfs, flanked by streets which are frequently pools of water, line a shore that ought to be encircled by well-built, well-kept piers, and even the precious little expanse of Battery Park is daily threatened with curtailment; in Boston the back yards of Beacon Street houses lie along the wide estuary where a stately, tree-bordered esplanade should have stretched, and the river or brook which intersects a country town is most often edged by rickety sheds or fringed with ragged weeds, and is spanned by bridges as perishable as they are ugly. Of late years public attention has, indeed, been directed to the subject of water-fronts, and much has been done to secure them, in the outskirts of great cities, against the disfigurement that has overtaken them in portions already built. The parks at Chicago have been laid out with a wise sense of the value of the lake-frontage. Boston has claimed for similar purposes certain stretches of the Back Bay Shore, and New York has constructed Riverside Drive and bought the water-front near Pelham. But there is need that more should be done in this direction and that we should learn from older countries the art of beautifying the water-fronts we are beginning at least to reserve. All foreign countries are full of examples of this art, whether it has been employed merely to dignify reaches of shore that must be put to commercial use or to create ornamental promenades and gardens. The quays at Antwerp
are as good in their more prosaic way as the Thames Embankment in London. The Elbe at Dresden is not defaced by the structures that line its banks, though they are not all terraced promenades, but include steamboat-landings, private grounds, hotels and restaurants. At Rouen the chief hotels look out on a river crowded with shipping, yet look on a scene devoid of squalor or architectural meanness. At Lyons the great stream rushes between close-pressed ranks of tall buildings, yet a fine drive runs by it in many places, and everywhere the shore is agreeable to look upon. At Prague there is a truly magnificent series of wide esplanades upon which some of the finest buildings in the city have been placed, and a succession of bridges where the newest wrought-iron span does not seem out of artistic keeping with the famous great stone bridge which, until some of its arches were swept away last summer, had stood intact since medieval times. And so one might pass from land to land and town to town, only to find that everywhere the water-front is valued and everywhere is intelligently treated, with parks or avenues if possible, and if not, at least with respectable buildings and cleanly shores.

The picture we give [above] shows a peculiarly charming treatment of a water-front. As possessing the only public gaming-house still open in Europe, Monaco would in any case attract a multitude of visitors. But its development would never have been so great, and it would never have drawn thousands of tourists who do not come for the sake of gaming, had its situation not been so marvelously beautiful. The town itself, and the promontory of Monte Carlo where the Casino stands, overlook from their rocky heights the vast blue expanse of the Mediterranean, and the gift of nature has been sedulously enhanced by the intelligence of man. The drives along the cliff-edge are admirably planned, and, like the Casino gardens, show what may be achieved when architecture and horticulture are combined by an artistic hand. Monsieur Edouard Andrè, the famous French landscape-gardener, never did a better piece of work than here, and the effect of his planting has been increased by the skill of gardeners who have caused Palms and other exotic plants to grow with extraordinary luxuriance. The treatment is somewhat formal, as befits the neighborhood of stately buildings and the presence of perpetual crowds of visitors. But there is no monotonous regularity in the arrangement either of the terraces and balustrades or of the sub-tropical plants which give such a singular charm to the spot in the eyes of travelers fresh from the wintry north. We can imagine what such a shore would be were this an American watering-place. It would doubtless not be given up to utter neglect and dishevelment, but a wooden paling would probably replace the marble balustrade, board walks the gravel slopes and marble steps, badly chosen trees in inharmonious variety the orderly avenue, and a stretch of Coleus-beds the beautifully grouped shrubbery. Of course, the exact treatment appropriate at Monaco would not be appropriate in a northern American watering-place; but something of the same orderliness, dignity and beauty ought to be secured far more often than it is. And while, in American country places, picturesqueness, rather than symmetrical stateliness, is usually appropriate, there are cases where it would be better to try for the more formal architectural charm which distinguishes the Casino gardens at Monte Carlo.

[Garden and Forest 4 (1891): 194]
THE NECESSITY OF PLANNING.

THE daily work of the architect and the landscape-architect is popularly supposed to consist in ornamenting lands and buildings so as to make them appear beautiful. Rooms may be inconveniently and awkwardly shaped, but they can be “beautified” by rich furniture and upholstery. Whole buildings may be irrationally planned, but they may still be made “artistic” by means of moldings, carvings and mosaic. House and grounds and college grounds, private gardens and public parks may be senselessly, as well as ineffectively, arranged, but they may still be glorified by yellow and purple leafage. In short, “The world is still deceived with ornament.”

On the other hand, although all seekers for the truth concerning beauty have discerned elements which defy analysis, such special students have nevertheless deduced from the visible and historical facts a whole series of fixed principles, which are quite as surely established as any of the other so-called laws of nature. Among these, perhaps, the most important is this, that “in all the arts which serve the use, convenience, or comfort of man, from gardening and building down to the designing of the humblest utensil which it is desired to make beautiful, utility and fitness for intended purpose must be first considered.” It is to be remembered that this is not theory but law. As a matter of fact and experience satisfying beauty is not won unless the law of nature is obeyed.

That faithful and well-reasoned planning for the accomplishment of purpose is necessary to the success of the work of architects of buildings is now generally understood. “A plan” is a skillful combination of convenience with effectiveness of arrangement. “A design” is made up of plan, construction and outward appearance, and by no means consists of the latter only. Indeed, the external aspect of a structure depends directly on the mode of construction, the construction depends, in turn, on the plan, and the plan on the purpose in view; with the result that the whole appearance of the building inevitably and naturally expresses this purpose.

If it be true that expression, character, and even beauty are thus most surely won, in the case of buildings, by keeping decoration subsidiary and designing with purpose in view from the start, it is equally true of all the wide field of architecture, using the word in its broadest imaginable sense. “Architecture, a great subject, truly,” says William Morris, “for it embraces the consideration of the whole of the external surroundings of the life of man; we cannot escape from it if we would, for it means the moulding and altering to human needs of the very face of the earth itself.” A busy pasture or a smooth green field in forest-clad New England is as truly a product of human handiwork as a green meadow in treeless and dusty Utah, yet each is beautiful, and neither owes a particle of its beauty to decoration. The English deer-park, with its broad-spreading trees, or the churchyard, with its ancient stones and yews, the typical Yankee farm with its low buildings and great Elm, or the Live Oaks and quaint structures of the plantations of Louisiana, these and all similarly interesting landscapes are interesting, not because they have been decorated, but because they are strongly characterized and highly expressive. Their moving beauty is the natural product of straightforward work for the adaptation of land and landscape to human needs and uses.
Believing these things, it will be impossible for us, when a tract of land is newly dedicated to some special purpose, be it that of a suburban lot, a railroad-station yard, a new village, a country-seat or a public park, to stand by and see it thoughtlessly laid out and then, perhaps, turned over to the decorators. We shall insist on premeditation and careful fundamental planning, knowing that therein lies the best, if not the only, hope of happy results. Once possessed of faith in that law of nature in accordance with which beauty springs from fitness, we shall be ready to agree that, when purpose is served, formal gardens, rectilinear avenues and courts of honor are not only permitted, but commanded. On the other hand, we shall be equally strenuous in demanding studied planning and adaptation to environment and purpose in the laying out of whatever work may need to be done to make the wildest place of private or public resort accessible and enjoyable. Positive injury to the landscape of such places can be avoided only by pains-taking, while the available resources of scenery can be economized only by careful devising. So with the whole range of problems which lie between these extremes. No work of man is ever successfully accomplished without taking thought beforehand; in other words, without planning.

And, strange as it may appear, opposition to such planning for effective results will not, in practice, be found to come from those who attempt decoration only because they know not how else to attain to the beautiful. Just as the literary class in China ruinously opposes change of any kind, so there is with us a comparatively small, but influential, body of refined persons, far too well educated to be “deceived by ornament,” who most unfortunately, though unintentionally, assist in the triumphs of ugliness by blindly opposing all attempts to adapt land and landscape to changed or new requirements. Enjoying the pleasanter scenery of their surroundings as it exists—certain shady roads, or some lingering fields or farm-lands—these estimable people talk of “letting Nature alone” or “keeping Nature natural,” as if such a thing were possible in a world which was made for man. No, the “moulding and altering” of the earth goes forward of necessity, and if those who ought to be leaders will not help to guide the world aright, the work will surely be done badly; as it is, in fact, done badly in the neighborhood of all our great towns. To refuse to exercise foresight and to adapt to purpose in due season, is simply to court disaster. Instead of hanging back, it ought to be the pride and pleasure of these very people to see to it that proper plans are seasonably laid for the widening of roads so that fine trees shall not be sacrificed, to see to it that electric-car tracks shall be placed only in suitably selected and specially arranged streets, that public reservations of one type or another shall be provided in accordance with some consistent general scheme, and that such reservations shall be saved from both decorative and haphazard development by the early adoption of rational and comprehensive plans. There is needed a little less selfish contentment in the doomed landscape of the present, a sharper sense of responsibility to the future and a living faith in that law of God, in obedience to which everything which is well adapted to use and purpose is sure to be interesting and expressive, and if not beautiful, at least on the way to be.

Brookline, Mass. Charles Eliot

[Garden and Forest 9 [1896]: 342]
PROPOSED PLAN FOR MADISON SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

. . . SIXTY years ago few buildings, except rural ones, stood north of Union Square, and the area now called Madison Square was an open tract some ten acres in extent in the centre of which stood a House of Refuge for unruly boys—an altogether neglected and unsightly tract, of which the only useful feature was a little pond used for skating in the winter. When the House of Refuge burned in 1839, efforts were made to improve the place, but nothing substantial was accomplished until the mayoralty of James Harper, between the years 1844 and 1847. This was some ten years before Central Park was thought of, and although Downing had already done some of his best work, he had not yet laid out those urban squares in Washington which first showed American eyes what might be accomplished in this direction.

When studied on paper the plan of Madison Square shows the working of design, not of accident; yet its treatment is so petty and monotonous, so

Fig. 18—Present Arrangement of Madison Square, New York.

Fig. 19—Suggestion for the Improvement of Madison Square, by E. Hamilton Bell and Daniel W. Langton.
wanting alike in broad unity, in effective variety and in conspicuous points of interest, that, we believe, few New Yorkers realize that it has any plan at all . . . The one virtue of the design is that those who wish to cross the park diagonally may do so with reasonable directness. And its chief defect is that its many minor paths cut up its lawns so pitilessly that the eye nowhere rests upon a quiet, reposeful stretch of green.

Truly naturalistic schemes of park design are, of course, more difficult to manage well on a small than on a large scale; and they are not as appropriate as others when the architectural surroundings of the pleasure-ground are of an obtrusively urban sort. Therefore, Messrs. Bell & Langton have sensibly conceived their rearrangement of Madison Square upon semi-formal lines. It may appear that in drawing their main paths anew they have made diagonal circulation less direct; but measurements show that, if anything, they have shortened the diagonal courses. By suppressing the minor paths they have won space for wide lawns. Yet the accommodation for strollers and for playing children, and for rows of seats as well, which is lost in this way, is more than made good by the broad mall which forms the central feature of their design, the two parallel paths which lie beyond its flanking flower-beds, and the large open circles which surround the basin that now exists, and the one which they indicate as balancing it toward the north . . .

[The plan] is published here less with the idea that Madison Square may actually be renovated according to its indications than in the belief that a comparison of it with the existing state of the Square will be instructive to those charged with the arrangement of new small parks in this and other cities . . . As a rule, a formal or semi-formal manner of treatment, resulting in a pleasure-ground which is properly to be called a large garden rather than a park, must be most appropriate for restricted areas in the heart of a great city. And Messrs. Bell & Langton show that such a manner of treatment need not exclude variety in design, abundance of shade, the reposeful effect of wide green lawns, or even such seemingly unstudied, yet artistic, arrangements of trees, shrubs and grass as may produce pleasingly naturalistic impressions and illusions.

New York City. M. G. Van Rensselaer

[Garden and Forest 9 (1896): 143]

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE PLANS OF MADISON SQUARE.

To the Editor of Garden and Forest:

Sir,—All persons interested in park-making will certainly be grateful for the two plans of Madison Square in your last issue and the study of their comparative merits by Mrs. Van Rensselaer. Perhaps still further discussion may be helpful, and I therefore write to say that it is hardly correct to classify the old plan as belonging to the naturalistic class. I draw a heavy line [see fig. 22] to show how symmetrical it is except where it has been
distorted in two or three places. Curved lines are not necessarily natural. Of course, the building (C) ought to be less conspicuous than it is, and the revised plan corrects this. Plainly, too, the statues are introductions of a later date, and the original designer is not responsible for placing them where they are. They might be well removed to the points [NN]. If this were done I do not discover any great superiority in the proposed plan over the old one. The area is so small that the insertion of a bit of rectangular treatment surrounded by a curvilinear treatment seems incongruous. Nor is it large enough for a “variety of design, abundance of shade, an effect of wide green lawns with seemingly unstudied, yet artistic, arrangement of trees, shrubs and grass, which produce pleasingly naturalistic impressions and illusions.” An attempt to accomplish all this in so contracted a space must result in confusion. Let us have symmetry where this is needed, but curvilinear symmetry and rectangular symmetry ought not to be mixed up in so small a place . . . Altogether, if there could be some rearrangement in the planting to make the symmetry of the present plan more evident, it strikes me as better than the new ones . . . Messrs. Bell & Langton have been
hampered by their efforts to save standing trees, so that they were allowed very little freedom of treatment, and it is not fair to criticise their plan as an original work.

New York City.  

S.A.

To the Editor of Garden AND Forest:

Sir,—I observe that in both plans of Madison Square, published in your issue for April 8th, the paths which converge at the circles are very inaccurately centered—that is, the axes of the paths do not point to the centres of the circle, and if the designs were executed as shown on the map the result would be disastrous. This, however, may be simply carelessness on the part of the draughtsman. I should add that both plans ought to show great seating capacity. Seats ought to be recessed so that the feet of those using them will not be in the way of pedestrians, because the paths as wide as those in the plans give no more than the necessary walking space.

New York  

L.G.S.

[MADISON SQUARE AGAIN]

To the Editor of Garden AND Forest:

Sir,—Your correspondent, S. A. . . . criticises the plan of Madison Square of Messrs. Bell & Langton because the centre of the park is formalized. I think the criticism just. He points out the symmetrical arrangement of paths as they exist, and says that the place is too small to contain formal as well as naturalistic effects. A seven-acre piece of ground is certainly too small for effects of wide green lawns if the centre is taken up with a rectilinear scheme covering more than an acre and a half. But seven acres are enough for naturalistic effects of respectable extent. Your correspondents (right, as I think) agree that formal features are desirable in a park of this kind. I do not believe, however, in the value of “symmetry” in lines of travel on a place of this size. This symmetry is not very obvious even on paper until emphasized by black lines, and it might be apparent to an observer hovering over it in a balloon. But how shall one who strolls into the square know that the path in which he walks is balanced by a similar on the other side? Artists in landscape too often forget that their paper plans are deceptive. Cannot effects of wide green lawns, abundance of shade and so forth be combined in seven acres with the popular formal effects? I think they can by relegating the formal design to a part of the ground where it will not interfere with the appearance of size. I enclose a design as a suggestion . . .

BB are the statues, C the kiosk, A the Farragut monument . . .

Pittsburg, PA.  

H. A. Caparn

[Garden and Forest 9 (1896): 178]
HOUSE AT HONMOKU IN JAPAN.

The photograph from which our illustration was drawn seemed to us of especial interest as displaying a Japanese solution of a problem very similar to that which often confronts a builder on the rocky shores of New England, especially north of Cape Cod, and on the borders of many of our inland lakes. This problem is to place a country-house on a rugged shore to the best advantage, while preserving, as far as possible, the natural character of the spot. It is only of very recent years that it has been so much as considered in this country. We have been much too anxious to imitate, under wholly different conditions, the country homes of Europe, and, in particular, of England. We have wanted to surround our houses with green lawns, well-kept flower-beds and trees symmetrical in shape and planted in accordance with the supposed laws of landscape gardening as practiced in countries all parts of which have long been subjected to cultivation. And we have too often tried to secure all this in actual defiance of natural conditions, and at the sacrifice of natural beauties which, to a really cultivated eye, would have seemed of priceless value. We have too often sacrificed the chance for a beautiful, wide outlook over the water by placing the house so far from the brink that lawns and drives could encircle it; have cut away the native growth of tree and shrubs—rough and straggling, perhaps, but picturesque and precious for that very reason—and replaced them by nursery specimens; have planted gardeners' flowers in the stead of nature's beautiful wild products, and in
the end, after a vast expenditure of time, pains and money, have succeeded in producing merely a bad imitation of an English villa, unattractive in itself, and utterly out of keeping with the landscape environing it.

Fortunately, tastes are changing, and one of the chief facts to be placed to the credit of the architectural profession in America to-day is the fact that it has developed a keen sense for the diverse natural beauties of our country, and an admirable power of adapting its constructions to the site and the surroundings at the moment in question. It is getting to be recognized as a binding aesthetic rule that a house shall conform itself to site and surroundings, and that these shall not be defaced to suit the character of a design abstractly evolved on paper, or tortured into the semblance of something which foreign hands had created under very different conditions. Many American homes exist, built within the last ten years, which are as worthy of praise from the point of view of appropriateness and picturesque charm as the Japanese house in our present picture... It will be noted that this house is placed quite at the edge of the cliff, so that the most extended possible view is obtained; that every tree which could be preserved in building it has been preserved; that the wild aspect of the spot has not been interfered with, and that the construction of man, alike in the house itself, and in the fences, steps and other surroundings, have been kept as simple and unobtrusive as possible. Picturesqueness is not the only quality to be prized, either in architectural or in gardening art; and it is a quality which, if forced into life where it does not naturally belong, is distressing to every cultivated eye. But when nature gives us picturesqueness in so clear and pronounced a form as here, the architect must accept her leading or ruin the effect both of her work and of his own. And spots quite as distinctively picturesque as this, and very similar in character, abound, as we have said, in many parts of our pine-grown, rocky coasts, and demand analogous architectural treatment. Naturally, to advise direct imitation of a Japanese house in America is no part of our desire, yet it may be said that the general architectural idea embodied in this house is far better fitted to adaptation in this country than most of those European models upon which we have so largely drawn in the past.


Each of us is constituted with a special idiosyncrasy related in some mysterious way to certain ideas of natural scenery, and when we find ourselves in a scene answering to our idiosyncrasy the mind feels itself at home there and rapidly attaches itself by affection. The influence of scenery upon happiness is far greater than is generally believed. There is a nostalgia which is not exactly a longing for one's birthplace, but a weary dissatisfaction with the nature that lies around us, and a hopeless desire for the nature that we were born to enjoy.

—Philip Gilbert Hamerton.

A sunset, a forest, a snow-storm, a certain river-view, are more to me than many friends, and do ordinarily divide my days with my books.

—Emerson.
FOREIGN PLANTS AND AMERICAN SCENERY.

It is not easy to explain why certain plants look distinctly in place in certain situations and why other plants look as distinctly out of place in the same situations. This is a matter which nature perhaps has settled for us. It is certain at any rate that combinations of plants other than those which nature makes or adopts, inevitably possess inharmonious elements which no amount of familiarity can ever quite reconcile to the educated eye. Examples of what we wish to explain abound in all our public parks, and especially in Prospect Park in Brooklyn, where there is more of nature than in any other great park, and where along the borders of some of the natural woods and in connection with native shrubbery great masses of garden shrubs, Diervillas, Philadelphus, Deutzias, Forsythias and Lilacs, have been inserted. These are all beautiful plants. They never seem out of place in a garden; but the moment they are placed in contact with our wild plants growing naturally as they do, fortunately, in the Brooklyn park, they look not only out of place, but are a positive injury to the scene. It is not that their flowers are too showy or conspicuous for such positions. The flowers of some native shrubs like the Elder, the Flowering Dogwood and the Viburnums, are as showy as those of any garden shrub. The reason is rather that we have become accustomed to see certain plants adapted by nature to fill certain positions in combination with certain other plants in a given region; and that all attempts to force nature, so to speak, by bringing in alien elements from remote continents and climates, must inevitably produce inharmonious results. Landscape gardeners have rarely paid much attention to this subject, or sufficiently studied nature with reference to the harmonious combination of plants in the construction of scenery, and especially of scenery intended to produce upon the mind the idea of repose. Nature, nevertheless, is the great teacher to which the artist who would hope to imitate her, however crudely, must ever turn for instruction and for inspiration.

[Editorial. Garden and Forest 1 (1888): 266]

To the Editor of Garden and Forest:

Sir.—In Garden and Forest of August 1st, page 266, the law seems to me to have been laid down that the introduction of foreign plants in our scenery is destructive of landscape repose and harmony. No exception was suggested, and the word harmony was used, if I am not mistaken, as it commonly is in criticism of landscape painting, not of matters of scientific interest; not as if the question were one of what, in matters of literary criticism, is called "the unities."

That a fashion of planting far-fetched trees with little discrimination has led to deplorable results, no good observer can doubt. That these results are of such a character that we should, from horror of them, be led, as a rule, in our landscape planting, to taboo all trees coming from over sea, many of your readers will not, I am sure, be ready to admit, and if no one else has yet offered to say why, I will ask you to let me assume that duty.

Suppose anywhere in our Northern Atlantic States an abandoned clearing, such as in Virginia is called an "old-field;"—suppose it to be bordered by the aboriginal forest, with such brushwood as is natural to its glades and skirts straggling out upon the open,—suppose that mixing with this there is a more recent,
yet well advanced growth of trees and bushes sprung from seed, of which a part has drifted from the forest, a part from a neighboring abandoned homestead, while a part has been brought by birds from distant gardens, so that along with the natives, there is a remarkable variety of trees and bushes of foreign ancestry;—suppose a road through more open parts of the old-field, and that on this road a man is passing who, having lately come from New Zealand (or the moon), knows nothing of the vegetation of Europe, Asia or North America, yet has a good eye and susceptibility to the influences of scenery.

Now suppose, lastly, that this man is asked to point out, one after another, so that a list can be made, trees and bushes in an order that will represent the degree in which they appear to him to have an aspect of distinctiveness; No. 1 being that which stands out from among the others as the most of all incongruous, unblending, unassimilating, inharmonious and apparently exotic; No. 2 the next so, and so on.

The question, as we understand it, is essentially this: Would all of the trees and bushes that had come of a foreign ancestry be noted before any of the old native stock?

Some of them surely would stand high on the list, and some of much popularity, such as Horse Chestnut and Ginkgo and numerous sports of trees in themselves, at least, less objectionable on this score, as, for example, Weeping Beech and most of the more pronounced weepers; most of the Japanese Maples, also, and the dwarf, motley-hued and monstrous sorts of Conifers.

But, all? or, as a rule, with unimportant exceptions? So far from it, to our eyes, that we doubt whether, even of different species of the same genus, the visitor would not point out some of the native before some of the foreign—some of the American Magnolias, for example, before any of the Asiatic. We doubt if the European Red Bud, the Oriental Plane or the Chinese Wistaria (out of bloom) would be selected before their American cousins. It appears to us that *Rubus odoratus* would be noticed before *Rubus fruticosus*. Passing from the nearer relatives, it seems to us likely, also, that many of the European and Asiatic Maples, Elms, Ashes, Limes and Beeches would be named after such common American forest trees as the Catalpas, Sassafras, Liquidambar, Tulip, Tupelo and Honey Locust; that the American Chionanthus, Angelica, Cercis, Ptelea, Sumachs, Flowering Dogwood, Pipevine and Rhododendrons would be placed before some of the foreign Barberries, Privets, Spireas, Loniceras, Forsythias, Diervillas or even Lilacs. We doubt if the stranger, seeing some of these latter bushes forming groups spontaneously with the natives, would suspect them to be of foreign origin, or that they would appear to him any more strange and discordant notes in the landscape than such common and generally distributed natives as have been named. We doubt if Barberry, Privet, Sweetbriar and Cherokee Rose, which, in parts of our country, are among the commonest wild shrubs, or the Fall Dandelion, Buttercups, Mints, Hemp Nettle and a dozen others which, in parts, are among the commonest wild herbaceous plants, though it is believed all of foreign descent, would ever be thought, by such an observer, out of place in our scenery because of their disreposeful and inharmonious influence. Two hundred years hence are not Japanese Honeysuckle, "Japanese Ivy" and "Japanese Box" (*Euonymus radicans*) likely to be equally bone of our bone in scenery?...
by the blending into a body of low, native tree foliage that of the Tamansk or
the Oleaster, that would not be supplied in a given situation by any of our
native trees?

Is there a plant that more provokes poetic sentiment than the Ivy? Is there
any country in which Ivy grows with happier effect or more thriftily than it does
in company with the native Madrona, Yew and Douglas Spruce on our north-
west coast? Yet it must have been introduced there not long since from the oppo-
site side of the world. Would not the man be a public benefactor who would bring
us from anywhere an evergreen vine of at all corresponding influence in
landscape that would equally adapt itself to the climatic conditions of our north-
eastern coast? . . .

Before agreeing that no addition can be made to our native forest, except to its
injury, we should consider that trees for landscape improvement are not solely
those that please simply from their fitness to merely fall quietly into harmony
with such as are already established. Trees would be of no less value to us that,
being adapted to our climate, would supply elements of vivacity, emphasis,
accent, to points of our scenery, such as we see happily produced by the Upright
Cypress and the horizontally branching Stone Pine when growing out of flex
groves on the Mediterranean. And this is a reminder that some scholar has said
that we can form little idea of what the scenery of Italy was in the time of Virgil
from what we see there now. This because so many trees and plants, which were
then common, have since become rare, and because so many, then unknown,
have since become common. Is there reason for believing that the primitive scen-
ery of Italy was, on this account, more pleasing than the present?

The present large majority of foreign trees that have been introduced with us
during the last fifty years, and which have promised well for a time, have been
found unable to permanently endure the alternate extremes of our climate, but
that there are many perfectly suited with it we have abundant evidence. Does the
White Willow flourish better or grow older or larger in any of the meadows of its
native land than in ours? . . . But on this point of the adaptability of many foreign
trees to flourish in American climates, only think of Peaches, Pears and Apples.

Brookline, September, 1888

Frederick Law Olmsted

[Mr. Olmsted's letter should be read with the greatest care and attention. No man
now living has created so much and such admirable landscape, and no man is
better equipped to discuss all that relates to his art. The position which GARDEN
AND FOREST has taken upon the question of composition in plantations made
with the view of landscape effect is embraced in the following sentence,
extracted from the article to which Mr. Olmsted refers: "It is certain, at any rate,
that combinations of plants, other than those which nature makes or adapts,
inherently possess inharmonious elements which no amount of familiarity can
ever quite reconcile to the educated eye." This sentence was written with spe-
cial reference to the fact that in Prospect Park, in Brooklyn, various showy flow-
ered garden-shrubs of foreign origin had been massed among native shrubs
growing apparently spontaneously along the borders of a natural wood in the
most sylvan part of the park. The effect which this combination produced
appeared to us inharmonious, and therefore less pleasing than if the plantation
had been confined to such shrubs as may be found growing naturally on Long
Island in similar situations. How far the idea of harmony in composition in landscape is dependent upon association it is hard to say. Mr. Olmsted acknowledges that trees like the Ginkgo, the Horse Chestnut and the Weeping Beech would look out of place in an American landscape—that is, trees which have no prototypes in our natural, native scenery. But would the inhabitant of New Zealand or of the moon, whom we suppose to be totally ignorant of the vegetation of the north temperate portions of the earth's surface, find anything to jar upon his feelings in seeing a Weeping Willow or a Ginkgo or a Horse Chestnut growing with and among Hickories, Tupelos or Sequoias, which may be taken as the three peculiarly North American trees? Probably he would find the combination an appropriate and pleasing one, and no feeling of inharmoniousness would ever cross his mind. Foreign trees with American prototypes, like the Beech, Linn[den], Red-Bud, Plane, from which they can hardly be distinguished except by a botanist, do not jar upon the sense of fitness when used in landscape planting here, because for all intents and purposes they are the same as our own species, except that, as a rule, they never grow here as vigorously; and, therefore, are less attractive objects. The European Oak, if it would grow here, might replace the American White Oak, which it closely resembles, anywhere, and this is true of almost every European tree which has an eastern American representative. We certainly did not intend to convey the idea that all American trees could be associated together harmoniously. One of the broad-leaved Magnolias of the southern Alleghany Mountains would appear as much out of place, from our point of view, in a northern landscape, as any tree from any foreign land could possibly do. This same Magnolia, however, amid the broad-leaved evergreens and luxuriant growth of the southern forests, seems to form an appropriate and necessary feature of the forest scenery. The fact that the Barberry in New England, the Cherokee Rose, the Pride of China tree, or the Ailanthus in the Southern States, when these plants are naturalized, and have been familiar objects for generations, do not look out of place in the landscape, confirms our idea that fitness comes not from similarity or dissimilarity of form or color or texture, but from mental association. When we have seen certain plants growing together often enough and long enough—that is, when they have been "adopted" by nature, to quote our own words—we become accustomed to the combination. It is only new and startling combinations which shock our mental susceptibilities. There is nothing more startling (and whatever is startling can form no part of a restful landscape) than to come upon an Apple-tree, as one may sometimes do in parts of New Jersey, growing in the midst of a thick Pine woods, and showing that the land had once been tilled. But if Apple-trees grew in our woods, and we had always seen them there, the combination would not seem an unnatural one. The truth is that great masters of landscape construction can combine material drawn from many climates and many countries into one harmonious whole, but the masters of the art are not many, and the planter who is not sure of his genius can wisely follow nature in her teachings of harmony in composition. Had this reservation been made in the article referred to, our statement that "all attempts to force Nature, so to speak, by bringing in alien elements from remote continents and climates, must inevitably produce inharmonious results," would, perhaps, have been less open to criticism.—Ed.]

[Garden and Forest 1 (1888): 418–419]
WAYSIDE BEAUTY.

In these days there is no lack of advice to plant trees by every roadside, and Village Improvement Societies are furnishing good examples of neatly kept highways. But many of our country roads are already bordered with trees and shrubs and climbing vines of Nature's own planting, and it is quite as important to preserve the wild beauty of this spontaneous growth as it is to provide for the more formal and stately rows of Elms and Maples which are planted on Arbor days. The illustration [above] gives a glimpse of a New England by-road which, fortunately, has escaped the axe and brush-hook of the enterprising path-master. Many officials in charge of our highways appreciate the value of trees when planted in straight rows and at equal distances, but a group of Cockspur Thorn, or Sassafras, or Black Haw, or a thicket of Sumach, or Hazel-nut, is too often looked upon as a disfigurement and a proof that the overseer is neglecting his duty to keep the roadside neat and clean. Miles on miles of wayside beauty are sacrificed every year to this mania for "trimming up," but the trees and shrubs spring up again to clothe the desert made by man. In smooth and level regions a strip of greensward bordering the wheel-way and running under the open fences into adjoining fields is always pleasing, and it cannot be too neatly kept. But in all hilly and stony regions east of the Alleghanies, no lovelier road-border can be conceived of than the native trees and shrubs which flourish where they are left to themselves . . .

[Garden and Forest 1 (1888): 42]
PARK-MAKING AS A NATIONAL ART.

THE Atlantic Monthly for January contains a noteworthy article under this title by Mrs. M. C. Robbins, who is well known to the readers of this journal. Her thesis is that the desire for the creation of beauty in America will find its fullest expression in the design and construction of public parks rather than in painting, sculpture or architecture. We have already done well in these latter fields, but our craving for liberty, and for enlarged and untrammeled utterance, can only be satisfied by bringing under control the mighty forces of nature and compelling them to develop and make manifest our artistic ideas . . . In our youthful exuberance we long for something that will appeal to all the people—something colossal and distinctly American—and this so-called Art of Public Improvement will find full scope in treating vast areas of mountain and cataract and forest in works of sufficient moment to need the support of sovereign states, or even of the Federal Government, and which need an army to protect them . . . Mrs. Robbins’ conclusion is that “there is everything in the United States to nourish a great art—wealth, enthusiasm, generosity, a sense of boundless capacity, the verve and spring of youth and unlimited aspiration. In the Art of Public Improvement, the dreamer and the utilitarian can combine, the nation’s beauty and the nation’s wealth can in it be united, and our achievements may be such as to satisfy even American ambition” . . .

The rapidity with which the acquisition of park lands by cities has been going on will be understood when it is remembered that in 1869 there were only two well-advanced rural parks in the United States. Fifteen years later there were twenty, and now there is hardly a city of consequence in the country which has not made the beginning of a system of parks and parkways. It is true, as Mrs. Robbins says, that when the schemes now begun have been fully carried out we shall have public reservations reaching, in what is practically an unbroken series, from the eastern seaboard to the shores of California. “The idea of such a continuous reservation, a national parkway from the Atlantic to the Pacific, leading from one beautiful pleasure-ground to another, or passing through great tracts of woodland controlled by Government foresters, is not inconsistent with the genius of our country, which ever seeks a closer union between its parts; while the gradually enlarging park systems of our cities indicate the way it may be brought out in the linking together of suburb to suburb by great boulevards, which tend to bring civilization to distant homes by affording safe and easy communication between them” . . .

We no longer hear objections of this sort against park-building, but there is another danger that ought to be shunned. It is not enough to secure a certain number of acres where they can be had with least cost and trouble. In the first place, the land should be wisely selected and its boundaries intelligently determined. Design for its improvement must be made by competent artists and executed with skill. When completed, pleasure-grounds must be maintained with care, for, if left to uncontrolled nature and unpoliced, they may become repulsive desolations. To secure a good design we need a school of landscape art, for, although such a school will never create a great artist, it can teach him the history of what has been done, point out to him what tools he needs and how to use them, and show him how he can most directly reach his end . . .

[Editorial. Garden and Forest 10 (1897): 11-12]
we see that a woman has entered the professional camp, Vauxhall Park, m London, opened to the public last year, conceptions? [8 (1895): 100]

innovations, unknown refinements, into our gardening delicate gifts of woman may not introduce valuable to a distinguished place in it by worthy results. It seems the camp of practicing artists, and has proved her right in every respect,” the Revue Horticole recently said: “So and characterizing Vauxhall Park as “a remarkable work is one of her latest works. Commenting upon these facts, and believing that Boston is a city of culture and refinement. [3 (1890): 148]

Besides its great parks, London now has 198 open spaces of less than ten acres in extent, with an aggregate area of three hundred and fifty-four and a half acres. Most of these grounds have been secured for public use in comparatively recent time, and the Gardeners’ Chronicle well says that any one who would have ventured to prophesy fifty years ago that there would have been now nearly two hundred such places for recreation and resort in the great city, would have been laughed at as a dreamer. [8 (1895): 10]

One of the most curious trees in Germany stands on the left bank of the River Oder, in Ratibor, Silesia. It is a Maple, at least one hundred years old, which has been twisted and cut into a sort of circular two-storied house. A flight of steps leads up to the first level, where the branches have been gradually woven together so that they make a firm leafy floor; above this is a second floor of smaller diameter, formed in the same way; and the ends of the branches have been woven into solid walls, and cut so that eight windows light each of the apartments. Below the first floor, at the level of the second, and at the top of the tree the boughs have been allowed to grow out naturally, while the intermediate walls and the edges of the window-like openings are kept closely clipped. [7 (1894): 270]

An English lady, Miss Wilkinson, has, in recent years, made herself widely known as a landscape-gardener, capable of undertaking public works and of carrying them to completion under her personal supervision, and Vauxhall Park, in London, opened to the public last year, is one of her latest works. Commenting upon these facts, and characterizing Vauxhall Park as “a remarkable work in every respect,” the Revue Horticole recently said: “So we see that a woman has entered the professional camp, the camp of practicing artists, and has proved her right to a distinguished place in it by worthy results. It seems a curious sign of the times. Who knows whether the delicate gifts of woman may not introduce valuable innovations, unknown refinements, into our gardening conceptions?” [8 (1895): 100]

NOTES.

From the twenty-sixth annual report of the Park Commissioners of West Chicago, it seems that the parks in that city are suffering from the same abuses of which the Park Board of Buffalo complain. It is said that visitors make walks across the turf and mutilate the plants. There is no cure for such a state of things except a more elevated and refined public sentiment. A community which allows the beauty of its public grounds to be trampled out so far proves itself lacking in certain elements of civilization. The people who are helping to devastate the Chicago parks, the wealthy men in this city who have tried more than once to turn Central Park into a trotting-course, the wheelmen and horsemen who are endeavoring now to confiscate a part of the Buffalo park system for bicycle tracks and speedroads, all belong to the same class. They are not intentionally public enemies. The trouble is they are not yet completely civilized. [8 (1895): 120]

Mr. W. K. Dexter, of St. Louis, has offered to present 250 acres of land at Hiawatha Lake to the people of Hennepin County, Minnesota, as a public park. The donor’s purpose is to have the tract preserved in its natural state, and he therefore makes it a condition of the gift that no landscape-artist shall be allowed to touch it. Mr. Dexter evidently entertains the mistaken belief that landscape-art and formal gardening are identical terms, or, at least, that landscape-gardening means primarily the destruction of natural beauty to make room for something that is artificial. Perhaps, too, he has not considered the fact that the highest beauty of this wild tract will never be discovered until some real artist studies out a practical scheme for making its key-points inviting and accessible, nor that its original charm will surely disappear as it becomes frequented unless provision is made for restoring what is worn away and maintaining and developing its essential elements, a work which also requires the highest artistic taste and training. When Mr. Dexter gives himself thoroughly to a study of the problems of design and maintenance, which must be solved if his praiseworthy and public-spirited purpose is to be carried out to the best advantage, he may still feel inclined to resent any suggestions from the class of landscape-gardeners whose loftiest aim is to arrange flower-beds and plant purple Barberries and golden Elders on suburban lawns, but he will welcome the advice of some true artist in landscape, who will be certain to have a broad appreciation of Nature and a respect for her simplest as well as her noblest manifestations. [8 (1895): 320]
The Influence of *Garden and Forest* on the Development of Horticulture

*Mac Griswold*

*Garden and Forest*: A Journal of Horticulture, Landscape Art, and Forestry, the brainchild of the Arnold Arboretum's first director, Charles Sprague Sargent, was published during a period (1888–1897) when the science of everything that grows—wild or cultivated—was still (barely) considered a single discipline. It's as if today's readers of, say, *Scientific American*, *Natural History*, *Martha Stewart Living*, and *The Nation* could scan the weekly issue of a single sixteen-page magazine and find detailed articles of specific interest to them.

It can't go without comment, however, that *Garden and Forest*'s readers were assumed to have general interests that far outran any narrow bounds of the subjects listed in its title. In 1889 Harper & Brothers, the New York publishing house, ran advertisements in the magazine for William Dean Howell's latest novel, *April Hopes*; for a Miss Juliet Corson's work on how to feed a family on $500 a year (subtitled *A Daily Reference Book for Young and Inexperienced Housewives*); and for a Civil War history written by an African-American who had served in the war, *A History of the Negro Troops in the War of the Rebellion, 1861–1865*, by G. W. Williams, LL.D.

Within this diverse setting *Garden and Forest* nonetheless published many editorials and articles that mark the beginnings of the specialized disciplines of horticulture, landscape architecture, botany, and forestry, with practitioners debating the directions their developing fields should follow. Horticulture, then as now, seems to have been the most vaguely delineated of the four, though as landscape architecture and forestry, previously considered to be aspects of horticulture, evolved into separate professions, the practice of horticulture became more circumscribed as well as more professional.
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Before reading those debates therefore, it is wise to scan the pages of *Garden and Forest* for an idea of what was meant by “horticulture” in late nineteenth-century America. Today’s general reader could assume that the term referred first and foremost to ornamental horticulture, as it does now. But in 1888 horticulture, which had piggybacked on agriculture since the days of colonial settlement, was still concerned with fruit and vegetable gardening to a very large extent. In 1888, the late Elisabeth Woodburn, an authority on horticultural literature, wrote an addendum to a new edition of U. P. Hedrick’s *A History of Horticulture in the United States to 1860* (originally published in 1950). Tallying books published on various “horticultural” topics between 1861 and 1920, she arrived at the following ranking, from highest to lowest in number:

### HORTICULTURAL EDUCATION.

In a recent number of this journal it was held that the study of horticulture and agriculture in their scientific aspects has a distinct value as a factor in furnishing exercise for certain powers of the mind. Every one admits that the natural sciences should have a place in the curriculum of colleges and schools as elements of wholesome intellectual development... but the fact should be emphasized that the mental exercise and discipline furnished by horticultural education in its broad sense is equal, and perhaps superior, to that furnished by the study of any other science. No kind of mental application will be more effectual in forming habits of careful observation and comparison and in securing those orderly methods of thinking which are of the greatest use in the examination of many of the problems which confront us in our daily life.

In an article in a recent number of *Science on Horticulture* at Cornell, we are glad to see that this view is set forth with considerable fullness by Professor Bailey, who contends that horticulture as studied at that university is capable of adding much to the value of a course of liberal academic training. Professor Bailey illustrates the merits of horticulture as a science by showing some of its uses and applications in discussing the theory of evolution, which is perhaps now the most important conception with which the thinking world has to deal. In supporting the hypothesis of evolution, horticulture shows the development of life in actual operation. More than six thousand species of plants are cultivated, and most of these have been broken up into varied forms by the touch of man. Some species have produced thousands of distinct forms, and the methods of the production of many of them are on record. In place of arguments as to the probable influence of climate upon plants the horticulturist cites definite cases, so that there is no conjecture about the matter. Instead of speculating upon the transmission of acquired characters the horticulturist furnishes proofs of such transmission. Paleontology brings disjointed evidence in regard to the influence of selection and probable changes from environment, while the horticulturist brings examples before our eyes to prove that he can modify and mould vegetation at his will. The horticulturist creates new species and shows you numbers of cultivated plants of which no one knows the original form, because the ones with which we are acquainted are so unlike the type that the two can never be connected. This is only a single line of inquiry, and other illustrations quite as striking can be given to show that there is an abundant field for scientific research and profound thought in horticultural science as such...

A Double-flowered Cyclamen.

fruits; vegetables; practical horticulture (propagation and cultivation); landscape and gardens (by which she meant design); and then flowers, flower gardening, and ornamental plants, which she ranked last.

Garden and Forest covered all these categories, offering descriptions of new species and of gardens and giving cultural direction and design advice. It also published articles specifically for greenhouse propagators and growers; articles for professional florists included a weekly flower-market bulletin. All this played a part in shaping the development of modern horticulture.

Most effective in promoting horticulture as a professional discipline separate from botany and landscape architecture, however, were some hard-hitting pieces that both criticized and set goals for horticultural training. For example, the publication in 1889 of an editorial on the negligible quality of American horticultural education in the same issue as a description of the French national school of horticulture clearly illustrated the two sides of the debate on professional training, the big question that eternally enlivens any discussion of horticulture being: How much is science and how much is practice?

Such American schools of horticulture as now exist, the 1889 editorial proposed, “provide an excellent course of botanical study and offer instruction in some branches of practical horticulture. It will not, however, be maintained by the best friends of these schools, that a well equipped gardener was ever graduated from any one of them.” In other words, the real lack in American training was experience in actual gardening.

The schools’ problem arose from “the want of appreciation of the requirement of a sound horticultural education on the part of their founders, and in part from the prevailing tendency of the American people to be satisfied with a hasty and insufficient training for any vocation in life.” Until there is a market for skilled men that will cause wages to rise, the piece curtly concludes, “our Schools of Horticulture can wisely give up trying to teach young men who do not want to be taught, and devote their energies to those wider fields of usefulness which, fortunately, are open to them, and by experiments, and in many other ways, at least help to create the demand for skilled gardeners which they were founded to supply.”

Garden and Forest’s description of the three-year course at the National School of Horticulture at Versailles could be called its formula for an ideal horticultural education. This short piece is the work of Henry Sargent Codman, Charles Sprague Sargent’s nephew and Frederick Law Olmsted’s promising (and short-lived) young employee. At twenty-five he was studying in France with Edouard François André, the French landscape architect soon to be appointed head of the Versailles school. The essence of his piece is that of the editorial: American horticultural training needs more of the practical.

An 1899 editorial argued strongly for a hefty dose of science even in the most practical applications of horticulture. It cited a pronouncement, both snobbish and categorical, by the then director of the Royal Botanical Gardens at Kew that “Horticulture is essentially an empiri-
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Botanical science can afford little a priori information as to the cultural conditions which any plant will require or tolerate; these for the most part can only be found out by trial and experience.” In other words, farmers and growers should not be taught science.

The editorial went on to offer a tentative but genuinely populist answer: “When it is stated that the gardener who has a genius for his work will naturally hit upon the right method of cultivation, this means that the gardener has been doing just what the man of science would have done if he had been engaged in research in the same field. It seems to our people that a man who knows why he adopts a given method of cultivation is likely to be a more practical cultivator, less likely to fail in the essentials of the practice, than one who blindly follows the rule of thumb. Horticulture and agriculture, too, are no doubt largely empirical arts; but we sympathize in the belief that the addition of scientific knowledge will help to place them on a foundation more sure and productive than that of individual experience.” In other words, farmers and growers should be actively involved in, and the beneficiaries of, scientific horticulture. Garden and Forest’s balanced and democratic editorial stance may well be what, in the long run, did the most for the development of modern American horticulture.

The editors’ stance was also well borne out in articles such as those by George Lincoln Goodale, the Fisher Professor of Natural History at Harvard. His long series on the principles of physiological botany helped to define the synergy between the scientist and the gardener as integral to modern horticulture, without any hierarchical distinction. His mild-mannered prose is as easily understood by a lay audience as by a professional one and his science would have been as useful to a greenhouse propagator as to an interested fellow professor. That is to say, his experiments were exactly those that would help to create the demand for skilled gardeners” deemed so necessary in the 1899 editorial cited above.

Goodale’s thirteenth piece, “Some of the Conditions Which Favor Rapid Growth—Certain Physical Phenomena of Growth,” includes a vivid little section on the remarkable strength of cellular growth in plants. His final sentence on the prodigious and often hidden power of root growth could stand as a metaphor for the manner in which all the articles and much of the debate published in Garden and Forest helped lift modern horticulture to new heights by addressing a small, intelligent, interested, and yet demographically broad audience over a single decade. “The force exerted in all these instances,” Goodale writes, “has been exercised solely by the innumerable delicate, thin-walled cells, which increase in number and in size in the orderly manner we have attempted to describe.”

Endnotes

3 “A Gardeners’ Problem,” G&F 3 (1890): 149.
5 Ibid., 153.

THE EFFECT OF GARDENING UPON THE MIND.

A taste for gardening is one of the elemental impulses of humanity. There are individuals without it, as there are people without sight or hearing or a sense of smell; but, on the whole, to dig comes naturally to man, and at some time or other in the course of his existence the desire to own a portion of the earth's surface is apt to seize upon him and demand satisfaction.

This impulse is of maturity rather than of youth, for gardening in its larger sense is a thoughtful pursuit, appealing to the broader qualities of the understanding. It is not merely the desire for healthful exercise which stirs a man, but also the wish to learn the secrets of our common mother, to force her hand, as it were, and compel her to reward his toil. The fable of the giant Antæus, who renewed his strength when he came in contact with the earth, has a subtle meaning, for it is by this contact that many weary souls have found rest and arisen refreshed...


VARIOUS MOTIVES FOR GARDENING.

We have just received a letter from a valued correspondent in which he says that he cannot understand the insistence of Garden and Forest upon planning and planting for general effect. He delights in his garden, but his pleasure is not associated in any degree with the landscape as he understands it. He loves plants, he appreciates the beauty of flowers, he enjoys their companionship and he reads with interest everything that is said about new or old ones which in any way broadens his knowledge of their habits and helps him to cultivate them more successfully. He finds abundant comfort in gardening of this kind, but he sees nothing to attract him in landscape-gardening. No doubt, this statement represents the innermost feeling of many people who take a genuine interest in horticulture, and it is often expressed to us in one way or another. With people of this taste and temperament the garden exists for its plants, and the plants are not grown for the sake of the garden. That is, a garden in this view is a place where a collection of plants is carefully attended and enjoyed for their individual beauty and other interesting qualities, and with no purpose of forming, in connection with the house, any picture which is to be studied and enjoyed as a whole. Perhaps the majority of all who are interested in gardens sympathize with the view of our correspondent, and they find a real pleasure, and pleasure of a most refining and refreshing kind, in their practice. It is our belief, however, that they might do all this, and at the same time gain a new and ever-growing satisfaction if they gave thought to the general modeling and arrangement of the whole scene as well as to its individual details.

[Editorial. Garden and Forest 9 (1896): 341]

One beautiful way in which flowers can be used, especially those distinguished for the brightness and clearness of their coloring or for their tall stalks, is to plant them in moss and among wild vegetation along the edge of a brook or some other piece of water. The reflections in the water and the play of their movements thus doubled clothes with a new charm this scene which is altogether natural.

A Japanese Flower Vender's Basket. There is no country in the world where flowers are so universally beloved as in Japan. They are inseparable from the life, art and literature of the people, and to deprive the Japanese of their flowers would be to take the sunshine out of their lives . . . Flowers are distributed among the people by means of perambulating flower-sellers, and by flower-fairs. The seller goes about the streets carrying two huge bamboo baskets swung from a pole across his shoulders. These baskets are divided into a number of different compartments, each containing a different variety of cut flowers or leaves. The carrier is sometimes almost hidden by the great mass of flowers and foliage he bears . . . Theodore Wores. New York. [1 (1888): 338–339]
DELIGHTS OF A ROUGH GARDEN.

In offering suggestions on gardening to the enthusiastic beginner it is usual to lay down at the outset a few unmistakable rules for his prudent guidance: Undertake no more than you can care for with thoroughness. Neatness is the first essential. Be content with small beginnings, and so on indefinitely.

The pleasures of the opposite plan, the rich satisfaction of a big, rough garden, in which beginnings and complete successes are somewhat loosely connected, and yet where freedom and beauty do live together in harmony, these attractive possibilities seldom find an advocate. On the strength of an experiment now in its fourth year I beg leave to put in a plea for the garden in which neatness is not a first essential. It seems quite possible to make a kind of treaty with Nature, in which she consents to do for a rough, yet much-loved garden filled with all sorts of tentative beginnings of loveliness, that which she does with so much charm for any old abandoned garden left wholly to her possession. The lover of wild beauty, who loves tamed and cultured beauty also, may find an opportunity for gardening upon this scale on any little country place of a few acres...

One of the delights of a rough garden is its continual surprises. With the habit of tucking in seeds, cuttings, roots and bulbs, as occasion serves, planting and sowing without formality, there is something very delightful in the apparent spontaneity with which unlooked-for bloom and beauty often come to light. Broad mixed borders in which hardy plants are irregularly grouped (not without a constant study of the advantages of contrast and relief) make this the simplest matter possible. The Iris or the Lily bulb is buried, the seed is sown and the ground occupied staked to prevent accidents; suddenly, as it seems, a new shape of delicate beauty greets the eye. A big rough garden gives an encouraging opportunity to experiment... Not annuals and biennials merely, but shrubs and trees also increase and multiply with extraordinary ease in the rough garden, where the discipline is not too severe. Fruit and flower, shade and fragrance, homely use and stately adornment mingle happily here in the garden held in partnership with Nature...

Amherst, Mass. D. H. R. Goodale

FARMING ON VACANT CITY LOTS.

During these times of agricultural depression the profits realized by farmers, even under the best conditions, are meagre enough, and, therefore, when Mayor Pingree, of Detroit, first conceived the idea of utilizing vacant city lots for the growing of potatoes by the unemployed of that city—that is, by men who were generally quite ignorant of the theory and practice of cultivating the soil—the experiment was looked upon as visionary, if not ridiculous. The result of the first year's cultivation, however, which enabled nearly one thousand families to support themselves through the winter by their crops alone, stimulated certain public-spirited citizens of New York to make a similar effort here, and the result is published in No. I of the periodical Notes, published by the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor. Of course, the philanthropic aspect of this experiment is the one of prime importance. The result proves that
many persons who own vacant land would prefer to have it cultivated instead of lying idle and unproductive, and that a very limited area will suffice to raise enough vegetables to contribute largely to the support of a family through the winter. It proves, too, that very many of the destitute people in tenement-houses are willing to work and can be made to support themselves with a very little help advanced as a loan. Besides this, the project offers a natural plan for giving to the people who dwell in stifling tenement-houses opportunity to work for themselves in the open air and under healthful conditions. It gives mothers the advantage of taking their children out of the heated houses and giving them a taste of rural life. It enables the superannuated and partially crippled to support themselves. In addition to these advantages, the entire scheme has a substantial business basis, with none of the odious and depressing suggestions of a charity.

Naturally, however, the educational side of this vacant-lot farming will have a special interest to readers of a journal devoted to the art of cultivating the soil . . . In every city where this vacant-lot farming has been successful the soil has been cultivated in accordance with the teachings of science . . . Every process from the very beginning to the end was carefully supervised, so that this vacant-lot farming, apart from its direct pecuniary profit, had a much more important function as a school of agriculture . . .

We cannot but assume that many of these tenement-house farmers who have had the advantage of this year of schooling will discover that there is a happier and wholesomer life for them outside of the congested districts of great cities . . . [I]f, under capable instruction, agriculture can be made profitable in city lots, and if the good example of experiment stations is visible in better farming all about them, why should not actual instruction in agriculture be made a part of the curriculum of rural common schools? . . .


SENTIMENTALISM AND TREE-FELLING.

A writer in a late number of the Springfield Republican finds his sensibilities wounded by the tone of Mrs. Van Rensselaer's book, entitled, Art Out-of-doors, and especially by the advice to cut down trees, given in the chapter entitled “A Word for the Axe.” It is not our purpose to enter into any defense of the book, which must stand on its own merits, any farther than to say that we know of no work where more sound doctrine on the subjects treated is given in the same space. On several occasions, however, Garden and Forest has advised the cutting down of trees, and a good many of them, in pleasure-grounds and elsewhere, and have been met with this same protest made by the writer in the Republican that no true lover of nature would think of such sacrilege. Now, we have no inclination to retort upon a critic of this sort that his own love of nature may be conventional and fictitious. We have no doubt that this writer, and many other good people who are distressed whenever they see or hear of the felling of a tree, love nature most sincerely after a sentimental fashion. But we believe that many people, whose practices they condemn, love nature quite as sincerely, and in a much more robust, and certainly more intelligent, way . . .

[Editorial. Garden and Forest 6 (1893): 311]
Chrysanthemums.—It often happens after Chrysanthemums have done flowering that they are stowed away either under green-house benches where there is but little light, or in cellars where there is less, or are left out in the weather to struggle as best they can with the elements. Good Chrysanthemums cannot be had next year from stock subjected to such treatment. Growers who aim at fine plants and fine flowers are now giving their stock-plants the best attention; the weaker kinds are placed in a cold green-house or frame, close to the light, and they are never allowed to want for water; the stronger kinds have also good positions in airy frames or green-houses... John Thorpe. Pearl River, N.Y. [Garden and Forest 1 (1888): 523]

THE USE OF TREES AND SHRUBS WITH LEAVES OF ABNORMAL COLORS.

A Boston correspondent writes in a discouraged tone about the planting he observes in the suburbs of that city. It seems to him that popular taste is setting strongly toward Prunus Pissardi [a purple-leaved form of P. cerasifolia, or cherry plum], the Golden Elder [Sambucus nigra ‘Aurea’], variegated Negundos [Acer negundo, box-elder] and the like. We have no doubt that too many trees and shrubs which are valued for the abnormal coloring of their leaves are used about Boston, and, in fact, about every other American city. Unless our own observation is at fault, however, the tendency of public taste, as a rule, is in the other direction, by which we mean that the people who plant nowadays are more inclined to follow the teachings of nature in this respect than they were a few years ago, when the tree agent, with his highly colored catalogues, was more pervasive and influential than he now is. The so-called foliage plants with brightly colored leaves and hues, set in patterns of various sorts, are certainly not as prevalent as they once were, and it is very evident that in American parks the use of shrubs and trees with streaked and spotted or variegated leaves is not as
profuse as it is in European parks. Perhaps, our correspondent in some afternoon
drive has observed several glaring offenses against that quietness and self-restraint
in planting which alone can make home grounds homelike, and this has depressed
his spirits . . .

[Editorial. Garden and Forest 10 (1897): 301]

CHRISTMAS GREEN.

EVERY morning for a week past the steamboat Minnie Cornell, from Keyport,
New Jersey, has come to her pier loaded with “rope” and “fancy green.” “Rope”
is the trade name for the cables made of Club-moss and occasionally of Hemlock
spray, and used for looping into festoons or twining about columns in Christmas
decorations. “Fancy green” includes the wreaths, stars and other designs, manufact-
ured chiefly from the leaves of Holly, Laurel and Rhododendron, together with
Mosses, green or gray, from Oak trunks and Cedar boughs, scarlet berries of the
Black Alder, the bluish gray fruit of the Juniper, the scarlet and orange fruits of the
Bittersweet, not to speak of Grasses dried and dyed in fearful and wonderful colors.
The little steamer has more than once carried 60,000 yards of the festooning mate-
rial, and 1,500 dozen stars and wreaths at a single trip, and the entire amount of
“rope” brought to this market during the season would reach from New York to
Boston. The very first Christmas green sold in this city came from Keyport. Some
forty-five years ago the wife of a Monmouth County farmer gathered enough
Ground Pine to fill a sheet with the four corners tied together, and shipped it on a
sloop with her poultry. It proved a lucky venture, and ever since, the people of
Monmouth County have held almost a monopoly of the industry, although both
the species of Club-moss most largely used, Lycopodium dendroideum and
L. complanatum, were practically exterminated from that region years ago. They are
still abundant, however, in Connecticut, some parts of northern New York, and
Massachusetts, and are shipped to New Jersey in such quantities that large dealers
buy them by the ton, and the manufacture of these festal wreaths and cables gives
employment to the wives and daughters of many farmers after the fall work on the
farm is over.

The trade in Christmas-trees began in 1851, when Mark Carr yoked up his oxen
and hauled from the Catskills to the steamboat landing on the Hudson two sled-
loads of young Balsams, and paid a silver dollar for the privilege of selling them on
the corner of Vesey and Greenwich Streets. At least 150,000 trees have been piled
up along the docks of the North River during the last week, and since the days of
Mark Carr many a dealer has been glad to pay a hundred dollars for a corner privi-
lege for holiday trade in Christmas trees. About half of the trees this year come from
Maine, the remainder from the Berkshire Hills, the Black River country in the
Adirondacks, and the Catskills. Good trees in the Catskills are becoming scarce,
however, and the woodsmen of those mountains are looking elsewhere for their
material. Short jointed, stocky trees with perfect whorls of branches at the base of
each annual growth, are the most sought for, and the Maine trees, as a rule, com-
mand rather higher prices than any others. The trees come up thickly where hard-
wood timber has been cleared away, and if they are cut above the second or third
joint, one of the limbs soon turns upward and becomes a leader to furnish another
Christmas-tree. In this way the same land is cut over several times. Fortunately the
Balsam Fir is about as nearly worthless for any other purpose as any of our native trees, and therefore the waste of cutting so much young timber is not serious. A few Black Spruces come among the Firs, and Hemlock boughs, which, oddly enough, are made to do duty as Palm branches in some church services [and] are in growing demand every year. Trees from Maine are shipped as far south as Baltimore; and of late years large quantities of Holly branches, mostly from Maryland, since the limited supply in New Jersey is nearly exhausted, are sent as far north as Boston. Within two or three years the Mistletoe has been sold here in a few shops and even on the streets, but in spite of its association with Christmas festivities in Old World traditions, it has filled but a small place here in the regular market of Christmas green. And yet this parasite is common on the Gum trees of southern New Jersey, and it is never so beautiful as at this season with its transparent berries clustered among its evergreen leaves.


**PLANT NOTES.**

**JAPANESE IRIS.**

ONE of the most attractive features in Mr. John L. Gardner’s beautiful garden in Brookline, Massachusetts, is the bed of Japanese Iris (*Iris laevigata* or *Kaempferi*), which forms the subject of our illustration. The plants, which were selected in Japan with great care by Mrs. Gardner, represent the best named Japanese varieties. They are arranged according to color, in the Japanese fashion; each
row across the bed consisting of one variety, those with white flowers at one end, and then all the intermediate shades to the dark blues and purples at the other end. The bed is sunk eight or ten inches below the surface of the surrounding lawn, and is furnished on one side with a perforated water-pipe so that the plants can be irrigated during the growing season. It is eighteen inches deep and consists of a rich compost of loam and thoroughly rotten cow-manure, and every year it gets a good top dressing of manure. Every pleasant morning after the middle of May the water is turned on at nine o’clock and allowed to run till three or four o’clock in the afternoon, by that time the bed is thoroughly saturated and covered to a depth of two or three inches with water; the supply is then shut off until the next morning. Some of the varieties, under this generous treatment, grow to a height of five or six feet, and have produced flowers fully ten inches across, and surprising in their profusion and beauty. While irrigation is doubtless necessary to develop the greatest perfection of the Japanese Iris, it can be successfully grown in this country in ordinary seasons in any good garden soil and without artificial watering. Very fine flowers have been produced without special treatment by Mr. [Francis] Parkman and other American growers, who have raised good seedling varieties of this plant without giving to it more care than is required by other Irises . . . The flowers are hardly surpassed in delicacy of texture or in beauty of color, but they do not appear here until July, and the hot sun soon fades them. The blooming season may be prolonged by the use of an awning placed over the beds during the day, but it cannot be denied that this plant flowers too late here, and that its period of beauty is too short in this climate ever to make it a great popular favorite . . .

[Garden and Forest 1 (1888): 259-260]

NEW OR LITTLE-KNOWN PLANTS.

XANTHOCERAS SORBIFOLIA.

To Mr. Paul Dana we are indebted for the opportunity of publishing in this issue the portrait of a remarkably fine specimen of the rare Xanthoceras sorbifolia in Mr. Dana’s collection at Dosoris [Long Island, New York].

Xanthoceras sorbifolia is a small tree of northern China, related to the Bladder-nuts [Staphlea] and Horse-chestnuts, and interesting as the only representation of the genus to which it belongs, and which owes its name to the presence between the petals of curious yellow horn-shaped glands. It is one of the most attractive of the hardy plants which our gardens owe to northern China, the region from which many of the most beautiful trees and shrubs in cultivation have been brought. It is a leafy, glabrous or puberulous plant with opposite pinnate leaves eight to twelve inches in length; the leaflets are alternate, linear-oblong, acute, coarsely serrate, dark green and glossy on the upper surface and pale on the lower. The flowers are white, handsomely marked with red streaks at the base of the petals, and are produced in great profusion in lateral racemes eight or twelve inches long, appearing as the leaves are unfolding. The fruit, which is a globose or pear-shaped capsule, not unlike that of some of the smooth-fruited Horse-chestnuts in general appearance, finally splits into three valves, and contains a number of globose, nearly black, shining seeds half an inch in diameter.
Xanthoceras was discovered nearly sixty years ago by the German botanist Bunge, who accompanied a Russian mission which traveled overland from St. Petersburg to Pekin; it was not, however, introduced into our gardens until nearly forty years later, when the French missionary David sent it to the Jardin des Plantes, in Paris, where the original plant may still be seen.

In spite of its hardiness and the beauty of its flowers, Xanthoceras is still rare in American and European gardens. This is, perhaps, due to the fact that,
although it is hardy against cold, it is evidently fastidious and does not grow well in all soils and situations. Most of the plants which have been tried in this country have perished sooner or later, and it is unusual to find either here or in Europe so large, vigorous and healthy a specimen as the one at Dosoris.

From the Abbé David's notes we learn that Xanthoceras is a tree fifteen to eighteen feet high, and exceedingly rare in those parts of China and Mongolia which he visited; that it is cultivated in the gardens of Pekin; and that the seeds are eaten by the Chinese.

At our request, Mr. Dana has sent us for the benefit of our readers the following note upon his method of cultivating Xanthoceras, which we hope will now become a more common object in our gardens:

"I first saw a plant of Xanthoceras at Baden-Baden on the grounds of Herr Max Leichtlin about the year 1884. I admired it, and Herr Leichtlin spoke of it as a new plant of great promise, which he felt sure would be an acquisition to horticulture. I secured two plants, and have been cultivating them now for eight or ten years. They are six feet high, and grow in rich warm loam. They have no protection whatever, and yet they have never lost a branch in winter, and they endure our dry summers perfectly. They are not strong-growing shrubs, but they bear flowers in great profusion, and are more beautiful when in bloom than at any other season. They ripen seeds every year, and I would be glad to furnish some of them to any one who cares to test the plant."

[Garden and Forest 6 (1893): 284-286]

CLIMBING PLANTS ON BOSTON BUILDINGS.

PROBABLY nowhere else in this country does the service performed by climbing and clinging plants in clothing and adorning the walls of buildings receive such good illustration as in and around Boston. Ampelopsis tricuspidata [now Parthenocissus tricuspidata] was first domesticated here, and has so long been a striking feature of this city as to gain for it throughout the country the familiar name of "Boston Ivy." This name, however, is seldom heard here, where it is most commonly known as the "Japanese Ivy" or the "Japanese Ampelopsis."

Ampelopsis tricuspidata had probably been cultivated hereabout for several years before it became particularly noticeable, but its popularity dates back to the Centennial year of 1876. Although for years familiar with all parts of the city and a close observer of such things, I had never noticed this plant until my return in 1877, after an absence of a year or so, when I was at once struck by its prevalence. It did not become remarkably common hereabout until about 1880. Now, however, it is seen everywhere, and is even more prevalent than its cousin, our beautiful native Virginia Creeper. It has become as characteristic of our city and suburban scenes as the White Pine is of our rural New England landscape, and one of our foremost authorities once told me that he regarded it as the greatest horticultural acquisition of the century.

Occasionally its use is excessive, but its luxuriant habit is seldom encouraged to an undesirable extent. This is probably due to the fact that one of its most conspicuous services consists in the concealment, or the amelioration, of architectural ugliness, and, fortunately, the people most liable to employ it to excess are generally the ones most responsible for bad architecture. Ugly objects are so
generally made graceful and picturesque by the kindly offices of the Japanese
Ampelopsis that the instances of its over-liberal use are usually merciful conceal-
ments. The Japanese Ivy, or, still better for this particular purpose, the Virginia
Creeper [*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*], could be usefully employed to drape the
electric-wire poles, whose gaunt interminable processions make hideous the
highways throughout the country, and convert them, for a large portion of the
year, at least, into objects of beauty, if the necessities of the linemen, with their
climbing-spurs, did not forbid. This might, however, be done with poles that
require no climbing, as the posts that support the trolley-wires of the electric-
railways, particularly along a road that has been adorned with central-lawn
spaces, like the boulevards of Beacon Street or Commonwealth Avenue.

As a means for the mitigation of bad architecture, the Japanese Ampelopsis on
our Museum of Fine Arts [then located on Copley Square] furnishes an instruc-
tive example, though it is not carried far enough. It clambered bravely over the
ugly walls of parti-colored terra cotta and brick, and for a while so nearly effaced
the unspeakable reliefs of the second story as to give them the charm of indefi-
niteness. But the trustees have since restricted the creeper to the first story . . .

Probably the building most famous for its exuberant, but not in the least
excessive, growth of Ampelopsis is the Old South Meeting-house, where it creeps
over an enormous expanse of gray old walls and high up on the tower, relieving
the severity of the Puritan architecture with its gentle touch. The suggestion of
nature amid the piles of neighboring brick and stone in the heart of the business
section of the town does much to heighten the charm of the Old South’s garb of
greenery. And this leads me to express dissent from only one point in the admi-
rable editorial on the general subject of the use of clinging growths in combina-
tion with architecture that appeared in *GARDEN AND FOREST* a few months ago.
The New York Post-office was instanced as one of the buildings where such a
growth would not be in place. But to my mind it would be peculiarly appropriate
there, for the reason that the architecture of that building is intensely offensive.
If, by any means, an ample growth of Ampelopsis or any other creeping
things could only be coax ed to embower a goodly portion of its façades, it would
not only mitigate the inartistic character of the edifice, but it would serve
to unite it with the remnant of the neighboring City Hall Park, from which its
site was unrighteously taken, and in a measure atone for the perpetual affront
of its existence . . .

One of the few redeeming features of our extravagantly praised Public Garden
is the growth of Virginia Creeper and Japanese Honeysuckle, that converts the
iron fence on the western side into a beautiful hedge, and the Japanese
Ampelopsis that covers some of its stone posts. This creeper would perform an
inestimable service if it were allowed to clamber at will over the bad sculpture
in the Public Garden and the Common.

The value of trailing growths for fences is not appreciated in this country as it
should be. In Germany the Virginia Creeper is put to simple and effective use for
this purpose in urban public grounds. A light, low fence is made of stakes and
connecting wires; the Virginia Creeper is trained up each stake and made to form
graceful festoons between. Its employment in some such fashion would do good
service on a place like the Cambridge Common, for instance, now a bare, unat-
tractive expanse, having a sort of kinship with the New England rustic burying-
ground. It is surrounded by a fence composed of unhewn granite posts with squared rails of wood between. Virginia Creeper, Japanese Ampelopsis, and perhaps other twining or climbing plants, might convert this old fence into a thing of beauty. In public parks the requirement for protection of the borders sometimes necessitates guards of wire and stakes along the paths. These are often great disfigurements, and their offensive aspect, in places where they seem to be required permanently, might be at least mitigated by the use of Virginia Creeper after the German fashion . . .

Boston.  
Sylvester Baxter

[*Garden and Forest 7(1894): 432-433*]

**THE FLOATING GARDENS OF MEXICO.**

The famous chinampas, or floating gardens, are a never-ending attraction of the City of Mexico, and yet little is known to the general reader regarding these curious places. Contrary to the general belief, the so-called floating gardens of the present day do not float. Many years since, however—in fact, before the conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards—the name was appropriate, for real floating gardens were then common on the lakes in the Valley of Mexico, especially in the immediate vicinity of the city. But when Humboldt visited Mexico (then called New Spain) in 1803, and Abbé Francesco Clavigero (a missionary among the Indians) a few years later, these peculiar possessions of the Mexicans were rapidly diminishing in number; and in 1826 Captain G. F. Lyon informs us that “the little gardens constructed on bushes or wooden rafts no longer exist in the immediate vicinity of Mexico (the city); but I learned that some may yet be seen at Inchimilco.”

Abbé Francesco Clavigero describes the true floating gardens as follows: “They plait and twist Willows and roots of many plants, or other materials, together, which are light, but capable of supporting the earth of the garden firmly united. Upon this foundation they lay the light bushes which float on the lake, and over all the mud and dirt which they draw from the bottom of the same lake.”

The common form was a quadrangle, and the average size about fifteen by forty feet, although some of the largest were a hundred feet in extent. Many of the latter contained a small hut, in which the cultivator sometimes lived; one or more trees were also growing in the centre of these largest plots. The earth used was extremely rich, and this being kept in a moist state by its proximity to the water (the elevation above it being not over a foot), the gardens were productive of the choicest vegetables and flowers, including also Maize.

The gardens of the present day are very different affairs. They do not float, but, on the contrary, are composed of strips of solid ground, usually about fifteen by thirty feet in extent, although some are larger. These plots are intersected by small canals, through which visitors are propelled in canoes. They are constructed by heaping up the earth about two feet above the water. Willows, and sometimes Poplars or Silver Maples, also a species of Cane, are often grown along

* *Journal of a Residence and Tour in the Republic of Mexico in 1826, vol. ii.*

† History of Mexico, 1807, vol. ii.
their banks to keep them from washing down. The nearest gardens to the City of Mexico are along La Viga Canal, a public waterway about forty feet in width and of varying depth. Its source is Lake Texcoco (formerly known as Tezcuco), two and a half miles west of the city, from whence it flows to a point near the town and then returns by a circuitous route to the lake. The gardens are located where the ground is naturally low or swampy.

All produce the choicest vegetables, flowers, and not infrequently fruits, in great abundance, embracing nearly every variety grown in the United States, and others unknown to us. Even in the ditches or little canals beautiful Water-lilies often line the way, while many of the plots are one mass of varicolored flowers, the most common ones being Roses, Pinks, Geraniums, Poppies and Fuchsias. The great variety of shades and the enormous size of many kinds astonish and delight the visitor from more northern latitudes. The Poppies are more attractive than our finest Pæonies; on certain feast days every one wears a wreath made exclusively from these showy flowers.

The quick and luxuriant growth of the products is mainly due to the daily application of water, which is dipped up in gourds attached to long swinging and pivoted poles, and deftly thrown about. It is needless to say that the cultivator never depends upon rain. Some of the plots are occupied by their owners and their families, who live in charming little houses constructed of cane, and surrounded by all their possessions, often including cows, horses, pigs and chickens. La Viga
Canal is almost impassable on Sundays especially, and the same may be said of
the beautiful driveways along its tree-lined banks; for Sunday in the City of
Mexico is the liveliest and, in many respects, the busiest day of all the week. It is
the great market day as well as holiday, and a large number of the craft on La Viga
are loaded with produce of every description from the gardens and elsewhere. The
visitor to the floating gardens seldom hides his disappointment on discovering
that they are stationary, but he never regrets having visited them; indeed, a day
spent on the canal and among the chinampas will long be remembered as one of
the pleasantest in Mexico.

Little is certainly known regarding the origin of these famous places. Abbé
Clavigero says that when the Mexicans were driven from their native country,
ages in the past, they were forced to occupy small islands in Lake Texcoco, where
“they ceased for some years to cultivate the land, because they had none, until
necessity and industry together taught them to form movable fields and gardens,
which floated on the waters of the lake... These were the first fields which the
Mexicans owned after the foundation of Mexico.” The custom may have origi-
nated as above stated, but the following view, founded on a careful examination
of some of the oldest works on Mexico, is advanced as the more probable, espe-
cially since the Mexicans still retained and cultivated the watery plots after their
independence was again established.

For long ages the Valley of Mexico was subjected to devastating inundations.
The valley is about sixty miles in diameter, and is surrounded by a continuous
wall of hills and mountains. The waters collected on these flow into six principal
lakes. The plaza mayor, or great square, in the City of Mexico is elevated a
few inches only above the nearest lake—Texcoco. In former times, a prolonged
rainy season caused the surplus waters in the other lakes—which have an eleva-
tion of from three to thirteen feet above the plaza mayor—to burst their banks
and flow into Lake Texcoco, which in turn overflowed and flooded the valley. In
June, 1629, the date of the last great flood, the city was covered with water to a
depth of three feet, and it remained in that state for five years.

The regular fields were, of course, ruined whenever a freshet traversed the val-
ley, and necessity finally compelled the people to depend upon floating gardens
for a supply of produce at all seasons, and to prevent a famine. These were
moored in places where the rise and fall of the lake waters would not affect them.
During the period when floods were looked for at any time, these floating patches
were very common, but when the city and valley were partially protected by a
gigantic canal in 1789 (commenced in 1607*), by which the main overflow was
carried off in safety, they gradually disappeared, until at the present time noth-
ing but the pretty name and stationary plots surrounded by water remains to
perpetuate an ancient custom.

Washington, D.C. Charles H. Coe

[Garden and Forest 8 (1895): 432-433]

* The drainage canal, commenced by the Aztecs, has been greatly improved and only
recently finished by the Mexican Valley Drainage and Canal Company, so that all
surplus water and the sewage of the city is now completely carried off.
It is stated that Mr. Ruskin maintains a Cherry-orchard solely for the benefit of the birds on his estate.

Forty-six Japanese gardeners are now employed, it is said, in California, where it appears that the taste for Japanese fruit and ornamental trees has greatly increased. [2 (1889): 180]

The latest atrocity in the way of “fashionable” floral arrangements is a muff composed of flowers, for the use of bridesmaids at weddings. People seem slow to learn that there is a right way and a wrong way to use natural flowers, and that all ways are wrong that force them to simulate the form of some article of dress or ornament. [2 (1889): 180]

It has been suggested that instead of the present plan of distribution of free seeds by the Government that the Department of Agriculture should issue legal-tender notes which Congressmen could distribute among their constituents, so that each one could purchase the particular kind of seeds or flowers or shrubs or trees he needed. Why not? [10 (1897): 190]

At this season, wherever any planting is done for beauty or for use, a little ground should be set apart for the children in every home. The possession and cultivation of a miniature garden will do much to cultivate habits of observation, turn the attention to the mysteries and beauties of plant-life and develop a taste which will be a fruitful source of pleasure in after life. [7 (1894): 140]

A correspondent inquires how much land it would require to furnish strawberries enough to supply an average-sized family. We should say that such a family might have in an average year all the fresh berries needed during their season, besides a few for canning, if five or six rows of plants a hundred feet long were set out and cultivated with rather more than average care. [7 (1894): 330]

The people of California are to be congratulated upon Professor Hilgard’s decision to refuse the position of Assistant Commissioner of Agriculture, offered to him by the President, and to remain the Director of the California experiment station, where he can accomplish infinitely more than he could do in Washington, under the demoralizing political influences which beset the Department of Agriculture. [2 (1889): 180]

A woman in Brooklyn who visited the grave of a deceased relative in Cypress Hills Cemetery, some months ago, alleges that she was poisoned by Rhus Toxicodendron [poison ivy] which had been allowed to grow in her lot. She has sued the cemetery association for $10,000 damages on account of the sufferings which she has since endured. This gives rise to some very interesting questions as to the responsibilities of corporations who control cemeteries. [8 (1895): 430] [In 1897 the plaintiff was awarded damages in the amount of $3,400.—Ed.]

A writer in the Southern Stockman says to test the ripeness of a Water Melon, the thumb-nail should be drawn over it so as to scrape off the thin green skin. If the edges of the skin on each side of the scar are left ragged and granulated, and the rind under the scar is smooth, firm, white and glossy, the melon is ripe. If the edges of the scar are smooth and even and the nail plows into the rind in places and the skin does not come off clean, then the melon is green. Two melons, one known to be ripe and the other green, should be taken and this test practiced on them until the difference is plainly observed. [5 (1892): 600]

The French Government has made Professor C. V. Riley a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor as a deserved compliment for his effective studies in economical entomology. His researches have not only been of advantage to the farmers and fruit-growers of the United States, but he discovered that the phylloxera was an American insect, and identical with the pest which had proved so disastrous to French vineyards. He also introduced into France the spraying-nozzle which bears his name, and which, with certain modifications, is used in that country to counteract the mildew of the vine. [2 (1889): 444]

At the late Chrysanthemum show in Philadelphia, Mr. W. K. Harris exhibited a plant upon which twenty distinct varieties had been grafted and all were in bloom at the same time. This suggests a new line of work, inasmuch as such plants would be objects of great popular interest at exhibitions, if a proper selection and arrangement of colors were made. It may be questioned, however, whether a plant bearing several different kinds of flowers possesses any value except as a curiosity. Whether some varieties of feeble growth would be improved if grafted on a more robust stock can be ascertained by experiment. [1 (1888): 480]
which grow in the swampy sections of the Pines. Mahlon Stacy, writing from West Jersey in April, 1680, to his brother in Yorkshire, says that from “May till Michaelmas we have great store of very good wild fruit, as strawberres and hurtelberres, which are like our bilberres in England, but far sweeter, and very wholesome,” and he adds: “the cranberries are much like cherries for color and bigness, and may be kept till fruit comes in again. An excellent sauce is made of them for venison, turkeys and other great fowl. They are better to make tarts than either gooseberries or cherries. We have them brought to our houses in great plenty by the Indians.” [7 (1894): 430]

We are sorry to learn that Mr. C. M. Atkinson, one of the best all-round gardeners that America has seen, has been obliged, through physical infirmity, to retire from the charge, which he has held for nearly thirty years, of the gardens and estate of Mr. John L. Gardner, of Brookline, Massachusetts. This place has long been known to lovers of horticulture for its well-grown fruits and flowers, and especially for many of those old-fashioned hard wood greenhouse-plants which are so sadly neglected in most gardens of the present day, and which Mr. Atkinson grew to perfection. His skill, however, was not limited to any single field, and he was equally successful with Azaleas, Japanese Irises, Roses, Orchids, Violets, and all sorts of greenhouse and hardy plants. [8 (1895): 30]

Professor [L. H.] Bailey and Mr. Wilhelm Miller have issued another bulletin on the Chrysanthemum which contains much that is of interest to florists and flower lovers generally. Mr. Miller’s chapter entitled “Chrysanthemums at Home” is certainly worth publishing under the Nixon Act, and perhaps the horticultural knowledge which can be disseminated by investigations and publications of this character justify the use of the costly machinery of the experiment station in this particular direction. The question is whether it could not be used to better advantage elsewhere. But since the bulletin is published primarily for educational purposes, we must express our regret at the use of such a barbarism as “mum” for Chrysanthemum. A subject which is of sufficient importance to be discussed in a bulletin from a university ought to command the use of dignified and scholarly language. [10 (1897): 270]

In an interesting article, called “Waste Products Made Useful,” published in the North American Review for November, Lord Playfair says: “As to perfumes, there are some which are really oils, and others extracted from flowers. There are others which are made artificially, and curiously, most frequently, out of bad-smelling compounds. The fusel-oil, separated out in the distillation of spirits, has a peculiarly nasty and sickening odor. It is used, after treatment with acids and oxidizing agents, to make the oil of apples and the oil of pears. Oil of grapes and oil of cognac are little more than fusel-oil largely diluted. Oil of pineapples, on the other hand, is best made by the action of putrid cheese on sugar, or by distilling rancid butter with alcohol and oil of vitriol. This oil is largely used for making pineapple ale. Many a fair forehead used to be damped with ’Eau de Millefleurs’ without knowing that its essential ingredient was got from the drainings of cow-houses, though now it can be obtained cheaper from one of the constituents of gas-tar [5 (1891): 540]

Christmas gifts supplied by florists this year consisted almost entirely of boxes of cut flowers, violets and roses being the favorites. Large, deep-colored Marie Louise violets, their long stems allowing of loose, graceful arrangement, sold for as much as five dollars a hundred. Roses cost from three dollars to eighteen dollars a dozen, an extra quality of American Beauty commanding the outside price of three dollars each. Lilacs at twenty-five cents to fifty cents a spray, tulips at one cent each, and stevia at fifty cents for a small bunch, were specialties of the holiday season. Carnations were plentiful and cheap; extra quality of American Beauty commanding the outside price of two dollars a dozen. The Orchid season is now fairly begun, and cut blooms of Cattleya at nine dollars a dozen, and Cypripedium insigne at four dollars a dozen, were in good supply. Fruited plants of Ardisia crenulata and the Otaheite orange were in some demand, and specimen plants of Cyclamens and of Chinese Primroses in ornamental baskets found considerable favor. But the most beautiful and the most costly were luxuriantly flowered plants of Heath, their foliage almost hidden under the myriad of tiny bells, and a few extra early pink and white Azaleas. [8 (1895): 10]

With the present issue, which completes the tenth volume, the publication of Garden and Forest ends. For ten years the experiment has been tried of publishing a weekly journal devoted to horticulture and forestry, absolutely free from all trade influences, and as good as it has been possible for us to make it. This experiment, which has cost a large amount of time and money has shown conclusively that there are not persons enough in the United States interested in the subjects which have been presented in the columns of Garden and Forest to make a journal of its class and character self-supporting. It is useless to expend more time and money on a publication which cannot be made financially successful, and must, therefore, sooner or later cease to exist.

Mr. J. H. Griffith, Room 106, Tribune Building, New York, is authorized to receive money due to the Company, and to attend to any other business matters which may arise in winding up its affairs.

Garden and Forest Publishing Co.
[10 (1897): 518]
A VIEW IN CENTRAL PARK.

The view on this page is taken from a point in the Ramble in the Central Park of this city, looking southward, and including a portion of the Terrace. Of course, it is much more than a picture of the Terrace, but it clearly shows how much this bit of architecture adds to the composition. The distant horizon line of trees has an attractiveness of its own. Nearer by are the upper Terrace lines contrasting with the masses of foliage above them. Below these are the open arches with deeper shadows, then the lower lines of the Terrace, the lake shore and the passage of water separating more distinctly the extreme distance from the middle distance. All these, with the lines of the shrubbery about the little lawn, mark the successive planes of the composition and help to bring out the gradations of light and shadow. In the Park the observer would enjoy in addition the ever varying tints of the sky which would also be reflected in the water, while he could look up to and into the leafy framework in the foreground forever without exhausting its interest. The illustration is a good example of what can be accomplished by framing in a distant object with foliage, so as to make a complete and consistent picture, and there is no reason why such planting as it shows should be confined to public parks. Many a lawn could be made the foreground of a picture quite as attractive, and it could be graded and planted so as to emphasize the interest and increase the pictorial effect of some important object, natural or artificial, and trees could be disposed about it so as to concentrate the attention which would otherwise be distracted by surrounding objects.

[Garden and Forest 1 (1888): 30]
Before reading those debates therefore, it is wise to scan the pages of *Garden and Forest* for an idea of what was meant by “horticulture” in late nineteenth-century America. Today’s general reader could assume that the term referred first and foremost to ornamental horticulture, as it does now. But in 1888 horticulture, which had piggybacked on agriculture since the days of colonial settlement, was still concerned with fruit and vegetable gardening to a very large extent. In 1888, the late Elisabeth Woodburn, an authority on horticultural literature, wrote an addendum to a new edition of U. P. Hedrick’s *A History of Horticulture in the United States to 1860* (originally published in 1950). Tallying books published on various “horticultural” topics between 1861 and 1920, she arrived at the following ranking, from highest to lowest in number:

**HORTICULTURAL EDUCATION.**

In a recent number of this journal it was held that the study of horticulture and agriculture in their scientific aspects has a distinct value as a factor in furnishing exercise for certain powers of the mind. Every one admits that the natural sciences should have a place in the curriculum of colleges and schools as elements of wholesome intellectual development... but the fact should be emphasized that the mental exercise and discipline furnished by horticultural education in its broad sense is equal, and perhaps superior, to that furnished by the study of any other science. No kind of mental application will be more effectual in forming habits of careful observation and comparison and in securing those orderly methods of thinking which are of the greatest use in the examination of many of the problems which confront us in our daily life.

In an article in a recent number of *Science* on Horticulture at Cornell, we are glad to see that this view is set forth with considerable fullness by Professor Bailey, who contends that horticulture as studied at that university is capable of adding much to the value of a course of liberal academic training. Professor Bailey illustrates the merits of horticulture as a science by showing some of its uses and applications in discussing the theory of evolution, which is perhaps now the most important conception with which the thinking world has to deal. In supporting the hypothesis of evolution, horticulture shows the development of life in actual operation. More than six thousand species of plants are cultivated, and most of these have been broken up into varied forms by the touch of man. Some species have produced thousands of distinct forms, and the methods of the production of many of them are on record. In place of arguments as to the probable influence of climate upon plants the horticulturist cites definite cases, so that there is no conjecture about the matter. Instead of speculating upon the transmission of acquired characters the horticulturist furnishes proofs of such transmission. Paleontology brings disjointed evidence in regard to the influence of selection and probable changes from environment, while the horticulturist brings examples before our eyes to prove that he can modify and mould vegetation at his will. The horticulturist creates new species and shows you numbers of cultivated plants of which no one knows the original form, because the ones with which we are acquainted are so unlike the type that the two can never be connected. This is only a single line of inquiry, and other illustrations quite as striking can be given to show that there is an abundant field for scientific research and profound thought in horticultural science as such...
