

Come into the Garden, Bard; Or, From Bed to Verse*

Russ McDonald

My title invites you to think of Shakespeare in the context of the pleasure garden, and I could spend twice my allotted time developing the symbolic value of the garden in the plays – Eden as a metaphor throughout the canon; the garden of England in the history plays, particularly *Richard II*; the metaphoric garden with which Iago instructs Roderigo on the competing claims of reason and will; the orchard in which Hamlet's father was murdered; Olivia's garden in *Twelfth Night*; Angelo's garden circummured with brick in *Measure for Measure*; the pleached bower of Leonato's garden in *Much Ado*; but I ignore these themes and sites, tempting though they are.

The project from which this talk derives addresses the emerging forms of Elizabethan poetry in the context of contemporary visual design, specifically the forms and shapes that characterize the arts

* This article reproduces a talk that was given at the Paris *Shakespeare 450* conference (21-24 April 2014) by the late and much missed Russ McDonald – who contributed his own unique point of view to the field of Shakespeare's language studies, in particular in *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001 and *Shakespeare's Late Style*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. On that occasion he had graciously sent his paper to our general editor, Rosy Colombo, for further discussion. Russ McDonald also served as a member of the Advisory Board of this journal from 2012. The visual impact of the original presentation is inevitably lost here, since copyright issues prohibit us from reproducing the rich array of images originally used by McDonald: an editor's note adds a relevant link to an online source when possible and/or necessary. However, we feel the oral quality the present paper retains is a testimony to Russ McDonald's extremely communicative presentation style, which Shakespeareans will remember from countless conferences, among which a memorable panel coordinated by Jonathan Culpeper on *Shakespeare's Language and Style* in 2012 at Lancaster University. To our knowledge the paper has not been published elsewhere, and we are very grateful to Russ's wife,

and crafts in the period: architecture, interior decoration, painting, clothing, jewelry, dance, and many others. These disciplines and sub-disciplines serve as productive contexts for studying not only the sonnet and the Spenserian stanza but even more especially for the iambic pentameter line that becomes the default mode of English Renaissance drama. The form of the decasyllabic line, the medium for the greatest poetic achievements of the period, is a major product of a culture in which artisans from many disciplines devoted themselves to the rewards of arrangement and pattern. It is the aural equivalent of the commitment to visual proportion. In various fields of craft, as in English thought generally, the values of similitude, contrast, equivalence, and symmetry become increasingly prominent as the sixteenth century proceeds.

The design and execution of the garden entails the cultivation and arrangement of this earth, the medium for the creation of ordered, beautiful outdoor spaces as the builders of the sixteenth century began to apply humanist principles to the property surrounding their houses. The soil was and had always been a necessary source for the maintenance of the commonwealth – feeding the people with the products of the soil, clothing them with the materials taken from cattle and sheep, housing them with the stone and timber that the earth yielded, and pleasing the senses with the ingenious arrangement of these earthly materials. Following the examples initiated in the reign of Henry VIII and emulating mid-century Continental designers, educated people began increasingly to consider the garden as a site of artistic expression. Visual delight was, of course, the primary goal, but early modern gardeners also sought to provide tactile pleasure (in the grasses and sands laid out underfoot and the contrasts between them), olfactory gratification from the plants chosen for the garden, aural delights particularly in the sounds the fountains and of the birds attracted to the space, and the satisfactions of taste in the herbs and fruits that were often mixed with the flowers and trees. The conventions and principles that produced the great gardens of England and Europe are among the same principles that Elizabethan poets were exploiting to delight readers and audiences. In a crude analogy, we might say that language is

Gail McDonald, for granting permission to publish this unedited version. Essential bibliographical notes have been added by the editors. (*Editors' note – Iolanda Plescia and Rosy Colombo*)

the poet's material equivalent of the gardener's earth, and that sounded language is the medium onto which the poet imposes patterns to create the harmonious, composed poetic object. The intersecting vocabularies of horticulture and of poetry help us to document the appreciation for form that attends Tudor humanism and characterizes particularly the last decades of Elizabeth's reign.

Landscape designers in Tudor England approached the creation of a garden with the same high seriousness as the professors of poetry reserved for the poem: Conradus Heresbachius, in his *Four Books on Husbandry*, 1586, offers instruction in "the art and trade of Husbandry, Gardening, Graffing, and planting, with the antiquity and commendation thereof"¹. In that same year Thomas Hill published his *Gardener's Labyrinth*, its first pages offering a list of those ancient worthies – Pliny, Cicero, Virgil, and 35 others – who have contributed to the store of horticultural information. In short, the Renaissance humanists consulted the ancients on the subject of gardening with the same alacrity as they did on the topic of poetry, and many of the Greco-Roman values apparent in the development of Elizabethan writing also mark the discourse of sixteenth-century English and European gardening. Moreover, these values extended beyond the poem and the garden. Thinking broadly about tillage and cultivation, Gervase Markham, that most prolific of such writers, describes husbandry as "the great Nerve and Sinew which holdeth together all the Joints of a monarchy"².

Since virtually all the gardens created in the sixteenth century have been destroyed or modified out of existence, scholarly research is limited to some early modern illustrations and to the surviving record, in print or manuscript, of the effects the designers were seeking to achieve. Happily this discourse is relatively ample and immediately discloses the influence of two fundamental principles of Elizabethan art: the first is ornament, and the second is order. The noun 'ornament' derives from the Latin for equipment or furnishing, and the earliest English definitions imply both utility and adornment, *utile et dulce*: it is difficult to separate surface from essence. The second principle is equally important: in their artistic theory as in their political ideology,

¹ Conrad Heresbach, *Four Books of Husbandry*, text available at EEBO – Early English Books Online (<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>).

² Gervase Markham, *The English Husbandman*, London, Printed by T.S. for John Browne, 1613, available at: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22973/22973-h/22973-h.htm>

the Tudors believed that materials – whether words or stone or fabric or human subjects – ought to be organized into patterns. And the combination of ornament and order produces that most recognizable and satisfying feature of Elizabethan culture, its passion for correspondence and symmetry, a feature immediately discernible in the design of the garden. Elizabeth herself did not spend much time on buildings or on gardens, although in 1583 she expressly ordered the reconfiguration of the palatial grounds at Hampton Court. But if the monarch was not especially interested in the house and garden, her minions most certainly were: among the most avid builders of the day, the creators of formal landscapes and thus the most important consumers of the garden's pleasures, were the Queen's chief ministers – Cecil, Hatton, Walsingham – those men charged with controlling her subjects and carrying out the monarch's political will. The relationships and parallels among these various disciplines – horticulture, architecture, politics, and poetry – derive from the humanists' increasing dedication to control and form. As Charlotte Scott puts it in her recent book from Oxford, *Shakespeare's Nature*, "Cultivation [...] is a form of reason precisely because it imposes human patterns of control on an otherwise non-human world"³.

The development of the garden in England depended heavily upon intellectual traffic with the Continent. The English aristocracy was well acquainted with the theory and practice of architecture and landscaping in Italy and France. They imported French laborers to help plan and execute their ambitious landscaping schemes: we know that between 1559 and 1585 there were Gallic gardeners working at Kew, at Theobalds, at Hampton Court, and at Wanstead. One of the most significant names is that of Sebastiano Serlio, the Italian designer who worked mostly in France, whose plans for palaces, gardens, and stage sets exerted a palpable influence in England, through his own publications and drawings but also through the filter of his student Androuet du Cerceau; his influence was also felt through that extremely productive conduit, the Antwerp connection, in this case drawings by the prolific Dutch engineer Vredeman de Vries. In a parallel field, it is relevant that the Duke of Northumberland sent Sir John Shute to Italy to study ancient and modern construction in

³ Charlotte Scott, *Shakespeare's Nature: From Cultivation to Culture*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014, p. 4.

Italy, resulting in *The First Book of Architecture* (1563). And Cecil kept a jealous eye on design in France, where Philibert de l'Orme was building a chateau for Diane de Poitiers and collaborating with Maria de Medici on the construction of the Tuileries; Cecil is on record as having ordered one of his political operatives to bring him a copy of de l'Orme's *Nouvelles Inventions*.

Such dependence represents a physical manifestation of the contemporary controversy over the practice of enlarging the English language with terms from Latin and the romance languages. Although some reticent voices preferred the directness and brevity of Anglo-Saxon diction – Gascoigne, example, cautions against excessive affection for polysyllables – still, most of the pedagogues welcomed the influx of Continental forms and endorsed and contributed to the Anglicization of romance roots. If we return to the analogy between the earth and the medium of language, we notice that English gardeners were complicating and enriching their plots with examples from abroad. In November of 1584 the Earl of Leicester wrote to Dr. Jean Hotman, his servant who was then residing in France, to secure the services of “a perfect gardener, such a one as is able to direct his ground into the best order, as also that can skill in planting and keeping of trees and hedges, that can make arbors and devices of all kinds of Imagery in them, that can skill of flowers for all times of the year, to have them that will grow here”. He also expected the gardener to “bring with him all manner of seeds the best you can procure among the Italians, as well for herbes and sallets as for all kind of rare flowers, beside seeds for melons, cauliflower, and such like asparagus and all sorts of radish”⁴. Essentially the introduction of foreign plants and the adoption of Continental patterns is the horticultural equivalent of linguistic expansion. Wendy Wall refers to it as “Englishing the soil”⁵.

The information we glean from gardening handbooks and letters on the appearance of the Elizabethan garden may be supplemented with certain kinds of visual records. In the famous drawing of the façade of Nonsuch in Speed's map of Surrey (1610) the grounds before the palace reflect the kind of demarcations that Markham later pre-

⁴ The Huntington Library, San Marino, CA (MS HM 271714).

⁵ Wendy Wall, “Renaissance National Husbandry: Gervase Markham and the Publication of England”, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 27:3 (1996), pp. 767-85; p. 767.

scribed⁶. Scholarly reconsideration of Tudor painting, long scorned, has helped us to focus attention on the backgrounds depicted in many of the well-known panels. Marcus Gheeraert's celebrated portrait of Elizabeth (1580-85) with the olive branch places her before a portal that looks out onto a knot garden⁷. Rowland Lockey's miniature, ca. 1593-94, of *The More Family, Household and Descendants* shows a fairly detailed Elizabethan garden with walls and a kind of gatehouse⁸. Perhaps the most elaborate representation is visible in Isaac Oliver's *Unknown Melancholic Man* (1590s)⁹, in which the depressed fellow in the foreground is backed by a cultivated, subdivided formal garden with a tandem couple walking in it, a detail perhaps calculated to emphasize the young man's single state.

Roy Strong describes the historical gap that separates our own visual culture from that of the Elizabethans. "Perhaps of all the [horticultural] achievements, that which can be appreciated least today but which at the same time characterizes them most precisely, is pattern. Sixteenth-century gardening depended on geometrical pattern for its spectacular effects, the square knots being laid out in a seemingly inexhaustible variety of shapes"¹⁰. The principles of geometric equivalence were observed by virtually all the Elizabethan builders and owners, whether they were creating a small cottage garden or, later, the great gardens at Wilton, which came to be fully developed in the 1630s. These various plots were based on harmonious opposition, contrasts of form, of color, of height, of botanical species. We have all heard of knot gardens, but it is worth pausing to clarify the terminology: a *knot* was a raised bed of plants worked into an interwoven pattern, almost always in pairs or squares or other even multiples. Thickets were relieved with symmetrical pathways, complementary varieties of sand provided color contrast in matching sections; rectilinear divi-

⁶ The image may be viewed at: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Speed%27s_Map_of_Surrey_1610_colour_full.jpg (copy and paste URL in web browser).

⁷ The image may be viewed at: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Elizabeth_I_of_England_Marcus_Gheeraerts_the_Elder.jpg (copy and paste URL in web browser).

⁸ The image may be viewed at: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Rowland_Lockey_Thomas_More_and_Descendents.jpg (copy and paste URL in web browser).

⁹ The image may be viewed at: <https://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/420639/a-young-man-seated-under-a-tree>.

¹⁰ Roy Strong, *The Renaissance Garden in England*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1979, p. 70.

sions might be softened with circular or swirling inner subdivisions; various complicating features such as pleached trees, hedge walls, bee houses, fountains, and other contrivances ameliorated the severity of the square design. These patterns were achieved not only in the planting of knots and hedges but also in the accompanying materials. The Swiss tourist, Thomas Platter, familiar to theatre historians from his review of a performance of *Julius Caesar* at the Globe in 1599, also visited Hampton court, where he noted that “numerous patches where square cavities had been scooped, as for paving stones; some of these were filled with red brick-dust, some with white sand, and some with green lawn, very much resembling a chess-board”¹¹.

Gervase Markham’s *The English Husbandman*, 1613, offers the most detailed instructions that typify the tastes and practices of the age. The abundance of detail and the typicality of the excerpt justify its length:

After you have chosen out and fenced your garden-plot, according as is before sayd, you shall then beginne to fashion and proportion out the same, sith in the conveyance remayneth a great part of the gardeners art. And herein you shall understand that there be two formes of proportions belonging to the garden, the first, onely beautifull, as the plaine, and single square, contayning onely four quarters, with his large Alleyes every way, as was directed before in the Orchard: the other both beautifull and stately, as when there is one, two or three leveled squares, each mounting seaven or eight steppes one above another, and every square contayning foure severall Quarters with their distinct and severall Alleyes of equall breadth and proportion; placing in the center of every square, that is to say, wehere the four corners of the foure Quareters doe as it were neighbor and meete one another, either a Conduit of antique fashion, a Standard of some unuall devise, or else some Dyall, or other Piramed, that may grace and beautifie the garden. And herein I would have you understand that I would not have you to cast every square into one forme or fashion of Quarters or Alleyes, for that would shew little varytie or invention in Art, but rather to cast one in plaine Squares, another in Tryangulars, another in roundalls, and so a fourth according to the worthinesse of conceite, as in some sort you may behould by these figures, which questionlesse when they are adorned with their ornaments, will breed infinite delight to the beholders.¹²

¹¹ Clare Williams, trans. and ed., *Thomas Platter’s Travels in England* [1599], London, Jonathan Cape, 1937, p. 200.

¹² See note 2.

Noteworthy here are the reciprocal values of uniformity and diversity expressed in the botanical medium. Variety is sought in every sphere, not only in the geometric layout but also in height – “leveled squares, each mounting seven or eight steppes one above another” – and the writer recommends especially delightful kinds of ornaments that can be used to “grace and beautify” the design. Here are some of his recommended arrangements¹³. Here, also, is a fascinating plot for a client’s garden designed by Robert Smythson, the most influential of the Elizabethan builders¹⁴.

One property deserves extended attention: William Cecil’s house and grounds in the Strand. Although the house and garden no longer exist, now replaced by a Starbucks, we know much about them thanks to an accident of architectural history, a discovery that should give hope to scholars in all fields. In 1999 the new archivist at Burghley House, Cecil’s great family estate in Lincolnshire, moved a storage chest and found behind it, dusty and forgotten, a detailed sixteenth-century drawing of Cecil’s London house and grounds¹⁵. Executed in ink on paper, the plan also bears some stylus markings, color washes to indicate gardens and walls, and annotations in Cecil’s own hand. It provides a clear picture of house, gardens, trees, sport facilities, walls, gatehouses, viewing mound, and other such features.

Most telling is its representation of virtually all the Tudor values to which I have referred. The new devotion to symmetry manifests itself in the careful arrangement of the garden behind the house, separated from the lower end of Covent Garden by a wall with a small banqueting house in the centre on an axis with the entrance to the house. The emphasis on complementarity and reduplication is especially apparent when the garden spaces here are compared with illustrations from the Henrician period. The earlier Tudor garden looked more nearly medieval, a congeries of walled sections separated by hedges and here

¹³ Some of the images from Markham’s text may be viewed in the Gutenberg Project edition: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22973/22973-h/22973-h.htm>

¹⁴ A reproduction of the design for Twickenham Park may be viewed through the search function of the online blog *Parks and Gardens UK* (<https://parksandgardensuk.wordpress.com>), in the post “Mounds and Mounts 2: the Height of Fashion” (posted 19/09/2015).

¹⁵ The image may be viewed through the search function of the online blog *Parks and Gardens UK* (<https://parksandgardensuk.wordpress.com>), in the post “Mounds and Mounts 2: the Height of Fashion” (posted 19/09/2015).

and there punctuated with small buildings, statuary, and other forms of ornament. By 1560 regularity had become the rule. Cecil's central garden – the kitchen gardens stood off to the side – was scrupulously divided into four equal parts. In the northwest corner was a square area with a snail mount, and at each corner of the square stood a single tree, marked with a circle on the drawing. The orchard trees were planted in five rows, in the shape of a quincunx. The walks surrounding the orchard were precisely proportional (18 feet) to those in the principal garden. The back gate gave onto the road that led directly to Theobalds, the other great house that Cecil was building in Cheshunt.

Evidence of this cultural commitment to symmetrical structure and ornament is the force with which Sir Francis Bacon objected to them. In "Of Building" he goes on to declare bluntly and without apology his commitment to functionality: "Therefore let Use bee preferred before Uniformitie; Except where both may be had: Leave the Goodly Fabricks of Houses, for Beautie only, to the enchanted Pallaces of the poets: Who build them with small Cost"¹⁶. Similarly, in the essay on gardens, he deplores efforts at mere visual charm based on antithesis and pattern: "As for the making of knots or figures with divers coloured earths, that they may lie under the window of the house on that side which the garden stands, they be but toys: you may see as good sights many times in tarts"¹⁷. Bacon's attitude here is consistent with his view of prose style, particularly the famous passage in which he assails the English Ciceronians, Ascham and Carr, as those who care "more for words than for matter"¹⁸. In a variety of disciplines he deplores this increasingly prominent pleasure in form: he doesn't like his prose style tarted up any more than he does his house or the garden surrounding it. But throughout the sixteenth century, many others did.

Bacon's censure provides an easy leap from landscape to literature, pointing as he does to the fundamental conflict in early modern England between utility and beauty, *res* and *verba*, information and poetry. The rush of interest in gardening as a legacy of the ancients

¹⁶ Francis Bacon, "Of Building" [1625], in *Essays*, New York, Cosimo Classics, 2007, p. 114-16; p. 114.

¹⁷ Bacon, "Of Gardens" [1625], in *Essays*, pp. 117-23; p. 120.

¹⁸ Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning* [1605], New York, Random House, 2001, p. 25.

mediated through the literature of the continent is addressed specifically by Gervase Markham in terms that remind us of the parallel movement in literature:

Now for the motiues which first drew me to vndertake the worke, they were diuers: as first, when I saw one man translate and paraphrase most excellently vpon Virgils Georgickes, a worke onely belonging to the Italian climbe, & nothing agreeable with ours another translates Libault & Steuens, [Maison Rustique] a worke of infinit excellency, yet onely proper and naturall to the French, and not to vs: and another takes collections from Zenophon, and others; all forrainers and vtterly vnacquainted with our climbes.¹⁹

Markham felt compelled, therefore, to undertake a similar work for his homeland, engaging in what Wendy Wall has referred to as “Englishing the soil”.

Poets and gardeners were aware of the parallels between the two disciplines. The title of one of the popular rhetoric texts of the period links the discourses: Henry Peacham’s *The Garden of Eloquence*, “containing the most excellent ornaments, exornations, lightes, flowers, and formes of speech, commonly called the figures of rhetorike”²⁰. This audience will already have recognized in the humanist discourse of husbandry the intimations of poetic structure provided by Gascoigne, Sidney, Puttenham, and others. A less familiar instance of this discourse has recently come to light, William Scott’s *The Model of Poesy* of 1599, a manuscript re-discovered in 2002 and recently been edited with meticulous care and exemplary notes by Gavin Alexander²¹. In articulating the “graces” and appealing characteristics of poesy, or fiction in general, Scott commends proportion and then turns to

variety and diuerseness of matter or invention, that may with supply of news hold up the mind in delight, soon quatted with satiety which makes even the best things seem tedious; and this is as well in the conveyance – in wrapping and inverting of the order of the same

¹⁹ Markham, “The Epistle to the generall and gentle Reader”, in *The English Husbandman*; see note 2.

²⁰ Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence*, London, H. Jackson, 1577, available at EEBO - Early English Books Online (<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>)

²¹ William Scott, *The Model of Poesy* [1599], ed. Gavin Alexander, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

things (like the many traverses, wreaths, and crossings in the continued knot of a garden that feeds the eye with a perpetual variety); and this is the poets special privilege – as also in the additaments of new accidents and devices. [...] [Y]our matter must not be led along all in one tenor, but mirth interlaced with serious and sad matters, precepts with narration. In this kind of orderly order Scaliger worthily commends Heliodorus for a well-contrived invention as a pattern.²²

George Puttenham, concluding his vast third book of ornament in *The Art of English Poesy*, reminds his readers that “the poet, in that he speaks figuratively, or argues subtly, or persuades copiously and vehemently, he doth as the cunning gardener that, using nature as a coadjutor, furthers her conclusions and many times makes her effects more absolute and strange [i.e. ‘causing wonder’]”. He proposes that “this ornament we speak of is given to it by figures and figurative speeches, which be the flowers as it were and the colors that a Poet setteth upn his language of art, as the embroiderer doth his stone and perle”. In the famous pages of the *Art* in which he illustrates the structure of poetic stanzas and metrical frames, Puttenham specifically identifies the ocular with the audible. “Likewise it so falleth out most times your ocular proportion doth declare the nature of the audible: for if it please the ear well, the same represented by delineation to the view pleaseth the eye well and *e converso*: and this is by a natural sympathy, between the ear and the eye, and between tunes and colores”²³.

The pervasiveness of these principles in early modern English culture is indicated by the interchangeable language used to describe the pleasures of form, whether in garden design, or in sartorial decoration, or in English verse. Markham describes the outlines and fillings-in of the garden in terms of habiliments and embroidery of the earth: “The adoration and beautifying of gardens is not onely diuers but almost infinite, the industry of mens braines hourelly begetting and bringing forth such new garments and imbroadery for the earth”, and he also speaks of the knots as looking like ribbons and similar decorations. “Italian and french flowers: or you may, if you please, take of euery seuerall plant one, and place them as afforesaid; the grace of all which is, that so soone as these flowers shall put forth

²² Scott, p. 36.

²³ George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, London, Richard Field, 1589, available at: <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/16420/pg16420-images.html>.

their beauties, if you stand a little remote from the knot, and any thing about it, you shall see it appear like a knot made of diuers coloured ribans, most pleasing and most rare"²⁴. Indeed, we know that Thomas Trevelyon, who designed knot gardens throughout the kingdom in the last decades of the sixteenth century, was also a designer of patterns for embroidery.

One more instance will underscore the discursive similarities among the various forms of craft, especially planting and poetry. In 1623, in his essential text, *Elements of Architecture*, Sir Henry Wotton praises the design skills of his friend Sir Henry Fanshawe, who "did so precisely examine the *tinctures* and *seasons* of his *flowres*, that in their *setting*, the *inwardest* of those which were to come up at the same time, should be alwayes a little *darker* than the *outmost*, and so serve them for a kinde of gentle *shadow*, like a piece not of *Nature*, but of *Arte*"²⁵. Not only does this description represent a splendid instance of the principles of contrast and subdivision that Elizabethan horticultural theory commends, but it also addresses directly that tension between the natural and the artificial that so profitably engaged the minds of the later humanists. Poets, architects, musicians (particularly 'composers', those who put together harmonically pleasing musical lines), and gardeners are regarded as finishers of those possibilities that nature offers.

The topic of order in sixteenth-century England is not usually discussed in this way. The trajectory of early modern studies in the past three decades has disputed the notion of cultural harmony, mostly dismissing it as a monarchical fiction, an affirmative scenario that Tillyard and his old-fashioned ilk wished to be true but that could not be sustained by the facts. New Historicism has often acknowledged the pressures exerted by the Elizabethan establishment but has read those exertions as instances of brutality. Our most successful literary historians, with Stephen Greenblatt at the head, have concentrated attention on the resistance to such efforts and to the fissures that necessarily emerged in the orderly surfaces that the crown sought to maintain. It is certainly true that the state did not function as smoothly as its spokesmen hoped or pretended, and it is

²⁴ See note 2.

²⁵ Henry Wotton, *Elements of Architecture*, London, John Bill, 1624, available at: <https://archive.org/details/architectureelem00wott>

true also that the efforts to maintain civil order depended upon an absolutist ideology and persuasive methods that we find unacceptable. But we have probably over-emphasized the negative effects of this urge to order.

There is another side to the story, of course. At about the time of *Richard II* Shakespeare himself becomes suspicious of style, dubious about the tyranny of pattern. The entry of Marcade into the festivities of the last act of *Love's Labor's Lost* signifies the turn, the asymmetrical figure in the perfectly patterned garden, the entry of death. That moment constitutes one of Shakespeare's first challenges to the certainties of Renaissance geometric humanism, but that is material for another paper.