

ROBERT LEE

PREFACE: WILL THE REAL EDWARD KEMP
STEP FORWARD?

History has not been kind to Edward Kemp. He is recognized as a ‘leading figure in the design of parks and gardens’ in mid-Victorian England, but despite his status as one of the most important and innovative landscape gardeners of his time, his achievements have been studiously neglected by landscape historians, at least until recently. All too often, coverage of Kemp’s designs, whether for parks, cemeteries or official institutions, as well as private clients, has been very limited. Brent Elliott’s *Victorian Gardens* (1986) includes a number of references to him, focusing on his advocacy of selecting plants that would harmonize with the residences of private clients, his approval of ‘globular or pyramidal, or conical, or square shapes’, and his preference for using rocky outcrops and plantations to create discrete enclosures in parks.¹ But all the material was taken from Kemp’s own writings without a wider analysis of how his designs evolved over time and with little consideration of his clients’ changing demands. Indeed, there has never been a rigorous study of Kemp’s landscape designs, even though it is acknowledged that ‘his words had weight’.

The lives and achievements of other famous landscape gardeners, such as Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown (1716–73), Uvedale Price (1747–1829), Joseph Paxton (1803–65), Shirley Hibberd (1805–90) and William Robinson (1838–95), have all merited closer analysis through the publication of biographies and learned papers, although even in the case of Brown, at least before the tercentenary of his birth, it was recognized by David Jacques that research about him, as well as his rivals and associates, was still ‘intermittent’ and ‘fragmentary’.² But, to my knowledge, Kemp’s important contributions to landscape design in the nineteenth century have been almost entirely ignored; a proper biography has yet to be written; and *Garden History* has never been in a position to publish a paper on his achievements. Indeed, it was only due to the commitment and hard work of Elizabeth Davey, with her study of his private commissions in Cheshire, that a start was finally made in exploring one of the key areas of Kemp’s professional work. Subsequently, as part of the celebrations for the bicentenary of Kemp’s birth, Barbara Moth, with the assistance of research and recording volunteers from the Cheshire Gardens Trust, published a useful study of his landscape designs for parks and gardens in Cheshire.³ But, in general, historians have shown little interest in researching one of the most influential landscape gardeners of the mid-Victorian period.

Why has Kemp been seriously neglected? Was it because most of his commissions, whether private or public, were in the North West of England, specifically in Cheshire and Lancashire, and therefore of little interest to writers with a more metropolitan focus? Was it a result of the unfortunate absence of a personal archive, which might have included at least a photograph or portrait of Kemp himself? Or was it due to the fact that at the time of his death in 1891 the gardenesque style of landscape design, with which he was most closely associated, had already been superseded by new fashions and

5 Cavendish Road, Birkenhead, Wirral CH41 8AX, UK. Email: w.r.lee@liverpool.ac.uk

alternative approaches to laying out gardens and public green spaces?⁴ Certainly, the absence of personal papers, plans and correspondence may well have deterred even the most adventurous landscape historian from developing a research project on Kemp.

Since 1860, Kemp and his wife, Sophia (until her death in 1887), lived at 74 Park Road West, a house designed by his friend, the Birkenhead architect Walter Scott. Over such a long and highly successful career as a landscape gardener, whose books had a major impact across the world (particularly in the United States, parts of the British Empire, such as Australia, and continental Europe), it seems reasonable to assume that the house would have contained an extensive library covering most aspects of landscape gardening and horticulture, plans, draft designs and correspondence with most of his contemporaries, as well as letters from his employer since his initial appointment as superintendent of Birkenhead Park in April 1843. On 8 May 1891, the house was sold by his executors for two thousand pounds (over two hundred thousand pounds in 2017 prices), while its contents were auctioned by Messrs Branch and Leete of Hanover Rooms, Liverpool, on 13 May 1891 ‘on the premises’ in Park Road West, by order of Kemp’s executors.⁵

The centrepiece of Kemp’s library, according to the list of contents, was ‘an excellently constructed table of pitch pine of extra size, admirably suited for an architect (or a draughtsman) having pedestals of wide draws and other convenient setting’. His collection of books, however, was described as ‘small’, although it included ‘many valuable botanical works with coloured plates’, including the *Magazine of Botany*, the *Gardeners’ Magazine* and the *Journal of the Horticultural Society*, and various books on botany and landscape gardening, as well as early volumes of the *Edinburgh Review*, the *Bridgewater Treatises* and the *Penny Cyclopaedia*. Of course, it is difficult to know whether some of Kemp’s library had been dispersed before his death, by gifts to friends or other landscape designers, but it is clear that his private papers had either been retained by his executors or simply disposed of. Nevertheless, the auctioneer’s catalogue reveals an insight into his style of life: a preference for Brussels carpets, green furnishing and vintage port, including a bin of the ‘splendid 1840 vintage’ and ‘some very choice old brown sherry’. There were also various items of furniture that had been manufactured ‘from Mr. Kemp’s designs’, reflecting an interest in interior design that was not uncommon among other landscape gardeners, such as John Claudius Loudon.⁶

KEMP’S WORLDWIDE REPUTATION

What happened to his private papers remains a mystery, but it does not justify the neglect of Kemp as an outstanding landscape gardener of his time. Indeed, this is all the more surprising because he was held in such a high regard by his contemporaries. Among professional designers of parks and cemeteries he was regarded as an ‘astute arbiter’ of ‘good taste’, whose words had weight.⁷ He enjoyed an international reputation and the fact that his books went through numerous editions and continued to sell particularly well throughout the world, is confirmation in itself of his widespread influence. His work inspired many contemporaries as well as younger generations of landscape gardeners, including Thomas Hayton Mawson (1861–1933), another prolific designer who was closely associated with the North West.

Moreover, Kemp was often regarded (incorrectly) as the designer of Birkenhead Park. According to Frederick Law Olmsted, the general public credited Kemp with the park’s design.⁸ Many contemporaries, including James Craig Riven, the curator of the Botanic Gardens in Hull who was responsible for landscaping the town’s Pearson Park in 1860, also regarded him as its real creator. He was unequivocal in praising Kemp’s initiative in instigating ‘a new era as regards public park design’ and for creating a landscape which

would stand ‘as a lasting memorial to his good taste’.⁹ In 1891, the influential *Gardeners’ Chronicle* directly attributed the creation and laying out of ‘this fine example of a public park’ to ‘Mr. E. Kemp’ with no reference at all to Paxton’s role.¹⁰

His international status was already evident in 1857, when the Board of Commissioners for Central Park, New York, was considering how to evaluate the thirty-three official entries in its design competition. It was agreed to explore the possibility of inviting two European specialists to New York in order to inform the decision-making process: Jean Charles Adolphe Alphand (1817–91), the designer of the recently restored Bois de Boulogne in Paris, and Edward Kemp, the superintendent of (‘Liverpool’s’) Birkenhead Park. It was subsequently reported in *The New York Times* that formal invitations had been extended to Kemp and ‘some person’ connected with the Bois de Boulogne, but the original resolution was amended: only plans of the two parks were purchased; and Kemp almost certainly never travelled to New York, at least on this occasion.¹¹ Even if the personal invitation was withdrawn, the fact that the commissioners were keen to seek his expert advice was evidence of the great esteem with which he was regarded. Indeed, Kemp continued to enjoy a high profile in America. When Olmsted was asked for advice on the best introduction to the theory of landscape gardening by the young engineer William Hammond Hall (1846–1934), the designer of San Francisco’s Golden Gate Park (1871), he did not hesitate to recommend reading the publications of prominent British landscape gardeners, including Humphry Repton, Price, William Gilpin, Sir Henry Steuart and Loudon. But he also included Kemp’s *How to Lay Out a Garden* in his list of prioritized texts.¹²

The works of Repton, Loudon, Andrew Jackson Downing and Edward Milner were recommended by Frederick A. Waugh, Professor of Landscape Gardening at the Massachusetts Agricultural College, for general readers and landscape design students who were anxious to understand and enjoy Kemp’s books more effectively. Frank J. Scott (1828–1919), as Paul Elliott notes, was so impressed with Kemp’s landscape designs and practical advice to gardeners, that the title of his own book, published in 1870, by focusing on the owners of grounds ‘of small extent’, could be interpreted as a way of honouring Kemp because of its undeniable similarity with the first edition of *How To Lay Out A Small Garden*.¹³ In continental Europe, his many contributions to the design of urban parks were cited by leading French landscape designers, including Alphand and Edouard André (1840–1911), among others, with a specific focus on his design and construction of park drives and the use of mounds of varying height to profile different types of tree (*vallonement*).

THE EDWARD KEMP SYMPOSIUM

September 2017 marked the bicentenary of Kemp’s birth and attempts were made to use this opportunity to raise his profile and address the continued lack of research papers on someone who clearly enjoyed a regional, national and international profile. While acknowledging that his landscape designs for parks and cemeteries were little known outside the North West of England and that his name may not ring a bell, Historic England recognized that his influence on landscape and garden design, as reflected in the seventeen sites registered in the National Heritage List for England for their national importance was ‘both instant and lasting’.¹⁴ Members of Cheshire Gardens Trust, as already mentioned, undertook research that led to a very useful publication; Davey delivered countless talks on Kemp; and the Mayor of Wirral, Councillor Pat Hackett, at the suggestion of Conservation Areas Wirral, unveiled a Blue Plaque on 5 April 2017 to celebrate Kemp’s achievements at the Visitor Centre in Birkenhead Park (Figure 1).

The papers in this special issue of *Garden History* were conceived as a contribution to the bicentenary celebrations. The Edward Kemp Symposium was convened at New



Figure 1. The unveiling of Edward Kemp's Blue Plaque (inset) at the Birkenhead Park Visitor Centre, 5 April 2017. Front row: Councillor Jean Stapleton; Elizabeth Davey; and Councillor Bernie Mooney. Back row: Councillor Phil Davies, Leader of Wirral Council; Professor Robert Lee, Chair of the Friends of Birkenhead Park; Councillor Pat Hackett, Mayor of Wirral; Roy Taylor, Heritage Gardener, Birkenhead Park; Frank Field, MP for Birkenhead; and Mary Worrall, Senior Manager, Parks & Countryside, Wirral Council

Brighton's Floral Pavilion on 18 October 2017 as part of the World Urban Parks European Congress (16–19 October). The congress was held on the Wirral primarily to celebrate the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the opening of Birkenhead Park. This offered an ideal opportunity to incorporate a special session on Kemp. Given the lack of research on the first superintendent of Birkenhead Park, it was very encouraging to secure contributions that offered coverage of many aspects of his life and works. The following section will highlight some of the key points that the individual presentations raised.

Elizabeth Davey provides the most complete biographical study of Kemp so far available, even if there are gaps still to be filled before we can understand fully his achievements during a career trajectory that enabled him to achieve upward social mobility from his working-class background as the son of a tailor to a millionaire. What emerges is a nuanced picture of a non-conformist whose professional life was largely dictated by his adherence to a demanding work ethic and a strong sense of duty, but who also placed a great value on family life, his marriage to Sophia and the company of her mother and sister, who came to live at 74 Park Road West, Birkenhead. Indeed, as Jan Woudstra demonstrates, progressing through the ranks of landscape gardeners to achieve international recognition was not an easy process. Rapid suburbanization in the first

half of the nineteenth century reinforced the demand for skilled practitioners who could offer advice on how best to lay out a new garden, while the Public Parks Movement and the urgent need for modern cemeteries provided an increasing number of employment opportunities for landscape gardeners on publicly commissioned projects. Despite this, however, conflicts and rivalries were not uncommon; the ownership of specialist journals by practising landscape gardeners provided an opportunity for highly personal attacks on other members of the emergent profession; while the authors of anonymous letters to local newspapers could denigrate competitors and their use of different design principles without hindrance. This should not come as a surprise, given the tradition of black-balling new membership applicants to Victorian clubs and societies and the disputes that arose in the development of other, more organized, professions.

Nevertheless, Kemp was able to rise to a position of eminence, partly because of his close connection to Paxton, but largely by his own skills in adapting his landscape designs to the configuration of specific sites. This sensitivity to local conditions is brought out in Paul Elliott's paper that seeks to locate Kemp's work within a wider intellectual context, focusing both on the design influences that informed his own practice and his writings, but also his impact on his contemporaries and younger generations of landscape gardeners. Further evidence is provided on the international reception of his writings, specifically his most successful book *How To Lay Out A Garden*, which captured the expectations of the middle classes anxious to see their gardens as works of art full of interpretative significance as well as symbols of their social and economic standing. By using Michel Foucault's concept of heterotopia and by locating Kemp within the aesthetic and cultural climate of the mid-nineteenth century, Elliott develops a convincing explanatory framework for his great success.

The following three papers by Katy Layton-Jones, David Lambert and Chris Mayes offer detailed studies of Kemp's public commissions for two Liverpool parks (Newsham Park and Stanley Park), Grosvenor Park in Chester and Birkenhead Cemetery (now known as Flaybrick Memorial Gardens). As Layton-Jones emphasizes, both Liverpool parks were developed and laid out on the basis of 'the proximate principle', where the sale of perimeter plots for high-class residential development was intended to offset, if not to cover, the council's initial expenditure. They also reveal some of the difficulties that Kemp encountered and the extent to which his designs were compromised by economic and political factors, particularly by the low volume and disappointing returns from land sales. At Newsham Park, Kemp's letter of 24 November 1864 to Liverpool's Real Estate Sub-Committee highlighted a problem right at the start of the planning process. Because it had been impossible to arrange a personal meeting with the sub-committee's members, he was 'in utter ignorance of their wants and wishes'. Even when a final plan had been agreed, Kemp was forced to compromise, particularly when the local economy, dominated by trade and shipping, was seriously affected by one of the periodic crises that affected Victorian Britain and the wider world. Again, at Grosvenor Park, according to Lambert, Kemp's original plan had to be modified because of similar issues: the 'wretched' statue of Richard, 2nd Marquess of Westminster, was imposed on Kemp because of his local importance and his critical role as the park's benefactor; the decision not to incorporate a lake was taken because the site was relatively small, but it was added to the design in 1867; while the lack of any provision for children's games reflected an expectation that only better-off sections of Chester's residents would make regular use of the park's facilities because it was to be regarded as a 'select place'. To this extent, the final appearance of Kemp-designed parks sometimes varied quite markedly from his initial plans; large-scale public commissions were completed over a number of years; and they reflected a range of external pressures, both political and financial, that required

compromise and significant modification. Even Kemp, despite his status as an eminent landscape gardener, was never in a position to realize his design plans as a free agent.

As Mayes emphasizes, the establishment of Birkenhead Cemetery was a direct outcome of the Burial Acts between 1850 and 1863, and the recognition that traditional burial grounds were filled to excess and posed a serious health hazard. In fact, Kemp's initial acceptance of public contracts was for the design and laying-out of cemeteries, rather than parks. In this case, it would appear that his plans were not subject to alteration or modification due to external pressures from the Commissioners for the Improvement of Birkenhead. Perhaps as a result, he was able to adopt a subtle design that reflected the slight gradation of the site, with burial spaces allocated in an efficient and equitable manner that would have been approved by Loudon.

The subsequent three contributions are more concerned with Kemp's private commissions, his effective exploitation as a writer of the technological changes that were transforming the publishing and printing trades; and the extent to which his wider commitments affected his continuing role as the (consulting) superintendent of Birkenhead Park. For a number of years, Davey has undertaken an important, but never-ending, task of locating all of Kemp's commissions, whether private or public (see the *Gazetteer*). Her paper reveals the likely extent of his professional work, covering almost one hundred commissions, most of which were ultimately implemented. Only four are recorded for the late 1840s when he was just establishing his practice, but in the following decade he undertook a total of forty-four commissions. The following three decades saw a continuing decline in his level of activity, with twenty-seven commissions in the 1860s, seventeen in the 1870s and only three in the 1880s.

As expected, a great deal of his design work was undertaken in Cheshire (29.6 per cent) and Lancashire (26.3 per cent). But the variety of his designs is impressive, with contracts not only for villa gardens and estate parks but also for seaside watering places, a range of institutions (including Birkenhead School and the Liverpool Convalescent Institute in Woolton) as well as the New Hotel at Grange. Clearly, the size, complexity and geological structure of sites differed considerably and some of the thirteen public commissions were large-scale developments that would have taken up a considerable amount of Kemp's time. But it is invaluable to be able to use the data to appreciate the number, scale and geographical location of the sites on which he worked. Moreover, they will provide a robust basis for examining other issues, including the process by which he obtained commissions and the relative wealth of his clients.

The paper by Bawden also breaks new ground. Kemp's success as an author was due to a number of factors. He was prescient enough to be aware of the rapidly growing market for books on landscape design and gardening; he recognized that most of the existing publications had been written for fellow professionals; and carefully defined his intended audience. His style of writing and the 'simple' directions he provided to enable the middle class (in particular its higher echelons) to manage 'small' gardens were highly praised and there can be little doubt that this contributed to his undoubted success as an author. What Bawden reveals, however, is the extent to which his impressive publication profile and the popularity of his books in Britain, continental Europe, North America and parts of the British Empire was dependent on technological change in the printing and publishing industry. The introduction and dissemination of steam power to printing presses not only facilitated a considerable increase in publishing output but also contributed to a noticeable reduction in price and a rise in demand. Kemp's publisher, Bradbury & Evans of 11 Bouverie Street, London, was at the forefront of this communication revolution and thereby underpinned his rise to be such a prolific and highly regarded author.

By contrast, my first paper focuses on Kemp's role as (consulting) superintendent of Birkenhead Park, between his initial appointment in 1843 and his death in 1891. His long association with what is now seen as a 'cutting edge project' undoubtedly brought him a great deal of respect and enhanced his profile considerably. As a landscape gardener to be employed to manage what was the first publicly funded park in the world, he would have served as an example to his contemporaries and helped to mould the public perception of the skills that were required to fulfil such a role successfully. Indeed, as early as 1847 there is evidence that he had already enjoyed 'flattering testimonials' from 'numberless' visitors to the park, so that he could be confident of 'a large and liberal patronage'.¹⁵ Dealing with his employer, the Commissioners for the Improvement of Birkenhead (rather than an aristocratic owner of a large landed estate) was a new experience that would have necessitated careful and sensitive management, particularly at times when political changes and financial concerns affected local policy towards the park. Kemp certainly had clearly stated principles, but it is important to assess whether these were always applied in practice. His commitment to Birkenhead Park was exemplary, but between 1849 and 1860 he was only paid in kind (namely free accommodation in the Italian Lodge) and his consulting fee after that date was a pittance in comparison with many of his private and public commissions. Within this context, the paper seeks to analyze the changing balance between his role as superintendent and his wider professional commitments, although there is little doubt that he remained committed to the park until his death.

The final contribution brings together for the first time data on the role and operational capacity of the friends groups that now contribute increasingly to the maintenance of parks and cemeteries designed by Kemp. The severity of the crisis facing many parks as a result of severe budgetary cuts by central government is well known, with a critical report from the Communities and Local Government Select Committee and the creation of the Parks Action Group. Within this context, local authorities are increasingly dependent on friends groups and their volunteers, as continuing reductions in staffing levels have an inevitable impact of maintenance standards. The role of friends groups, particularly those supporting Kemp-designed cemeteries and parks, needs to be publicly acknowledged, as many of them have already achieved so much: they provide an invaluable volunteer resource, organize events, raise funds and help to write up applications for funding support. In some cases, such as Flaybrick Memorial Gardens, they have managed to transform a site that had been neglected for decades. But in other cases the picture is not encouraging: currently five of Kemp's sites in the North West, including Newsham Park, Grosvenor Park, Stanley Park and Southport Cemetery, do not have a friends group to provide future support and to campaign on their behalf.

A RESEARCH AGENDA FOR THE FUTURE

This special issue of *Garden History* represents a considerable step forward in relation to research on Kemp. Perhaps inevitably, in view of the limited extent of primary evidence, there is some overlap between the different papers, but it is clear that further work will be necessary. Indeed, the changing context in which landscape gardeners operated in the Victorian period has seldom been addressed by historians. There has never been a systematic analysis of the 'emergent' profession which has already been undertaken for other professional groups, including architects, whose professionalization process Loudon took as a prospective model for landscape gardeners. Some of the contributions to this special issue touch upon the commissioning process, whether through public competitions or personal recommendations, but again there has been no substantive study that would cast a light on factors that determined the relative success or failure of individual landscape designers, let alone the popularity of different 'schools'. Indeed, it seems

appropriate at this juncture to advocate a greater emphasis on interdisciplinary studies that could address the wider context in which landscape gardeners operated, including factors that affected the supply of new entrants into the nascent profession; changing patterns of demand for specific types of design expertise; the cultural conditioning of new fashions in landscape design; technological change in communication, construction and publishing techniques; and the attractiveness of landscape gardening in terms of its monetary rewards and opportunities for social mobility. If Kemp was sufficiently successful in his career to become a millionaire from a working-class background, how did this compare with the achievements of his contemporaries, including his mentor Sir Joseph Paxton, whose effects were valued at his death in 1865 at under £180,000 (or £16,360,000)? The world of garden historians was once described, perhaps somewhat unfairly, as ‘rarefied’, but the papers arising from the Edward Kemp Symposium confirm the benefits of collaborating with other disciplines, whether cultural, economic, social history or information science, as well as methodologies such as social network analysis and Foucault’s concept of heterotopias, which would allow a more rigorous examination of the interaction between landscape gardeners in Britain during the Victorian period, the cultural and professional context in which they worked, and the factors that determined their career development. It is only by moving in this direction that outstanding questions will be answered and a wider audience for publications in this field will be secured.

A WORD OF THANKS

Without financial support from Historic England the Edward Kemp Symposium might never have taken place and everyone who participated in the event is grateful to Jenifer White, its National Landscape Advisor. Indeed, it was she who suggested that the papers presented at the symposium could be published as a special issue of *Garden History* both freely online and also as a hard copy journal. Given the peripheral status of garden history as a discipline in higher education, such a strategy of reaching out to a new audience must be endorsed and reinforced. The fact that the event was held as part of the World Urban Parks European Congress at the Floral Pavilion, New Brighton, was a result of the constant support of Mary Worrall, Senior Manager Parks & Countryside, Wirral Borough Council, and her ability to convince the international organizing committee that space needed to be found to discuss and debate Kemp’s many achievements during the bicentenary of his birth. She and her staff were instrumental in enabling the many representatives of friends groups involved in maintaining and supporting Kemp-designed cemeteries to attend the symposium. Their active participation was a vital element in the proceedings and everyone was impressed by their commitment to their respective cemeteries and parks. Of course, I will always be grateful for the willingness of my colleagues in responding to the call for papers, and it was reassuring that their collective verdict on the outcome of the symposium was positive. I hope very much that you will share their opinion.

REFERENCES

¹ Brent Elliott, *Victorian Gardens* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1986), pp. 53, 66, 99–105, 112, 114, 120–3, 134, 139, 171–2. Kemp is described as Paxton’s ‘foreman’, a post he never held following his initial appointment by the Commissioners for the Improvement of Birkenhead in August 1843. The original agreement had included a provision that Paxton would furnish ‘an efficient superintendent to be permanently on the ground to watch and direct

the whole details’ at a fee of three guineas per week; Robert Lee, *Managing the First Public Park: The Superintendents and Team Leaders of Birkenhead Park* (Birkenhead Park History and Heritage Vol. III) (Bootle: Oriol Studio Designs, 2019).

² David Jacques, ‘Introduction’, in ‘Capability Brown: Perception and Response in a Global Context’, *Garden History*, 44(Suppl. 1) (2016), pp. 4–6, at 4. Recent examples

of biographical studies of leading landscape designers include: Jane Brown, *The Omnipotent Magician: Lancelot 'Capability' Brown, 1716–1793* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2011); Charles Watkins and Ben Cowell, *Uvedale Price (1747–1829): Decoding the Picturesque* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012); John Anthony, *Joseph Paxton. An illustrated Life of Sir Joseph Paxton 1803–1965* (Princes Risborough: Shire, repr. 1992); Kate Colquhoun, *A Thing in Disguise: The Visionary Life of Joseph Paxton* (London: Fourth Estate, 2003); Anne Wilkinson, Shirley Hibberd, *The Father of Amateur Gardening: His Life and Works 1805–1890* (Birmingham: Cortex Design, 2013); and Richard Bisgrove, *William Robinson: The Wild Gardener* (London: Frances Lincoln, 2008).

³ Elizabeth Davey, “‘A Complete and Constant Superintendence’: the Cheshire parks and gardens of Edward Kemp (1817–1891)”, *Cheshire History*, 50 (2010–11), pp. 71–99; Barbara Moth and Cheshire Gardens Trust research and recording volunteers, *Kemp’s Parks and Gardens in Cheshire: The Work of Edward Kemp, Landscape Gardener, in the Historic County of Cheshire* (Congleton: Cheshire Gardens Trust, 2017).

⁴ Frank A. Waugh, *Landscape Gardening. How To Lay Out A Garden by Edward Kemp Landscape Gardener, edited, revised and adapted to North America*, 4th edn (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1912), p. xii. Waugh, in editing Kemp’s work, did not hesitate ‘to eliminate outgrown methods and to substitute the rules of modern practice’.

⁵ ‘By Order of the Executors of the Late Edward Kemp, Esq., Birkenhead Park’, *Liverpool Mercury* (Friday 1 May 1891), ‘Advertisements and Notices’, p. 4; ‘By Order of the Executors of the Late Edward Kemp, Esq.’, *Birkenhead News and Wirral General Advertiser* (9 May 1891), p. 4.

⁶ John Claudius Loudon, *An Encyclopaedia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture and Furniture containing numerous designs for dwellings, from the villa to the cottage and the farm* (London: Longman, Green, Roberts & Green, 1863); new edn, ed. Mrs Loudon.

⁷ *Description of the Gardens at Biddulph Grange: abridged from an account published in*

the Gardener’s Chronicle in the years 1857–62 (London, 1862); Elliott, *Victorian Gardens*, p. 103.

⁸ Alan Tate, *Great City Parks* (London: Spon, 2001), p. 75.

⁹ C. Riven, ‘Birkenhead Park’, *The Garden* (9 December 1876), p. 550. Riven had also been a contemporary of Kemp when they were both serving their apprenticeship as Chatsworth.

¹⁰ Anon., ‘Edward Kemp’, *Gardeners’ Chronicle*, 9 (7 March 1891), p. 311.

¹¹ Roy Rosenzweig and Elizabeth Blackmar, *The Park and People. A History of Central Park* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), pp. 117–18; Laura Wood Roper, *A Biography of Frederick Law Olmsted* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), p. 137; Morrison H. Heckscher, ‘Creating Central Park’, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art*, 65/3 (2008), p. 21. I am grateful to Elizabeth Davey, Sarah Cedar Miller and Alan Tate for their very helpful contributions on this point.

¹² Terence Young, *Building San Francisco’s Parks, 1850–1930* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), pp. 74–5, 229.

¹³ Waugh, *Landscape Gardening*, p. x; Fred E. H. Schroeder, *Front Yard America: The Evolution and Meaning of a Vernacular Domestic Landscape* (Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1993), pp. 80–1; Frank Jesup Scott, *The Art of Beautifying Suburban Home Grounds of Small Extent; to Advantages of Suburban Homes over City and Country Homes; The Comfort and Economy of Neighboring Improvement; The Choice and Treatment of Building Sites; and the Best Modes of Laying Out, Planting and Keeping Decorated Ground* (New York: Appleton, 1870), pp. 77–8, 105–6. Scott was an architect and landscape designer, but primarily a real estate businessman, who had studied for two summers under Andrew Jackson Downing and Calvert Vaux (c.1849–51).

¹⁴ Historic England, ‘How to lay out a garden: the legacy of Edward Kemp (1817–1891)’, *Heritage Calling, A Historic England blog* (22 August 2017).

¹⁵ ‘Advertisements and Notices’, *Liverpool Mercury* (6 August 1847).