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ABSTRACT

The Turkish tent stood at the entrance to Henry Hoare’s garden at Stourhead from the 1760s to 1792. While Stourhead remains a masterpiece of Georgian England’s most innovative art form, the landscape garden, the Turkish tent has received little more than a mention in the histories of Stourhead. There is no doubt that had the Turkish Tent and other exotic features survived the nineteenth century, the accounts of Stourhead would read very differently today. As Henry Hoare situated the Turkish tent (and other oriental features) spatially and conceptually on the eastern slopes the Stourhead circuit garden, this dissertation seeks to restore some of its former prominence.

Turkish tents in England have never been defined as a class of garden pavilions. Like other so-called Turkish tents in eighteenth-century Britain, the Stourhead Turkish Tent was a permanent structure designed to look like a portable Ottoman tent. It overlooked the lakeside garden and was the most prominent feature in the panoramic view from both the Grotto and the Pantheon. The genre of Turkish tents as garden pavilions was initiated at Vauxhall Gardens where ambiance and diversions referenced contemporary nighttime entertainments at the Ottoman Porte, the Topkapi Palace and other sites in Tulip Era Constantinople. The Painshill Turkish Tent, commissioned by Richard Hamilton and designed by architect Henry Keene, transitioned the Vauxhall model to a rural pleasure garden setting.
Turkish tents in Britain were indebted, formally and conceptually, to popular culture and publications. *Turquerie* fashions in portraiture (human and equine), fancy dress costumes, livery for servants and grooms, interior decoration and theatre all constitute aspects of the cultural climate of the Stourhead Turkish tent. As Henry Hoare purchased books on Ottoman culture and travel in the Levant by subscription, we know that his orientalist interest began early and were sustained throughout his life. Images from Henry Hoare’s books suggest source material he used to create his own Turkish tent, closely related to the tent captured by Jan Sobieski, King of Poland, at the Siege of Vienna in 1683. Henry Hoare possessed significant insight into genuine Ottoman architecture.

The meanings associated with Turkish tents in Britain are initially straightforward: they evoke notions of Ottoman military prowess and defeat, and they also recall the indulgent lifestyle of the Sultan and his family in the gardens of the Topkapi Palace and wherever they might travel in a palace of tents. In the special interplay of features at Stourhead, eighteenth-century visitors and authors Henry Hoare admired nuanced these themes. The Turkish tent could also suggest notions of cultural authenticity, industry versus idleness, and warnings about British watchfulness. In the end, the Turkish Tent and the exotic features at Stourhead only enhance the emblematic, iconographic and semiotic readings of previous interpreters.
DEDICATION

To Julie, who possesses wisdom borne of study, faith, and experience, and does not waste it.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am immeasurably grateful to my advisor, Myroslava Mudrak, the inspiring teacher I can only attempt to emulate in the classroom. Her intellectual generosity has sustained and enhanced my journey. Arline Meyer also deserves many thanks for so readily sharing her expertise in British art and culture at the early stages of this dissertation and even from retirement. It has been a privilege to work with Howard Crane in the late stages of this process.

Other members of the faculty of the History of Art Department at the Ohio State University have been influential in my life of the mind, in the discipline of art history and beyond. They include particularly, Anne Morganstern, Frank Richardson, Stephen Melville, Barbara Haeger, and Christine Verzar.

Other colleagues and confidents have also contributed to the successful completion of this document: Heather Belnap Jensen, C. Mark Hamilton, Mark J. Johnson, Martha Moffitt Peacock, Campbell Gray, Matthew B. Christensen, Dana Bourgerie, Linda Reynolds, Stephen Jones, Seth Taylor, Drew Allsup, Chris Benard, Thomas G. and Katy Taylor, Christian and Kacy Faulconer, Brian and Suzanne Kershisnik, Scott and Pam Frost, and Dan and Abby Priedeman
VITA

February 7, 1961.......................Born - San Francisco, CA

1992.....................................M.A. Art History, The Ohio State University

1997 – present.........................Instructor, Brigham Young University

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Art History
European Garden History
Eighteenth- and Twentieth-Century European Art and Architecture
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ....................................................................................................................... ii

Dedication ................................................................................................................... iv

Acknowledgments ....................................................................................................... v

Vita .............................................................................................................................. vi

List of Plates ............................................................................................................... viii

INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................ 1

CHAPTER ONE: The Turkish Tent at Stourhead: Historical Background and Historiography ................................................................. 17

CHAPTER TWO: Defining Turkish Tents: Stourhead and Beyond ......................... 37

CHAPTER THREE: A Taste for *Turquerie*: Ottoman Themes and Turkish Tents in British Popular Culture .............................................. 89

CHAPTER FOUR: The Turkish Threat: The Contest for Meaning on the Mount of Diana and in the Greater Stourhead Circuits ....................... 130

CONCLUSION ............................................................................................................. 174

Bibliography ............................................................................................................. 192

Appendix, Henry Hoare’s Subscriber List ................................................................. 228

Appendix, Chronology of Travel Accounts of Turkey 1585-1760 ......................... 230

Appendix, Plates ........................................................................................................ 235
## List of Plates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fredrik Magnus Piper, <em>Plan of Stourhead</em>, 1779. Watercolor on paper, 32 x 44 inches. Royal Academy of Fine Arts, Stockholm, pi-e-6-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>View from the former site of the Turkish Tent, National Trust Stourhead, Wiltshire. Photo: Mark Magleby, 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>A View from the Pantheon in Mr. Hoare's Garden at Stourton in Wiltshire</em> from <em>A New Display of the Beauties of England: or, A Description of the Most Elegant or Magnificent Public Edifices, Royal Palaces, Noblemens [Sic] and Gentlemens [Sic] Seats, and Other Curiosities, ... in Different Parts of the Kingdom....</em> Vol. II. London: printed for R. Goadby, 1776-77.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Detail of <em>The Mount of Diana and Turkish Tent, Stourhead</em>, The Green Frog Service, ca. 1770. Painted porcelain, 15 inch oval covered dish. Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, cat. 917a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Estate Map</em>, Stourhead, 1785, Wilshire County Record Office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plate 10  *Prospect of Constantinople from the Vineyards above Fundaclee* from George Sandys, *A Description of Constantinople* (London: Printed by Richard Cotes and are to be sold by John Sweeting, 1652), 30. 11 ½ x 9 inches...............................................................244

Plate 11  Detail of Vauxhall Turkish Tent, J. S. Muller after Samuel Wale, *Vauxhall Garden showing the Grand Walk at the Entrance to the Garden and the Orchestra with Music Playing*, c. 1751. Etching and engraving, 10 1/16 x 15 13/16 inches. Yale University Libraries, New Haven, (5392/7)..............................................................245


Plate 14  Dome of Revan kiosk, 1635, Topkapi Palace Musuem, Istanbul…..248


Plate 18  Interior view of the Kiosk on the Terrace overlooking the former Tulip Garden (1704, renovated 1752-53), Topkapi Palace, Istanbul……..252

Plate 19  *A View from the Corridor with Pillars (Iftariye Kiosk), 18th century, reproduced in Godfrey Goodwin, Topkapi Palace* (London: Saqi Books, 1999)………………………………………………………………………………..253


Plate 21  View of Topkapi waterside kiosks, a detail from Cornelius Loos, *Panorama of the Seraglio*, 1710. Ink and watercolor on paper, ca. 8 x 30 inches. Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, THC 9114………………255

Plate 22  *The Turkish Temple* (sometimes called *The Crescent Moon or The Turkish Tartar Tent*), ca. 1757-58, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire………………………………………………………………………………256

Entertaining (London: Claude du Bosc, Engraver at the Golden-Head in Charles-Street, Covent Garden, 1739). 18 ½ x 11 ½ inches.

The Turkish Temple (sometimes called The Crescent Moon or The Turkish Tartar Tent), ca. 1757-58, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire…………………………………………………………..257

Plate 24  William Chambers, Mosque at Kew (1759, completed 1761), watercolor, from John Harris, Sir William Chambers: Knight of the Polar Star (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1970), plate 33……………………………………………………………..258


Plate 26  Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, Mosque, from Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, A Plan of Civil and Historical Architecture (Translated by Thomas Lediard. Leipzig, 1730), 11 ½ x 9 inches………………………………………………………………………………..260

Plate 27  Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, Bath, from Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, A Plan of Civil and Historical Architecture (Translated by Thomas Lediard. Leipzig, 1730), 11 ½ x 9 inches…261

Plate 28  Umbrello Seat in the Indian Manner from Charles Over, Ornamental Architecture (London: Robert Sayer, 1758), plate 8, 9 x 5 ⅞ inches…………………………………………………………………………………………..262

Plate 29  Gothic Temple from Batty Langley, Gothic Architecture Improved by Rules of Proportions (London: John Millan, 1747), plate LVI, 12 x 9 inches…………………………………………………………………………………………..263

Plate 30  Gothic Pavilion at Painshill, Surrey………………………………………..264

Plate 32  William Kent, *A Design for a Royal Tent*, n.d. Pencil and ink wash, 32 x 20 inches. Private collection…………………………………..266

Plate 33  William Kent, *Elevation and Plan of Three Chinese Temples*, n.d., Pencil and ink wash, 27.5 x 16 inches; 28.5 x 18 inches; 29 x 19 inches. Private collection…………………………………..267

Plate 34  Jonathon Richardson (attributed), *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, ca.1725. Oil on canvas. Private collection…………………………………..268


Plate 36  Franz Geffels, *Turk siege: The Relief Battle around Vienna on 12 September 1683*, 1683. Historisches Museum der Stadt, Vienna. 72 x 107 inches…………………………………………………………...270

Plate 37  Franz Geffels, *The Siege of Vienna* (a tapestry design), ca. 1700….271

Plate 38  *Siege of Vienna*, Zamek Królewski na Wawelu, Kraków. 36 x 56 inches……………………………………………………………….272

Plate 39  *Siege of Vienna*, Historisches Museum der Stadt, Vienna………273

Plate 40  Anonymous Dutch, *The Siege of Vienna*, ca. 1683. Engraving………274

Plate 41  Detail, Anonymous Dutch, *The Siege of Vienna*, ca. 1683. Engraving………………………………………………………………...275

Plate 42  Detail, Anonymous Dutch, *The Siege of Vienna*, ca. 1683, engraving……………………………………………………………….276

Plate 44  Simon Gribelin, The Tent of Darius (after Charles Le Brun), from André Félibien, The Tent of Darius Explain’d (London: William Redmayne, 1703), 12 ½ x 16 ½ inches.................................278

Plate 45  Charles Le Brun, Alexander before the Tent of Darius (or The Queens of Persia at the Feet of Alexander the Great), 1660-61. Oil on canvas, 117¼ X 165 inches. The Palace of Versailles.........................279

Plate 46  After Ludovico Ottavio Burnacini, Turkish Encampment before a Christian City, second half of 18th century. Engraving, 11 7/16 x 15 3/8 inches. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 53.600.3588. 280

Plate 47  Detail of Cornelius Loos, Panorama of the Seraglio, 1710. Ink and watercolor on paper, ca. 8 x 30 inches. Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, THC 9114.................................................................281


Plate 49  John Frederick Lewis, The Reception, 1873. Oil on canvas, 25 x 30 inches. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection, New Haven, Connecticut.................................................................283


Plate 51  Single-columned Ottoman tent, before 1683. Arsenal Museum, Vienna.................................................................285
Plate 52  
*Zubdetu’rt-Tevarih*, Turkish Museum of Early Islam, Istanbul, Cat. no. 1973…………………………………………………………………………………286

Plate 53  

Plate 54  
Claude du Bosc, *Othman I, Founder of the Othman Empire*, in Demetrius Cantemir, Late Prince of Moldavia, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire* ... (London: James, John, and Paul Knapton, 1734). 15 x 12 inches…………………………………288

Plate 55  

Plate 56  

Plate 57  

Plate 58  

Plate 59  
Claude du Bosc, *Murad III, Twelfth Emperor of the Turks*, in Demetrius Cantemir, Late Prince of Moldavia, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire* ... (London: James, John, and Paul Knapton, 1734). 15 x 12 inches…………………………………….293


Plate 65  *The South Prospect of Santa Sophia* in *A Late Voyage to Constantinople*, 1683. Engraving, 11 ½ x 9 inches.........................................................299

Plate 66  Comparison: Iznik tiles, Circumcision Pavilion, 17th century, Topkapi Palace Museum, Istanbul. Double-columned tent wall fragment with foliate and architectural appliqué, first half of the 17th century. Wawel Royal Chateau, Kraków. ..........................................................................................300


Plate 69  William Hogarth, Untitled (An Audience Scene with the Grand Seignior), from Aubry de La Mottraye, A. de la Motraye's travels through Europe, Asia, and into part of Africa.... Vol. 1. London, 1732.303


Composite mirror images of the above…………………304

Plate 71  Antonio Guardi, *The Commander of Janissaries*, ca. 1730. Oil on canvas, ca. 30 x 41 ½ inches. Private collection, Switzerland………305

Plate 72  Comparison: Antonio Guardi, *The Commander of Janissaries*, ca. 1730. Oil on canvas, ca. 30 x 41 ½ inches. Private collection, Switzerland.

*The Mount of Diana and Turkish Tent, Stourhead*, on Josiah Wedgwood’s Green Frog porcelain service, ca. 1770. Hermitage, St. Petersburg, cat. 917a………………………………………………….306

Plate 73  Stable tents from Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Stato Militare Dell' Imperio Ottomanno* (Haya: P. Gosse, 1732), 6 ¼ x 9 ½ inches………………………………………………………………………………………………………307

Plate 74  A battle scene depicting the Grand Vizier’s tent complex from Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Stato Militare Dell' Imperio Ottomanno* (Haya: P. Gosse, 1732), 4 ½ x 4 ½ inches………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..308

Plate 75  Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Ottoman Military Tents*, ca. 1727. Watercolor and ink, ca. 9 x 11 inches. American Academy, Rome…………………309
Plate 76  *Ottoman Military Tents* from Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Stato Militare dell' Imperio Ottomanno* (Haya: P. Gosse, 1732), 9 ¼ x 16 ¼ inches………………………………………………………………………………………………310

Plate 77  Martino Altomonte, *Sketch of Grand Viziers tents as erected in 1684*, 1684. Watercolor and ink, 10 x 24 ¾ inches. Graphic Collection, Stift Melk, Austria………………………………………………………………………………311

Plate 78  Detail of tent with carpet from Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Ottoman Military Tents*, ca. 1727. Watercolor and ink, ca. 9 x 11 inches. American Academy, Rome………………………………………………312

Plate 79  *Presentation of Gifts by the Safavid Ambassador* in Seyyid Lokman, *Sehname-I Selim Han*, 1581. Topkapi Palace Museum, Istanbul………………………………………………………………………………313


*The Mount of Diana and Turkish Tent, Stourhead, The Green Frog Service, ca. 1770*. Painted porcelain, image size 3 ½ x 8 inches. Hermitage, St. Petersburg, cat. 917a……………………………..318


Plate 87  Gilt Leather Hangings, before 1748, Ham House, London, The National Trust…………………………………………………………………………………………………………321

Plate 88  Antoine Aveline, *Trianon de Porcelaine*, 1670-89, Engraving…….322

Plate 89  Mihrab Niche, 16th century, Isfan, Iran, 135 1/16 x 113 11/16 inches…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………323
INTRODUCTION

For much of the reign of George III, a silver-blue and white Turkish Tent stood overlooking the temples, pavilions, grottos and naturalized landscape that surrounded the lakeside circuit garden at Stourhead, Warminster, Wiltshire. This sheltering seat was situated atop a man-made knoll designated as “the Mount of Diana.” It was, despite its ephemeral appearance, a permanent structure styled to resemble an Ottoman tent.\(^1\) The famous garden the Turkish Tent adorned was created by Henry Hoare II (1705-85), called “the Magnificent” because of his taste in collecting and gardening and to distinguish him from a league of Henries that followed. Henry Hoare’s Turkish pavilion was conceptualized as early as the mid-1750s. It was observed by visitors from the 1760s, remodeled or “improved” in 1776, and finally demolished – both structure and site – in the 1790s.

At mid-century – when Henry Hoare exhibited his classical temples in juxtaposition with his oriental pavilions – exotic architecture already occupied a legitimate, if secondary, place in the mix of features that made up the nascent English

---

\(^1\) The designation “Turkish tent” refers to an English garden pavilion created in emulation of a real or imagined Ottoman model. In this context, the appellation is strictly and uniquely of English origin. Pavilions or garden buildings created in the Ottoman Empire will be referred to as “Ottoman” tents, kiosks, or seraglios. “Exotic” is perhaps the broadest term used here, but not so broadly as it often is in Postcolonial studies. The exotic is a category that can include both Ottoman and Chinese subjects, and in this discussion, it is limited to only those. In this context, “exotic” is all but synonymous with “oriental” in that it connotes Europe’s Other. “Oriental” and “occidental” are defined by contrasts and differences that should not be seen as pejorative. However, the use of “orientalist” and “orientalism,” is defined by Edward Said’s discourse. These terms imply a hegemonic relationship with the West exploiting the East.
landscape style.² Hoare (and a few like-minded squires) created Turkish tents when most garden makers were content to let a single, whimsically-painted Chinese pavilion serve the role of exotic Other to their Roman-inspired temples, Renaissance-like grottos and hermitages evocative of the waning Middle Ages.³ Thus, decades before the fashion for Turkish and Islamic architecture became ubiquitous under the Regency, a small group of landed gentry incorporated a more proximate Orient into their estates. Little attention has been paid to these Turkish-styled innovations.

The Turkish Tent was one of at least four oriental-themed structures at Stourhead, concentrated, meaningfully, on the eastern slope of the valley. Like every other exotic element at the estate, it was eradicated from the garden by Henry Hoare’s grandson and heir, Richard Colt Hoare.⁴ During the subsequent long absence of the tent and its chinoiserie companions,⁵ Stourhead’s successive owners, visitors, and historians have all but forgotten the prominent role the Turkish Tent and its associative meanings played in Hoare’s composed vistas. This dissertation reasserts the formal and conceptual significance of the Turkish Tent within the lakeside gardens at Stourhead.

Stourhead, like other equally programmatic gardens – Stowe (ca. 1720), Castle

---

² Important Chinese pavilions in Britain and Europe predated Stourhead, notably: the Badenburg (1719-1721) and the Pagodenburg (1716-1719) at the Nymphenburg Palace, Munich, and the Chinese House (1738) at Stowe, Buckinghamshire. Other famous Chinese pavilions – the Tea-house (1754-1757) at San Souci, Potsdam, and the House of Confucius (1757) at Kew Gardens, Middlesex – were constructed after the Chinese Alcove (1749) at Stourhead.


⁴ Sir Richard Colt Hoare, 2nd Baronet (1765-1838), called Colt Hoare, became Henry Hoare’s only living male issue after the untimely death of Henry’s twenty-year old son, Henry Hoare III, while he was on the Grand Tour in Naples.

⁵ “Chinoiserie” and “Turquerie” both imply European appropriation of oriental styles. Both are mid-century French styles which have very little to do with any authentic Chinese or Turkish designs. “Turquerie” in Britain means nothing more than an attempt to emulate a supposed Ottoman aesthetic, not necessarily mediated by real knowledge of the French style.
Howard (ca. 1720), Hagley (ca. 1735), the Leasowes (ca. 1745) – has been characterized as an emblematic, literary or poetic garden, implying that the educated, contemplative visitor would accumulate thematic associations from the textual, architectural and representational features sited throughout the garden. Accordingly, the garden was to be viewed systematically, in a prescribed sequence, so that its temples, inscriptions, statues or relief carvings, urns, and evocative place-names (viz. “the Mount of Diana”) might be purposefully deciphered and synthesized by the visitor. Art historians and literary scholars interpreting Stourhead consistently propose an allegorical narrative that connects the architectural features surrounding the lake. Decoding this alleged program has been almost the singular task of the art historians and the literary scholars who have addressed Stourhead. Citing only the extant features, these scholars have imposed divergent allegories upon the garden that range from the Christian’s pilgrimage through life, or Hercules choice at the crossroads, to Aeneas’ journey to found Rome. Visitors to Stourhead either retrace these celebrated wanderings, or create their own rationale for Stourhead’s surviving temples and grottos. Neither visitor nor scholar is prompted by the site to recall the Turkish Tent. Despite the prominence Henry Hoare gave Stourhead’s exotic pavilions, especially its flagship Turkish Tent, no scholarly interpretation has concluded that the tent had a real stake in the garden’s original syntax.

---


The tidiness of Stourhead’s allegorical (and occidental) readings resulted in a general inattention to its exotic features; not surprisingly, Stourhead’s interpreters have found it vexing to contextualize a feature such as a Chinese Alcove within Aeneas’ journey. Nevertheless, the historical record is clear: an assemblage of classical, gothic, as well as non-western, exotic features coexisted originally in Henry Hoare’s garden, and the Turkish Tent held extraordinary visual impact, comparable to the surviving temples of the landscape. This dissertation seeks to present a more inclusive interpretation of Stourhead’s familiar monuments by reintroducing the lost oriental features of the garden. The Turkish Tent is a particularly enigmatic feature of this seminal English garden about which much more could be known. Therefore, the aim of this study is to establish a place for the Turkish Tent within the considerable body of scholarship on Henry Hoare’s Stourhead, thereby enriching the broader field of Georgian garden history.

Because, on the whole, scholarship remains scant on Turkish tents as British garden pavilions, we will address this lacuna and justify the process of inquiry on the basis of four fundamental premises: first, that Stourhead has inspired a range of scholars to read the garden as a coherent whole – as a single, unified allegory – and that these interpretations account for surviving features, but not for Henry Hoare’s orientalizing diversity; secondly, that “Turkish” garden buildings in Britain – reflecting contemporary thought, conversation, and debate on the Ottoman empire – have been previously undefined, yet merit consideration as a significant subcategory of Georgian garden architecture; thirdly, that the English notion of a Turkish tent entered public awareness via British print sources in advance of its garden applications, and that Henry Hoare was
uniquely aware of these publications; and finally, that a comprehensive iconographic or
semiotic reading of Hoare’s garden at any stage of its development must account for the
conceptual impact of his Turkish pavilion on the Mount of Diana, the acknowledgement
of which only enhances, and does not negate, previous interpretations. The evidence that
prompted these four claims is laid out and analyzed in the corresponding four chapters
that follow.

Since the 1930s, architectural and cultural historians have offered interpretations
of Stourhead that have subsequently grown into a considerable body of scholarly
literature. The primary objective of this dissertation’s first chapter is to survey the various
studies and interpretive accounts of the garden and its maker. Stourhead, generally
speaking, has inspired researchers to read the garden as a coherent whole – as a single,
unified allegory. However, in considering these accounts, it quickly becomes clear that
virtually all authors explicate Stourhead’s surviving features, but not Henry Hoare’s
original stylistic diversity.

Defining the structures designated “Turkish tents” is the second area of this
document’s inquiry. While it seems obvious that these distinctive garden buildings
reflected and contributed to British discourse about the Ottoman empire, almost nothing
has been written on their shared physical characteristics, nor on the scope of variants
within this specialized architectural category. To better understand Henry Hoare’s long
missing Turkish Tent at Stourhead, this feature must be reconstructed and contextualized
within a survey of all contemporary and comparable structures. Thus, Chapter Two lays
out all that can be known of the Stourhead Tent itself, and considers related Turkish or Islamic structures of the era.

The first and only painted images of the Stourhead Turkish Tent were discovered in 1995 on a Wedgwood porcelain service in the Hermitage state collection, St. Petersburg, and are incorporated in the study of Stourhead’s lake garden for the first time. These images reveal Stourhead’s Turkish Tent to be a major element in Hoare’s collection of pictorial compositions and interrelated themes at Stourhead. In Henry Hoare’s lifetime, the Turkish pavilion served as the entrance (or, at the very least, as the privileged, recommended gateway) to the lakeside circuit path, offering the first comprehensive view of the valley garden. This site dominated the panoramic view from the Pantheon, which Hoare designated “a charming Gaspd [sic] painting.” Recognition of the Turkish Tent’s optical prominence from various points of the circuit inevitably prompts questions about its relative absence from the most credible histories and interpretations of Stourhead.

The Georgian garden structures designated “Turkish” are not adequately defined, having not been subjected to any systematic or sustained formal, contextual, or conceptual analysis. The dearth of scholarship on these otherwise intriguing designs implies that they have been perceived as too rare to be knowable, or too poorly documented to be decided. Added to this is the problem that few Turkish tents survived into the nineteenth century, none of which were substantially unaltered. Nonetheless, at

---

9 Gaspard Dughet (1715-1775), sometimes called Gaspard Poussin or “the English Poussin” after his famous brother-in-law, painted landscapes and specialized in storm scenes. Hoare thought the view from the Pantheon resembled Gaspard’s style. Henry Hoare to Lady Bruce, 23 October 1762, C. Hoare and Co. Archive, London.
least eight important gardens in Great Britain and Ireland once housed documented, permanent structures identified as Turkish tents or Turkish mosques;\textsuperscript{10} other tents, mosques and kiosks (realized or merely designed for a specific site) are related iterations of the genre. Although the quality and precision of documentation of each Turkish tent or mosque varies considerably, the majority of these structures were insightfully described by contemporary tastemakers and travel writers. These accounts, combined with a very few illustrations of Turkish-styled garden structures, establish the parameters for understanding the nature and function of the eighteenth-century “Turkish tent” and form the basis of this study by defining the essential characteristics of contemporary Turkish garden buildings. A comparison of these oriental structures in English gardens in terms of scale, material, manufacturer, ornament, style, and placement within the garden supplements and supports this definition. In addition, the historical chronology and patronage of such garden architecture reveals individual, as well as collectively shared features, modeled at important precursors of Turkish garden pavilions, specifically those at Vauxhall, the famous pleasure garden in London. Vauxhall’s Turkish features share with other contemporary British and European Turkish garden structures surprising details, such as brick and mortar construction (despite a deliberate appearance of impermanence), emphasizing the value that was attached to these structures within the garden. That Vauxhall would come to reflect Ottoman traditions identifies it as one of the sites where the Turkish tent is defined as a new type of English garden building.

The Turkish tent was a cultural commonplace in popular literary and pictorial

\textsuperscript{10} Namely, Vauxhall, Painshill, Stourhead, Wotton House, Audley End, Kew, West Wycombe, and Bellevue.
media long before it was made flesh in the Georgian garden. The contemporary understanding of what constituted an Ottoman tent in Henry Hoare’s day can be reconstructed through travel descriptions, political tracts and a full spectrum of pictorial representations of actual or imagined oriental tents. Other evidence, specifically porcelain painting, poetry, and war reportage, also provided useful stylistic and contextual sources from which Turkish tent creators like Hoare could envision their own designs. This diversity of images ranges from authentic transcriptions of military encampments to fanciful caprices of the Sultan’s rococo garden pavilions. Collectively, this archive of Turkish-themed documents popularized ideas of Ottoman culture in Britain, and clearly fed Henry Hoare’s generation’s desire to embrace the Turkish tent as a signifier of Britain’s increasingly complex relationship with the Ottoman Empire. An examination of this body of literature and imagery – the cultural context of English Turkish tents, and the source material for their designers and owners – is the primary impetus of Chapter Three.

Commencing in the seventeenth century, two narratives disseminated via popular print media, involving magnificent tents or pavilions, captured the British imagination. The first is the often-recited account of the Ottoman military’s ill-fated second Siege of Vienna (1683) when the Grand Vizier’s11 opulent tents became the plundered prize of the King of Poland. For fifty years after the failed siege, sensation-mongering London newspapers and tract printers profited from retelling the exploits of the Grand Vizier’s military conflicts with Europe. The second narrative includes various stories in which Ottoman pavilions in palace gardens or at remote sites became the setting of spectacular...
events or the locus of sensuously described indulgences of the Sultan (called “the Grand Seignior”). These reports retained public interest long after they ceased to be news and continued to feed the imagination of the British literate classes. These European “eyewitness” accounts of Ottoman pavilions enabled a diverse British public to recognize the currency of pavilions designated as “Turkish tents” when they began to appear in public, and later, in private, pleasure gardens. Moreover, Henry Hoare was uniquely aware of these publications.

It is of utmost importance to this study that Henry Hoare personally acquired books on Levantine travel, culture and religion from among the score of such publications issued just prior to the appearance of the first Turkish tent in England. Indeed, a compilation of Hoare’s subscriber list\(^\text{12}\) indicates an early and active interest in Ottoman culture and suggests source material for his own Turkish Tent. Hoare’s library included images of the most famous Ottoman tents of his day. For instance, Hoare subscribed to *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire* (1734)\(^\text{13}\) and to Charles Perry’s *View of the Levant* (1743),\(^\text{14}\) suggesting that his choice of a Turkish structure was anything but capricious or inconsequential. By virtue of his collection, Hoare, more than any other Turkish pavilion maker, was qualified to create a Turkish

---

\(^{12}\) A list of subscribers was printed as front matter to about ten percent of the books published in England during the Georgian eighteenth-century. Individual subscriber lists can be generated by a database compiled by R.V. and P.J. Wallis in the 1990s at Newcastle University. It was originally issued as *Biography Database, 1680-1830* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England: Avero Publications, 1998). An individual’s subscriber list identifies books purchased pre-publication, potentially revealing something of the subscriber’s interests or patronage.

\(^{13}\) Demetrius Cantemir, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire* . . . (London: James, John, and Paul Knapton, at the Crown in Ludgate Street, 1734-35), and Charles Perry, *A View of the Levant Particularly of Constantinople, Syria, Egypt and Greece* (London: T. Woodward, 1743). See Appendix I regarding Hoare’s subscriber list. It should be noted that no intervening works on Turkey were sold by subscription.

\(^{14}\) Pococke’s *A Description of the East* was published the same year as Perry’s work, but was not sold by subscription and thus there is not the same documented connection to Hoare.
Tent that reflects a genuine Ottoman prototype. While Henry Hoare did not construct the first Turkish Tent in a landscape garden, he is incomparable amongst his peers in his documentably early and enduring interest in publications about Ottoman culture.

Henry Hoare’s creation of Stourhead constitutes an important moment in western garden history. The fruitful collaboration between Henry Hoare and the architect Henry Flitcroft\(^\text{15}\) resulted in Stourhead’s sophisticated compositions and inspiring views that included oriental features. Knowledge of the Turkish Tent’s position, visual impact, and especially its symbolism, contributes to a more accurate understanding of Stourhead, and to its place in the English landscape movement. Chapter Four probes the public and private meanings caught up in Henry Hoare’s Turkish Tent.

Today’s visitors to Stourhead experience the lakeside garden as complete and whole. This sensibility is achieved by the enclosure of the valley walls, mature trees and a concave earthen dam that frames one’s field of vision. An organizing path encircles the lake, passing temples, grottos, and other purposefully composed views. This orderliness suggests a composite experience greater than the sum of its parts. While Stourhead’s lush nineteenth-century arboretum masks those eighteenth-century sites once dominated by now-missing structures or statuary, these were integral to Henry Hoare’s original vistas and meanings.

Hoare’s inclusion of a Turkish tent within Stourhead’s emblematic circuit is at odds with modern interpretations of the garden as a unified whole. Again, scholarship on

\(^{15}\) Henry Flitcroft ( ) was a member of Lord Burlington’s circle of Neo-Palladian designers and Henry Hoare’s primary architect. Flitcroft was also William Kent’s engraver, and as such was very familiar with the latter’s work and drawings which would become influential in the architectural style of Stourhead’s temples and grottos. There is no documentation to link Flitcroft to the Turkish tent.
Stourhead generally reflects only the garden’s surviving elements, not Henry Hoare’s original, planned and executed designs. Rare instances of research that emphasizes oriental or exotic features at Stourhead have been marginalized by authoritative voices in the field. Primary sources that offer a more complete understanding of the Turkish Tent’s character, location and appearance have largely been overlooked, de-emphasized, or altogether excluded. For example, two anonymous poems, published during Henry Hoare’s lifetime and highlighting other non-extant (and hence overlooked) garden features at Stourhead, such as the Mount of Diana, provide evidence of the contents of the Chinese Alcove, and of the propensity of some viewers to discern other Turkish features at Stourhead. The poems, coupled with visitor accounts, provide unparalleled descriptions of Stourhead at important stages of its development. Despite its absence in previous discussions of Stourhead, the Turkish Tent co-existed in a visual equilibrium with Stourhead’s more famous features, and it unquestionably had as much capacity for symbolism as any surviving feature. Stourhead’s exotic pavilions – of which the Turkish tent is the most dominant example – inescapably created a nuanced network of meanings between themselves (Turkish and Chinese), and the more conventional classical, gothic and other features at Stourhead. In some ways, the Turkish Tent was a foil to other features like Stourhead’s Pantheon filled with classical antiquities or its medieval Bristol Cross supported (not unlike Sluter’s Well of Moses) by sculptures of eight kings of England. In other ways, the Turkish Tent signified Hoare’s take on current events and contemporary values. Perhaps the most important claim of this dissertation is that the Turkish Tent held compelling, associative meanings for an eighteenth-century audience,
and for Henry Hoare himself, and that it fully participated in the original “enchanting whole” that was Stourhead.

Contrary to past practice, the “Asiatic” or “Turkish” concepts Hoare associated with his garden have the potential to enrich, rather than cloud, the longstanding interpretations of Stourhead as a primarily classically-themed garden with gothic additions. It can be demonstrated that acknowledging the Stourhead Turkish Tent and the site it occupied augments various scholarly readings of the garden circuit advanced by the school of Kenneth Woodbridge.

Therefore, presuming that a Turkish tent cannot be without meaning, the tent’s ideational contribution to the garden – the values that Henry Hoare associated with the greater estate and with the Turkish Tent – must be identified. Not surprisingly, and very importantly, some of these ideas have been noted by scholars who have otherwise ignored the Turkish Tent, but have understood Henry Hoare’s life so well as to find signifiers of these values in other locations at Stourhead. These values include four that find particular resonance with Stourhead’s Turkish Tent: the appreciation for authentic copies of famous works of European or Oriental art; the ambition to encyclopedically collect paintings or garden pavilions; the injunction to model industriousness, not idleness, in one’s labors; and lastly, the admonition to watchfulness in one’s domestic and foreign affairs. Some of these values suggest obvious connections to Hoare’s Turkish Tent; others will be expanded upon in subsequent discussions.

In the end, the historical record of the Turkish Tent strongly indicates that a

---

comprehensive iconographic or semiotic reading of Hoare’s garden at any stage of its development must somehow account for the conceptual impact of this Turkish pavilion. This acknowledgement will enhance, not negate, previous interpretations.

Finally, having previewed the four aims of the dissertation, we will turn briefly to the methodology of approaching an Enlightenment-era, Islamic-styled garden pavilion created in the homeland of the British Empire. The very presence of a Turkish tent at Stourhead invites revisionist, or as suggested above, supplementary, readings of the Stourhead circuit. No study of British emulation of Ottoman culture can ignore issues of colonialism and “otherness.” Given the degree to which Henry Hoare incorporated Turkish and Chinese themes into the oriental and occidental iconography at Stourhead, the seminal discourse of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1970) offers an invaluable approach that has been missing from the theorization of Hoare’s garden.

Many of the British literary and pictorial sources that provide a context for the Turkish Tent at Stourhead affirm Said’s infamous indictment that “the Orient” was developed as a construct to legitimate the West’s ambitions to subdue, colonize and capitalize upon a contrived image of the Middle East. However, Said compellingly argues that Orientalism’s discourse is not merely an ideological distortion contrived to justify a new, Euro-centric global order, but a “densely imbricated arrangement of imagery and expertise that organizes and produces the Orient as a political reality.”

---

17 Timothy Mitchell, “Orientalism and the Exhibitionary Order” in *Colonialism and Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 289-90. Mitchell further explains, “Three features define this Orientalist reality: it is understood as the product of unchanging racial or cultural essences; the essential characteristics are in each case the polar opposite of the West (passive rather than active, static rather than mobile, emotional rather than rational, chaotic rather than ordered); and the Oriental opposite is, therefore, marked by a series of fundamental absences (of movement, reason, order, meaning, and so on).” Mitchell also notes that colonial mastery of the East will “reinscribe and reinforce these defining features.” Thus, Orientalism becomes self-perpetuating.
Said exposes the self-serving motives in even scholarly representations of an idealized and eternally unchanging “Orient,” and in doing so, stakes out the academic discourse of Postcolonialism that has subsequently informed the humanities and the social sciences, especially literary studies, film studies, philosophy, art history and political science.

A British landscape garden like Stourhead lends itself to insightful probing by the methodology of Orientalism or Postcolonialism. Indeed, Henry Hoare’s Turkish Tent might be seen as a quintessential example of Orientalism’s conjured exoticism—a construct that not only reinforces myths about distant lands but also, in large measure, through habits of collection “colonizes” and perpetuates the myth. The Turkish tent in British gardens might also be seen to reflect a pervasive and long-term public curiosity about the Ottoman Empire, a curiosity that was often, regrettably, satisfied with Orientalist fictions. As a new architectural form in eighteenth-century Britain, the Turkish tent suggests a naive synopsis of Islamic architecture and purportedly related cultural practices. Thus, a revealing approach to Chinoiserie or Turquerie pavilions in Britain or Europe would be to expose, in a Postcolonial critique, how the British Turkish tent makers misapprehended and misappropriated the complexity of Ottoman (or Chinese) culture; i.e., how they got it wrong.

Another approach, also based on the legacy Said’s Orientalist inquiry, might be to note the ways in which, despite the odds, Henry Hoare and others of his generation did get it right, how they distilled Ottoman conventions, motifs and practices from their scant, oftentimes flawed and incomplete source material. While more authentic knowledge about the Ottoman Empire was increasingly available in Britain from the
seventeenth century onward, this dissertation presupposes that any culture fails to fully comprehend another as it studies, emulates or mythologizes it. This investigation of Turkish motifs in English gardens privileges textual, architectural and pictorial emulations, including parodies of it, as primary sources offering insights into Georgian British culture. Even prejudiced, bigoted and/or apologetic accounts of “the Turks” are considered alongside “enlightened” eighteenth-century documentation that scrutinizes Ottoman culture with a sense of awe and genuine admiration, unabashedly privileging the Other over the familiar. Again, Henry Hoare was demonstrably susceptible to, and influenced by, some of the most accurate accounts of Ottoman culture transmitted back to Britain, as well as widespread misunderstandings of that same culture.

In an age of gifted amateurs, Henry Hoare rallied a host of sub-contractors to create one of the most picturesque landscapes in the genre, making Stourhead the most emulated English garden in Europe. Hoare raised the benchmark for future garden makers by including both Turkish and Chinese pavilions in a garden that today is remembered primarily for its Greco-Roman temples and equally classical statuary. Close examination of the Stourhead Turkish Tent, however, demonstrates that the association of ideas implicit in Henry Hoare’s landscape garden cannot be understood without taking the garden’s exotic elements and, specifically, the Turkish Tent, into account.18

While recent scholarship has debated whether a garden is even capable of

---

18 Previous inquiries have, for the most part, examined only Richard Colt Hoare’s simplified and edited garden, not Henry Hoare’s more potent juxtaposition of features.
meaning, the experience of Stourhead demands interpretation from its visitors. As noted above, some historical accounts of Stourhead suggest that the various features of the garden are, in the end, seen as elements of a composite whole. For reasons that have already been alluded to, and that will be further expanded, Stourhead’s Turkish Tent must be considered as part of Henry Hoare’s interplay of thematic elements. It will signify many things: Ottoman military aggression and humiliation, and Orientalist insinuations of stagnant decadence. It will suggest the exotic, as well as the incorporation of the exotic (like tea and carpets) into the essential nature of British culture. In the juxtaposition of the Turkish Tent with classical temples, ancient and modern empires will be comparatively evaluated. In the light of Henry Hoare’s sensibilities, the Turkish Tent will be, like the garden as a whole, an iconographic manifestation of his class, his profession, his prejudices, and his moral convictions.

This dissertation builds upon a magnificent heritage of many earlier scholars who offered variant interpretations as to what Henry Hoare’s Stourhead really means. This study seeks to mitigate the longstanding irrelevance of the Turkish Tent to this collective discourse. The tent’s existence, location, and longevity are facts. What remains is to review the scholarship that elided the tent, to reveal the specific nature of this lost feature, to situate the Tent in Georgian culture, and to demonstrate the prominence – visually and ideologically – of the Turkish Tent to Stourhead as a whole.

Jane Gillette, “Can Gardens Mean?” Landscape Journal 24, 1 (2005): 85-97. To make her case, Gillette has to implausibly argue that a garden is what is left when architecture, sculpture, and inscriptions have been stripped away.
CHAPTER ONE

The Turkish Tent at Stourhead:
Historical Background and Historiography

Henry Hoare inherited the Stourhead estate and its nearly-completed Palladian mansion from his father, a partner at Hoare’s Bank, London. He became himself a partner at the bank upon his father’s death in 1725. Though he did not occupy Stourhead until 1741, he commenced planning and planting an expanded garden for the estate nearly twenty years earlier.¹ Henry Hoare’s classical education culminated in a belated Grand Tour to Italy.² This trip, usually undertaken at age nineteen with a tutor (Hoare was thirty-three and twice married before his departure), habituated his lifelong passion for collecting paintings, statuary, drawings, prints, fine furniture and diversely styled garden buildings. The princely gardens of Italy – especially those adapted to hilly terrain – informed Hoare’s taste in garden making. At Stourhead, he employed terraced plantations, cascades, classical grottos and temples – all reflecting the structure, vistas and ambiance of the famous gardens of Renaissance Italy. Hoare’s sustained interest in

¹ The garden plan was described a decade and a half later in the following way: “On the Brow of this Hill is a Walk of considerable Extent, of the softest mossy Turf, bordered on each Side by stately Firs of Mr. Hoare’s own planting, about 24 years since; these, as well as the Wood behind them, are rather too thick set. This noble broad Walk is terminated by an Obelisk one hundred and twenty Feet in Height . . . . Below this fine Walk, are several irregular Walks of Different Breadths leading into the Valley. These are covered by stately trees, and receive the most heightened Charms by a large piece of Water at the Bottom, on which there is a very pretty boat . . . .” Jonas Hanway, The London Chronicle, 18 June 1757.

² The specifics of Henry Hoare’s youth are elusive. His classical training is evident in the passages from Virgil and Ovid he quoted in his letters as well as in his facility with both French and Latin. Based on the purchases made and customs charges paid between 1737 and 1740, it is clear that he made the Grand Tour during this period. See Henry Hoare’s personal ledgers, Hoare’s Bank, London, and Kenneth Woodbridge, Landscape and Antiquity (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 23.
Turkish culture may also have been bolstered by his time in Venice, the great marketplace for Ottoman goods and Italian artists appropriating Ottoman style and themes. Yet Italy was not the only source for his garden style. Hoare’s subscriptions to books on Ottoman culture, a decade in advance of his personalized Grand Tour, coupled with his eventual construction of an Ottoman-styled pavilion in his garden, frame him as an Orientalist of sorts. He was not the classical Orientalist whose primary concern was linguistic, nor did he qualify as a member of Francis Dashwood’s short-lived Divan Club for Englishmen who had visited the Ottoman empire. Henry Hoare’s Orientalist pursuits were those of an enthusiastic, well-read amateur: he began collecting the best new publications on Ottoman history and culture while still in his twenties, and he eventually constructed a Turkish garden pavilion of the same quality and prominence as his classical stone temples.

After the death of his second wife, Susan, in 1743, Hoare began to create the extensive gardens in the valley adjacent to, but not visible from, the house. In 1744, he built the Temple of Ceres (later designated Flora), the first of many pavilions to lend meaning and interest to the future lake circuit tour. This feature also marked the genesis of his fruitful collaboration with the architect Henry Flitcroft, a protégé of Lord Burlington, and a colleague of the extraordinary garden designer, William Kent. Hoare next constructed a domed grotto across the valley (1748) and a series of chinoiserie

---

1 Francis Dashwood’s Divan Club, functioning for only two years in the 1740s, was instituted to bring together dilettante who had traveled within the Ottoman Empire which then comprised much of the Middle East and Egypt. Rachel J. Finneghan, “The Divan Club, 1744–46” in The Electronic Journal of Oriental Studies, 10 (2007), 9.

4 Richard Boyle, Third Earl of Burlington, (1694–1753), amateur architect of Chiswick House, commissioner and publisher of Vitruvius Britannicus and founder of the Neo-Palladian movement.

5 William Kent (ca.1686-1748), was a painter, draftsman/architect, landscape-, interior-, and furniture-designer, and companion to Lord Burlington on the Grand Tour.
features completed by 1749 – an arching wooden bridge that spanned the future lake called Chinese (because of its steep single arch and because the same design was used for the Chinese Bridge at Kew despite being based on a design by Palladio), a Chinese Alcove, and one or two oriental umbrello seats. At some point between 1754-68, Henry Hoare completed his Turkish Tent, as well as the Pantheon (1754-55) and the Temple of Apollo (1759). None of the non-western elements at Stourhead has survived, but all were prominently placed and highly visible to contemporary garden makers seeking to imitate Henry Hoare’s imaginative, picturesque interplay of classical, gothic, and oriental motifs.

Stourhead is both conventional and innovative. It represents the fruition of an experiment in garden planning that began in the seventeenth century. Charles II admired the symmetrical geometry and topiary of French gardens while in exile, and Hampton Court and other Restoration-era gardens reflected this taste. The ascension of William and Mary brought the Dutch style garden to England. This was the last time a garden style would be set by the monarchy. Dutch-style gardens were formal, enclosed and

---

6 An umbrello seat is a circular bench centered on a pole that supported an umbrella-like roof. Batty Langley uses the term umbrello for a more substantial pavilion.


8 Charles II came by his Frenchified taste naturally. His mother, Henrietta Maria of France, was the sister of Louix XIV, and during Cromwell’s interregnum, the future Charles II spent nearly a decade in France.

9 Andre Le Nôtre (1613-1700) declined when invited by Charles II to work at Hampton Court, but sent his assistant, John Rose (1619-77), to create the mile long canal inspired by Versailles. Thomas Coke (1675-1727) laid out the formal gardens at Melbourn Hall, Derbyshire, from about 1696 and 1706 with some professional assistance from Henry Wise. Between 1686-1707, William Cavendish, the First Duke of Devonshire (1640-1707) made Chatsworth the quintessential Franco-English style garden of topiary hedges amidst free-flowing vegetation. French-style gardens like these were showcased in the engravings of Johannes Kip, *Britannia illustrata or views of several of the royal palaces as also of the principal seats of the nobility and gentry of Great Britain* (London, 1720).

10 This is no small point – it represents the kind of shift of power that limited the Monarchy in other politically important ways. It served to shape a consciousness that ultimately circumvented a French-style revolution.
smaller in scale than French gardens, although they were, fundamentally, a mutation of the French style to meet the conditions of Dutch estates: flat, treeless, and frequently subdivided by canals. The popularity of evergreens like box, holly, and yew created a market for the first large-scale commercial nursery operated by George London and Henry Wise. The demand for such species would only increase in the years that followed.

The “natural” garden, which would become England’s greatest contribution to European aesthetics, developed in literary accounts of country estates before it found its way to practical applications in real gardens. This discourse was spearheaded by intellectuals and aesthetes, the likes of Joseph Addison, who recommended that the garden maker “compose a Picture of the greatest Variety.” Descriptions of the new style suggested sinuous and free design principles. In practice, however, gardeners would continue to use radiating paths and clipped hedges for another twenty years. The real innovations in the new style would be made at country estates where surrounding fields could be optically appropriated by the garden designer. Stephen Switzer observed that,

11 George London (1681 – 1714) was a pupil of John Rose, and went to France twice to see its spectacular garden models. With three partners, he started the Brompton Park nursery in 1681 and was joined by Wise in 1687. They served as royal gardeners to King William and worked on the Great Fountain Garden at Hampton Court as well as the new gardens at Kensington Palace. Their nursery grew to 100 acres, and they designed gardens all over England with London riding from county to county, and Wise tending the business in London.

12 Joseph Addison (1672–1719), a popular writer and minor politician, who, collaborating with Richard Steele, transformed periodical literature in English through his essays in *The Tattler* and *The Spectator*. These broadside papers were published three to six times a week, frequently selling 4000 copies.

13 Joseph Addison, *The Spectator*, No. 477 (6 September 1712). Addison continued: “There is the same Irregularity in my Plantations, which run into as great a Wildness as their Natures will permit.”

14 Alexander Pope’s garden at Twickenham and Lord Burlington’s at Chiswick should be considered transitional gardens possessing both formal French style features and naturalized plantings with undulating paths.
... running thro’ a Corn Field or Pasture Ground [was] as pleasing as the largest Walk in the most magnificent Garden one can think of. ... Such gardens are “much cheaper made, and still cheaper kept. [Here,] the careless and loose Tresses of Nature, that are easily mov’d by the least Breath of Wind, offer more to the Imagination than the most delicate Pyramid, or any of the longest and most elaborately clipped Espalier. ...

The rejection of topiaries and parterres, a remnant of the French influence, was interpreted as a manifestation of British liberty. Other garden theorists like Robert Castell suggested that the new style had parallels in the Orient, which he alluded to in this description of the gardens surrounding Pliny’s Tuscan Villa:

... of the present Manner of Designing in China... whose Beauty consisted in close Imitation of Nature; where, tho’ the Parts are disposed with the greatest Arts, the Irregularity is still preserved; so that their Manner may not improperly be said to be an artful Confusion, where there is no Appearance of that Skill which is made use of, their Rocks, Cascades, and Trees, bearing their natural forms.

The immediate precursor to the mature English Landscape style was a garden style that might be characterized as “nature created artificially,” or nature replicated by artifice. Just before Henry Hoare planted the Fir Walk at Stourhead, John Vanbrugh executed the gardens of Castle Howard (1720s) in such a way that the temples would appear one after another as the visitor meandered asymmetrically through a highly


16 The “political” dimensions of the English Landscape style were a recurrent theme in Horace Walpole’s The Modern Taste in Gardening: “that the reason why [English] taste in [natural] Gardening was never discovered before the beginning of the present Century, is that It was the result of all the happy combinations of an Empire of Freemen, and Empire formed by Trade, not by a military and conquering Spirit, maintained by the valour of independent Property, enjoyed long tranquility after virtuous struggles, & employing its opulence & good sense of the refinements of rational Pleasure.” John Dixon Hunt noted that Walpole’s “deeper agenda was that the ‘English Taste in Gardening’ was a direct result of the growth of English political liberties... This fundamental assumption of a link between the English landscape garden and the British Constitution, which others had implied before him, underlies all of Walpole’s discussion.” See John Dixon Hunt, “Introduction” to Horace Walpole, The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening (New York: Ursus Press, 1982), 43, 8.

17 Robert Castell, The Villas of the Ancients Illustrated (1728), in Hunt and Willis, eds., The Genius of the Place, 189.

18 John Vanbrugh (1664-1726) was an architect and writer. He worked at Castle Howard and designed Blenheim Palace.
controlled, yet seemingly natural terrain punctuated with classical temples. Charles Bridgeman promoted the use of the ha-ha, a sunken fence/trench that allowed for a seamless optical transition between the garden and pasture or field. Horace Walpole (1717-1797) credited William Kent with introducing this innovation into the English Landscape garden.

At that moment appeared Kent, painter enough to taste the charms of landscape, bold and opinionative enough to dare and to dictate, and born with a genius to strike out a great system from the twilight of imperfect essays. He leapt the fence, and saw that all nature was a garden. He felt the delicious contrast of hill and valley changing imperceptibly into each other, tasted the beauty of the gentle swell, or concave scoop, and remarked how loose groves crowned an easy eminence with happy ornament, and while they called in the distant view between their graceful stems, removed and extended the perspective by delusive comparison.

Rousham, the estate of General Cotrell-Dormer in Oxfordshire, offers the best example of Kent’s ability to discern “the genius of the place” or to utilize the site’s existing features to best advantage. An awkward and steep ground, Rousham was transformed by Kent into a series of discrete “pictures” or landscape scenes, interdependent spaces that built upon each other and incorporated views within and external to the garden itself. Kent’s success at transforming the inclined banks of the Cheerwell River at Rousham doubtlessly sparked Henry Hoare’s imagination about

---

19 Wray Wood, a lost feature at Castle Howard, was reputed to have been the first naturalized clearing within a grove, but was probably composed of intersecting straight walks which provided good views of the landscape beyond.

20 Horace Walpole (1717-1797) was the son of Sir Robert Walpole, the first Prime Minister of England. Horace Walpole was an important tastemaker at mid-century, popularizing the gothic revival style at his estate at Strawberry Hill (after 1750) and critiquing the stately homes and gardens of his contemporaries in his *Journal of Visits to Country Seats* (Strawberry Hill Press, 1782). His first recorded visit to Stourhead was in 1762.


22 William Kent began working at Rousham in 1733.
transforming his well-watered valley. It also offered a model as to how aspects of the Italian Renaissance garden could be adapted to English soil.

Henry Hoare’s surviving documents of provide a rich source for information about Stourhead’s creation and use. Descriptions of various stages of Stourhead’s developments were recorded by such illustrious visitors to the site as Horace Walpole and Sir John Parnell (1744-1801). Though no guide to Stourhead was written or published during Henry Hoare’s lifetime, sporadic and intermittent tourist descriptions – comments made by the famous and the anonymous – offer subjective impressions and substantially fill the voids created by the dearth of published commentary. Two maps of Stourhead created during (or just after) the years of Henry Hoare’s activity play an important role in sitting the Turkish Tent amidst other features of the garden. The first, dating to 1779 (Plate 1) by Fredrik Magnus Piper (1746-1824), shows the diverse assortment of features that existed in Henry Hoare’s garden. Piper’s Plan offers important documentation of the features that were subsequently removed even though

---

23 Most of Henry Hoare’s personal papers, including those associated with the design and construction of Stourhead are housed as the Wiltshire Records Office, Trowbridge, File number 383.4.

24 Sir John Parnell, Baronet (1744-1801) was an Irish politician and a self-styled travel diarist. He created drawings of the Painshill tent in his unpublished journal (British Library, GB 0097 COLL MISC 0038). He observed and recorded accounts of many important English country seats between 1768 and 1783. Parnell served as Member of Parliament for Bangor (1761) and Chancellor of Irish Exchequer (1785).

25 The first guide to Stourhead was published in 1800 by Richard Colt Hoare. Colt went on to write six volumes of modern Wiltshire history and many more of ancient Wiltshire history (Stonehenge is just five miles from Stourhead and many other burial mounds and monuments are located on estate lands). Like his grandfather, his wife died very young and he did not remarry. Two thirds of Kenneth Woodbridge’s Landscape and Antiquity: Aspects of English Culture at Stourhead 1718 to 1838 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970) deals with Colt Hoare’s adventures away from Stourhead, as he spent much time in Italy, Malta and Germany. Colt Hoare was a great book collector, but his library (including his grandfather’s books from which we might gain substantial insight) was auctioned in the 1880s. Colt Hoare instituted the Annals of Stourhead estate, from which we know when he tore down the Chinese Bridge and the Turkish tent and made changes to the plantations.

26 Fredrik Magnus Piper (1746-1824) was a Swedish garden designer and architect who worked for the King of Sweden and traveled through much of England recording the new style of gardening. Piper’s map is the most comprehensive account of the features which were part of Henry Hoare’s Stourhead. It shows the location of the Turkish tent, the Chinese Bridge, and the Grotto, as well as the Chinese Alcove and other structures which were torn down by Colt Hoare.
he drafted no detailed elevation of the Stourhead Turkish Tent as he did at Painshill. Piper may have remained at Stourhead for several weeks and had access to Henry Flitcroft’s now-lost renderings of the Grotto and the Pantheon. Piper’s Plan includes an aerial view detailing the precise location and contours of the Turkish Tent.

While the sight lines which Piper traced on his map are not consistently accurate, they do demonstrate the practice of pausing to view each feature anew from strategic positions along the circuit path. Piper captured the shape and relative scale of each structure and paid special attention to the three-dimensional contours of its roof. The Chinese Alcove (marked D) is trapezoidal in shape, an unusual deviation from the ubiquitous ninety-degree angles of Chinese pavilion plans reproduced in the Chinoiserie pattern books of the 1750s. On the other hand, his overhead view of the Turkish Tent is so carefully rendered that the tent stakes are visible. Like Copplestone Warre Bampfylde’s (1719-1791) panoramic drawings of the circuit garden at Stourhead, Piper’s map carefully indicates the location of heavy plantation versus open grassy plains and slopes. Piper’s map also depicts the cascade, including churning white water at its base. Omitted from Piper’s Plan is Stourton Village and St. Peter’s

27 In addition to the Turkish tent, Piper’s Plan included the following no-longer-extant features: the Chinese umbrello seat, the Chinese alcove, the Gothic greenhouse, the Chinese bridge, the Hermitage, an open temple, and the several rock-work passages.

28 Siren believed this based on the quantity of sketches made. Osvald Siren, China and the Gardens of Europe of the Eighteenth Century (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1950), 47. Piper included features of the Pantheon that were executed by 1757, but altered by 1763, long before his arrival. In other words, he illustrated things that were part of Flitcroft’s original design that he could not have observed on his visit to Stourton. In his drawings of the Grotto, he illustrates cut-away views showing substructures that seem to rely on original drawings more than on-sight inspection.

29 An estate map of 1785 (Wiltshire Records Office, Trowbridge, File number 383) offers limited insights into the specifics of the tent, but confirms Piper’s placement and it verifies that the Turkish tent was still in place at the time of Henry Hoare’s death. Very significantly, the tent is here presented in the same manner as any other permanent structure on the estate.

30 Copplestone Warre Bampfylde (1719-1791) was a landscape painter and friend of Henry Hoare. His drawings of Stourhead are held at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, E. 360 – 1949.
Church – the only features that predate Henry Hoare. He also excludes the gardener’s cottage between the Grotto and the Pantheon, which was first designated a feature under Colt Hoare’s ownership. Thus, Piper’s map is a fairly complete inventory of the creations of Henry Hoare’s Stourhead.

Little more had been written on Stourhead between the time that Colt Hoare published his last guide to the house in 1818 until the twentieth century. When Osvald Siren published *China and the Gardens of Europe in the Eighteenth Century* in 1950, it brought together the most comprehensive study on the subject of the English landscape garden, despite the fact that England was not his sole focus. Siren looked at Piper’s map of Stourhead in the Royal Academy, Stockholm, and realized that some of the missing elements might contribute significantly to the tone and temperament of the garden: “In the foreground, near the outlook on the sloping shore of the lake, there were formerly a Turkish Tent and a Chinese parasol, of which Piper has made a special drawing which also shows the Temple of the Sun on the hill to the left.”


32 Osvald Siren, *China and Gardens of Europe of the Eighteen Century* (London: The Ronald Press Company, 1950). The scope of this study was dictated by war-time conditions in which Siren did his research and photography. He would not discuss any gardens he had not visited, and so Germany and Russia – so rich in examples of the exotic taste spawned by Stourhead, Painshill and Kew – were not considered. Siren’s research and his incomparable photography preserved the memory of significant structures that have since been lost, not the least of which is Monville’s Chinese House. He also brought to light the profound contribution of F. M. Piper and other Swedish architects to this genre.

33 Ibid., 48.
Siren discussed the exotic elements of the garden in the order in which Henry Hoare intended them to be seen – as some of the first features encountered on the way to the lake circuit. As Siren moved around the lake, he enhanced his narrative by enumerating various features he knew to have been there originally (such as the Turkish Tent) but were no longer extant. This is a practice that all accounts of Stourhead would need to follow in order to more accurately and authentically engage Hoare’s original conception.

Behind the Temple of Flora the ground rises rather steeply and is now overgrown with rhododendron thickets and larger trees; but according to Piper’s plan there were originally, here too, a number of decorative buildings, namely, the Lodge, an Ionic portico with an arched opening in the middle, and the Chinese Alcove. . .  

Piper made a series of technical drawings of the “Chinese” arched bridge spanning the northernmost arm of the lake. This was reached from the path descending from the Turkish Tent. The bridge has not survived, but its high arch and ornamental railing is captured in great detail on Piper’s drawings. 

Siren perpetuates an anecdotal account of the bridge as having survived until the mid-nineteenth century when it was removed because it became unsafe. In fact, Colt 

---

34 Ibid.

35 Piper measured the span of the bridge at “one hundred feet in length. It was made of oak that had been allowed to dry for two years so that it would not warp or become distorted. . . . The path leading around the bay consequently is now much longer.” Ibid. John Dixon Hunt suggests we should find meaning in the longer route if we would only “think in garden terms” but he, Turner and Olin (whom Hunt invokes) all fail to register that the long path needs no justification as it was not part of Henry Hoare’s design. Colt Hoare was more forthcoming. Even after removing the tent, the Chinese bridge, temporarily providing a ferry boat and then ultimately laying a gravel path around the top of the lake connecting the east side with the Grotto, he continued to insist that the only authentic way to approach the garden was from the path descending from the Fir Walk, the entrance to the circuit formerly marked by the Turkish tent. Richard Colt Hoare, A Description of the House and Gardens at Stourhead. . . (Salisbury: J. Easton, 1800), 45.
Hoare tore down the bridge in May of 1798, an act, which by his own account,\textsuperscript{36} was based on stylistic concerns rather than safety or maintenance. The Chinese association with the bridge offended his classicist and antiquitarian sensibilities. Unlike Colt Hoare, Osvald Siren privileged any potentially Chinese or oriental motif in his reconstruction of Henry Hoare’s garden. In the 1940s, Siren painstakingly reconciled his own experience and description of what remained at Stourhead with Piper’s map of the garden as it stood in the 1770s:

Besides the monuments mentioned so far there are indicated on Piper’s plan a few which no longer exist: the Portico (H), the Orangerie (F), the Lodge (Q), the Chinese Alcove (D), the Tent (B), and the Obelisk (Z), which was of “the same dimensions as that at Porta del Popolo in Rome,” and formed the junction between the two paths in the northwestern periphery of the park. – There was thus no lack of architectural monuments of both classical and exotic character, but they were merged with the landscape in a different way than, for example, at Stowe. Piper certainly has good reasons for his remark that the park at Stowe wanted “much of the simple and rustic appearance and the Romantic and picturesque Character of which one is so delightedly aware in the park at Stourton” – a judgment that may be endorsed even today.\textsuperscript{37}

Piper’s visual record resonated for Siren, who saw the eighteenth-century Stourhead as stylistically eclectic with neither the oriental pavilions nor the classical temples dominating the landscape.\textsuperscript{38} He retraced the emblematic circuit and subsidiary walks at Stourhead with Piper’s \textit{Plan} as his guide, and in the publication of his book, restored currency to Piper’s significant, but largely forgotten, achievements. Siren

\textsuperscript{36} Richard Colt Hoare, The Stourhead Annals (unpaginated), 1798, Wiltshire Record Office, 383.924.

\textsuperscript{37} Siren, 51.

\textsuperscript{38} Siren’s watershed documentation of Stourhead and other English Landscape gardens was a very early work, so it is a forgivable oversight that he did not account for Stourhead’s gothic-style monuments and buildings. He fixated on a binary opposition of east and west, and thus the \textit{western} gothic features may have seemed, to him, homogeneous with those of Greco-roman derivation. It has been difficult for all of Stourhead’s iconographers to manage the full spectrum of Henry Hoare’s emblematic, thematic and stylistic features.
correctly understood the essence of Stourhead as a composite of many styles. Siren knew that Henry Hoare was, among other things, a collector of orientalia and none of Stourhead’s subsequent interpreters have been so intellectually open to the garden’s totality of features. That does not mean that there has been a dearth of excellent scholarship on Stourhead.

The impact of Kenneth Woodbridge’s irreplaceable work on Stourhead is still felt today. The experience of Stourhead is much the richer for almost any visitor because of the documentation of Henry Hoare and Colt Hoare that Woodbridge synthesized. Between 1965 and 1986, Kenneth Woodbridge continued to refine his reading of Stourhead as an allegory of home and heroes – Aeneas, Hercules, and later Alfred. In researching the life and achievements of Henry Hoare, Woodbridge discovered an endlessly more productive paper trail for Richard Colt Hoare, heir to the Stourhead estate. Colt Hoare was a scholar and historian, and his travels and collecting of art and books were even more impressive than his grandfather’s extensive connoisseurship. Colt Hoare’s antiquarian activities proved to be monumental in Woodbridge’s 1970 monograph, Landscape and Antiquity. This work began as a

---

39 Probably because of certain factual errors, and because Osvald Siren sought to emphasize oriental associations, Woodbridge downplayed the contribution of Siren’s China and Gardens of Europe of the Eighteen Century (London: The Ronald Press Company, 1950). It was listed in the bibliography of Kenneth Woodbridge’s Landscape and Antiquity: Aspects of English Culture at Stourhead 1718 to 1838 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), though Siren is never mentioned in the text. When the National Trust published The Stourhead Landscape, Woodbridge excluded Siren from his list of “the more authoritative” works on Stourhead or English gardens in general.

40 Apollo and Diana, the earliest lead statues purchased for the garden, should be added to this list. The Pantheon, originally the Temple of Hercules, featured Rysbrack’s powerful reinterpretation of the Farnese Hercules. Woodbridge connected the River God in the Grotto to a Salvator Rosa etching, The Dream of Aeneas (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) as well as other inscriptions in the garden to Aeneas (Burlington Magazine 116:861, 1974). He reiterated his belief that “sometime between 1744 and 1751 the association was made with the Aeneid.” Prior to this date, “[Henry Hoare’s] original intention was to celebrate the springs of the River Stour below the Temple of Flora and in the Grotto” but after 1762, “a new kind of imagery” was introduced (gothic styles, Christian/British overtones, and Alfred). However, prominent oriental features were either planned or executed in each of his three periods. Even when Woodbridge tries to find a category large enough to cover all his motifs (great heroes) he had to ignore the Turkish tent, the Chinese Bridge, the Chinese Alcove, the Chinese umbrella seats, and any “Asiatic” association Henry Hoare articulated regarding the Cold Bath in the Grotto, because the Oriental did not match his notion of the heroic. It was beyond him that Chinoiserie or Turquerie pavilions might contribute to the garden’s overall meanings.
biography of Henry Hoare, but was soon dominated by the much-better documented life of his grandson. Colt Hoare removed the oriental features at Stourhead, and rerouted the circuit around the lake as they were “ill accorded with the different Grecian buildings.”41 With few exceptions, scholarly accounts of the garden up to this point have found such radical excisions from Henry Hoare’s original plan inconsequential or unworthy of notice. The reasons behind Colt Hoare’s removal of the umbello seats, the Chinese Alcove, the Palladian Chinese Bridge and the Turkish Tent at Stourhead have not been probed since Osvald Siren’s 1950 study. Woodbridge confirms that,

While in general applauding his grandfather’s design, Colt disapproved of ‘nature overcrowded by buildings’, particularly if these were not in harmony with one another. Thus the Gothic greenhouse, Chinese temple, and Turkish tent were removed from the hillside nearest the house, together with the Palladian temple, at the end of the terrace, whose urn and marble busts were transferred to the Temple of Flora. His object, Colt wrote, was to render the design of the gardens as chaste and correct as possible, and to give them the character of an Italian villa.42

Initially Woodbridge did not consider the Turkish Tent as an entity unto itself and avoided discussing its prominent position in the emblematic circuit of the lakefront. Eventually, he revised some of his former assertions regarding the Turkish Tent as noted in the *The Stourhead Landscape*, “a Turkish tent of painted canvas at Stourhead, similar to the one at Painshill . . . stood on a level below the terrace with a view of the lake and the Pantheon.”43 Even though he was more specific about the location of the

41 Richard Colt Hoare, A Description of the House and Gardens at Stourhead..., (Salisbury: J. Easton, 1800), 45.
42 Woodbridge, *Landscape and Antiquity*, 146.
tent, he did not take note that this site placed it at the prescribed entrance to the circuit walk, a point of transition from the baroque Fir Walk to the “modern” garden below, the Turkish Tent being the first architectural feature of a host of lakeside pavilions, as well as the site of the first panoramic view of the circuit garden.

Other historians have fruitfully contemplated the inspired mix of literary themes and concrete forms at Stourhead. Ronald Paulson discussed features of the circuit walk in semiotic terms, and emphasized the importance of Hercules. An emblem of “industry over idleness,” Hercules came to stand between Flora and Ceres in the Pantheon. Max F. Shultz added further nuances to the symbolic nature of the circuit by bringing in well-motivated parallels to religious pilgrimage. Michael Bevington takes up another of Woodbridge’s astute observations – that Hoare’s garden making seems to have some memorial quality to it, particularly in relation to Henry Hoare’s son, Henry III (1730-1752), who died in Italy. Malcolm Kelsell challenges the specifics of Kenneth Woodbridge’s attribution of literary themes at Stourhead, rejects the narrative of Aeneas founding Rome, and asserts greater resonance in passages from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses.*

---

43 Woodbridge, *The Stourhead Landscape*, 31. Woodbridge corrected his previous statement about the Stourhead tent having been potentially moved from Painshill and correctly noted (before any image of the Stourhead tent was known) that the two are related types. In 1970, the Painshill tent would have seemed transportable. The research (and archaeology) demonstrating its material nature was still a quarter century away. Mavis Collier and David Whightson, “The Re-Creation of the Turkish tent at Painshill,” *Garden History: The Journal of the Garden History Society* 21 no. 1 (Summer 1995): 46-59.


of Hercules to Henry Hoare and makes much of a fork in the circuit path immediately after the Pantheon at Stourhead. James Turner offers the best insight to Henry Hoare’s garden development, by explicitly differentiating the garden before the lake from the garden that followed and by acknowledging the import of the site of the Turkish Tent (if not the tent itself) as Hoare’s intended entrance to the garden. John Dixon Hunt’s recent historiographic approach to Stourhead’s various interpreters will be the point of departure for Chapter Three.

The varied and extensive scholarship on Stourhead has been shaped almost exclusively by the surviving buildings that naturally call for classical interpretations. There is good reason to subscribe to a classical interpretation of the garden. Antique inscriptions from the Temple of Flora to the Pantheon suggest links between various structures and figurative statuary. Nevertheless, from the beginning, the heroic Virgilian/Ovidian theme of the garden was not the only narrative written under Henry Hoare’s authorship. Hoare’s plans evolved – he was not hesitant to try different things – and in doing so implemented a spectrum of ideas and fashions in a half century of active garden making. While Colt Hoare did not maintain the diversity of features at his grandfather’s remarkable estate and certainly he had every right to change it, a problem arises, as we have seen, when subsequent scholarship interprets Colt Hoare’s changes as Henry Hoare’s intention. None of the preceding scholars proposing a


thematic program for Stourhead has attempted to factor the exotic features into his interpretation. An understanding of the Turkish Tent’s role in the whole of the circuit would help bridge this gap.

Landscape designer/historian Laurie Olin provides a valuable phenomenological approach to the garden. Yet even his recent highly-praised close reading of Stourhead sometimes confuses the existing garden with Henry Hoare’s original. Olin’s approach to the development and iconography of Stourhead, published at the close of the millennium, crafts a cogent synthesis of previous scholarly interpretations in elegant, thoughtful prose. It is a relatively informal essay — he does not footnote his sources — but with the perspective of time and intellectual distance from the earlier publications, Olin has much to offer. For example, his observation that Hoare “must be seen as one of Burlington’s cultural equals” characterizes Hoare’s achievements much more accurately and to the point than Woodbridge’s emphasis on Hoare’s deference to aristocracy. The latter may have been true (Woodbridge recalled Hoare’s obsequiousness to his son-in-law, Lord Bruce), but pales in significance next to Olin’s reading of the ambition and influence caught up in the creation of Stourhead.

Olin alone touches on the prominence of Diana in the iconography of Stourhead, and the potential significance of other iconic women, including Dido, to Henry Hoare’s thematic associations. Olin offers the most developed and convincing reading of all the statues in the Pantheon, and of the elegiac themes Hoare dispersed throughout the garden in memoriam to recently lost family members. He explores the

layers of meaning that were created by the formal associations between the Temple of Apollo at Stourhead and its dual sources in the Temple of Venus at Baalbek and the Temple of the Sybil at Tivoli. His extrapolations feel true to the Georgian practice of emblematic association and truly supplement earlier accounts that only hinted at such connections and their significance. The sole weakness in Olin’s account is the failure to mention any of the structures no longer surviving at Stourhead and to account for these in his reading of what remains.

In recounting the itinerary of the Stourhead circuit path, Olin names a series of familiar structures in chronological order: the Temple of Ceres (1745), an obelisk (1746-47), the Grotto (1748), the Pantheon (1753-54), the dam creating the lake (1754), the Temple of Apollo (1757), and the stone Palladian bridge (1760). At this point he parenthetically mentions that “a single-arched wooden bridge based on a design of Palladio was added to the upper end of the lake but has since disappeared” and then he moves back to the realm of surviving features with the Convent (n.d.), the underpass grotto (1760-70), the erection of the Bristol Cross (1765), the Hermitage (1771), and Alfred’s Tower (1772). With the exception of the wooden bridge that was based on Palladio but called Chinese by Colt Hoare and several visitors, no mention is made of any of the exotic features including the Turkish Tent.

Olin suggests that in his “Itinerary of Stourhead” he will reveal the way it was created under Henry Hoare’s direction. “By 1744 Henry Hoare had begun to work on the major landscape space that unifies the garden . . . . Steadily for the next twenty-seven years, he continued to plan, build, and adjust the elements within this park to
create a picturesque itinerary rich in allusion and meaning.”52 From the Temple of Ceres (Flora), Olin indicates that “one walks up the valley away from the temples toward a small vale with groves and ponds known at the Baths of Diana”53 but this path represents not Henry Hoare’s “itinerary” through the garden, but a course adjustment necessitated by the demolition of the bridge that spanned the lake. The so-called Baths of Diana, a lily pond at the top of the lake, represent a Victorian era attempt to give meaning to an otherwise iconographically bereft stretch of the greatly expanded circuit path. Hoare’s allegorical circuit omitted the northern extremities of the lake which were included in the outer circuit to Alfred’s Tower. In treating the current state of the garden as if it were the same as the garden Henry Hoare created, Olin follows the model of Woodbridge and virtually every other historian of Stourhead with the exception of Siren and, nominally, Turner, the only author who approached the garden looking for oriental features. It is a misreading of the historical garden to consider only surviving features.

Like his predecessors, Olin embraces the notion that only the classical and gothic elements mattered to Hoare, that they constituted a neat and clean opposition that generated meaning. Looking to Stourton Village from the Pantheon, Olin compellingly observes that for Hoare

“these passages of classical landscape are used to form a proscenium, to frame a vision of England, its religious faith, history, villages, and landscape as if seen

52 Olin, 264.
53 Ibid., 265.
upon a stage. What Hoare and Flitcroft have literally done is to present one age and culture so that it is seen and framed in terms of another.\textsuperscript{54}

but does not account for the permanent oriental features in the garden which dominated the very same view he was describing. Olin probes many features thoroughly, but not the Chinese Alcove, Chinese Umbrello, Palladian Chinese Bridge and Turkish Tent which vex the tidy binary opposition of the classical and the gothic.

With the exception of this blind spot (which, as argued in this dissertation is a monumental blind spot), Olin comprehends much about Stourhead. “From [the Temple of Apollo], standing on its steps like the god whose temple it is supposed to be, high above the world, one can look back and down upon the entire journey made through the grounds, and by inference reflect on the passage through one’s own life. It is a place for contemplation, for recollection, memory, and vision.”\textsuperscript{55} Even though the view does not reveal “the entire journey,” the spirit of this observation rings true to anyone who has stood on those steps and contemplated that composed view (though changes in plantation have substantially altered it since Hoare’s day), and in ways that will become apparent in the chapters that follow, Olin’s admirable retelling of Henry Hoare’s circuit narrative will be enhanced by the insertion (or restoration) of Apollo’s oriental sister, the Turkish Tent on the Mount of Diana.

Finally, John Dixon Hunt, the dean of American garden history, responds to the preceding “readings” of Stourhead asserting that its garden-ness makes it different from a poem (read beginning to end) or a painting (complete, in front of the viewer). Can any

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 270-71.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 271.
interpretation prompted by conceptual “triggers” in the garden account for all the features of the garden? Hunt asserts the idea that Stourhead is a garden to be grasped as a whole is “an undefended claim.” He finds very few of Stourhead’s “critics” are truly holistic in their approach. In this spirit, he suggests, remarkably, “Even perhaps the Turkish and Chinese items might just have had a role to play in Stourhead’s declaration of different cultural alliances . . .” but does not pursue this generous thought. He anticipates this study without suggesting what its conclusions might be, and I welcome his avant garde thinking. I owe much to his incomparable scholarship and to his models of thinking about gardens.

There is no doubt that had the Turkish Tent survived the nineteenth century, the accounts of Stourhead would read very differently today. Henry Hoare decisively situated the Turkish Tent – spatially and conceptually – between the Villa’s formal gardens and the expansive lake circuit; this dissertation will restore some of this pavilion’s prominence and voice, to confront its Turkishness as an essential feature of Henry Hoare’s evolving concept from the lake garden’s nascent stages of development.

---

56 John Dixon Hunt, op. cit.
CHAPTER TWO
Defining Turkish Tents: Stourhead and Beyond

Henry Hoare erected his Turkish Tent upon the Mount of Diana, a grassy, man-made knoll on the east side of the Stourhead lake valley, perhaps as early as the mid-1750s. Its appearance was first recorded by a visitor, Sir John Parnell, in 1768.¹ Colt Hoare razed the tent and removed the mount in 1792, seven years after the death of Henry Hoare. Thus, the tent endured over three decades during the period of the garden’s greatest fame and influence.

The Turkish Tent prepared the visitor to apprehend the consecutive features of Hoare’s allegorical garden. Its position at the entrance to the lake circuit – projecting outward into the valley – allowed the visitor take in a preliminary overview of the garden, a view that is today regrettably cropped by encroaching trees (Plate 2). In Henry Hoare’s era, the occupant of the Turkish Tent would have seen the arching white Chinese bridge to the far right, partitioning off the north branch of the lake. Directly across the lake stood the austere outer walls and rustic portal of the Grotto; more distantly to the left of the Grotto stood the Pantheon’s façade, presiding over the lake. The Hermitage and the Temple of Apollo were seen to the far left and, depending on the foliage, potentially a bit

¹ The Turkish tent is not mentioned in Henry Hoare’s surviving letters until 1776 (as much as two decades after its construction) when he recorded that it had been recently altered and improved. Kenneth Woodbridge offered commentary in “Stourhead in 1768” in Journal of Garden History 2, 1 (1982): 59-70.
of the roof of the Temple of Flora would be visible below. The Turkish Tent additionally provided a conceptual transition between Stourhead’s divergent garden styles as it spatially separated the earlier, axial *allées* surrounding the villa from the more naturalized and meandering lakeside circuit valley below.

After providing an elevated overview of Stourhead’s emblematic garden, the Turkish Tent subsequently functioned as a re-orienting “eyecatcher” – the visitor circumambulating the lake circuit could look back to the Mount of Diana to measure progress. An eighteenth-century engraving of Stourhead’s eastern slopes and Stourton Village (hereafter called the *Beauties of England* print) preserves this view of the tent site, now completely obscured by overgrowth. This early panorama particularly showcases Henry Hoare’s Mount of Diana (Plate 3). The compositional hub of this image is a foliated island centered on the great white plain of the lake. There are two islands in the lake, both of which represent topographic constants for the historian attempting to understand Stourhead’s original landscape. The *Beauties of England*’s foreground staffage stand enthralled by the scene, reinforcing the landscape-painting quality of this vista which Henry called his “charmng Gas[pa]r [Dughet] picture.” The distant shore is mostly forested, almost obscuring the diminutive Temple of Flora at

---

2 The only lakeside features not visible from here were the temple on the terrace, the Gothic Greenhouse and the exotic features (Chinese umbrella and Chinese Alcove) seen on the way to the Turkish tent in some accounts, and Stourton Village which would soon be seen across the lake and at the conclusion of the circuit.

3 This view of the garden dates to about 1765 based on the features included (the Palladian Bridge is there, but not the Turkish Tent). It was cited by Kenneth Woodbridge as belonging to the Devizes Historical Society, Wiltshire. It is actually a book illustration in *A New Display of the Beauties of England; or, A Description of the Most Elegant or Magnificent Public Edifices, Royal Palaces and Other Curiosities, Natural or Artificial, in Different Parts of the Kingdom* (London, 1774), following page 304. The print in the Devizes museum was presumably cut out of a later “revised and enlarged” edition as it is dated “1787” in pencil.

4 In discussions to follow, these islands will help identify the precise location of the Turkish Tent and other features in today’s Stourhead. For clarity of reference, the island nearest the Pantheon will hereafter be called “Island P,” whereas that nearest the Turkish Tent site will be designated “Island T.”
middle-right. The dense foliage is relieved to the far right behind Stourton village and on the lower slopes of the Apollo Temple’s hill (the temple itself is just outside the view). At middle-left, the Mount of Diana is presented as an open and luminous, Mt. Fuji-shaped clearing, a vivid contrast to the boskiness of its surroundings. Its slope is shorn grass; its summit, a level terrace – an earthen plinth upon which to display a structure unlike any that has survived at Stourhead. Halfway below the top, a low fence horizontally bisects the hillside in three swags. This anonymous image is the single most complete picture of this vista at Stourhead during its formative years, and dramatically displays the optical dominance of the Mount of Diana over any other feature. Even St. Peter’s Church, underlined by a stone Palladian bridge of five arches can’t compete in terms of visual impact. This view suggests Henry Hoare calculated to heighten the prominence of the Mount of Diana and its exotic pavilion in proportion to other features of the garden.

While the Beauties of England print reveals much about the central place of the Mount of Diana within Stourhead, the only known elevations of his Turkish Tent itself are depicted on Josiah Wedgwood’s Green Frog porcelain service. One image presents the tent in isolation on the Mount of Diana while the second contextualizes the tent and mount within Stourhead’s eastern panorama, corroborating the tent’s prominence and relative importance revealed by the Beauties of England’s view. The Mount’s nearly-frontal, close-up view (Plate 4, hereafter Green Frog 1) is observed from directly across

---

5 The Wedgwood Green Frog Service was created for Catherine II of Russia. It featured 1244 painted landscape views and famous buildings from Britain, including eight depictions of Stourhead, several of which correspond to C. W. Bamfylde’s drawings of the Stourhead landscape. Regrettably, none of Bamfylde’s surviving panoramas include the Turkish tent itself. Michael Raeburn, The Green Frog Service (London: Cacklegoose Press in association with the State Hermitage, St. Petersburg), 1995.
the narrow upper branch of the lake, not from the * Beauties of England* vantage point at the distant Pantheon. The more rounded Mount of Diana is surmounted by a splendid Turkish Tent with teepee-like contours similar to western images of contemporary Ottoman tents. Its verticality stands in contrast to the more-squat tent at Painshill. The tent’s interior is accessed through a relatively wide opening and an ornamental surround. Above the opening, two faint horizontal bands outline a cornice or valance, marking a transition between the tent’s oval base and conical roof. If the height of the tent’s opening indicates the scale of the rest of the structure, the tent at Stourhead was exceedingly lofty. Its drapes splay in such a way as to appear continuous with the roof and are not shown drawn back in great gathered swags as seen in other renderings of the Painshill or Audley End tents. Although painted in *grisaille*, we know from visitor descriptions that the Stourhead Turkish Tent was painted blue and white. The barely-visible pinnacle is surmounted by at least one crescent moon.

In *Green Frog 1*, the inky foreground shore and the two clumps of shrubbery below the otherwise treeless hill anchor the composition symmetrically (even though the mount is slightly off center). These two tufts of foliage were also reproduced on the * Beauties of England* print and will appear in *Green Frog 2* (Plate 5). The consistency of this and other small details suggests, first, that the painters/engravers of these views were working from a common source, and, more importantly to our task of reconstructing the

---


site of the Turkish Tent, that scenographic accuracy was a priority for each artist. The two islands in the lake, one of which is observed to the right of this composition, will also prove vital to understanding where these features were situated in the eighteenth century.  

The upper part of the mount in *Green Frog* 1 is cordonned off by a row of tiny vertical brush strokes that suggest a picket fence bowing outward in three divisions, duplicating the swags of fencing in the *Beauties of England* print. Two radiating lines reach from the tent opening to highest points of the fence. These contours extend the sweep of the tent draperies down the hill, perhaps suggesting a carpet extending out of the tent. The area between the radiating lines resembles a raked stage that tapers at the back to a forced perspectival recession. Visually, the fence, and especially the orthogonal lines that extend upward from it, reflect the drapery forms of the tent and successfully adjust the overall proportions of the composed prospect. Without them, the Turkish Tent would appear dwarfed atop the constructed mount.

*Green Frog* 2 corroborates the details of the Mount of Diana revealed in the *Beauties of England* and in *Green Frog* 1. It reaffirms that the appearance of Stourhead’s east bank in the twenty-first century is radically different from Henry Hoare’s original landscape, retaining only one diminutive temple (Flora) to the left of the village. Even if the *Green Frog* pictures offer a somewhat ambiguous witness to the tent’s surface details, they provide reliable views of the site amidst known landmarks. Most importantly, the *Green Frog* images, coupled with the *Beauties of England* print, offer invaluable documentation of this now-obsured panorama, dominated by the Mount of Diana and

---

8 A textual account records that there were three islands, but there is no evidence of this on the lakebed nor in other visitor accounts.

the Turkish Tent. The arboreal veil over this site has been botanically and culturally naturalized for two centuries. The density of the foliage has distracted scholarly and popular interpreters of Henry Hoare’s Stourhead from the task of accounting for the early oriental motifs situated upon this significant feature, or within this massive area, of Hoare’s original design. The fallout of this camouflaging of the Mount of Diana is that the modern understanding of the garden circuit is botanically diverse but less architecturally enriched.

The accounts that follow – organized chronologically – reveal that many eighteenth-century visitors approached the lake from the formal gardens near the villa, via the Turkish Tent. This is the pattern practiced by Henry Hoare and as Colt Hoare reaffirmed in his guides to Stourhead’s house and grounds. In the recommended circuit through Hoare’s original garden, the Mount of Diana site was given prominence before and after the tent was erected there. Even Colt Hoare expressed disappointment that visitors often entered the circuit garden through the village rather than via the Fir Walk and the path leading downward at the site of the Turkish Tent. He was following the lead of Henry Hoare who conducted tours on the same route. Even after Colt removed the tent, the Mount of Diana and the wooden Chinese-Palladian bridge, the visitor’s path to the Grotto (the first feature of the circuit he didn’t remove) started at the approximate site of the Turkish Tent. The importance of viewing the features of the garden sequentially is emphasized in Colt Hoare’s second guidebook:

---

9 Richard Colt Hoare, (1800), and (1818).
Those who have studied the views of nature with a minute and judicious eye, are well aware, that much of their beauty and interest depend upon the manner and light in which they are seen; and thus perambulating any extensive demesne, some regular order of progress should be laid down. From a perfect knowledge of the grounds at Stourhead, we are persuaded that such an arrangement is absolutely necessary, a wish equally desirable both to its owner, and to all those who may honor it with a visit.

At a short distance from the Mansion-House, we descend under the shade of a thick grove of tall and august trees, into the gardens, and catch, most unexpectedly, the first view of a spacious vale beneath [i.e., the tent site], embosomed in wood, the uniform tints of which are most happily relieved by a handsome Temple, called the Pantheon; from its resemblance (in miniature) to the one of the same name in Rome. Our walk now leads us on the side of this lake to a passage over it, which in past times was effected by a lofty Chinese bridge, but now by a simple ferry-boat. From hence we are conducted by a well-planned approach, to the Grotto . . . .

From Colt Hoare’s guidebook we learn that a “thick grove of tall and August trees” lined the path down the hill even before the destruction of the mount of Diana. The author goes on to evaluate the features around the lake through the filters of his classical, and especially British, antiquarian interests and concludes with an explicit reminder to view the garden’s culminating vista at the tour’s conclusion, not its commencement.

But before we quit these cheerful [sic] grounds, where art and taste have been so happily combined with nature, we must devote a few minutes to the general view presented to us from the rustic seat above the steps; for so varied and perfect a composition has not appeared before our eyes; it is indeed the very best and most picturesque which the gardens afford, and therefore should be seen the last, and form the finale of this promenade – it frequently however is seen the first whenever company visit the gardens from the Inn; on which account we recommend the starting from the House and not from the Inn.

---

10 Richard Colt Hoare, *A Description of the House and Gardens at Stourhead* (Bath: Barratt and Son, 1818), 22-23.

11 In the earlier edition of the guide, he revealed his priorities by calling the Bristol Cross “the most interesting building which adorns these gardens.” Richard Colt Hoare, *A Description of the House and Gardens at Stourhead* (Salisbury: J. Easton, 1800), 45.

12 Colt Hoare (1818), 27.
It is revealing and relevant that while Colt Hoare neither esteemed nor maintained the Turkish Tent, he continued to recommend its altered site as the preferred entrance to the sequential features of the lake garden. In short, he valued the relative location, but not the iconography, of the Turkish Tent. When the man-made mount was removed in 1798, a variety of trees, boxwood and laurel were planted to cover the scar; later generations would add rhododendrons. As noted earlier, a preliminary view of the Pantheon has been subsequently maintained near the original tent site, and it is from this point that the switch-back path shown on Piper’s map still descends to the lakeside.

No canvas-draped Turkish tent has survived in any English garden, yet five eighteenth-century Turkish tents can be examined by means of architectural plans or pictorial views. These Turkish pavilions are associated with the gardens at Vauxhall, Painshill, Stourhead, West Wycombe and Audley End; other oriental-styled tents were erected in stately gardens only to be removed without leaving a visual record when the mid-century fashion for architectural exotica dwindled.

In order to define the Stourhead Tent, it will be compared to other known Turkish tents in Britain and beyond. As noted, the evidence of the pavilions is sometimes pictorial but more often eyewitness travel accounts. It is crucial to this discussion of Stourhead’s Turkish Tent within the broader field of British Turkish tents, that the known tents be compared feature to feature, not merely tent to tent. As Painshill is the most complete model of this architectural genre (both in terms of its

---

13 The wooden Turkish temple (sometimes called the Turkish Tartar tent) at Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire, is very close in design and scale to the Stourhead tent. It survived into the 20th century in near complete, though dilapidated condition. It was extensively restored in the 1990s by Elaine Brunner who purchased the estate in the 1960s.
eighteenth-century documentation and its accurate recreation in the 1990s) we must return to it frequently.

The eyewitnesses to Henry Hoare’s Turkish Tent reveal much about its character, aspects that compensate for its lack of archaeological record. In 1995, the National Trust commissioned archaeologist Ian Mayes to find the foundations of the medieval manor house that was torn down and replaced by Henry Hoare I and to access the archaeological condition of other sites held by the Trust around Stourton. His report indicated that the Mount of Diana was removed in 1798, six years after the demolition of the tent. Thus, further evidence of the tent’s appearance and material nature must be gleaned from Henry Hoare himself via a single letter in which he alluded to his daughter’s work on the Turkish Tent with parental pride, and from visitors’ descriptions, for there were among Stourhead’s legions of visitors individuals who recorded idiosyncratic impressions that illuminate this rare, exotic garden structure.

The earliest was Sir John Parnell who traveled the south of England in the summer of 1768, and kept a travel journal of his visits to country seats and townships. He recorded the following regarding Stourhead:

On the bank opposite the Attic Temple is a Turkish tent taken from Mr Hamiltions, very elegant but rather inferior to his. Below this tent is a little Gothic greenhouse, and a small temple still nearer the water. [We then], mounting up a visto from the water arrive at the Turkish tent, from whence at one view you take in the great lake with two beautifull islands, the attic temple beyond it, the great knoll of wood, a large piece of water apparently a continuation of the great lake tho’ on the other side of the road.


Parnell’s description of the Stourhead tent appearing “very elegant” and “somewhat inferior” to Painshill might indicate that it was smaller, less sophisticated or decorative, or in a poor state of repair. Such a tent would require periodic replacement of its painted fabric panels. If Parnell approached the Stourhead tent at the end of a replacement cycle, he may have been able to see its tattered elegance through its inferior maintenance. Piper’s plan of Stourhead indicates that it was no smaller than Painshill, and thus not inferior in scale. However, the Stourhead tent depicted on the Wedgwood service was certainly not as lavishly decorated as Mr. Hamilton’s whose Rococo gilded cornice had no equivalent at Stourhead.

By contrast, the interior of the tent at Stourhead was ultimately embellished more than the Painshill pavilion, but this was years after Parnell’s snub. In 1776, the Stourhead tent was decorated with “mosaic” designs (an eighteenth century synonym for Ottoman, or more general, Islamic, designs); contemporary drawings indicate that Painshill was merely whitewashed within. Henry Hoare revels in its interior splendor in a loving letter to his granddaughter, Henrietta (called Harriot), on July 8, 1776. By then, the tent had stood in place for as much as two decades:

your dear Mama promised me a sweet treat of returning & I never saw her better than in this her allmost native air & this place & walks bless her for the

---

and borrowed £6000 from Hoare’s Bank in 1766 to finance his own gardening ambitions. The phrase “taken from Mr. Hamiltons” (meaning Painshill) led Woodbridge to mistakenly conclude that only one tent was shared by the two gardens. The Gothic greenhouse (called the Orangerie by F. M. Piper) has not survived, but it was noted by Horace Walpole on his first visit to Stourhead in 1762. The little temple is the Temple of Flora, which several early visitors missed altogether.

Four years after the re-creation of the Painshill tent in 1993 (using eighteenth century fabric content and paint formulas), its lower drapes were badly damaged by the elements. The maintenance demands of a painted fabric Turkish tent in the eighteenth century would have been considerable.

Henrietta (Harriot) Boyle was the daughter of Charles Boyle, Lord Dungarvan, and Susanna (Sukey) Hoare.
improvements she made whilst here & the inside of the Tent is alterd as she directed, looks sweetly & much admired . . . .\textsuperscript{18}

This is Henry Hoare’s only surviving comment on the Turkish Tent, though it is not his only reference to exoticism, and specifically to oriental themes in the garden.\textsuperscript{19} Little can be gleaned from these sparse allusions about Susannah’s improvements to “this place” (likely the house) as separate from the “walks” in the circuit garden; the most specific activity took place inside the tent, though it was not altered by Susannah herself, but executed by others after her departure according to a plan she may have originated. The specific nature of the redecoration of the interior of the Turkish Tent is clarified by the visit of Mrs. Philip Lybbe Powys. Only a month after Henry Hoare’s letter to Harriot (August 7, 1776), Caroline Powys became one of the admirers of Susanna’s alterations: “The Turkish tent at Mr. Hoares is very pretty; ‘tis of painted canvas, so remains up the whole year; the inside painted blue and white in mosaic.”\textsuperscript{20} While this account is brief, it confirms important facts about the tent after its renovation. It expands upon Hoare’s more vague appreciation the Susanna’s work inside the tent, amplifying that it was painted (or covered in contemporary usage) with blue and white mosaics. And she specified that the exterior of the tent was covered in painted canvas that made the Turkish Tent a permanent, year-round structure.

\textsuperscript{18} Henry Hoare to Henrietta Boyle, July 8, 1776. Wiltshire Records Office, 383.907.

\textsuperscript{19} He also ironically described a plunge in the Grotto’s cold bath as the experience of “Asiatick Luxury.” This was in jest as it was common to designate the hot baths of Rome and the Ottoman Empire as an example of “Asiatick” or “Oriental Luxury.”

\textsuperscript{20} Powys, Op.Cit. Hoare’s renovated Turkish pavilion of 1776 testifies to the sustained resonance of Islamic themes within his emblematic circuit. See Chapter Four.
Mrs. Powys apparently understood the “oil cloth” process that gave canvas a weather-resistant character. The manufacture of oil cloth (sometimes called oil skin) tents became a specialized business at mid-century. English oil cloth also had a corollary in Ottoman tents “observed” at the Topkapi Palace in Constantinople. George Sandys writes of a passageway “made for the time, of waxed linnen,” between the palace and a waterfront pavilion that was made of a comparable fabric. It is clear from Sandys’ narrative that this pavilion over the water was used to frame views in much the same way as the Stourhead Turkish Tent.

The Ottoman fabric Sandys chronicled may or may not have the same appearance as oil skin in England, but it does raise the possibility that oil skin was not only employed to make the pavilions waterproof, but also to suggest an authentically Turkish material. Indeed, a surviving English example of an oil cloth pavilion is the “Chinese” tent of Boughton House (Plate 6). The tent’s interior is richly decorated like Powys’ and Hoare’s descriptions of the Stourhead tent, but unlike the known Turkish tents, it was stored in the winter to protect it from the worst of the elements.

The Boughton House tent (originally at Montagu house, Whitehall, before being moved to the Montagu estate at Boughton House, Northamptonshire) is a seasonal garden

---

21 A few practitioners can be traced: Nathaniel Nicholls of Long Lane, London, is the only oil-cloth maker listed in Kent's Directory and The Universal Pocket Companion in all editions between 1753-1790, but there were surely others. The directories are important historical documents because they offer both professions and addresses of individual tradesmen on an annual basis. Regarding oil cloth tents: The Boughton House tent was stamped “Smith Baber London.” William Smith (56, Snow's fields, Southwark) is listed as an “oil cloth manufacturer, silk manufacturer, umbrella manufacturer and toy making” in Kent's Directory, 1791. Another account suggests the Boughton tent’s origin was “an unnamed firm in Knightsbridge.” Gwyn Headley and Wim Meulenkamp, Follies Grottos and Garden Buildings (Frome: Butler and Tanner Ltd., 1999), 378.

22 George Sandys, Description of the Turkish Empire, 2nd ed. (London: R. Field for W. Barrett bookseller, 1615), 33. Italics mine.

pavilion, not stationary, as was Stourhead, though both were sheathed in “painted canvas.”

F. M. Piper’s Plan of Stourhead (see Plate 1) revealed that the Turkish Tent was a large oval structure with taut drapes stretched outward and fixed by ornamental stakes and corroborates the _Beauties of England_ and the Wedgwood _Green Frog Service_ images. Another valuable plan of Stourhead was created at the death of Henry Hoare in 1785 to itemize real properties and buildings when his estate was settled on Colt Hoare (Plate 7). While not as artfully rendered as Piper’s _Plan_, it offers a careful inventory of features including the Chinese bridge, the Chinese pavilion and the Turkish Tent, corroborating Piper’s plan. It documents the structure beneath the drapery of the Turkish tent, but not the drapes themselves (Plate 8, arrows added by author). This 1785 map, which attempted to give an accurate shape to each of the buildings around the estate, presents a tent that is broad and flat on the front facing the lake and tapering backward into a semicircle. By contrast, the overhead view of the Chinese pavilion in the 1785 map is exactly as seen in Piper’s drawing from six years earlier – a trapezoid with a groin-vaulted, pitched-gable roof.

---

24 Despite Mrs. Powys’s testimony, Patrick Conner speculates that most Turkish tent drapes “were surely intended to spend each winter folded up indoors,” but that is unlikely the case for the Stourhead Tent as it was an important year-round visual feature in the eastern panorama. Patrick Conner, _Oriental Architecture in the West_ (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979), 74-75.

25 The approximate dimension of the Turkish Tent is 26 feet at its widest point. This measurement is based on a scale comparison between F. M. Piper’s rendering of the tent’s footprint and other buildings whose dimensions are known.

26 Note the detailed depiction of the Pantheon’s narthex, the relationship of various houses in Stourton village or on a more mundane level, the outbuildings connected to the mansion house. These details point to Piper’s commitment to measured accuracy in recording a building’s footprint. Piper’s plan was not created until his return to Sweden and was thus unavailable to the creator of the 1785 map.
In Henry Hoare’s day the preliminary view of lake and its diversions were framed by the ornamentation of the tent. Exiting the tent to the right, the visitor follows a switch-back path to the lake which she almost immediately crosses via the wooden “Chinese” bridge. From the far shore, the visitor would look back toward the tent as the focal point of another view (the same depicted in Green Frog 1) with the bright white tent crowning the hill against the hanging wood of the ridge. Still another vantage point, the Pantheon (the same depicted in Green Frog 2), yields additional views of the Mount of Diana. In Henry Hoare’s day, the Turkish Tent was central to the visitor’s experience of multiple vistas within Stourhead.

As noted, Piper left no elevation of Stourhead’s Turkish Tent. Notwithstanding this omission, his plans for gardens after his return to Sweden frequently included prominently placed Turkish tents very similar to the one he depicted in his Plan of Stourhead. Piper thus emulated Henry Hoare’s garden features in some cases, for specific commissions; others he rendered as capriccios. One of the latter, depicting an unidentified hilltop Turkish tent, bears a striking resemblance to the Green Frog view of Stourhead’s Mount of Diana (Plate 9). Piper’s pavilion sits at the summit of an open hillside against a forested background. The hill, not quite as steep in Piper’s version, is likewise framed by deciduous trees. The tent itself is a combination of

---

27 Henry Hoare to Henrietta Boyle (Granddaughter), July 8, 1776. Wiltshire Records Office, Trowbridge, File number 383.4.

28 Piper executed garden designs, including at least four Turkish-style pavilions, at the royal gardens of Drottningholm and Haga. He also rendered plans for other unidentified gardens that included prominent tent structures. Piper’s original drawings are archived at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts, Stockholm. The Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) has complete photo documentation of the Stockholm collection.

29 Capriccios constitute a genre of painting, drawing or printmaking developed in the eighteenth century by Canaletto, Panini and Piranesi, among others. Such works combine real or imagined architecture, sculpture or famous monuments in fantasy landscape or cityscape settings. Piper sometimes created capriccios as garden plans, resembling a bird’s-eye view of an intricately painted landscape.
features from several Turkish tents: a lead roof and “horse-tail” plumes (Painshill), an open front divided by columns and hung with drapery swags (Vauxhall). Ample seating is provided for view-takers. For those looking back from the other side of the lake, the impact of the tent and its podium is visually underscored by the enclosure of a chinoiserie fence. The path swings off to the left and descends from the pavilion to a bridge and a small cascade. Here Piper has conflated Stourhead’s bridge and cascade into one space. (Hoare’s nearby cascade was below the Temple of Flora, located just outside the picture to the right; the Chinese Bridge traversed the lake to the left.) If Piper took artistic license with the bridge’s location (though he only slightly modified the span of its arch and its decorated structural cross bars), he precisely transcribed the position of Island T (foreground right), its compositional prominence within the view, and the density and scale of trees. The jutting boulders flanking the cascade correspond to the two clumps of shrubbery at the base of the Mount of Diana. The essential spatial relationships between all of the other elements as recorded on the Green Frog service offers a compelling reproduction of Stourhead. This drawing was an exercise in creating the ideal location for a Turkish tent within an imagined Swedish garden. Yet in that hypothetical design, Piper could find little to improve in the arrangement of features he first discovered at Stourhead in 1779.

In the twenty years after Piper’s visit when Stourhead’s international reputation was firmly established, additional accounts of the Stourhead landscape were published. In many of these, circumambulation of the garden systematically conducted the visitor to each staged feature of the circuit and the Turkish Tent was mentioned in all of the
subsequent accounts. In each case, the circuit around the lake was accessed by first approaching the tent site. The following description of Stourhead appears in the 1778 edition of Defoe’s *Tour through the Island of Great Britain*:

. . . leaving this walk [the Fir Walk], and descending a short way though the wood, you arrive at a large tent, fixed to the spot, and made in the form of an eastern pavilion. This point commands a view of the lake, the pantheon, hanging wood, the temple of the Sun, &c. which form a scene of the most polished beauty. Descending from hence to the side of the lake, and crossing an arm of it, by a wooden bridge, consisting of one very extensive and lofty arch, from a design of Palladio, you enter the bottom of the hanging wood . . . [which] mark[s] the passage to the grotto . . . .

This account of the experience of the allegorical circuit itemizes the key features. Regarding the Turkish Tent, most visitor accounts, including Defoe’s, attest to the permanent nature of the pavilion, “fixed,” so to speak, to the Mount of Diana. It is this fixedness, its architectural immobility, that affirms that the Stourhead tent was like all other known Turkish tents, an enduring substructure decorated “in the form of an eastern pavilion.” As Defoe (or rather, his surrogate writer) approached the Pantheon, he also recalled the Turkish Tent: “from the [Pantheon] portico whereof you look back, over the lake, to a finely wooded brow, on whose declivity the tent is placed which I have already mentioned.”

Thus, like the Pantheon or the Temple of Apollo, the Turkish Tent was experienced in the garden from various vantage points and in immediate proximity. In the prescribed sequence of the garden circuit, the stone temples of Stourhead were often first anticipated by glimpsing them from a distance,

---

30 Or in the case of the 1795 narrative, the visitor described the “eminence” near the tent’s former location.

31 The novelist Daniel Defoe also wrote travel books, and while he never visited Stourhead, posthumous editions were updated to include new sites like Henry Hoare’s garden. Daniel Defoe, *A Tour Through the Island of Great Britain. Divided into Circuits or Journeys*, vol. 1 (London, 1778), 317.

32 Ibid.
then inspected inside and out, and finally re-appraised from a culminating vantage point looking across the lake from the Apollo Temple, or as Colt Hoare recommended, from Stourton Village. The Turkish Tent was, by contrast, seen first at short range, and then observed again from the top of the Chinese Bridge, the Grotto and the Pantheon in progressively more distant views. In the account that was published the year after Colt Hoare demolished the tent, the author clearly visited the Tent’s site while it was still in place as substantiated by the following comment:

This seat (which is 25 miles from Bath) is not large, yet has an air of grandeur, and is well designed for pleasure and convenience. . . . From the obelisk, through an avenue, you discover a most enchanting prospect of a pavilion [the Turkish Tent], at the foot of which is a fine piece of water, and over it is a bridge formed of one arch wonderfully light, and easy of ascent; leaving the bridge, you enter into a shrubbery, which leads along the confines of the river, and brings you to a most romantick grott. . . .

The established pattern of movement is repeated here again. One enters the garden from the villa, traverses the Fir Walk to the Turkish Tent and then crosses the bridge to the grotto. The author discovers “a most enchanting prospect of a pavilion” which suggests that the encounter with the blue and white tent itself is enchanting, apprehended from above and behind, silhouetted against the panorama of the lake and the rest of the garden. Equally enchanting to the viewer is the panoramic prospect of the lake circuit as seen from the pavilion. In this account, the Turkish Tent is again optically and physically confirmed to be the gateway to the lake garden, the beginning of a narrated encounter with a famous garden. The next anonymous travel writer suggests that both the Tent and the Mount have been removed, but that the visitor still accesses the lake

---

and the circuit path via their former site. The flowering meads can only refer to the Great Oar, a still flowering pasture between the mansion and the Fir Walk.

After passing along a winding road, through flowery meads of variegated appearance, a prospect opens from an eminence, of woods and water, summerhouses and pavilions, in a manner most charmingly diversified and picturesque. . . [The author moves on to observe the Tower of Alfred, statues in the Pantheon, Doric temple, temple of Nymph, river god], . . . Such a variety and assemblage of the productions of nature and art, our limits will not suffer us to do justice to; and we must recommend to the curious stranger to visit them, to form any tolerable idea of this situation.34

The only place one can enter the circuit garden from “an eminence” is the site of the Turkish Tent. Thus, the foregoing accounts collectively reinforce that eighteenth-century visitors to Stourhead entered the lakeside circuit from the formal gardens near the villa, via the Turkish Tent, exactly as Henry Hoare was accustomed to do and as Colt Hoare codified in both editions of his guide to the house and gardens. That is not to say that every visitor in the Georgian era adhered to this practice; deviations occurred naturally because of the predisposition to commence the tour from Stourton Village where visitors lodged.

Richard Pococke,35 who visited Stourhead July 2, 1754 during a transitional moment in the garden’s development, articulated how the lake, then in progress, was intended to be completed: “There are to be three islands in it, with different kinds of buildings in them, one of which is to be a Mosque with a Minaret.”36 Pococke knew

---

34 An Authentic Account of Old and New Sarum, the Cathedral, and Other Public Buildings Together with a Brief Description of Stonehenge (Salisbury, 1795), 58-60.

35 Dr. Richard Pococke (1704-1765) a traveler from Dublin, who became Bishop of Ossory and Meath, published several travel accounts of English country seats.

36 Dr. Richard Pococke, The Travels Through England of Dr. Richard Pococke (London: Camden Society, 1889), 43. George Sandys informed British readers that “No Mosque can have more then one of these turrets, if not built by an Emperor.” George
something of Turkish mosques; he had recently returned from Constantinople and published a two-volume work about his observations in the East. The specificity of Pococke’s knowledge about Stourhead’s unexecuted features demonstrates that Henry Hoare (or a well-informed servant) guided him through the garden. Hoare would have unquestionably taken pleasure in consulting with this well-known Orientalist, since Hoare’s own interest in Turkish culture dates as early as his subscription to The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire in 1734 and again in 1743 when he subscribed to Charles Perry’s View of the Levant. During his visit to Stourhead in 1754, Pococke described in explicit detail all the current developments in the garden. As the Temple of Hercules or Pantheon neared completion, Pococke even outlined its future contents: “[Rysbrack’s] Colossal Statue of Hercules [is] to be placed in the nichi opposite to the entrance; in the other niches are to be statues and pulvinars.” All of Pococke’s predictions regarding the Pantheon were fulfilled except for the island pavilions. Pococke’s projections for Stourhead constitute one of the earliest discussions of a proposed Islamic- or Turkish-themed garden pavilion in Britain. The Oriental

37 The ordinary practice would have been for visitors to pay the gardener or other household servant to conduct them through the estate. This became a substantial source of secondary income at noteworthy sites like Stourhead. For a thorough discussion the economics and practices of Georgian garden tourism, see Ann Bermingham, Landscape and Ideology: The English Rustic Tradition, 1740-1850 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).

38 Demetrius Cantemir, The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire . . . (London: James, John, and Paul Knapton, at the Crown in Ludgate Street, 1734-35), and Charles Perry, A View of the Levant: Particularly of Constantinople, Syria, Egypt and Greece (London: T. Woodward, 1743). See Appendix I regarding Hoare’s subscriber list. It should be noted that no intervening works on Turkey were sold by subscription.

39 Charles Perry (1698-1780) was a doctor who traveled extensively between 1739 and 1742 in France, Italy, and the East, visiting Constantinople, Egypt, Palestine, and Greece. He published several medical volumes but only one travel book.

40 Pococke’s A Description of the East was published the same year as Perry’s work.

41 Pococke, 43.
theme, moreover, is another telling manifestation of Henry Hoare’s early and enduring interest in Ottoman culture. Even though the imagined island mosque quickly evolved into an alternate Islamic-styled Turkish Tent, the innovation of Henry Hoare conceptualizing a mosque as a garden pavilion at this early date is unparalleled. Possible sources for his proposed island mosque must be considered, as well as the motivation to set this feature aside in favor of another Islamic structure – a Turkish tent.

Henry Hoare’s ultimate decision to feature his Turkish pavilion as an elevated tent overlooking the lake, rather than as an island mosque, corresponds to at least one depiction of Constantinople widely available in Henry Hoare’s day (Plate 10). This illustration from George Sandys’ *Description of Constantinople* depicts a hilltop tent overlooking the waters of the Bosporus. This composition emphasizes the foreground tent and diminishes the distant island. Sandys’ illustration corresponds to the vantage point from which the Stourhead Tent would have first been viewed by a visitor descending from the plateau of the Fir Walk. The tent is below, its entrance facing the lake, ornamented all around with tent stakes. It would be difficult to find a landscape (let alone Ottoman) that corresponds more closely to the specific topography of Stourhead than this engraving.

Henry Hoare’s documented ambition to replicate Islamic architectural models commenced very early in his avocation as garden maker. A mosque-as-garden-pavilion was utterly unprecedented in 1754. Hoare’s island-mosque concept was presented to

---

42 Sandys, 30. There is no documentary connection between this book and Henry Hoare, but Sandys is quoted in later works by Mary Wortley Montagu and Gilles, and was a crucial monograph for English readers interested in Ottoman culture.
Pococke before the dam was complete, before the lake was filled and while the Pantheon was yet under construction, more than a decade in advance of the Temple of Apollo, the Bristol Cross, or Alfred’s Tower. The idea of a mosque evolved after Pococke’s early visit into another type of Islamic building; had the mosque been executed in 1754, it would have been seven years in advance of Chambers’s mosque at Kew.

As noted, the disappearance of the exotic features at Stourhead has allowed them to remain theoretically superfluous to the structure and meaning of the garden as a whole. This is the case even though every historian who has interpreted the allegorical features at Stourhead aspires to create a comprehensive program or thoroughgoing meaning for the garden. Pococke’s experience – hearing firsthand of Henry Hoare’s Mosque – constitutes evidence of exoticism at Stourhead that has to be either incorporated or ignored. The fact that a discussion of proposed Islamic-themed features occurred at Stourhead before the islands were constructed demands a more complete inventory and a more inclusive iconology.

---

43 Fredrick, Prince of Wales, contemplated a “Moresque” Alhambra in 1750. Johann Henry Muntz observed the Alhambra, Granada, in 1748. John Harris records that “on April 12, 1750, Muntz promises to publish ‘a Temple for a Garden in the Moresque Stile, of the Author’s Composition, and which is going to be executed at a Nobleman’s Country Seat.’ When the Alhambra was finally built in 1758, Muntz’s design, a creative interpretation of Islamic motifs, was abandoned in favor of a more Rococo-Gothic pavilion by Chambers that now seems comparatively lifeless.” John Harris, “Sir William Chamber and Kew Gardens” in Sir William Chambers Architect to George III (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996), 56-7. The exiled Polish King Stanislas created a Turkish Trêfle and a Kiosk in his gardens at Lunéville in Lorraine. These structures were Rococo summerhouses – intentionally frivolous in tone. Guy Cabourdin, Quand Stanislas régnait en Lorraine (Fayard: Librairie Arthème, 1980), 134-40.

44 Each of these features were famous follies or eye-catchers which at various times received laudatory comments for visitors equal to those recorded about the Turkish Tent. The Bristol Cross, a market cross from its namesake city, was transferred to Stourhead in 1765, the same year that construction began on the Temple of Apollo. Alfred’s Tower was not completed until 1772. Its architect, Henry Flitcroft, died in 1769, three years before its completion.

45 John Harris, Sir William Chambers (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1970), 213. When the Mosque at Kew was constructed, it was the Dowager Princess Caroline’s tribute to her husband’s exotic taste; the Mosque, the House of Confucius and the great Pagoda were erected after Frederick’s death. John Harris notes that Thomas Brand of The Hoo (Hertfordshire) inquired about building a Kew-like mosque in 1764 (p. 211), and that Henry Keene designed a similar mosque which was perhaps intended for Hartwell House (Buckinghamshire) “where one is known to have existed, and where Keene worked” (p. 37, note 23).
Before the lake, the burden on Pococke to understand Stourhead as a composite of disparate allegorical features (some present, some projected) is not unlike that made on the present-day observer of Stourhead: the former was asked to imagine the missing future components, while the latter is required to mentally reconstruct the deleted passages. Twenty-first century interpreters of Stourhead cannot overlook or dismiss a signifier of Islamic culture, or more broadly, Oriental culture, as a part of the field of symbolic associations at Stourhead. Pococke’s early observations at Stourhead placed a conjectural mosque at the very center of the circuit; we can surmise that this centrality and its potential to overpower other features is what prompted Hoare to eventually modify his aggressive plan. All of Henry Hoare’s pavilions eventually clung to the shoreline or were backed farther up the valley walls. Ultimately, Hoare allowed no temples, no matter how subtle or imposing their contours, to occupy the islands of the lake. Pococke’s report establishes that thematically Chinese and Turkish structures informed the cumulative meanings of the allegorical garden as early as 1754; no interpretation of Henry Hoare’s association of ideas within the garden circuit is accurate or complete without taking into account Stourhead’s spectrum of oriental elements.

Having surveyed the spatial and optical prominence of this missing (one might say non-canonical) feature at Stourhead, the remainder of this chapter consists of a discussion regarding related Middle-Eastern styled garden structures. Stourhead’s Turkish Tent had important precursors which merit scrutiny and consideration. One of the most important was the pleasure garden at Vauxhall in London, perceived by a
number of contemporary witnesses to have been the re-creation of a so-called Turkish paradise. Turkish architectural elements and ambiance at Vauxhall established by 1750 the pattern for subsequent Turkish tents in Britain. After Vauxhall, the second-most-famous and -visible Turkish Tent of the era was Richard Hamilton’s at Painshill, Surrey; Hoare’s relationship with Hamilton and his tent was also unquestionably influential on the Turkish Tent at Stourhead. The Turkish Tents at these two seminal sites, the urbane Vauxhall and the bucolic Painshill, contribute rich elements to the fledgling enterprise of Turkish tent making in Britain.

Vauxhall’s tent demonstrates how a Turkish theme can permeate a garden that is not exclusively oriental; contemporary visitors interpreted the garden as overwhelmingly Turkish even through the Turkish elements were juxtaposed with just as many classical, Gothic and pseudo-Chinese motifs. This combination of occidental and oriental pavilions also occurs in many famous gardens on the continent; it will thus be illuminating to a study of the Stourhead Tent to become familiar with contemporaneous Turkish-style garden features in Britain and Europe. Equally informative to Henry Hoare’s Tent and the greater field of English Turkish tents are the Islamic-style pavilions designated as kiosks. These were created for urban and landscape gardens during Henry Hoare’s period of travel and garden-making. Turkish tents and kiosks collectively reflect the cultural currency and vibrancy of a Turkish style in mid-eighteenth-century Britain.

While oriental tents of various sorts were occasionally featured in European gardens in the seventeenth century, they were popularized under the influence of the exotic
tastemaker, Frederick, Prince of Wales. How they crossed the channel is not immediately clear. A number of wooden, permanent structures designed to evoke Turkish style, though not necessarily to resemble tents, were created for gardens in the Netherlands in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{46} The occurrence of this fashion in Holland was coincident with the transmission of other Dutch garden styles to England during the reign of William and Mary. There is, however, no evidence of Turkish tents in the Dutch-style gardens in England between 1689-1702, or at least no buildings so designated. Moreover, no overtly Islamic-styled structures were employed by the most innovative gardeners of the nascent English landscape style – John Vanbrugh, Charles Bridgeman and William Kent.

The first manifestation of a Turkish tent in English gardens occurred at Vauxhall, a seventeenth-century pleasure garden on the south bank of the Thames, which was modified and enhanced by its new proprietor, Jonathan Tyers, after 1728.\textsuperscript{47} Vauxhall’s renovations were premiered on June 7, 1732 with a \textit{ridotto al fresco} attended by four hundred revelers in masquerade dress including the Prince of Wales. The Prince’s taste for exotic architecture (manifested not only in his patronage of Vauxhall but in plans for his own garden at Kew)\textsuperscript{48} contributed to the mid-century popularization of the genre. As the King-in-waiting, Frederick invoked oriental architecture to differentiate


\textsuperscript{47} When Henry Fielding found himself inadequate to describe Vauxhall, words did not fail him in paying tribute to the character and talents of Jonathon Tyers (1702-67): “To delineate the particular Beauties of these Gardens, would, indeed, require as much Pains and as much Paper too, as to rehearse all the good Actions of their Master . . . .” Henry Fielding, \textit{Amelia} (London: Printed for A. Millar, 1752), 300-301.

\textsuperscript{48} The Chinese and Islamic follies at Kew will be considered forthwith. Frederick’s untimely death in 1751 resulted in the Dowager princess executing later features. Two generations later, The Prince Regent (the future George IV) also employed an oriental style to define his protracted court-in-waiting.
his court from the classicism of the reigning monarch. Partnering in an innovative adaptation of a Turkish motif at Vauxhall, the Prince of Wales and Jonathan Tyers formed an early, highly visible model of this new exotic taste. It was likely Tyers’ Orientalist sensibility that ignited the Prince’s passion for chinoiserie ornamentation (and its Turkish variant); it is no coincidence that Turkish tents were created by the sycophants of Princess Augusta, Frederick’s widow.49

For three decades, Tyers augmented Vauxhall’s eclectic mix of oriental and occidental styles of architecture. While the Chinese-styled pavilions were a pastiche of decidedly inauthentic Chinese motifs, two tented features demonstrated specific knowledge of contemporary Ottoman architecture, tile work, and textile designs. The first was a large-scale, open air, Turkish-styled pavilion next to the Orchestra in the center of the Grove, called the Turkish Tent (Plate 1). Additionally, the dome of the indoor Rotunda or Music Room – seventy feet in diameter – was painted like an appliquéd Ottoman tent (Plate 12). The Rotunda’s undulating ribbons and floral swags contained within the radiating divisions of the canopy were not merely Rococo flourishishes, but a transcription of the same embroidery motifs employed in authentic seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Ottoman tents.

Yet another comparison could be made between Vauxhall’s Rotunda and Cornelius Loos’50 drawings of the same ornate, foliate dome decorations in several Ottoman

---

49 The circle of Frederick and Augusta included three documented Turkish tent makers: Jonathan Tyers of Vauxhall, Richard Hamilton of Painshill and George Grenville of Wotton Underwood. John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute, the most trusted confident of the Dowager Princess and the tutor of the future George III, is another likely Turkish tent maker. He participated in the creation of the Alhambra and the Mosque at Kew, thereafter executing parks and formal gardens at his Bedfordshire estate, Luton Hoo. Regrettably, his eighteen-century plantations were stripped away without an inventory of their garden buildings.

50 Cornelius Loos (1686-1738) visited Constantinople in 1710-11 as an artist with the Swedish diplomatic embassy.
kiosks in Constantinople (Plates 13). Loos’ illustrations were the most detailed European depictions of Ottoman interiors until the nineteenth century, yet not known in England. Nonetheless, they illustrate how closely Tyers followed Ottoman precedents from some other source at Vauxhall. The ceiling of the Revan kiosk at the Topkapi Palace (Plate 14) offers a surviving example comparable to Loos 1710 illustrations, patterns derived from embroidered tent architecture. This vocabulary of geometric and iconoclastic ornament permeates Islamic design: Persian carpets and Ottoman manuscripts share the same ornamental motifs as the Revan kiosk dome (Plate 15). For centuries, Ottoman brick-and-mortar architecture invoked Islamic textile and ceramic arts. Jonathan Tyers’ sophistication in replicating a genuine Ottoman style in his Turkish Tent and Rotunda at Vauxhall reflects a remarkably early familiarity with this aesthetic.51

Aspects of both the dome of an eighteenth-century kiosk adorned with radiating medallions and arabesques, and the embroidered drapery swags and foliate garlands of a surviving Ottoman tent can be compared to the ceiling of the Vauxhall Music Room. Such kiosks repeat the soft forms of the Ottoman tent with floral serpentine and scalloped fabric at the roofline.52 Myriad examples of this transference of motifs exist.

51 Archaeologist Nurhan Atasoy describes how architectural models of colonnades, arches, calligraphic inscriptions, and decorative doors or windows were transcribed from brick and mortar architecture to the embroidered decorations of ceremonial tents. Reciprocally, tile, mosaic, wood and stucco surfaces in masonry buildings replicate foliate, geometric and figural patterns from textile and other decorative arts. Nurhan Atasoy, “Tents and their Structural Characteristics,” in Otug-i Humayun: The Ottoman Imperial Tent Complex (Istanbul: Aygaz, 2000), 76-145. No comparable sources were available for Chinese architecture.

52 The tents created contemporaneously record with exuberance the windows and columns of solid architecture. Vauxhall’s Elegant Music Room repeated the patterns and fenestration of specific Ottoman tent wall panels. This spacious room – rigid architecture decorated like a fabric tent – anticipated later British Turkish tents with tent-like drapery applied to a permanent substructure. After noting that the same patterns appeared on tents in the Wawel Castle Collection, Kraków, and in ceramic tile rooms in the Topkapi Palace, Beata Biedronska-Slota asserted that “the tent designer followed the designs of ceramic ornament, probably those produced in the most brilliant period of the factory at Iznik.” Beata Biedronska-Slota, “A Turkish Tent in the Kraków National Museum” in
In the Islamic tradition, the features of solid architecture (like mullioned windows) and foliate motifs of ceramic tiles were duplicated in the embroidery of tent designs. The Rotunda at Vauxhall was an impression of an Ottoman kiosk drawn by a Westerner that embodied more overtly Ottoman motifs and tent-like forms than the designated Turkish Tent at the center of the garden.

Vauxhall’s Turkish Tent was constructed between 1737 and 1744, just after a period of considerable cultural exchange between Western Europe and the Ottoman Porte. The garden’s illuminated nocturnal exoticism reflected contemporary publications detailing the Ottoman Sultan’s festivals near Constantinople. By 1741, the gardens at Vauxhall were described by British observers as a “Turkish Paradise,” a designation that conflated the aforementioned sultanic garden with a western perception of the Muslim heaven, imagined as a garden stocked with all the pleasures and luxuries of the Sultan’s private retreats. In Vauxhall’s earliest days, London’s cosmopolitan

---

53 Atasoy, 88-92.

54 An engraving, called the Vauxhall Fan, depicts the Grove area of Vauxhall without the Turkish tent in 1737, whereas the tent is in place before the perspectival Plan of 1744. It is not immediately clear why Tyers would name his new pavilion a Turkish tent since it is structurally more like an Ottoman kiosk than a tent.

55 The Tulip Era, or Lale, corresponding to the reign of Ahmed III (1703-1730), “was marked by new political and cultural relations with Europe . . . Ottoman ambassadors were sent to Europe on longer missions and they returned with extensive reports on European civilization, life and manners. In no time European manners and tastes became popular among the ruling elite . . . new relations brought many diplomats and merchants to the Ottoman capital and European furniture, costumes and objects were introduced in to the Ottoman markets soon appearing in houses and palaces.” Günsel, “Vannour and Life in Istanbul” in An Eyewitness to the Tulip Era, Jean-Baptiste Vannour (Istanbul: Koçbank, 2003), 41.

56 This designation comes from a poem that praises the improvements at Vauxhall made by Tyers. In describing the seedy nature of the garden’s former clientele, the anonymous poet wrote “Hogarth, with Ease, had hither trac’d his rake.” The Turkish Paradise; or, Vaux-Hall Gardens (London: Printed for T. Cooper, 1741).

57 The British notion of a Turkish Paradise was far more indulgent than their own heaven: “the Turks have a firm belief and Persuasion that their Portion of Pleasure and Beatitude in Paradise (as to the Number and Beauty of Women, &c.) Will be in proportion to highest Rank, Or Sphere, which they had once occupied here.” Perry, 30. The Reverend Purbeck, in explicating the Islamic conception of heaven, claimed that Mohammed promised that the women of Paradise were created “for the use and
pleasures were compared to the Turk’s Paradise: “A young Country Gentleman [on his first visit to London] thinks himself in Elizium, fancying he enjoys more delights then the Turks Paradise affords. . .”\(^{58}\) While divergent styles were employed at Vauxhall, the combined effect was read by some visitors as Turkish or Islamic.\(^{59}\) The infrastructure and entertainments of Vauxhall (where Tyers replicated Turkish forms and practices) reflect reports published in London and Paris of nearly contemporary Ottoman garden practices as in the following account of Vauxhall.

The illuminations began before we arrived, and I must confess, that upon entering the gardens, I found every sense overpaid with more than expected pleasure; the lights everywhere glimmering through the scarcely moving trees; the full-bodied consort bursting on the stillness of the night; the natural consort of birds, in the more retired part of the grove, vying with that which was formed by art; the company gayly dressed looking satisfaction; and the tables spread with various delicacies, all conspired to fill my imagination with the visionary happiness of the Arabian lawgiver, and lifted me into an extacy of admiration. Head of Confusious \([sic]\), cried I to my friend, this is fine! this unites rural beauty with courtly magnificence, if we except the virgins of immortality that hang on every tree, and may be plucked at every desire, I don’t see how this falls short of Mahomet’s Paradise!\(^{60}\)

Sixteen years before Tyers took over the operation of Vauxhall in 1728, Sir Roger (a pseudonym for Joseph Addison)\(^{61}\) visited the gardens and “could not but look upon the satisfaction of Nobler Males.” Rev. Mr. Purbeck, The Present State of The Turkish Empire (London: T. Totteridge, 1740[?]), 202-03.

\(^{58}\) Francis Kirkham, The English Rogue (London: Francis Kirkman, 1680), 150. In the same passage, the author refers to the country gentleman as “this innocent, not having yet scented the city air . . .”

\(^{59}\) “Turk” was often used for “Muslim,” the Turks being to Christian nations the typical Muslim power from circa 1300. "turk, 3a." The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed. 1989, OED Online, Oxford University Press, 6 March 2009 <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00181778>.


\(^{61}\) Joseph Addison (1672-1719) was an English essayist and poet. Sir Roger was his fictional alter ego through which Addison vicariously engaged contemporary society.
place as a kind of Mahometan Paradise.”  

Thereafter, Tyers renovated Vauxhall to enhance its reputation as a Turkish paradise.

French taste in architecture, garden design and entertainments were made fashionable at the Porte by the reports sent by Celebi Mehmed, Ottoman Ambassador to the Court of Louis XV. This embassy was the Ottoman Empire’s first non-military outreach to the west. By recreating the gardens and fêtes of the French nobility, Ahmed and members of the ruling class (the Divan) sought to appear more European. French inspired pageantry (including nighttime illuminations à la Versailles) distracted the Ottoman nobility from the shame of the Ottoman Empire’s ever diminishing international stature. These events were staged at old and new palaces. For example, the Grand Vizier constructed a Rococo-styled summer palace with a tulip garden on the upper reaches of the Golden Horn, that was called Sa’adabt, the Palace of Happiness. It was modeled on the French château of Marly, whose plans had been sent by the Ottoman ambassador in Paris. When the Sultan admired it, the Vizier gifted it to him. This site in Constantinople offered what Mary Wortley Montagu called “all together the most beautiful prospect in the world.”  The palace was surrounded by gardens, wherein Ahmed and Ibrahim Pasha “presided over a continual series of garden fêtes.

---


64 Ahmed III turned to the arts and court ceremonies as the option of military conquest and expansion of empire had been finally quelled by the Ottoman army’s defeat at Vienna in 1683. The Ottoman Empire would continue to contract until the creation of the modern state of Turkey.

65 Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689-1762) was the wife of the Ambassador to the Ottoman Porte and an astute observer of Ottoman culture, particularly concerning the lives of Ottoman women. Her letters were widely circulated during her lifetime and posthumously published as Lord Wharncliffe, ed., *The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* (New York: W. Moy Thomas, 1970).
that climaxed each year with the blossoming of the tulip, celebrated at the time of the first full moon in spring . . . .” The customs practiced at such events doubtlessly prompted Jonathan Tyers to adopt the Turkish garden themes and activities at Vauxhall and to mesh them with one of the most dramatic and beloved traditions at Vauxhall: its illuminations – specifically thousands of tiny lanterns hanging in the trees and strewing the walks. On April 24, 1727, Monsieur d’Andresel, the French ambassador to the Sublime Porte, observed the Tulip festival. The following account indicates how Ahmed III illuminated his garden:

The Grand Vizier and others of the Court have a great taste for flowers, above all for Tulips . . . When the Tulips are in flower and the Grand Vizier wants to show them off to the Grand Seigneur, they take care to fill any spaces with Tulips picked from other gardens and put in bottles. At every fourth flower, candles are set into the ground at the same height as the tulips, and the pathways are decorated with cages of all sorts of birds. All the trellis-work is bordered with flowers in vases, and lit up by a vast number of crystal lamps of various colours. Greenery is brought in from the woods roundabout and used as a backdrop behind the trellises. The colours and reflections of the lights in the mirrors makes a marvelous effect.

This constructed theatricality of the Ottoman garden, supplemented by trellised scrims and controlled lighting, were also essential elements at Vauxhall. To create this effect, Tyers used monumental painted-canvas backdrops with footlights to extend the views of the Vauxhall garden. Tyers also replicated other features of the Ottoman festivals. Ahmed III’s garden illuminations were accompanied by instrumental music played long into the night as long as the tulips were in flower, reported the French Ambassador, who also observed that the annual tulip festival was financed by the

---


67 Translated from the original quoted in Le Père d’Ardene, Traité des tulips (Avignon, 1760) and also in Anna Pavord, The Tulip: The Story of a Flower that Has Made Men Mad (New York and London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1999), 46-47.
Grand Vizier, “who during the whole of the tulip time, lodges and feeds the Grand Seigneur and his suite.”68 The presence of the Prince of Wales’ circle, who sometimes gathered in his private but very visible pavilion at Vauxhall, creates a royal parallel to the “suite” of the Ottoman ruler. One important contrast, however, exists between the English Prince and the Grand Vizier as entertainers: Vauxhall’s nightly entertainments constituted a commercial enterprise. Tyers’ garden had a much longer season and collected admissions from its guests and was thus revenue generating. The Grand Vizier received only political capital for his monumental expense.

An observer of Mahomet IV’s mid-May festival reinforces the notion of spectacle caught up in the Ottoman tulip festivals, but relocates the performances from a palace to a compound of lavish ceremonial tents. On this occasion, the Sultan and the crown prince visited the magnificent tent city erected for the sovereign by the Grand Vizier. Here,

a very stately Throne was erected, with a Canopy of Cloth of Gold, extending under the shady Leaves of two tall Elms, which set off with many Lamps in the Night, represented a very pleasant and glorious Scene . . . . Opposite to the Tents were several Poles fix’d, where hung Lamps of several shapes, by the Light whereof in the Evening were exercised several Tricks of Activity; and Wrestling, Dancing, Comedies, or rather Farces, and the like: and the Night at last concluded with Firworks . . . .69

Night lighting, pyrotechnics and performance augmented that fantastic character of these ceremonial tents. Priority was given to tents as the chosen stage for Ottoman festivals; tents were not inferior substitutes for the palace garden. The tent compound

68 Pavord, 47.

described above provided a lavish, customized infrastructure for ceremony and entertainments, more courtly and dignified than any preexisting setting. Travel accounts of Ottoman tents inhabited by the Grand Vizier (sometimes erected in immediate proximity to palatial urban domiciles) were disseminated to British readers via a range of publications from sensational populist newspapers and pamphlets to scholarly monographs sold to the affluent and educated by prepaid subscriptions. High- and lowbrow narratives revealed to their readers that Ottoman tents were often the more luxurious and prestigious alternative to a brick-and-mortar compound. No palace was an adequate complement to the luxury of these tents.

As attested by contemporary accounts, Tyers played the excellent host to Vauxhall’s socially diverse guests, providing music and spectacle, the combination of which felt Turkish to some. Even though Vauxhall’s association with a sensuous Turkish Paradise was already made in the seventeenth century, Jonathan Tyers “greatly altered and improved” the pleasure garden with the Porte-inspired ambiance of two large-scale Turkish pavilions. The Vauxhall Turkish Tent, was situated next to the Orchestra in the Grove, the center of illuminated performances and impromptu diversions. The Turkish-style Rotunda provided an indoor performance space.

---

70 This letter was published in French and thus did not have the same wide circulation as the foregoing accounts of the siege. These tent complexes blurred the boundary between temporary and permanent structures, a subtle characteristic that may have been understood by the British Turkish tent makers. Atasoy, op. cit., 76-145.

71 Letters written and published by correspondents’ claiming to offer eyewitness descriptions of the 1683 Siege of Vienna are an example of this, and will be discussed in Chapter 3.

72 The Ottoman nation prized ceremonial tents as a manifestation of its nomadic heritage. Masonry domes over mosques and kiosks recalled the tent origins of these fixed, often monumental, structures. However, for seasonal court festivals and royal celebrations, only a tent would suffice. The most completely documented Imperial tent complex is the Sûrnâme of Ahmed III, created and illustrated on the occasion of the circumcision of his three sons. Ahmet Ertug, ed., Surname: An Illustrated Account of Sultan Ahmed III's Festival of 1720 (Bern: Ertug & Kocabiyik, 2000).

73 Wroth, 290. Tyers first leased the former Old Spring Gardens at “Fox-hall” in 1728.
immediately adjacent to the Grove. The author of *The Turkish Paradise* called the
pleasure garden a “Theatre resort” where visitors mingled on the “stage where all who
see the Play perform a Part.” This observation includes patrons from a wide range of
British classes, for anyone who could afford the modest admission could participate in
Vauxhall’s theatricality. It is well documented that servants dressed in their
employer’s cast off finery, or laborers in their own guise, intermingled with their
superiors in this paradisical Turkish garden. Thus, prior to Tyers’ entrepreneurship,
descriptions of Vauxhall (discussed above and in others that follow) indicate that the
notion of a garden-like Turkish paradise was already a cultural commonplace in Britain.
Vauxhall generated reportage accessed by a diverse readership and invited divergent
social classes to participate.

While only a fraction of structures at Vauxhall were styled to be specifically
Turkish, the composite whole of the garden, was read as Turkish. The final stanzas of

*The Turkish Paradise* confirm this:

O could our neighboring Nations see this Sight,
But the Appearance of this happy Night,
Such natural charms, Complexions all the Grain,
Such Modesty, unlike what others feign,
Such Excellence of Shape: how would they bear
Their Olive Beauties daily painted fair?
How would they gaze, and feast their wond’ring Eyes,
And call VAUX-HALL, a TURKISH PARADISE?

---

74 *The Turkish Paradise; or, Vaux-Hall Gardens* (London: Printed for T. Cooper, 1741).


76 *The Turkish Paradise, op cit.*
This poem praises the “natural charms” of Vauxhall – the bosky spaces between the axial promenades of a previous age of gardening. The poet invests Vauxhall with nationalistic pride: Europe and the Ottoman Empire would marvel at its modest excellence and find their painted women don’t compare with the English beauties always present at Vauxhall. Another visitor exclaims, “The whole place is a realization of Elizium.”

Again, the whole of the garden is improbably invoked. The comparison of Vauxhall with the Islamic Paradise is suggested by the painting exhibited on site: *Two Mahometans Gazing in Wonder at the Beauties of the Place.* Tyers’ improvisation on the theme of Turkish luxury, opulence and entertainments was received by some of its public as a garden capable of exceeding the expectations of the Grand Seignor himself. As a thoughtful admirer of orientalia and as an entrepreneur, Tyers enhanced the “Turkish Paradise” he inherited by creating a Turkish tent consistent with the escapist atmosphere of pleasure gardens.

The oriental characteristics of Vauxhall and its specifically Turkish pavilions were widely familiar in Georgian England. In addition to published travel accounts to the Levant, the “Turkish” characterizations of Vauxhall in the popular press provide evidence that mid-eighteenth-century vernacular English usage included the notion of tents as the preferred architectural form in the Ottoman East for certain court rituals and functions. The English novelist and dramatist, Henry Fielding, indicated that there

77 Wroth, 292. Wroth also quotes the poet Farmer Collin, “No paradise is sweeter. Not that they Eden call.”

78 Ibid.

79 Henry Fielding (1707-1754) was known for satirical novels including *Tom Jones.*
was a near universal awareness of Vauxhall gardens among his audience, “The extreme Beauty and Elegance of this Place is well known to almost every one of my Readers; and happy is it for me that it is so; since to give an adequate Idea of it, would exceed my Power of Description.” Vauxhall was frequented by London’s tastemakers and was an anticipated destination for country gentry visiting the capital. In the end, the term “Vauxhall” became a descriptive term for a certain kind of entertainment or locale evoking its namesake.

Furthermore, the Turkish Tent was also brought into cultural prominence by Vauxhall’s promotion of a broader art-viewing culture in England. Vauxhall was a spectacle enhanced by art. The novelty of art on display in such an extraordinary environment attracted ever more spectators since there were no public galleries as such in London at that time. Tyers’s commitment to novel features like paintings in the supper-boxes attracted a diverse viewership – from sophisticated art collectors to pedestrian critics schooled in print shop windows. By perpetually refreshing the gardens Tyers assured their popularity despite increasing competition during the 1740s.

---

80 Tyers couldn’t buy the kind of advertising provided gratis in the most-read literature of the day. Henry Fielding, Amelia (London: Printed for A. Millar, 1752), 300-301.

81 John Evelyn visited in 1661, recording that it was “a pretty contriv’d plantation.” Guy de la Bedoyere, ed., The Diary of John Evelyn (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1995), 121. Vauxhall was promoted in Tom Brown’s Amusements (London, 1700) and by 1726, it was highlighted in A New Guide to London as one of the city’s must-see attractions. After Jonathan Tyers assumed management of the garden in 1728, its crowds grew considerably. It was featured as the setting for romantic novels, but was also an attraction for non-fictional, respectable patrons. Vauxhall was “frequented in the three summer months by most of the nobility then in and near London.” England’s Gazetteer (London, 1751). “Even Bishops have been seen in this Recess without injuring their Character . . . but the place was never exclusive or select, and at no other London resort could the humours of every class of the community be watched with greater interest or amusement.” Wroth, 292.


83 In 1742, when Tyers was unveiling specially commissioned paintings by Frances Hayman and William Hogarth, the paintings of St. Martin’s Lane Academy at the Foundling Hospital were almost a decade away. The public response in 1738 to the installation of Roubillac’s celebrated statue of Handel at Vauxhall, “must have made Tyers aware of the novel, crowd-pulling appeal of works of art displayed in public.” See Allen, op. cit., 116.
and 1750s. Vauxhall possessed a singular mix of features – acres of woodland divided by intersecting allées, dramatic night lighting, sophisticated stagecraft, musical performances, and critically acclaimed sculpture. All of this, plus a ground-breaking exhibition of paintings displayed in a compound of fanciful exotic pavilions contributed to the sense of a grand impromptu “theatrical” in which a remarkably broad cross-section of Georgian society could play roles, from the Prince of Wales to the laborer with one shilling for admission. At Vauxhall – simultaneously stage set, performance and audience – the concept of the English Turkish tent as a garden pavilion was codified: the English Turkish tent was henceforth an immobile architectural support to which fabric drapes were attached. All future Turkish tents would conform to the innovations of the Vauxhall model.

The Vauxhall pavilion was engraved many times and painted by Canaletto (Plate 16). The following description emphasizes its impressive scale as well as the delicacy of its adornments. The Vauxhall Turkish Tent dome was

finely carved and supported by eight columns of the ionic order; the outward case stands on twelve columns of the doric: between these both within and with out, hang very rich festoons of flowers, which have a fine effect. The outside of the dome is variously embellished and surmounted by a plume of feathers. From the center hangs a large glass chandelier, and four lesser ones at each corner. In it are fourteen tables for the accommodation of company.  

In considering Ottoman sources that informed Vauxhall’s Turkish architecture, Charles Perry has much to offer. His description of one of the Topkapi garden kiosks was published during Tyers’ remodeling of Vauxhall. The columns Perry described as supporting a lead roof were analogous to those at the Vauxhall Turkish Tent (and, on a

---

84 A Description of Vauxhall-Gardens (London, 1762), 9-10. Fabric drapery swags are also visible in the depictions of this pavilion.
smaller scale, later Turkish tents). The following is the most detailed description of an
Ottoman kiosk in contemporary travel literature:

This Kiosk is embellished in a very splendid elegant manner; its Roof is covered all over
with Lead, resting upon little Arches, which are sustained by 30 small Pillars: The
Intercolumnations are filled with Sheets of free Canvas, which, when stretched out, may
serve as Umbrella’s . . . between the pillars in each Space rises a Balustrade about Two
Feet from the Ground, upon which was a Sofa of very rich Brocade. . . .

It is easy to see in Tyers’ tent the multiplicity of columns, the stretched out canvas
drapes, and the curvaceous lead roof, even if more conventional English chairs and
tables stood in place of the low brocaded “sophas.” The Turkish Tent at Vauxhall is
related in form and scale to Constantinople’s latticed kiosks that enclosed shaded
fountains for cooling and refreshment. The spacing and number of Vauxhall’s columns
and the ogival dome with an extended soffit and ornamental trim indicate Tyers’
sympathetic understanding of the essential nature of an urban Ottoman kiosk.
Moreover, the individual components (i.e., the lunette dormers and Ionic columns) may
be of European derivation, but their recombination here is stylistically consistent with
Ottoman kiosks of the Tulip period. Loos’ drawings, archived in Stockholm since their
early eighteenth-century creation, were not a source for Tyers, but confirm how
consistent Vauxhall was to western views of comparable Ottoman structures. In the

85 Perry, 24-25. The pillars resemble Vauxhall more than any subsequent Turkish tent, but the free canvas drapes described were
potentially prototypes for the Tents at Painshill and Stourhead.

86 Sophas, the forerunner of the modern sofa, were low, deep upholstered platforms installed around the outside walls of a chamber or
kiosk.

87 Alfred Westholm, Cornelius Loos, and Ulf Cederlöf, Cornelius Loos: Teckningar Från En Expedition Till Främre Orienten 1710-
absence of pictorial models, Charles Perry’s account of an Ottoman kiosk was sufficient for the construction of Tyers’ expansive Turkish pavilion.

Vauxhall remained by far the most visited and visible Turkish Tent in Britain for the rest of the eighteenth century. Because it was significantly larger than all of its country cousins and located in a commercial pleasure garden, it has been relegated to a separate category rather than acknowledged as a singular prototype for the inclusion of Turkish or Islamic pavilions in later landscape gardens.\(^{88}\)

Notwithstanding its segregated status, Tyers’ designation of his exotic kiosk as a Turkish Tent staked out a space for thematic Turkish tents in future gardens. Other garden makers, emboldened by Tyers’ innovation, created Turkish tents as counterpoints to a variety of themes within their gardens. The tents acted as a specialized motif among a few exotic seats in the greater Arcadian, classical, and gothic landscape. This was especially true of the Turkish tents created for country estates, the most important of which is Charles Hamilton’s\(^{90}\) renowned Painshill.

The Turkish Tents at Stourhead, Wotton House, and even Painshill, were all created shortly after Tyers established the motif at Vauxhall. The Painshill Turkish Tent is the earliest of record in a *private* pleasure garden.\(^{90}\) Indeed, it was twice observed prior to

---

\(^{88}\) Garden historian, Michael Symes, observed that, “A supper-box or pavilion in Vauxhall Gardens was decorated as a Turkish tent” as but one of the known Georgian era Turkish tents. Its early date, extraordinary fame and visibility were not noted. Despite the Vauxhall tent’s unique function in contrast to the landscape garden installations, the concept of the Turkish tent in England found its genesis at Vauxhall at least ten years prior to any other comparable pavilion. Geoffrey and Susan Jellicoe, eds., *The Oxford Companion to Gardens* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 570.

\(^{89}\) Charles Hamilton (1704-1786), an influential and frequently consulted garden maker, was the ninth son of James Hamilton, sixth earl of Abercorn. After completing his BA at Christ Church, Oxford, he visited Rome twice (1723 and 1732) where he acquired antiquities. He began gardening at Painshill in Surry in 1737, and from 1738-1747, Hamilton served in the household of Frederick, Prince of Wales. He was forced to sell Painshill in 1773 to repay debts, after which he retired to Bath.
Stourhead’s. John Parnell and Richard Pococke both believed that Painshill – surely the best documented of the Turkish tents – was Stourhead’s precedent; in any event, it was the more sophisticated design. 

The Painshill Turkish Tent, painted blue and white with gilded embellishments, corresponds to an untitled design created by Henry Keene sometime during the 1750’s when he was working on Hagley Park with Sanderson Miller. F. M. Piper’s 1779 drawing of the Painshill tent corroborates virtually every aspect of the Keene design (Plate 17). It is unknown if Keene created the tent specifically for Painshill or if Charles Hamilton merely copied Keene’s pre-existing design. John Parnell sketched this tent in his journal. Even his amateur rendering is equally consistent with the details of both Piper’s and Keene’s depictions. Its realism was achieved by painted drapes attached to the rigid masonry structure, which from a distance looked to be of one piece with the painted lead roof.

---

90 Michael Symes entry for “Turkish tent” in The Oxford Companion to Gardens is telling. The Painshill tent is listed first followed by “there was a similar one at Stourhead, although one visitor, John Parnell, found it inferior to its Painshill cousin.” Geoffrey and Susan Jellicoe, 570.

91 John Parnell observed the Painshill tent in 1763, and again in 1769, yet it is presumed that both Stourhead and Painshill may have had their tents in place in the 1750s. Although the Turkish tent was first observed at Stourhead in 1768, the Stourhead lakefront was fully developed before Parnell’s first visit to Painshill. Both Henry Hoare and Charles Hamilton were gardening in the early 1740s, yet tourist descriptions of their gardens were rare until the 1760s.

92 Painshill’s sophistication actually calls into question the assumption that it was created first. Given the competitive pattern that existed between Henry Hoare and Richard Hamilton, it is unlikely that Henry Hoare would create a less sophisticated Turkish tent than his friend and gardening rival. If, as John Parnell impugned, the Stourhead tent was in any way inferior, that fact could suggest it as preceding the Painshill tent. Any other feature that Hamilton innovated and Henry Hoare emulated was built on a much greater scale at Stourhead. The Gothic tower at Painshill was tripled in size by Alfred’s tower at Stourhead. The cascade at Stourhead was colossal compared to Hamilton’s earlier version. On the other hand, the Grotto at Stourhead was completed before Hamilton began his much grander complex of glistening stalactited chambers. Kenneth Woodbridge noted this pattern of competition between Hamilton and Hoare. See Kenneth Woodbridge, Landscape and Antiquity: Aspects of English Culture at Stourhead 1718 to 1838 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 25-26.

93 Sanderson Miller (1716-1780), a country gentleman with interest in literature, landscape gardening and architecture. His achievements at Hagley made him much sought after for consultation on other projects.

94 Mavis Collier and David Whightson, “The Re-Creation of the Turkish Tent at Painshill,” in Garden History: The Journal of the Garden History Society 21, 1 (Summer 1993): 46-59. Contemporary descriptions note the lead roof. The advantages of masonry interior walls are clear in terms of both space and decoration: a tent with sloping walls has ample floor space but little head space,
The Painshill Turkish Tent is dated shortly before 1760 on the basis of William Woollett’s engraving “View of the Lake to the West Side of the Grotto Island” and depicts a portable tent on the site of the Turkish Tent at Painshill. Alas, Woollett’s image looks neither like Keene’s design nor the finished tent. This discrepancy has led to the conclusion that in 1760, the Turkish Tent was still only a proposal, and not yet executed.\(^9^5\)

The dome of the Painshill Turkish Tent, encrusted with gothic and \textit{rocaille} flourishes, strongly resembles the lines and construction techniques of an actual Ottoman kiosk. By 1750, a Rococo architectural vocabulary was employed just as extensively in new construction in the westernized Sublime \textit{Porte} in Constantinople as in England, suggesting the Painshill ornaments reflect current trends in the Ottoman capital (Plate 18).\(^9^6\) In scale, form and function, the Painshill tent corresponds to the dome of the \textit{Gilded Bower}, also known as the \textit{Iftariye or Sundowner Kiosk}, built by Sultan Ibrahim (1640-48) overlooking old Constantinople and the Golden Horn. This pavilion was the focal point of the fourth courtyard of the Topkapi Palace in a late eighteenth-century image by an unknown Western artist (Plate 19) and remains so today. The \textit{Iftariye} Kiosk (like the Topkapi sea-side pavilions) appeared in Ottoman miniatures (Plate 20) and was well known to European travelers because it was visible whereas vertical walls can be hung with pictures (as were the supper-boxes at Vauxhall) or otherwise ornamented in ways that are more difficult to admire on sloping tent walls.

\(^9^5\) Letter from Michael Symes, London, to Mark Magleby, Provo, May 25, 2000. Mavis Collier interprets the inclusion of an unfamiliar tent as Woollett’s “. . . short cut of repeating almost exactly the same tent as is shown in the painting by William Hannan (1752) of the lake and cascade at West Wycombe Park, Buckinghamshire.” Thus, Woollett’s print provides no compelling evidence of the tent being in place at the time of its engraving. Collier, op. cit., 46-59.

\(^9^6\) The Kiosk on the Terrace overlooking the former Tulip Garden (1704, renovated 1752-53) at the Topkapi Palace is an example of the Turkish Rococo style. Many private houses in Turkey were decorated in this manner. Fanny Davis, \textit{The Palace of Topkapi in Istanbul} (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970), 176-79.
from outside the Seraglio that was off-limits (Plate 21). Ambassadors granted an
audience with the Sultan would witness another kind of kiosk dome related to the
Painshill tent: the baldachin over the Sultan’s divan in the Topkapi throne room. Thus
the Painshill pavilion reflects known Ottoman models as well its Vauxhall precursor.
Most significantly, it pre-defines a position for other Turkish tents in Britain’s
naturalized landscape gardens.

The historical record identifies several Turkish pavilions that have not survived
and about which we know little. They will be considered here briefly. Among them is the
Turkish Tent at Audley End, a seventeenth-century country house in Essex. It was
probably part of Lancelot Brown’s improvements in the 1760s. At Wotton House,
Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire, there was a structure that was marked on the
estate map of 1789 as “The Turkey Building.” It was a six-sided wooden enclosure
topped with a copper roof, “crowned with a large golden crescent giving rise to its
alternative name The Crescent Moon” (Plate 22). This jaunty pavilion bears strong
resemblance to a detail in a widely circulated engraving of the great courtyard
surrounding the Ka’aba at Mecca (Plate 23). In this print, a near-circle of columns

97 Thomas Warren’s map of 1783 offers a very rough sketch of a simple tent and William Tomkins’ (1730-1792, landscape painter
and engraver) View of the Elysium Garden from the North, c. 1788, presents an open-sided, seemingly movable shelter with stripes
of color on its fabric roof. No overtly orientalizing motifs are visible in this painting, however, an undated drawing preserved in the
garden scrapbook at Audley End corresponds, in many aspects, to Painshill, a permanent feature.

98 It probably dates to the period around 1757-58 when payments indicate most of the work in the garden was completed. This
structure represents a logical transition from the large, wooden Vauxhall pavilion to a smaller scale country-estate tent. Andrew
Fiddle to Stowe!” in Follies: The International Magazine for Follies Grottos and Garden Buildings 4, 38 (Autumn 1998). See also
was restored in the 1990s by Elaine Brunner who purchased the estate in 1960.
encloses the *Ka’aba* and connects three modest pavilions, each covered with the same parabolic vaulting of the Wotton House tent.

Wotton’s composite columns were gothic features used by the English architect Batty Langley and by Tyers in the Chinese-Gothic supper-boxes at Vauxhall.

David La Touche II\(^9^9\) built the Turkish Tent at Bellevue House, Delgany, County Wicklow, Ireland, on “the southern extremity of the hill, a pretty seat . . . consisting of drapery and ornaments in the style of an eastern pavilion; it is usually called the Turkish tent, and commands a view of the fertile vale towards Newtown-mount Kennedy. . . .”\(^1^0^0\) While no image of this pavilion survives, its straightforward nomenclature demonstrates that it would have signified in this Irish garden the same way Hoare’s tent did at Stourhead. The Mosque at Kew is a sophisticated example of the English turquerie style (Plate 24). It was designed by William Chambers for Augusta, Dowager Princess of Wales, in 1759 and executed in 1761—ten years after the Prince of Wales’ untimely demise. The Mosque’s importance to its contemporary Turkish tents is signaled by illusionistic murals (Plate 25) which suggested drapery and rendered the solid walls transparent, or more tent like.\(^1^0^1\) Chambers’ source for his

---

\(^9^9\) The La Touche’s were French Huguenots who came to Ireland after the Edict of Nantes. David La Touche II purchased Bellevue (formerly Ballydonough) in 1753. Thus, all the British Turkish-styled garden structures of this era were constructed within the bracket dates for the existence of the Stourhead tent.

\(^1^0^0\) Rev. G. N. Wright, *Tours in Ireland; or Guides to the Lakes of Killarney; County of Wicklow; and the Giants Causeway* (London: Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, 1823), 36.

\(^1^0^1\) Murals depicting naturalistic, upswept draperies lined the rotunda, and the dome was a *trompe l’oeil* open sky. The interior decoration’s function was to give the Mosque as sense of tremendous openness and transparency, not to replicate an Islamic mosque interior, the style of which was well known in Britain via illustrated travel accounts. The wall paintings make the building feel very tent-like, or more specifically, like a kiosk hung with heavy drapery. Thus beyond its designation and external form, the Kew Mosque cited the practice of painted drapes shared by many of the Georgian Turkish tents. Another mosque-like pavilion was created by Samuel Wyatt for the park at Kendleston, Derbyshire in 1767.
Mosque at Kew derived, at least in part, from Fischer von Erlach’s
designs (Plate 26). However, the Austrian architect’s Turkish bath proves to be the more
immediate model for Chambers’ domed rotunda with symmetrical flanking wings
(Plate 27). The Wotton Turkey Building, the Bellevue Turkish Tent, and Chamber’s
Mosque at Kew constitute a range of variants within the United Kingdom’s Turkish or
Islamic garden pavilions in the second half of the eighteenth century. Each shares
essential features of the Vauxhall precedent. Whatever the material nature of the
Stourhead tent, the structurally knowable Turkish pavilions of eighteenth-century
England each consisted of a substructure of timber or masonry, a skin of illusionistic
painting or canvas draperies and in most cases, a lead roof. In terms of its function
within a naturalized (and in some cases, allegorical) landscape garden, each also shares
significant characteristics of the remote or hilltop locations of the Painshill and
Stourhead tents.

Thus far, this chapter has considered the eyewitness accounts of the Stourhead
Turkish Tent, the important precedents of Vauxhall and Painshill, and other
contemporary Turkish tents in Britain. This survey was undertaken to grasp the
character and limits of the sample group, of which the Stourhead Turkish Tent was a

102 Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach (1656 - 1723) was perhaps the most important Austrian architect in the Baroque style. His
architectural treatise gave him pan-European influence.

103 A spectrum of Ottoman/Islamic sites were featured in Fischer’s *A Plan of Civil and Historical Architecture* (London, 1737), a
monumental work created shortly after a trip to England in which he had the opportunity to review “descriptions of journeys in the
East, volumes of which also contained sketches and reconstructions of ruins.” His biographer then observed that Britain offered a
unique body of published works on Oriental travel and customs that had no equivalent in the Saxon, Bourbon or Hapsburg courts
where Fischer von Erlach had previously worked and studied. It was important to both Fischer von Erlach and the Turkish tent
makers of Henry Hoare’s generation that Britain possessed a disproportionate share of documentation regarding Turkish style and
ritual. The Austrians and the Poles had more intimate contact with the Ottomans, and certainly possessed greater artifacts than those
found in Georgian Britain. They did not, however, share the same wealth of observant writers and artists whose works were
disseminated by enterprising publishers.
What remains unclarified is the relationship between the British Turkish tents and the garden features call “umbrellos” or umbrello seats. Like Turkish tents, umbrello seats were conceived of as existing somewhere between permanent and transient structures. Georgian architects and cultural critics applied the terms “tent,” “umbrello” or “kiosk” somewhat idiosyncratically, yet almost exclusively to garden buildings that signified eastern cultures. There was significant flexibility in the English usage of “Turkish tent” or “kiosk.” For example, Jonathan Tyers called his new pavilion a tent when it was obviously modeled on an Ottoman kiosk. There may be meaning in this, for, noted in regards to the Vauxhall Rotunda, Tyers’ Turkish Tent merged the textile canopy and the masonry dome, the ephemeral and the concrete, demonstrating a relatively sophisticated knowledge of the history of the tently heritage of Ottoman architecture.

Portable umbrellas were used in England for their modern purpose: shielding its bearer from inclement conditions or providing shade in fine weather. The variation Umbrello was used to designate a more ceremonial, less mundane, use of the same familiar structure. The umbrello could be a bit larger than an ordinary umbrella, especially if staged as an honorific nimbus of color behind a dignitary. Eighteenth-century British accounts suggested umbrellos were mobile symbols of status in eastern lands: “Twelve stout Indians carried a canopy of yellow and green silk, under which all the royal family walked: the rest had umbrelloes . . . .”¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁴ Eliza Heywood, "Commentary on Umbrelloes Written in 1745" in Female Spectator 3, 18 (1748): 301.
Traditional movable tents and umbrello seats designed for gardens were structurally and functionally quite similar. Both are organized around a vertical pole (or multiple poles in the case of a longitudinal tent) – a central shaft that supports a parasol-shaped roof made from oilcloth (or from more permanent materials like lead sheeting). It also includes a bench, that, in the case of the umbrello seat, wraps around the central pole. The earliest design of this kind of seat is attributed to architect Charles Over and dates to 1758 (Plate 28).\textsuperscript{105} It was called Indian by Over. Umbrello seat were also associated with a chinoiserie style even when a specifically Chinese style was not employed. Piper, for example, labeled his drawing of the umbrello seat at Stourhead “Chinese” although it had no Chinese characteristics.\textsuperscript{106} “Umbrello” almost always connotes some degree of exoticism, but the designation “Chinese” sometimes means nothing more specific than “oriental” or just plain “exotic.”

Freestanding umbrello seats placed at strategic stopping points throughout the garden anticipated the demands of the picturesque circuit at Stourhead and in other gardens throughout the Victorian period.\textsuperscript{107} Of course classical shade pavilions could as easily have been built since there were more models for them in contemporary pattern books. But tent-like umbrellos held inescapable exotic or oriental associations because

\textsuperscript{105} Charles Over, \textit{Ornamental Architecture in the Gothic, Chinese and Modern Taste} (London, 1758). Nothing biographically is known of Charles Over beyond the publication of this book, a volume that was influential on architects such as William Wrighte. Whether any of Over’s designs were ever executed is also unknown.

\textsuperscript{106} Piper also designed or replicated two other garden umbrellos based on his experience in Britain. The wooden umbrello seat eventually evolves into the whimsical models which John Harris calls “a regency obsession.” Its indebtedness to the portable tents that came into fashion half a century earlier is readily apparent.

of the centuries old traditions in Europe that associated baldachins with eastern monarchs and their regalia.108

Batty Langley influenced a burgeoning new style in British architecture – the gothic – with the publication of his pattern book in 1747, a few years before garden umbrellos or tents were popularized.109 Langley’s umbrello designs offer insight into the structure of, and the oriental associations with, English Turkish tents. The gothic decorative vocabulary of Langley’s fanciful designs was easily modified to suit exotic follies like the Turkish tents or the Chinese supper-boxes at Vauxhall. Langley and other architects improvised freely with the gothic style because it was not codified like the classical orders and thus experimentation and mutation were more acceptable to the architectural establishment.110 Langley’s designs were published in the only building manual that applied the gothic style to free-standing garden buildings. His was the only printed source which Jonathan Tyers may have consulted for ornamental gothic applications at Vauxhall. This manual innovatively promoted the gothic style; it also offered a definition of the term umbrello considerably different from those drawn by Over or

108 Concurrent with the popularization of umbrello seats, portable tents like the one pictured at West Wycombe appeared in select gardens. These fabric tents were supported by central poles and further shared with umbrello seats the function of a shady retreat appropriately spaced between other features. The structural distinction between such tents and the Turkish tents is that the latter tended to be supported by outside walls, not a central post. Both kinds of tents were versatile outdoor rooms, particularly conducive to shaded viewing and alfresco dining. If the portable tent was round, its roof was suspended from the central pole, and the circumference of the roof was defined by a rigid, usually wooden, ring from which detachable drapes were hung as required. This circular tent, used since the Middle Ages in both military campaigns as well as in ad hoc festival installations looked superficially like the Turkish tent at Stourhead and perhaps a little less like Painshill, but the structurally documented Turkish tents were consistently created as permanent structures from their inception even as they borrowed associations from both umbrello seats and portable tents.

109 The plates for the pattern book were engraved in 1742. Batty Langley, Gothic Architecture Improved by Rules and Proportions in Many Grand Designs (London, 1747), engravings XLIX-LXII. The Oxford English Dictionary’s first definition of Umbrello (variation of Umbrella) invokes protection against the sun in tropical climates. Secondly, it was defined as a symbol of rank or state in the Orient and Africa. Protection against inclement weather is a secondary.

110 Concurrently, William Kent had experimented with Gothic and Chinese style designs (though seemingly not as a merged single style); however, Kent’s designs remained in his private notebook (or were executed in a individual commissions with a limited audience).
Piper. Via Langley’s solid designs, a tent or umbrello profile could be re-imagined as an enduring, permanent structure, even if it retained the fabric drapes of portable tents. Langley’s is a more architectonic umbrello, very much like an Ottoman kiosk, and really quite similar to the structure of the Painshill and Wotton Turkish Tents. In fact, Langley’s Gothic Temple (Plate 29) is the most important prototype for the Gothic Pavilion at Painshill (Plate 30).

During the height of the English Rococo chinoiserie style at mid-century, there were tent models by William Kent which displayed both classical and exotic characteristics to which Hoare’s architect, Flitcroft, had access. While the so-called Chinese bridge at Stourhead is the best example of the ease with which Palladian superstructures were enriched with exotic decoration, the Turkish Tent was not immune to this kind of stylistic intermingling. William Kent’s drawings of uncommissioned works are nearly impossible to date, as his hand is very consistent from the beginning to the end of his career. The Shell Temple111 (Plate 31), which Kent completed in 1725 for Pope’s garden at Twickenham, was an open pavilion, and in Langley’s terminology, an umbrello for the intersection of walks. It was eight-sided, and its domed roof terminates in a cupola with small, oval clerestory windows. The ridges of the roof are emphasized ornamentally, and perhaps the most remarkable feature of this structure is that its supports bow outward like French cabriole furniture legs and rest on small plinths of stone. To further complicate these columns, they were constructed of alternating blocks which are either contoured to follow the curve of the column, or rectangular, rusticated

111 The Shell Temple was the architectural centerpiece of Pope’s garden, located close to the underground entrance from his house, and thus a transition to the gardens axial views and deviating paths.
forms. The Shell Temple suggests that such whimsical, free-standing garden pavilions were part of Kent’s vocabulary from the earliest moments of his career.

William Kent offers a much more developed vision of his tent architecture in A Design for a Royal Tent (Plate 32). It is not known for what patron, if any, Kent designed this fanciful tent pavilion. Kent’s tent is a significantly more complex enclosure than one supported by a single central post. It is rigidly architectonic, surmounted by a tiered canopy that is more temple- than tent-like. This tent also has a clerestory of elliptical windows and elaborated ridges on the concave portion of the roof. It is presumed to be a Royal tent, because of the central cartouche flanked by the lion and unicorn, the heraldic figures of the British Crown. John Dixon Hunt speculates that this might be the kind of tent set up temporarily for an “ad hoc festival.” The only part of this tent that approximates fabric is the drapes that frame the three openings. The shadow image reveals that this pavilion could have been expanded to include wings extended to the rear.

Perhaps the most compelling aspect of this tent is the subtle splaying of the supports that are anchored on plinths in the same way as Pope’s Shell Temple. Indeed, this tent-like structure is supported by an eight-sided umbrello remarkably like the Shell Temple and is modified only by a slip-cover of drapery and decorative festoons. It seems that Kent is here costuming the Shell Temple (or some preexisting kiosk) as a tent. The tent makers at Painshill and Stourhead would later only nominally refine this practice. Kent’s tent illustrates that it is not irreconcilable for a Palladian architect to create well-

\[112\] Ibid., 158.
proportioned exotic structures. The School of Burlington’s (i.e. architects Campbell, Kent, and Flitcroft) geometry and rigor is abundantly clear in this tent as well as in his masterful chinoiserie pavilions (Plate 33). William Kent’s meditations on chinoiserie and draped pavilions renders this explicit: Hoare’s oriental-styled architecture (Stourhead’s Turkish Tent, Chinese Alcove, and the Chinese Bridge) can be read as an expansion of the scope of a Neo-Palladian architect, not an alternative to it. This argument – that Palladian architects were not immune to the appeal of chinoiserie or Turkish styles – is advanced to flesh out an observation Kenneth Woodbridge and others have made about Stourhead’s so-called Chinese bridge, that it is classically inspired despite its oriental designation.113

Early in this chapter, the Turkish Tent was laid out as but one of several oriental features at Stourhead, the others being a Palladian-Chinese bridge, Chinese Alcove and an exotic umbrello-seat or two. While there has been little scholarly interest in Stourhead’s Turkish Tent, this feature was important to its creator, and was visually prominent. The imposing character of the tent within the greater garden can be demonstrated and reconstructed through depictions painted on Josiah Wedgwood’s Green Frog Service, and the best view of the tent’s site, the Mount of Diana in the larger context of the garden, is illustrated in an intaglio plate from the travel book, The Beauties of England. Additional insight to the specific nature of the Turkish Tent and its relationship to other features at Stourhead can be seen in two site maps (1779 and 1785) that depict the Turkish Tent from above, but also explicate the network of paths.

113 “The wooden bridge, which some called Chinese, was Palladian.” Woodbridge, Landscape and Antiquity, 59.
surrounding it. These sources are important because the garden’s contours and plantations have changed enough to render the Mount of Diana invisible today.

The Stourhead Turkish Tent served as a transitional space from the formal gardens adjacent to the manor house to the naturalized circuit garden surrounding a man-made lake. The tent was the entrance to the emblematic tour of bridges, temples and grottos, but modern tourists do not, as a rule, start at the tent’s location, but rather from Stourton Village – a practice that Henry Hoare and his heir advised against. Visitor descriptions of the tent, including Hoare’s letter to his granddaughter about additions and enhancements made to the Turkish Tent in 1776, reveal the original tent. One visitor observed that it was made of oil cloth like contemporary descriptions of a certain kind of Ottoman garden pavilions. Genuine Ottoman artifacts – manuscripts, porcelain or embroidered tents – were rare but present in England from the seventeenth century onward. Entrepreneurial authors and engravers anticipated public interest in books on Ottoman culture and travel narratives of the Orient, and Hoare subscribed in advance to such publications in 1734 and 1743. Hoare’s interest in Turkish style and culture was manifested both in his library and in his planning for the garden. He reputedly planned a mosque for one of the islands of the lake (never executed) prior to 1754. The mosque evolved into his notion of a hillside Turkish Tent.

This chapter additionally discussed precursors to the Stourhead Turkish Tent, first in Dutch gardens, next at the London pleasure garden, Vauxhall (possessing three separate pavilions with Turkish associations). The nighttime entertainments at Vauxhall – illuminations and musical performances – were shown to parallel the Tulip festivals
in the Ottoman Porte, Constantinople. Vauxhall’s mix of features suggested to some visitors the notion of a Turkish Paradise.

Vauxhall’s owner, Jonathan Tyers, clearly referenced the architectural style of Ottoman kiosks in his Turkish Tent. Tyers was an intimate of Fredrick, Prince of Wales, who was also enthusiastic about oriental styles. Vauxhall’s delights were widely known in England. The Painshill Turkish Tent, illustrated by three different travel diarists, stood in the garden of Henry Hoare friend and rival, Charles Hamilton. Many of Painshill’s features found corollaries at Stourhead. The Mosque at Kew was one of the very few Islamic-styled buildings beyond Turkish tents in English gardens, and suggested that the range of architectural styles at Kew was not unlike that of Stourhead. Finally, we discussed that even though Batty Langley and William Kent are known primarily for, respectively, gothic and Neo-Palladian classicism, both architects imagined exotic pavilions like umbrellos and tents that were structurally related to English Turkish tents. In summary, this second chapter laid out all that could be known about the physical appearance and situation of the Turkish Tent at Stourhead, and discussed all the other contemporaneous garden pavilions that influenced, or reflected, its design and function.

Jonathan Tyers of Vauxhall or Charles Hamilton of Painshill’s Ottoman design sources remains speculative; one can, however, point to many of Henry Hoare’s sources because of the known contents of his library. In the pages that follow, we will examine the proliferation of Ottoman imagery and narrative accounts in British publications that informed Turkish tents in Britain. Old and new representations of Ottoman military and
ceremonial pavilions played a crucial role in transmitting the character and ideas of the Ottoman tent to Western Europe and allowed tent makers from Stourhead to Stockholm to incorporate notions as diverse as military prowess or exotic escapism into their own decidedly Turkish garden pavilions. The plethora of images and text, scholarly or popular, revealing real Ottoman or imagined oriental tents will be surveyed now.
CHAPTER THREE
A Taste for Turquerie:
Ottoman Themes and Turkish Tents in British Popular Culture

This chapter considers the cultural context of British Turkish tents; it identifies the sources that most likely influenced the awareness of Turkish/Ottoman tents in British society, and more specifically, it examines the texts and images in Henry Hoare’s possession which were Ottoman prototypes for Stourhead’s Turkish Tent.

By 1700, British citizens from a range of social classes supposed they knew a great deal about Turkish practice and artistic traditions, perhaps as much as they knew about the Continent itself. The Ottoman Empire was the Orient that geographically pressed against Europe; reciprocal cultural exchange enhanced both European and Ottoman culture.¹ From its perspective of distance, the theatre initially fed the imagination of Englishmen about the Turks and shaped British understanding of Islamic culture. Homegrown dramaturgy that featured filicidal sultans and, more popularly, seafaring Turkish pirates proliferated during the seventeenth century which corresponded to the period of the Ottomans’ greatest threat to Europe. Once the fear of Ottoman expansion was considerably allayed, repelled by the first Siege of Vienna in 1629, playwrights turned their attention to other subjects. Wood-block prints of life in Turkey had

circulated in Europe since the sixteenth century, depicting alleged Turkish atrocities inflicted upon Christians or other adversaries, but this was not the only perspective offered. A series of travel accounts to Constantinople and the Levant also captured the imagination of the British public. First-hand observers like Pieter Coecke van Aelst and later, Jean-Baptiste Vanmour, depicted life at the Ottoman Porte as a magnificent spectacle of pageantry and refined culture, to which Europeans vied for access. The increased availability of imported goods from the Levant, as well as compelling pictures and descriptions of Ottoman culture, including imaginative depictions of lavish tents and kiosks, fed the English interest in Ottoman style and habits. The Turkish garden pavilion was but one of the responses to the public’s piqued curiosity.

On the continent, Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi and his entourage’s spectacular entry into Versailles in 1720 popularized Turkish fashions throughout Europe and revealed the splendors of the Tulip Era’s pageantry. Çelebi presented Louis XV with a bound monograph on Turkish costumes. Subsequently, artists such as Jean-Étienne Liotard and Amédée Van Loo responded to market demand by producing scores of

---

2 See Appendix II: Chronology of Travel Accounts of the East.

3 Jean Baptiste Vanmour (1671-1737), born in Valenciennes, went to Istanbul with the French ambassador Charles de Ferriol in 1699. Charles de Ferriol commissioned Vanmour for 100 paintings of the local people, a series that was published as prints and was to be highly influential on the West's image of the inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire. Vanmour also recorded the French ambassador's presentation of his credentials to Sultan Ahmed III. These audience scenes became Vanmour's speciality: other ambassadors commissioned similar paintings capturing this important moment in their diplomatic career. De Ambassadeur, De Sultan En De Kunstenaar: Op Audiëntie in Istanbul (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2003); Auguste Boppe, Les Peintres Du Bosphore Au XVIIIe Siècle (Paris: ACR, 1989).

4 Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi (died 1732) was the first Ottoman ambassador to France.

5 Jean-Étienne Liotard (1702-1789), a Swiss-French painter who started as a miniaturist in Geneva and earned a reputation for virtuosity that was truly pan-European, including England. A portraitist and a painter of Turqueries, Liotard was extensively patronized in England by the surviving family of Frederick, Prince of Wales.
subjects in Turkish-styled dress. In England, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu popularized Turkish fancy-dress through the celebrated accounts of her experiences in the seraglios of the Ottoman Empire – private, female spaces that no other European had observed. While she was depicted in many Turkish-guise portraits, it was the ongoing private circulation of manuscript copies of her correspondence from Constantinople that gave her such cultural currency in the first half of the eighteenth century. In Jonathan Richardson’s portrait of Montagu (Plate 34, ca. 1725), Lady Mary wears a Turkish costume slightly modified to conform to English masquerade ball fashions of the day as she stands before architecture readily suggesting Constantinople. For Lady Mary and other aristocratic sitters, Turkish costume was worn to signify travel to the Levant as well as expertise in Ottoman culture and, potentially, trade. The Turkish portrait was not an isolated nor idiosyncratic subject in Georgian England; artists as diverse as Andrea Soldi, William Hogarth, Francis Hayman, Adrien Carpentiers, George Romney, Angelica Kauffman, Jean-Etienne Liotard and Joshua Reynolds all painted British subjects in Turkish costume.

6 Charles-Amédée-Philippe van Loo (1719-1795), a French painter, studied under his father, the painter Jean-Baptiste van Loo, in Italy (Turin and Rome) where he won the Prix de Rome in 1738. He joined the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture in 1747. He painted Turqueries that were more fantastic than representative of life in the Ottoman Empire. 
8 Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s letters were circulated within the elite circles of her correspondents and friends from 1717. She elected not to publish the during her lifetime, but in the last year of her life entrusted her manuscript copy of the Embassy Letters to a contact in Amsterdam, from whence purloined and official publications emerged. Mary Wortley Montagu and Robert Halsband, The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).
Turkish costumes were also worn by grooms attending to Arabian horses. John Wootton invoked Turkish exoticism in some equine portraits of famous Arabian sires, the bloodstock of the English Thoroughbred, to indicate their oriental origins. His favorite sitter was perhaps the Bloody Shouldered Arabian, sent to England by Nathaniel Harley, a merchant in Aleppo – the point of departure for virtually all Arabian horses exported to Britain. Wootton established two conventions to signal the horses’ Ottoman heritage: Turkish-clad grooms leading or standing by as attendants to the more-important horses, and a strip of horizontal water to allude to the stallion’s importation from across the Mediterranean Sea. Wootton’s Orientalist iconography was followed by later horse painters like Stubbs as well.

Concurrent with Wootton’s painted grooms, other domestics were required to don oriental or Turkish livery. In an alleged letter-to-the-editor feature in The Tatler, Pompey, a household servant, considered it the ultimate indignity of his young life to have to dress as a Turk:

Sir, I am a Black-moor Boy, and have, by my Lady’s Order, been christened by the Chaplain . . . I desire also to know, whether now I am a Christian, I am obliged to dress like a Turk, and wear a Turbant. I am, SIR, Your most Humble Servant, Pompey.

Steele presented Pompey as an exotic innocent who failed to understand that it had become fashionable to don Turkish habit. Steele’s sometimes collaborator, Joseph

---


11 George Stubbs (1724-1806), was born in Liverpool and is best remembered for his paintings of horses and his conversation pieces. His classification as a sporting painter prevented him from achieving full membership of the Royal Academy. Stubbs visited Rome in 1754, and later published his influential, *The Anatomy of the Horse*.

12 Richard Steele, *The Tatler* (245, Thursday, November 2, 1710), iii, 256.
Addison, also invoked “Eastern Habit” in describing his dream of an allegorical battlefield: “Tyranny was at the head of one of these armies, dressed in an Eastern habit, and grasping in her hand an iron scepter [followed by other menacing figures including] Ignorance with a turbant upon her head . . . .” Derisive characterizations of oriental guise parallel battlefield accounts that will be discussed shortly.

Preserved correspondence reveals individual authors’ perception of Ottoman culture. Horace Walpole, the most prolific correspondent of his day, was less than revealing about Turkish fashion in his voluminous letters. He invoked “turks” or “Turkey” frequently in his letters and publications, mostly humorously or derisively. His comments give relatively little insight into his feelings about Turkish ornament and fashion, but much more revealing was his choice to create a Turkish tent-styled room in his “little gothic castle” of Strawberry Hill at Twickenham. This cheerful blue and white breakfast room offers a ringing endorsement of Turkish fashion as part of a series of thematically diverse rooms in his home.

Walpole chronicled both the career and practice of Jean-Étienne Liotard. Upon his arrival in Paris in 1725, his prodigious talent was recognized by François Lemoyne, who arranged for him to study in Naples with a patron. Liotard went to Rome in 1735

---

13 To add injury to insult, for centuries, a “Black Eunuch” held positions of great authority within the Sultan’s household, so it was perhaps to this role in the Seraglio that Pompey’s mistress (or rather, Steele) alluded with the costume. The association of the office with castration could not have placated Pompey’s reservations.


where he painted portraits of Pope Clement XII and other Vatican luminaries, and his formative trip to Constantinople, in the company of two English patrons, commenced in 1738. Few artists in eighteenth-century Europe experienced Constantinople first hand; Liotard lived there for almost four years while the European mercantile community in Pera and Galata patronized him – as did the Grand Vizier.

It was in the Ottoman capital that Liotard adopted his signature oriental costume and flowing beard, and it was here that he painted the full-length portrait of Richard Pococke with Constantinople and the Bosporus as background (Plate 35). The scale and originality of this painting (by far the largest of his portraits and incorporating an unusually specific landscape) suggest that living in Constantinople was liberating to the artist. It is not clear if this painting was ever exhibited in England, but Richard Pococke, returning to Britain wearing Ottoman habits and fashions, embodied his portrait and thereby broadcast the spirit of Orientalist fashion. Pococke’s experience in Constantinople earned him entry to Francis Dashwood’s short-lived Divan Club, the fraternal organization for alumni of a trip to the Ottoman Empire.17

Three visits to England created significant visibility for Liotard’s style and imagery; he was certainly the most well-known orientalist painter of the century. He was in London briefly in 1744, but left a lasting impression because of his appearance (Ottoman dress and a long beard) as well as the clarity and realism of his imagery. Walpole begrudges Liotard’s high prices and makes note of his Turkish dress.

Liotard is a Genevois; but from having lived at Constantinople, he wears a Turkish habit and a beard down to his girdle: this, and his extravagant prices, which he has raised even beyond what he asked at Paris, will probably get him as much money as he covets, for he is avaricious beyond imagination.

Back in Britain from 1755 to 1757, Liotard painted the family of the late Frederick, Prince of Wales, including Princess Augusta, their nine children, and other commissions. David Garrick, the great Shakespearian actor, was also a patron.

During Liotard’s third and final visit in 1772, Walpole marveled again at Liotard’s marketability “...he brought a collection of pictures of different matters, which he sold by auction.” England was an excellent place for Liotard to exhibit and sell his Turkish pictures, and his reputation was secure from the moment of his first visit.

In the nascent days of England’s Turkish tents, many manifestations of Turquerie were in the air, and in evidence: the authority of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s accounts of Ottoman life (even if they circulated in select circles), Wootton’s Turkish-garbed grooms tending imported Arabian bloodstock from Allepo, Walpole’s tent-draped room at Strawberry Hill, and Liotard’s monumental Orientalist reputation in London, cumulatively demonstrate that Turkish ideas permeated many genres of art and material culture. Turkish style and motifs were part of the cultural consciousness in Britain, and were increasingly donned or inhabited by British subjects.

---


20 It was on this trip that Liotard’s painting *Lady Pouring Hot Chocolate*, currently in the National Gallery, was sold. He also exhibited at the Royal Academy for two years running. Walpole, *Op. Cit.*, 116-117.

Turkishness was something one could put on or occupy, and it was in this Turkey-infused symbolic order that the English Turkish tent began to be erected in select gardens and came to possess complex and competing associations for both their creators and their viewers.

As discussed in Chapter Two, contemporaries perceived Jonathon Tyers’ Vauxhall as a re-creation of a “Turkish Paradise” that corresponded, not so much to an imagined afterlife as to widespread reports of the lavish nocturnal garden entertainments of Mehmed III. Vauxhall invariably demonstrated British awareness of, and fondness for, Turkish style. Indeed, the proliferation of Turkish tents was anticipated by the numerous published accounts of Turkish military, governmental, and religious culture. Turkish tents responded to an evolved British taste for Ottoman architecture, decoration and costume, a taste that was fostered and promoted at Vauxhall, concurrently with the far more lavish manifestation at the trend-setting French court were Louis XV led the revelries and patronage. British appropriations of French fashions like Turquerie might be expected to become more pragmatic and polite in the channel crossing; the functionality of Turkish tents in landscape gardens illustrate this.

Turkish tents in England may be seen as a favorable critique of Ottoman visual arts and in a selective way, Ottoman cultural practice. Published descriptions and images in the 1740s, when Henry Hoare began to plan his garden, reveal that English/Turkish pavilions were associated, first and foremost, with Ottoman military conquest, as well as the “licentious” indulgences of the Sultan and the opulent ceremonies and settings of

his court. Taken as a whole, these sometimes vivid depictions begin to explain the significance that Turkish tents had in Georgian Britain. Each new account contributed to the already-conflicted attitude Britain held for the Ottoman Empire. A Turkish tent was not a clear-cut allegory when inserted into an emblematic garden, nor was it an unfamiliar signifier. The sheer volume of London publications regarding Turkish culture and the Sublime Porte – unparalleled in other languages including French – demonstrates the popularity of Ottoman topics for the British in general, and ultimately, their importance for Henry Hoare as source material.

Ottoman tents actually made the “headlines” of the London popular press in 1683 when, for the second time, the combined armies of Central Europe bested the onslaught of Ottoman aggression outside the walls of Vienna.23 This was the Empire’s most humiliating defeat. Not only were the Turks repelled, but they were forced to retreat so quickly that they abandoned all of their provisions, including reportedly 6,500 tents. Jan Sobieski III, King of Poland, was the universally acknowledged hero of that day and his actions during and after the battle appropriated the Ottoman tent as an emblem of his victory and of the Ottomans’ defeat. The tents were distributed as war booty with the King of Poland deservedly receiving the lion’s share. A few tents from the Siege of Vienna have survived, though certainly not the most lavish examples.24

23 Despite the fact that by the middle of the sixteenth century Europe was no longer in any real danger of the expansion of the Ottoman Empire, skirmishes with the Ottomans continued until the mid-eighteenth century.

News of the siege of Vienna was recounted to a British readership in published letters (sold by booksellers as tracts).\textsuperscript{25} They demonstrate a widespread interest in this distant conflict,\textsuperscript{26} as it would impact British trade interests in a very direct way. These accounts further document Britain’s unusual identification with continental Europe when the conflict is framed in terms of Christian nations versus the primarily-Muslim Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, British war correspondents prioritized inventories of Ottoman tents in general, and the magnificence of the Grand Vizier’s tent in particular, as war spoils. Newspaper stories were short-lived compared to the souvenir tents retained as memorials in Kraków or Vienna that continued to signify the Ottoman defeat, year after year. Lacking such physical evidence, the British memory of Ottoman tents would be substantially revived with the translation and publication of histories and travel accounts of the Polish King. Jan Sobieski III was a pivotal player in romanticizing the Ottoman tent as an object of luxury and a pathetic memento of conquest. In one account, 60,000 tents were captured, two million “Dollars” were found, and the Grand Vizier’s tent was calculated to be worth GBP 40,000.\textsuperscript{27} Another letter finds the Turks equally disgraced, but relays a slightly different list of goods:

\textsuperscript{25} Each letter purports to be a narrative written from a battle-front eyewitness to a personal contact in England, but there is significant near-duplication of text in some cases, indicating that some of the letters were appropriated by entrepreneurial publishers. Five published letters (some variants) on the Siege of Vienna. An account of the Defeat of Count Teckely and of his being Slain. Together with a Total Rout, given to the Turkish Army by the United Forces of the Christian Emperour and the King of Poland. British Library, PB 50-40.

\textsuperscript{26} The demand for these publications is revealed by the number of printers involved in pirated reproductions, as well as in the edition sizes, where known. See Michael Harris, “Scratching the Surface: Engravers, Printsellers and the London Book Trade in the Mid-18th Century” in The Book Trade & Its Customers 1450-1900, eds. Arnold Hunt, Giles Mandelbrote and Alison Shell (New Castle, Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 1997), 95-114.

\textsuperscript{27} A True Copy of a Letter Sent From Vienna, September the 2\textsuperscript{nd} 1683. By an Eminent English Officer Under the Duke of Lorraine, to his Friend in London, Declaring the Raising the Seige and the Total Overthrow of All the Turkish Army (London, 1683).
The Vanguard . . . they retired Fighting, leaving to the Christians all their Camps full of Pavillons, Tents, Barracks, and Eight Pieces of Cannon . . . . The King of Poland having in the mean time with the greatest Vigor repulsed the Enemy on his side and put them to flight, leaving the Plunder of their Camp behind them, which consisted of a very Rich Tent of the Grand Visier, his Colours, Two Poles with the Horse Tails, their usual Signal of War, and his Guidon or Standard, set with Diamonds, his Treasure designed for the Payment of the Army, and in short, all his Equipage was possess'd by the Polanders. As for the rest of the Tents, Baggage, Artillery, Ammunition, and Provisions enough to load Eight thousand Waggons, was divided among our Army. 28

Huge numbers of abandoned tents were mentioned in nearly every English account of the Siege of Vienna, but the richness of the Grand Vizier’s tent became legendary and was often depicted by painters and engravers. From these depictions it was easy to tell the rank of the person occupying the tent based on the number of posted horse-tails (a motif that was sometimes confused by the British with the spray of feathers) represented the rank of the person occupying the tent. In the following passage, the Polish King slept in the Grand Vizier’s bed, claiming Turkish luxury as his own domain. In addition to the description of “richness,” this account is especially pertinent as it reiterates the huge number of tents that were abandoned, and signals a hierarchy among them.

The Right Wing, led on by the King of Poland, had the Glory to face the Quarter of the Prime Visier, and so it was his Fortune that his stately Tent should fall to his share; which for the Richness of it every way, was accounted a great Treasure. He slept in it that night, and entered Vienna next morning, attended with all sorts of Persons, with the greatest Honour and Acclamations, as their Grand Deliverer . . . . To give a general Estimate of the Booty take up on the occasion of this signal Defeat of

28 A True and Exact Relation of the Raising of the Siege of Vienna And the Victory Obtained Over the Ottoman Army, the 12th of September 1683 (London: Samuel Crouch, 1683). The English accounts of the Siege of Vienna (one of the previous accounts mentioned Irish and English mercenaries employed by the armies of the Emperor Leopold) inundate the English press and feed a British public anxious for a detailed account of a battle whose outcome was already known. These accounts provided insights from English observers who would reinforce their sense of being on the right side of this conflict. “We beat them back with great slaughter” aligned English sympathies with “Popish” princes and interpolated the London reader as European Christians more than as subjects of Charles II. Only an enemy of the Ottoman’s magnitude could create such an alliance or allegiance.
the Infidels; there were 6500 Tents, 4500 Barrels of Powder, 6000 weight of Lead, 20000 Grando-shells. . . 29

Jan Sobieski described the tent of the Grand Vizier from within to his wife Marysienka on the night of September 13, 1683:

I was informed by one of his courtiers where his tents were, which are as large as Warsaw or [Lwow] within the walls. I have all his signs which are carried above him; Muhammad’s banner, given to him by his emperor . . . . I have captured tents and all wagons, and mille d’autres galanteries fort jolies et for riches . . . I count one hundred thousand tents because they had several camps. People are still dismantling them already two nights and a day, whoever wishes, also from the city but I doubt if they can do it in a whole week . . . And what delicacies had [the Vizier] in his tents, it is hard to describe. He had a bath, a garden, and fountains, rabbits and cats, even a parrot, but this was flying and we could not catch it. 30

Sobieski stated that the Grand Vizier had left him his heir, “and that he had found several thousands of ducats in his tent, ‘so you won’t say to me,’ continued he, ‘what the Tartarian women say to their husbands: you are no men, since you return without booty.’” 31 These and other passages from Siege reporters point toward the élite culture and environment caught up in the Grand Vizier’s tent, its opulence and luxuriousness. Indeed, the most overstated accounts of the Vizier’s tent seems to have most shaped British expectations about the lavishness of a Turkish tent re-erected on British soil. These imaginative narratives doubtlessly prompted Turkish tent makers, and their guests, to associate such tents with Ottoman aggression and priceless spoils captured by Europeans.

29 Turkey: Compleat History of the Turks, vol. 1 (London, 1719), 145.
30 As quoted by Nurhan Atasoy, “Tents and their Structural Characteristics,” in Otag-i Humayun: The Ottoman Imperial Tent Complex (Istanbul: Aygaz, 2000), 240-41. This letter was published in French and thus did not have the same wide circulation as the foregoing accounts of the siege.
31 A. Hawkins, Esq., The History of the Turkish or Ottoman Empire, From its Foundation in 1300 to the Peace of Belgrade in 1740, vol. 4 (Exeter: R. Thorn, 1787), 321.
London never felt any real peril from the Ottoman army but relished observing the siege of Vienna from a safe distance. Although Henry Hoare was born twenty-two years after the Siege, and the last passage was published when Henry Hoare was a teenager, the Ottoman audacity that led to that day, and the Ottoman humiliation that resulted, were kept alive in British popular culture during Hoare’s formative years. The Siege of Vienna reports informed Hoare’s generation and, coupled with the fashionable French Turquerie style, fired the imagination of artists in Britain and in Europe for the next fifty years.

Among the numerous paintings depicting the siege, we find a variety of tent types that will remind one of the project undertaken by Henry Hoare at Stourhead, and at other British sites. Contemporary foreign prints and books circulating in England were more accessible than Viennese paintings to Henry Hoare’s circle. Engravings of the Siege were a valuable commodity in London and the British imported not only continental prints but also the engravers themselves.

The newsworthy tent of the Grand Vizier at the Siege of Vienna was depicted in a variety of works, among which the following offer the most explicit “details” of allegedly Ottoman tents. The contours of the prominent tent in the foreground of Franz Geffels’s The Battle for the Relief of Vienna, 1683 (Plate 36), correspond to the ogival dome of the Painshill tent, and presents a more taut, rigid version of its splayed drapes. The tent is further elaborated by Geffels in his design for the tapestry, The

32 “From 1710 to 1730 the English market was saturated with the best of French and Italian design. The celebrated English taste for the Italian is usually linked to the Grand Tour, but it has just as much to do with this influx of foreign prints which reached many more men who never made the journey to Rome. . . . Thus English collections and many English walls were dominated by prints of Italian and French design.” Timothy Clayton, "Lately Brought Over From Abroad" in The English Print, 1688-1802 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997), 48.
Siege of Vienna, ca. 1700 (Plate 37) wherein the tent has a two-tiered dome. Another Siege of Vienna (Plate 38) from the Wawel Castle Museum reveals a tent on a grand scale with great fabric flounces decorating the roof and with its drapes drawn back to reveal that the battle itself rages within. This tent, bathed in sunlight while the foreground carnage is obscured in shadow, is conspicuously larger than all the other tents except the one almost completely obscured by it. It is this second, round tent that appears more like an Ottoman audience tent and that wears the crescent pinnacle. Other tents in the background represent a great variety of tent styles and designs. In yet another Siege of Vienna, the tents of the Grand Vizier’s compound are being toppled one by one (Plate 39). The brilliant stripes of one tent (right foreground) are being trampled by horses, while the sumptuous tent directly above it is collapsing. While English Turkish tents may look to such prints for stylistic proportions and ornament, they did not seek to replicate their depicted fragility. English Turkish tents were transplanted and restored pavilions, ever recalling a defining conflict between east and west.

An anonymous Dutch print of the Siege (Plate 40), typical of English imports published in France, offers a bird’s-eye view of the field of battle with the city of Vienna in the distance. The foreground depicts at least four types of Ottoman tents in various states of disassembly while the conflict rages at middle distance. To the left (Plate 41) infantry men have laid aside their weapons to take down their tents, but a commander holding a shield gestures urgently that it is too late to pack their provisions. The Grand Vizier’s tent is inset in the upper left of the print (Plate 42) hosting new
owners who admire their piles of booty. This tent is grand in scale, but resembles a fanciful State bed (Plate 43) rather than an Ottoman pavilion which is fitting given Sobieski’s plans for symbolic occupancy the night he captured it.

Technically a Persian, rather than a Turkish tent, Simon Gribelin’s engraving of Alexander before the Tent of Darius (1693, Plate 44, after Charles Le Brun, 1661, Plate 45), was widely circulated in England during the eighteenth century, and offers details of two elaborate tent designs. The narrative action takes place under a makeshift marquee tied between two trees, but a great tent fills three-fourths of the background and carefully depicts a valance with tasseled-flaps. Gribelin’s somewhat expanded version elaborates both of the tents; it depicts more of the main tent and more of the tent in the left background frame.

No lack of imagination informed the formidable stage design after Ludovico Ottavio Burnacini, The Turkish Encampment before a Christian City (Plate 46). The artist employs the same range of ornamental regalia seen in Moncornet’s elaborate tent. Burnacini multiplies the effect by creating an endlessly deep throng of luxurious tents with no two alike. This vast, operatic backdrop paid tribute to the Ottoman camp’s reputed grandeur, even if the design motifs were exclusively European. This collection of fictionalized tents was created by artists who fantasized about the vainglorious Siege

---

33 This should not be surprising. The same “upholders” (upholsterers) who designed and manufactured tent beds also produced both Turkish cabinetry and tented garden seats.

34 The print was included in André Félibien, The Tent of Darius Explain’d (London: printed Newborough; and B. Barker, 1704). Text translated from: André Félibien, Descriptions de Divers Ouvrages de Peinture Faits pour le Roy (Paris, S. Mabre-Cramoisy, 1671).

35 This particular image was created after 1750, but Burnacini’s original design dates to the seventeenth century. Francesco Sbarra, Lodovico Burnacini, and Mathäus Küsel, Il Pomo D’oro: Festa Teatrale Rappresentata in Vienna (Vienna d’Austria: Appresso Matteo Cosmerovio, 668).
of Vienna. The Turkish customs and practices chronicled in the British press included architectural descriptions of the Sultan’s palace and gardens, and the Topkapi Seraglio, which were particularly popular, and useful to future Turkish tent makers.

Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century travel literature reinforced the value of the Grand Tour as part of an English gentleman’s education, and for some, supplanted real travel. As the eighteenth century progressed, travel to Turkey became increasingly feasible and desirable, and those who could not embark upon such a journey experienced it vicariously through the descriptions of an impressive body of literature.\footnote{For the most widely-read accounts of travel to the Ottoman empire, see Appendix II.}

Several observers were critical of Ottoman architecture, claiming that the great Mosques were derivative of Italian achievements and that the palaces of the sultans were inconsequential, poorly planned and too far removed from the classical orders. The following account reflects this darker side of Orientalist analysis of Ottoman culture. Joseph Tournefort observed that the Topakapi palace lacked nobility because the Turks fail to follow architectural rules and therefore lack magnificence. The best Ottoman architecture is derivative: “... if they have made fine Mosques, it is because they had a fine Model before their Eyes, the Church of St. Sophia ...” Indigenous Ottoman structures indicate that one is “moving from Italy, and approaching Persia, nay China itself.”\footnote{Joseph Pitton Tournefort, \textit{Voyage into the Levant}, vol. 2 (London, 1741), 181-82. It is admirable that the author could admit he was describing a building he could only observe from one exterior angle. Other Turkish travel writers pretended to have entered the palace.} In other words, anything noble about Ottoman architecture is borrowed from the West, and the local inclination is toward anarchy in architecture rather than
classical order. On his visit to Constantinople in 1610, George Sandys\textsuperscript{38} praise for the Topkapi Seraglio was lukewarm. He noted that new construction spared no expense, but “great confusedness” reigns throughout because Ottoman residences lack “uniformity.”\textsuperscript{39} Nonetheless, while these rooms are inferior to “Italian” architecture, they do not lack in “costly curiousnesse [sic].”\textsuperscript{40}

Lady Mary concurred. She also found the layout of Ottoman palaces inexplicable, but defended their aesthetic.

It is yet harder to describe a Turkish palace than any other, being built entirely irregular. There is nothing that can be properly called front or wings; and, though such a confusion is, I think, pleasing to the sight, yet it would be very unintelligible in a letter.\textsuperscript{41}

Travel author, Joseph Tournefort, also addressed the lack of order, though he acknowledged that he was offering second-hand observations of an unseen palace. The value of his account is undiminished by his lack of on-site experience. In this study, both fictional and travel narratives offer insight into contemporary British perceptions of Ottoman culture. In his role as editor, Tournefort concurred with Lady Mary, that no amount of remodeling could make the Topkapi a “fine Ediface.”\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{38} George Sandys, 1577/8-1643/4, poet, philosopher and a participant in the Jamestown settlement in Virginia.

\textsuperscript{39} George Sandys, \textit{Description of the Turkish Empire}, 2nd ed. (London: R. Field for W. Barrett bookseller, 1615), 32-3.

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{41} Montagu, 236.

\textsuperscript{42} “The Apartments of the Seraglio have been made at different Times, and according to the Capriciousness of the Princes and Sultanesses: thus is this famed Palace a heap of Houses clustering together without any manner of Order: no doubt they are spacious, commodious, richly furnisht d. . . . In short, notwithstanding what has been said, take it all together, it is answerable to the Greatness of its Master; but to make a fine Edifice of it, it must be pull’d down, and the Materials employ’d to build another on a new Model.” Tournefort, op. cit., II, 181-82.
Based on the kinds of accounts published, one concludes that whoever constituted the English readership, they did not demand symmetrical order of the Sultan’s Seraglio (i.e., Baroque applications of classical orders); books and periodicals dealing with Ottoman sites and practices suggest that the public wanted descriptive details of the palace’s lavish chambers and inside knowledge of the Sultan’s libertine practices. Exotic novels and imaginative travel accounts tended to incorporate and reconfigure their predecessors’ observations. Based on these narratives, one of the themes that a British viewer would expect to discover at a Turkish tent was the luxury and seclusion of life in the harem (meaning the private living quarters of the Sultan’s family and staff). In 1688, The Turkish Secretary offered the British public a voyeuristic account of the Sultan’s lavish apartments and his sensuous dining, bathing, and sleeping regime—all unobservable events in inaccessible spaces:

‘Tis the Sultanaess who rubs and washes his highness; the others prepare the Linnen perfum’d with Amber and Aloes-wood . . . Then he assists at the Divan, if it be one of the days appointed for Justice, or confers with the Vizier about Affairs of State; if not, he reposes an hour or two, or else takes Horse. . . . Before he sits down to Table they spread a great Indian Carpet of Silk Embroidery, and upon that another smaller one of Gold Broccard. . . . There is another reason which induces the Turks to make use of this green Porcelain which comes from Tartary; they fancy that it cannot suffer any poys’ned thing without breaking. . . . [the Sultan then receives] a great Porcelain Cup, full of Sorbet. The Coffee and sweet things follow this Beverdige. After his Highness rises for Table, then reposes again for a while, and then takes the Divertisement of Hunting, Walking, and Exercise of the Itchoglans, Wrestling, Buffoons, Mutes and Dwarfs. [His bed is made with] three Quilts lined with a very rich Stuff, and in Winter the last is garnished with Sables, [and topped with] a Coverlet of Broccard, or Embroidered Sattin.43

43 Sieur des Joanots du Vignau, The Turkish Secretary Containing the Art of Expressing Ones Thoughts, without Seeing, Speaking, or Writing to One Another (London: printed by Joseph Bennet and sold by Jo. Hindmarsh at the Golden Ball over against the Royal Exchange, and Randal Taylor at Stationer’s-Hall, 1688), 74–76.
These descriptions of furnishings, refreshments and entertainments within the palace proper set the standard for the kiosks in the royal gardens in Constantinople, most famously the Topkapi. The Sultan’s garden structures were unusually available to the English tentmakers as some could be seen from outside the palace grounds. At the Seraglio, the kiosks offered the same luxury as the Sultan’s apartment on a smaller scale with additional privacy. A kiosk (or a domed tent) as replicated by the English, was a miniaturization or even a model of Ottoman architecture’s greatest domed structures (palaces and mosques) and thereby represented Islamic architecture in British emblematic gardens. Ottoman kiosks were consistent with the British expectation of the function of a garden pavilion.

Pierre Gilles’ *A Description of the City of Constantinople* is not employed here randomly. The quarto-sized monograph is one the Ottoman-subject volumes documented to have been in the Stourhead Library collection. The following passage from this work is consistent with the kind of self-conscious viewing savored by the proponents of the English picturesque, and exemplified by the Stourhead lake circuit. With logically deduced detail unmatched by his contemporaries, Gilles delivers the object of every reader’s desire: the unseeable view inside the Seraglio. It is, however, a sleight-of-hand. Instead of describing the contents and style of the palace, the author focused on the vistas seen *from* the Seraglio. Despite the lack of throne rooms and baths, Gilles lent authority and intimacy to his narrative by imaginatively putting himself in the place of the Sultan.
I would observe by the By, that though all the Hills of Constantinople afford a very pleasing Prospect, yet there is none which entertains you with such peculiar Delectation as the first Hill, where the Sultan lives in a licentious and luxurious manner. He has before him, whether he is walking in his Gardens, or in his Chambers of the Seraglio, a full View of the Bosporus and both its Shores, which are green, and flourishing with Woods belonging to the neighboring Farms. On the right Hand he beholds the spacious Field of Chalcedon, cover’d with his own Gardens; he sees the Propontis, Islands without Number, and the woody Mountains of Asia. If he looks at an immense Distance, behind him he beholds the Olympus always cloath’d in Snow. If he takes a shorter Prospect, he views before him the Wonders of his one City, the Church of St. Sophia and the Hippodrom. If he casts his Eyes to the left Hand, he beholds the seven Hills on which the City is seated, and more remotely, he looks round the unmeasurable spacious Fields of Thracia. If he extends his Prospect over the Seas, he views a moving Scene of Ships passing and repassing before him . . . And if he looks below him, he has the agreeable Pleasure of beholding the three Sides of the first Hill, dressing with Trees, Flowers and Plants of all Kinds.44

Gilles is convincingly knowledgeable of the Sultan’s vistas, and his views are relevant to the ambiance of the English Turkish tents which were constructed to embrace extensive vistas. Following his multi-directional views, Gilles described one of the kiosks visible from outside the compound. His anecdotal account of the Sultan parallels Jonathon Tyers or Henry Hoare: British garden makers experimenting not only with the function and form of a Turkish tent, but also its placement within a larger garden complex. Stourhead’s Turkish Tent and a multiplicity of diverse kiosks at the Topkapi compound were situated above the water, as well as in densely forested passages of their respective gardens. The Stourhead tent’s position between the estate’s formal avenues and naturalized paths combines two kinds of Topkapi kiosk sites: those kiosks appended to the palace proper within geometrical courtyards, and those kiosks scattered through the bosky grounds of the Topkapi’s outer gardens on the Seraglio

44 Pierre Gilles, A Description of the City of Constantinople (London, 1729), 40-41.
Point peninsula. Gilles interpreted his Topkapi kiosk as panoptic: all-seeing but unseeable, a position of power and privilege. Once again, Gilles describes features of this Topkapi kiosk that could be ascertained from a distance:

But he has not only a fine Prospect from the Palace, but is entertain’d with several delightful Visto’s from the Top of the Gardens rising on the Hills. If he has an Inclination to take a View of his Seraglio, here he beholds it in all its Glory, strengthen’d with large Pillars of Marble, and fann’d with gentle refreshing Breezes, where he often sits with small Osier Lattices before him; so that, like another Gyges, he discerns all that sail near him, though he himself is visible to none: And if at any time he is weary of the Company of his Domesticks, he can divert himself with the ridiculous Drollery of the Watermen.\(^{45}\)

Aspects of Vauxhall’s Turkish entertainments – being entertained by the elite company one arrived with, or by the antics of people below one’s station – are presented by Gilles as the Sultan’s kind of entertainments in a garden kiosk. Further parallels can be noted. Gazing upon magnificent architecture within the garden precinct is another entertainment that Vauxhall and the Topkapi palace share. The entertainment value in the two gardens’ situation above their respective capital city’s rivers is another. The reference to Gyges suggests that the act of viewing others in such a garden is inevitably sensuous and voyeuristic. Gilles repeats long established Orientalist insinuations about the Grand Seignior’s licentiousness, and this kind of travel account reinforces the libidinal associations some Londoners expressed regarding Vauxhall function like, or appearing like, a Turkish Paradise.

The early Ottoman rulers led their troops into war with their Grand Viziers by their sides, but by the late seventeenth century, the Sultanic heirs of Osman lived lives of

\(^{45}\) Ibid., 41-42.
protected, luxurious isolation. During the latter period, the Grand Vizier handled most affairs of state. The enforced privacy of the Seraglio was the subject of speculation in the imaginative novel, *The Turkish Secretary*, where various kiosks set the stage for palace intrigues. Even servants, as in the following passage, were portrayed diverting themselves in garden kiosks. The author describes the Ottoman kiosk in terms of a comparable English pavilion, a banqueting house, demonstrating a propensity to find European parallels to Ottoman culture:

> ... two Sultanas meaning to be private, dismiss’d for a time all their Slaves, out of their Presence. Some that were most Intimate struck off from the rest, that they might discourse with more freedom, and went to sit in the great Kiochque, or House of Pleasure to take the Air. This Banquetting-house look’d upon the Gardens of the Seraglio, and upon the open Sea, that washes the great Front of the City of Constantinople, on the sides of the Isles of the Princes.

Several things in this passage would stand out to a British reader like Henry Hoare, i.e., someone already interested in Ottoman publications who, about mid-century, was seeking literary sources that could inform the authenticity of his Turkish-styled pavilion. He could deduce that Ottoman kiosks privileged elevated sites with panoramic views. He would note that the Topkapi kiosks provided an escape for the Sultan and his favorites from the court in an atmosphere that was both informal and worthy of his station. *The Turkish Secretary* also claimed that the garden provided a setting for the women of the Harem to attract the Sultan’s attention and to punish the cruelty of their

---

46 Throughout the Köprülü Era (1656–1703), immediately preceding the Tulip Era, Sultans were politically weak while the Grand Viziers exercised unprecedented power. Alan Warwick Palmer, *The Decline and Fall of the Ottoman Empire* (New York: M. Evans, 1992), 16-31.

47 Du Vignau, *The Turkish Secretary*, 9-10.
guards. The kiosk’s atmosphere was informal compared to the palace and kiosk entertainments seemed spontaneous.

While the Sultan reposes in some Arbour or Grotto with his Favourites, the Maids run, leap and play a thousand Apish Tricks, to divert him, and inspire him with Love. They horribly plague the Eunichs . . . They pull off their Turbants, which they throw into the water, and often tread them themselves under foot, as well out of Revenge for the severity of those Monsters, as to make the Sultan laugh. 48

The theme of entertaining the Sultan at the kiosk reoccurs in subsequent passages below. Ottanviano Bon also alluded to the privacy and views provided by the Topkapi garden buildings.

In this Seraglio there are many stately rooms, suited to the seasons of the year; the greatest part whereof are built upon plain ground; some upon the hills which are called Kiosks, that is, rooms of fair prospect, or (as we term them) banqueting houses, into which the King sometimes goes alone, but more commonly with his concubines, for his recreation. 49

Bon also translated the Ottoman kiosk into an equivalent English structure and use. In a garden pavilion, Europeans as well as the Sultan, could dismiss their servants for a time, who nonetheless hovered close at hand, as seen in this image of a kiosk by the sea (Plate 47). One of the kiosks depicted on the outside wall of the seraglio (Plate 48) and in many of Ahmed III’s festival miniatures from 1720, was described as being draped and cushioned in rich textiles in the same manner as the Sultan’s apartment or his tents used for the same festival:

Besides these inward scenes of the Grand Signoir’s dalliances, there stands a lettic’d Kiosk, or Summer house, adorn’d with cloth of Gold, and Velvet cushions, whence, while they are drinking coffee, tea, or chocolate, they have an open prospect of the

48 Ibid., 55.
Asian Mountains, all the Haven, and the Town upon the other side, with the Kaickgees or Boatmen, rowing up and down, and the said Summerhouse being built upon the outward Wall of the Seraglio, all the Gallies, Ships of War, and trading Vessels, the foreign or their own, must necessarily pass almost within Pistol shot of their commodious situation.  

The latticed shutters mentioned above are preserved in several kiosks on the Topkapi grounds, as pictured in a nineteenth-century image of the harem (Plate 49). Tournefort further described the waterside kiosk and its activities, but emphasized the entertainment value of the munitions installed there. The military association is appropriate as the three largest Topkapi kiosks (Baghdad, Revan, and Mecidiye) were built in tribute to successful conquests. 

From accounts such as the foregoing, an English reader familiar with the lavish battlefield tent outside Vienna was prompted to also associate the garden pavilions of the Seraglio with Ottoman military prowess and aggression. Orientalist writers further reinforced English preconceptions about the luxurious indolence in the house of Osman, using garden pavilions as the setting. Romantic novelists like Du Vignau, and travel diarists like Gilles and Bon, sometimes described Ottoman architecture (or specific sites) merely to set the stage for the real subject: the grandiose ceremony, the secret tryst or the machinations of a foreign culture. However, sometimes the architectural narrative was approached as an end unto itself. European visitors to Constantinople interpreted Ottoman kiosks in their own terms: grottos, summerhouses, banqueting houses or pleasure pavilions; they identified with their presumed functions even as they marveled at their opulent forms. The scope of texts and illustrations of

---

Ottoman architectural nuances considered here inspired confidence in European garden makers as they devised their own Turkish pleasure houses.

The idyllic atmosphere of these retreats (and their prominence in the travel accounts) raises the issue of why Tyers, Hamilton and Hoare designated their creations Turkish *tents* rather than *Kiosks*. The answer is that Turkish tents in Britain were literally and symbolically a composite of different models of oriental architecture. Turkish tentmakers created a type of building that summarized the quintessence of Islamic architecture – domed mosques, palace kiosks, spectacular tents cities or military installations; the English Turkish tent is a synthesis of several types of Ottoman architecture. British Turkish tents were designated *tents* or, synonymously, *pavilions*, because of the fame of the Grand Vizier’s tent at the Siege of Vienna; this exotic, politically-charged tent resurfaced periodically in the British press for decades after and came to symbolize the greatest defeat of a military empire that once truly threatened Europe. The literary accounts also reveal that Britain was awed by the magnificence of Imperial tent compounds that were, in essence, palace architecture translated into a portable form. In the Ottoman court, tents or kiosks functioned equally well as a setting for the Sultan to survey the Bosporus in seclusion or to dispense justice publically. However, for the British Turkish tentmaker, the portable pavilion was the more impressive, for it transcended western expectations about the grandeur or opulence of a tent. Tournefort was shocked by the Grand Vizier’s tent compound, four miles from the city of Adrianople: “Nothing surpriz’d me so much as these portable Houses: they are
prodigiously magnificent, rich, large, beautiful; the Proportions, Design, Ornaments, every thing is admirable. 51

Seemingly no observer was unmoved by the spectacle of the Imperial tents. The Sultan’s “Tents in the Plain near the City, which were very magnificent” included a pavilion “with a Canopy of Cloth of Gold . . . set off with many Lamps in the Night.” 52 Even without pictorial reference, the English reader had many cues to the grandeur of an Ottoman tent and found that its structure and furnishings replicated the character of the Sultan’s immoveable apartments.

This tent with brilliant color, rigid contours and intimate scale exemplifies the purpose of the Imperial tent complex: to recreate all the essential features of the palace in fabric and poles with no compromise of grandeur, luxury or workmanship. In ingenious ways, it duplicated the dual role of the sultan’s honorific, enframing pavilion: the gilded tent of the Iftariye Kiosk, the throne and focal point of the fourth and most private courtyard of the Topkapi Palace (Plate 50): it allowed the Sultan to occupy a place of privilege for events within the compound’s enclosure of fabric walls, and was also positioned to serve as the parapet from which the Sultan could observe the view beyond the enclosure of his precinct. In short, the portable pavilion functioned in all crucial ways like the Iftariye Kiosk. This essential Ottoman structure did not go

51 Tournefort, 202-203. He goes on to describe the rituals attending an audience with the Grand Vizier.

52 This recalls the significance to Jonathan Tyers of “many Lamps in the Night” surrounding a Turkish tent, a feature which reinforced the ambiance as a “Turkish Paradise.” Turkey: Compleat History of the Turks, From Their Origin in 755 to 1718, &c. Svo. Translated out of Arabick into French by the Sieur De Ryer, Lord of the Malezair, and Resident for the French King at Alexandria: Now Faithfully English’d, vol. 2 (London, 1719), 194-195.
unnoticed as artists like Claude du Bosc53 sought to replicate Ottoman art forms in both pictures and architecture for an eager audience in the West.

Claude du Bosc played an important role in transmitting images of Turkish culture to the British public. Indeed, du Bosc was known to have made English versions of prints issued earlier in France. Du Bosc’s work can be connected to Henry Hoare in the period prior to his Grand Tour and subsequent development of the Stourhead circuit garden. Du Bosc was involved in at least four engraving or publishing ventures that supplemented English documentation of Ottoman or Islamic subjects, and as purveyor of the most comprehensive, illustrated Turkish history (i.e., non-travel narrative) published in England by 1739, unquestionably has an impact on the context of the British Turkish tent and perhaps proved the catalyst for the Stourhead tent itself.

By 1735, Lord Burlington hired Claude du Bosc to engrave Pieter Rysbrack’s54 paintings of Chiswick,55 and thereby du Bosc was introduced into the Burlington circle of William Kent (four years before Kent improved Rousham) and Henry Flitcroft (ten years before Flitcroft’s first commission at Stourhead). The next year, du Bosc financed the publication of John Campbell’s The Military History of the Late Prince Eugene of Savoy . . . which described the tents at the Siege of Vienna and referenced the Ottoman tent of Damad Ali Pash which Prince Eugene captured at the battle of

53 Claude Du Bosc (1682-1745), French printmaker, very successful in England.
54 Pieter Rysbrack (1684-1748), brother sculptor Michael Rysbrack, was trained in Antwerp and came to England ca. 1720. Known primarily for Flemish-style still life painting.
Peterwaradin (1716) and which was displayed at the Arsenal in Vienna (Plate 51). Clearly, du Bosc not only provided extensive pictorial documentation of Ottoman culture at the high point of its eighteenth-century popularity in England, he did so as a colleague to Stourhead’s future architect.

The most important of all of du Bosc’s works as regards Henry Hoare is The History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire, the first British-published Book of Kings in the Ottoman tradition of sultan genealogical albums (Plate 52). Henry Hoare’s early interest in Turkish subjects is documented by this publication, as he was a named subscriber. It is illustrated after the manner of Ottoman miniature painting, of which few examples existed outside of the libraries in Istanbul. No comparable Ottoman-produced manuscripts can be documented in Henry Hoare’s circle at this date, but du Bosc’s work is a brilliant surrogate that demonstrates significant knowledge of Turkish originals. In some ways du Bosc’s portraits are an orientalized

---

56 Nurhan Atasoy makes the point that while most Ottoman tents in Europe were obtained in conquests like the Siege of Vienna, they were also circulated as diplomatic gifts, beginning with Süleyman I’s gift to Francis I. Atasoy, 272. For the battle of Peterwaradin, see John Bancks, The History of Francis-Eugene, Prince of Savoy ... Containing the Military Transactions of Above Thirty Campaigns (London: J. Hodges, 1741).

57 Nicholas Tindal, The History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire Written Originally in Latin, Translated into English, from the Author’s Own Manuscript Adorn’d with the Heads of the Turkish Emperors, Ingraven from Copies Taken from Originals in the Grand Seignor’s Palace (London: James, John, and Paul Knapton, at the Crown in Ludgate Street, 1734). Du Bosc is not named on the title page, but he signed each of the engravings.

58 This can be ascertained by a comparison of the subscriber lists of each of Hoare’s peers and the members of the Burlington Circle. Henry Flitcroft, not surprisingly, mirrored Henry Hoare’s taste in subscribing to Charles Perry, A View of the Levant: Particularly of Constantinople, Syria, Egypt, and Greece (London: T. Woodward, 1743), and Chishull’s Travels in Turkey and back to England, 1747. Flitcroft’s mentor, Lord Burlington, demonstrated the earliest taste in Turkish publications by pre-purchasing A. de la Mottraye’s Travels through Europe, Asia and into parts of Africa, 1723 with its plates by Hogarth, and, like Henry Hoare, Tindal’s, The History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire ..., 1734. Charles Hamilton subscribed to several works on architecture including Robert Morris’s Rural Architecture, 1750, but nothing related to Turkey. Hamilton’s employer, Lord Lyttleton, subscribed to the unillustrated History of the Saracens, 1757, and would later serve as ambassador to Constantinople. George Grenville, creator of the Wotton House Turkish tent, subscribed to eleven books between 1747 and 1766, including Thomas Wright’s Universal architecture, 1755, but nothing related to Near Eastern subjects (although he did subscribe to a “histoire japonnoise”). The earliest work to which William Chambers subscribed is dated 1760 and no Ottoman subjects include his name as subscriber. David La Touche II, of Bellevue, subscribed to an Irish garden dictionary, but no travel literature other than The Memoirs of the Celebrated Dwarf, Joseph Boruwłaski, a Polish Gentleman, 1788. See Early UK & US Directories & Lists, 1680-1830, formerly Biography Database, 1680-1830 (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England: Avero Publications, 1998). Hoare alone collected Turkish volumes.
version of the European tradition of frontis portraits framed by architectural surrounds such as those found in *The Heads of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain* (Plate 53).  

Albums of genealogical portraits were commissioned by Ottoman sultans “to show that the dynastic patron was securely the glorious heir of the heroes of the past.”

Claude du Bosc illustrated the first English edition of a sultan genealogy. These portraits adhere to a strict formula: each sultan is seated on a divan as if receiving petitions (Plate 54). The composition of each setting is subdivided into horizontal bands of patterned tile covering the wall, the bolster of his divan and the carpet beneath him. The costumes are not specific to each Sultan’s historic period and thus call other issues of likeness into question. In the Ottoman format, each stylized frame represented not a window, but a complete architectural enclosure that provided a specific conceptual and pictorial precedent for the Turkish pavilion in England. In du Bosc’s portraits, the sultan is consistently displayed under a dome supported by decorative brackets and surmounted by a finial or lantern. Ottoman sultan portraits reveal that du Bosc understood Islamic pictorial conventions despite his inability to set aside chiaroscuro.

Each of du Bosc’s “pavilion frames” is unique. Although the variations are subtle, the artist’s experimentation emphasizes the importance of the frames (vital to this study as a representation of a Turkish pavilion type, specifically an honorific shelter or baldachin for a Sultan, demonstrably in the hands of Henry Hoare by 1734). The

---


61 Ottoman albums of illustrated sultan genealogies tend to imitate a known portraiture for recent sultans, but replicate standard types for earlier Grand Seignior’s when Islamic law was interpreted as forbidding portraiture.
architectural frame casts an illusionistic shadow on the larger background half-tone field, a space that is enlivened by “empty”\textsuperscript{62} medallions varying in size, placement and number. The “empty”-ness of the medallions are related to a device that shows up in various European-produced Ottoman family-tree prints: empty frames to either represent filicidal disruptions in the succession of Ottoman rulers (Plate 55, note the names inscribed around the pictorial voids), or the same empty frame to accommodate the addition of a future sultan’s portrait, holding the print’s obsolescence at bay for one more regime (Plate 56, bottom right corner). The circle motif also figured in early Ottoman genealogies (Plate 57). Du Bosc becomes more experimental with composition as he progresses through the series and rewards the careful viewer with the discovery of variants within his system. He plays with the format in another almost unnoticeable way. Beginning with the “Eight [sic] Emperor” (Plate 58) the pavilion frame moves to the upper limit of the background and progressively breaches this boundary, culminating in the Twelfth and Fourteenth Emperors (Plates 59 & 60). The pinnacles of all the subsequent pavilion-frames remain outside the upper edge of the background enclosure.

Du Bosc’s architectural frames and the protruding pinnacles are important; they tie Henry Hoare to an early source of accurate Ottoman visual culture. The protrusion of the pinnacle into the margin of the consecutive pavilion-frames was not du Bosc’s idea. This specific feature is characteristic of countless Ottoman miniature paintings (Plate

\textsuperscript{62} The vacant medallions are related to a device that shows up in various European-produced Ottoman family-tree prints: empty frames to either represent filicidal disruptions in the succession of Ottoman rulers. The same empty frame accommodates the addition of a future sultan’s portrait, holding the print’s obsolescence at bay for one more regime. The circle motif also figured in early Ottoman genealogies.
His compositions demonstrate that he understood not only the nuances of Turkish miniature painting, but perhaps even an Ottoman convention that might be called “architectural synopsis.” This practice adapts any building to suit the compositional space available and the narrative needs of the illustration. Architectural synopsis is apparent in Ottoman pictorial works and in three-dimensional structures. The main characters in nearly every scene are placed under (or in front of) a domed enclosure. The box-under-dome structure can be scaled up to accommodate multiple figures (Plate 62), or scaled down to comfortably contain only one seated sultan (Plate 63). The same simple proportions could be a mosque, a baldachin or a Koran box (Plate 64), each of which presents itself as a pictogram of the culture’s highest architecture, as a reduction or concentration of Ottoman architecture. In editing or simplifying an architectural enclosure, the gifted painter retains the essence of the structure it encapsulates. The practice of synopsizing Ottoman forms by which du Bosc erected his pavilions mirrors not only Ottoman portraiture, but also narrative miniature painting wherein a library, mosque, palace or garden kiosk is reduced to the perfectly-scaled symbolic structure. In the Islamic world, the Iftariye Kiosk (and myriad others) demonstrate this urge to essentialize the grandest examples of Ottoman architecture in even its smallest structures, from the massive sanctuary of Hagia Sophia (Plate 65) to the tiniest domed vestibule in the same engraving. In the West, Claude du Bosc (graphically) and Henry Hoare (spatially) each felt prompted to create a paradigm for the character of Islamic architecture. Both generated models that reflect a desire to understand the nature of Ottoman architecture, not to merely cite Europe’s imaginary Orient.
As seen at Vauxhall, domed tents and tently domes reciprocally used the same vocabulary of ornament irrespective of its application to either rigid and fabric structures (Plate 66). It was not an Orientalist oversimplification for Claude du Bosc to observe that in Constantinople, the dome symbolized the Turks’ nomadic origins, their empire’s assimilation of a Christian capital and, as interpreted by Mohamed, "the heavens spread like a canopy." In the end, the English-made Turkish pavilion contained not only the British desire to synthesize Ottoman culture into one potent emblem of empire and Islam, it also discerned that within the Ottoman architectural tradition, something akin to a paradigmatic synopsis was already at play. It is not a given that du Bosc understood all of these subtleties, but it is undisputable that his kiosk frames were discerning, sophisticated interpretations of both Ottoman architectural traditions and Ottoman pictorial representation. At the very least, his foray into the practice of another culture’s art demonstrates greater understanding than misunderstanding – something that cannot be said of many of his contemporary orientalists.

In the formal sense, du Bosc’s pavilions were perhaps a more important prototype for the domed-profile of the Painshill tent than of Stourhead’s – the frames codified the
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63 The Koran, Sutha 21:25.
64 The same kind of “synopsis” occurred in the West, not least in the miniature temples that populated the English landscape garden (and at the Trianons, Pagodenburgs, Tempietos, etc.). This said, the difference is that Europe did not share the Ottoman’s consistency between the actual “synopsis” of enclosure and the convention for the pictorial representation of such. I am suggesting that the mode of representation – Ottoman miniature painting – with buildings scaled to the demands of narrative or content, reinforced the idea of the kiosk or baldachin being a paradigm or synopsis of Ottoman architecture as a whole.
65 For all of Jonathan Tyers’ sophistication with an Ottoman decorative vocabulary, the Chinese pavilions at Vauxhall represent an utter lack of stylistic sensitivity to the culture invoked. The Chinese supper boxes were constructed from a pastiche of gothic and other irrelevant motifs. Britain’s many manifestations of a Chinoiserie style had little to do with China (prior to the 1757 publication of William Chamber’s designs) compared to her Turkish tents, which had much to do with the comparatively well-documented Ottoman Empire.
ceremonial enclosure of the prototypical Iftarīye Kiosk. Du Bosc’s engravings may have provided Hoare’s contemporaries limited stylistic elements for a Turkish pavilion even prior to the construction of the Vauxhall tent. Yet Charles Hamilton was not a subscriber to this work. Of course, he could have acquired it after its initial offering, or have had access to better sources, but on the face value of the subscriber lists, Henry Hoare was the verifiable Turkish amateur (not a true Orientalist in terms of learning Eastern languages) with the capacity to introduce Hamilton to du Bosc’s engravings and to at least two other publications on Turkish art and architecture. It must be remembered that of all the Turkish tentmakers, only Henry Hoare’s subscriber list reflects an early and sustained interest in Ottoman subjects. Even if Henry Hoare’s library was not a direct source of Turkish motifs for Hamilton and Henry Keene, the du Bosc portraits reflect the kind of translation of scale they practiced in creating far-more-intimate Turkish tents than Vauxhall’s public pavilions.

Henry Hoare’s Turkish Tent was not a direct transcription of Claude du Bosc’s model, yet like du Bosc’s portrait frames, the Stourhead tent acts as an essentialization of Turkish architecture. Other depictions of Ottoman tents in England correspond

---

66 Du Bosc’s kiosk frame, and particularly the tile backdrop, also reference the divan in the Topkapi reception hall depicted by J. B. Vamour and his copyist. The asymmetry of its placement in the room recalls the complaints by European observers that the palace lacked order.

67 Henry Flitcroft, not surprisingly, mirrored Henry Hoare’s taste in subscribing to Perry’s *A View of the Levant*. Flitcroft’s mentor, Lord Burlington, demonstrated taste in Turkish publications relatively early by pre-purchasing *A. de la Mottraye’s Travels through Europe, Asia and into parts of Africa*, 1723 with plates by William Hogarth. Like Henry Hoare, Lord Burlington also acquired Tindal’s, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire*, 1734. Charles Hamilton subscribed to several works on architecture including Robert Morris’s *Rural Architecture*, 1750, but nothing related to Turkey. Hamilton’s employer, Lord Lyttleton, subscribed to the unillustrated *History of the Saracens*, 1757, and would later serve as ambassador to Constantinople. George Grenville, creator of the Wotton House Turkish tent, subscribed to eleven books between 1747 and 1766, including Thomas Wright’s *Universal architecture*, 1755, but nothing related to Near Eastern subjects (although he did subscribe to a “histoire japonnoise [sic]”). The earliest work to which William Chambers subscribed is dated 1760 and no Ottoman subjects include his name as subscriber. David La Touche II, of Bellevue, subscribed to an Irish garden dictionary, but no travel literature other than *The Memoirs of the Celebrated Dwarf, Joseph Woroslawski*, a Polish Gentleman, 1788. See *Early UK & US Directories & Lists, 1680-1830*, formerly *Biography Database, 1680-1830* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England: Avero Publications, 1998). Hoare alone collected Turkish volumes.
formally to the contours of the Green Frog/Stourhead tent. As European prints were plentiful and Ottoman manuscripts elusive in mid-century London, the former will be referenced (works Henry Hoare could access in Britain), while invoking the latter (Ottoman miniature paintings of tents) to clarify what the European painters attempted to represent.

The tent depicted by George Sandys in his Description of Constantinople, 1652, (see Plate 12) was previously discussed in terms of the spatial relationship between the hillside tent and the distant island structure. The view over the water is picturesque and not dissimilar to proportions of terrain, water and islands presented at Stourhead. This volume was readily available to Henry Hoare’s generation as subsequent new editions were published a dozen times during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Sandys’s understanding of an Ottoman tent’s structure is corroborated by later drawings of the Grand Vizier’s military tents. The contours of this tent are consistent with the Green Frog tent, especially if the drapes were only opened at the front.

The tents of the Ottoman Empire were rendered visible to Europeans by the prints produced by artists visiting Turkey in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-centuries. J. B. Vanmour’s paintings of Ottoman court life reflect his long-term residence in Constantinople. He painted portraits of Mary Wortley Montagu during her residency in Constantinople (Plate 67). Ultimately, he created over one hundred paintings of Turkish life, costumes and customs for the French Ambassador Charles de Ferriol, which were then engraved and published, and some copies were meticulously hand-colored, as in
this 1714 representation of the *Commander of the Janissaries* (Plate 68). More than any other artist, Vanmour influenced Europe’s perceptions regarding the inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire. Vanmour’s engravings were copied by both Hogarth (Plate 69) and du Bosc in England.

Vanmour’s *The Commander of Janissaries* (Plate 70) offers a startlingly immediate view of a specific tent type. The embroideries only loosely correspond to decorations used primarily inside surviving Ottoman tents; the tent’s walls curve outward until they almost reach the ground and are then squared off neatly as if stretched over a low platform. A figure sleeping can be glimpsed through the open portal. The hospital corners of this tent make it appear rigid and architectonic. This image illustrates a modestly-scaled Turkish tent. The 100 Turkish plates by Vanmour were in the Stourhead library at the time of the 1840 inventory; given Henry Hoare’s pattern of Turkish book acquisition, its presence is not unexpected.

Another version of this tent can be seen in Antonio Guardi’s transcription of Vanmour’s print (Plate 71). It represents another point of exposure to depictions of Ottoman tents for Henry Hoare. In 1715, at the end of a long and successful military career, Johann Schulenburg entered the service of the Venetian Republic to defend it

---


69 Although authorship is irrelevant to establishing the *Turqueries* as a source available to the English grand tourist, it should be noted that their attribution to Antonio is not unchallenged: an alternate view is that they are collaborative works with his younger brother Francesco. For the attribution arguments, see Edmonde Charles-Roux, “‘C’étaient-là de vraies personnes . . .’ De Venise, de ses amoureux et de quelques collectionneurs,” in *Guardi: quadri turcheschi* (Milano: Electa, 1993), 13-16; Giuliano Frabetti, “Due vedute veneziane del Settecento” in *Pittura veneziana dal Quattrocento al Settecento: studi di storia dell’arte in onore di Egidio Martini* (Venezia: Arsenale, 1999), 269-270; and Antonio Morassi, “Four Newly Discovered Turkish Scenes by Antonio Guardi,” in *Apollo* 146 (April 1974): 274-278.
against the Turks and defeated them at Corfù. Acclaimed as the liberator of Venice, he settled there, renting the Palazzo Loredan and avidly collecting works of art. He commissioned at least 103 paintings from Guardi, among them a series of *turqueries.* Alice Binion suggests that Schulenburg had “a view to establishing a permanent gallery” of these works in Venice.⁷¹ Schulenburg’s collection was the venue for English tourists – not just Henry Hoare, but all of the Burlington circle and Charles Hamilton – to view Guardi’s imaginative variations on Vanmour’s *Cent Estampes.*

The profile of the Vanmour/Guardi tent is similar to the *Green Frog* tent (Plate 72), but the opening of the former is constricted when the latter is generous. There is an even closer model for the Stourhead Turkish Tent: the designs of Marsili who observed Ottoman military tents in 1679-84, although his illustrated work was first published posthumously in 1732. Marsili was a scientist and a member of the Royal Academy in London, inducted by Isaac Newton. He visited London only once, in 1721, but was already internationally know as a soldier and scientist by that date.

Marsili portrayed hundreds of tents in his monograph, some examined from above the battlefield, and others more schematically as is the case with his depiction of tents used to stable horses (Plate 73). The Grand Vizier’s tent complex is depicted amidst an array of ordinary tents (Plate 74) and Marsili’s expertise at close observation is demonstrated in a watercolor sketch of the great variety of tents deployed by the Ottoman forces (Plate 75). The specific tents retain all their vitality in the engraving

---

⁷⁰ Johann Matthias Reichsgraf von der Schulenburg (1661-1747) patronized most leading artists of the Veneto. He was the friend of Sebastiano Ricci and Pittoni was his chief advisor, restorer, and supplier of pictures during the 1730s. He owned more Piazzettas that any other eighteenth century collector. He commissioned Canaletto’s largest *vedute* painting.

published with Marsili’s book (Plate 76), and one tent in this collection, the pavilion on the lower left, demands special scrutiny.

In 1679, Marsili was sent as a soldier for the Republic of Venice to Constantinople where he observed the Ottoman forces in preparation for an attack against Hungary. With a scientist’s empiricism and a spy’s shrewdness, he created a vast record of the Ottoman military’s preparedness. A year later, he offered his services to the Emperor Leopold, and was later captured by the Turks just a month before the Siege of Vienna and “enslaved” until March 1684. His credentials for familiarity with Ottoman military tents were excellent, and his own drawings are corroborated by Martino Altomonte, an artist in the employ of the Polish King. One year after Sobieski returned to his wife with the requisite spoils of war, including the much-touted tents of the Grand Vizier, he celebrated the anniversary of his victory by erecting the tent compound in the garden of the Zółkiew palace near Lwów (present-day L’viv, Ukraine). Altomonte was present at Sobieski’s fête and created what appear to be unelaborated images of the Imperial tents in terms of their construction, scale and placement (Plate 77). They bear little resemblance to the operatic boudoir tents produced by other European artists, and the foremost tent, second from the left, answers any challenge to Marsili’s authority on the subject. The canopy of Altomonte’s largest tent covers and spreads to the same breadth as the inner tent; likewise in Marsili’s version. The latter is open, perhaps shown as a cutaway of the tent’s interior where an upholstered divan faces outward. Each tent depicts a pinnacle ornament; Marsiili’s is a ball whereas Altomonte’s is a spear. These two images represent the best surviving visual record of the Siege of Vienna tents and
they also correspond to the Stourhead tent more than do any other known Turkish tent in England.

Given that the tents of Marsili and Altomonte are stately but otherwise fairly unremarkable in their construction, is there any reason to believe that Henry Hoare was referencing Marsili specifically at Stourhead? There are at least two aspects of the Henry Hoare tent that link it to this particular image by Marsili (or some copy of it) as the model at Stourhead: the fence enclosure and the carpet spread before the tent opening.

The fantastic splaying carpet is the most important characteristic of the Marsili tent (Plate 78). Ottoman manuscripts often depicted great Turkish carpets spread out in front of tents or pavilions (Plate 79), but not perspectivally as in Marsili’s documentation. It was not until the Tulip Era under the reign of Ahmed III that miniature painters began to use European Renaissance perspective in the depiction of space, and then only capriciously. Levni employs perspectival recession in about half the paintings he created celebrating the Circumcision Festival of 1720. One of these was the culminating view of the activities, the Fourth Courtyard flanked by the Circumcision pavilion, the Baghdad kiosk and the Iftaiyre Kiosk (Plate 80). Note how the marble pavers are not seen perspectivally but that other orthogonals attempt to converge toward the horizon. Levni offers many other examples of playing with perspective and this experiment can be seen in some of his paintings of carpets issuing forth from tents (Plates 81 & 82) with varying degrees of interest in the principle. One painting, which occurred very early in the narrative series gives a strong sense of the carpet splaying wide as it extended.
forward, and tapering as it receded into the tent (Plate 83). The attendant figures line up to reinforce the tipped perspective. Levni also circumscribed this scene with an embroidered fabric fence designed to imitate a colonnade with vessels hanging from the apex of each arch.

As shown in Chapter Two, the *Green Frog* image which was dominated by the Turkish Tent was contained within a fence of sorts and also included splaying outlines which radiated away from the tent and connected with the fence. An awareness of Ottoman design is manifest, to some degree or another, in all the English Turkish tents, but it is particularly intense in the Stourhead tent. Marsili’s tent was certainly one of the sources to which Henry Hoare appealed. A comparison of the Levni tent and the *Green Frog* tent (Plate 84) explains the trapezoidal foreground of the Stourhead tent, and this carpeted space is also recorded – perhaps even more distinctly – in the second *Green Frog* view (See Plate 5). Henry Hoare marked the ground before his tent in some manner (a contrasting planting, or carefully cropped grass?) to replicate the best pictorial evidence of authentic Ottoman tents available in Europe, and make his tent/mount a more authentic view from a distance (see Plate 3). And knowing the Grand Vizier’s tent was surrounded by fabric walls in all the Ottoman miniatures (Plate 85) as well as in Marsili’s schema, Henry Hoare clearly felt the need to enclose his Turkish Tent as well. And even though the tent itself is not visible in the *Beauties of England* view of the Mount of Diana (again, Plate 3), the fence, exactly true to the *Green Frog* depiction, decorates the landscape with gentle scallops. To say that every aspect of the *Green Frog* depiction of Stourhead’s Turkish Tent points to some level of understanding of Ottoman
sources would not be an overstatement. The delineations of Henry Hoare’s outdoor Turkish carpet must have been very clear on the sources from which the Wedgwood painter interpreted his own image. This is the view that the eighteenth-century visitor had of Stourhead when exiting the Pantheon: the lake, the islands, and hanging woods that opened only at the garland-draped Mount of Diana, the most prominent, contrasted feature on the far side of the lake.

There are many ways that Henry Hoare may have come in contact with Marsili’s tent templates. Marsili’s book was not included in the 1840 inventory of the Stourhead library, but du Bosc remedied that situation. Marsili’s engraving that depicted a multiplicity of Ottoman military tents was reconfigured and simplified for Picart’s last volume on “the Mohammedan religion” which came out in 1739\(^2\) (Plate 86) but the tent with the great carpet reappeared. Picart’s book is included on the inventory of the Stourhead library. Henry Hoare’s consultation of this book seems unavoidable. His passion for exotic, specifically Turkish, subjects in contrast to Colt Hoare’s overtly stated sense of their impropriety, link Marsili and Henry Hoare before he ever contemplated an island mosque.

This chapter has reviewed the literature and pictures whereby anyone in Britain might learn of Ottoman tents and kiosk pavilions. Some of the sources were so broadly cast that everyone would have known them. Others would have naturally been sought out by those with a manifest interest in turquerie. It is not necessary to guess that Henry Hoare may have been intrigued by Islamic architecture. His subscriber list documents

an interest in Turkey – three books before 1757 – that began very early in his life. Yet ninety percent of books weren’t published by subscription and therefore can’t be tracked or connected to an individual in the same way. The 1840 inventory of the Stourhead library, when compared to Henry Hoare’s subscriber list and Turkish garden motifs, suggest that between Henry Hoare and Colt Hoare, the former was far more likely to have acquired all the best Ottoman history books in print. The Stourhead copies of Thévenot, Gilles, Picart and Vanmour would have been of comparatively little interest to Colt Hoare’s British and classical antiquarian bent, but essential to Henry Hoare’s creation of his decidedly Turkish pavilion.
CHAPTER FOUR

The Turkish Threat:
The Contest for Meaning on the Mount of Diana and the Greater Stourhead Circuit

No less a miracle, than if a Turk
A Mosque should raise up of mosaic work.¹

In order to carve out a place for Henry Hoare’s Turkish Tent within Stourhead’s scholarly discourse, it had to first be understood in terms of its physical nature and prominence within Henry Hoare’s garden. Additionally, this emblematic structure had to be contextualized within the field of other Turkish- or Islamic-style garden pavilions in Britain. English interest in popular press accounts of Ottoman conquest, court life and decorative arts, as well as Turkish style portraits and costumes, informed the appearance and reception of Turkish tents that were created for public and private gardens. A final task remains in exploring Stourhead’s Turkish Tent: what did it mean in and of itself, or within the semiotic of its juxtaposition with other symbolic features at Stourhead?

In conceptually situating the Turkish tent within the multiplicity of architectural and other features of Stourhead, I have heeded John Dixon Hunt’s call to be more inclusive in considering the components of the garden. Hunt maintains that the Stourhead garden does not present itself to the visitor like a painting or a poem.

What the garden does do, however, is present visitors with a host of architectural objects, inscriptions that are quotations from Virgil (even if not attributed), Gothic structures and other inscriptions that reference Anglo-Saxon

history, and many more such inventions – all set more or less harmoniously but at different times into a contrived landscape scenery.\textsuperscript{2}

Even though there is no mention of a Chinese Bridge or a Turkish Tent in the statement above, Hunt later acknowledged that even Stourhead’s missing exotic features might have had some resonance with a limited audience (local Wiltshire landowners).\textsuperscript{3} Otherwise, he frames the themes or associations at Stourhead in purely occidental terms: classical vs. gothic styles. Hunt does not mentally reinsert Henry Hoare’s oriental structures while pursuing what Stourhead meant in the eighteenth century or what Stourhead’s accretion of interpretations has subsequently come to mean. This aspect of his otherwise outstanding state-of-the-research article can be augmented.

Hunt notes that past interpreters of Stourhead tended to “fixate on a single conceptual trigger” (a painting by Claude, a passage from Virgil) and have reoriented the rest of the garden toward it. The Turkish Tent existed “more or less harmoniously”\textsuperscript{4} with all the other thematic prompts or triggers that the august critics of Stourhead have advanced, and that the associations of disparate elements resonate meaningfully in close proximity. In considering meanings that Hoare inserted by erecting a Turkish Tent at Stourhead, there is no need to set aside the excesses of previous readings. These things have largely sorted themselves out as Stourhead’s later interpreters built upon


\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., 337. Hunt credits this notion to Malcolm Kelsall, but it is not stated in his 1983 article.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 334.
and edited their progenitors. However, even the best historical and interpretive studies of Stourhead still tend to confuse the much-altered modern garden with Henry Hoare’s original creation, the implied rationale being tautological: the portions of Stourhead which have survived must be the only allegorical features that really matter. This chapter calls upon the contemporary observers of Stourhead to bring into full relief the associative meanings of the Turkish Tent within the thematic interconnections of the greater garden.

Three contemporary visitor responses to Stourhead as well as a relevant travel text will be considered. These four documents demonstrate themes that Hoare put forward in a garden that combined classical, gothic, oriental, horticultural, geological, topographical and other yet-to-be-categorized motifs. Stourhead represents a natural history of Henry Hoare’s day, an exhibition of his cultural, aesthetic, religious, and moral priorities. Some of these themes, reinforced by the inclusion of the Turkish Tent, would be shared by other contemporary garden makers who also employ Hoare’s diversity. Other areas in the garden engage these themes and are heightened by the Turkish Tent to showcase Henry Hoare’s notions of cultural authenticity, encyclopedic collecting, the merits of industry over idleness, and a protective patriotism that might be called British watchfulness.

The following accounts have been underutilized as primary documents, we might deduce, because they give special deference to the oriental features of the garden, the same attention the Turkish Tent and other architectural exotics would have received when they were still extant. Mrs. Powys provides the most detailed account of the
specifics of the Turkish Tent and the loftiness of the Chinese Bridge. Charles Perry’s book was acquired by Henry Hoare by subscription. Perry recounts the Turkish fable of the Barber who was raised by his own tenacity and skills to become the Grand Vizier of the Ottoman Empire; the notion of Turkish meritocracy finds parallel in Henry Hoare’s experience and letters.\textsuperscript{5} The last two interpretive eyewitness accounts of Stourhead are recorded at length as poetry. These two anonymous poets offer more detailed accounts of the experience of moving through the gardens at Stourhead than any other record. This chapter will thus consider, first, Mrs. Powys’ commentary on Stourhead’s “mosaick painting” followed by a discussion of Charles Perry’s Turkish Barber. The two topographical and iconographic poems – one early, one late in Henry Hoare’s career – are the most inclusive accounts of the experience of the circuit in writing; they will be addressed last.

The \textit{Green Frog} images offer a general understanding of the Turkish Tent’s external appearance and situation, but we know nothing of its interior until after it was renovated by Susannah Hoare in the summer of 1776. Mrs. Powys stated offhandedly that the interior of the Turkish Tent at Stourhead was “painted blue and white in mosaic.” “Painted in mosaic,” “mosaic painting” or “mosaic pattern” suggest techniques and materials that allude to secular and sacred Ottoman architecture, and thus reaffirm its Turkishness.

\textsuperscript{5} Stourhead itself exemplified Hoare achievements, as cited by his nephew and correspondent, also Henry Hoare (called Fat Henry), who explained “that he had by long application to business . . . improved and considerably increased his Estates and had formed a Beautiful Place; that his ideas was that it was right for the Possessor of the Place to enjoy all the Estates about it in order to support it properly.” An account by Henry Hoare’s nephew, Henry Hoare (1744-1785), Wiltshire Record Office, 383.927. In a letter to his nephew, Richard, Henry Hoare cited Stourhead’s assorted features as his reward for industriousness: “When [the fruits of industry like grottos and temples] are won by the industrious, they have the best claim to them . . . .” Letter from Henry Hoare to Richard Hoare, January 30, 1755, Hoare’s Bank, Fleet Street, London.
Mrs. Powys used the phrase “painted . . . in mosaic” twice in her diary of many years, the second time referring to gothic-style chairs in the Stourhead Convent painted “brown and white in mosaic.” Mrs. Powys also used “mosaic pattern” while visiting Kirtlington Park in 1778:

“Lady Dashwood’s China room [was] the most elegant I ever saw. ‘Tis under the flight of stairs going into the garden; it’s ornamented with the finest pieces of the oldest china, and the recesses and shelves painted pea-green and white, the edges being green in a mosaic pattern.”

“Mosaic painting” covers a wide range of applications. This discussion will consider three usages of the phrase: first, paint which duplicated Ottoman/Islamic diamond-shape patterns; second, real mosaic or marquetry meaning “covered with mosaic work;” and finally ceramic tiles such as those alluded to by Mrs. Powys. The first type is illustrated by the leather painted wall coverings in the Marble Dining Room at Ham House, London:

"To John Hutton Leather Gilder the Sum of Nineteen Pounds one Shilling in full of his bill and all demands for a Sett of Gilt Leather Hangings White and Gold Mosiac Pattern, & putting up in the Room over ye Bagnio at Ham."

The definition of “mosaic” extends to include anything resembling tile in Ottoman miniatures. The geometry of mosaic pattern has its origin in Islamic tile work, and Iznik mosaics, comparable to the mosaic designs at Ham House (Plate 87), were depicted in

---

6 Today, the Convent, a small house on the longer circuit that includes St. Peter’s pump and Alfred’s Tower, is on a long term lease from the National Trust as a vacation home and thus is not open to the public. It contains several gothic-style chairs which have not been in the Convent continuously and display no sign of ever having been painted. They are almost certainly not the chairs described and were lent by the National Trust as an approximation of those in Powys’s description. Caroline Powys, Passages From the Diaries of Mrs. Philip Lybbe Powys for Hardwick House, Oxon. A.D. 1756 to 1808, ed. Emily J. Climenson (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1899).

7 Sir James Dashwood, Kirtlington Park, employed one of the leading architects of the day, John Sanderson, to improve the house and garden, 1747-1752. Powys, 198.

8 In an untitled account book of the 4th Earl of Dysart (d. 1770), which dates from 1742 to 1761. It is housed in the Archives at Buckminster Park, Buckminster, Gratham, Lincolnshire. Reference number 929.
Henry Hoare’s copy of du Bosc’s Sultan portraits. Du Bosc’s frames offered images of
tiled backgrounds accurately portraying the essence of many Ottoman interiors. Du
Bosc’s mosaic patterns illustrate how to paint a Turkish tent in mosaic, and thus we come
to an understanding (and definition) of the usage. Thus the first definition of “painted in
mosaic” meant that it replicated a mosaic pattern reminiscent of Ottoman tiles as seen at
Ham House or simply painted with some Islamic motif. The voluminous Vauxhall
Rotunda was decorated like a tent, and provides another example. In Turkish fashion, its
ceiling was “adorned with grand painted Festoons of Flowers, terminating in a Point; it
looks like the Dome . . . of a most August, royal tent . . . the walls painted in Mosaic.”

The phrase “painted in mosaic” was often used in European accounts to describe Turkish
or Islamic design, as in the following source.

Travel writers in the Ottoman Empire frequently invoked the second usage of
“painted in mosaic”: “The name of Mosaic is given to all works composed of little inlaid
pieces, whether they be of stone, wood, ivory, enamel, or any other natural or artificial
matter.” Parts of the Topkapi Palace were paved with “fine Marble in Mosaike
worke” and another account used virtually the same expression: “Having passed the

---

9 Seventeenth-century Iznik ceramics, called İz尼克 Çini in Turkish meaning “İz尼克 China,” represent a Renaissance in Ottoman art under the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent. Walter B. Denny, “Images of Turks and the European Imagination” in Court and Conquest: Ottoman Origins and the Design for Handel’s Tamerlano at the Glimmerglass Opera (Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Museum, 1998), 4.


11 Thus, beyond the stone or glass used in Byzantine mosaics, wood, ivory, and enamel can be “painted in mosaic” on furniture. It is
in this sense that some eighteenth century descriptions use the word mosaic and marquetry interchangeably. Thomas Nugent, The
Grand Tour; or, A Journey through the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and France, vol. 3, 2nd ed. (London: Printed for D. Browne
without Temple Bar, A. Millar in the Strand, G. Hawkins in Fleetstreet, W. Johnston in St. Paul’s Church-yard, and P. Davey and B.
Law in Ave-Mary-Lane, 1756), 53.

William Stansby, for Richard Meighen, next to the middle Temple in Fleetstreet, 1635), 24.
[Topkapi’s] third gate . . . is another fair court, paved . . . with Mosaical work.”13 The ceiling of the Topkapi Palace is described as “adorned with Mosaike painting.”14 Here, “painting” refers to the ceiling being covered or encrusted with mosaic,15 Italian-made tiles of fired clay.”16

The blue and white interior of Hoare’s Tent referenced mosques and even domestic interiors of the Levant, the very same tiles employed in the most important rooms of the Topkapi Palace.17 For Henry Hoare, Mrs. Powys and their contemporaries, these oft described tiles coincided with Turkish style, though travelers described them inconsistently.18 Hoare clearly did not import Iznik tiles but employed the comparable blue and white delftware. The long-term Dutch fascination with orientalia19 inspired pan-European manufacturers of ceramic tile to began producing cobalt blue Chinese motifs by the seventeenth century20 and by 1750, these Chinoiserie tiles were copied in England21.

---

14 George Sandys, Description of the Turkish Empire, 2nd ed. (London: R. Field for W. Barrett Bookseller, 1615), 31.
15 Lady Mary offers another example of this usage: “The young lads generally divert themselves with making garlands for the favourite lambs, which I have often seen painted and adorned with flowers lying at their feet while they sung or played.” The lambs were not pigmented, but altered by the profusion of flowers. Lord Wharncliffe, ed., The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (New York: W. Moy Thomas, 1970), 137.
16 Sandys, 31.
18 Even while in Turkey, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu called blue and white ceramic tiles “stones” or “Japan China.” Mary Wortley Montagu and Robert Halsband, The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 171. On another occasion, when she was allowed to tour an unoccupied royal residence, Lady Mary admired “the bagnios . . . all of white marble, the roofs gilt, and the walls covered with Japan China.” Montagu, 236.
19 Europe’s first pictorial view of Chinese landscapes and architecture was facilitated by the publication of Johan Nieuhoff, An Embassey from the East India Company of the United Provinces, to the Grand Tartar Cham Empourer of China, published in Dutch in 1665, and in English four years later. The economic fiasco that was Tulipmania did not deter a Netherlandish interest in the Levant, and, as I have already noted, the so-called Tulip period (1717-30) initiated an unprecedented exchange between the Ottoman empire and western Europe, particularly Holland and France.
where blue and white delftware installed in repetitive patterns looked oriental to a public who had no better model to contradict it. By the eighteenth century, when more authentic visual sources of Chinese interiors were brought forward, the tradition of blue and white tiles, whatever their individual motifs, was indelibly affixed to the Orient, and lent authenticity to any “oriental” pavilion.

It was in emulation of this imagined Eastern architecture that the interior and façade of Louis XIV’s Trianon de Porcelaine (the first garden pavilion in Europe to be designated Chinese, Plate 88) was covered in Delftware blue and white tiles from French and Dutch manufacturers. It became the model emulated by the princes of Europe and served to diversify garden pavilions beyond a classical taxonomy. The similarity between tile work of the Mosque of the Valide Sultan in Constantinople and the faïence decorations of the Trianon de Porcelaine was noted in one of the earliest travel accounts to Turkey. The mosque and the Trianon were each encrusted with the same remarkable material, in patterns of blues and whites. In Constantinople, the viewer found that two exotic monuments – one European and one authentically Ottoman – shared the exoticism insinuated by blue and white tiles. Whatever the actual materials of the mosaic

---


22 C. H. de Jonge, 92. The chinoiserie architecture and furnishings were designed by Louis Le Vau. It was constructed in the gardens at Versailles in 1670 by Louis XIV for his mistress, Madame de Montespan. Pamela Cowen proposed that a previously unidentified fan painting in the Victoria and Albert Museum is actually Madame de Montespan in the Trianon de Porcelaine. Barely visible in this potentially unique view of the interior are the blue and white tiles surrounding the windows. It was demolished in 1687 and eventually replaced by the Grand Trianon. Pamela Cowan, “The Trianon de Porcelaine at Versailles” in *Magazine Antiques* 143, 1 (1993): 136-143.

23 The Trianon de Porcelaine was the precedent for Chinoiserie features at early eighteenth-century palaces like Sanssouci, Potsdam and the Nymphenburg, Munich. Patrick Conner, *Oriental Architecture in the West* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979), 69-75.

24 Jacob Spon and George Wheler, *Voyage d’Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grece, et du Levant fait aux années 1675 & 1676* (Lyon: Chez Antoine Cellier le fils, rue Mercière, à la Constance, 1678), 75.
decorations in the Turkish Tent at Stourhead, they were the direct stylistic heirs of the
*Trianon de Porcelaine*. English amateur architects would soon discern that blue and
white tile interiors were not particularly Chinese, but quintessentially Turkish. Although
blue and white tiles originally invoked Cathay, travel narratives in Hoare’s day
established that a structure “painted in mosaic” was authentically Ottoman or Islamic,
whereas William Chambers’ authoritative eyewitness via his depictions of Chinese
architecture (1757) established that the Chinese did *not*, as a rule, encrust their buildings
with blue and white porcelain. The Turkish tents of mid-century England appeared at
exactly the moment when a discerning connoisseur familiar with the travel accounts
could begin to distinguish between Chinese prototypes and Islamic improvisations in blue
and white porcelain.

Turkish tents in the English landscape were glyphs evoking not just Ottoman tents
but the full range of an opulent, exotic culture in a contained, instantly comprehensible
format. They summarized Britain’s perception of the Ottoman Orient, and represented a
negotiation – an intellectual sorting out – between the observed use of Ottoman tile in the
Porte’s domestic and religious architecture and the European tradition of tiling garden
pavilions with exotic associations. Painting the Stourhead tent “in mosaic” conforms
with an authentically Turkish aesthetic. For those who possessed some understanding of
contemporary Ottoman interiors via British publications, blue and white tile work came
to be associated with the familiar orient of Constantinople. The readiness of a British
connoisseur to interpret Dutch tiles as Turkish is not because individual delftware tiles
appeared analogous to Ottoman tiles, but because encrusting whole buildings or whole
rooms with blue and white glazeware was an expensive and startling visual effect that could only find precedent in the garden of France’s most extravagant monarch or in the architecture of the Ottoman Emperor’s protected precincts.\textsuperscript{25} “Mosaick” tiles signified the lavish interiors of the Sultan’s palace, bath and even his mosque.

Susanna Hoare’s “mosaick” improvements to Stourhead’s Turkish Tent read as a concave wall of blue and white tiles not unlike the Mihrab niche, the focal point of every Ottoman mosque interior (Plate 89). Indeed, the Turkish Tent at Stourhead might legitimately be read as reprise of Hoare’s 1754 intention to build a mosque. It represented Ottoman or Islamic architecture in the mix of styles at Stourhead. Like genuine Ottoman tents, English Turkish tents (with the exception of the colossus, Vauxhall) were imaginative, miniature models of military pavilions, palaces or mosques lined with mosaic ceilings and clad in Iznik tiles. A blue and white Turkish tent interior evoked configurations of tile by Ottoman, Dutch and English artisans (each emulating and manipulating the same Chinese prototype) as well as the more recent European tradition of garden pavilions and baths “painted” in delftware.

In 1776, Mrs. Powys designated the Stourhead Turkish Tent “painted blue and white in mosaic” because she found the pavilion’s replication of Ottoman visual culture convincing – aesthetically consistent with her understanding of Turkish ornament. In eighteenth-century usage, “painted in mosaic” signified that the interior possessed Turkish style even more than it designated the precise decorative medium. This is no surprise as the visual, textual and biographical evidence points to Henry Hoare being

\textsuperscript{25} Spon and Wheler go on to find Hagia Sophia superior to St. Peter’s in Rome.
among the most qualified individuals in Britain to create a Turkish tent that would read, as least to a British viewership, as authentically or genuinely Ottoman.

Charles Perry’s account also reinforces the theme of cultural authenticity at Stourhead and introduces an additional concept: the perceived Turkish value of advancement in station in life, despite birth or class, by personal merit. Michael Charlesworth, Ronald Paulson and others have cited this philosophy in Hoare, but none have connected it to the garden’s Turkish themes. It is an important link and meaning caught up in the Turkish Tent and the greater garden. In the sixty years between the Siege of Vienna and the commencement of Henry Hoare’s gardening in earnest (1683-1743), fictional and eyewitness accounts imagining the pleasures and dangers of Ottoman court life had become ubiquitous in early Georgian England (see Appendix II). The enduring popularity of the 1683 letters relating to the Seige of Vienna, as well as the surge of “Turkish” books in the 1730s and 1740s, confirm public interest in Ottoman topics. This is borne out in the preface to Charles Perry’s travel account, advising readers that they had not purchased yet another grand tourist narrative:

...as many other Travelleres and Voyage-writers have treated very largely and circumstantially upon those Countries, so we pass them over in absolute Silence, and shall hasten to present the Public with what we hope and presume will prove more novel, more interesting, and more entertaining.

Indeed the Turkish Empire likewise, at least the more central Parts of it, (such as Constantinople, the Archipelagean Isles, the Sea-costs of Asia Minor, and of Syria) are now become pretty trite Subjects; and therefore we have treated on them in a more cursory, superficial manner.²⁶

Although Perry may be preemptively defending the superficiality of his own narrative, he insists that the British public was familiar with Turkish subjects to the point of saturation. Accounts of court life in Turkey portrayed the Sultan and his household living in luxurious apartments, walled gardens, and within draped kiosks. Lavish tent structures were associated with festivals of the Ottoman court and particularly with the Grand Vizier. Perry’s romantic descriptions exemplify the reasons why visitors to a Turkish Tent in England would arrive with preexisting expectations – not of Ottoman tents alone, but of Turkish/Islamic manners and customs.

Perry’s *A View of the Levant* is directly relevant to the notions of Turkishness surrounding the Stourhead and Painshill tents. Subscribers to Perry’s publication included Henry Hoare, William Kent, Horace Walpole, and Richard Pococke – readers who instigated or supported what would become the English landscape movement. Richard Pococke, himself a published observer of Turkey, reported Henry Hoare’s plan to build a mosque on an island and his travel accounts contextualize Stourhead within a spectrum of significant contemporary gardens. Horace Walpole hailed Stourhead as “one of the most picturesque scenes in the world” – high praise from one of the most influential tastemakers of his day. William Kent “leaped the fence” in Walpole’s terms (i.e., abandoned the restrictions of formal, geometric gardens) and ultimately prepared his protégé, Henry Flitcroft, to assist in Henry Hoare’s already progressive plans for innovative gardening at Stourhead. Most importantly, Henry Hoare was on the
subscriber list of Perry’s *A View of the Levant*.\(^2^7\) Subscriber lists printed in the front matter of books account for an estimated ten percent of the book market during Henry Hoare’s lifetime.\(^2^8\) Hoare’s subscription to Perry’s book corroborates an interest in Ottoman culture befitting one who would shortly propose to build a mosque and thereafter complete an overtly Turkish pavilion in his garden.

Perry’s book was but one of twenty-two Turkish or Middle Eastern-themed works (some multi-volume) published or distributed in London between 1729 and 1743.\(^2^9\) References to Turkish history and culture were rife in the British popular press. Despite the overarching sense of Western superiority (an attitude that was explicitly manifest in the Vienna letters that celebrated a Christian victory), English travel accounts and fictional observations of the Sultan and his people were often empathetic to their Ottoman subjects. To Richard Steele, a Turk was likened to the landed gentry in England who cared more for his horses than his women.\(^3^0\) Steele also admired soldiers of the Ottoman Empire who fought daringly, like pirates, “sword in hand pell-mell.”\(^3^1\) J. B. Tavernier reported that “the present Sultan-Mahomet is extremely (sic) addicted to Hunting, and makes it so much his Darling Divertisement.”\(^3^2\) Between the Siege of

\(^{2^7}\) Kenneth Woodbridge, *The Stourhead Landscape* (London: The National Trust, 1986), 17. Later editions of *The Stourhead Landscape* omit the fact that the library and important paintings had to be sold to pay off Henry Ainslie Hoare’s gambling debts. The library was dispersed in 1888 without an inventory that separated would have Henry Hoare’s books from those collected by his heir.

\(^{2^8}\) There are certainly limits to what can be assumed from an individual being named on a book’s list of subscribers, especially in a day when some wealthy men ordered virtually every book that went to press. This was not true in Henry Hoare’s case (see Appendix I). His list of books purchased by advance subscription is small enough to refute indiscriminate (or comprehensive) collecting, and large enough to indicate trends in the subscriber’s fields of interest.

\(^{2^9}\) See Appendix II.

\(^{3^0}\) Richard Steele, *The Tatler* (121, Tuesday, January 17, 1710), ii, 219.

\(^{3^1}\) Steele, *The Tatler* (42, Saturday, July 6, 1709), i, 306.
Vienna and the first sighting of the Turkish Tent at Vauxhall, Turks were repeatedly portrayed as both remarkable and contemptible. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu was one of the enlightened travelers:

Thus, you see, sir, these people are not so unpolished as we represent them. It is true their magnificence is of a very different taste from ours, and perhaps of a better [taste]. I am almost of opinion they have a right notion of life.33

Maxime Rodinson’s optimism about East/West perceptions in her *Europe and the Mystique of Islam* (1987) is laudable. In this tome, she highlights some of the happier interactions of Europe and the Middle East in response to her sense of the “excesses” of Edward Said’s *Orientalism*.34

The eighteenth century *Philosophes* saw the Muslim East through fraternal and understanding eyes. The idea that all men were born with equal abilities, along with the prevailing optimism (the real religion of the age) now made it possible to seriously reconsider the earlier charges leveled against the Muslim world . . . In the Enlightenment, the Muslims were not singled out as being different from other men. In fact, if anything many of them were considered superior to Europeans. “The Turk, whose bigotry interferes not with his better feelings, is as charitable as he is confiding,” wrote the English antiquarian Thomas Hope.35

It is easier to substantiate Edward Said’s view of the Orient as a pejorative construct of the West too intent on “administering” the East than it is to justify Rodinson’s optimism. All things considered, Said’s view were not excessive, especially regarding his utterly convincing take on the colonization strategies of Victorian Britain, but a

---

32 Jean-Baptiste Tavernier, *The Six Voyages . . . Through Turky: To Which is Added A New Description of the Seraglio* (London: Printed for M.P. and are to be sold by George Monke ... and William Ewrey, 1788), 82.

33 Wharncliffe, 237. Lady Mary felt genuinely conflicted that Europeans were burdened with comprehending scientific advancements in a way the Turks were not. She was “almost” ready to give up this priority.

34 Maxime Rodinson, *Europe and the Mystique of Islam*, Translated by Roger Veinus (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1987), 130-131. She praises Said for “many valuable ideas” but fears that he neglects “an Orientalism before the empires . . . . The growth of Orientalism was linked to the colonial expansion in a much more subtle and intricate way than he imagines.”

35 Ibid., 48-49.
century earlier, it was not only the *Philosophes* in Georgian England who admired the Turks to the point of emulation. Alexandrine N. St. Clair is not as sanguine as Rodinson. She described tension between those Europeans who revered Islam and those whose frame of reference had not been touched by a tolerant strain of Enlightenment thought:

A new morality based on the doctrine of natural law was developing to fill the void created by disillusionment with Christian dogma. With new found reason and objective criticism, the century attempted an unbiased appraisal of non-Christian cultures. Louder expressions of tolerance for other religions were heard, but a disparity between the works of poets and playwrights, and those of historians and travelers, continued. The former were reluctant to forsake the old tantalizing notions and violent images; the latter, like Lady Mary, were not yet widely enough accepted to dispel them.  

We must acknowledge that Lady Mary is the exception to the rule, though perhaps not within the category of travelers to the Levant. Contact and prolonged proximity in Constantinople particularly, often yielded mutual understanding that was based on more than a superficial familiarity with Ottoman culture. Henry Hoare came of age during what Alexandra St. Clair characterized as the promotion of the “new morality” of the Enlightenment, the same sentiment that would bring about greater political freedom and social reform. Some of Hoare’s generation had unconcealed admiration for leadership characteristics associated with Turkish rulers. It was widely (though incorrectly) believed that the Turkish state was a meritocracy, which comes close to the British idea of liberty, particularly as it was defined against the French notion of absolute monarchy. Perry embodies this British perception of the rewards for Ottoman ambition:

And there is no Person, whose Condition is so low, abject, and mean, as absolutely to exclude him from the Possibility of becoming, one time or other, Prime Vizir; for it has happened, within the Memory of People now living, that a Barber and a common Waterman have, in their Turns, been raised to that Dignity.\textsuperscript{37}

The concept of elevating one’s rank through outstanding performance was a sensibility of the ascending merchant classes in Britain. At Stourhead, the reputedly Turkish idea of attaining a position of influence through diligence reflected Henry Hoare’s experience. He and his father were bankers and his grandfather was a goldsmith, but his daughters married titled men because of the fortunes they could bring to the unions. Hoare lists the features of the garden to signify his discipline and commercial success, as well as his aspirations for his grandchildren, in the following statement:

What is there in creation . . . Those are the fruits of industry and application to Business and shows what great things may be done by it, the envy of the indolent who have no claim to Temples, Grottos, Bridges, Rocks, Exotick Pines and Ice in Summer.\textsuperscript{38}

Based on the features listed (more than one bridge), this letter would have been written after 1765. It has the tone of an injunction to his posterity to follow the example of his work ethic. It summarizes the greatest achievements of his career as a banker, the way he has invested the wealth he has accrued. This statement also reveals Henry Hoare as somewhat old fashioned, for the new style of landscaping ca. 1765 precludes the very features he lists as his achievements. Although he could afford to renovate his garden and house to reflect any passing style, Henry chose to maintain Classical temples and

\textsuperscript{37} Perry, 30.

\textsuperscript{38} Henry Hoare to Richard Hoare, Undated, cited in Woodbridge, \textit{The Stourhead Landscape}, 17.
Turkish tents when many of his contemporaries were embarrassed by them. In the statement above, Hoare listed specifically “exotic pines,” likely from North America. Playright Richard Brinsley Sheridan ridicules exotic plants in verse, casting them as unpatriotic:

Exotic fopperies, hail! whose flatt'ring smile  
Supplants the Sterner Virtues of our Isle!  
Thus while with Chinese firs, and Indian pines, 
Our nurs'ries swarm, the British Oak declines.  

The ambition to be in the Turkish barbers terms “raised to dignity” by “industry and application” was consistent with Henry Hoare’s interpretation of his garden – the just fruits of discipline and labor. Any Temple or Grotto in the garden at Stourhead would stand as witness to his industry, but a Turkish pavilion would illustrate Perry’s published observations on Ottoman culture that Henry Hoare acquired so early in the planning stages of Stourhead. It is revealing that, whatever else each garden structure signified individually, in totality their creator felt that they demonstrated his work ethic and his unfettered “Turkish” ambition to prosper beyond his station at birth.

As Henry Hoare’s ambitions parallel the legendary Barber Vizier, his interest in Turkish culture was life-long and shared by a significant portion of the populace, and communicated to his contemporaries through the visibility and fame of his Turkish Tent. While other scholars have discussed the theme of industry and


40 This argument is further expanded in Michael Charlesworth, "On Meeting Hercules in Stourhead Garden" in Journal of Garden History 9, 2 (1989): 71-75.

41 This is also consistent with Kenneth Woodbridge’s interpretation of Hoare’s garden as establishing a patrician homeland for his posterity.
idleness related to Stourhead and Hoare,\textsuperscript{42} they have focused on Rysbrack’s \textit{Hercules} or the gothic market cross. No notice has been given to the Turkish Tent as marking Hoare’s engagement with Ottoman culture, and reflecting Perry’s account in Hoare’s library. Even though all the interpreters of Stourhead aspire to comprehensive readings of Stourhead as a whole, most are high-centered on one particular thematic trigger: that the circuit is a religious pilgrim’s path of life; that the circuit represents Aeneas founding Rome; that the circuit is all about Hercules. Not so with the two anonymous poets that follow, for while they bring their own preconditioning with them, namely specific memories that help them to recognize the objects of their world, they also apprehend far more of Stourhead than any of the prose diarists. The first poet visited Stourhead at an early date, 1749, which allows us to see the import of James Turner’s emphasis on the temporal development of Stourhead. Together, the two poems strongly indicate that a passion for encyclopedic collecting resulted in the diversity of Hoare’s art collection and his garden features.

The Poet’s approach to the infant Stourhead from a “fair avenue,”\textsuperscript{43} implies it is from the Bristol Road, just south of the future lake circuit. His first impression is botanical and olfactory: sweet peas and a “dusky elder, crown’d with flowers gay”\textsuperscript{44} perfume the air and color the vista. Even at this date, 1749, six years before the dam and

\textsuperscript{42} Charlesworth, op. cit. and Ronald Paulson, \textit{Emblem and Expression: Meaning in English Art of the Eighteenth Century} (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), 19-34.

\textsuperscript{43} “Stourton Gardens” (written 1749) in \textit{Royal Magazine} (February 1764): 102-103, line 4.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., line 7.
the lake, water was already a dominant feature at Stourhead, and the combination of its early features already signified “Paradise.”

Mark yonder waters, thro’ the bending trees,
Glittering with light, and quivering with the breeze;
Prepare the mind for something grand and new;
For Paradise soon opens to the view! 45

The designation “Paradise” for this site was coined by Hoare’s predecessors. Malin and Woodbridge both noted that Paradise Well, the future site of the Temple of Ceres (later, Flora), was extant prior to Henry I’s purchase of Stourhead. His son enlarged this basin into a canal expansive enough to accommodate pleasure boating, presumably at the same time he erected Flitcroft’s temple-over-grotto design at the head of the canal. In 1745, this site, with pleasingly “exact proportions,” 46 constituted a new and complete garden, and the only architectural elements on the valley floor. The poet next describes the interior of the temple:

There stands thy statue, once at Rome rever’d,
When in meridian glory Rome appear’d;
The form, the attitude, and every grace,
The same as when ’twas copy’d from thy face!
Thus marble can our fleeting features hold, 47

Livia, wife of the Roman Emperor Augustus and here in the guise of the goddess, Ceres, is addressed by the poet as if in supplication. Ceres, goddess of agriculture, contributes iconographic meaning to Hoare’s expansive estate by her associations with

45 Ibid., lines 9-12.
46 Ibid., line 13.
47 Ibid., lines 17-21.
harvest and fruitfulness, as well as to the shrine she occupied. Positioned on the porch of the temple, the viewer

Commands a prospect, where, with pleasing ease,
The lovely windings of the vale you see,
Which charming Livia’s sacred made to thee.⁴⁸

Livia-as-Ceres and her temple preside over the vale (now under water) that constituted the majority of the early Stourhead garden. Based on the poet’s and Jonas Hanway’s response,⁴⁹ it was beguilingly beautiful even then. The declaration that Livia made the landscape *sacred* appears to reference the inscription over the Temple of Ceres’ door, *Procul, O Procul Estes Profani*, [Away, ye unhallowed, away!] a defensive line against the desecration of Ceres’ temple and precinct. Kenneth Woodbridge and the majority of Stourhead’s interpreters believe the Temple of Flora is the starting point for Aeneas’ trip around the lake, based on this inscription and the convenient proximity of the Temple to Stourton Inn.⁵⁰ The Temple of Ceres (later Flora) was created for a predeluvian garden now subsumed by the lake and the dam’s expansive footprint. The winding vale with its sloping green fields and stream constituted the center of the garden, a vertically- and laterally-undulating landscape that the poet imagined was consecrated by Ceres’ presence.

---

⁴⁸ Ibid., lines 14-16.

⁴⁹ Jonas Hanway was an enthusiastic visitor to Stourhead before the lake was dammed. “In this delicious abode are no Chinese works; no monsters of imagination, no deviations from nature . . . all is grand, or simple, or a beautiful mixture of both.” (He missed the Chinese works.) Jonas Hanway, *A Journal of Eight Days Journey from Portsmouth to Kingston Upon Thames; Through Southampton, Wiltshire, &c. with Miscellaneous Thoughts, By a Gentleman of the Party* (London, 1756), 92.

⁵⁰ Following this narrative, Aeneas would descend into the underworld of the Stourhead Grotto where the River God (representing both Stour and Tiber) pointed the way forward to the Pantheon, which represented Rome. This symbolic itinerary is the consensus view, but logically, the inscription “Away, ye unhallowed, away!” over the entrance to the Temple of Ceres, relates to this temple specifically, not to a circuit path that will not be formalized within the next decade!
Walking along the canal, the Poet looks back beneath the Temple of Ceres to see the “grotto, far remov’d from light,”\textsuperscript{51} housing a “silver god”\textsuperscript{52} and imagines “invisible” Naiads weeping over him. That he took pains to distinguish the unseen Naiads from the observable features give credence to his account: he won’t be populating the landscape with fantasy features we might mistake for physical elements. As his walk parallels “the lake’s fair margin,”\textsuperscript{53} “the watry mirror here reflects the scene.”\textsuperscript{54} He inventories the fish in the lake/canal: pike, carp and tench and arrives at a boat, which prompts him to think of the history of navigation and its importance to the British economy and identity:

That litt’

e skiff moor’d here in safety rides,
Fearless of tempests, storms, or rapid tides.
Perhaps, at first, on some such dimpled pool,
Bold man essay’d this element to rule,
Whose slender bark its daring master bore,
And landed safe, as yonder, on the shore:
Elate with joy, invention then would try
With oars to run, with sails and winds to fly!
To distant climes the well-built bark to steer,
Stranger to nothing but unmanly fear.
O my dear country! may propitious peace
Extend thy commerce, bid thy trade increase:
Blest be thy mariners!\textsuperscript{55}

The patriotic sensibility expressed here parallels Henry Hoare’s genuine feelings, expressed in letters, about Britishness and commerce.\textsuperscript{56} Several of Stourhead’s

\textsuperscript{51} “Stourton Gardens,” line 26.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., line 28.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., line 38.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., line 37.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., lines 46-58.
interpreters have noted that Hoare alluded to the lake as a safe harbor and represented his longing for his nation to be so secure. This passage is an excellent example of a viewer’s interpretive response to a garden like Stourhead that is a more general feeling, and less like an intricate iconography. It relates to the understated theme at Stourhead which reflects the patriotic and cautious “British watchfulness” that is reinforced by the presence of the Turkish Tent.57

In a way that is now all but impossible to imagine, the Poet crosses the pre-lake valley (leaping a small stream) toward the Grotto of the Nymph (1748), completed three years after the Temple of Ceres. This view of the grotto’s facade, “a dome . . . inchanting to the sight [where] taste and grandeur happily unite” is no longer visible at Stourhead except from a rowboat. Before the lake displaced the valley, the Grotto was a looming structure with a cascade pouring out from under its rustic window into a comparatively small pool. The lake covered the foundation storey such that the former cascade now oozes out of the grotto wall at water level. In the following account, only the dome room with the nymph has been constructed. Two wings will be added later: the cave of the River God, Father Stour, and the entrance passage. The visitor marvels at its construction, claiming that “virtuosi with amazement own they never thought such wonders were in


57 Kenneth Woodbridge chronicles Henry Hoare’s watchfulness during the political instability which Britain experienced during the Seven Years War, the protracted and, ultimately, failed attempt to suppress the American colonies, and the very real threat of French and Spanish invasion in 1778-80. Woodbridge suggests that foreign instability strongly influenced Henry Hoare’s business practices and his iconography in the garden at Stourhead. Hoare gives a sense of being politically “tossed in a Sea of Troubles & uncertainty & kept in Hot Water. . . .” (Letter, September 28, 1779, Tottenham House Archive). Hoare hovered protectively over his estate and other assets during the his last two decades, cautious, and sometimes hopeful, but ever vigilant and full of insight into what should happen. “I think the face of Affairs in America now seems favourable. The Lord of Hosts is I trust with Us & they will be made of repent of their Rebellion.” Letter, July 1, 1776, Tottenham House Archive). Predictably, Woodbridge linked Hoare’s sense of political vigilance with existing features at Stourhead, but Hoare’s expressed concerns are equally relevant to the symbolism of the Turkish Tent. Woodbridge, Landscape and Antiquity, 63-70.
In other words, the most discriminating viewer of the exterior of the Grotto of the Nymph will marvel at the masonry that is both rustic and informed by classical orders.

His description of the interior borrows from the poem inscribed on the lip of the cold bath that foregrounds a cascade—“the limpid stream runs murm’ring” and the lead statue of a sleeping nymph, “who, bound in fetters of eternal sleep, forgets the waters she is plac’d to keep.” This statue of a nymph, based on the Vatican’s *Sleeping Ariadne*, has layers of meaning ranging from the associations with the suicide of Cleopatra to Virgil’s *Aeneid* and Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. It is surely, at least in part, a memorial to Alexander Pope, who penned the inscription at Stourhead and who stated that he wanted this very statue in his own Grotto at Twickenham. The *Sleeping Nymph* is also likely Hoare’s *memento mori* for second wife, Susan, though we have no direct reference to this on his part. In 1748, when it is only the second structure in the valley garden, it is also a female counterpart to the river god who reclines in the grotto under the Temple of Ceres.

Visible from the Grotto’s eastern window was a waterwheel wherein “nature’s pow’r is overpower’d by art” and the “water that downward tends” curiously “ascends the lofty mountain’s side” by means of this technology. A waterwheel was also a

---

58 “Stourton Gardens,” lines 74-75. In the future Hanway would exclaim enthusiastically: “In this delicious abode are no Chinese works; no monsters of imagination, no deviations from nature . . . all is grand, or simple, or a beautiful mixture of both.” Hanway, 92.

59 Ibid., lines 64-65.

60 Ibid., lines 66-67.


62 “Stourton Gardens,” lines 76-79.
garden feature at Charles Hamilton’s Painshill. After the construction of the lake, the water wheel was reinstalled and preserved as a feature below the dam.

The next stanzas seem to suggest the wooden Palladian/Chinese bridge was complete, as indeed it was in 1749, six years in advance of the lake. The poet also indicates that the grotto was entered and exited in the reverse manner than it was after the lake was filled (the opposite of the circuit described in Chapter One). Moving northward on the path from the Grotto, the visitor encountered the newly completed timber arch crossing the tiny stream-sized origins of the Stour. While the Temple of Ceres, its own grotto and the Grotto of the Nymph were garden spaces unto themselves that did not anticipate the unifying lake, the 1749 bridge clearly did, prompting the poet to call Henry Hoare a “modern artist” as its creator. It spanned the narrowest part of the future shoreline, and its stone foundations match perfectly with the projected water level. The bridge’s railing was about 30 feet above the lake after 1755, but was nearly 40 feet above the streambed in 1749. The poet emphasized its height and the view from the “seat” or platform at the center of the bridge’s “lofty dome.”

The modern artist nature’s laws combines;  
[Hoare] on some pleasing eminence designs  
The splendid seat: there builds the lofty dome;  
Joins health with prospect, beauty with perfume.  

---

63 Turner suggests a smaller, earlier bridge, based on apparently nothing more than his skepticism that Henry Hoare would build the bridge in advance of the lake. Since Hoare lined the shoreline with cut stone in advance of the dam’s completion (see below), I feel it is certain that he also customized the lakebed to fit his ornamental and functional bridge with a precise 100-foot span. James Turner, “The Structure of Henry Hoare's Stourhead” in Art Bulletin 61, 1 (March 1979).

64 In 2002, Richard Higgs, then the head gardener at Stourhead, related that the entire lakeshore was lined with stone in advance of the completion of the dam. If this is more than tradition, it indicates extraordinary surveying skills on the part of Hoare’s contractors. Interview with Mark Magleby, August 2, 2002.

65 “Stourton Gardens,” lines 84-87.
All the other “eminences” or seats in the garden had either architectural or foliate enclosures around them, but the apex of the lofty bridge, the 100-foot span that must have seemed so commanding at this point, was “design’d for contemplation” of the various elements of the garden. Colt Hoare’s later demolition of the Chinese Bridge eliminated several important views that are savored by the poet. Thus, from this inspiring vantage point, “the pensive mind [could] stretch its thoughts to worlds remote, and trace its Maker’s wonders thro’ unbounded space.”

“Unbounded space” characterizes the openness on each side of the bridge, and also describes the outward view to the south. Before the dam, the Stourhead valley would have sloped transparently down to the vale and water now below the dam, even as the meadows west of the village would have inclined toward the nascent rivulet. The poet, with his back to the Grotto, spies an appealing range of foliage “beneath these shades” and attributes botanical beauty as well as snake and scorpions to “the same High Wisdom and Almighty Power.” Then he spies, part way up the east ridge behind the Temple of Flora, Stourhead’s earliest exotic feature, the Chinese Alcove, and once inside the effigy of “a Mandarine” prompts immediate assumptions about the Chinese world view:

To yon strange feat, my friends! we next repair,
Perhaps a Mandarine inhabits there!
Design uncommon is in all express’d,
’Twas surely finish’d in the furthest East.
The genius thus by foreign nations shown

66 Ibid., lines 90-91.
67 Ibid., line 94.
68 Ibid., line 98.
(And but for commerce never had been known)
Deputed there the stately Tartar see,
Whose greatest princes dare not say they’re free:
His finger points to th’ globe beneath his hand;
He seems to say, All China I command.⁶⁹

In the later poem, this gesture of pointing to the globe will be derided by the poet as
“bigotry.” The importance of this passage is that Stourhead’s Chinese Alcove, lacquered
as if actually “finish’d” in China proper, was already in place in 1749 and was
contribute to the thematic dynamic between the formal upper garden featuring long
straight avenues, the Obelisk, and the Apollo Belvedere; and the valley with its mix of
classical and (thus far) Chinese features (the bridge and the alcove). This passage
corroborates the fact that oriental themes of the garden have co-existed with classical and
gothic meanings from Hoare’s earliest conceptions of the garden. Indeed, it suggests that
the Chinese alcove may have predated any of the gothic features at Stourhead. This
revelation is followed by another that verifies the reasons that the Mount of Diana was
created and thus named in the first place, as a site to display John Cheere’s statue of
Diana the Huntress, purchased with the Apollo Belvedere in 1745 and as an overview of
the valley below. The path from the Chinese Alcove to the Mount of Diana winds gently
upward:

Hence thro’ the windings of a lovely grove,
Thro’ shady walks, and flow’ry paths we rove;
The virgin huntress next presents to view;
Her favourite chace seems eager to pursue.
From view to view thy eyes, spectator, run,
And various scenes below unite in one.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Ibid., lines 108-115.
⁷⁰ Ibid., lines 116-121.
No previous analysis of Stourhead has offered any suggestion of how the Mount of Diana came to be designated as such, nor how the statue of Diana was connected to the Mount of Diana. This statue, now in the Pantheon, stood atop her mount from potentially 1745 when she was shipped with the Apollo Belvedere to Stourhead, at least ten years before she was relocated. It makes sense that this statue was displayed – situated by the poem on that very site – the only rationale for naming the site after Diana. There is untapped meaning in this act of ideologically transforming what Hoare initially called the Temple of Hercules into a genuine Pantheon. The transfer of the Diana statue to the Pantheon was one rational for creation of a Turkish Tent, appropriately enough, on the Mount of Diana. Conversely, the Turkish-styled pavilion, anticipated by Henry Hoare since at least 1754, was situated on the Mount of Diana because such an important viewpoint demanded the emphasis of enclosure or special framing of the view as well as greater visibility for the site when looking back at it from across the lake. Hoare’s early interest in Turkish subjects favors the petite Diana stepping aside for a larger enterprise; by moving it to the Pantheon, the theme of Diana was reprised half way around the circuit.

The Poet then follows the outer circuit, notably finding allusions to “old Britons,” Druids, and grave mounds where “sundry nations, and from other climes, Entrench’d in arms, have lain at different times; The Briton, Roman, Saxon, and the Dane . . .”71 and concludes with a tribute to King Alfred, anticipating by twenty years the raising of

71 Ibid., lines 146-148.
Hoare’s memorial tower, dedicated to Alfred, several miles to the northwest. It is impressive that the poet would be so informed of Henry Hoare’s interest in a specific iconography. It suggests that Henry Hoare had contemplated the significance of Stourhead’s proximity to Alfred’s battlefield long before finalizing his plans to build one of the greatest (150 feet) follies in England. On his way back to the valley garden, the poet praises Stourton village, the statue of the Apollo Belvedere, Hoare’s villa and art collection and concludes with a regret that the time has elapsed too quickly. Even at this early stage in Stourhead’s development, there is a mature garden forecast and the diversity of features that already exist indicates Henry Hoare’s passion for collecting art and architecture which represent something akin to comprehensiveness, not just a fundamentally classical vs. gothic dichotomy.

The second poem, entitled “A Ride and a Walk through Stourhead,” was published toward the end of Hoare’s life in 1780 by yet another anonymous poet. The substance of this document has never been meaningfully cited by any Stourhead scholarship. Even though its florid metaphors border on hyperbole, it constitutes in fact by far the most complete and detailed visitor account of the mature Stourhead in existence; furthermore, it is filled with expansive, verifiable descriptions of known elements. This descriptive poem offers a comprehensive and continuous narrative of the poet’s spatial movement between designated elements in the garden. As in the previously-discussed poem, the notion of Stourhead as a collection of architectural and landscape features come quickly to the fore, as well as themes of English watchfulness.

Hunt does, but not meaningfully in terms of this argument.
The Poet provides a vivid sense of seeing the Turkish Tent from different vantage points, something offered by no other single account. Turkish and other oriental themes occur throughout the poet’s circumambulations, first following the outer path to Alfred’s Tower on horseback (seven miles), and thereafter tracing the familiar lake circuit on foot (two miles).

The poet starts at the formal gardens to the south of the house and quickly finds himself on the Fir Walk. Very early on he speculates that this path’s terminus, the Obelisk topped with a gilded sun disk, would have elicited a prayerful response from an Islamic visitor:

> Deluded Persians here might prostrate fall,  
> And pay their Adoration to their God.\(^{73}\)

This initial encounter with a rather ordinary garden feature, the Obelisk, demonstrates the poet’s predisposition to discover or manufacture Islamic themes in the garden. Even more telling about the poet’s associations with the Obelisk is that it functions for him in a way that is both east and west, both Middle Eastern and Classical. The same monument prompts, first, an association with Islamic supplication, followed quickly by a fragment of a narrative from classical mythology, that Daphne (fearing Apollo) would shrink from the Obelisk’s sun. This observation occurs in close proximity to the Mount of Diana and the Turkish Tent when he writes:

> Extended Mountains guard the sacred Streams,  
> Till they descend where Neptune rides in state.\(^{74}\)

\(^{73}\) “A Ride and a Walk Through Stourhead.” (London, 1779), lines 46-47.

\(^{74}\) Ibid., lines 93-94.
The sculpted Neptune and his bronze horses “ride in state” in the water below the Temple of Flora. The reader familiar with Stourhead knows exactly to what the poet refers and is oriented not only by the Fir Walk but by familiar features on the unseen lake circuit below. The “sacred streams” that run out of the grotto refer to the spring that once poured into Paradise Well. This body of water, the rectilinear pool described in the 1749 poem formerly framed the foreground of the Temple of Flora; by 1780, the temple’s grotto springs continue to replenish the lake that has subsumed the original pool. If the poet can’t see the Temple or the Neptune from there (he couldn’t today for the foliage), he was clearly so familiar with the garden that he knew they were near. In fact, the following allusion to iconographic, figurative sculpture contextualizes the very next thing he would have seen or imagined to his left as he progressed down the Fir Walk:

O’er the cropt luscious Terrass [Fir Walk] I proceed,  
(Maro’s Elysian Fields surpassing far)  
Till on the left an Amphiteatre [concave, sloping valley wall],  
The artful Work of Nature when in Sport,  
Dilates its deep-indentend Sides profound  
Into Immensity [to the south, the valley across the dam, opens to the horizon]  
The giddy Head  
Pays for the Raptures of the greedy Eye.  
Here Dryads kept in state, Seraglio chaste,  
Give Plenitude of Joy unsatiating.  
Can the Grand Seignior boast of Nymphs like these?  

It is perhaps the intersection of woods and shoreline that prompt the poet to contemplate wet and dry creatures, Dryads and Nymphs. This undoubtedly alludes to

---
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statuary like the Neptune now lost to us, but later in the poem he refers to a swan on the lake as Cycnus, and to giant carp as porpoises – logical characterizations from the standpoint of classical mythology – demonstrating unequivocally that he is not beyond taking mundane visual cues and personifying them in enhanced guises. What is relevant is the poet’s predisposition to see these otherwise classical female presences through Turkish eyes. Most modern historians of Stourhead accept some association between the Sleeping Ariadne in the Grotto and Diana’s court of chaste nymphs, but for this poet, the signs at Stourhead suggest more: there are Turkish associations made credible by their very placement adjacent to the site of the Turkish Tent. To ask if the Grand Seignior has nymphs or dryads in his harem comparable to the beauties of an interstitial, transitional space at Stourhead indicates that at least this visitor has made a comparison to the hillside gardens and watery shores at the Grand Seignior’s palace on the Bosporus in Constantinople. It is a logical association, and one that coincides with Henry Hoare’s interest in the Ottoman Sultans and Turkish culture.

Returning to the “terrass,” the poet sets out on the outer circuit for Alfred’s Tower, where from the top he sees “Asiatic Mountians” and “Apollo’s distant Fane” (the highest structure of the lake circuit). On the way back, he visits the gothic-styled Convent. Just as he approaches the lake from behind the Pantheon, he comes within view of the cascade. Back on the inner circuit path, he apprehends a “consecrated Edifice” (the Stourton Village Church) and then turns to look back. This is the view Colt thought

---
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should be reserved for last. Here, from the village of Stourton, the poet presents “striking contrasts” between the “various Style[s]” as a strength of the garden, a bonus for the visitor who follows the poet’s allegorical journey.

The captivated Eye, views and reviews
This striking Contrast with its neighbouring Fanes.
Their various Style with various Pleasure fills,
And each conspires to form th’ enchanting Whole. 79

In these four lines, the poet has made an important claim about Stourhead that is germane to this dissertation. His observation is vital enough to merit a brief detour from the trajectory of this interpretive description. The balanced “contrast” of stylistic and symbolic features – the classical, the gothic, and the exotic (as well as other influences we may not have focused on) – is the essence of Henry Hoare’s “enchanting whole” as any eighteenth-century observer could witness. Yet historians or interpreters of Stourhead, as was discussed in the introduction, have not portrayed the estate thus. Since a juxtaposition of international styles, not uniform classicism with gothic accents, defines the essential nature of this allegorical garden, Stourhead (or Henry Hoare’s intentions manifested through Stourhead) are understood only in part by excluding the oriental “contrast” that contributes toward the “enchanting whole.” In modern interpretations of Stourhead, the thematic journey of Aeneas, or Hercules, or the Christian pilgrim has become such an amplified narrative that it mutes the foreign accents of long-gone oriental pavilions. Woodbridge and others, in their indifference to the Turkish Tent fail to engage the ideas caught up in a lost Turkish Tent. They fail to see how these ideas could be
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compared to those inscribed upon a Pantheon, or by extension, inscribed on every path that leads to and from the Pantheon. This approach overlooks what the poet renders as explicit, that during Henry Hoare’s lifetime, visitors understood the allusions in the Stourhead landscape by synthesizing the diversity of its modes and meanings. The medieval village church, the Roman temple and the Turkish Tent are aesthetically and semiotically enriched by their repeated juxtaposition in the sequence of the circuit path. Their significance is defined by the syntax of their relative positions. Each is respectively more classical, medieval or exotic when introduced within this symbolic order. The classical myths and heroes emphasized by Woodbridge and company become two-dimensional without the contrast of Christian piety and Eastern decadence.

It is thus from this ideal view, the iconic view of the Pantheon across the lake, that the poet sets out on foot toward the Turkish Tent. When he was in proximity of the tent at the beginning of his tour, he made unequivocal associations with the Ottoman Sultan’s palace, exotic gardens, and harem women. Now, he makes another reference to the goddess Diana as he passes by the Temple of Flora with hardly a nod; then he starts to climb the hillside toward the “terrass” where he began. He first encounters the Chinese Alcove:

Ascend we, where the haughty, puff’d Chinese
With Look disdainful views the Globe his own:
Which he proves clearly was then thousand Years
In Being, ere the Architect divine
In Wisdom had contriv’d the glorious Plan.
What may not Home-bred bigotry conceive!80

80 Ibid., lines 395-400.
The poet’s description of the Chinese Alcove focuses, not on the structure itself, but on its iconic inhabitant – the sculptural effigy that we understand from the 1749 poem to be pointing to China on the globe. Piper shows this pavilion to be facing directly south toward the Temple of Apollo, however, the evidence of the 1749 poem reveals that this pavilion predated that Temple by sixteen years or more.\textsuperscript{81} The poet’s description of a figural occupant, and his political, bigoted response to the “Chinese’s” alleged delusions of grandeur contributes to our understanding of the Alcove’s function and meaning. It is a counterpoint of Far East to Near East in its proximity to the Turkish Tent. The Chinese Alcove was noted by other visitors, but they did nothing more than name it. Having examined and dismissed the occupant of this pavilion, the poet continues to climb:

Still we ascend, till the gay Silver Tent  
Of Musselman th’ extended Nerves unbends.

The poet and his companions ascend even higher, turning their backs on the “home-bred bigotry” of the Chinese Alcove. They plod forward to a site that is equally exotic, but infinitely more appealing to the poet when judged by his description. The “extended nerves” that he suffers from suggests, in eighteenth-century usage, a real neurological malady.\textsuperscript{82} This is soothed – the nerves unbent – by the sight of the Turkish Tent. Religion, not merely ethnicity, now figures into the taxonomy of this tent; it belongs to a Muslim, not just a Turk or a “Chinese.” The tent is repeatedly compared to the Chinese Alcove. The tent is, by contrast, serene and rejuvenating. It is beautiful: in the sunlight, the blue and white ornaments appear cool and silvery. It is a “gay” retreat –


ornamented and light-filled. The Turkish Tent is presented by the poet as the antithesis of the Chinese Alcove: semiotically high versus low, enlightened versus bigoted, inviting versus off-putting, pious versus blasphemous. In the next stanzas the poet finds no idol of the “Musselman” comparable to the distained likeness of the Chinese man. The Chinese Alcove was already occupied by an effigy, but the Turkish Tent was designed to-be-occupied by the visitor, and it was apparently a posh place in which to sit.

Here seated I regale luxuriously;
while three resplendent Crescents o’er my Head;
At mid-day shine – and Phoebus is obscur’d.

Despite the hyperbole about Phoebus being outshone by the brilliance of the tent’s pinnacle, the poet makes visible otherwise unknown aspects of the tent. If the Stourhead tent was actually topped by three crescent moons, it would not be distinctive among other Turkish tents in England. The drawing of the Turkish Tent at Audley End brandishes three crescents – perhaps in emulation of, or a source for, Stourhead. Sitting in the Turkish Tent gives the poet the sensation of being fêted like a Sultan. He requires no one to regale him. In this rarified setting, confronted with Stourhead’s panoramic view, he regales himself. This description of the tent’s design and ornamentation supplements the visual record of its grandeur. Clearly, as we presumed from the prominence of the ornamental Mount of Diana, the Turkish Tent was calculated to overwhelm the occupant with its luxury. The next line is his summary praise of the experience within the tent.

“What may not Art with Nature when combine’d Atchieve!”

The “Art,” or artifice, is the custom-made Turkish Tent and its calibrated placement, while “Nature” invokes the naturalized landscape framed as a panorama
through the tent’s wide portal. The landscape itself was also recognized as a combination of artifice and nature, Henry Hoare’s mosaic. The next twenty-three lines describe the panoptic view from the tent – the Palladian/Chinese bridge (“Bestrides Colossus-like the lucid Plain”), the surface of the lake (“the reflecting liquid Mirror see”), and the Pantheon (“the Habitation of the Gods”). There is little in the entire narrative of the ride and walk through Stourhead that is not summarized in the itemization of the view from the Turkish Tent. Three images of the Tent or Mount of Diana demonstrate that this site was the most prominent of any feature in the panorama from the Grotto or the Pantheon. The Turkish Tent and its Mount was unquestionably carefully crafted to be observed and reconsidered from multiple positions in the garden circuit. The same import is demonstrably connected to the view from the Turkish Tent. By the end of the poem, more lines are committed to the experience of the Turkish Tent than to any other Stourhead feature excepting the Grotto of the Nymph. Before departing the tent, the poet summarizes his composite observations, which sounds like a reiteration of his earlier exultation, that Stourhead’s “various Style[s] . . . form th’ enchanting Whole.”

Each Object to its Neighbour Lustre adds,
And each receives the Lustre that it gives.83

This couplet reiterates the semiotic character of the Stourhead circuit walk. Each allegorical structure, inscription, or statue is a signifier with multiple signifieds. Each site ostensibly possesses its own, independent meaning, even as it inescapably borrows visibility and associative meaning from its sequence in the circuit, from its juxtaposition with nearby features, as well as with distant views. If the Turkish Tent were only the
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point of departure for the lake circuit, never to be seen from a distance, it might be quite forgettable despite its reputed interior grandeur and luxury. But it cannot be forgotten, for as each new feature is encountered by the visitor, it is explored inside and out and ultimately discovered to frame a new view of the Mount of Diana. Additionally, the “luster” in the above passage reminds one of Hoare’s passion for collecting, this attribute of Stourhead’s creator is rendered visible by the inventory of places, interstices and vistas provided by the poet. Stourhead constitutes a matrix of sites and contextual meanings.

The poet then crosses the Palladian/Chinese Bridge, lingers in the grotto and the Pantheon, then passes the Hermitage as he ascends the hill to the Temple of Apollo. Like Horace Walpole, the poet found this view to inspire comprehensive praise.84

Amazed, what ev’ry Genius cou’d atchieve;  
That Titian’s Pencil I shou’d own surpass’d;  
That Eastern Grandeur shou’d no more be heard  
with Wonder; that Elegance unrivall’d  
Shou’d its whole Self expand at once to View.85

In the final stanza of the poem, Stourhead, a composite of its diverse features, is deemed a better Elysium than Titian could imagine, a paradise surpassing the reputation of exotic Eastern gardens. Stourhead offered its visitor Eastern Grandeur. The Turkish exotic ceases to be novel – a wonder – as Stourhead’s throngs of visitors all experience the Eastern Grandeur of the Turkish Tent. In his conclusion, the poet hyperbolized that Stourhead surpassed the loftiest standards of art in the Western tradition as well as the in

84 Walpole famously pronounced it “the most picturesque scene in the world.” Horace Walpole, “Visits to Country Seats,” in Walpole Society 91 (1927-28), and also sited by Kenneth Woodbridge in his introductory tour of Stourhead. Woodbridge, Landscape and Antiquity, 3.
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Orient. Despite this overreaching, no prose account of Stourhead is more credible in its objective authority or more comprehensive in its panoptic gaze than the specifics laid out by these verses. These two exhaustively complete poetic accounts of Stourhead are even more revealing because they were created at two radically different stages of the garden’s development. It is regrettable that they have been substantially passed over, and thereby implicitly discredited, by the historians of Stourhead who have all-but-universally been engaged in the process of interpreting the circuit as a whole. The benign neglect of these detailed eye-witness accounts would be inexplicable, were it not for the resistance of each of Stourhead’s interpreters to include the non-western features in their proposed programs and iconologies. The problem with the poets’ accounts in that they record how symbiotically the classical, gothic and the oriental coexisted at Henry Hoare’s Stourhead, so different from the Stourhead of today.

The themes of authenticity, collecting, industry and watchfulness (that have been cited as Hoare’s intention by Woodbridge, Charlesworth, and Paulson) are reinforced by the original exotic others at Stourhead. In other words, the themes others have suggested are consistent with the classical and gothic styled monuments at Stourhead, are compatible with the garden’s original oriental features. The Turkish Tent does not distract from the most compelling interpretations of Stourhead’s historians, but rather reinforces them. There may be little consensus among modern critics as to the primary or governing meaning of Stourhead, but contemporary accounts, the culture from which Stourhead and its creator originated, do not demand a single grand narrative so much as variety and the possibility of a range of associations. Visitors to Stourhead enjoyed
inventorying features of the garden as much as the paintings in the house, while
acknowledging, in each case, that some cohesion exists between these two collections
because of the pervasive, excellent quality of its shelter, be it Palladian villa or
landscape. The collection in the house is illustrative of how we might see the
“collection” in the garden. Hoare could afford any painting that was on the market – he
turned down old master paintings that were not deemed worthy of their name. In fact,
in Stourhead’s grand “Saloon,” all but one of the largest paintings were painted after
old masters; they were quality copies and were highly esteemed even by elitists like
Walpole. As noted earlier, the pavilions of the garden are also reproductions,
sometimes miniaturized versions of famous architectural genres. It is not sufficient to
speak only of “Classical vs. Gothic” for Hoare commissioned nuanced subcategories
within this opposition. The Pantheon here essentializes the greatest achievement of
Imperial Rome, parallel to the way the Apollo temple captures the Baroque
extravagance of the Roman Lebanese outpost at Baalbek. Similarly, Alfred’s tower and
the Hermitage where hardly cut from the same “gothic” cloth either; they two represent
a primitive grotesque style versus the monumental aspect of the indigenous English
vernacular. Three different Chinese structures, each distinct, enhanced by a Turkish
Tent, and a tropical Orangerie start to give the circuit walk a feel of circumnavigating a
larger world than the isolated sphere of the Mediterranean. There was nothing
comparable to this, even at Stowe. Hoare proved the consumate collector inside and
out.
That the garden is a collection, that the quality or authenticity of its individual works offers meaning caught up in, and not just as a condition of the garden, is consistent with Henry Hoare’s own accounts. There is no doubt that it was held in common with other patrician gardeners, but its meaning is not the kind that iconographers tend to point toward. The moralizing meanings of industry and watchfulness are also amply borne out in Hoare’s life and the emblems he chose to populate his garden. These have been observed and remarked upon, to some degree or another, by most of Stourhead’s interpreters. In order to put a sharper point on the semiotic discourse that exists between the Turkish Tent and all other western features around the lake, one final observation relating it to the English memory of the Siege of Vienna is relevant.

Travel accounts which described Ottoman architecture and customs allowed eighteenth-century Europeans to remember the Ottoman Empire’s dissipated military prowess in romantic terms. If the Turkish pavilion in England assumed the role of summarizing the complexity of Ottoman culture (or signifying Islam itself), the waxing and waning of Turkey’s military empire is certainly one of the themes its visitor was invited to recall; some would respond to this message, some would not. Other associations – the opulence and indulgence of the Sultan’s lifestyle, the mastery of Ottoman ornament and the nomadic “tently” origins of Turkish architecture – were translated by English garden makers like Hoare and Hamilton from textual and pictorial accounts to garden pavilions they called Turkish tents.
The recorded travel narratives of Stourhead, such as they are, indicate that these Ottoman themes were recognizable to garden tourists in the same way that some may have recognized the inscriptions from Virgil or Milton, but the Turkish Tent was not as exclusive. “Knowledge” of the Turks through populist readings like the published letters from correspondents witnessing the Siege of Vienna meant that even spectators who lacked a classical education were “in the know” when it came to British assumptions about Ottoman culture. As it was such a memorable event, visitors to a Turkish tent could draw upon one of the most commonplace Ottoman symbols that had permeated popular culture – specifically the Vizier’s lavish, abandoned pavilion outside the walls of Vienna. The accounts of the Siege of Vienna allowed the British, an empire in ascendancy, to thoughtfully engage a poignant motif for an empire in decay. The Turkish Tent at Stourhead functioned on one level as cautionary tale about imperial ambitions.

Thus, at Stourhead, the Turkish Tent standing on the hillside was experienced by some visitors from within and from a distance, with themselves assuming the role of the Turk looking down upon the West and later, looking backward as they moved through the pleasure garden in the role of a citizen of Greco-Roman spawned Europe or of Christendom. The latter role was to sense the menace or threat of Ottoman encroachment, but by the mid-eighteenth century, they experienced something less charged, a more varied response of either contempt or pity or something like nostalgia or desire as the visitor contemplated the tent from a distance. The Turkish tent in Britain was just as surely reconfigured spolia as was Bernini’s baldacchino, and
equally symbolic. It was the melting down of the Orient’s temple and the recasting of it, not in an equally grandiose mold, but often as a diminished cameo of its former self. Just as the seventeenth-century pirate plays recorded British fear of the Ottoman threat to Europe, so the Turkish tents of Georgian England were inscribed with a radical reappraisal of the Ottoman Empire’s menace. Whether or not this signification was comprehended by every visitor at such a specific level, he would still better apprehend the character and nuanced meaning of a medieval market cross in juxtaposition with a Roman temple and a Turkish Tent. The English elements become more English in a conceptual or stylistic triangulation. Far from diluting the semiotic integrity of the system, the exotic features of Stourhead, clustered geographically and conceptually on the east side of the garden, enriched the classical distinctions of the temples and bridges, and the gothic heritage of grottos and defensive towers. In the end, there has been no iconographic advantage in avoiding the implications of the Turkish Tent at Stourhead.

This interpretive chapter is an attempt to respond to John Dixon Hunt’s observation that the chroniclers of Stourhead usually approach the garden with a particular “conceptual trigger” cocked – the proposed programs of Aeneas’ journey to Rome, the Christian pilgrim’s path of life, Hercules at the crossroads, etc. – and almost never privilege the observations, reactions or interpretations of known visitors like Horace Walpole or Richard Pococke. In fact, there are no visitor accounts that demonstrate a particular alliance with any of the scholarly decodings of Stourhead’s overriding program. Some of Henry Hoare’s generation may have picked up on aspects of the
themes proposed by Woodbridge, Kelsall or Turner; yet their recorded inventory of experiences fails to demonstrate this. This dissertation explores Hoare’s original gardens, including its non-surviving features, by being attuned to what the contemporary eyewitnesses said about them. Jonas Hanway and John Wesley, for example, both responded to statuary on the circuit path with concerns about idolatry. This may represent an aspect of Stourhead’s meaning for a small but significant portion of its visitors. It would not be inconsistent with Henry Hoare’s character and sentiments (a lifetime patron of a bible distribution society within the Church of England) to have asked himself the same questions in a garden that so explicitly contrasts the sacred and the secular, the pagan and pious.

Thus, the visitor-generated notions of cultural authenticity, encyclopedic collecting, the merits of industry over idleness, and British watchfulness, observed at Stourhead, do not undermine the more intricate interpretive programs proposed by modern scholars. Mrs. Powys’ observation about the interior of the Turkish Tent being clad in some kind of blue and white mosaic work represents Henry and Susannah Hoare’s striving for greater cultural authenticity. Ottoman tents were not tiled but architectural kiosks often were. For a period of time, delftware in European garden pavilions signified China. Later, tiled walls would be associated with Islamic architecture, and the Stourhead Turkish Tent’s tiles were installed concurrent with that transition.

Charles Perry’s book relays a legend about the lowly barber who became the Grand Vizier, a story that Henry Hoare and his contemporaries might have known anyway. “Industry over Idleness” was a pervasive proverb in Henry Hoare’s England, copiously
illustrated by William Hogarth. The barber who aspired to achieve status and wealth through his own skill and commitment resonated with Henry Hoare. His family and posterity enjoyed the fruits of his industry and discipline. Henry Hoare’s ambition also parallels the Hercules narratives of Stourhead.

The two poems considered here are truly the best argument for a comprehensive reading of the garden as a whole. Meaningfully, a statue of Diana was found at the site of the Mount of Diana, establishing the logic of the name and residual meanings for the site. It may reflect Henry Hoare’s personal mythology that Stourhead’s shrines to the sibling deities of Apollo and Diana are both placed on elevated hills visible from afar. The Chinese alcove is revealed to have been in place since before 1749 and that it contains an effigy of a Mandarin pointing to the globe. There are patriotic reveries in these poems that reflect both the inclination of the poets, but also the broader culture of Britain and the specific allegiances of Henry Hoare. The 1780 poem made several mentions of Ottoman culture beyond the Turkish Tent as if Stourhead were like the seraglio garden of the Ottomans’ Grand Seignior, that the beauties of Stourhead surpass even “Eastern Grandeur.” No modern visitor has had this reaction to Stourhead, but in its original fullness, its oriental character was seen as natural and apparent.
CONCLUSION

Henry Hoare’s stature as an amateur garden maker in eighteenth-century England is without peer. He started his gardening in earnest a decade after William Kent became a professional landscape designer and before Capability Brown apprenticed with Kent, but neither Kent nor Brown ever consulted at Stourhead. Hoare employed Henry Flitcroft to draft construction plans for his temples and grottos, yet the letters exchanged between patron and architect make it clear that Hoare had envisioned each structure as part of a greater landscape before it was rendered. In all, Henry Hoare created three interconnected gardens at Stourhead: the monumental Fir Walk from the statue of Apollo to the Obelisk, the valley garden of ponds and grottos prior to the dam, and the lakeside allegorical circuit that unified and augmented it. Exotic pavilions coexisted with classical structures from the beginning, and the site of the Turkish Tent played a role in each period of the garden’s evolution. It complicated the meaning of the circuit garden. The Stourhead Tent was not only a marker of British interest in exotic fashions and practices but also a harbinger of Henry Hoare’s early and enduring interest in Ottoman culture.

Henry Hoare was neither the first nor the last Turkish tent maker of the Georgian era, but among his peers who erected Turkish Tents in their own gardens, he demonstrated the greatest interest in Ottoman culture as evidenced by the following conditions or practices. For example, early in his life, Hoare’s consciousness of the
Levant was raised by the experiences of two uncles in the Turkey trade. Such connections procured Ottoman luxury goods that featured prominently in the Stourhead villa – Hoare not only possessed the “Turkey carpet” displayed in his spacious entrance hall (a thirty-foot Palladian cube), but the massive carpet was also laid out on the floor in the oriental manner, contrary to contemporary practice. While this may seem utterly ordinary today, eighteenth-century visitors marveled at Hoare’s ingenuity at employing the carpet thus. Even more unconventional were Hoare’s 1754 plans to erect a mosque on one of the islands of the lake, which would have been the first mosque of any type in England. This early aspiration ultimately evolved into his hilltop Turkish Tent.

Stourhead’s waxing reputation as an art collection and picturesque landscape, as well as Henry Hoare’s interest in Ottoman arts and history, attracted the Levantine travel writer, Richard Pococke, to experience the allegorical garden first hand. Pococke (and any other visitor to Stourhead) could have traveled to and from London on the Stourhead coach that arrived in the capital at Hoare’s designated meeting point: the sign of the “Saracen’s Head.” The “Saracen’s Head” or the “Turk’s Head” became common names and pictorial emblems for inns and taverns in Henry Hoare’s time and have only multiplied since. Both are intended to signify the Middle East or Islam. Returning to Stourhead, the privacy of the Grotto afforded Hoare what he satirically called the “Asiatic luxury” of his cold bath ritual, which consisted of plunging into the icy pool for relief in the heat of summer, and throughout the year for therapeutic benefits. The cold bath was his bracing, puritanical corollary to the steamy, indolent baths of Turkey. In public life, Hoare associated with members of the circle of Frederick, Prince of Wales, the arbiter of Islamic and Chinese
architectural fashions in his day, and with the favorites of the Dowager Princess after Frederick’s untimely death, including Charles Hamilton and Jonathan Tyers. Henry Hoare’s subscriber list, perhaps the most telling record of his erudition and interests, marked him as an aficionado of Ottoman culture and Levantine travel. Most notably, his library housed the earliest English translation of a *Book of Kings* (1734), based on the genealogical albums maintained at the Porte in Constantinople. This book marked a groundbreaking manifestation of the best kind of Orientalist activity: it was a well-informed British emulation of one of the Ottoman Empire’s most valued historical and pictorial records. These networks of Ottoman associations and affiliations caught up in Henry Hoare’s life and garden practice are not inconsequential ephemera. They collectively constitute the creative context and worldview that informed Stourhead as a breakthrough garden, the flagship of the English landscape movement. All of these discrete affiliations with Orientalist practice accrue above and beyond the fact that Henry Hoare created and maintained for decades an orientalized pavilion he called a Turkish Tent on one of the most optically prominent sites in his garden. His creative achievements secured for Hoare the moniker, “Henry the Magnificent.” This honorific title recalls the oriental splendor of a Grand Vizier’s tent as well as the greatest patron of the Florentine Renaissance. Henry’s magnificence was perceived in the full spectrum of his taste – in the classical, gothic and oriental features deployed throughout his world-famous gardens.

As noted, other gardeners of Henry Hoare’s ilk juxtaposed classical temples, ruins, neo-gothic pavilions and other western motifs with oriental structures in their
landscapes, yet no other Georgian gardener achieved Stourhead’s equilibrium of these features. The English-style gardens of continental Europe, Sweden, and Russia, of which F. M. Piper’s plans for such magnificent gardens as Haga or Drottningholm are an exquisite example, confirm the influential and revered status Stourhead, and specifically Stourhead, achieved even while continually evolving under Henry Hoare’s tutelage. Hoare and his circle experimented with Turkish and Islamic architecture, with exotic features that went stylistically and conceptually beyond the Chinoiserie garden ornaments that evolved in pleasure gardens since the seventeenth century.

In laying out what has and has not been said of the Stourhead Turkish Tent it has become clear that a study of Turkish tents as English garden pavilions is long overdue. Turkish tents as garden structures have been under-investigated in the literature on English landscape gardens and they have persisted as an undefined garden structure type. The Turkish garden pavilion emerged after Ottoman subjects and fashions infused the British popular press and fancy-dress portraiture. It evolved from textual and pictorial sources that Henry Hoare was demonstrably attuned to. His fascination was fueled by the most credible publications on Ottoman culture and history. In the end, the exotic embodied in Stourhead’s Turkish Tent contributed to a broad range of associative meanings contained within the garden circuit that were both appreciative and critical of Ottoman culture and that represented values held by Henry Hoare himself.

This rarified structure turned out to be far more prominent, conceptually as well as visually, to the garden as a whole than any previous account has recognized. Its removal from Stourhead after Henry Hoare’s death has distorted later views of Henry
Hoare’s design. The presence of the Turkish Tent (representing Henry Hoare’s early and sustained commitment to exotic garden motifs at Stourhead) must finally be reconciled as a part of any credible iconographic reading of the Stourhead lake circuit.

Chapter One took up the first claim, that Turkish tents were undefined and that the Stourhead tent was a prominent feature in Hoare’s composite whole. More than any other, the Stourhead Turkish Tent demonstrated that despite the small sample group, Turkish tents constitute an architectural type or category in period gardens that could be defined and clarified by a comparative study. As regards the Stourhead Tent, its site’s appearance and function has been under-defined. When excised from Henry Hoare’s garden by his grandson, Colt Hoare, its location was largely forgotten. However, if one takes seriously Henry Hoare’s abiding interest in the exotic, it is possible to demonstrate a pattern of juxtaposing not only classical and gothic features, but oriental structures and sculpture as well. Henry Hoare’s exotic constructions – the Umbrello seats, the Chinese Bridge and Alcove, and the regal Turkish Tent – were clustered in close proximity on the oriental, literally, the eastern slopes of the circuit garden. There, they were observed by many literary visitors who offer the modern historian insightful perspectives on these no longer-extant features at Stourhead.

After centuries of obscurity, two images of the Stourhead Tent painted, of all places, on a tureen and a lid of Josiah Wedgwood’s Green Frog porcelain service, surfaced in 1995 when Catherine the Great’s porcelain collection was being catalogued for an exhibition at London’s Victoria and Albert Museum. Catherine was herself engaged in creating country estates with English style gardens. The Wedgwood painter
confirmed the visual dominance of the Mount of Diana from two vantage points within the garden, documenting the Turkish Tent’s placement in Stourhead’s Gaspard-styled panorama. Wedgwood’s views of the Stourhead Turkish Tent are the most important images of the site, corroborating details such as its prominent fence enclosure around the hillside, as seen in the *Beauties of England* print, the only surviving complete view of the vista from the Pantheon. The *Green Frog* images allow for a scholarly inquiry into the most radically altered space at Stourhead, a prospect visible from more than half the circuit.

Even after Colt Hoare dismantled the tent (1792) and carved away the hillside (1798), he nonetheless retained the proximate site as the recommended entrance to the garden, and ferried visitors across the water after taking down the Chinese Bridge. These practices demonstrate Colt Hoare’s residual respect for his grandfather’s design despite his distaste for non-western features. Eyewitnesses like John Parnell, Susanna Hoare, Mrs. Caroline Powys, F. M. Piper, and Daniel Defoe’s posthumous ghost writer all contributed intimate observations about the Turkish Tent, but none was quite as revealing as Richard Pococke’s narrative of the Island-Mosque, the Turkish caprice that was, surely, the precursor to Henry Hoare’s Turkish Tent at Stourhead. As a model to the Stourhead design, Vauxhall Gardens constituted another important precedent.

Vauxhall Gardens have been extremely well documented, but even in the abundant scholarship on the site, the gardens’ relevance to the Turkish tent in England has not previously been brought to the fore. For many, the entire garden at Vauxhall functioned or was perceived as a Turkish Paradise. From 1728, Tyers refined a
preexisting pleasure garden into an artful, exotic spectacle. That Tyers’ entertainments paralleled compellingly the concurrent events at the Ottoman Porte under Ahmed III’s Tulip festival has been overlooked. The public response to Vauxhall’s Turkish ornamentation establishes it as the most visible manifestation of a *turquerie* architectural style in Britain. This study argues for Vauxhall’s practice of visuality – of promenading to see and be seen, of being framed by Turkish tents or kiosks – all of it deriving its character from descriptions and imagery of the Sublime Porte, as do other Vauxhall features: the music, the illuminations, and the crystal lanterns in a garden setting. The Prince of Wales’ patronage at Vauxhall also reinforced a connection to the Ottoman seat of government. Frederick and his favorites’ presence in his open-air pavilion, facing the Turkish Tent, also recalled the Ottoman Sultan or Grand Vizier presiding over nighttime entertainments in the imperial palace gardens or in nomadic tent cities. It became an English commonplace in literary accounts of London’s diversions that Vauxhall (and gardens like it) embodied a Turkish Paradise.

Turkish tents in England are structurally like Ottoman Kiosks: masonry or wooden walls support a domed roof (often covered with sheets of lead or copper) with canvas drapes attached to the permanent substructure. The Turkish tents of England could find no better model to emulate than the *İftarıye* or Sundowner Kiosk in the innermost courtyard of the Topkapi Palace. The *İftarıye* kiosk was close in scale to the English tents, unusually visible from outside the Palace, and thus well illustrated in Turkish travel books. An overview of the Turkish tents contemporary to Henry Hoare demonstrates that they followed known Islamic building types. Continental tents continued the tradition of
durable, solid construction utilizing painted sheet metal instead of oil cloth draperies. Batty Langley’s kiosks and umbrellos, which functioned as shaded enclosures for taking in a constructed view, had oriental associations (despite their gothic vocabulary of ornamentation). Even the Neo-Palladian architect William Kent created oriental pavilions and tents with masonry substructures demonstrating that the desire to construct exotic pavilions on the cusp between permanent and ephemeral was comparatively widespread among the leading gardeners of the day.

Thus, Chapter One gave voice to a range of interpretations of Stourhead and considered the general avoidance of Stourhead’s oriental features in this body of literature. In Chapter Two, the Stourhead Turkish Tent was prominent and essential to Henry Hoare’s composed vistas. Surveying the known Turkish tents in Britain reveals them to be kiosk-like, immovable garden buildings masquerading as the most portable of temporary structures. Vauxhall’s tent was the earliest British iteration of the genre, and the Painshill Tent set the standard for pastoral installations. European emulations of the Turkish tent became expected components of the exported English style of landscape gardening. This chapter defines the scope and character of structures identified as Turkish tents in England and documents the specifics of the Stourhead Tent’s site and prominence. Despite the dearth of scholarship on these otherwise intriguing designs they are not too rare to be knowable, and the documentation of this orientalist practice of tent making has radical implications for Stourhead and every garden that ever possessed a Turkish tent.
The popular culture context for the notion of a Turkish tent in England was considered in Chapter Three, and argues from the beginning that such tents possess either military themes or associations of oriental luxury: initially they signified either the Tent of the Grand Vizier at the Siege of Vienna or the Sultan’s luxuriant lifestyle in the palace gardens. The fashion of Turquerie extended into many realms of artistic practice. Turkish guise was adopted in masquerade costumes and related portraiture. Paintings of Arabian horses – the bloodstock of the English Thoroughbred – became a popular subset of sport paintings. These horses were imported from the British trading enclave at Allepo, Syria, and were accompanied in the pictures by oriental grooms in Turkish livery. A further manifestation of the popularization of a Turkish style is the frequent residency of Europe’s greatest Orientalist painter, Jean Étienne Liotard, in London. Swiss by extraction, Liotard visited Constantinople, painted many Ottoman subjects, and exhibited in Britain throughout his career. Each of these cultural events or practices witness to increasing interest in a Turkish style and its ambiance in London’s visual culture.

The concept of a Turkish tent was developed in British and imported publications in advance of its garden applications – sources that describe genuine Ottoman tents in use. European “eyewitness” accounts of Turkish culture in general, and specifically tent-like pavilions – on the battlefield and at Court – facilitated the British public recognizing the currency of structures designated “Turkish tents.” The diversity of travel descriptions and political tracts which constituted the amateur Orientalist’s primary documents and course of study, also provided the best historic and stylistic sources for Hoare and other
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Turkish tent makers. No study of Stourhead has ever sought to assemble and analyze these.

The most revealing sources of Hoare’s fascination with Turkish culture are the books he purchased by subscription in advance of their publication and the greater inventory of his library of Turkish-subject works. While many British publications provide descriptions and illustrations of Ottoman tents, some of the most important tomes can be linked directly to Henry Hoare in advance of the earliest Turkish pavilion in England, including an image of the actual tent captured from the Grand Vizier at the siege of Vienna. The Stourhead literature has never considered what Hoare’s subscriptions reveal about any of his interests, let alone those of an oriental nature.

Attention to Hoare’s interest in Turkish subjects in general, and his creation of a Turkish Tent in particular, have led to a reevaluation of the emblematic circuit’s meaning, or more accurately, to an unprecedented consideration of concepts or themes that the Turkish Tent contributed to Stourhead’s meta-narrative or interrelated allegory. Chapter Three, therefore, explores how the Tent’s inclusion (and that of the other exotic features) contributes to the previous interpretations of the garden as a unified whole. Of all of Stourhead’s chroniclers, only James Turner, author of “The Structure of Henry Hoare’s Stourhead,” recognized the Mount of Diana as the correct way to enter the circuit in Henry Hoare’s day, but Turner failed to connect this portal to the Turkish Tent that unquestionably occupied the very site. John Dixon Hunt more recently suggested that the exotic elements might figure into some reading of Stourhead, and allowed this study to expand the discourse.
The “all-but-universal” resistance to considering oriental elements as a part of Stourhead’s collective features has been taken up as a problematic in this dissertation. It is hoped that henceforth, iconographic or semiotic readings of Hoare’s garden will choose to factor in the conceptual impact of Hoare’s Turkish pavilion or the Mount of Diana which preceded it. While previous scholarship on Stourhead generally concentrates primarily on the garden’s surviving elements, not Henry Hoare’s original executed design, the primary documents analyzed in this chapter demonstrate the relative import of the Chinese Bridge, the Chinese Alcove, and of most consequence, the Turkish Tent. The poems of 1749 and 1779 offer a richer and fuller understanding of the Turkish Tent’s character, its location and appearance as a landmark structure of the eighteenth century. These sources reveal that any document, primary or secondary, which exposed the relative prominence, interest and impact of Stourhead’s oriental features has been overlooked, de-emphasized or excluded from the ongoing scholarly commentary on Stourhead. This dissertation seeks to turn that tide.

In the future, rigorous approaches to such a well-documented garden will choose to confront the Turkish Tent, a feature that retains its charge, its conceptual vigor (especially compared to the ubiquitous Classical temples), even two centuries after its demise. This element can now be incorporated into a reading of the garden because Hoare’s personal library and early discussions of Islamic-themes in his garden indicate that his choice of a Turkish structure was anything but capricious or inconsequential. Moreover, the graphic prototypes which most closely parallel the contours, scale and carpet of the Stourhead tent correspond to the very tent of the Grand Vizier which was
captured at the Siege of Vienna and set up as a trophy in the garden of the Polish King Jan III Sobieski. Thus, from a range of pictorial sources, we now have a remarkably clear view of the Turkish Tent at Stourhead; since the discovery of the *Green Frog* images in 1995, the Tent has become a visible part of the Stourhead landscape.

Chapter Four concludes with the argument (implicit throughout) that the “Asiatic” or “Turkish” concepts Hoare associated with his garden enrich, rather than cloud, the longstanding interpretations of Stourhead. Several themes were discussed that can be specifically associated with insertion of a Turkish Tent into the mix of features at Stourhead. The first is Henry Hoare’s privileging high quality copies of art work and of cultural authenticity in his duplication of known Ottoman models for the creation of his Turkish Tent. Every discernible aspect of his tent reflects the best available knowledge of Ottoman tent culture. Hoare’s insistence on documented models for his Turkish pavilion is in stark contrast to the Rococo frivolity of the Painshill tent. A parallel commitment to archaeological authenticity is seen in the Pantheon, the Temple of Apollo, and the Obelisk; virtually every architectural feature in the garden is a measured reproduction of an important precedent. This is not the rule in other contemporary gardens. The second theme is related to the first: it is that Hoare, in true Enlightenment fashion, engages in encyclopedic collecting of art and architecture according to established orders, categories and sub-categories. In the end, Henry Hoare’s house and garden both exhibit collections of highly valued ideas. Inside and out, Hoare’s commissions reflected the diversity of Henry Hoare’s taste and the scope of his ambition, the greatest variety of specific
pictorial and sculptural styles and themes. Henry Hoare’s collections aspire to comprehensiveness.

A third theme, the merits of industry over idleness, is a thoroughgoing value of Georgian Britain and it is twice manifested at Stourhead: the occidental version is Rysbrack’s *Hercules*’ choice between Ceres and Flora, while its oriental counterpart is the legend of the Turkish barber who rose by his own merit to be the Grand Vizier. The latter tale of industry over idleness was recorded in Charles Perry’s *View of the Levant* (1743), one of Henry Hoare’s early Turkish books purchased by subscription. The Turkish Tent at Stourhead was modeled directly on the very Ottoman pavilion occupied by the Grand Vizier who rose to military supremacy only to fail at great cost to his empire in 1683. Victory in conquest is also an aspect of the fourth and final theme, the necessity of Britain to practice political and military watchfulness in the protection of English liberty. The Turkish Tent encamped at the “walls” of the Stourhead lake garden reminds Henry Hoare and his visitors of the perpetual menace of invasion, and regrettably and inescapably, the alleged superiority of the west over the Orient.

None of these associative meanings overturns the conflicting and varied interpretations of the Stourhead circuit walk. The tent and its site augments the generally western, “classical with gothic supplements” readings of the garden circuit advanced by Kenneth Woodbridge and his followers. Each of the supplementary themes proposed here enhances one or more of the preexisting interpretations of the comprehensive meaning of the Stourhead allegory. It becomes inescapable that there was never any reason to avoid the implications of Stourhead’s exotic features.
The occasion of a conclusion to this dissertation invites a review of the contributions this document makes to the Stourhead scholarship. Many of these observations or revelations seem self-evident now, but none have previously been included in the generations of excellent and imaginative interpretations on Stourhead. This dissertation reintroduces the Turkish Tent as an essential player in Hoare’s presentation of pictorial compositions and consciously interrelated themes around the lake at Stourhead. It demonstrates that in Henry Hoare’s lifetime, this pavilion served as the privileged, recommended entrance to the lakeside circuit path, framed the first comprehensive view of the valley garden, and that this site dominated the panoramic view from the Grotto and the Pantheon. Additionally, the Stourhead Turkish Tent was one of four prominent oriental-styled structures that have never been factored into interpretive scholarship on Stourhead. The garden as it stands today is erroneously taken to be substantially equivalent to the Stourhead of Henry Hoare’s period of active gardening (1743-1780).

The concept of an Ottoman tent became a cultural commonplace in Britain through the popular press coverage of the 1683 Siege of Vienna and the garden pavilions of the Grand Seignior’s palaces from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. When surveyed, these travel accounts, war reportage, architectural descriptions and imaginative images establish the cultural context for British Turkish Tents like Stourhead’s. Visitors to Stourhead recognized the Turkish Tent as a pre-existing trope.

Altomonte’s eyewitness sketch of the Grand Vizier’s tent re-erected in a Polish garden corresponds to Marsili’s print of the same tent in the Stourhead Library. The latter
includes a splaying Turkish carpet emerging from the tent’s opening and a surrounding fence – features that appear in the only two surviving images of the Stourhead Turkish Tent as depicted on Josiah Wedgwood’s *Green Frog* Service. Via these documents, Stourhead’s Turkish Tent is uniquely tied to the moment an Ottoman tent was appropriated from its famed original function to become a caricature of Turkishness in a European pleasure garden.

Two anonymous poems (1749 and 1780) document important features at Stourhead. Although they contain the most complete inventory of circuit garden features of any eyewitness accounts, neither has played a significant role in previous iconographic interpretations of Stourhead’s allegorical circuit. The former, most importantly, reveals the terrain and features of the garden before the lake was created and after the Chinese alcove (which housed a Mandarin in effigy) was situated by 1749.

The Mount of Diana, one of the earliest features of the garden (ca. 1745), was designated such because it was the original site of John Cheere’s statue, *Diana the Huntress*, subsequently relocated to the Pantheon. The Turkish Tent replaced the Diana statue, but the site persisted as “the Mount of Diana” likely because such names become habituated, but also because the Turkish Tent was thematically consistent with Diana’s longstanding connection to Ephesus, Turkey (i.e., one of the Seven Wonders). The play between Diana’s crescent moon and the Turkish Tent’s Islamic pinnacle reinforces this association.

Interior enhancements executed in 1776, described as “painted blue and white in mosaic,” tie Hoare’s Turkish Tent to Levant travel accounts of tile-covered palace rooms
in Constantinople, as well as to the Continental tradition of signifying oriental splendor in garden pavilions via Delftware blue and white tiles.

All of the oriental features at Stourhead were clustered around the Turkish Tent on the eastern side of Stourhead’s valley wall. Turkish and Chinese architecture fleshed out the diversity of Henry Hoare’s collection of architectural styles, even as the Turkish Tent’s looming presence layered additional meanings on the circuit: the perils of empire building, the victory of Europe/Christendom over Turkish/Islamic aggression, the virtues of an Ottoman meritocracy overlaying Hoare’s notion of a protestant work ethic, et al. Reinserting the Turkish Tent into the circuit reveals that Henry Hoare created a balance between classical, gothic and oriental features. This triangulation served to enhance the essential features of each structure as it was repeatedly juxtaposed with stylistically and ideologically diverse motifs.

The conclusion of the dissertation comes to closure with an anecdote from the life of Edward Gibbon, followed by some recommendations to the National Trust for the future of Stourhead. Gibbon, the author of the still-relevant *Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire*, visited Stourhead with his father in the summer of 1751. He was at that time fourteen years of age and was less impressed with the gardens (before the dam, the lake and the Pantheon) than with Henry Hoare’s library. Here, young Edward discovered a book that he said led him to a comprehensive study of the Middle East, Lawrence Echard’s second volume of his *Roman History*. He was so engaged that it was a burden when the supper bell dragged him from his “intellectual feast.” Among the books of Henry Hoare, Gibbon discovered the Orient:
Mahomet and his Saracens soon fixed my attention... I was led from one book to another till I had ranged round the circuit of oriental history. Before I was sixteen, I had exhausted all that could be learned in English of the Arabs and Persians, the Tartars and Turks...

Gibbon’s experience is invoked to reassert that a Turkish Tent must be seen as a natural and indigenous addition to the intellectual and symbolic terrain of Henry Hoare’s Stourhead, not as an anomaly. A history of Stourhead that incorporates the permutations of lost features like the Turkish Tent is only beginning with this dissertation. There are other meaningful structures – the Hermitage, the Gothic Greenhouse, the evolution of the Temple of Ceres into the Temple of Flora – that have yet to contribute to a new understanding of the scope of Henry Hoare’s encyclopedic garden. Stourhead remains a garden about which no one should yet feel adequate to utter the final word.

In terms of the structural, physical future of Stourhead, some things seem clear: to reconstruct the mount of Diana and the Turkish Tent would destroy a portion of the garden that has become valued by subsequent generations. Stourhead has become a world-class arboretum that includes great stands of mature rhododendrons at the site of the Mount of Diana. It would be difficult to justify so radical a change even under the compelling guise of historical restoration. There is one feature related to Stourhead’s now-lost oriental richness that ought to be reconstructed: the Chinese (and Palladian) bridge of one arch. This elegant feature could be reinserted to restore several original vistas without displacing anything. And as part of the functional, original path to the Grotto from the Turkish Tent, the Chinese Bridge would also make the inestimable contribution of restoring Henry Hoare’s original distance and duration of the circuit walk.
One final amendment should be made near the site of the Turkish Tent. It seems imperative to place a marker indicating that a grand oriental pavilion (but one of several) formerly occupied its own customized mount overlooking the lake, and that this feature was a vital part of Henry Hoare’s “enchanting whole.” It will ultimately take comparatively little effort to reintegrate Stourhead’s exotic features into the consciousness of its modern-day circle of caretakers and admirers. This dissertation is intended to be a starting point.
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Appendix I: Henry Hoare’s Subscriber List
with Ottoman/Turkish titles highlighted

The subscriber entries make no differentiation between Henry Hoare I and II. Other than the first entry, Henry Hoare, Esq. is used, sometimes with the Stourhead address, which is noted in parentheses when it occurs. “Esquire” indicates a landowner with no other title.

1708  Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, v. 1, by Jeremy Coller
1718  Theologica Speculativa, by Richard Fiddes
1720  History of the Reformation, v. 1, by Gerard Brandt
1724  Sixty Sermons ... by George Smalridge
1725  Vitruvius Britannica; or, the British Architect, by Colin Campbell
1727  Ecclesiastical History. v. 1, by Charles Fleury (of Stourton Castle, Wilts)
1727  A Treatise of the Laws of Nature, by John Maxwell
1729  The History of Arianism, by William Webster
1733  The Practical Husbandman and Planter, by Stephen Switzer (Stourton, Wilts.)
1733  Quinti Horatii Flacii Opera (The Complete Work of Horace), ed. John Pine
1734  The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire, by N. Tindal
1734  Bishop Barnet's History of his Own Times
1734  Twenty-four Sermons ..., by Leonard Twells
1736  Dissertationes in librum Jobi, by Samuel Wesley
1736  Poems on Several Occasions, by Stephen Duck
1739  The Tapestry Hangings of the House of Lords, by John Pine
1740  Thirteen Sermons on Various Subjects, by Adam Batty
1743  Discourses on Several Important Subjects by Jeremiah Seed
1743  A View of the Levant ..., by Charles Perry
1745  Six Solos for a Violin and Thorough Bass by Henry Holcombe
1747  Travels in Turkey and back to England by Edmund Chishull (Flitcroft)
1747  A Natural History of Uncommon Birds, by George Edwards
1748  History of the Popes, by Archibald Bower
1748  A Voyage round the World in the Years 1740-44, by George Anson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Poems on Several Occasions</td>
<td>Christopher Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>A Series of Observations upon the Cathedral Church of Salisbury</td>
<td>Francis Price. (Stourhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>L’Historie Générale</td>
<td>Voltaire [Not a subscription; Hoare quotes from this text in a letter.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>The Lives of Cleopatra and Octavia</td>
<td>Sarah Fielding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Tragedies of Sophocles</td>
<td>Thomas Francklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Gleanings of Natural History</td>
<td>George Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Ecclesiastical Law</td>
<td>Richard Burn (Stourhead, Wilts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>The Temple Builder’s most useful Companion (with designs)</td>
<td>T. C. Overton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>A New Translation of the Heautontimorumenos…</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Poems</td>
<td>Anne Penny (Stourhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Works of Lucian</td>
<td>Thomas Francklin (Fleet St.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>Letters of the late Ignatius Sancho</td>
<td>Joseph Jekyll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Gleanings; or, Fugitive Pieces</td>
<td>Rev. J. Moir. (Fleet St.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Chronology of Travel Accounts of Turkey
Published in English 1585-1760

The purpose of this bibliography is to identify the books available to the Turkish tent makers without leaving London. They are not all travel accounts in the strictest definition.

1585 Nicolas de Nicolay, The Navigations into Turkie, Illustrated
1586 Anonymous, Omnium Turcarum Imperatorum Effigies, illustrated
1615 George Sandys, Description of the Turkish Empire, illustrated
1625 John Greaves, Description of the Grand Signor's Seraglio in Mr. Purchase, Pilgrims, part II
1650 Greaves published The Description of the Grand Segnior’s Seraglio dedicated to his cousin, George Tooke, seemingly unaware of the previous version.
1652 George Sandys, Sandys Travailes Containing a History of the Original and Present State of the Turkish Empire, Illustrated
1670-77 John Covel, unpublished journal of travel to Constantinople
1675-76 Sir George Wheler (cleric) in Constantinople (botanic interest)
1676 La Guillatiere. An Account of a Late Voyage to Athens ... and of the present Empire of the Turks
1680 Guillaume-Joseph Grelot, Relation Nouvelle D'un Voyage De Constantinople, illustrated (Fischer von Erlach’s primary source for Turkish/Islamic architecture)
1683 R. D., Historical and political observations upon the present state of Turkey

*2 If a foreign language edition of a book was published before its English edition, it is included on this list.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>John Gadbury, <em>John Gadbury, student of astrology, his past and present opinion of the Ottoman or Turkish power</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td><em>A True and particular relation of the victory obtained by the Christian armies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Mehmed IV, Sultan of the Turks, 1642-1693. <em>A defiance and indiction of war</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td><em>A particular account of the sudden and unexpected siege of Vienna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td><em>True News of another bloody Battle, of the King of Poland with the Turks and also an Account of the taking of the Great Vizier</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td><em>A Vaunting, Daring, and a Menacing Letter, Send from Sultan Morat the great Turke, from his Court at Constantinople, by his Embassadour Gobam</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Guillaume-Joseph Grelot and John Phillips. <em>A Late Voyage to Constantinople</em>, Illustrated (Fischer von Erlach’s primary source for Turkish/Islamic architecture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td><em>A short relation of the most remarkable transactions in several parts of Europe between the Christians and Turks including an exact diary of the siege of Buda</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>J. de Thevenot, <em>The travels of Monsieur de Thevenot into the Levant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Paul Rycaut, <em>The History of the Turkish Empire</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Richard Knolles, <em>The Turkish history</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Tavernier, Jean-Baptiste. <em>Six voyages de Jean-Baptiste Tavernier</em>. <em>Collections of travels through Turky into Persia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td><em>The Intrigues of the French King at Constantinople</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687-1700</td>
<td>Richard Knolles, <em>The Turkish history</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>D. Jones, <em>A compleat history of Europe</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>Jean Baptistte Travernier, <em>Six Voyages</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Jean Thevenot, <em>Travels into the Levant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>The Turkish Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687-1700</td>
<td>Sir Paul Rycaut,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Ellis Veryard,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Sieur Jean Du Mont,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Aaron Hill,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Cornelius Loos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Vanmour, J. B. and C. Ferriol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>J. P. Tournefort,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Aubry de la Motraye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Aubry de la Motraye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>John Ball,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Templeman, Thomas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>J. B. Fischer von Erlach,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Aubry de la Motraye and William Hogarth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Luigi Ferdinando Marsili (Marsigli), <em>Stato militare dell’ Imperio Ottomano</em>, illustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Aaron Hill, <em>A Full and Just Account of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire in All Its Branches</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Tindall, <em>The History of the ... Othman Empire</em>, illustrated <em>(Hoare subscribed)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>John Campbell, <em>The military history of the late Prince Eugene of Savoy, and of the late John duke of Marlborough</em>, illustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Wesley, Dissertationes in Librum Jobi, illustrated <em>(Stourhead Library)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Alberoni, Cardinal. <em>Cardinal Alberoni's Scheme for Reducing the Turkish Empire to the Obedience of Christian Princes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Cornelis de Bruin, <em>Voyage to the Levant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach and Thomas Lediard, <em>A Plan of Civil and Historical Architecture</em>, illustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Picart, Bernard. <em>The Various Sects of Mahometans</em>, illustrated <em>(Stourhead Library)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Roe, <em>The negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe, in his embassy to the Ottoman porte, from the year 1621 to 1628 inclusive</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Rev. Mr. Purbeck, <em>The Present State of The Turkish Empire</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Abbot Provost, <em>The History of a Fair Greek who was taken out of a Seraglio at Constantinople</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>John Bancks, <em>The history of Francis-Eugene, prince of Savoy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>J.P. Tournefort, <em>Voyage into the Levant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Charles Perry, <em>A View of the Levant particularly of Constantinople, Syria, Egypt and Greece</em> <em>(Hoare subscribed)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Pococke, Richard. <em>A Description of the East, and Some Other Countries</em> illustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td><em>The lives and amours of queens and royal mistresses ... of Turkey</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td><em>Travels in Turkey and back to England</em> <em>(Flitcroft subscribed)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>“A Key to the Lock: Or, a Treatise Proving, Beyond All Contradition, the Dangerous Tendency of the Late Poem, Entitled the Rape of the Lock, to Government and Religion. Written in the Year 1714.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In <em>Miscellanies</em> <em>(Stourhead Library)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td><em>The Great Honor of a Valiant Prentice ... Brave Adventures in Turkey</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td><em>Natural History of Aleppo</em>, <em>The History of the Saracens ... An Account of the Arabians ... Of the Life of Mahomet, and of the Mahometan Religion</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plate 2: View from the former site of the Turkish Tent, National Trust Stourhead, Wiltshire. Photo: Mark Magleby, 2004.
Plate 3: A View from the Pantheon in Mr. Hoare's Garden at Stourton in Wiltshire from A New Display of the Beauties of England: or, A Description of the Most Elegant or Magnificent Public Edifices, Royal Palaces, Noblemen [sic] and Gentlemen [sic] Seats, and Other Curiosities, ... in Different Parts of the Kingdom.... Vol. II. London: printed for R. Goadby, 1776-77.
Plate 7: *Estate Map*, Stourhead, 1785, Wilshire County Record Office.
Plate 10: *Prospect of Constantinople from the Vineyards above Fundaclee* from George Sandys, *A Description of Constantinople* (London: Printed by Richard Cotes and are to be sold by John Sweeting, 1652), 30.

11 ½ x 9 inches.
Plate 11: Detail of Vauxhall Turkish Tent, J. S. Muller after Samuel Wale, *Vauxhall Garden showing the Grand Walk at the Entrance to the Garden and the Orchestra with Music Playing*, c. 1751. Etching and engraving, 10 1/16 x 15 13/16 inches. Yale University Libraries, New Haven, (5392/7).
Plate 14: Dome of Revan Kiosk, 1635, Topkapi Palace Museum, Istanbul.
Vauxhall Rotunda dome (detail of Plate 14).
Plate 18: Interior view of the Kiosk on the Terrace overlooking the former Tulip Garden (1704, renovated 1752-53), Topkapi Palace, Istanbul.

Plate 22: The Turkish Temple (sometimes called The Crescent Moon or The Turkish Tartar Tent), ca. 1757-58, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire.

*The Turkish Temple* (sometimes called *The Crescent Moon* or *The Turkish Tartar Tent*), ca. 1757-58, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire.
Plate 30: Gothic Pavilion at Painshill, Surrey.
Plate 33: William Kent, *Elevation and Plan of Three Chinese Temples*, n.d., Pencil and ink wash, 27.5 x 16 inches; 28.5 x 18 inches; 29 x 19 inches. Private collection.
Plate 34: Jonathon Richardson (attributed), *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, ca.1725. Oil on canvas. Private collection.
Plate 36: Franz Geffels, Turk siege: The Relief Battle around Vienna on 12 September 1683, 1683. Historisches Museum der Stadt, Vienna. 72 x 107 inches.
Plate 37: Franz Geffels, *The Siege of Vienna* (a tapestry design), ca. 1700.
Plate 38: *Siege of Vienna*, Zamek Królewski na Wawelu, Kraków. 36 x 56 inches.
Plate 39: Siege of Vienna, Historisches Museum der Stadt, Vienna.
Plate 41: Detail, Anonymous Dutch, *The Siege of Vienna*, ca. 1683, engraving.
Plate 45: Charles Le Brun, Alexander before the Tent of Darius (or The Queens of Persia at the Feet of Alexander the Great), 1660-61. Oil on canvas, 117 1/2 x 165 inches. The Palace of Versailles.
Plate 51: Single columned tent, before 1683, Arsenal Museum, Vienna.
Plate 54: Claude du Bosc, Othman I, Founder of the Othman Empire, in Demetrios Cantemir, Late Prince of Moldavia, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire* ... (London: James, John, and Paul Knapton, 1734). 15 x 12 inches.
Plate 59: Claude du Bosc, Murad III, Twelfth Emperor of the Turks, in Demetrius Cantemir, Late Prince of Moldavia, The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire ... (London: James, John, and Paul Knapton, 1734). 15 x 12 inches.
Plate 65: *The South Prospect of Santa Sophia* in *A Late Voyage to Constantinople*, 1683. Engraving, 11 ½ x 9 inches.
Tent wall panel with foliate and architectural appliqué, 18th century. Location unknown.
Plate 69: William Hogarth, Untitled (An Audience Scene with the Grand Seignior), from Aubry de La Mottraye, A. de la Mottraye's travels through Europe, Asia, and into part of Africa…. Vol. 1. London, 1732.
Plate 71: Antonio Guardi, *The Commander of Janissaries*, ca. 1730. Oil on canvas, ca. 30 x 41 ½ inches. Private collection, Switzerland.
Plate 72: Comparison: Antonio Guardi, The Commander of Janissaries; ca. 1730. Oil on canvas, ca. 30 x 41 ½ inches. Private collection, Switzerland.

The Mount of Diana and Turkish Tent, Stourhead, on Josiah Wedgwood's Green Frog porcelain service, ca. 1770. Hermitage, St. Petersburg, cat. 917a.
Plate 73: Stable tents from Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Stato Militare Dell' Imperio Ottomano* (Haya: P. Gosse, 1732), 6 ¼ x 9 ½ inches.
Plate 74: A battle scene depicting the Grand Vizier’s tent complex from Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Stato Militare Dell' Imperio Ottomanno* (Haya: P. Gosse, 1732), 4 ½ x 4 ½ inches.
Plate 76: *Ottoman Military Tents* from Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Stato Militare dell' Imperio Ottomano* (Haya: P. Gosse, 1732), 9 ¼ x 16 ¼ inches.
Plate 77: Martino Altomonte, *Sketch of Grand Vizier’s tents as erected in 1684*, 1684. Watercolor and ink, 10 x 24 ¾ inches. Graphic Collection, Stift Melk, Austria.
Plate 78: Detail of tent with carpet from Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Ottoman Military Tents*, ca. 1727. Watercolor and ink, ca. 9 x 11 inches. American Academy, Rome.
Plate 79: *Presentation of Gifts by the Safavid Ambassador in Seyyid Lokman, Sehname-I Selim Han, 1581.*
Topkapi Palace Museum, Istanbul.

Plate 89: Mihrab Niche, 16th century, Isfan, Iran, 135 1/16 x 113 11/16 inches.