

2010

Grafts at Work in Late Eighteenth-Century French Discourse and Practice

Giulia Pacini

William & Mary, gxpaci@wm.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/aspubs>

Recommended Citation

Pacini, G. (2010). Grafts at work in late eighteenth-century French discourse and practice. *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 34(2), 1-22.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Arts and Sciences at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Arts & Sciences Articles by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.



Grafts at Work in Late Eighteenth-Century French Discourse and Practice

Giulia Pacini

College of William & Mary

“What don’t we make grafting do?” (“Que ne fait-on pas faire à la greffe?”), exclaimed the naturalist Antoine-Joseph Dézallier d’Argenville (1680–1765) as he took note of his contemporaries’ excitement over grafting.¹ The techniques of this ancient art had been transmitted over the centuries through gardeners’ practices, trade books, and a Georgic literary tradition, but as a culture of stewardship developed in the eighteenth century and the reading population expanded, there was a related increase in the public’s interest in grafting.² As a material means by which to improve the quantity and quality of one’s harvests, grafts mattered dearly to landowners and gardeners. In addition, grafts were an exciting topic of study because they demonstrated man’s creative powers and his land management skills: the discourse on grafting thus intersected with late-Enlightenment discussions about ideal governance, civic participation, and the merits or faults of culture and civilization.

Ever since antiquity and across cultural traditions, grafting had been viewed as an invaluable agricultural practice. In 1600, the agronomist Olivier de Serres (1539–1619) defined it as a “science that by universal judgment has been considered the most excellent of Agriculture, as that which, by giving luster to the rest of land management, has been, not only

Eighteenth-Century Life

Volume 34, Number 2, Spring 2010 DOI 10.1215/00982601-2009-014

Copyright 2010 by Duke University Press

1

cherished, but also virtually adored, by many great people struck at the contemplation of its supernatural effects.”³ Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century gardeners and writers echoed the hope that the “supernatural” products of grafting might facilitate the return of the earth to its prelapsarian state: when the botanist and poet Jean-Baptiste-Louis-Théodore de Tschudi (1734–84) credited agriculture for transforming the earth into a “new Eden” (“nouvel Eden”), grafting was the first practice he mentioned.⁴ And in *Les jardins de Betz* (1792), the revolutionary poet Joseph-Antoine-Joachim Cerutti (1738–92) proclaimed: “One will say that I want to restore the garden of Eden. But what can’t culture, industry, and grafting do? . . . The cultivator, man of genius, is the only magician who commands over the sun.”⁵ Grafting was vested with a magical, quasi-religious charge that distinguished it from other forms of agricultural activity. Boosting a plant’s productivity by inserting a more attractive and fruitful branch was an extraordinary operation that allowed man to feel as powerful as nature: the enhanced plant excited dreams of economic prosperity, as well as enthusiasm over man’s apparent ability to create. To paraphrase the agronomist and scientific editor François Rozier (1734–93), “If not altars, the inventor of this art at least [deserved] statues.”⁶

Similarly, images of grafts or grafting had long been used metaphorically to represent creative alliances, hybrid structures, and innovative processes of production and improvement. One finds an abundance of such figures in eighteenth-century French texts (both fictional and not), the most famous of which, perhaps, describes the relationship of the protagonists of the novel *Paul et Virginie* (1788) by Jacques-Henri Bernardin de Saint Pierre (1737–1814): the two children are, in fact, said to have nursed at each other’s mother’s breast, and therefore to have benefited from a graft-like enhanced support system.⁷ Grafts could also signify aesthetic improvement, as is evident in the correspondence of Julie de Lespinasse (1732–76), where the two terms “grafted” and “decorated” (“orné ou enté”) are glossed as synonyms.⁸ Sometimes, grafts were used to represent ideal systems of reform. Victor Riqueti, marquis de Mirabeau (1715–89), used a graft to describe the productive effects of demographic, political, and financial decentralization; he argued that one should cut off Paris’ useless resources and transplant them onto provincial structures.⁹ Also, in her *Considérations sur la révolution française* (1817), Anne Louise Germaine Necker de Staël-Holstein (1766–1817) noted that it was extremely difficult to create an entirely new society, and

that therefore one should always graft changes onto traditional structures and institutions.¹⁰ Other political uses of the grafting metaphor can be found in *Les Fastes, ou l'usages de l'année* (1779), where the poet Antoine-Marin Le Mierre (1723–93) lauded Louis XV for grafting the olive tree onto a laurel bush. Le Mierre thus referred to the French king's victory at Fontenoy during the War of the Austrian Succession, emphasizing that this feat ultimately brought peace and prosperity to the land.¹¹ Last but not least, the marriage of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette was repeatedly illustrated as a graft, for instance, in a sonnet published in the gazette *Mercur de France* that proclaimed that the royal French fleur-de-lis had just “grafted” itself onto the Austrian eagle. Instead of continuing the never-ending rivalry between the two countries, Louis XV had chosen to ratify their alliance and thereby usher in the spring that would renew the world.¹²

These are but a few examples of the ways in which images of a graft were used metaphorically to represent productive forms of improvement, transformation, decoration, or alliance. In the second half of the eighteenth century, however, literary writers began to use grafting images more deliberately, displaying a serious interest in the metaphor's literal meaning as well. Authors chose to illustrate, and therefore to call attention to, the mechanical aspects of this operation, a shift in focus also reflected in the fact that all mentions of the figurative use of the verb *to graft* (*enter*) disappeared from the Académie Française's dictionaries after 1718.¹³ To a large extent, this fascination with gardening and the mechanics of grafting coincided with a recent increase in the amount of information available to the general public thanks to the work of eighteenth-century agronomists and the proliferation of technical manuals.¹⁴ Scientific texts, such as Henri-Louis Duhamel du Monceau's *Physique des arbres* (1758), Jean-Baptiste Cabanis de Salagnac's *Essai sur les principes de la greffe* (1764, 1781), and André Thouin's various *Mémoires* (1807–21), explained grafting's history and utility, taking care to detail traditional as well as innovative techniques, sometimes with the help of beautiful illustrations. The public's interest in these topics was probably further stimulated by the contemporary discourse on selective breeding, and by news of the anatomical experiments of the Swiss naturalists Abraham Trembley (1710–84) and Charles Bonnet (1720–93), and the Italian Giuseppe Baronio (1759–1811), all of whom were investigating the possibilities of animal tissue grafting.¹⁵ A summary of this research was regularly presented to the general public via weekly or

monthly reviews in agricultural journals and other less specialized newspapers and literary magazines such as the *Mercure de France*, Fréron's *L'Année littéraire*, the *Nouvelliste économique et littéraire*, and *La Décade philosophique, littéraire et politique*.¹⁶ Not yet separated by today's disciplinary boundaries, different forms of writing—some predominantly technical, others more literary—were fused and confused in this ongoing dialogue, as is obvious, for instance, in the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, where Virgil's *poetical* description of the art of grafting is offered as a reliable source of *scientific* information.¹⁷ More importantly, these works insisted on grafting's contributions to the well-being of a nation. Since nature often seemed to act more as a “step-mother” (“marâtre”) than as a generous mother, this innovative technique that improved and multiplied the country's agricultural riches was heralded by agronomists, botanist-travelers, philosophers, and men of letters as the ultimate sign of civilization, as a work of pure genius.¹⁸ The agronomist St. John de Crèvecoeur (1735–1813), among others, explained the importance of grafting:

Similarly to the wild tree of the forests, whose fruits were bitter until the epoch when the marvelous invention of grafting modified its sap, thereby enhancing and sweetening it, so man, in his original state, was nothing but an uncouth, unsociable, and fierce being until the moment when civilization, by developing his intelligence, created in it the understanding of his power, and gave him the means to exert it to increase his pleasures and happiness.¹⁹

Both materially and figuratively, grafts transformed the savage into a happy, sophisticated, civilized man.

As a result, in late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century French culture, grafts seem to have been “good to think with,” to use anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss's terms.²⁰ They were perceptible objects and practices on which to apply more abstract debates about the effects of culture on nature. The *Encyclopédie* article “Natural” adopted the image of a grafted tree to illustrate the difficulty of distinguishing the natural from the artificial, arguing that once man starts using an object, it immediately loses its natural quality: a plum tree can clearly be classified as natural while it grows untouched in the forest, but once it has been grafted, it becomes impossible to decide whether its improved fruits are entirely natural; their taste and particular sweetness are clearly due to man's work.²¹ And when in 1796 the novelist Isabelle de Charrière (1740–1805) wanted

to express her doubts about ever being able to distinguish between culture and nature, she too chose grafting to exemplify the issue.²² Regardless of whether they were taken as material objects or as metaphors, grafts were intriguing because they excited and yet challenged one's desire to classify knowledge. They effectively helped philosophers, scientists, and writers at large perceive and theorize the limits of their analytic categories.

Grafting's natural or unnatural character may have been unclear, but according to most botanists it was nonetheless a venerable enterprise. Eighteenth-century texts granted grafting the status of a liberal art as well as that of an empirical science. Far from viewing it as a routine mechanical operation practiced by unsophisticated farmers and gardeners, agronomists more and more frequently glossed grafting as "the triumph of art over nature" ("le triomphe de l'art sur la nature"), as a science that should be practiced and rationally analyzed by "men of genius and of taste" ("hommes de génie et de goût").²³ The *Encyclopédie's* articles "Botany" and "Natural History" insisted that the noble art of grafting was "worthy" ("digne") of the attention of professional botanists.²⁴ In addition, contracts from this period show the emergence of a professional class of grafters whose specialized services were used not only by wealthy property owners, but also by village communities.²⁵ Contrary to other agricultural labors such as planting, fertilizing, or pruning, grafting was an art that required expert practitioners. At the turn of the nineteenth century, the professor of agriculture André Thouin (1747–1824) concluded: "This form of multiplication [grafting] is the most attractive for the intelligent cultivator, because it offers a great number of combinations that, when one exerts one's intellectual faculties, produce even more useful and desirable results."²⁶ Grafting, in short, was a proper object of interest for both the scientist and the gentleman gardener. It was an intellectually stimulating exercise, not a merely utilitarian endeavor.²⁷

Insofar as they drew upon and supported the notion that agriculture was the nation's main source of wealth, these ideas were rooted in the French agronomist and physiocratic traditions. They also aligned themselves within the larger culture of stewardship that was developing in this period in England and on the European continent. As the king was increasingly viewed as the steward of his lands, issues such as protecting and expanding the national forests, establishing state nurseries, and promoting botanical expertise and research became important state business.²⁸ Ensuring that the nation's trees received proper pruning and grafting was now one of the monarch-gardener's responsibilities: only by such care, after all, would

he have the resources to feed, warm, and protect his subjects. Furthermore, a late eighteenth-century fashion for picturesque gardens and orchards, and a growing perception of the corruption of city and court life, boosted this interest in rural economies and agricultural practices. As the poet Jacques Delille (1738–1813) noted in the introduction to his immensely successful translation of Virgil's *Georgics* (1782), this was an ideal moment both for agricultural metaphors and for literary works on agricultural topics.²⁹

Among the literary documents that speak to the eighteenth-century public's growing interest in the operations of grafting were Pierre Fulcrand de Rosset's poem *L'Agriculture* (1774), Jacques Delille's poem *Les jardins ou l'art d'embellir les paysages* (1782), and the 1786 edition of Louis Sébastien Mercier's utopian text *L'An deux mille quatre cent quarante* (first published in 1771). Rosset's long poem clearly aligns itself with the Georgic tradition, with an allusion to Virgil in fact placed right up front in the preliminary "Discourse on Georgic Poetry" ("Discours sur la poésie géorgique"). The text, however, does more than celebrate agriculture and the joys of a quiet, rural life. *L'Agriculture* is dedicated to Louis XV, and it weaves a subtle political commentary throughout its many verses. Rosset's references to grafting function doubly: they indicate literally that this operation is one of the most important events that can take place in the royal gardens, and they make pointed suggestions—via this metaphor for the productive naturalization of the foreign—about the ways in which the king might best appropriate other countries' resources to his own nation's advantage.

L'Agriculture starts out by celebrating the king's exploits. As was the case in the poem by Le Mierre discussed earlier in this essay, here too Louis XV is portrayed as the glorious conqueror of Flanders and as an admirable steward of his lands. The text clearly indicates that there was an important continuity between the king's military and agricultural activities: Louis XV's victories on the battlefield ensured a time of peace that would allow for the regeneration of the nation. Rosset therefore applauded the planting and scientific experiments that were taking place in the king's newly established nurseries at the Trianon. He commended the gardener Jean-Baptiste de La Quintinie's importation of foreign saplings, as well as Louis XV's tree-planting projects throughout the land (93–94). These plants were said to be the "sweet hope" ("doux espoir") of their race and homeland, just as they also helped offset France's serious lack of timber (91, 98).³⁰ Good laws and the technologies of modern planting and transplanting were going to reenergize a weary, wounded, and degenerate country:

Soon the young plant, sweet hope of its race,
 Follows its ancestors, grows, and takes their place.
 Thus, near those same walls, where our proud veterans,
 Outraged by the sword, or bent by the years,
 Called to rest after long service,
 Now carry the noble scars of their exploits,
 Louis has established a new refuge:
 Fortunate nursery, honorable cradle,
 Where of an ancient tree, tarnished by age,
 New sprouts grow, hope of the country.³¹

This idea that the locus of honor could extend from the battlefield to the plant nursery is a standard convention in the writings of this period. René Rapin's *Les jardins* (1773), a poem first written in Latin, but widely circulated in a French translation, Delille's *Les jardins* (1782, discussed below), and Claude-François-Adrien Lezay-Marnézia's *Le bonheur dans les campagnes* (1785) and *Essai sur la nature champêtre* (1787) are just a few examples that show how heavily contemporary texts could be shaped by this assumption.³² The panegyric literature surrounding Louis XV and Louis XVI abounds with references to these kings as new incarnations of Triptolemus, the mythical protector and teacher of agriculture. Authors were clearly well aware of the many ways in which the French monarchy had long invested in plants and gardens, and mobilized architectural and botanical resources for political effect. Louis XIV had been particularly devoted to such strategies, but similar practices can be dated back at least to the reign of Henri IV.³³

The most striking part of Rosset's poem, therefore, is the unexpected negative discourse that one can find encoded within this panegyric document: a streak of concern colors the poem, communicating worries about the monarchy's degeneration (98). Rosset opens his discussion on a warning note that "in your trees, humans, you will read your destiny" ("dans vos arbres, humains, vous lirez votre sort"); he then explains in the following verses that old plants can lose their original "virtue" or strength (98). With its focus on the trees planted at Versailles, the poem ultimately reads as a warning about the state of the Bourbon family tree. *L'Agriculture* speaks of the "perverse" descendants of Louis XIV's trees (98), alluding, not too subtly, to the significant decay the gardens of Versailles were showing in 1774. One of the first actions taken by the newly crowned monarchs Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette would be to remove and, eventually, to replace these old trees, thereby showing the kingdom that they were going

to be responsible stewards of the land.³⁴ In response to this problem, Rosset presented foreign alliances—here imagined as grafts, both figural and not—as France’s best strategy for the future:

From a trunk full of virtue the perverse descendant
 Degenerates, and always carries bitter fruit;
 By recalling its original nature
 Grafting changes a vulgar sap into delicate juices

 The Germans in the middle of a strong root
 Have learned to graft the shoot that has been destined to it.
 Thus in your gardens, Kings and Legislators,
 To your vulgar subjects you give other customs.
 You rule the alliance of families among themselves:
 The tree adopts another tree, glorifies its birth;
 Ennobled by new bonds, it admires
 Leaves and fruits that are not its own.³⁵

Thus, grafting is simultaneously an operation that will return the nation to an ideal, but currently lost, state, and a progressive practice that will open new possibilities for the future: Rosset explains that the new technology of grafting “[recalls] an original nature.” This tension between a nostalgia for the earth’s Edenic state, and a hope that, in Olivier de Serre’s terms, the “supernatural” effects of grafting will usher in a better future world, ran throughout the eighteenth-century discourse on grafting. Furthermore, it is important to note that although Rosset was certainly giving credit to the Germans for their unique root-grafting techniques, at the time of their writing, these verses also resonated with references to other, more important recent events, such as the “Germanic” Marie Antoinette’s marriage to the young dauphin.³⁶ During the early 1770s, many a poem was written to announce this strategic alliance and to proclaim that the future monarchs’ interest in agriculture would renew and further civilize the French nation.³⁷ *L’Agriculture* also suggested that new customs and laws were necessary to reform and reinvigorate the degenerate House of Bourbon. The poem’s “Dédicace” lauds Louis XV for having understood that one cannot abandon agriculture—the true wealth of a nation—to “the servile routine of laborers” (“la routine servile des laboureurs”). Far from letting its economy sink into the mire of traditional practices, a forward-looking monarchy must support agronomy’s innovative methods and scientific research; the future

Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette should understand as well that these changes are necessary to reestablish the monarchy's ancient glory.

Jacques Delille reiterated these thoughts a few years later in a more explicit set of verses. His poem *Les jardins* (1782) was written to celebrate the royal marriage of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette and the birth of their first son in 1781. Delille directly addressed the new queen, whom he described as a garland that connected the "Germanic people" and the French.³⁸ Then, echoing Rosset, Delille used the image of a graft both to repeat that this botanical science would bring the nation the glory it deserved, and to illustrate metaphorically the monarchy's new alliances. Here is a translation of the verses that immediately follow his celebration of Marie Antoinette's marriage to Louis XVI:

To pleasure do you also want to add glory?
 Do you want to be victorious in your art?
 Already the happy decorator of our gardens,
 Add to these names the name of creator.
 See how in secret nature ferments;
 What a need to procreate constantly torments her:
 And you do not help her! Who knows in her treasury
 What goods for industry she still reserves?
 As art at its will directs the course of a wave,
 So it can guide sap with its fertile fluid.
 Illustrate new passages, open new canals!
 In your fields enriched by new marriages,
 Attempt the mixture of still virgin juices;
 Favor the exchange of their mutual gifts!³⁹

Delille describes the creation of hybrid plants through grafting, using a highly suggestive language of glory, victory, virginity, marriage, exchange, and birthing. Given the vicinity and similar vocabulary of these two scenes, one heralding the royal nuptials, the other applauding the innovative work of grafting, this part of the poem ultimately reads as a reflection on the value and productivity of foreign alliances. As in Rosset's poem, the literal meaning of these verses supports their metaphorical one: Delille believed not only that the royal couple should—and would—promote agricultural research and experimentation, in particular, by marrying different plants, but also that their union would engender a glorious future: it would improve France's diplomatic relations with the House of Austria and pro-

duce a healthy dauphin for the nation (in fact, his birth is celebrated later in the poem). As a figure of strategic transplantation and naturalization, grafting thus served as a metaphor for actively appropriating and integrating foreign resources or strengths, and since grafting and acclimatizing were tightly interconnected in this important national project, Rosset and Delille made it clear that the grafter-king should also transplant and naturalize as many exotic plants as possible.⁴⁰

The venerable status of grafting explains how these rather technical images could be used in such a close and potentially immodest connection to the marriage of Marie Antoinette and Louis of France: grafting was a feat worthy of the royal couple insofar as it could potentially transform a country in crisis into an Edenic land of plenty. More importantly, the imperative mood that dominates throughout these verses reinforces the impression that the two authors were interested in portraying the grafter and his actions, as well as the results of his labors. At stake here are not only Rosset's and Delille's botanical or economic concerns, but also larger political questions about how the king should best apply his power, and how to define good stewardship of the land. I have already noted that monarchs in the late eighteenth century were expected to be good stewards of their land. They needed to guarantee sufficient timber to satisfy the needs of the navy and their national industries; they needed to control the circulation of grains in order to prevent famine in years of bad harvest; and in general, they needed to encourage agriculture as the science that would best ensure the subsistence and prosperity of the nation. These poems, however, offer a more detailed picture of these responsibilities. The king was not merely construed as someone who would institute conservative reforms and protect his resources. Rather, he had to be an innovative leader who could rally science and man's genius to his side. Writers such as Rosset and Delille hoped that Louis XV and Louis XVI would be savvy enough to encourage agricultural research and, more generally, to adopt useful implants and imports from foreign cultures. Only then would they bring about the transformative changes that would increase the quantity and quality of French harvests and improve the future of their country.

Thanks to these grafting and transplanting efforts, modern agronomy would allow the gardener-king to override the boundaries of geopolitics, the limited and limiting natural contours of his lands. It would also grant him more and more power over a potentially erratic Mother Nature. Ros-

set's and Delille's poems speak to the way in which nature could be conceptualized in the eighteenth century as a relatively controllable and passive element. Although, as Rosset argued, she sometimes acted up and behaved as a miserly "stepmother" ("marâtre"), seventeenth- and eighteenth-century philosophers increasingly believed that scientists, especially male scientists, could effectively manage and guide her reproductive processes.⁴¹ Grafters in particular worked to overcome the supremacy of Mother Nature, effectively disrupting her exclusive claims to creative power and authenticity.

Not too surprisingly, this representation of nature as a force that must be tamed, and this definition of a good king as the proactive steward of his land were eventually applied to representations of good citizenship in general. In his futuristic utopian text *L'An deux mille quatre cent quarante*, Mercier dedicated an entire chapter to the gardening activities of the ideal citizen, emphasizing that planting, pruning, and grafting were his most important practices: "Among these people, the most cultivated art was that of gardening. . . . Every citizen cultivated his garden, and it was an embarrassment not to know how to plant, graft, or prune a tree."⁴² Mercier continued to develop these thoughts in a different chapter: "We graft our wild trees so that our work speaks to the happy generosity of nature, who just waits for the hand of the master to whom the creator has, so to speak, subjected her."⁴³ Grafting was a positive practice insofar as it established man's control over the creative process, thereby forcing a subjugated nature to fulfill her generative potential. Furthermore, Mercier echoed the notion that the good citizen, like the good king, should have an ambitious, progressive agenda. Similarly, agronomists across the country reiterated their appreciation of grafting's ever-improving, creative character: in the words of the baron Tschudi, "These facts show us the immense wealth of nature, and they must engage to solicit *ever more* her generosity."⁴⁴

Despite this triumphant rhetoric, it is important to remember that the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century discourse on grafting was not always perfectly consistent, nor did it run uncontested. Indeed, the basic trajectory that these pages have traced up to now was disrupted by the tension between a nostalgia for a lost paradise on earth, and French philosophers' and agronomists' hope that grafting would usher in a more rational and civilized future. The discourse on grafting paradoxically combined mythical images of Eden and a teleological discourse of continuous improvement. Moreover, for reasons both practical and ideological, graft-

ing was sometimes viewed as a dubious operation. To begin with, it was so delicate and technical that it was “rarely well performed,” according to Honoré-Gabriel Riquetti, comte de Mirabeau (1749–91).⁴⁵ Grafting could also be criticized for masking or corrupting the true work of nature. The philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–78) voiced the loudest complaints in this regard:

Everything is good as it comes out of the hands of the Author of things; everything degenerates in the hands of man. Man forces one land to nourish the products of another region, a tree to bear the fruits of another plant; he mixes and confuses the climates, the elements, the seasons; he mutilates his dog, his horse, his slave; he upsets everything, disfigures everything, he loves deformity, monsters.⁴⁶

.....

These innate feelings that nature has engraved in everyone’s heart to console man of his miseries and to encourage him on the path of virtue can well be extinguished in individuals by artifice, intrigues, and sophisms, but since they are prompt to re-form in the following generations, they will always bring man back to his original dispositions, as the seed of a grafted tree always engenders the wild plant.⁴⁷

In Rousseau’s mind, grafting epitomized the ways in which civilization deformed and perverted the human spirit. It was artificial, and at best had illusory worth.⁴⁸ Since the seeds of a grafted plant seemed to revert to its natural stock, the metaphor was also popular in theological arguments that the children of baptized (i.e., improved) parents were still born into sin (Davidson, 28). Last but not least, the same metaphor was used frequently in literature to represent illegitimate unions and other forms of contamination.⁴⁹

Negative arguments about grafting continued to be popular in the early nineteenth century. When, in *De la démocratie en Amérique* (1835), the historian Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–59) illustrated the ways in which the English and American common law system functioned, he noted disparagingly that conservative English lawyers preferred “grafting” creative interpretations to creating new legislation.⁵⁰ A more developed example of this skepticism about the nature of a grafted plant—and therefore about similar forms of revolutionary “progress” by transplanting culture—can be found in *Le notaire de Chantilly* (1836), a rather didactic work by the novelist Léon Gozlan (1803–66), which mourned Ancien-Régime society and the ways

in which the church and Christianity traditionally held society together. Although it was published slightly after the period I have been discussing, this reactionary novel directly engaged the late eighteenth-century debates about the improvement of nature, and it too was written in a language of trees.

Gozlan's novel tells the story of a notary named Maurice whose life is almost destroyed by a conniving wife and ambitious brother-in-law. It is a story of speculation, corruption, and greed set amid the 1831–32 uprisings in Vendée against King Louis Philippe. More importantly, throughout the entire novel Gozlan uses a language of trees to portray his main characters. He explains that the notary's methodical, content nature can be "read" in the good care that he takes of his garden: "The discipline of the soldier can be read in the brightness of his buttons; the good name of the rural functionary, in the presentation of his boxwoods, in the symmetry of his flowerbeds. The style is the man; horticulture is the notary."⁵¹ And Gozlan describes M. Clavier, an old *Conventionnel* (member of the Convention; also known as the "regicide," 1:113), by saying that he reads *Le parfait jardinier* and that he owns an avant-garde hothouse for acclimatizing foreign plants (1:9, 1:4). Despite his ferocious politics, M. Clavier has a good sense of humor that surfaces in ironic comments about how his neighbors must be surprised that he hasn't already "decapitated" his trees in an excess of revolutionary fervor.⁵² At the end of the novel, M. Clavier's death is prefigured by the ominous state of his parterres, which start looking like cemeteries (2:124). Gozlan uses plants throughout his narrative to represent characters and lives, and notes time and again that most people regard Chantilly's woods only in terms of their commercial value (1:151, 1:251, 1:254, 2:222).

A grafting metaphor is the most intriguing of these arboreal figures, and it is no coincidence that Gozlan puts it in the mouth of the *Conventionnel*. M. Clavier lives with his protégée Mlle Caroline de Meilhan, the sole remnant of an aristocratic family he killed during the Terror (at the end of this massacre, the young revolutionary took pity on Caroline, whom he eventually adopted; since then Caroline has taken care of M. Clavier without knowing that she is to be his sole heir on the one condition that she not marry an aristocrat). But Caroline is seduced by the ultraroyalist Edouard de Calvaincourt, a leader of the rebellion in Vendée, and this unfortunate turn of events brings M. Clavier and Edouard face to face in a duel. Interestingly, the *Conventionnel* does not fault the young man for

having seduced his protégée; he believes that he would be able to forgive a crime of passion, which, in any event, marriage would erase. The issue instead is that such a marriage would devalue his entire existence:

Vendeian, you do not understand a republican: the *chouan* does not comprehend the blue? Caroline is not my daughter: she is better than that; she is my conquest. The only palm that I have extracted in my bloody fighting with yours. She is the last branch of a noble race, which I cut off of a trunk that will regrow no longer, thanks to me! And when I have killed all the ancestors of this child, when I have robbed her mother, from whom I stole her, you come, you, with your castles, your titles, your name, your prejudices, you come mix your abundant and impure sap to this sap to perpetuate it; you come plant nobles where I have prepared the ground for a plebeian harvest; you come graft counts where I waited for the common branch that, with its large leaves, would have cast shade over my old age. And who will reward me for this? The children, which you will have with Caroline? But they would curse me for having killed their ancestors. For my death, mister, I want the rest that I did not have during my life.⁵³

Clearly, a graft is a problematic choice for a metaphor to describe Caroline's potential marriage. The *Conventionnel* prefers to think of his protégée as a natural plebeian, as if Caroline's education were sufficient to naturalize her adopted social status. He fears that Edouard will "graft" nobility on a trunk that in reality is of pure noble blood. Through this paradoxical image of a graft that in fact is not one, Gozlan marks as illusory the revolutionary's conviction that culture might change the work of nature and override the determinations of birth. Furthermore, that M. Clavier is only interested in resting in the shade of Caroline's dynastic tree, while she and Edouard are characterized by "abundant sap," speaks to the sterility of the former's life in contrast to the vitality of aristocratic culture.

The rest of this conservative novel works to overturn M. Clavier's ideas by showing how Caroline is naturally attracted to Edouard because of their common heritage (1:191). She feels the pull of her roots, regardless of the ideas that M. Clavier has tried to implant within her. Caroline, moreover, ultimately dies asphyxiated by the culture that adopted or transplanted her: when she learns of her lover's death amid the fighting in Paris, she loses her will to live and lets herself be poisoned by M. Clavier's "fatal trees" ("arbres funestes"), a group of exotic manchineel trees that emit dangerously toxic vapors (2:269). Once again through a language of trees, the novel com-

ments negatively on change, novelty, and difference—in short, on innovative or revolutionary culture in general. Gozlan suggests that M. Clavier's work was both useless, since transplanting can neither change the powerful course of nature, nor alter Caroline and Edouard's instinctive attraction to each other, and ultimately treacherous, since M. Clavier's foreign saplings kill the very hand that feeds them. "Nature," tradition, and the pull of roots are reasserted in this counterrevolutionary novel, while grafting, transplantation, innovation, and the foreign are all marked as futile, if not perilous forces.

In conclusion, the discourse on grafting helped eighteenth-century French authors conceptualize and articulate their understanding of the merits or faults of civilization, just as it allowed them to define good civic participation and ideal forms of stewardship of the land. Insofar as grafts could be read as figures of the transplantation and integration of foreign culture(s), they also resonated with allusions to contemporary political events and issues. Above all, however, grafts were ambiguous metaphors that could be mobilized both as positive proof of the improving power of man's work, and as a negative sign of the weakness and inauthentic character of a life without roots. Grafting could be approved as a progressive art that created new resources for the nation, or be rejected as an outlandish procedure that perverted authentic forms of native culture. It was most likely this malleability of the grafting image, combined with the ideological strength of the concepts it immediately summoned (e.g., nature, civilization), that allowed it to maintain currency over the centuries. Today, grafting has become such a popular metaphor that one risks forgetting that this figure of speech was once grounded in practice, and that in its literal meaning the discourse on grafting addressed some of the most important economic and political concerns of eighteenth-century French society. Grafts were "good to think with" because they helped eighteenth-century writers negotiate the tensions and contradictions that surfaced between their nostalgia for a "natural" society or a lost Ancien Régime, and agronomist or revolutionary dreams of never-ending culture, innovation, and progress. In many ways, this fuzzy image was particularly compatible with a culture that was struggling to understand and accept the fact that the world cannot always be classified as neatly as one might like.

Notes

I would like to thank Sibel Zandi-Sayek and *Eighteenth-Century Life's* anonymous reviewers for their good feedback on an earlier version of this essay.

1. Antoine-Joseph Dézallier D'Argenville, *La théorie et la pratique du jardinage* [1747] (Arlès: Actes Sud: ENSP, 2003), 374.

2. Among the ancient authors most frequently cited by eighteenth-century philosophers, agronomists, and botanists were Aristotle, Cato, Varro, Columela, Theophrastus, and Virgil.

3. Olivier de Serres, *Le théâtre d'agriculture et le mesnage des champs* (Paris, 1600), 655: "Science, par jugement universel, estimée la plus excellente de l'Agriculture, comme celle qui donnant lustre au reste du gouvernement des champs, a été, non seulement chérie, ains presque adorée, de plusieurs grands personnages, arrêtés à la contemplation de ses supernaturels effets." All translations from the French are my own.

4. Jean-Baptiste-Louis-Théodore de Tschudi, *La nature sauvage et la nature cultivée* (Metz: Joseph Antoine, no date), 7.

5. Joseph-Antoine-Joachim Cerutti, *Les jardins de Betz* (Paris: chez Desenne, 1792): "On dira que je veux refaire le paradis terrestre. Mais que ne peut la culture, l'industrie, la greffe? . . . et le cultivateur, homme de génie, est le seul magicien qui commande au soleil."

6. François Rozier, *Cours complet d'agriculture pratique, d'économie rurale et domestique, et de médecine vétérinaire*, 6 vols. (1784–96; rep. Paris, 1809), 4:41: "L'inventeur de cet art qui n'a été décrit que vers la fin de la République romaine, et qui pourtant doit être fort ancien, est resté inconnu, quoiqu'il eût mérité, sinon des autels, du moins des statues."

7. Jacques-Henri Bernardin de Saint Pierre, *Paul et Virginie* [1788] (Paris: Flammarion, 1992), 98–99: "Comme deux bourgeons qui restent sur deux arbres de la même espèce, dont la tempête a brisé toutes les branches, viennent à produire des fruits plus doux, si chacun d'eux, détaché du tronc maternel, est greffé sur le tronc voisin; ainsi ces deux petits enfants, privés de tous leurs parents, se remplissaient de sentiments plus tendres que ceux de fils et de fille, de frère et de soeur, quand ils venaient à être changés de mamelles par les deux amies qui leur avaient donné le jour."

8. Julie de Lespinasse to M. de Guibert, "quatre heures après midi, 1774," in *Lettres*, ed. Jacques Dupont (Paris: La Table Ronde, 1997), 89 (letter 34).

9. Victor de Riquetti, marquis de Mirabeau, *L'ami des hommes, ou, Traité de la population*, 5 vols. (Avignon, 1756), 2:409: "Dix greffes tirées d'un arbre vont féconder dix sauvageons, dont la fertilité étonnera dans peu; et si elles eussent demeuré sur l'arbre nourricier, cet arbre n'en eût pas été plus vigoureux."

10. Germaine de Staël, *Considérations sur la révolution française* [1818] (Paris: Tallandier, 1983), 222. This work was heavily edited and published posthumously by her son Auguste-Louis de Staël.

11. Antoine-Marin Le Mierre, *Les Fastes* [1779], in vol. 3 of *Oeuvres*, ed. Périn (Paris: Maugeret fils, 1810), canto 5: “Toi qui sur le laurier voulait enter l’olivier.”

12. Del Medesmo [M. A. Cardinali], “Sonetto in lode di LUIGI XV, re di France, all’occasione dei denominati regi sponsali,” in *Mercure de France* (June 1770): 185.

13. In the 1687 and 1694 editions of the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie Française*, you can still read: “On dit fig. qu’*Une famille est entée sur une autre*, pour dire, qu’elle y est entrée, et qu’elle en a pris le nom et les armes.”

14. For a history of eighteenth-century French agronomy, see André Bourde, *Agronomie et agronomes en France au XVIIIe siècle*, 3 vols. (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N, 1967).

15. This work on animal tissues was directly inspired by plant grafting. See the preface to Charles Bonnet, *Contemplation de la Nature*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: chez Marc-Michel Rey, 1764), xxviii. See also Jenny Davidson, *Breeding: A Partial History of the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia Univ., 2009).

16. Bourde discusses the journals dedicated to the circulation of these ideas in *Agronomie*, 3:1506–20.

17. See Jacques Lacombe, *Encyclopédie méthodique: Art aratoire et du jardinage* (Paris: Agasse, an V), 109.

18. Pierre Fulcrand de Rosset, *L’agriculture, ou les géorgiques françaises* (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1774), 52.

19. J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, *Voyage dans la Haute Pensylvanie et dans l’état de New York*, 3 vols. (Paris: Maradan, 1801), 1:16: “Semblable au sauvageon des forêts, dont les fruits ont été amers jusqu’à l’époque où l’invention merveilleuse de la greffe, en modifiant la sève, lui en fit rapporter de meilleurs et de plus doux, l’homme, dans son premier état, n’a été qu’un être agreste, insociable et féroce, jusqu’au moment où la civilisation, en développant son intelligence, y créa le sentiment de sa puissance, et lui procura les moyens de l’exercer pour augmenter ses jouissances et son bonheur.” Cf. *Voyage*, 2:167, 2:225. See also [Jean-Baptiste-Louis-Théodore Tschudi], *De la transplantation, de la naturalisation, et du perfectionnement des végétaux* (London: chez Lambert et Didot, 1778), 42–44, and passim, and Etienne Bonnot de Condillac, *Cours d’étude pour l’instruction du prince de Parme*, 16 vols. (Genève: Dufart, 1789), 1:133.

20. Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Totemism*, trans. Rodney Needham (Boston: Beacon, 1972), 89.

21. “Naturel (Métaphysique),” in vol. 11 of *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* [1751–77], ed. Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d’Alembert (Paris, 1765), 45: “En ce sens là, il n’est presque rien dans l’usage des choses, qui soit totalement naturel, que ce qui n’a point été à la disposition des hommes. Un arbre, par exemple, un prunier est naturel lorsqu’il a crû dans les forêts, sans qu’il ait été ni planté ni greffé; aussi-tôt qu’il l’a été il perd en ce sens là, autant de naturel qu’il a reçu d’impressions par le soin des hommes. Est-ce donc que sur un arbre greffé, il n’y croît pas naturellement des prunes ou des cerises? Oui en-tant qu’elles n’y croissent pas surnaturellement; mais non pas en-tant qu’elles y viennent par le secours de l’industrie humaine, ni en tant qu’elles deviennent telle prûne ou

telle cerise, d'un goût et d'une douceur qu'elles n'auraient point eu sans le secours de l'industrie humaine; par cet endroit la prune et la cerise sont venues artificiellement et non pas naturellement."

22. Isabelle de Charrière, the article entitled "Nature," in the philosophical dictionary at the end of *Trois femmes* [1796] (Lausanne: L'Age d'homme, 1996), 139: "Le sauvageon est naturel, sans doute; mais c'est aussi la nature qui donna à l'homme la pensée et l'art de greffer la pêche perfectionnée sur le sauvage amandier. On sépare mal à propos la société d'avec la nature. . . . Est-il quelque chose hors de la nature où nous ayons puisé nos institutions sociales, nos vices et nos erreurs?"

23. The first quotation is from the article "Greffe (Jar.)," in vol. 7 of Diderot and d'Alembert's *Encyclopédie* [1757], 921. The same article continues to say that "ce petit art est ce que l'on a imaginé de plus ingénieux pour la perfection de la partie d'agriculture qui en fait l'objet." The second quotation is from Jean-Roger Schabol, *Dictionnaire pour la théorie et la pratique du jardinage et de l'agriculture, par principes, et démontrés d'après la physique des végétaux* (Paris: Dubure, 1767), ix.

24. See, for example, Louis-Jean-Marie Daubenton's article "Botanique (Ordre encyclop. Entendement. Raison. Philosophie ou Science. Science de la nature. Physique générale, particulière. Botanique)," in vol. 2 of Diderot and d'Alembert's *Encyclopédie* [1751], 343: "Cet art précieux [de la greffe et de la taille des arbres] est inépuisable dans ses productions. Combien ne nous reste-t-il pas d'expériences à faire, dont il peut résulter de nouveaux fruits qui seroient peut-être encore meilleurs que ceux que nous avons déjà trouvés? Ce que nous avons fait pour les arbres et les arbrisseaux ne peut-il pas aussi se faire pour les autres plantes, surtout depuis que nous croyons savoir comment s'opere leur génération, en substituant aux poussières fécondantes d'une plante, des poussières d'une autre espèce? n'y auroit-il pas lieu d'espérer qu'elles produiroient dans le pistil de nouveaux germes, dont nous pourrions tirer des sortes de mulets, comme nous en avons dans les animaux; et que ces mulets de plantes auroient de nouvelles propriétés, dont nous pourrions faire usage. Le nombre des variétés auxquelles la nature peut se prêter, est presque infini: c'est de ces variétés que nous avons tiré nos meilleurs fruits. Si nos prunes, nos pêches, nos abricots, etc. ne sont pas des espèces constantes, ce sont au moins des productions préférables à la plupart des espèces constantes, et bien dignes par leur utilité d'occuper les Botanistes, qui semblent les dédaigner et en abandonner le soin aux Jardiniers." The article entitled "Histoire naturelle" contains similar statements.

25. Florent Quellier, *Des fruits et des hommes: L'arboriculture fruitière en Ile de France (vers 1600-vers 1800)* (Rennes: Presses Univ. de Rennes, 2003), 197.

26. André Thouin, "Sixième mémoire," in "Description de l'école d'agriculture pratique du Muséum, aux cultivateurs. Hommage offert par un de leurs confrères affectionnés, et déposé à la bibliothèque centrale du peuple français par un de ses membres" (unpublished collection of printed texts, assembled and dated Paris, 22 March 1814), 2: "Cette voie de multiplication [la greffe] est la plus attrayante pour le cultivateur intelligent, parce qu'elle fournit un grand nombre de combinaisons, qui en exerçant les facultés intellectuelles, donnent encore des résultats utiles et agréables."

27. Thouin also indicated that grafting was an aesthetic project that could enhance the appearance of a picturesque garden: see “Mémoire sur une nouvelle sorte de greffe, nommée greffe en arc, et sur les avantages qu’on peut en obtenir,” in “Description.”

28. In regards to this culture of stewardship in England, see, for example, Stephen Daniels, “The Political Iconography of Woodland in Later Georgian England,” in *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design, and Use of Past Environments*, ed. Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1988), 43–82; Tom Williamson, *Polite Landscapes: Gardens and Society in Eighteenth-Century England* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ., 1995); Stephen Bending, “A Natural Revolution: Garden Politics in Eighteenth-Century England,” *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetics and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Berkeley: Univ. of California, 1998), 241–66; and Richard Drayton, *Nature’s Government: Science, Imperial Britain, and the “Improvement” of the World* (New Haven: Yale Univ., 2000). Regarding the political and economic importance of botany in this period, see *Visions of Empire*, ed. David P. Miller and Peter H. Reill (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1996); *Nature and Empire: Science and the Colonial Enterprise*, ed. Roy Macleod, *Osiris*, 2nd ser., 15 (2000): 1–323; Londa Schiebinger, *Plants and Empire: Colonial Bioprospecting in the Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ., 2004); *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World*, ed. Londa Schiebinger and Claudia Swan (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 2005); and Beth Fowkes Tobin, *Colonizing Nature: The Tropics in British Arts and Letters, 1760–1820* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 2005).

29. *Les Géorgiques de Virgile*, trans. Jacques Delille (Paris: Didot l’aîné, 1782), iii.

30. Rosset, *Agriculture*: “La France n’offre plus que des bois nécessaires; / Les verrons-nous tomber sous vos mains téméraires? Non; par de sages loix les arbres rassurés / Ne craignent plus du fer les coups prématurés” (91).

31. Rosset, *Agriculture*: “Bientôt le jeune plant, doux espoir de sa race, / Succède à ses aïeux, croît, et remplit leur place. / Ainsi près de ces murs, où nos fiers Vétérans, / Outragés par le fer, ou courbés sous les ans, / Appelés au repos, après de longs services, / Portent de leurs exploits les nobles cicatrices, / LOUIS vient d’élever un asyle nouveau; / Heureuse pépinière, honorable berceau, / Où d’une tige antique, et par l’âge flétrie, / Croissent les rejetons, espoir de la Patrie” (98).

32. Claude-François-Adrien Lezay-Marnézia, *Le bonheur dans les campagnes* (Neufchâtel, 1785); Lezay-Marnézia, *Essai sur la nature champêtre* (Paris: Prault, 1787); and René Rapin, *Les Jardins, poème en quatre chants*, trans. M. Gazon Dourxigné (Paris, 1773).

33. In this regard, see, for instance, Chandra Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1997), and Elizabeth Hyde, *Cultivated Power: Flowers, Culture, and Politics in the Reign of Louis XIV* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 2005).

34. See Susan B. Taylor-Leduc, “Louis XVI’s Public Gardens: The Replantation of Versailles in the Eighteenth Century,” *Journal of Garden History* 14:2 (1994): 67–91,

and Giulia Pacini, "A Culture of Trees: The Politics of Pruning and Felling in Late Eighteenth-Century France," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 41 (2007): 1–15.

35. Rosset, *Agriculture*: "D'un tronc plein de vertu le descendant *pervers* / *Dégénère*, et toujours porte des fruits amers; / La greffe rappelant sa nature première, / Change en suc délicats une sève grossière. / L'un d'un arbre étêté fend le tronc vigoureux, / Insère dans son sein un rameau plus heureux; / Marient leur écorce, et fermant l'ouverture, / De la pluie et des vents il écarte l'injure. / En forme d'écusson, d'un arbre fructueux / D'autres vont enlever l'écorce avec ses noeuds. / L'arbre sauvage éprouve une utile blessure, / Où s'unit l'écusson qui change sa nature. / . . . Les Germains au milieu d'une forte racine / Ont appris à greffer le jet qu'on lui destine. / *Ainsi dans vos jardins, Rois et Législateurs, / A vos sujets grossiers vous donnez d'autres moeurs. / Des familles entr'eux vous réglez l'alliance: / L'arbre adopte un autre arbre, illustre sa naissance; / Il admire, ennobli par de nouveaux liens, / Un feuillage et des fruits qui ne sont pas les siens*" (98–99, my italics).

36. Although Marie Antoinette was Austrian, contemporary literature often described her as "Germanic." See the quotation in note 38 from Jacques Delille, *Les jardins ou l'art d'embellir les paysages* (Paris: Frères Didot, 1782).

37. See, for instance, Abbé de Rouzeau, *Ode sur le mariage de Monseigneur le Dauphin* (Paris: chez la veuve Duchesne, 1770), and Imbert de Nîmes, *Ode sur le mariage de Monseigneur le Dauphin* (Paris: chez de Lormel, 1770). Cf. also Rapin, *Jardins*, and Lezay Marnézia, *Bonheur and Essai*.

38. Delille, *Jardins*: "Et toi par qui le ciel nous fis cet heureux don, / Toi qui, le plus beau noeud, la chaîne la plus chère / Des Germains, des Français, d'un époux et d'un frère, / Les unis, comme on voit de deux pompeux ormeaux / Une guirlande en fleurs enchaîner les rameaux" (50).

39. Delille, *Jardins*, 51–52: "Au plaisir voulez-vous joindre encore la gloire? / Voulez-vous de votre art remporter la victoire? / Déjà de nos jardins heureux décorateur, / Ajoutez à ces noms le nom de créateur. / Voyez comme en secret la nature fermente; / Quel besoin d'enfanter sans cesse la tourmente: / Et vous ne l'aidez pas! Qui sait dans son trésor / Quels biens à l'industrie elle réserve encor? / Comme l'art à son gré guide le cours de l'onde, / Il peut guider la sève à sa liqueur féconde / Montrez d'autres chemins, ouvrez d'autres canaux. / Dans vos champs enrichis par des hymens nouveaux, / Des sucS vierges encore essayez le mélange; / De leurs dons mutuels favorisez l'échange."

40. See Delille, *Jardins*, 52; Rosset, *Agriculture*, 92.

41. See for instance Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1989).

42. Louis-Sébastien Mercier, *L'An deux mille quatre cent quarante*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1786): "L'art le plus cultivé chez ce peuple, était le jardinage. . . . Chaque citoyen cultivait son jardin, et c'était une honte de ne point savoir planter, ni greffer, ni tailler un arbre" (2:364).

43. Mercier, *L'An deux mille*: "Nous greffons nos arbres sauvages, afin que nos travaux répondent à l'heureuse libéralité de la nature, qui n'attend que la main du maître à qui le créateur l'a, pour ainsi dire, *soumise*" (2:41–42, my italics).

44. [Tschudi], *De la transplantation*: “Ces faits nous prouvent l’immense richesse de la Nature, et nous doivent engager *toujours plus* à solliciter sa générosité” (29, Italics in the original).

45. A graft “rarement est bonne,” from Honoré-Gabriel Riqueti, comte de Mirabeau, *Lettres originales de Mirabeau: écrites du donjon de Vincennes, pendant les années 1777, 1778, et 1780* (Paris, 1792), 223. Cf. Mercier, *Du Théâtre, ou, nouvel essai sur l’art dramatique* (Amsterdam: van Harrevelt, 1773), vii.

46. This is the opening paragraph of book 1 of Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s *Emile* [1762], in *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Bernard Gagnebin and Marcel Raymond, 5 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1959–1969), 4:245: “Tout est bien sortant des mains de l’Auteur des choses, tout dégénère entre les mains de l’homme. Il force une terre à nourrir les productions d’une autre, un arbre à porter les fruits d’un autre; il mêle et confond les climats, les éléments, les saisons; il mutile son chien, son cheval, son esclave; il bouleverse tout, il défigure tout, il aime la difformité, les monstres.”

47. This quotation is taken from the third dialogue in Rousseau, “Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques” (*Oeuvres complètes*, 1:972): “Ces sentimens innés que la nature a gravés dans tous les coeurs pour consoler l’homme dans ses misères et l’encourager à la vertu peuvent bien à force d’art, d’intrigues et de sophismes être étouffés dans les individus, mais prompts à renaître dans les générations suivantes, ils ramèneront toujours l’homme à ses dispositions primitives, comme la semence d’un arbre greffé redonne toujours le sauvageon.” See also Rousseau’s *Lettres sur la botanique*, in *Oeuvres complètes*, 4:1188. In regard to Rousseau’s criticism of exotic botany, see Alexandra Cook, “Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Exotic Botany,” *Eighteenth-Century Life* 26 (2002): 181–201.

48. In regard to the limits of grafts and grafting, see also Joseph Marie de Maistre, *Considérations sur la France* (London, 1797): “L’homme peut tout modifier dans la sphère de son activité, mais il ne crée rien: telle est sa loi, au physique comme au moral. L’homme peut sans doute planter un pépin, élever un arbre, le perfectionner par la greffe, et le tailler en cent manières; mais jamais il ne s’est figuré qu’il avait le pouvoir de faire un arbre” (92).

49. See, for example, Jean-Baptiste Louvet de Coudray, *Une année de la vie du Chevalier de Faublas* (1787), *Romanciers du XVIIIe siècle*, ed. René Etiemble, 2 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1960), 2:641.

50. Alexis de Tocqueville, *De la démocratie en Amérique* [1835–40], in *Oeuvres*, ed. André Jardin, 3 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1992), 1:308: “La législation anglaise est comme un arbre antique, sur lequel les légistes ont greffé sans cesse les rejetons les plus étrangers, dans l’espérance que, tout en donnant des fruits différents, ils confondront du moins leur feuillage avec la tige vénérable qui les supporte” (1:308).

51. Léon Gozlan, *Le notaire de Chantilly* [1836] (Geneva: Slatkine, 1973): “La discipline du soldat se lit dans l’éclat de ses boutons; la bonne renommée du fonctionnaire rural, dans la toilette de ses buis, dans la symétrie de ses plates-bandes. Le style est l’homme; l’horticulture, c’est le notaire” (1:232).

52. Gozlan, *Notaire*: “Dans leur naïve terreur, ils s’étonnent sans doute de ce que je laisse vivre mes fleurs et de ce que je ne décapite pas mes arbres” (1:113).

53. Gozlan, *Notaire*: “Vendéen, vous ne comprenez pas un républicain; le chouan ne devine pas le bleu? Caroline n’est pas ma fille: elle est mieux que cela; elle est ma conquête; la seule palme que j’aie arrachée dans mes sanglantes luttes avec les vôtres. C’est la dernière branche d’une race noble que j’ai coupée à un tronc qui n’en poussera plus, grâce à moi! Et tu viens, quand j’ai tué tous les aïeux de cette enfant, quand j’ai volé sa mère, à qui je l’ai volée, *tu viens, toi, avec tes châteaux, tes titres, ton nom, tes préjugés, mêler ta sève abondante et impure à cette sève pour la perpétuer; tu viens planter des nobles là où j’ai préparé le terrain pour la moisson plébéienne; tu viens greffer des comtes où j’attendais le rameau roturier qui, de ses larges feuilles, aurait ombragé ma vieillesse.* Et qui donc me payera? Les enfants que tu auras de Caroline? Mais ils me maudiraient pour avoir tué leurs aïeux. Je veux pour ma mort, monsieur, le repos que je n’ai pas eu pour ma vie” (2:60–61, my italics).

